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TRUST IN THE POLICE: ANALYSIS OF URBAN CITIES IN GHANA

Abstract

by Francis Danso Boateng, Ph.D.
Washington State University
May 2015

Chair: Otto Marenin

Given the deteriorated relationship between the police and the people of Ghana, this study examines the causes of trust in selected urban areas in Ghana. Specifically, the study aims to: (1) test the performance theory for its applicability and generalizability in Ghana; (2) examine individual and contextual variables likely to affect Ghanaians' trust in the police. Three theoretically based research questions and four theory-driven hypotheses developed around specific indicators of the performance theory guided this study. It was hypothesized that: (1) perception of police effectiveness will positively affect citizen's trust in the police; (2) fear of crime will have a negative effect on citizen's level of trust in the police; (3) perception of neighborhood disorder will have a negative effect on trust in the police; and (4) citizen’s experiences of police corruption will have a negative effect on their trust in the police.

Using representative data collected between March and June 2014 from selected urban areas/cities in five administrative regions of Ghana, the study observed three patterns attitudes toward the police in the Ghanaian socio-cultural context. The first
observable pattern was that, findings from the study support the general assumption that citizens’ trust and confidence in institutions increase as their perceptions of institutional performance increase. This assumption is derived from the performance theory. The second pattern that was observed from the results of the present study was that procedural justice theory can also be used to explain variations in Ghanaian’s trust.

Finally, using multilevel modeling technique, findings from the study revealed significant contribution of community/neighborhood-level characteristics in explaining variations in aggregate levels of trust in different neighborhoods. Specifically, community rate of disorder, community levels of income and education, as well as average fear of crime in the neighborhood exerted significant influence on the level of trust of people living in the area, controlling for their individual characteristics, such as ethnic background, perception of fairness, and exposure to the media. The findings have several implications for the Ghana Police, and by adopting a multidimensional approach, several recommendations were offered to improve and strengthen public relationship with the police.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments ........................................................................................................ iii

Abstract ........................................................................................................................ vii

Table of Contents .......................................................................................................... ix

List of Tables ................................................................................................................ xiii

List of Figures ............................................................................................................... xiv

## Chapter 1: Introduction ......................................................................................... 1

Introduction ................................................................................................................. 1

Current Study .............................................................................................................. 5

Conceptual Clarification ............................................................................................. 6

Chapter Overview ...................................................................................................... 8

## Chapter 2: Review of Theories of Trust in the Police .................................... 11

Introduction ............................................................................................................... 11

Performance Theory .................................................................................................. 11

Procedural Justice Theory ......................................................................................... 28

Social Capital Theory ................................................................................................. 49

Conflict Theory ........................................................................................................ 59

Media Effects on Trust in the Police .......................................................................... 67

Importance of Trust to Police Work ......................................................................... 68

Chapter Summary ................................................................................................... 70
Chapter 3: Country Description and Policing in Ghana ................................. 72

Introduction ........................................................................................................... 72

Ghana: A Brief Description ....................................................................................... 72

Regions Selected for Fieldwork ................................................................................. 79

Ashanti Region ........................................................................................................... 79
Greater Accra Region ............................................................................................... 81
Eastern Region .......................................................................................................... 82
Volta Region .............................................................................................................. 82
Central Region .......................................................................................................... 83

Policing in Ghana: Historical and Contemporary Assessments ............................... 84

Pre-Colonial Policing ............................................................................................... 84
Colonial Policing ....................................................................................................... 86
Post-Colonial Policing ............................................................................................... 89

Functions of Modern Police in Ghana - GPS .............................................................. 90
Organizational Structure of GPS .............................................................................. 90
Offenses Reported to GPS: 2000 - 2010 ................................................................. 94
Legal Framework of GPS ......................................................................................... 96
Relationship Between GPS and the Public .............................................................. 98
Explaining Ghanaians’ Trust: Reviews and Limitations ......................................... 102

Chapter Summary ................................................................................................. 105
Chapter 4: Methodology ................................................................. 106

Introduction .................................................................................. 106
Study Objectives and Research Questions ...................................... 106
Study Hypotheses ......................................................................... 107
Methods ........................................................................................ 111
Study Population and Participants ................................................ 111
Sampling Techniques and Procedures .......................................... 112
Measures ....................................................................................... 116
Dependent Variable: Trust in the Police ........................................ 116
Independent Variables .................................................................. 117
Perception of Police Effectiveness .................................................. 117
Fear of Crime ................................................................................ 118
Police Corruption ......................................................................... 118
Perceived Neighborhood Disorder ................................................. 120
Control Variables ......................................................................... 120
Analytical Strategy ........................................................................ 125
Factor Analysis and Reliability ....................................................... 126

Chapter 5: Analysis and Interpretation of Results ......................... 131

Introduction .................................................................................. 131
Section One .................................................................................... 132
Demographic Distribution of Study Respondents ....................... 132
Relationship: Predicting Variables vs. Trust in Police .................. 134
Factors Influencing Trust in the Ghana Police ................................. 138

Section Two .................................................................................. 142

Exploring Significant Differences among the 25 Neighborhoods .......... 143

Contextual Effects of Trust in the Ghana Police Service ..................... 146

Chapter 6: Discussion and Policy Recommendation ........................... 152

Introduction .................................................................................. 152

Discussion .................................................................................... 152

Understanding the Effects of the Neighborhood Variables ............... 162

Study Limitations ........................................................................ 165

Policy Recommendations ............................................................ 166

Chapter 7: Conclusion ................................................................... 172

Concluding Remarks .................................................................... 172

References .................................................................................... 175

Appendices

A: Survey Instruments .................................................................. 204

B: Population by Age, Region, and Sex ......................................... 219

C: Major Offences Reported to the Police: 2000 - 2010 .................. 225

D: Commonly Committed Offences Reported to the Police: 2000 – 2010 .... 226

E: Collinearity Analysis of Study Variables .................................. 227

F: Sample Distribution by Cities and Neighborhoods ................. 228
LIST OF TABLES

1  Reliability Test and Factor Loadings of Scaled Items  ........................................... 127
2  Descriptive Statistics of Participants in the Study .................................................. 133
3  Relationship among Study Variables ......................................................................... 136
4  Ordinary Least Squared Regression Analysis Estimating the Effects of Predictors on
   Trust in the Police ......................................................................................................... 139
5  Neighborhood-Level Variables in Aggregate Trust in the Police, Fear of Crime,
   Disorder, More than high school and Income ........................................................... 145
6  Hierarchical Linear Model Analysis of Trust in the GPS ........................................... 149
LIST OF FIGURES

1. The Map of Ghana
2. Organization Chart of the GPS
3. Trends in Ghanaians’ Trust in the Police
4. Proposed Model of Trust in the GPS
Dedication

For my mother and my father

For fiancée and all my siblings
“For in him you have been enriched in every way
– in all your speaking and in all your knowledge –“
…… I Corinthians 1:5 ……

“Anyone, then, who knows the good
he ought to do and doesn’t do it, sins.”
…… James 4:17 ……

“When you have police officers who abuse citizens, you
erode public confidence in law enforcement.
That makes the job of good police officers unsafe.”
…… Mary Frances Berry ….
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

This paper aims to explore and analyze the causes of trust and distrust in the police in selected urban areas in Ghana, and to test a major theoretical framework that has been applied to explain trusting relationship between the police and citizens. There have been numerous studies conducted on the factors that affect citizen's trust in the police (see Bradford, 2011; Flexon, Lurigio and Greenleaf, 2009; Hough, 2007; Lai and Zhao, 2010; MacDonald and Stokes, 2006; Rosenberger, 2011; Skogan, 2009).

Tyler (1990) related treatment of citizens to low and high trust, and argued that the way the police treat people in the neighborhoods determine how the people will evaluate the police. More specifically, Tyler suggests that fair and favorable treatment of individuals will result in favorable evaluation of the police, and unfavorable treatments will correspondingly lead to unfavorable evaluations. His line of argument assumes that police trustworthiness is tied to the quality of treatment people receive from officers on the street.

Other researchers have attempted to explain the causes of trust by appealing to factors relating to police performance. Dowler and Sparks (2008) believed that disorderly behaviors reduce confidence in the police because they are signals of police ineffectiveness. As Goldsmith (2005) noted, the competency of the police to control
crime in the community is necessary to build public trust, and the lack of it undermines trust. Public trust is a concept, which according to Govier (1997) "involves a sense of the other's competency" (cf. Goldsmith, 2005, p.14).

In a post-colonial society like Ghana where crime and fear of crime may be high, the competency of the police to curtail the occurrence of these incidents may play a major role in shaping their attitudes toward the police. Ghanaians' sense of the ability of the police to prevent crime and ensure personal security everywhere in their communities will inform their thinking that the police are trustworthy. Tankebe (2008a) argued that Ghanaians' perceptions of police effectiveness influenced their evaluation of police trustworthiness. Therefore, this suggests that the police must earn the public's trust through effective performance, and not simply through authoritative or fair treatment means.

An understanding of trust is important in every society, especially in post-colonial societies – for example, Ghana, Nigeria, and South Africa - where a deficit of trust may be high. Public trust, it has been argued, enhances police effectiveness and legitimizes police actions (Lea and Young, 1984; Lyons, 2002; National Research Council, 2004; Six, 2003 Sunshine and Tyler, 2003). Goldsmith (2003) contends that public trust is linked to the capacity of state police to provide basic citizen security. When the public views police as trustworthy they co-operate in ways that ensure effectiveness of performance. However, not every police institution is viewed as reliable. Some police institutions face acute trust problems, and that has led to their ineffectiveness. A deficit
of trust in the police is common in deeply divided, post-conflict and post-authoritarian societies (Weitzer, 1995; del Frate, 1998; Mishler and Rose, 1998).

Like all post-colonial societies, Ghana faces various developmental issues, and the chief among them is the inability to instigate workable mechanisms to control police actions in the country. This failure has resulted in persistent corruption, violence, and brutality unleashed on the citizenry (Atuguba, 2003; CHRI, 2007; Tankebe, 2008a). Police violence, as reported by two major international organizations, has been part of police routine during the colonial period and continues in the contemporary period. The abusive behavior of the police especially during interrogation and citizen encounters, according to the Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative report (2007) has marred the experience that citizens have with the police and the criminal justice system in general.

In 2007, the Commonwealth Human Rights reported that corruption, illegal arrest and detention, excessive use of force and a failure to respond to complaints are widespread practices among police officers in Ghana. These claims were later supported by another human rights report initiated by the US Department of States in 2010. The report echoed that police brutality, corruption, negligence, and impunity were problems facing the police. These human rights reports have unmasked the dark side of the Ghana police which has daunted their relationship with the public.

Moreover, there are several media accounts of police misconduct which substantiate the claims by the human rights reports. For example, it was reported by one of the major local media outlets in Ghana that "when cases are reported at police
stations, it often becomes an opportunity to collect bribes. They create the impression that they cannot help much; sometimes advising victims to go home and let sleeping dogs lie. But immediately some few thousand cedis change hands; they come alive with enthusiasm to attend to the work for which they are paid with taxpayers' money." (The Chronicle newspaper, Thursday, July, 2006; cf. CHRI, 2007). This kind of behaviors perpetrated by members of the Ghana police service explain why Atuguba (2003) proclaimed that the relationship between the police and the public is marked by suspicion, hatred, discontent and distrust. Given the strained relationship between the police and the people of Ghana, it is no doubt that an understanding of trust in the Ghana police deserves some attention.

Despite the much needed attention, the current literature on policing in Ghana has focused on discussing the historical development of policing without much efforts being made to empirically examining police-citizen's relationship. Few exceptions need to be acknowledged (e.g. see Boateng, 2012; Boateng, Makin, and Yoo, 2014; Tankebe, 2008b; 2010). These few studies further suggest the need for more empirical research probing into public attitudes toward the Ghana police, with the idea of furthering knowledge on how favorable attitudes can be promoted. It is against this background that the present study seeks to examine the causes of trust in selected urban areas in Ghana. Specifically, the study aims to: (1) test the performance theory for its applicability and generalizeability in Ghana; (2) examine individual and contextual variables likely to influence Ghanaians' trust in the police.
Current Study

The main purpose of the present study is to examine the causes of trust in the Ghana police by testing performance theory and examining individual and contextual factors influencing trust in the police. In addition to testing performance theory, this study examines variables from other major theories of trust to offer further theoretical explanations to the causes of trust in the Ghana police. These other theories included procedural-justice theory, conflict theory, and social capital theory. A major issue about these theories is that they were developed and tested with "the people in mind" or "the majority in mind" (Van Craen, 2012). That is, these theories have primarily been tested in the developed nations, with no such effort in the developing nations. Despite this, findings obtained are used as the basis of making argument about public attitudes toward the police everywhere.

For such argument to be valid, we need to determine whether these theoretical assumptions provide relevant explanations to the variation in citizens' attitudes toward the police in a non-western context. This dissertation tests the assumptions of the performance theory and to some extent the three other theories to ascertain whether such assumptions will provide a meaningful explanation to why Ghanaians trust or distrust the police.

Therefore, the significant contribution of this research is three-fold: First, it will contribute to knowledge about public attitudes toward police institutions, particularly in non-western societies. Second, it will offer a holistic perspective on the factors
influencing Ghanaians' trust in their police, and will initiate the first attempt to develop an integrated model for explaining citizens' trust in the police. Third, this dissertation will question whether theories developed and tested in the western world also hold true in the non-western world by using Ghana as a case study.

Conceptual Clarification

To carry out this study's empirical agenda, certain concepts need to be clarified and defined, to inform the reader, provide conceptual consistency throughout the study, as well as ensure measurement reliability during the data collection effort. As noted in the introduction, trust in the police has been variously conceptualized. For an institution such as the police to be trustworthy they must be seen by the public to be effective, to be fair, and to have shared values, interests, and a strong commitment to the community they purport to serve (Jackson and Bradford, 2009, 2010; Jackson and Sunshine, 2007; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Tyler and Huo, 2002). In defining trust in the police, this study adopts a grounded definition provided by Devos et al. (2002), because their definition of trust encompasses several factors that research suggests influence citizens' trust in their local police. To restate,

"If someone trusts an institution, it implies that he or she believes that this collective entity, on the whole, is competent, fulfills its obligations, and acts in responsible ways. Trusting an institution entails having confidence that the institution is reliable, observes rules and regulations, works well, and serves the general interest. Thus, the notion of trust goes beyond whether individuals have a positive or negative attitude toward an institution or whether they approve or disapprove of it. Trust refers to a set of beliefs or expectations rather than to a purely affective reaction” (Devos et al., 2002:484).
Fear of crime, like trust in the police, is facing conceptual issues. Studies have not only disagreed on a single definition but have debated on what the concept constitutes (Hale, 1996). For instance, most researchers have conceptualized fear of crime as one generalized construct using a single-item measure of fear. However, this approach of conceptualizing fear of crime has been seriously criticized by some researchers as inadequate, and who have argued that fear of crime is not a monolithic construct (Moore and Shepard, 2007). These researchers believe that the conceptualization of fear of crime must capture all the dimensions of fear of crime, hence are advocating for a multiple-item measure of the concept. Further, other researchers also believe that fear of crime is only one indicator of the larger construct, threat of victimization (Rader, 2004). In spite of this academic misunderstanding, and for the purpose of clarity, this study generally defines fear of crime as fear of becoming a victim of crime (see Reynolds et al., 2008). This definition captures the elements of both general- and specific fear of crime.

Contact with the police is defined in this study as the personal experiences individual citizens have had with the police, as well as vicariously derived knowledge about the police. This may include serving as a witness for the police, demanding service from the police, reporting a crime at the police station, being interrogated as part of a police investigation, traffic stops and control, as well as experiences during demonstrations. Recognizing the fact that some individuals may form their opinions about the police based on the experiences of others - a family member, friend,
neighbor (Weitzer and Tuch, 2005) - this study also conceptualizes contact with the police as a vicarious contact or experience to accommodate and distinguish the views of such individuals from those who have had personal contacts.

Finally, in this study, police corruption is defined as the use of official position by an officer for personal gains (Ivkovic, 2005). Practices that may be considered as police corruption in Ghana include failure to arrest, investigate or prosecute because of family or friendship ties to colleagues in the force, and to take bribes from suspects and motor vehicle offenders (Tankebe, 2010). Similar to the conceptualization of contact with the police, police corruption in this study is conceptualized as individuals actually experiencing police corruption and those who have indirectly experienced police corruption (vicarious experience with police corruption).

Chapter Overview

Guided by the study propositions above, Chapter Two outlines the extant literature on the theoretical perspectives of trust in the police. Key theories that have been developed to explain citizens’ trust in the police are discussed. Specifically, the performance model, procedural justice model, the conflict model, and the social capital model are explored in this chapter. In addition, the chapter reviews existing literature to determine factors that have predictive influence on citizens’ trust in the police.

Chapter Three offers a detailed description of the country and the regions where this study was conducted. The chapter also discusses policing in Ghana, from both
historical and contemporary perspectives, as well as draws a link between the public and the police in Ghana. The chapter finally concludes by summarizing the main points discussed.

Chapter Four presents a detailed explanation of the research methodology and design of this study. The research design takes a five-level-multi-stage approach to achieving the study's purposes. This approach involves first, selection of the regions, second, selection of cities in the regions, third, selection of residential areas within the cities, fourth, selection of households with the residential areas, and fifth, selection of individuals within each household. Discussion of the research question, hypotheses, participants, study design, data collection procedures, and operationalization of measures were included in this chapter.

Analysis and results of the data collected in the study are presented in Chapter Five. Following the discussion of the factor analysis, a detailed description of the sample used in this study will be provided. A factor analysis is a data reduction technique used "to reduce a data set to a more manageable size while retaining as much of the original information as possible" (Field, 2009:628). This chapter also provides detailed bivariate and multivariate analyses, and discusses the actual results from the study.

Chapter Six discusses the findings of the study and how the findings relate to the hypotheses laid out in the methodology chapter. The extent to which findings support particular theory discussed in chapter two will also be discussed in this chapter. This
chapter also discusses the strength and limitations of the study, implications for policy, and direction for future research.

Finally, the chapter seven offers concluding remarks about the key findings obtained.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THEORIES OF TRUST IN THE POLICE

Introduction

Several theories have been applied to explain variations in citizens' trust in the police. This chapter discusses the extant literature on the theoretical perspectives of trust in the police. Though four theories are discussed, the primary theoretical focus in this study is performance theory, which has been widely used to explain why citizens may dis/trust their local police. Purposively, four performance indicators - fear of crime, neighborhood disorder, police effectiveness and police corruption - are examined, in addition to other variables, for their contributions to the causes of trust and distrust in the Ghana police. The remaining three theories - procedural justice, the social capital, and the conflict - with their related variables are used to offer further explanations to the variation in Ghanaians' trust in the police.

Performance Theory

Performance theory has been used extensively by police scholars to explain the causes of trust and distrust in police institutions. Generally, Performance Theory relates trust and distrust, respectively, to good and bad performance of government institutions (Bouckaert, Van de Walle, Maddens, and Kampen, 2002; Brown and Coulter, 1983; Espinal, Hartlyn, and Kelly, 2006; Lipset and Schneider, 1983).
The theory suggests that citizens will trust government institutions that perform well or effectively and will distrust institutions that perform badly. Performance Theory, therefore, assumes that the public recognizes whether government institutions are performing well or poorly and react accordingly. Hence, the theory suggests a relationship between trust in institutions and institutional performance.

According to theorists, performance theory can either be micro-performance theory or macro-performance theory. Micro-performance theory is concerned with the actual performance of institutions. As argued by scholars, this type of performance theory linked variations in levels of trust in the institution to differences in the actual provision of services by the institution (Bouckaert et al., 2002; Maarten Van Crean, 2012). This implies that, citizens, for instance, will trust the police less if actual services provided by the police (such as responding to emergency calls and assisting citizens in the neighborhood) fall short of citizens' expectations. Contrarily, if citizens’ expectations are met by the services provided by the police, they will trust the police more.

Bouckaert and colleagues (2001, 2002) identified several key indicators for judging micro-performance of any institution. These indicators include quality of service, existence of a particular service, and the level of service. The authors suggested that service institutions can mold the perceptions of their clients by gaining adequate knowledge about what the clients consider as important and normal, and act accordingly. For instance, if citizens are concerned about quality of service, the lack of it will lead to a negative evaluation and the presence of it will lead to a positive
evaluation. Furthermore, if citizens consider quality of service to be normal, then providing service at the highest quality will have no influence on citizens' evaluation. Moreover, at the micro level, an institution such as the police, can be judged to perform well when citizens consider that institution (the police) to be responsive to - and competent in addressing individual crime problems (see Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry, 1990). In addition, an institution's level of reliability and credibility is an indication of micro-performance (Zeithaml et al. 1990). However, other micro-performance scholars believed that level of bureaucracy present in an institution influences the public's judgments about that institution. For instance, Serra (1995) noted that individuals' opinions about governmental agencies are much worse when people are asked about bureaucracy than asking about specific performance of an institution.

Macro-performance theory states that differences in citizens' trust in institutions arise from differences in the range of social phenomena for which responsibility is attributed to the institutions (Maarten Van Crean, 2012). Indicators for judging macro-performance of an institution include host of criteria such as unemployment rates, poverty rates, economic growth, quality of life, and years of democracy in the country (Bouckaert et al., 2001, 2002; Lane and Ersson, 1994). In policing, the police can be judged at the macro-level by considering crime rates, insecurity, levels of fear of crime and neighborhood disorder.
At this point, it is obvious that irrespective of the specific type of performance theory one may ascribe to, the theory assumes a relationship between trust and performance. However, scholars of this theory have emphasized that in order to determine this relationship, two criteria must be met. First, researchers must know what citizens regard as institutional tasks (Borre, 2000; Rothstein, 2001). Knowing this will help them to be informed about how citizens will evaluate the institution. It has been assumed that citizens, who hold an institution accountable for performing a particular task, tend to develop a negative attitude towards that institution if the task is poorly performed (Glaser and Denhardt, 1997; Uslaner, 1999). For instance, if citizens believe that the police have the ultimate duty to reduce and or prevent crime, disorder and insecurity, as well as ensuring quality of life of citizens; poor performance would eventually lead to a decline in confidence (Jesilow, Meryer, and Namazzi, 1995; Maxson, Hennigan, and Sloane, 2003; Weitzer, Tuch, and Skogan, 2008; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002). Other scholars have also concluded that citizens attribute high crime rates and high fear of crime to poor police performance (Blumstein and Wallman, 2000; Sampson, Randenbush, and Earls, 1997). Accordingly, these researchers have directly or indirectly assumed an inverse relationship between citizens' attitudes toward the police and the performance of the police which is linked to quality of service provided, crime rates, fear of crime, insecurity and disorder, and general ineffectiveness. In explaining the relationship between police performance and trust, Wilson and Kelling's (1982) Broken Windows thesis has often been applied.
This perspective, as a component of the performance theory, posits a complex relationship between crime, disorder, the community, and social cohesion which include trust and confidence in the community as well as in the police. Scholars argue that if incivilities and disorderly behavior in the community are unchecked, they will lead to small violations and disorders ultimately to urban decay, and subsequently to serious crime (Skogan, 1990; Wilson and Kelling, 1982). Skogan (1990) discussed the cycle of decline to demonstrate the effect of unchecked disorderly behavior on the community which include weakening of informal social control system. Similarly, Wilson and Kelling (1982) argued that if disorderly behavior is unchecked, members of the neighborhood become fearful and accordingly lose trust and confidence in the police for failing to prevent or stop disorders. Responding to neighborhood disorder is one way of preventing crime, reducing feelings of insecurity, and subsequently improving public attitudes toward the police (Wilson and Kelling, 1982).

Furthermore, corruption almost by definition indicates poor performance of police institutions. Police institutions that are highly corrupt are perceived to perform poorly due to the unfair provision of services to individuals. Officers may take a bribe before performing crucial duties such as assisting crime victims, apprehending and prosecuting of criminal suspects. Bribe taken prevents officers from following the law, undermines officers’ sense of morality as well as police trustworthiness. As Goldsmith (2005) noted, police corruption undercuts citizen assessments of the motives why individuals enter the police service.
The second condition that must be met in order to determine the relationship between performance and trust is that performance perceptions do not always correspond to reality (see Allport, 1958; Bok, 1997; Loveless, 1997). The relationship between trust and performance does not only depend on actual performance but, also, on perceptions of performance (Boukaert et al., 2002). Boukaert, Van de Walle, Maddens, and Kampen (2002) note that, "to determine whether there is a relationship between performance and trust, it is important to know how citizens perceive performance" (Bouckaert, et al., 2002:49). They further note that citizen's perceptions of institutional performance are as real to people as the actual performance of an institution. This implies that in determining citizens' attitudes toward the police perceptions are as important as reality.

Police researchers have examined the effects of several performance indicators on citizen's attitudes toward the police, even though some of these indicators have received minimal attention. As an indicator of police performance, public perceptions of police effectiveness measure how well the police perform their duties. These may include perceptions about how the police control crime, maintain order, and provide services to citizens. With regards to citizens' evaluations of the police, perception of police effectiveness is as important a factor as actual police effectiveness. As Goldsmith (2005) noted "actual incompetence is not necessary to undermine trust" (pg. 14). Instead, believing that the police are ineffective or performing poorly is a necessary condition for citizens' negative ratings of the police.
Despite the trust-eroding potential of public perception of police effectiveness, very few empirical studies have directly examined the link between the two variables. Most of the studies have either found modest or no influence of perceptions of effectiveness on citizens' trust and confidence in the police. For instance, in a survey of 1,653 New Yorkers, Tyler (2005) observed that perceptions of police fairness is more influential in shaping trust in the police than are either judgments about police effectiveness in controlling crime or fairness in the distribution of police services. He however advised that for the police to maintain trust they must adhere to procedural standards of exercising their authorities.

Notwithstanding Tyler's (2005) conclusions, studies conducted in the latter part of the decade have shown otherwise. Using an Australian sample of 2,611 residents, Hinds and Murphy (2007) argued that police performance had the same effect on police legitimacy as procedural justice. This suggests that citizens' acceptance of the police as being legitimate will largely depend on citizens' evaluations of the police as both effective and as procedurally fair. Similarly, Tankebe (2008) also observed a positive influence of perceptions of effectiveness on trustworthiness of the police. However, he noted that the effect of citizen’s perception of effectiveness will be stronger if the citizen also believes that the police are procedurally fair. Therefore, suggesting that, police effectiveness in controlling crime alone, without the police being fair in the exercise of their authority will weakly impact on individual’s overall trust.
Findings from a recent study conducted to examine police perceptions of their legitimacy in the eyes of the public confirm the effectiveness argument made by studies that utilized community surveys to assess police legitimacy. Jonathan-Zamir and Harpaz (2014) examined factors that Israeli Police Officers believed might influence their external legitimacy using a sample of commanding officers from the Israel National Police. The authors found that instrumental judgment citizens make about the police (from the police perspective) was the strongest predictor of police legitimacy in Israel. Thus, Israeli police officers believed that their performance in controlling crime in the communities determines their legitimacy more than procedural fairness in the eyes of the public.

Police corruption is another indicator that has been examined research to determine its trust-eroding effect. The concept police corruption has been variously defined and each of these definitions denote one, if not all the three elements proposed by Baker and Carter (1986) to embed in corrupt behaviors of officials. These elements include: (1) They are forbidden by some law, rule, regulation, or ethical standard; (2) they involve the misuse of the officer's position; and (3) they involve some actual or expected material reward or gain. Lynch (1989) believed that any act that put an officer's personal gain ahead of duty violates police procedures and or criminal law, constitute police corruption. A more precise definition which encompasses the nuances of police behavior deemed to be corrupt has been offered by Ivkovic (2005). According to her, police corruption is the use of official position by an officer for personal gains.
This definition brings into the fabric of police corrupt behaviors involving bribery and extortion.

Several studies have generally examined the effect of corruption on institutional trust (Chang and Chu, 2006; Hakhverdian and Mayne, 2012; Kim, 2005; Kim and Voorhees, 2011), and have broadly concluded that corruption reduces institutional trust. However, in policing context, the effect of police corruption on citizens' trust in the police has barely been studied. This is one area of police research which needs much attention. Due to the lack of research in this area, scholars mostly assume that excessive police corruption will erode public trust and confidence in the police. This assumption has in part been empirically justified by the few studies that observed a negative effect of police corruption on citizens' ratings of the police. For example, Silva Forne' (2009) found that bribery solicitation negatively affected respondents' satisfaction with the police.

Similarly, Sabet (2012) examining the factors that contributed to citizens' dissatisfaction with the Mexico police, observed that corruption among police officers was a major contributor to citizens' dissatisfaction. More specifically, the author found that direct experience with bribery was a major source of citizens' dissatisfaction with the police. Individuals, who have directly experienced police corruption in the form of bribe extortion, expressed higher dissatisfaction with the police. Contrary to Sabet's (2012) finding, Tankebe (2010) observed a non-significant relationship between direct experience with police corruption and citizens' ratings of the police as trustworthy.
However, he observed that, individuals who have vicariously experienced police corruption through listening to stories about individuals who have directly experienced police corruption considered the police as less trustworthy. The results of these studies demonstrate two forms of experience with police corruption. One is direct experience which involves individuals personally encountering police corruption and another form been vicarious or indirect experience involving knowledge about individuals' personal experiences with police corruption. The studies have shown that both forms of experience negatively influence citizens' evaluations of the police. Since more research is still needed to offer an in-depth understanding of the effect of police corruption on citizens' attitudes toward the police, the present study helps to fill in the gap by testing this variable in the African context.

Research on public attitudes toward the police has further shown that corrupt acts perpetrated by officials in other government institutions do affect public trust in the police in a negative way (Boateng, 2012; Kaariainen, 2007). These authors have demonstrated that perception of corruption in other government institutions, not necessary in the police; reduce citizens' trust in the police. A plausible explanation to this observation would be that, people consider the police not to operate in a vacuum, instead, operate in an institutional setting where its behaviors affect and are affected by other institutions such as the courts, government, and the correction.

Moreover, previous studies have explored the impacts of fear of crime, victimization, crime rates and neighborhood disorder on evaluations of the police
because researchers believe that the presence of any of these conditions signals poor performance of the police. Several studies have been conducted to extend our knowledge on fear of crime in the community (Doran & Lee, 2005; Moore & Shepherd, 2007; Rader, 2004; Renauer, 2007; Sutton & Farrell, 2005; Vilatta, 2012). Most of these studies have focused on various aspects of fear of crime, such as factors that influence levels of fear of crime, mechanisms for reducing fear of crime, and operationalization and conceptualization of fear of crime. However, despite the abundant studies on fear of crime, far more limited attention has been given to the influence of fear of crime on public perceptions of the police. Studies that have concentrated on this area of policing research have been largely inconsistent in their findings.

Some studies have demonstrated that fear of crime has negative relationship with attitudes toward the police (Cao, Frank, & Cullen, 1996; Cao, Stack, & Sun, 1998; Kaariainen, 2008; Reisig & Giacomazzi, 1998; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Reynolds, Semukhina, & Demidov, 2008; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998; Zhao, Scheiden & Thurman, 2002; Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). These studies have collectively demonstrated that fear of crime in the neighborhood inversely predict individuals' attitudes toward the police. The more people become fearful of crime in their neighborhoods, the less they become confident in the police, hence rating the police very low. Prior studies have argued that a decline in fear of crime will ultimately lead to an increase in confidence in the police (Zhao et al., 2002).
Furthermore, research on fear of crime and attitudes toward the police has shown that citizens' fear of crime and recent victimization have a greater influence on confidence in the police than do demographic variables (Cao et al. 1996). Similarly, Reynolds et al. (2008) analyzed raw longitudinal data collected annually from 1998 to 2005 to examine the influence of fear of crime on trust in criminal justice institutions. Using a structural equation modeling, the authors found that an increase in the level of fear of crime results in a decrease in the variance of trust in the criminal justice system. This further suggests that respondents who scored high on fear of crime index, reported low criminal justice trust. This result is consistent with the findings observed by Kaariainen (2008). Kaariainen (2008) observed an inverse relationship between insecurity and trust in the police, suggesting that feeling of insecurity in one's neighborhood lowers the level of trust the person has in the police.

Research on fear of crime has discussed two basic components of fear of crime - generalized fear of crime and specific fear of crime (Clement & Kleiman, 1976; Ferraro & LeGrange, 1987; Hale, 1996). Generalized fear denotes the fear that individuals have in general about their safety in the community, and is normally measured by a single item asking respondents how worried they are about walking alone at night. Contrary, specific fear of crime denotes the fear of becoming a victim of specific types of crimes. Police researchers examining the influence of fear of crime on public attitudes toward the police, have made attempt to investigate the specific impact of these two components and have obtained remarkable results. For example, Kautt (2011), by
examining the factors that influence citizens’ attitudes toward the police, included two distinct measures of fear of crime. The first measure of fear of crime was a composite scale which comprised five questions asking respondents how worried they were about becoming victims of crimes such as robbery, home break-ins, and sexual assaults. The second measure of fear of crime used a single item, asking respondents how safe they feel when walking alone after dark. These two measures of fear of crime respectively denote specific fear and generalized fear. The author found that respondents who had higher scores on the fear of specific crime index rated the police excellent while those who were worried about walking alone after dark were less confident in the police. These findings imply that, being afraid to be robbed, raped or sexually assaulted, project to higher confidence in the police, because such individuals consider the police to be their protector. This argument is in line with Block’s (1970) argument that, people who were fearful of crime gave the police extensive authority to stop and question suspected individuals. However, being generally afraid is linked to inability of the police to protect individuals, hence results in lower confidence in the police. Kautt (2011) has demonstrated that the effect of fear of crime on perceptions of the police largely depend on whether the fear is specific or general.

In contradiction to studies that have observed effects for the influence of fear of crime on public attitudes toward the police, some researchers claimed that fear of crime is unrelated to attitudes toward the police (Zevitz & Rettammel, 1990). These authors argued that, irrespective of how fearful a person will be, the attitudes of that person
toward the police will not be affected. This is surprising considering the number of studies that have observed significant effects of fear of crime on citizens' attitudes toward the police.

A plausible justification for why people who are fearful of crime in their neighborhoods tend to have negative attitudes toward the police can be seen in the ineffectiveness of the police to promote a high degree of community safety. As mentioned in chapter 2, scholars have linked high crime rates and high fear of crime to poor police performance (Blumstein and Wallman, 2000; Sampson, Randenbush, and Earls, 1997). Hawdon, Ryan, and Griffin (2003) have argued that citizens who expressed more fear of crime were significantly less likely to rate the police as effective at controlling crime. Their argument augments the assumption that fear of crime will correspond to low confidence in the people because of the police ineffectiveness to ensure safety in the community.

Furthermore, one can also argue that the inconsistencies among prior studies with regard to the effect of fear of crime on perceptions of the police are due to measurement and operationalization issues. Though most of the studies measured fear of crime by using several items, they did not take into consideration the separate effects of specific fear and generalized fear. Studies like Kautt's (2011) which considered the separate effects of the two basic types of fear of crime, measured generalized fear of crime using a single item. Fear of crime researchers have however argued that, such a measure is insufficient in capturing individuals' general fear of crime.
This study addresses these limitations by using a scale of five items to measure fear of crime on citizens' attitudes toward the police.

In addition to fear of crime, studies have demonstrated that victimization significantly influence public attitudes toward the police. Previous studies have observed that victimization reduces confidence in the police (Merry et al., 2012; Ren et al., 2005). Ren et al. found that respondents who reported been victimized within the last twelve months prior to the study reported lower confidence in the police. The negative effect of victimization may probably be due to the reason that the police failed to protect those who had been victimized, as a result view the police as not capable of protecting them against crime. Crime victimization has also been found to cause low reporting rate among sexually assaulted women (Boateng and Lee, 2014). Boateng and Lee (2014) observed that, less than 30% of women who had been sexually assaulted were willing to report future victimization to the police compared to almost 90% of those who had not been assaulted in the past. An explanation to this pattern of behavior is due to the poor treatment meted on previously victimized individuals by the police which served as a secondary victimization to them, hence, eroding the victims' confidence in the police.

Finally, Studies examining the effects of performance variables on citizens' perceptions of the police have considered the importance of crime rates in influencing perceptions (Blumstein & Wallman, 2000; Hennigan, Maxson, Sloane & Ranney, 2002; Jesilow, Meyer & Namazzi, 1995; Maxson, Hennigan & Sloane, 2003; Reisig & Parks,
2000; Sampson, Raudenbush & Earls, 1997). These studies have consistently found negative relationship between high crime rates and attitudes toward the police. Maxson et al. (2003) examined factors that influenced public opinion of the police in four geographic areas of Los Angeles. They found that people's perception of crime levels significantly influence their opinion of the police. It is imperative to note that this study suffered from the lack of external validity because the four areas selected were not representative of the entire city of Los Angeles. Despite this limitation, the study observed a salient factor that seriously predicts individuals' attitudes toward the police. Their result is consistent with previous studies that argued that people living in communities considered to be crime ridden and dangerous were less likely to approve of the police (Hennigan et al., 2002). In contrast, Ackerman and colleagues (2001) observed that, though crime rates are high, Americans seemed to have high confidence in the police and approved increasing funding for law enforcement agencies across the nation.

Neighborhood disorder has been found to reduce confidence in the police (Cao et al., 1996, Covington & Tyler, 1991; Dowler & Sparks, 2008; Dowler, 2002; Maxson et al., 2003; Sprott & Dood, 2009). Sprott and Dood (2009) compared the influence of perception of disorder on citizens' attitudes toward the police and the court. They found that perception of disorder has a greater influence on citizens' attitudes toward the police than toward the court. This means that if people consider disorder to be high in the community, they tend to have more negative attitudes toward the police than
toward the court. Crime and disorder prevention are considered to be the work of the police and not the court. Maxson and colleagues (2003) further observed that, those residents who perceived disorder in their neighborhoods expressed less approval of the police and the way the police do their work. Consistent with this finding is the observation that individual’s perception of quality of life in the neighborhoods greatly influences their perception of the police (Dowler & Sparks, 2008). The authors further noted that this impact is greater than the impact of race on citizens' attitudes toward the police. This suggests that, people formulate their attitudes about the police based on the level of quality of life in the community. Quality of life is affected by the level of disorder in the neighborhood (Skogan, 1990; Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Neighborhood disorder can cause serious crime if unchecked (Wilson & Kelling, 1982) as well as urban decline (Skogan, 1990). Further, these scholars have argued that if disorderly behavior is unchecked members of the neighborhood become fearful, and accordingly loose trust and confidence in the police for failing to prevent or stop disorder. Therefore, responding to neighborhood disorder is one way of preventing crime, reducing feelings of insecurity, and subsequently improving public attitudes toward the police.

Performance theory makes specific assumptions about how trusting relationships develop between citizens and authority figures, and most of these assumptions have been widely tested with data mainly collected from the developed nations. The theory has received scant attention in the developing nations hinders our ability to achieve a global acceptance of the validity of the theory in explaining citizens' trust in the police.
In filling the gap, the present study examines the influence of performance variables in the Ghanaian context, and argues that citizens' trust in the Ghanaian police is tied to their perceptions of police effectiveness, fear of crime, neighborhood disorder and police corruption.

**Procedural Justice Theory**

As one of the major theoretical orientations for explaining citizens' trust in institutions such as the police, and developing from the social justice theory (Tyler and Blader, 2000; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith and Huo, 1997; Tyler and Smith, 1997), procedural justice theory argues that people evaluate the police through the manner in which the police treat citizens (Tyler, 1990, 2000; Tyler and Darley, 2000; Tyler and Huo, 2002). Procedural justice theory suggests that the key issue to shaping trust is an assessment of the decision making fairness and interpersonal respect with which the police exercise their authority (Tyler, 2005).

The early form of procedural justice theory concentrated on the level and type of control individuals exercised during interactions with legal authorities (Reisig and Lloyd, 2009). In analyzing decision-making in judicial settings, Thibaut and Walker (1975) were the first to highlight two distinct elements of decision-making that affect individuals' satisfaction with an institution or authority figure. First are the processes or procedures used by the authority to make decisions as well as the outcomes of the decision-making (Reisig and Lloyd, 2009). As the fore-runners of procedural justice
theory, Thibaut and Walker (1975) coined the term procedural justice to refer to people's perceptions of the treatment they receive during the processes involved in decision-making.

A considerable number of studies have found that an authority's legitimacy is linked to people's satisfaction with the procedural justice aspect of the encounter they have with authority (Cheurprakobkit and Bartsch, 2001; Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, and Tyler, 2013; Mazerolle, Bennett, Antrobus, and Eggins, 2012; Murphy, 2005; Tyler and Lind, 1992, 2001). When people are treated fairly, they tend to be more satisfied with authorities than when they are not treated fairly. According to equity researchers, fair treatment is as major a concern to people as is the outcome in an encounter (see Messick, Bloom, Boldizer, and Samuelson, 1985; Mikula, Petri and Tanzer, 1990).

For instance, Mikula et al. (1990) found that a considerable proportion of the participants in their study refer to the manner in which people are treated in encounter. This suggests that outcomes of citizens' encounter with authorities have little or no impact on individuals' evaluation of the legitimacy of an authority system (Tyler, 1990b). Instead, perceptions of the legitimacy of authority are influenced by justice-based judgments, which according to Tyler (1990a), are the fairness of procedures used. In sum, public compliance and cooperation with legal authorities are influenced by the public's subjective judgments about the fairness of procedures through which institutions such as the police and the courts exercise their authority (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2003; 2005; 2006; Tyler and Huo, 2002).
Research focusing on procedural justice has found several factors influencing individuals' subjective judgments about the fairness of how they were treated (Leventhal, 1980; Lissak and Sheppard, 1983; Sheppard and Lewicki, 1987; Tyler, 1988, 2000). Leventhal (1980) argues that bias suppression, consistency, accuracy, and other factors not directly related to process control influence fairness judgments. Accordingly, he contends that the weight that people place on each of these factors varies from situation to situation. Similarly, according to Tyler (2000), there are four primary factors influencing individuals' judgments about their fairness. These four factors are opportunities for participation, the neutrality of the forum, the trustworthiness of the authority, and the degree to which people receive treatment with dignity and respect.

According to Tyler (2000), people feel more fairly treated if they are allowed to participate in the resolution of their problems or conflict, though they may not have the right to determine the outcome of the decision-making process. Studies testing this assumption have found positive effects of citizens' participation in the decision-making process in various institutional settings, including plea bargaining (Houlden, 1980), sentencing hearings (Heinz and Kerstetter, 1979), and mediation (Kitzmann and Emery, 1993; Shapiro and Brett, 1993). These and other studies have shown that when people are offered the chance to participate in the process and communicate their views about situations to the legal authorities, they are more likely to consider the procedure as
satisfying, and perceive to have been treated fairly (see Coupe and Griffiths, 1999; Fitzgerald, Hough, Joseph and Guershi, 2002; Paternoster et al, 1997).

With regards to neutrality, Tyler (2000) argued that "people are influenced by judgments about the honesty, impartiality, and objectivity of the authorities with whom they are dealing" (pg. 6). According to him, people believe that decision-makers should desist from the habit of infiltrating their personal values and biases into their decisions. Instead, decisions should be made based upon rules and facts. "Basically, people seek a level playing field where no one is unfairly disadvantaged" (pg. 6). This suggests that individuals, who think that authorities are employing impartial rules and making factual, objective decisions, tend to believe that procedures are fairer.

Trustworthiness of authorities and treatment with dignity and respect are two other factors that Tyler believes shape people’s views about procedural fairness. In terms of trustworthiness of authorities, Tyler (2000) noted that it is linked to people's assessment of the motives of the third-party authority in-charge of resolving cases. "People recognize that third parties typically have considerable discretion to implement formal procedures in varying ways, and they are concerned about the motivation underlying the decisions made by the authority with which they are dealing" (Tyler 2000: 6). He further added that citizens evaluate whether an authorities are benevolent and caring, are interested in their predicaments as well as care about their individual needs. Individuals, who judge authorities favorably on all these elements, tend to think that authorities are trustworthy.
Finally, during interaction with authorities, individuals are much concerned about their dignity and want that to be recognized and acknowledged. According to procedural justice studies, people place equal amount of weight on the respect they receive during encounter with authorities as well as the outcome of such encounter (Tyler, 2000). Treatment with dignity and respect is therefore an important consideration of people's assessment of the fairness of procedures used by authorities.

Since its development, procedural justice theory has been extensively used in policing studies (Gau, Corsaro, Stewart and Brunson, 2012; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 2006; Tyler and Wakslak, 2004). Gau et al. (2012) argued that the theory's implication for policing, as it relates to police policy, police-community relations and crime reduction, are remarkable. Though Tyler (2000) has discussed four elements of procedural fairness, recent studies in procedural justice have broadly conceptualized the field as consisting of two related components. These two categorizations were made around Tom Tyler's four elements. The first, quality of treatment, encapsulate issues of neutrality and assessment by the public that decisions are based on objective indicators rather than on personal views. This implies that police officers must treat citizens with dignity and respect. Second, quality of decision making requires police decisions to be fair and just (Reisig et al. 2007; Tyler and Fagan, 2006). Police officers symbolize mainstream society (Gau et al. 2012) and are also representatives of the rule of law. As a matter of fact, their behavior is of great concern to the public. Edward (1999) remarked that citizens are more concerned about the way in which the police behave
than about the behavior of other professionals because of the enormous powers police officers wield. To maintain their symbolic status in the society, the police are expected to conduct themselves professionally.

Procedural justice has been found to be integral part of police work (Hough et al., 2010; Reisig and Chandek, 2001; Tyler, 1990, 2003, 2006; Tyler and Folger, 1980). These studies collectively argued that, without the police treating citizens fairly and justly, citizens' voluntary cooperation and compliance will be very difficult to achieve. By extension, this will also affects police performance in controlling crime. Tyler (2003) has argued that procedural justice judgments are major determinants of whether citizens will cooperate with the police to control crime. As noted earlier, citizens evaluate the police based on the fairness of the procedures they use during interactions as well as the fairness of the decisions the police make. Therefore, to achieve favorable evaluation from the citizens the police must, according to Tyler (2004), treat everyone in a similar manner irrespective of race, gender or socioeconomic status.

One important outcome of procedural justice, which has received substantial academic attention, is police legitimacy (Gau et al. 2012; Reisig et al. 2009; Tyler, 2006; Tankebe, 2008). By definition, legitimacy is the "belief that authorities, institutions, and social arrangements are appropriate, proper, and just" (Tyler, 2006, pp.376). Police legitimacy, the belief that the police have the authority to mold behavior in accordance to the rule of law, is influenced by people's views about the way the police treat them (Hinds and Murphy, 2007). Based on this argument, people will view
the police to be more legitimate when they consider the police to use fair procedures in the making of decisions, and in the exercise of their authority.

The benefits of police legitimacy have been widely recognized. Studies have shown that when citizens view the police as legitimate, they are more willing to report crimes and offer information about offenders and neighborhood problems (Gau, 2011; Murphy, Tyler, and Curtis, 2009; Tyler and Fagan, 2008; Tyler, Schulhofer and Hug, 2010). Citizens' willingness to offer information is crucial because the police rely heavily on witness' accounts of incidents to be successful in solving crimes. Police legitimacy promotes citizens' voluntary cooperation, compliance, and support for the police, as well as shape public perceptions of the police, particularly public trust in the police. In contrast, unfair use of authority will make citizens view the police as illegitimate. The consequences of this are devastating to the smooth operation of the police. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) argue that police use of unfair procedures when they exercise their authority can lead to alienation, dissatisfaction, defiance, and non-cooperation from the public.

Given the importance of procedural justice in the assessment of police legitimacy and trustworthiness, it is necessary to pay particular attention to some of the studies that have tested the influence of procedural justice variables on public trust. Most of these studies (Gau, Corsaro, Stewart, and Brunson, 2012; Hind, 2007; Hind and Murphy, 2007; Jonathan-Zamir, Mastrofski, and Moyal, 2013; Mazerolle, Bennett, Antrobus, and Eggins, 2012; Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, and Tyler, 2013; Mazerolle,
Bennett, Davis, Sargeant, and Manning, 2013; Murphy, 2009; Reisig and Lloyd, 2009; Tyler, 2011, 2005, 2001; Tyler and Wakslak, 2004) have observed several positive outcomes. For instance, in a systematic review of studies that examined the effects of procedural fairness and performance on public trust and confidence, Tyler (2001) observed that procedural justice has a greater impact on shaping public's support for authorities like the police and the court than the performance or effectiveness of the institution. Though citizens' evaluation of the police can be influenced by performance, the impact is less than that of the fairness of the procedures used by the police (Tyler, 2001). Hence, people who consider the police to be fair in dealing with citizens, will have favorable views of the police. Tyler's result suggests that people value fair treatment by the police more than effectiveness of the police in controlling crime and disorder.

Several studies conducted afterwards have found similar results suggesting that procedural fairness has the greatest impact on citizens' assessment of the police. Sunshine and Tyler (2003) conducted two surveys of New Yorkers to explore issues about police legitimacy and found that procedural fairness is a major factor that informs people's judgments about the New York police. They further found that performance of the police and distributive justice do not matter much in judging the New York police as legitimate or illegitimate. In assessing New Yorkers' personal experiences with the police, Tyler (2004) observed that fairness of the interpersonal treatment people received influenced their overall views about police legitimacy, and that judgment about
fairness of the outcome does not influence citizens' views about legitimacy. A later study by Tyler (2005) supports these findings. Tyler (2005) argued that process-based judgments are more influential in determining levels of citizens’ trust in the police than either assessments about the effectiveness of police crime-control activities or judgment about the fairness of the distribution of police services as has been noted by other research. Process-based judgment is a judgment about the manner in which the police interact with citizens and was developed from the social justice literature (Tyler & Blader, 2000; Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997; Tyler & Smith, 1997) which implies that citizens’ reactions to authorities are influenced by how fairly authorities make decisions and how respectfully they are treated

In addition to Tyler's works, several recent studies in the policing context have also observed the importance of procedural justice in shaping the public's evaluations of the police. Hinds and Murphy (2007) used a sample of Australian citizens to assess the influence of procedural justice on police legitimacy and subsequent public satisfaction with the police and found a positive relationship between procedural justice and satisfaction with the police. The authors demonstrated that individuals who believed the police used procedural justice in exercising their authority were more likely to view the police as legitimate, and in turn, were more satisfied with the services provided by the police. The 2009 study published by Murphy found similar result by observing that procedural justice is very important in police-initiated encounters than in citizen-initiated encounters (Murphy, 2009).
Most recent studies on procedural justice, conducted between 2012 and 2013 have given credence to the findings of previous studies conducted during the early 2000s. Hence, they are worth reviewing. Gau, Corsaro, Stewart and Brunson (2012) used a hierarchical linear modeling to examine the effects of macro-level factors on procedural justice and police legitimacy, and found that, though macro-level factors such as concentrated disadvantage influence perception of procedural justice, procedural justice remained the strongest predictor of legitimacy. This suggests that individuals who live in communities with high rates of unemployment and poverty will view the police as legitimate if they consider the police to employ procedural justice principles when exercising their authority. Their findings have been supported by three separate studies conducted by Mazerolle and her colleagues in 2012 and 2013.

In a randomized field trial experiment conducted by Mazerolle, Bennett, Antrobus, and Eggins (2012) tested the impact of police using procedural justice principles - neutrality, citizen participation, respect, and trustworthy motives - public views of the police. The authors concluded that the police will benefit positively when they use the principles of procedural justice in dealing with people. A recent study conducted by Mazerolle, Antrobus, Bennett, and Tyler (2013) also found that procedurally just traffic encounters with the police shape citizens views about the actual encounter. They observed this result in the experimental condition and not in the control group, further indicating the importance of procedural justice in shaping citizens' global and specific perceptions of the police. The importance of procedural justice has
further been supported by a meta-analysis conducted by Mazerolle, Bennett, Davis, Sargeant, and Manning (2013). The authors conducted the meta-analysis to synthesize empirical research on the impact of police-led interventions that used procedurally just dialogue focused on improving citizen perceptions of police legitimacy. They included in their review only studies that utilized either an experimental design or a quasi-experimental design and were conducted between 1980 and 2007. The authors found that, among other measures, the procedural justice measure had a positive and statistical significant relationship with police legitimacy.

The literature reviewed so far focused on the influence of procedural justice in shaping adults' views about the police. However, research on procedural justice has gone beyond examining the effect of procedural justice on adults' perceptions of the police to examine how procedural justice influences young people's views of the police. Studies that have focused on this area of research have observed positive outcomes, suggesting that in discussing factors that shape young people's views of the police, procedural justice matters. For example, Hinds (2007) used a survey of 14 to 16 year-old high school students to examine the influence of young people's attitudes toward police legitimacy. The author found that, young people's attitude toward police legitimacy is related to police use of procedural justice.

Similarly, Reisig and Lloyd (2009) used a sample of 289 Jamaican high school students to test hypotheses derived from the process based model of policing. They found a positive relationship between procedural justice and perception of police
legitimacy. Specifically, the authors observed that high school students, who have positive attitude toward the police as a result of the police using procedural justice, expressed greater willingness to assist the police to fight crime in their community. That is, students who perceived the police to be fair and just, believed that the police were legitimate. Hence were willing to cooperate with the police.

Procedural justice is widely used by scholars in terms of what factors influence citizens' perceptions of the police. Some scholars have also highlighted the tension between procedural justice and some key functions of the police. Order maintenance policing is an important role performed by the police to ensure safety and order in the community. This type of police function, according to scholars (Skogan, 1990; Wilson and Kelling, 1982) is necessary to prevent serious crime and neighborhood decline. However, research has shown that order maintenance policing and procedural justice have a negative relationship. A study conducted by Gau and Brunson (2010) found that strategies of order maintenance policing such as frequent stops of vehicle and persons for suspected disorderly behavior have negative implications for police legitimacy and crime control efforts because those strategies are likely to damage citizens' perceptions of procedural justice. The authors' finding brings our attention to the complexities involved in the work of the police. The police are required to maintain order or more generally, perform their work, but at the same time, are expected to follow procedural principles such as fairness, respect, and citizens' participation. Though, this is
achievable in practically all situations, it is very difficult to balance the two in some complex situations.

Contact is another procedural justice variable which has been well explored. Citizens' contact with the police has been used to explain variations in public's attitudes toward the police. Numerous studies have shown that contacts or experiences with the police have great influence on citizens' evaluations of the police (Bartsch & Cheurprakobkit, 2004; Cheurprakobki, 2000; Kautt, 2011; Merry, Power, McManus, & Alison, 2012; Nofziger and William, 2005; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Rosenbaum, Schuck, Costello, Hawkins, and Ring, 2005; Skogan, 2005, 2006). However, these studies disagree on the pattern of effects of contact on citizens' attitudes toward the police. While some researchers believe that citizens who request services from the police tend to have positive attitudes toward the police, others believe that citizens who experience the police through the initiatives of the police tend to have negative attitudes toward the police.

Several studies have shown that two main types of contact with the police matter in the debate about the influence of experience on public opinion about the police. One type is called citizen-initiated contact, also called voluntary contact. This involves the citizens making an attempt to contact the police for a host of reasons including reporting of crime, requesting services, and giving out important information. The other type of contact is police-initiated contact (also known as involuntary contact) which involves instances in which the police initiate the contact. The police may contact
citizens through traffic stops and stopping persons walking on the street for questioning.

Studies have demonstrated that citizen-initiated or voluntary contact results in favorable evaluations of the police (Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Ren, Cao, Lovrich, & Gaffney, 2005; Skogan, 2005, 2006). For instance, Cheurprakobkit (2000) observed that people who contacted the police tend to have more favorable views about the police than those who were contacted by the police.

Similarly, Skogan (2005) examined citizens' satisfaction with police encounters in the city of Chicago to understand the factors that influence citizens’ levels of satisfaction with citizen-initiated with the police. He observed that respondents of all ages as well as both males and females who had involved the police previously expressed being more satisfied with the encounter than those in the same categories who encountered the police through police initiating the contact. In terms of race, on average, respondents who initiated the contact indicated being more satisfied than those who experienced police initiated contact. Skogan argued several reasons explaining why respondents who initiated the contact were satisfied. Almost all mentioned that the police were timely in responding, polite, paid attention to their needs, and were actually helpful. In contrast, those who were less satisfied with the police initiated contact stated that the police were unfair in their treatment and the police were not polite. In a later study, Skogan (2006) conducted a meta-analysis to assess the relationship between trust and citizens’ personal encounter with the police.
and argued that trust emerged easily in citizen-initiated contacts in which citizens seek help from the police. He further contended that victims of crime were more critical of police work than others, and that trust in the police among victims emerges above all from policing that consider victims’ experiences and needs. Subsequently, citizens’ personal negative experiences will easily erode trust.

Moreover, several other studies have demonstrated the negative effects of police-initiated contacts on citizens’ specific attitudes toward the police (Jesilow et al, 1995; Ren et al., 2005; Smith et al., 1991). These studies have observed that individuals, who have been ticketed, arrested or have been stopped by the police either in a vehicle or walking on the street have negative assessments of the police. For example, Ren and colleagues (2005) found a negative relationship between receiving a ticket and confidence in the police, suggesting that citizens who received a ticket rated the police low in terms of their confidence in the police. Some explanations can be offered for the negative effects of police-initiated contact on citizens' evaluations of the police. It has consistently been argued that contacts that are initiated by the police frequently lead to confrontations between the police and the citizen. Consequently, these confrontations result in citizens developing hostile attitudes toward the police, hence rating the police low.

Conversely, some previous studies have observed a positive relationship between police-initiated contact and attitudes toward the police. Kautt (2011) used the British Crime Surveys from 2001/2002 through 2007/2008 to assess whether signal crimes and
negotiated order perspectives will be applicable in UK. Signal crime perspective believes that individual's perception of being victimized is connected to particular crimes or deviate behaviors in the neighborhood. Thus, a person's level of fear of crime is developed based on the occurrence of certain crimes in the area where one lives. Kautt (2011) found that having police-initiated contacts was associated with more confidence in the police, compared to contacting the police by citizens. Kautt (2011) further added that respondents who have experienced involuntary police contact were more likely to assess the performance of the police as excellent. These findings suggest that police-initiated or involuntary contact with the police result in a positive evaluation of the police. However, not everyone agrees with this conclusion.

Irrespective of the type of contact described above, the experience with the police is considered personal, and scholars have argued that such experiences are not the only factors that influence citizens' evaluations of the police (Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). According to these authors, citizens who do not directly or personally experience the police base these views about the police through secondary interactions. These secondary interactions are what research has described as vicarious experiences with the police. Vicarious experiences involve stories told by family members, friends, loved ones, colleagues, and neighbors about their personal encounter with the police. These stories largely influence the views of individuals who hear them. In addition, vicarious experiences may include news from the media, social comments, blogs, and even entertainment about the police.
Empirically, studies have shown that vicarious experiences with the police lower the public's confidence and trust in the police. Rosenbaum and colleagues (2005) observed negative results about the influence of vicarious experience. For instance, they observed that citizens who reported negative vicarious experience with the police expressed more negative attitudes. Conversely, citizens who reported positive vicarious experiences expressed negative attitudes. These results therefore suggest that no matter the nature of the vicarious experience - positive or negative - citizens' evaluations of the police will still be low. This raises questions concerning the true effect of such experience on public attitudes toward the police. If the negative effect of vicarious experience is true, it is therefore advisable that the police will be careful of how they treat people during interactions since a single negative personal encounter can have devastating effect on the image of the police because vicarious depictions act as a multiplier of the depictions of the conduct.

In policing contexts, studies have shown that quality of the encounter between the police and citizens matters in the evaluations of the police. Several studies have indicated that positive and negative contacts with the police are linked to favorable and unfavorable views of the police respectively (Bartsch & Cheurprakobkit, 2004; Bradford et al., 2009; Frank, Smith, & Novak, 2005; Merry et al., 2012; Nofziger & Williams, 2005; Schuck & Rosenbaum, 2005; Skogan, 2006). For example, Nofziger and Williams (2005) analyzed a community-level survey conducted in a small nonmetropolitan area to assess factors predicting confidence in the police. They found that having a positive
encounter with the police increases people's confidence in the police. Since the authors conducted the study in a small town, they concluded that quality of contact or interactions between police officers and the citizens have greater impact on citizens' evaluations of the police in small towns than will happen in urban or suburban areas. This seems intuitive because small towns unlike large cities, have strong informal social control networks which regulate behavior of the people (Banton, 1964), and also, individuals in small towns are much closer to each other. Furthermore, it can also be argued that many small towns have a fairly rigid hierarchy of social status and groups, hence, making quality of interaction salient in citizens' evaluations.

Examining the reasons why people hold specific attitudes toward the police, Frank and colleagues (2005) found that positive encounter was a major reason. They observed that the majority (approximately 87%) of respondents in their study who had been involved in an interaction with a police officer during 6 months prior to the study provided several reasons for the positive attitudes they held about the police. For instance, most respondents cited that "officers responded to my questions and took a report" (Frank et al., 2005: 218). This suggests that positive interactions do not predict citizens' perceptions of the police but also becomes the basis for having favorable attitudes toward the police. Moreover, a recent study conducted to extend our knowledge on the factors that drive confidence in the police, found that people who previously held negative or neutral views tend to develop positive attitudes toward the police upon positively experiencing the police (Merry et al., 2012).
Furthermore, several studies have also concluded that negative encounters with the police correspond to negative evaluations of the police. Schuck and Rosenbaum (2005) examined global and neighborhood attitudes toward the police. Their findings made them conclude that negative experience with the police is linked to negative evaluations of the police. This holds true for both citizens' global attitudes and neighborhood-specific attitudes. Similarly, Bradford, Jackson, and Stanko (2009) found that people who were not satisfied with the encounter expressed less favorable views of police effectiveness, fairness, and engagement with the community. Consistent with this observation was the argument that individuals who have had experience with crime were more likely to view the police as unfair and not courteous (Orr and West, 2007). The authors further observed that fair treatment in encounters strongly predicts a person's evaluation of the police. Furthermore, studies about the quality of contact have indicated that people who have had any form of contact with the police either through a traffic stop or requesting a service, and were satisfied with the contact, were more likely to be satisfied with the police than those who have not had any contact with the police (Reisig & Parks, 2000).

Reisig and Parks' (2000) findings however contradict results of some studies that were conducted after 2000 (Allen, Edmonds, Patterson & Smith, 2006; Fitzgerald, Hough, Joseph & Qureshi, 2002; Skogan, 2009). These studies collectively demonstrate that no contact with the police results in favorable attitudes toward the police. For instance, Skogan (2009) utilized a longitudinal structural equation model to analyze
panel surveys conducted in the Houston area and observed that respondents who reported recent contacts of any kind with the police expressed unfavorable perceptions of the police. Skogan (2009) further noted that respondents who reported no experience with the police have more favorable opinions about the police. These findings suggest that citizens who have not had any personal experience and or vicarious experience tend to have positive attitudes toward the police than those have personally or vicariously experienced the police.

To further complicate the disagreement among researchers about the pattern of the effect of contact on citizens' evaluations of the police, some studies have also observed that contact with the police and citizens' attitudes toward the police are uncorrelated. This implies that, contact or experience with the police does not in any way influence a person's trust and confidence in the police. That is, whether a person has had a contact with the police or not, his or her opinion about the police will not be affected. Kaariainen (2008) analyzed data from the European Police Barometer and concluded that contact with the police is unrelated to citizens' trust or confidence in the police.

The above reviews show the number of studies that have been conducted to examine the effects of citizens' attitudes toward the police. Though numerous studies have been conducted, they disagree on two main issues. First, the studies disagree on the direction of the impact of contact on citizens' evaluations of the police. While some have argued that contact has positive attitudes toward the police, others also argued
conversely that contact has negative effects on attitudes toward the police. Further, these studies also disagree about the effects of citizens-initiated contacts and police-initiated contacts on citizens' evaluations of the police. Second, the studies reviewed generally disagree about the effect of contact on citizens' attitudes toward the police. Some of these studies argued that contact - police-initiated or citizen-initiated, positive or negative - predicts public's perceptions of the police. Yet, others also believe that contact does not influence citizens' perception in any way. Explanations to these disagreements can be seen from the methodological and measurement limitations that are apparent in these studies.

So far, attempts have been made to establish the findings of previous studies about the effect of procedural justice on public's attitudes toward the police. The literature reviewed collectively demonstrates that procedural justice is an important factor to be taken seriously when building public's trust and confidence in the police. People's views about the police are easily influenced by the fairness of the procedures used by the police when exercising their authority. Individuals who consider the police to be fair in making decisions tend to hold favorable views of the police. Conversely, those who see the police to be unfair and unjust in dealing with people tend to hold negative views about the police in the community. Based on the review of the procedural justice perspective, distributive fairness and performance of the police have less influence on citizens' evaluation of the police.
The procedural justice theory, therefore, requires that for the police to gain trust and acceptance from the public, they must ensure that procedures used in making decisions that affect the lives of innocent citizens are fair and just. Further, the police must also treat people with respect and dignity, use their authority wisely and fairly, as well as treat everyone in a like manner. Police agencies that meet these simple requirements enjoy among other things, public support and favorable public ratings. In this study, it is assumed that citizens who perceive the police to be procedurally fair and have had contact with the police will have higher trust in the police than those who perceive the police to be procedurally unfair and have had no contact.

**Social Capital Theory**

Another theoretical mechanism for understanding citizens' trust in the police can be found in the social capital literature (Coleman, 1988; Putnam, 1993, 2000, 2007). The concept of social capital has been used to refer to "features of social organization such as trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions" (Putnam, 1993, 167). Putnam (1993) mentioned that networks of civic engagement foster norms of reciprocity and reinforce trust because they facilitate communication among people and also reduce uncertainty. According to Coleman (1988), social capital is the relationship that exists among persons within the social structure that facilitate obligations, expectations, trust, and effective norms. Social capital has therefore been used to represent resources in a society (Coleman,
According to these authors, these particular societal resources are not only financial or cultural but also social in nature.

Coleman (1990) states that, the relationship that exists among people can be used as a resource to facilitate actions. To him, the distinctive characteristic of social capital is the relations among people. Coleman's argument implies simply that, due to the relationship that exist among community members, they can easily organize themselves and pull strength together to successfully undertake community projects. This is what has been described in the academic literature as social cohesion. The concept of social capital has been variously defined by many scholars in recent years with emphasis different from the earlier definitions. As Kaarianen (2007) noted, "The basic idea behind most definitions of social capital is that well-functioning social networks and communities lay the foundation for the emergence of norms of reciprocity and trust" (pg. 137). According to the author, irrespective of the diverse definitions provided by scholars, the underlying ideas of the social capital concept remain the same across all definitions. The main ideas are three and form the major components of the social capital theory. These are social networks, shared norms and values, and trust.

Some scholars believe that social networks form the basis of an individual's social capital. According to Kaarianen and Siren (2011), "the larger the number of people we are familiar with in our families, living environments, schools, work places etc, the wider our social network" (pg.68). They further noted that "wider social network can be seen as a resource from the individual's point of view: a resource that allows for joint action,
and various kinds of social protection and security" (Kaariainen and Siren, 2011). Other scholars of social capital theory hold a similar viewpoint. For instance, Putnam (2000) reiterated that social networks have value like tools in physical capital and training in human capital. Though the importance of social networks cannot be doubted, these authors overemphasized the sheer number of people one has in his or her network without recognizing the role that the quality of the people within the networks play.

Regarding shared norms and values, it is believed to determine the rules of joint action and also direct the community’s activities (Kaariainen and Siren, 2011). Shared norms and values enhance cooperative efforts among members of a given community, depending on what is included in the idea of ‘community’ (Putnam, 1995). Banfield (1958) argued that shared values are limited to families and do not extend to others. The consequence is what he called ‘amoral familism’ – placing much emphasis on the immediate family rather than the common good or what is good for community. Stated differently, amoral familism describes instances whereby people always do what is good for the family without any commitment to the greater community. This kind of behavior leads to political chaos and violence, as well as hinders the formation of associations and the growth of social capital. In 1994, Putnam, Leonardi and Nanetti tested the amoral familism thesis in the book “Making Democracy Work” and found that the thesis is valid by comparing regions of Italy (Putnam, Leonardi and Nanetti, 1994).

The third component of social capital is trust in others. Trust in others has been conceived as a precondition of social interaction (Hooghe and Stolle, 2003; Paxton,
2007; Rothstein and Stolle, 2003). Some eminent scholars consider trust in others as the central component of social capital (Coleman, 1990; Fukuyama, 1995; Inglehart, 1997; Putnam, 1995; Uslaner, 2002). Trust in others is generally categorized into two distinct forms: particularized or specific trust and generalized trust (Glanville and Paxton, 2007; Freitag and Traunmuller, 2009; Saegert, Winkel, Swartz, 2001; Sztompka, 1999; Welch et al., 2005). Particularized trust involves a narrow circle of familiar others. That is, trusting people that we are familiar with such as friends and relatives. Scholars argue that particularized trust functions in small, face-to-face communities where people know each other, and interact closely as well as in communities where social controls are strong (Gambetta, 1988; Portes and Laudott, 1996; Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993) and misbehavior can be easily sanctioned (Axelrod, 1990). This type of trust, it has been argued, tends to promote corruption among people and institutions (see Collins et al., 2009; Rose-Ackerman, 2001; Tonoyan, 2003). This is because when a member of the small group needs a favor, another member of the group will be inclined to help.

On the basis of this argument, it can be concluded that particularized trust encourages police misconduct and corruption. Police officers, due to the high trusting and cooperative relationship among them, are propelled to shield each other from scrutiny either external or internal. Further, because of the close ties officers have with a section of the community such as friends, relatives and politicians, they end up doing favors which under normal circumstances they wouldn't do. This view is widely
supported by research. For instance, a study of police officers conducted by Beck and Lee (2002) found that close relationships contribute significantly to the policeman's moral reasoning. The authors concluded that relatives and friends were justifications for officers accepting bribes.

The second type of trust, which is generalized trust, concerns a wider circle of unfamiliar others. That is, generalized trust means trust in people in general, not necessarily people we are familiar with (Delhey, Newton, and Welzel, 2011). Generalized trust functions in complex societies that involve countless daily interactions between unfamiliar people (Nannestad, 2008; Newton, 2007). In brief, generalized trust is the perception of people that others are trustworthy in the community they live. Unlike particularized trust which promotes corruption, generalized trust works against corruption among people and authorities (Tonoyan, 2003). Studies have found several factors that affect variation of generalized trust. That is, the degree to which people will trust others unfamiliar to them is related to several factors which may have different degrees of influence. Some of these factors include the organization of community activities, corruption and social inequality.

The organization and ability to participate in community activities develop trust among people. Putnam (2000) recognized the beneficial role of voluntary activity in the development of generalized trust. Thus, voluntary activities increase trust among people, whereas, lack of opportunities reduces the trust that people have for others in the community. Unlike voluntary activity which enhances generalized trust, social
inequality, it has been observed, reduces generalized trust (Bursik and Grasmick, 1993; Paxton, 2007; Uslaner, 2003, 2005). These authors observed that communities having higher rates of poverty, unemployment, and family disruption are less likely to engage in local organizations, and less likely to make proactive demands on local governmental institutions. Saegert, Winkel, and Swartz (2002) noted that structural and historical inequalities weaken the ability of poor communities to form effective social capital. In effect, the above studies suggest that communities with higher rates of inequalities will have lower levels of generalized trust.

Governmental corruption has also been observed to influence generalized trust negatively (Rothstein and Eek, 2006; Seligson, 2002; Stulhofer, 2004; Tonoyan, 2003) and as noted earlier, reduces trust in people in general. In a comparative study conducted among Swedish and Romanian undergraduate students, Rothstein and Eek (2006) found a negative correlation between generalized trust and corruption. Specifically, the authors found that students reported a lower level of generalized trust after reading that government officials often take bribes. A similar result was found by Tonoyan (2003) who found that low corruption levels are related to high levels of generalized trust. In a study of Croatians, Stulhofer (2004) demonstrated that perceptions of corruption correlate with lower generalized trust. Based on these findings, there is no doubt about the negative contribution that corruption makes in the development of generalized trust in societies. In societies that have higher levels of corruption, people will tend to have less trust in each other.
Before extrapolating the social capital theory's argument to the policing context, it is necessary to extend the social capital argument by considering the importance of the social-psychological approach. The social-psychological approach, as used by researchers to expand the notion of the social capital theory, uses personality trait to explain why people trust others and are willing to cooperate with each other. Erikson (1950) noted that feelings of inner goodness trust in others and oneself, and optimism form a basic trust personality trait that is formed in the first stages of psychological development as a result of the mother-baby feeding experience. Rosenberg (1956, 1957) takes this discussion further by arguing that alienation, trust in people, and beliefs that people are fundamentally cooperative and inclined to help others combine to form a single trust in people scale. According to the social-psychological approach, due to individuals’ psychological history and make-up, some individuals are more willing to help others, cooperate with and trust others in the society.

In policing, just like in any other political institution, such as the court, social capital has tremendous impact on citizens' trust and confidence (Jackson et al., 2009; Kaarianinen, 2007; Kim, 2005; MacDonald and Stokes, 2006; Marien and Hooghe, 2011; Putnam, 2000). According to Putnam (2000), social capital increases trust in authorities because it increases citizens' awareness of and knowledge of how institutions work and, in essence, would enable them to influence the institutions' operational policies. In policing for instance, gaining adequate knowledge in the operations of the police will not only enhance positive attitudes people hold toward the
police but will also enable the citizens to develop an informed expectation of the police and, accordingly, will know what exactly they can expect from the police. Trust develops when such expectations are met and, by contrast, distrust occurs when expectations are not met. Thus, citizens who believe that the performance of the police meet their expectations, do not hesitate to trust the police. However, those who believe their expectations are not met will definitely distrust the police. Hardin (1991, 1993) used a risk-benefit analysis to underscore the trusting relationship between the public and authority figures like the police. He maintained that when the public consider trusting an institution beneficial in terms of what they expect from that institution, they tend to trust the institution more than when they consider it too risky or not beneficial to trust that institution.

For instance, if citizens believe that trusting the police would be beneficial in terms of meeting their expectations, they will trust the police and vice versa. Distrust in the police is partly due to the lack of adequate knowledge of the police by the public. Other scholars have demonstrated the significant impact of social capital on public attitudes toward the police by arguing that collective efficacy, ties and bonds, citizens' involvement in community activities, as well as their availability (Jackson et al., 2009; Kaarianen, 2007; MacDonald and Stokes, 2006), foster a breeding ground for trust in the police.

Ideally, studies that have actually examined the influence of social capital on citizens' evaluations of the police (also see, Hawdon, 2008; Kaarianen and Sireno, 2011;
Newton and Norries (1999) have been few. These studies have observed positive and significant relationship between levels of social capital and citizens' levels of trust in the police. Newton and Norris (1999) analyzed data from the World Value Surveys and demonstrated that, individuals who trust each other tend to have more confidence in public institutions such as the police. They therefore observed a strong correlation between social capital and confidence in all public institutions, indicating that when social capital is high, confidence in institutions is also high.

Moreover, studies conducted recently have also found similar results. For example, Macdonald and Stokes (2006) used a survey of almost 3000 American residents to determine the explanatory power of community's levels of social capital on trust in local police. Utilizing an ordinal logistic regression to estimate the effects, they found a strong effect for social capital on residents' trust in the police. Specifically, the authors found that, higher levels of social capital in the community correspond to higher levels of residents' trust in the local police. Conversely, a lack of social capital leads to distrust in the police. Macdonald and Stokes (2006) further noted that, by including social capital in the regression model, the effects of race, gender, and age, do not disappear. Consistent with this result is the finding obtained by Kaariainen and Sireno (2011). The authors observed a positive link between generalized trust and trust in the police. Similarly, Sun, Hu, and Wu (2012) testing the effects of social capital and political participation on trust in the police, found that trust in the police increases as trust in leaders of neighborhood committees and trust in neighbors increases. These
results were obtained by analyzing survey data which comprised 3500 citizens in eight cities in China. Furthermore, in a comparative study of American and South Korean respondents, Boateng, Lee, and Abess (under review) found that Americans who expressed feeling of trust for their neighbors also expressed having higher confidence in the police. This was however not observed among the South Koreans, indicating the lack of predictive effect of social capital on Koreans' confidence in the police. Considering the findings of the above studies, one can justifiably conclude that social capital actually influences citizens' trust in the police. However, such conclusion must be taken with caution until similar studies have been conducted in the African context to offer scholars holistic idea about the general effect of social capital on citizens' evaluations of the police.

In a nutshell, social capital theory posits that when people trust others in the community, they tend to have positive attitudes toward authorities like the police. That is, the belief that other people in the community are trustworthy will result into believing that the police, for instance, are trustworthy as well. If this logic is correct, we expect that higher levels of generalized trust will lead to higher levels of citizens' trust in the police.
Conflict Theory

Conflict theory is one of the numerous theories that have been used to explain differences in citizens' attitudes toward the police and the criminal justice system in general. The theory links criminal justice institutions to the structure of inequality in society (Weitzer and Tuch, 1999). Institutions of the criminal justice such as the police, courts and corrections have been labeled as key mechanisms in the control of subordinate groups, and in the protection of dominant group interests (Bonger, 1969; Chambliss and Seidman, 1971; Quinney, 1970; Turk, 1969; Vold, 1958). Conflict theory is therefore concerned with the struggle between individuals and groups in relation to power differentials. Thus, the theory is used to explain the struggle between social classes competing for scarce resources and control over resources in the society.

The continuous struggle over resources leads scholars to agree that conflict theory describes a society not based on consensus, but rather on conflict. Tibbetts and Hemmens (2010) remarked that conflict perspective "assumes that different groups disagree about the fairness of laws and that laws are used as a tool by those in power to keep down other, lower-power groups" (Tibbets and Hemmens, 2010: 6). This assumption reinforces the argument about power struggle between the various social classes and the nature of disagreement existing between them. In their argument about class differentials, Tibbetts and Hemmens (2010) noted that individuals who are poor and mostly from the lower classes are arrested and charged with crimes at a disproportionate rate. This conclusion is similar to the assertion that the rich get richer
and the poor gets prison (Reiman and Leighton, 2010), and as well echo the key assumptions in Turk’s (1969; cf. Bernard, Snipes and Gerould, 2010) theory of criminalization. In this theory, Turk explained how conflict situations could lead to the criminalization of certain acts. He believed that the meaning that the prohibition act has for the individuals/authorities enforcing the law plays a major role. When officials consider the prohibition act offensive, according to Turk, arrest and conviction rates will be high.

From a conflict theory perspective, the bourgeoisie in a capitalist society determine the acceptable standard of behavior and do so by defining the behavior of the proletariat as unacceptable with the intention of protecting their own interests. This implies that the ruling or upper class maintains their dominance over the ruled or lower classes through the use of law. However, some conflict theorists have argued that such situations often result in disputes, as individuals or groups who feel oppressed struggle to change their relative social positioning (Siegel, 2002). Three major assumptions about conflict theory are therefore in evidence. The first assumption is that, conflict and competition rather than consensus characterize all social interactions. The second assumption is that social inequalities are built into all social institutions. The third, argument is that conflict occurs in and between societies competing over scarce resources where structural inequality exist (Hagan, 1994; Siegel, 2002). In brief, proponents of conflict theory believe that individuals and groups, due to inequality,
compete over society's limited resources, and the most powerful of the group takes a "lion's share" whereas the less powerful takes meager share or nothing.

Conflict theory has been applied to the study of various aspects of the criminal justice system, such as bias in the operations of the system, the relationship between class and the criminal law, and discrimination in the system (Belknap, 2001; Greenberg et al., 1985; Homes, 2000; Kersette, 1990; Mann, 1993; Myers, 1985; Poveda, 1992; Simon, 2007; Walker, Spohn, and Delone, 2012; Weitzer, 1996). In policing, conflict theory has been extensively applied to explain the functions and operations of the police (Binder and Scharf, 1982; Jacobs and Britt, 1979; Kent and Jacobs, 2005; Liska, Lawrence and Benson, 1981; Mosher, 2001; Sorensen, Marquart, and Brock, 1993; Stucky, 2005). These studies have focused on various aspects of police behavior such as police use of excessive force, police homicide, arrest rates, and police discrimination.

Furthermore, other police scholars have also used conflict theory to examine the perceptions of the public about their experiences with the police and their overall ratings of the police (Gabbidon and Jordan, 2013; Weitzer and Tuch, 1999, 2002, 2004, 2005, 2006; Wu and Sun, 2009). The authors have specifically examined the role of gender, class, and race plays in shaping public's perceptions and attitudes about the police and the criminal justice system as a whole. Most studies have concluded that individuals in the lower socioeconomic status tend to have less favorable attitudes toward the police than those in the higher socioeconomic status (Cao et al., 1996; Huang and Vaughn, 1996; Wu et al., 2009). For instance, Wu et al. (2009) observed
that lower class individuals were most likely to express lack of satisfaction with the police. Explanations to these effects can be offered by exploring existing literature on conflict theory. According to Sun and Payne (2004) and Sun et al. (2008), individuals in the lower social classes are more likely to be the subjects of police control actions, where as persons of higher socioeconomic status are willing to receive services from the police, rely on the police to serve and protect their interests. In effect, these authors attributed negative ratings of the police among lower socioeconomic persons to constant police monitoring and surveillance which is due to the perception that these people commit more crimes. Other conflict experts have argued that the interests of the dominant class are represented and protected by the police and those from lower class are more likely to be victims of law enforcement (Chambliss & Seidman, 1971; Das, 1983). Hence, persons of lower socio-economic status who are frequently observed by the police tend to have little or no trust in the police due to biased treatment of the police against them. The dominant class within a given society will subsequently have more trust in the police as their interests are affected by the laws of society and thus offered greater protection by the police in contrast to people with lower socio-economic standing.

However, some studies have also found contrarily that the wealthy and highly educated individuals perceive the police less favorably than the lower income and less educated persons (Murphy and Worrall, 1999; Weitzer and Tuch, 1999). In a recent comparative research which utilized both U.S and South Korean samples, Boateng et al.
(under review) found that the less educated in both countries have higher confidence in their respective police institutions than the highly educated individuals. Specifically, the authors observed that Americans who have high school education were more likely to have higher confidence in the police compared to those who have more than high school education. Similarly, South Koreans who possessed less than high school education tend to have higher confidence in the police than those having high school education or higher. To complicate matters further, other studies have argued that socioeconomic status and education are unrelated to attitudes toward the police (Correia et al., 1996; Parker et al., 1995; Priest and Carter, 1999; Ren et al., 2005; Sims, Hooper and Peterson, 2002; Sun and Wu, 2009). Correia et al. (1996) observed that level of education does not significantly predict a person's trust in the police. Similarly, Priest and Carter (1999) found that income has no impact on perceptions of the police.

Blumer’s (1958) group position theory of racial prejudice asserts that an individual’s perception stem from that person’s sense of his or her group position in the society. Using this theory to explain race-based differentials in attitudes toward the police, Weitzer and Tuch (2004, 2005) argued that Whites are more likely to hold favorable views of police because they perceive racial threats from Blacks, and thus, rely on aggressive law enforcement from the police to control Blacks and their neighborhoods. Other studies have also found that minorities in general have negative attitudes toward the police than Whites (Ackerman et al., 2001; Brown and Benedict,
2002; Jefferson and Walker, 1993; Wu et al., 2009). Ackerman et al. (2001) noted that minorities rated police officers' honesty and ethical standards lower than their Whites counterparts, and Wu et al. (2009) also observed that African Americans exhibited less satisfaction in the police. In a recent study conducted to examine public opinion about the shooting of Trayvon Martin, Gabbidon and Jordan (2013) found a racial divide in the perceptions of the respondents about the injustice of the system. Specifically, the authors found that racial minorities hold a greater sense of criminal injustice than Whites. According to the authors, the sense of injustice among minorities is due to past mistreatment unleashed on them by the criminal justice system and its representatives, such as the police.

The effects of other demographic variables, such as age and gender have also been explored by prior research. Studies examining the influence of age on individuals' attitudes toward the police have found positive relationship between age and perception of the police (Brown and Benedict, 2002; Bridenball and Jesilow, 2008; Chemak et al., 2001; Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Hurst and Frank, 2000; Marenin, 1983; Merry et al., 2012; Murphy, 2008; Murphy and Worrall, 1999; Ren et al., 2005; Stack and Cao, 1998; Wu and Sun, 2009). These studies have collectively argued that as age increases, trust and confidence in the police also increases. Merry et al. (2012) found that older persons have higher confidence in the police compared to younger persons. This indirectly supports the conclusion that younger persons view the police less favorably (Murphy and Worrall, 1999). Similarly, Wu and Sun (2009) testing the effects
of demographic variables on Chinese's trust in the police, observed that younger Chinese tend to have lower levels of trust in the police.

All these studies have demonstrated that younger people compared to older people have lower levels of trust and confidence in the police. There are several plausible explanations to this pattern of behavior. As argued by Gaines, Kappeler, and Vaughn (1994), younger folks are more likely to see the police as a hindrance to their freedom, hence, will rate the police more negatively than older folks. They further asserted that younger people are likely to engage in risky behaviors than older people and that explains why younger people have negative attitudes toward the police. Other reasons include; older people are least likely to be victim to crime (Merry et al., 2012), younger people are more likely to be influenced by the mass media (Wu and Sun, 2009) and younger people are most likely to have more frequent contacts with the police than older people (Walker, 1992). Despite the numerous studies that have found support for age influences attitudes toward the police, other researchers have also maintained that age has no effect on a person's rating of the police (Parker, Onyekwuluje and Murty, 1995).

Unlike the effect of age that has been found to be largely consistent in the literature, the effect of gender has been mixed. Some previous studies have concluded that females tend to have more favorable attitudes toward the police than males (Cheurprakobkit, 2000; Huebner, Schafer and Bynum, 2004; Myhill and Beak, 2008; Sun and Wu, 2009; Taylor, Turner, and Esbensen, 2001; Weitzer and Tuch, 2002).
According to these studies, women have positive attitudes toward the police because they tend to have less aggressive contacts with the police than men. Conversely, not every researcher believes that women express favorable perceptions of the police than men (Correia, Reisig and Lovrich, 1996; Hurst and Frank, 2000; Sampson and Bartusch, 1998). Irrespective of the pattern of the effect, the above studies have observed that gender plays a role in shaping public attitudes toward the police. However, there are other researchers who believe otherwise (Cao et al., 1998; Chermak et al., 2001; Ren et al., 2005; Worrall, 1999; Wu and Sun, 2009). These studies found that gender has no effect on individuals' attitudes toward the police.

The review of conflict theory and its variables means that conflict theory has been extensively tested in various dimensions of policing. However, only a few studies utilizing conflict theory to explain police behavior and operations in the African context have been forthcoming and this creates a gap in our understanding of the extent to which the theory holds true in policing, as well as inhibits our ability to draw general conclusions about the findings of such studies. The present study included several conflict variables as controls in its regression models to account for their effects on trust in the police in Ghana.
Media Effects on Trust in the Police

Research assessing factors that drive public opinions about the police have recently focused attention on the media, and have consistently argued that the media play an important role in shaping attitudes toward the police (Mazaev, 2004; Surette, 2007; Weitzer and Tuch, 2004, 2006). The public's negative ratings of the police as well as their dissatisfaction with the police have been linked to high media exposure and news consumptions. Studies have shown that, extensive media coverage of police antisocial behaviors such as use of force, brutality, and corrupt acts decreases people's confidence in the police (Dowler and Zawilski, 2007; Weitzer, 2002). Television shows that portray the police as being bad, and dramatize police work, have been found to have varied effects on viewers' trust and confidence in the police (Eschholz, Blackwell, Gertz, and Chiricos, 2002).

According to U.S. National Institute of Justice (2009), "episodes where police engage in excessive use of force have been well publicized in the media. Television shows regularly portray excessive use of force. Widespread media attention to these events unfortunately conveys the impression that rates of use of force, or excessive use of force, are much higher than what actually occurs" (pg. 1). This extensive portrayal of the police by the media, coupled with the reality that most people derive their information about the police through the media, make the media influential in driving citizens' toward developing negative feelings for the police. In Russia, a study has shown that, more than 70% of all information about the police received by the people
is through fictional movies and TV shows (Mazaev, 2004). In a country like Ghana where the police do not publicize information about themselves, the media will play an important role in this regard, hence, capable of shaping Ghanaians' trust in the police. As a result of this, the present study will control for the effect of mass media exposure on citizens' ratings of the Ghana Police Service.

**Importance of Trust to Police Work**

The contemporary policeman everywhere performs several functions ranging from bringing a neighbor’s cat from on top of a tree to picking a drunk from the roadside. Broadly, the police perform the following functions: law enforcement, crime control, order maintenance, peace keeping, problem-solving, conflict resolution, provision of services, just to name a few. Researchers have argued that the police spend less of their time on enforcing our laws or controlling crime (Bayley, 1994) and spend more time on order maintenance (Banton, 1964). However, some scholars still believe that the most crucial function performed by the police today is service provision (Westley, 1970).

Irrespective of which function is considered to be the most important, we require the police to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. Police scholars have noted that, for the police to perform their work well, and be effective, they need the public's approval and consent (Frazier, 2007). According to Frazier (2007), the police can scarcely fulfill their mission to police without public approval and consent. Public trust,
as it has been argued, is necessary to ensure citizens’ cooperation with the police, especially in democratic societies (Hough and Roberts, 2004; Jackson and Bradford, 2010; Mazerolle et al, 2013; Murphy and Cherney, 2012; Rosenbaum et al. 2005; Tyler, 1990, 2005; Stoutland, 2001; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003).

These studies have shown that trust in the police leads to voluntary citizen cooperation with law enforcement, as well as voluntary compliance with the laws being enforced. Citizens, who trust the police, willingly cooperate with police officers by either reporting crimes they witness and/or by providing vital information leading to the apprehension of individuals who have violated criminal law (Flexon et al., 2009). Prior studies have found evidence suggesting that public trust influences police effectiveness and legitimacy (Goldsmith, 2005; Hough et al. 2010; Hough, 2012; Sunshine and Tyler, 2003) and have argued that public trust legitimizes police actions (Hough et al. 2010). A legitimate police force faces minimal to no challenge to its authority, and such a force enjoys citizen cooperation (Tankebe, 2013; Resig et al. 2012). To this end, it is apparent that public trust in the police is a vital ingredient to police operation and police effectiveness. While a presence of trust enables the police to be effective and efficient in performing their duties, the lack of it can make police institutions ineffective and incapable of performing their duties. A police force suffering from the lack of trust faces difficulties in securing public cooperation and compliance (Memmo et al. 2003).
Summary

This chapter has reviewed major theoretical frameworks for explaining public attitudes toward the police. The theories reviewed demonstrated exactly how trust in institutions like the police can be developed and can be destroyed. For instance, according to the procedural justice theory, if the police want to build and maintain citizens' trust, they must use fair and just procedures when dealing with citizens. In contrast, using unfair, bias and unjust procedures will easily erode citizens' trust in the police. For the social capital theory, trust in the police will come about when citizens generally trust themselves and the community. Though this seems to be external to the police, the police can still do something to ensure that people trust themselves. Among such things is to ensure safety and quality of life. Regarding conflict theory, the police must put an end to the bias and differential treatment they render to the public in order to gain higher levels of citizens' trust. Differential treatment, no doubt is responsible for the low levels of trust among certain group of individuals in the community. Lastly, performance theory assumes that if an institution performs well, citizens will trust that institution. Conversely, if an institution performs badly or effectively citizens' will distrust that institution. What this means for the police is that, they must enhance their performance in order to attract citizens' trust or else, they will be constantly be distrusted by the public.

Generally, the theories help us to understand the dynamics of the trusting relationship between the public and the police. However, a major limitation about the
use of these theories to explain citizens' attitudes toward the police is the lack of comparable studies in the African context. This lack creates a gap in our understanding of the extent to which the theories hold true in policing as well as inhibits our ability to draw general conclusions about the findings of studies testing these theories. In the attempt to redress this limitation, the present study, tests the key assumptions of the performance theory and the other three theoretical orientations in the Ghanaian context to determine whether such assumptions hold in developing countries, and also whether Ghanaians' perceptions and attitudes can be explained by the theories.

In addition, the chapter discussed the importance of trust in policing and suggests that trust ensures public cooperation and public's willingness to report crime to the police, as well as provide information to the police. Therefore, without public trust, the police will largely be ineffective in performing their duties.
Introduction

This chapter offers a detailed discussion of policing in Ghana. Specifically, the discussion focuses on the historical and contemporary developments of the Ghana police, as well as the nature of police-citizen relationship in Ghana. However, to place the discussion into proper context, a brief description of Ghana as a country warrants some attention.

Ghana: A Brief Description

Formed from the merger of the British colony of the Gold Coast and the Togoland trust territory, Ghana gained its political independence in 1957, becoming the first sub-Saharan African country to gain independence from their colonial authorities. Like many other African countries, Ghana has endured a long series of military takeovers before eventually becoming a democratic state with an elected government in 1992.

As a sovereign and a unitary republican West African country, Ghana is bordered by three emerging African countries: Cote d' Ivoire to the west; Burkina Faso to the north; Togo to the east; and the Gulf of Guinea to the south. With Accra as its capital city, Ghana has a population of 24, 658,823 (2010 Population and Housing Census Report) and covers a landmark of 238, 535 square kilometers. This landmark places
Ghana in the 81st position in the world. Currently, Ghana's population density is 102 persons per one square kilometer. This is an unprecedented increase over the previous years. For instance, in 1970, there were thirty-six persons per square kilometer; in 1984, fifty-two per square kilometer; and in 1990, there were sixty-three persons per square kilometer.

**Figure 1:** The Map of Ghana
As a multiethnic society, there are 79 related but differing languages, including the kwa family (Akan, Ga-Adamgme); Gbe family (Ewe), Gur family (Dagbani, Dagaare, Frafra) and the kulango languages. It is worth noting that, though all these languages exist, the official language which is widely spoken in Ghana is the English language. English is spoken by almost 90 percent of the Ghanaian population, and is predominant in government and business affairs, as well as in educational instruction. Even with massive internal migration, it can be said that no part of the country is ethnically homogeneous. Instead, there is a high degree of heterogeneity (Though the ethnic identities have not disappeared; they are simply more mixed up or living intermixed than the before) especially in the urban areas where employment and educational opportunities are available. Nevertheless, one can still argue that, since economic opportunities are not evenly distributed across the country, the level of heterogeneity varies among the localities. Localities or cities with more economic opportunities tend to be more heterogeneous.

Demographically, Ghana has a youthful population, with a median age of 30 years and the average household size is 3.6 persons. Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the population were 0 to 14 years, 20 percent were between 15 years and 24 years, 35 percent were between 25 years and 59 years, and only 7 percent were 60 years or older. With regards to gender, there were 51 percent females and 49 percent males. Given the population above the age of 12 years, the 2010 population and housing census report mentioned that 42 percent never married; consensual union constituted 5
percent; 43 percent were married couples; separated were 2 percent; divorced, 3 percent, and widowed 5 percent. About 51 percent of the population resides in urban localities\(^1\). In terms of ethnicity, the Akans are the majority, forming 48 percent, Mole-Dagbon 17 percent, Ewe 14 percent, Ga-Dangme 7 percent, Gurma 6 percent, Guan 4 percent and other 4 percent.

Geographically, Ghana is divided into five regions. The coastline is mostly a low, sandy shore backed by plains and scrub, and intersected by several rivers and streams while the northern part of the country features high plains. Southwest and south central Ghana is made up of a forested plateau region consisting of the Ashanti uplands and the Kwahu Plateau; the hilly Akuapim-Togo ranges are found along the country's eastern border. Administratively, the country is divided into 10 regions which are subdivided into 170 districts (see map above).

The administrative regions are Ashanti, Brong Ahafo, Central, Eastern, Greater Accra, Northern, Upper East, Upper West, Volta and Western. Greater Accra is the country’s capital region with Accra as its capital city. Each administrative region has several big and small cities, as well as its own capital city. Fieldwork for the current study was conducted in five of the ten administrative regions.

In terms of politics, Ghana is considered as a presidential representative democratic republic in the sense that the president plays a dual role as the head of State and the head of government. The president wields executive powers, and

\(^1\)The 2010 Population and Housing Census report defined an urban as any locality with more than 5000 inhabitants while rural constitutes localities with less than 5000 inhabitants.
accordingly, appoints the vice-president. However, regarding the appointment of cabinet ministers, the president makes nominations and these must be approved by members of parliament. The constitution of Ghana allows members of parliament to be doubled as cabinet ministers, and this has been a common practice in Ghana's politics. For example, the current Minister for Foreign Affairs, Ms. Hanna Tetteh, is also a member of parliament representing the Awutu Senya West constituency. This practice, it has been critiqued, makes checks and balances in Ghana difficult.

Ghana's parliament, which is the law making body in the country currently, has 275 members, each representing a single constituency. Parliamentary affairs are overseen by a Speaker of Parliament, who also ensures that rules and regulations are obeyed by all members. The Speaker is assisted by two Deputy Speakers who assist in the enforcement of rules and regulations in the house of parliament. There are also the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader in the house of parliament. The Majority Leader is elected from a political party with the majority of the seats in parliament whereas the Minority Leader is elected from the second largest political party in terms of number of parliamentary seats occupied. Unlike the executive and the legislative bodies, the judicial wing of Ghana government is highly independent. Powers of judicial review are vested in the Ghana's Supreme Court, which is also mandated by the constitution to rule on all constitutional matters brought before it by aggrieved individuals. That is to say that, the Supreme Court of Ghana can rule on any executive and legislative action requested by citizens.
Since Ghana became democratic, the country has largely been experimenting with a multi-party system with several political parties running for elections. Currently, there are 7 registered political parties on the list of the Electoral Commission of Ghana (www.ec.gov.gh). Despite the existence of multiple parties in Ghana, many believe that Ghana has a two-party system. This claim rests on the fact that only two parties have been achieving electoral success since 1992.

In Ghana, general elections (presidential and parliamentary elections) are held on December 7th every four years to elect a president and members of parliament in all the 275 electoral constituencies. Previously, the two elections were held on different dates. Presidential election was conducted first, and then a month later, parliamentary election was conducted. The Ghana Constitution allows elected presidents to stand for a second term but cannot go for a third time. Every elected president has a maximum of eight years in office. Winning a presidential election requires a candidate to obtain a majority of the total votes cast. That is; the winner must get 50 percent of the total votes plus one vote to be declared president. In the event that no presidential candidate meets this threshold, the Republican Constitution requires that a run-off election be held for only the top two candidates three weeks from the date of the first election. This means that, according to the constitution, run-off elections can only be conducted on December 28 of the year that general election is conducted. It needs to be mentioned that, all the general elections (presidential elections) that have been conducted since 2000 have resulted in a run-off.
Ghana's Constitution makes provision for aggrieved candidates and citizens who suspect electoral malpractices, and would like to challenge the validity of the election results, to do so through the court of law. Chapter 8, Section 64, Subsection 1 provides that "The validity of the election of the president may be challenged only by a citizen of Ghana who may present a petition for the purpose to the Supreme Court within twenty-one days after the declaration of the results of the election in respect of which the petition is presented." The constitution, therefore, empowers the Supreme Court to hear cases of allegation involving electoral frauds. Two of these electoral frauds or accusation cases warrant some attention due to their significance in the history of Ghana's politics. During the 1992 presidential election, the main opposition party, the New Patriotic Party, led by Albert Adu Boahen (then presidential candidate for the party) accused the National Democratic Congress with Jerry John Rawlings\(^2\) as the presidential candidate for massively rigging the election\(^3\). In the light of the allegation made, the New Patriotic Party boycotted the parliamentary election, creating an opportunity for the National Democratic Congress party to win a majority (about 78%) of the 200 parliamentary seats at the time. The accusation and later, the boycotting of the parliamentary election is popularly known in Ghana's politics as "the stolen verdict."

\(^2\) Jerry John Rawlings is a former Flight Lieutenant of the Ghana Air Force who led a coup in Ghana in 1979 and became the country's head of state. Rawlings initially came to power in Ghana following a coup d'état in 1979 and, after initially handing power over to a civilian government, took back control of the country on 31 December 1981, as the Chairman of the Provisional National Defense Council. He remained in power as a military leader until 1992, when he resigned from the Armed Forces, founded the National Democratic Congress and became the first president of the Fourth Republic. He was re-elected in 1996 for a further four years (en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jerry_Rawlings). He is remembered for the role he played in the country's democratic development.

\(^3\) The 1992 general election was considered by international observers as free and fair.
Similar accusation was made during the 2012 general election, but this time, the opposition could not boycott the parliamentary election because it was conducted on the same day as the presidential election. The New Patriotic Party with its presidential candidate, Nana Akuffo Addo alleged that the Electoral Commission and the incumbent president, also the National Democratic Congress candidate - President John Dramani Mahama - have tampered with the election results. Following the allegation, the opposition party filed a petition to the Supreme Court in January 2013 to review the election results. The court set up a nine-member committee chaired by Justice William Atuguba to conduct the review. The review and hearing of petitions lasted for about seven months, after which panel members unanimously affirmed and upheld the declaration of the Electoral Commission, implying that, the election was free and fair. Though the decision of the court did not go well for many people, as it has always been, Ghanaians accepted the election results and embraced the winner.

Elections in Ghana, and to some extent, pre-election activities such as campaigns and rallies have always been conducted in a peaceful atmosphere. Though minor clashes among supporters of various political parties have occurred in the past, the country has never recorded any significant conflict or violence during and or after elections. This sets Ghana apart from the many African countries that have lost the lives of many young men and women as a result of pre- and post-election conflicts.
Regions Selected for Fieldwork

To obtain data for the current study, I conducted fieldwork in five of the ten administrative regions of Ghana: Ashanti, Greater Accra, Eastern, Volta, and central.

The section briefly discusses each of the regions by focusing on their sizes, population, and demographic composition. It must be noted that the regions differ largely on these dimensions. Demographic statistics for the five regions were taken from the 2000 and 2010 Population and Housing figures (See Appendix B for details).

Ashanti Region

Ashanti Region is located in the south of Ghana, and is ranked the third largest of 10 administrative regions, occupying a total land surface of 24,889 km² (9,417 sq mi) or 10.2 per cent of the total land area of Ghana. However, in terms of population, the region is the most populated, with a population of 4,780,380 in 2010. Kumasi is the region's capital city, and it shares boundaries with Brong-Ahafo region in the north, Eastern region in the east, Central region in the south and Western region in the South west. Ashanti region is divided into 27 districts, with each headed by a district chief executive. With regards to demographic distribution, almost 52 percent of the region's population is females, and approximately, 61 percent lives in urban areas. The highest proportion of the population (58%) is below 25 years (0 – 14 years, 38% and 15 – 24 years, 20%). Thirty-five percent is in the 25 to 59 age group whereas 7 percent are sixty years and above.
Greater Accra

Though Greater Accra Region is the smallest among the 10 administrative regions, it is the second most populated. According to the 2010 population and housing census, the region has a population of 4,010,054 and occupies an area of 3,245 square kilometers. Historically, the Greater Accra region was originally part of the Eastern region prior to 1982, and was created from the Eastern region in 1982. Fieldwork in this region was conducted in Accra, the capital and largest city in the region. Accra has a population of about 3 million people (Ghana Population and Housing Statistics, 2000). Accra, apart from being the regional capital, serves as the seat of the national government.

Accra is considered as an administrative, communication, and economic center of Ghana. The city stretches along the Atlantic Coast and North into the interior. Given its sprawling nature, Accra has a vast number of neighborhoods and is divided into four districts: Accra Central, Accra North, Accra East, and Accra West. The population of Accra is largely youthful with a majority of young people (56% under the age of 24 years), and females (51%). These statistics are representative of the demographic distribution of the region. The highest proportion of the region's population is women (52%) and lives in the urban areas (91%). More than half (52%) of the population is below the age of 25 years. However, majority of the population (42%) are within the age group of 25 years and 59 years and only 5 percent are 60 years and older. As an administrative, educational, industrial, and commercial center, Accra has attracted many
people from all over the country either working or schooling in the city, making its population very diverse with different ethnic backgrounds.

**Eastern Region**

Eastern Region, like Ashanti region, is located in southern Ghana, and is bordered to the north by Brong-Ahafo region, to the west by Ashanti region, to the south by Central region and Greater Accra region, and to the east by the Lake Volta. Though its inhabitants are from different parts of Ghana, the Akans are the dominant inhabitants and natives of Eastern region. Eastern region is the home of the Akosombo dam, which generates electricity for the entire country. In terms of geography, the region occupies an area of 19,323 square kilometers, representing about 8.1% of Ghana's total land space. The current population of the region stands at 2,633,154. Of this, 51 percent are females and 49 percent are males. About 43 percent of the population are urbanized, implying that, majority of the region's inhabitants reside in the rural areas. Majority of the inhabitants (39%) are between the ages of 0 and 14 years, followed 25 to 59 years (34%) and then by 15 to 24 (19%). Only 8 percent are 60 years and older. The region has a total of 26 administrative districts.

**Volta Region**

Historically, Volta Region was created from the former German and British Togolands, and became part of the then Gold Coast (Presently Ghana) as Trans Volta
Togoland (Beigbeder, 1994). Today, Volta region is one of the ten administrative regions in Ghana and is located west of the Republic of Togo and to the east of Lake Volta. Having Ho as its regional capital, the region has a population of 2,118,252, occupying an area of 20,570 square kilometers (7,940 sq mi). According to the 2010 Population and Housing Census Report, about 52 percent of the people leaving in the region are females, and 48 percent are males. The report further indicates that, high proportion of the region's inhabitants are between the ages of 0 and 14 years (39%), followed by 25 to 59 years (33%), then by 15-24 years (19%) and 60 years and older (9%). Only about 34 percent of the population resides in urban areas of the region, the rest living in rural areas. The region has 25 districts, made-up of 5 municipal and 20 ordinary districts.

Central Region

Central Region, located in the south of Ghana, is surrounded by Ashanti and Eastern regions to the north, Western region to the west, Greater Accra region to the east, and to the south by the Gulf of Guinea. Among all the regions, Central region is known for its quality education at the secondary level, as well as tourist attractions including castles, forts, and beaches that stretch along the region's coastline. The region's economy is predominantly service-oriented, followed by mining and fishing. Cape Coast is the region's capital, and that is the city where fieldwork was conducted. In terms of population, the 2010 census statistics reports 2,201,863 people residing in
the region, majority of which are females (52%) and reside in the rural areas (53%). About 40 percent of the region's population aged 0 to 14 years and approximately 33 percent are aged 25 to 59 years. However, 20 percent are between the age range of 15 to 25 years, and only 7 percent are 60 years and older. The region comprises only 17 administrative districts.

**Policing in Ghana: Historical and Contemporary Assessment**

This section discusses policing in Ghana from both historical and contemporary perspectives. Specifically, three major eras of policing (pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial eras) are discussed.

**Pre-Colonial Policing**

Pre-colonial policing in Ghana was entirely in the hands of traditional authorities who authorized and provided security and protection within their jurisdictions. As noted by Arthur and Marenin (1996), before the advent of colonization, there were well-developed traditional institutions of social control in pre-colonial Ghana. According to these authors, maintenance of law and order was the responsibility of local chiefs who also retained a system of courts. During the pre-colonial era, the local leaders legitimized their authority and powers of social control through religion. According to Mbiti (1969), "the authority that these political figures had was legitimized by religion
because as a social institution, religion served as the binding force that united the collective sentiments of the community and thus provided the context within which the apparatus of social control operated." (cf. Arthur and Marenin, 1996:165). Mbiti's assertion holds relevance in contemporary Ghanaian society because today, as it was in the past, religion still permeates every aspects of Ghana's society. Most Ghanaians still believe that violation of certain norms departs the violator from his/her ancestors, and subsequently fears that the ancestors will not bless him/her (Arthur and Marenin, 1996).

To promote security, the local chiefs or kings had the mandate to organize young and able men into small groups or units with the authority to patrol and enforce by-laws of the community. Among such groups or units were the 'Akwansrafo' formed by the Ashanti Empire. The 'Akwansrafo' were road wardens who patrolled trade routes and collected taxes.

There were three unique features that characterized the organization of policing in pre-colonial society of Ghana, and these characteristics largely defined pre-colonial policing as unprofessional. The first was that, the men who were tasked to provide security in the community by patrolling and performing other policing duties, did not receive salaries for their hard work. They performed police duties on voluntary basis. Related to this was the fact that, the men were only paid commissions from the taxes they collected (Wilks, 1966). Third, the men were not properly organized and trained.
Recruitment into the units did not follow any professional standards, as men were mostly forced or conscripted into the unit.

**Colonial Policing**

Professional Policing was introduced to Ghana, then the Gold Coast, in 1831\(^4\) by the British Colonial Authorities. Police scholars have argued that policing in the Gold Coast originally started at the time when the then governor, Captain George MacLean formed a body of one hundred and twenty-nine men to maintain and enforce the provisions of the Treaty of Peace signed with the Fante chiefs and the King of Ashanti (Teku, 1984). These 129 men were trained and tasked to perform civil police duties. However, in 1873, an ordinance was enacted which formalized the operations of the Gold Coast Police Force. This was a period of British aggression against the Ashanti communities, and the Governor sought assistance from the British military stationed in Nigeria. Quantson (2006) has noted that 700 men were brought in from the Hausa people in northern Nigeria to assist with establishing and maintaining control. The men, who stayed after the conflict has ended, were given civilian policing duties to perform. An ordinance was passed that “sought to provide for better regulation and discipline of the Armed Gold Coast Police” (Quantson, 2006, p.6). The Hausa police used brutal

\(^4\) There is much disagreement as to when professional policing was introduced in Ghana. Some historians believed that professional policing started from 1844, when the Bond of 1844 was drawn between the Fante chiefs and Governor MacLean. Others gave their accounts starting from the Second World War, implying that professional policing is fairly new thing in Ghana.
tactics in discharging their duties. This brutal behavior, according to Appiagyei-Atua (2006) earned them the nickname 'buga-buga', meaning 'beat-beat' in Hausa.

The Gold Coast Police Force was renamed the Gold Coast Constabulary in 1876. As a result, several units were created, such as the Railways and Mines Detachments and Escort Police, Marine Police and a Criminal Investigations Department (Quantson, 2006). These units were assigned different roles to play. For instance, the Escort Police were given guard and escort duties in the important mining areas, the Marine Police was focused on smuggling and looting, and the Criminal Investigations Department was used to gather intelligence (Aning, 2006). A new ordinance was passed in 1894 which gave the authority to form a civil police in the Gold Coast. This civil police later became the new Gold Coast Police Force, which comprised of 400 Constables. According to Quantson (2006), the passage of the new ordinance also led to the establishment of police stations and the standardization of policing in the British controlled areas of the Gold Coast. The majority of the constables were illiterate, and training was heavily militarized. The police officers produced had “attitudes that generated intimidation and bullying with an almost robotic obedience to repressive colonial laws that were regime-centered” (Quantson, 2006, p.7).

Generally speaking, the colonial police force was intended to achieve the following goals. First, establishing and maintaining security for trade in European goods and as a vanguard for colonial expansion into the hinterland for increased exploitation of agricultural and mineral resources (Ward, 1948, pg.184). The second purpose was to
protect the ruling and propertied class. The 1896 mandate issued by Governor George Maclean uniquely presents the primacy of these two goals. This mandate established that ‘no police should be stationed where there were no Europeans’ (Gillespie, 1955:36).

During the colonial era, concerns were raised about the moral standing of the police among the public and their efficiency. Gillespie (1955) offered that successive governors and police commissioners described the police as ‘worse than inefficient’. This observation underscores the ineffectiveness of the colonial police in the maintenance of the colonial government machinery. Police ineffectiveness was not the only issue confronting the police. Equally important was the extreme public distrust in the police, a result of systemic police brutality - systemic in that the brutal nature of the Gold Coast Constabulary was initiated and cultivated by the British colonial authorities believing the only means of developing a conducive atmosphere for successful trade was to have a police force that would be brutal to the indigenous citizens (Atuguba, 2003; Killingray, 1991). Achieving this aim was simplified by recruiting the “Hausas”. Recruited from Northern Nigeria, the Hausas formed a unified force with the mandate to enforce the laws of colonialists through brutalization. Historians suggest that this brutal and alien character of the force made the police unpopular among the citizenry (Killingray, 1991; Gillespie, 1955; Ward, 1948).
**Post-Colonial Policing**

Immediately after the departure of the British and Ghana gained her political independence in 1957, the Gold Coast Constabulary was renamed Ghana Police Service (GPS). An initiative was taken by the first president - Kwame Nkrumah - to Africanize the Ghana Police Service. This initiative made Ghanaians the occupants of the top hierarchy of the service (positions formerly occupied by the Europeans). Though efforts were made to rebrand the police force, all that changed was the name, as the service retained all existing units and divisions. Postcolonial policing in Ghana took the shape and character similar to that of colonial policing (Tankebe, 2008a). Atuguba (2003) remarked the GPS kept the same basic objectives established by the imperialist powers.

The GPS, like its predecessor remained the 'property' of the political and propertied class championing their interests as well as assuring them maximum protection. In addition, the GPS retained a centralized organizational structure with twelve administrative regions, fifty-one divisions, one hundred and seventy-nine districts, and six hundred and fifty-one stations across the nation. The strength of the police service increased progressively from the few years leading up to independence and continued until the peak year in 1971. Then, the police force numbered 19,410 personnel which served the total population of Ghana of nearly eight and half million (Aning, 2002). Despite the above, we must recognize the GPS has undergone notable functional and compositional changes to improve the service.
Currently, the GPS employs 23,702 officers, serving a population of twenty-five million, which is grossly above the United Nation Standards for ideal police staffing. The GPS officer to citizen ratio is 1 to 1054. The United Nations recommended ratio is 1 to 450. Of the total number of officers currently employed, about 79 percent are males and 21 percent are females. The GPS performs several duties, most of which are specified by the Police Force Act, 1970 (Act 350).

Functions of Modern Police in Ghana - GPS

To achieve its mission and objectives, the Ghana Police Service performs several challenging functions. These functions have been grouped into: core activities and non-core activities.

The core activities are considered the main functions of GPS, and are stipulated in Section one of the Police Force Act, 1970 (Act 350). These include the prevention of crime and protection of Life and Property. This particular function is achieved through foot and mobile patrolling of communities; criminal intelligence gathering; police station operations; traffic control; conflict resolution; and forensic analysis for the purpose of apprehending offenders. The second core activity perform by GPS is the detection and apprehension of criminals that is achieved mainly through investigation and creation of crime intelligence. When offenders are arrested, and there is enough evidence pointing to their culpability, they are handed over to the court for further action. The GPS, as its core function, prosecutes offenders. It is their responsibility to prepare offenders for
prosecution in court. This is done by first remanding offenders in custody and then, sending them to court.

Unlike the core activities, the non-core activities performed by the Ghana Police Service are not defined by the Police Force Act. However, these activities are considered to be pivotal to the effective performance of the core-activities described above. They include general administrative, welfare, human resource, research and development, finance, and general and technical duties (transport, workshops, tailoring and catering).

Organizational Structure of GPS

To achieve its mandates, GPS has operationalized its activities into several directorates and departments, each having a well-defined mandate. The directorates are headed by either a Director General or a Director who reports directly to the Inspector General of Police (IGP) on the affairs of the directorate. These directorates include Operations\(^5\), Finance, Legal, Administration, Human Resource and Development, Welfare, Technical Services, General Services, Special duties, ICT, Domestic Violence and Victim Support Unit (DOVVSU)\(^6\). In addition, GPS has several departments that perform specialized tasks, all with the unique aim of achieving the constitutional

\(^5\) The operations department is at the center of GPS organization because it performs the core-activities of the Service.

\(^6\) The Domestic Violence Victim Support Unit (DOVVSU) was established in 1998 to address cases of abuse and violence against women and children in Ghana. The unit has offices across Ghana.
mandates of the Service. These departments include the Community Policing Unit\(^7\), the Motor Traffic and Transport Unit, Criminal Investigation Unit, the Police College, and the Police Hospital. Refer to figure 3 for details.

As mentioned earlier, GPS operates in twelve administrative regions - ten covering the ten administrative regions of Ghana, one assigned to the Seaport and industrial areas of Tema and the other being the Railway, Ports and Harbors. Each of the twelve police regions is headed by a regional commander who reports to the Director General of Administration. Furthermore, the police regions are divided into divisions, with each headed by a divisional commander. The police divisions are further divided into districts, with districts commanders reporting directly to the divisional commander. Finally, there are several police stations having limited control in each district. These stations are mostly headed by Chief Inspectors, who report to the district commanders relating to affairs within their limited jurisdictions. It can be argued that, this type of organizational structure is carefully designed to ensure nationwide coverage of police activities, as well as effective policing in Ghana. For the organizational chart of the Ghana Police Service (GPS), see figure 3.

\(^7\)The Community Policing Unit of the Ghana Police Service was established in June 2002 with the setting up of the administration section and the Bicycle Patrol Unit Community Protection Assistants, (CPAs) are being recruited, equipped and, trained to employ non-coercive methods in the delivery of services to the communities.
**Figure 2:** Organization Chart of the GPS

*Source:* Adopted from Arthur and Marenin, 1996 with modification
Offences Reported to GPS: 2000 to 2010

Criminal cases that came to the attention of the Ghana Police Service between 2000 and 2010 can be categorized as major offences and commonly committed offences. According to GPS official records, major offences include robbery, murder, defilement, rape and narcotic drugs - heroin, cocaine, and Indian hemp. Though these offences are not committed frequently, offenders face severe punishment when found guilty. Punishment can range from several years in prison to a death penalty. Section 46 of the 1960 Ghana Criminal Code (ACT 29) specifies death for whoever commits murder. According to section 47, murder is defined as "Whoever intentionally causes the death of another person by any unlawful harm is guilty of murder, unless his crime is reduced to manslaughter by reason of such extreme provocation, or other matter of partial excuse...." (pg. 39) Moreover, persons convicted of rape face a minimum sentence of five and a maximum of 25 years in prison.

In terms of reporting, statistical data obtained from the GPS for the period indicated above do not only show a low reporting rate for the major offences, but also do not show variations in reporting across the period. For instance, the total number of cases reported to GPS in the year 2000 was 2,762, 3,810 in 2001, 4,794 in 2002, and 4,492 in 2003 (see Appendix C for details).

8 According to section 101 of the Ghana Criminal Code, 1960 (ACT 29), defilement is the natural or unnatural carnal knowledge of any child under sixteen years of age.

9 Section 98 of the Criminal Code defines rape as the carnal knowledge of a female of sixteen years or above without her consent. This definition of rape excludes rape against a man, making it limited in scope.
The commonly committed offences are those offences which are frequently committed, and include attempted murder, manslaughter, causing harm, assault, stealing, fraud, abortion, and abduction. Unlike the major offences, punishment for these offences are mostly less severe and can range from few months in prison/jail to few years. These offences do not carry either life sentence or death penalty. However, like the major offences, reporting over the years have not been encouraging and did not differ much from one year to another. For example, in 2000, the total number of cases reported was 153,423; 171,636 cases were reported in 2001, and 167,993 were reported in 2002. This trend is similar across the 11 year period (see Appendix D).

The low reporting rate for both the major and commonly committed offences in Ghana are perplexing, given the 30% increase in Ghana's population from 2000 to 2010, and the number of police officers that have been employed over the years. These indications suggest a higher reporting rate of all offences. Several thought-provoking questions require answers: Is the low reporting due to previous maltreatment of and mishandling of victims by the police? Is it the result of a deliberate attempt by the police to under-record cases for political points? Or is it because Ghanaians do not believe justice may be served? Explanations to these questions have not been forthcoming. However, there is a need to acknowledge the limited efforts made by prior studies.

Adinkrah (2011) attempted to explain why sexual assault reporting in Ghana was low, and argued that, people lack confidence in the Ghanaian criminal justice system.
He attributed the low reporting of sexual assault crimes to lower levels of confidence that Ghanaians have in the justice institutions. Similarly, Boateng and Lee (2014) explained why women do not report sexual assault cases but did so from a different perspective. These authors appealed to the cultural context of the Ghanaian society to argue for the low reporting rate. They believed that reporting of sexual assault cases are low because most of these cases are solved by the family who wants to prevent public humiliation and stigmatization. This may be true in the sense that families in Ghana value and cherish their family names, and as a result, desist from engaging in things that will bring disgrace and shame onto the whole family.

*Legal Framework of GPS*

The 1992 Republic Constitution establishes the Ghana Police Service and sets in Section 200, subsection 1 that "No person or authority shall raise any police service except by or under the authority of an Act of Parliament." In subsection 3, the Constitution specifies that the "Police Service shall be equipped and maintained to perform its traditional role of maintaining law and order." Furthermore, the

---

Constitution creates the Police Council and the Regional Police Committee with advisory and oversight responsibilities. The Police Council, as setup in Section 201, is composed of 10 members as follows: the Vice-President, who shall be chairman; the Minister responsible for internal affairs; the Inspector-General of Police; the Attorney-General or his representative; a lawyer nominated by the Ghana Bar Association; a representative of the Retired Senior Police Officers Association; two members of the Police Service, appointed by the President, acting in consultation with the Council of State, one of whom shall be of a junior rank; and two other members appointed by the President. These members are tasked with the responsibility to advise the president on matters of policing relating to internal security, including the rule of the Police Service, budgeting, finance, administration, and promotion of officers above the rank of Assistance Commissioner of Police.

The Regional Police Committee on the other hand is made up of the Minister of State appointed for the region, who shall be chairman; the two most senior members of the Police Service in the region; a representative of each district in the region appointed by the District Assembly in the district; a lawyer practicing in the region nominated by the Ghana Bar Association; a representative of the Attorney-General; and a representative of the Regional House of Chiefs. The committee is tasked with the responsibility of advising the Police Council on matters relating to the administration of
the Police Service in the region. Finally, the Constitution also sets out the procedure for appointing the Inspector-General of Police.

Another legislation governing the operation of the Ghana Police Service is the Police Service Act, 1970 (Act, 350). The Act defines several aspects of GPS. As mentioned earlier, Section 1 of the Act sets out the functions of the Police Service: "It shall be the duty of the Police Service to prevent and detect crime, to apprehend offenders, and to maintain public order and safety of persons and property." Other aspects of GPS detailed by the Act include: Structure and Conditions of the Service (Part II); the Police Council (Part III); Misconduct and Unsatisfactory Service (Part IV); Complaints and Offences (Part V); the Volunteer Police Reserve (Part VI); and Miscellaneous and Supplemental (Part VII).

In addition, there are two sets of regulations that also guide officers of the Ghana Police Service. There is the Police Service Regulations, 1974 (L1 880) that specifies standards of conduct for officers, and the Police Force Regulations, 1974 (L1 993) set out the procedure for disciplining police officers' misconduct. Each of the above legal frameworks plays a dual role - as guidance and as oversight - and collectively presents an active force of checks and balances for the Ghana Police Service.

*Relationship Between GPS and the Public*

Two thought-provoking questions about the relationship between the Ghana police and the citizenry need to be addressed: First, why do Ghanaians have low trust in the
police? And second, what factors determine Ghanaians' trust and confidence in the police? While the later is the focus on this study, the former has been sufficiently answered in this section.

The relationship between police and citizens in Ghana has been marked by suspicion, hatred, discontent, and mistrust. These negative feelings are largely due to the brutal character of the Ghana police force under British colonialism (Atuguba, 2003; Tankebe, 2008a). To understand the present nature of police-citizen relationship in Ghana, a brief discussion of the relationship that existed during the colonial period is necessary to provide historical context.

During the colonial era, as noted above, the police were ineffective, especially in protecting the indigenous Ghanaians. Ineffectiveness was not the only issue confronting the police. Equally important was the extreme public distrust in the police as a result of massive police maltreatment. The Gold Coast police force which was mainly consisting of Hausas used repressive measures in discharging their day-to-day police duties. Historians have long contended that this behavior made the police unpopular among the citizenry (Killingray, 1991; Gillespie, 1955; Ward, 1948).

Today, though the Ghana Police Service is composed of only Ghanaians, the police remain oppressive, and has been described as excessively corrupt and brutal (Atuguba, 2003; Tankebe, 2008a). This mars their relationship with the public. Researchers have even argued that police misconduct appears to be even worse than during the colonial period (Tankebe 2008a). Police corrupt practices in Ghana take
different forms (Tankebe, 2010) and may include: the failures to arrest, investigate or prosecute offenders because of family and friendship ties and bribe-taking from suspects. Anecdotal evidence suggests that some police officers mount road barricades to extort money from law-abiding commercial drivers. The magnitude of police corruption in Ghana has been evidenced in recent survey findings. In 2008 for instance, the Afrobarometer survey observed that about 78% of Ghanaians perceived the police to be corrupt.

Pervasive police brutality also explains Ghanaians' low trust in the police. Police beating of suspects during arrest and interrogation as well as manhandling innocent citizens during demonstration, are common practices among police personnel in Ghana. A 2010 report on human rights practices in Ghana remarked that police brutality, corruption, negligence, and impunity were problems facing the police. The report added that the police extorted money by acting as private debt collectors, setting up illegal checkpoints, and arresting citizens in exchange for bribes from disgruntled business associates of those detained.

The most high profile act of police brutality, which threw the whole country into a state of mourning and has since left an indelible mark in the minds of citizens, occurred on May 9, 2001. On this day, 126 soccer fans were crushed to death and several hundred spectators were injured when the police used tear gas in response to soccer hooliganism during a local match. The incident received worldwide attention and
has been considered the worst stadium disaster in Africa, further undermining the level of trust between Ghanaians and police.

Today, according to Aning (2006), though the public welcome the new service orientation of the police, there remains an underlying sense of mistrust and discomfort. Recent surveys conducted in Ghana have demonstrated that Ghanaians have low trust in the police. For instance, research shows that more than half (53%) of Ghanaians do not trust the police at all (Boateng, 2012). Similarly, surveys conducted by Afrobarometer (2005-2012), a regional public attitude survey organization, indicated that, Ghanaian's trust in the police continues to decline over time. For instance, in 2005, the survey found that almost 38% of Ghanaians trusted the police “a lot.” This fell to 28% in 2008, and 18% in 2012 (see figure 1).

Figure 3: Trends in Ghanaians’ Trust in the Police

Source of data: Adopted from Boateng (2013)
Explaining Ghanaians’ Trust: Empirical Review and Limitations

Few empirical studies have been conducted to examine the factors that influence variation in levels of trust in the police among Ghanaians. These studies have variously found several predictors of public trust in the Ghana police service. In two separate studies, Tankebe (2008b, 2010) found that perceptions of police effectiveness, procedural fairness, personal encounters, and vicarious experiences with police corruption affect trust in the police. In his 2008 study, Tankebe argued that public perceptions of police effectiveness exercise a direct impact on perceived police trustworthiness. A trustworthy police force is one adjudged by the public to have the interests of the public at hand rather than personal or political interests. Citizens who perceive the police not only as effective in controlling crime but also as effective in meeting citizen expectations and interests will accordingly consider the police to be trustworthy. Tankebe (2008b) however noted that effectiveness alone without the police following procedure standards will have weak effect on trust.

Research on public trust in the police has also found that vicarious experiences of police corruption influence Ghanaians’ levels of trust in the police (Tankebe 2010). This study found that Ghanaians who have indirectly experienced police corruption either by witnessing the police taking bribes from other persons or have witnessed a situation where the police refused to investigate, arrest, or prosecute because of friendship or family ties would be less likely to trust the police. It must be noted that, Tankebe (2010) did not find any effect for personal experiences of police corruption.
Boateng (2012) conducted a study to examine factors that shape Ghanaians’ trust in the police and found that fear of crime and satisfaction with police work have significant influence on trust in the police. Fear of crime had a negative relationship with trust, indicating that, when fear of crime is high, trust in the police will be low. Ghanaians decide where to live, shop and socialize based on their perceptions of relative safety (Boateng, 2012). As a result, persons who fear attack or victimization anywhere in the city or neighborhood will consider the police as ineffective, and consequently demonstrate lower levels of trust in the police. Furthermore, Boateng (2012) found that when citizens are satisfied with the work of the police in their respective neighborhoods, they tend to have higher trust in the police than when they are not satisfied, a finding that has also been observed in other social contexts (Reynolds et al, 2008; Wu & Sun, 2009).

The discussion of factors that influence Ghanaians’ trust in the police would be incomplete without considering the effects of perception of corruption among other government institutions. This variable was found to have a negative effect on public trust in the Ghanaian police (Boateng, 2012). Ghanaians who consider other government officials - not necessarily the police - to be corrupt tend to have low trust in the police as well. The effect is possibly due to the fact that the police operate within an institutional setting and not in a vacuum. Therefore misconduct that occurs in one institution affects public ratings for the other institutions and in this case, the police. Political affiliation only influenced trust at the bivariate level. The influence was
negative, suggesting that Ghanaians who have affiliations with political parties demonstrate lower trust in the police than those with no such affiliations. This effect disappeared when accounting for multiple variables.

The above studies have several limitations which must be acknowledged. First, these studies focused on very small sample sizes as well as examined far more limited variables which preclude detail examination of the issue. These studies therefore cannot tell us anything about the influence of social capital, contacts, and media, just to mention a few. These are important variables that have been found to predict perceptions of the police in several social contexts similar to that of Ghana. Second, the studies were geographically limited, as they were conducted in only one out of the several regions in Ghana. The combined effect of these methodological issues is the inability to generalize their findings to the entire Ghanaian population. To address these issues, there is the need for a comprehensive attitudinal research that utilizes a large sample size and focus on several regions of Ghana to explain the variations in citizens' level of trust in the police. The present study addresses these issues, and by so doing, presents a comprehensive model for explaining citizens' trust in the Ghanaian police.
Chapter Summary

This chapter provided a historical map of policing in Ghana from pre-colonial period through colonial era to the post-colonial era. Policing today, it can be argued, is a legacy inherited from the British Colonial Masters who because of trade and suppression of local people introduced professional policing in the then Gold Coast in the 19th century. The Gold Coast Police Force (GCPF), with a majority of its officers being Hausas, employed repressive measures in performing the day-to-day regular police work. This behavior has not been different ever since the name was changed to Ghana Police Service after independence. Apart from the name and the changes that were made in the composition of the police force through the Africanization Policy, all other facets remained unchanged, including the use of repressive tactics.

GPS, like its predecessors, continue to use aggressive mechanisms against its citizens and political dissidents. In addition, the police have been criticized for protecting the interests of politicians and the rich at the expense of the ordinary Ghanaian and the poor in society. All these have resulted in contention between the police and the public, resulting in low public evaluations of the police. This study seeks to determine and explain factors that influence trust in the GPS by focusing on selected regions and urban areas in Ghana.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Chapter Four presents a detailed explanation of the research methodology and design. Discussion of the study purposes, research questions, hypotheses, participants, study design, data collection procedures, and operationalization of measures are discussed in this chapter.

Study Objectives and Research Questions

As indicated in the literature and previous studies on public trust and legitimacy, variables derived from the performance theory have significant impact on public evaluations of the police. People who believe that the police are performing well and help to reduce fear among citizens, tend to rate the police fairly. To explore the influence of performance indicators in more detail using cross-sectional data, this study seeks to test the performance theory to determine whether its assumptions can be used to explain trust in the Ghana police, and to examine individual and contextual variables that are more likely to influence citizens’ levels of trust in the Ghanaian police. There are significant differences among regions, cities and neighborhoods in Ghana – by income inequality, demographic distribution, population density - and therefore it is expected that trust in the police will vary based on the neighborhood a person resides.
This exploration will help to compare the urban areas [and to some extent the cities] to determine causes of variation of trust in the police at neighborhood/city level.

Based on the study’s objectives, the following research questions were addressed:

1. Can performance theory explain variations in citizens' levels of trust in the police in a developing nation such as Ghana?

2. Can any other theory of trust, apart from the performance theory, explain the causes of trust and distrust in the Ghana police?

3. What specific individual and contextual factors influence Ghanaians' perceptions of the police? The second part of this question seeks to examine whether neighborhood-level characteristics play a significant role in the variation of trust in the Ghana Police.

**Study Hypotheses**

To achieve the primary objectives of the study as well as address the above research questions, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. It is hypothesized that favorable perceptions of police effectiveness will positively influence citizens' trust in the police. People who believe the police to be effective in controlling crime and providing services will indicate higher trust than those who believe
otherwise. This assumption is based on the performance theory which presupposes that trust or distrust is linked to good or bad performance of the police.

2. Fear of crime will have a negative effect on citizen's level of trust in the police. Fear of crime is used as a measure to determine whether the police are performing well or not. As such, higher fear of crime is an indication of poor police performance, consequently, leading to unfavorable evaluation of the police. In developing societies - like Ghana - where fear of crime may be high, trust in the police may correspondingly be low. Hence, based on assumptions derived from the performance theory, it is expected that people who express being worried about crime or fearful of crime will significantly demonstrate lower trust in the Ghana police.

3. Greater perceptions of neighborhood disorder will have a negative effect on citizens' trust in the police. Neighborhood disorder like fear of crime is linked to police performance. Therefore, a high perception of disorderly conducts will imply that the police are ineffective in ensuring orderliness in the society and accordingly resulting in negative evaluation. Also derived from the performance theory is the expectation that Ghanaians who perceive disorderly behavior to be rampant in their communities will ultimately express lower levels of trust in the police.

4. It is hypothesized that citizens with prior experiences of police corruption will have negative effect on trust in the police. Corruption, in the form of bribe-taken,
undermines performance and ultimately leads to police untrustworthiness. The practice prevents police officers from performing their duties in the manner they are required, as a result, are constantly viewed as ineffective. In some societies, officers do not only demand money but also refuse to arrest or prosecute. Being a common practice in Ghana, it is assumed that individual's experiences of police corruption will undermine trust in the Ghana police.

Based on the above hypothesized relationships, the following model (see Figure 4) will be tested. This model graphically explains the expected effects of the four performance indicators on trust in the police, after controlling for other variables.
Figure 4: Proposed Model of Trust in the GPS

Note: Solid line represents the relationship between a performance variable and trust in the police, whereas dashed line represents the relationship between a control variable and trust. Plus or minus signs represent effects, and arrows represent direction of an effect.

Source: Adopted from Boateng (2013) with modification
In the model, it is proposed that experiences of police corruption will negatively influence trust. However, public acceptance of police corruption is expected to have a positive effect on citizen’s level of trust in the police. Moreover, the police effectiveness is also expected to influence trust in a positive way, whereas perceptions of fear of crime and neighborhood disorder are to negatively impact trust. The model further contains several variables expected to mediate the hypothesized relationships between the performance variables and trust in the police.

Method

Study population and participants

The target population for this study included all individuals aged 18 years and above, living in the selected urban areas of Ghana at the time of the survey administration. The survey collected information on people’s opinion about the Ghana police and utilized a face-to-face interviewing technique to obtain relevant information from respondents selected randomly from five communities in the capital cities of five administrative regions. Each respondent participating in the study was selected from one household. Survey administration in all the five regions lasted approximately four months, starting from March, 2014 to June, 2014. Specifically, in each region, field work, including training that was offered to research assistants lasted three weeks. The remaining four weeks were spent on training of data entry personnel and entry of data in an excel format.
**Sampling techniques and procedure**

To select respondents for participation in this study, a multistage cluster sampling method was adopted to ensure that a representative sample is obtained. The selection involved five stages. First, five regions were purposively selected from the ten administrative regions in Ghana. Though there are ten administrative regions in Ghana, not all are highly diverse in terms of population heterogeneity. Some regions are more diversified because of tremendous economic and industrial activities, while others are more agrarian and homogenous. Therefore, since the aim was to obtain a representative sample, five regions with highly heterogeneous population were selected. Based on this criterion, the following regions were selected: Ashanti, Greater Accra, Central, Eastern, and Volta. Second, the capital city of each region was purposively selected for the study. There are two main reasons for focusing the study on the capital cities. The first is that, regional capitals have more heterogeneous population than other cities, due to economic and other activities which are widespread in the capital cities. People migrate from other cities to the regional capitals for work or school. Second, police activities are presumed to be high in the regional capitals than in the rest of the cities mainly because of the widespread economic activities which attract people from different parts of the regions. Due to the intensity of enforcement efforts, it is believed that people in the regional capitals will experience the police more frequently than those in the other cities. Subsequently, such people are assumed to be in the position to evaluate the police fairly.
The third selection involved selecting five communities purposively from each regional capital in the five regions. Several reasons explain the purposive selection of the five communities. First, certain areas in Ghana are typically for commercial activities and are not residential areas. Hence, they are not useful for reaching populations. Second, some communities are reserved for specific government officials such as police officers, correctional officers, fire officials and ministers. Including such areas in the study may bias the results since respondents may not offer genuine responses to the questions asked. Third, some communities are either inhabited solely by the rich or by the poor, and by including any of those communities in the study, one is bound to obtain partial views of the police, since the rich and the poor hold differential views of the police because of the differential treatment they receive. These reasons preclude random selection of the communities.

Fourth, two hundred and fifty households were randomly selected from the five communities (50 households from each community) of each capital city. According to Hailand (2003), a household constitutes one or more people who live in the same house and also share at meals or living accommodation. For the purpose of data collection, any single house where people do not share meals or living space was considered to constitute multiple households. In selecting the households, first, the researcher and the research assistants walked around the selected communities to count the number of households within a particular community. The idea was to prepare a list of all households in the community to facilitate random selection of the households. Once the
list was prepared, a quota of 50 households was used, and households were randomly selected until 50 were met. For example, assuming community A comprised of 200 households, the first household was selected at random and subsequently, every other 4th household was selected for inclusion in the study. This system of selection was to ensure that every household in the community was given an equal chance of inclusion.

The final selection involved the selection of individual respondent from each household. In this selection, the use of the birthday methods - which involve selecting an individual from a household whose birthday is closer to or has just celebrated his/her birthday prior to the survey administration - was highly desirable as they are quick, easy, and less intrusive as well as maximize the cooperation rates (Gaziano, 2005; Oldendick, Bishop, Sorenson and Tuchfarber, 1988). Both the last-birthday and the next-birthday methods were used randomly in selecting the respondents. Though, the birthday methods have been criticized for not been truly random approaches, by applying both the last-birthday and the next-birthday selection methods in the same survey, the selection becomes truly random (Battaglia, Link, Frankel, Osborn and Mokdad, 2008). The last-birthday method was used to select an individual who was at least 18 years and was the last to celebrate his/her birthday in the household at the time of the survey administration. The next-birthday method was used to select an individual whose birthday was nearest to the date of the survey administration and was 18 years or older. Overall, 250 respondents were selected from each of the five
administrative regions mentioned above, making the total sample size of 1250 respondents.

Though the nature of the study did not necessarily require authorities’ permission, as a matter of courtesy, I sought permission from the central police administration and the local council in the various regions the study was conducted. This approach enabled authorities to be aware that the study was been conducted in the country. Research assistants (RAs) were employed to assist in the administration and collection of questionnaires. Though assistants possessed bachelor’s-level education and had prior knowledge about survey research, they were thoroughly trained on the modalities of conducting survey research and proper administration of survey instrument. During the fieldwork, RAs were thoroughly supervised by the researcher to ensure that they perform their work well.

The supervision involved walking along with the RAs making random checks on their progress. In addition, I occasionally talked to people I suspected might have been spoken to by the RAs just to ensure that the RAs were really working. The use of assistants ensured timely collection of data and a thorough administration of questionnaires. Questionnaires were administered to the selected individuals, and were collected at the time of administration. This procedure ensured that the sampled individuals were the ones who actually filled out the questionnaire. Overall, 1024 questionnaires out of the 1250 were completed and collected, obtaining a response rate
of about 82%. For further information about the distribution of questionnaires, see Appendix F.

**Measures**

**Dependent Variable**

Trust in the police was an index variable created from five items in the survey. Each item was measured using 5-item Likert-type scale. The items were gleaned from Sunshine and Tyler's (2003) questions with modification to fit into the context of the present study. All five items have the same lead-in question: "For the following items, kindly indicate whether you agree or disagree: Overall, I trust the police in my neighborhood to protect lives and property; the police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the people in your neighborhood; the police in your neighborhood are generally honest; I have absolute confidence that the police can do their job well; the police care about the well-being of everyone they deal with. Response categories were (1) Strongly disagree, (2), Disagree (3) Undecided (4) Agree and (5) Strongly agree. A factor analysis with a maximum likelihood estimator indicated that all these items measured the same underlying construct (see Table 1). Therefore, the responses of all the items were summed to form an addictive trust in the police scale. The scale has a mean of 14.67 (SD = 4.46) and an alpha value of 0.79, suggesting good internal reliability.
Independent Variables

Four variables derived from the performance theory were anticipated to influence citizens’ trust in the police. These are police effectiveness, fear of crime, police corruption, and neighborhood disorder.

Perception of police effectiveness was measured by nine items adapted from Tankebe (2009) and Sunshine and Tyler (2003). The items asked respondents to indicate the extent to which the police were effective in performing duties in the neighborhood. The nine items have the same responses categories as (1) Strongly disagree, (2), Disagree (3) Undecided (4) Agree and (5) Strongly agree. These items included: The police are effective in controlling violent crime in your neighborhood? The police are effective at arresting criminal suspects in your neighborhood? The police are effective at controlling theft (mobile phone, purse or bag snatching) in your neighborhood? The police are effective at controlling burglary in your neighborhood? The police are effective in controlling disturbances in your neighborhood? The police always provide assistance to the general public when needed? The police respond quickly when they are called for help? The police are always ready to provide satisfactory assistance to victims of crime? When the police stop people, they usually handle the situation well. In a factor analysis, five items loaded on factor one while four items loaded on factor two. The five items which loaded on factor one were combined to form police effectiveness in controlling crime subscale. The subscale has a mean of 14.99 (SD = 4.49) and an alpha value of 0.81, suggesting good internal reliability. And
the four items which loaded on factor two were combined to form police effectiveness in providing service subscale. This subscale has a mean of 11.57 (SD = 3.36) with an alpha value of 0.68, indicating acceptable level of internal consistency.

*Fear of crime* is defined as a fear of becoming a victim of crime (Reynolds et al, 2008). Fear of crime was measured using 4-item Likert-type scale asking respondents to indicate whether they agree or disagree with the following statements: I am afraid to walk in my neighborhood at day time, I am afraid to walk in my neighborhood at night time by myself, the level of security in my neighborhood is very low, and overall, I am afraid to be attacked in my neighborhood. The response categories were (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. A factor analysis with a maximum likelihood estimator indicated that all these items measured the same underlying construct. As a result, the responses of the four items were summed together to form an addictive fear of crime scale. The scale has a mean of 12.08 (SD = 3.52) and an alpha value of 0.64, suggesting acceptable internal consistency.

*Police Corruption* was measured by using four separate measures: perception of corruption, personal experiences of corruption, and vicarious experiences of corruption and public acceptance of police corruption. All but the perception of corruption measure were scaled measures which were formed by combining several items.
Perception of corruption was measured by a single item asking respondents to indicate whether they agree or disagree that police officers take bribe. Response categories ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree.

Personal experiences were measured using four items: In the past, have you paid money or made a promise to a police officer to overlook your unlawful behavior? In the past, have the police demanded money from you even though you did not engage in unlawful behavior? The police refused to investigate, arrest, charge or prosecute you because of your personal relationship with a police officer? And Have you used somebody related to a police officer to prevent a case being pursued against you? Response categories ranged from "not at all" to "many times". The items, which were combined to form the personal experiences scale, were adapted from Tankebe (2010). The scale has a mean of 6.72 (SD = 3.21) and an alpha value of 0.78.

Vicarious experience was measured using two items (also gleaned from Tankebe, 2010): Have you witnessed anybody making payment to a police officer to overlook his/her unlawful behavior? Do you know of any situation where the police refuse to investigate, arrest, charge or prosecute someone because of his/her relations to a police officer? Response categories ranged from "not at all" to "many times". These items were combined to form a vicarious experience scale, possessing a mean of 4.77 (SD = 1.99) and an alpha value of 0.53.

Public acceptance of police corruption was measured with two items adapted from Hyams (1990): It is not wrong for an officer to accept small gifts from the public
and an officer must sometimes use prohibited means to accomplish enforcement of the law or make an arrest. The response categories were (1) Strongly disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Undecided, (4) Agree, and (5) Strongly Agree. The responses of the two items were summed to form the public acceptance scale, with a mean of 5.49 (SD = 2.25) and an alpha value of 0.40.

*Perceived neighborhood disorder* measured the extent of neighborhood disorderly problems perceived by the respondents. It was measured by using eight items, six of which were used by Reisig and Parks (2000) to measure perceived incivility in their hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police study. The eight items measured the extent of neighborhood problems: litter/trash, hanging around, vandalism, abandoned buildings, dirty gutters, gangs, unrepaired street lights, and drug dealings. Each of these items has a three-point response set (1 = not a problem, 2 = minor problem, and 3 = major problem). A factor analysis indicated that all these items measured the same underlying construct. Therefore, the responses were summed to form an addictive neighborhood disorder scale. The scale has a mean of 18.52 (SD = 3.87) and an alpha value of 0.79, suggesting good internal reliability.

*Control Variables*

Several variables have been found by the police literature to influence citizen's evaluations of the police. The effects of some of these variables were controlled in the analysis to ensure that any observable relationship between the four independent
variables and the dependent variable was not spurious. Most of these variables were theoretically driven and will help to offer further theoretical explanations for the causes of trust and distrust in the Ghana police service. The following variables were controlled:

Based on the procedural justice literature the study controls for the effects of procedural fairness and contacts on attitudes toward the police. *Procedural fairness* was measured by six Likert-type items adopted from Sunshine and Tyler (2003) and Tankebe (2009). The items which were modified, asked respondents to indicate the frequency with which the police engage in behavior consistent with procedural fairness in their neighborhood using the following response categories, (1) never, (2) almost never, (3) sometimes, (4) almost always and (5) always. The items included: the police make decisions about how to handle problems in fair ways; the police treat people fairly; the police treat everyone in your neighborhood equally; the police accurately understand and apply the law; the police make decisions base upon facts not their personal biases or opinions; and the police give honest explanations for their actions to the people they deal with. A factor analysis revealed that all these items measured the same underlying construct. Therefore, the responses were summed to form procedural fairness scale, which had a mean of 16.78 (SD = 4.53) and an alpha value of 0.77.

*Contact with the police* was measured using a single indicator adapted from Rosenbaum et al's (2005) study. Respondents were asked if they have had any type of
contact with the police in the past 12 months. This was a dichotomous variable measured as 0 = no contact and 1 = contact.

*Social Trust*, derived from the social capital theory, was measured as an index of the trust in people which was created from seven items, five of which were adapted from the 2005-2008 World Value Survey. The seven items have the same lead-in question: “I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people. Using the responses 1 = no trust at all, 2 = not very much, 3 = somewhat, and 4 = trust completely, could you tell me how much you trust: (1) your neighbors, (2) people you know personally, (3) people you meet for the first time, (4) people of another religion, (5) people from different ethnic group (6) people from different regions, and (7) people of another nationality.” The order of the answers were reversed in this study, with a higher score indicating greater degree of trust, such that: 4 = trust completely, 3 = somewhat, 2 = not very much, and 1 = no trust at all. The eight items loaded on the same factor, hence, were combined to form the social trust scale. This scale has a mean of 14.34 (SD = 4.20) and an alpha value of 0.86 (see Table 1 for factor loadings).

The effects of the following demographic variables (also conflict variables) were also controlled. *Employment status*, respondents were asked to indicate their current employment status and response categories were (1) permanently employed (2) temporary employed (3) self employed (4) national service personnel (5) unemployed (6) Student and (7) Retired. These categories were later combined to form a dichotomous measure with 0 = unemployed (included initial categories: 4, 5, 6 and 7)
and 1 = employed (included initial categories: 1, 2, and 3). Age was measured as respondents actual age in years at the time of the survey. Gender was measured as 0 = female, 1 = male.

Marital status was measured as 1 = married, 2 = never married/single, 3 = divorce, 4 = separated. The responses were later combined as 0 = not married (included categories 2, 3, and 4) and 1 = married. Education was measured as 1 = No formal education, 2 = Junior high school (JSS), 3 = GED or Senior high school (SSS), 4 = Higher National Diploma, 5 = Bachelor, and 6 = Graduate/professional degree. These categories were later combined to form a dichotomous measure with 0 = Senior High School or below (included initial categories: 1, 2, and 3) and 1 = More than Senior High School (included initial categories: 4, 5 and 6). Socioeconomic status was measured in terms of respondents' annual household income. Respondents were asked to indicate their household's income per year (1 = less than GHC 5,000, 2 = 5,000 to 10,000, 3 = 10,001 to 15,000, and 4 = more than 15,000). These categories were later combined to form a dichotomous measure with 0 = GHC 10,000 or less (included initial categories: 1 and 2) and 1 = More than GHC 10,000 (included initial categories: 3 and 4). Any respondent who earns GHC10 000 or below, was considered a low-income earner\textsuperscript{11}.

Ethnicity was initially measured as a categorical variable with 1=Akan, 2=Ewe, 3=Ga, 4=Mole-Dagban, 5=others. However, for the purpose of comparison, response

\textsuperscript{11} In terms of the US dollar, GHC 10,000 is equal to approximately $6,700.
categories were recoded as 0 = Other (Eve, Ga, Mole-Dagban and others) and 1 = Akan. Political affiliation was measured by asked respondents to indicate whether they have affiliation to any political party (0 = no, 1= yes).

Finally, *Perception of corruption of other criminal justice officials* was measured by two 5-Likert type items asking respondents the following questions do you agree that court staff: judges and prosecutors take bribe? Do you agree that prison officers take bribe from people? The response categories ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. These two items were combined to form an addictive scale, with a mean of 6.88 (SD = 2.05) and an alpha of 0.53.

In addition to the above variables, previous studies have found that media exposure influences citizen's evaluation of the police, hence, was controlled in this study. *Media exposure* was measured by a single 4-point Likert type item asking respondents to indicate the extent to which they hear news about the Ghana police through the mass media. The response categories included (1) never, (2) almost never, (3) sometimes, (4) almost always and (5) always.
**Analytical Strategy**

In this study, I used several analytical techniques. The analyses were conducted in two different levels. First, urban or neighborhood level analysis was conducted to determine the factors that influence trust in the police. This helps to make neighborhood level comparisons. Second, individual level analysis was conducted to determine factors that predict Ghanaians' trust in the police. This analysis will help to determine whether the performance theory holds in Ghana. To adequately examine the data obtained, the study utilized descriptive statistics, correlation, analysis of variance (ANOVA), regression and Multilevel Modeling.

A correlation matrix was used to determine the nature of the relationships that exist between the predictors and the dependent variable, and to assess whether such relationships were significant. Since the dependent variable was a scale, Ordinary Least Square regression was used to determine the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable—trust in the police. A maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis (ML) was conducted to determine the factor loadings of each of the scaled items.
Factor Analysis and Reliability

Factor analysis has often been described as a data-reduction technique employed to reduce a set of variables to a smaller number of unobservable factors (Green, Salkind, & Jones, 1996). Factor analysis is important to determine whether underlying constructs might influence a set of variables featured in a survey instrument. Researchers have contended that highly correlated measures are often influenced by the same factors, while uncorrelated variables are influenced by different factors (DeCoster, 1998). This implies that variables which are correlated tend to load on the same factor whereas those which do not correlate load on different factors.

In this study, a confirmatory factor analysis was used to test the predictability of influences on given variables. That is, a confirmatory factor analysis was used to examine how underlying constructs influence a set of responses in a predicted way, and to reduce the data (Harrington, 2008). This analysis helps to determine whether scaled items measure the same underlying construct. Specifically, a maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis (ML) was used to determine factor loadings of each item. Though the use of principal component (PC) estimation method has been found to be a reasonable factor analytic model to be used in the social sciences (Reisig et al., 2007), maximum likelihood was the preferred estimation method in this study. The preference was due to the limitations of the principal component estimation method. PCA does not differentiate common variance and unique variance; because it assumes that there is no measurement error in the observed variables. The consequence of this is that factor
loadings get inflated and the values are often very high. However, with maximum likelihood estimation, common and unique variances are clearly differentiated because the estimation assumes that there is a measurement error in the observed variables. Therefore, ML produces accurate estimation of the data, hence, making it a better option.

Furthermore, a reliability test was conducted to ensure internal reliability of the items measuring the construct, as well as to verify whether scale items represent one distinct dimension. A Chronbach’s alpha, which measures how well a set of variables are internally consistent within a multi-item construct, was used in this study. The larger the alpha value, the stronger the inter-correlation among the construct items. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 1 below.

### Table 1: Reliability Test and Factor Loadings of Scaled Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust in the police scale</th>
<th>Reliability Test</th>
<th>Variance Explained (%)</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I trust the police in my neighborhood to protect lives and properties.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the people in your neighborhood.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police in your neighborhood are generally honest.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have absolute confidence that the police can do its job well.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police care about the well-being of everyone they deal with.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Police Effectiveness in Controlling crime subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police are effective in controlling violent crime in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police are effective in controlling public disturbances in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police are effective in controlling burglary in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police are effective in controlling theft in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police are effective at arresting crime suspects in your neighborhood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Police Effectiveness in providing service subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police always provide assistance to the general public when needed?</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police respond quickly when they are called for help?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police are always ready to provide satisfactory assistance to victims of crime.</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When the police stop people, they usually handle the situation well</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fear of Crime scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid to walk in my neighborhood at day time by myself</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid to walk in my neighborhood at night time by myself</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of security in my neighborhood is very low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, I am afraid to be attacked in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Personal Experience of corruption subscale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the past, have you paid money or made a promise to a police officer to overlook your unlawful behavior?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past, have the police demanded money from you even though you did not engage in unlawful behavior?</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The police refused to investigate, arrest, charge or prosecute you because of your personal relationship with a police officer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you used somebody related to a police officer to prevent a case being pursued against you?</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Vicarious Experience of corruption subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you witnessed anybody making payment to a police officer to overlook his/her unlawful behavior?</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Public Acceptance of corruption subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know of any situation where the police refuse to investigate, arrest, charge or prosecute someone because of his/her relations to a police officer?</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Vicarious Experience of corruption subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not wrong for an officer to accept small gifts from the public.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Public Acceptance of corruption subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An officer must sometimes use prohibited means to accomplish enforcement of the law or make an arrest.</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>Public Acceptance of corruption subscale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is litter/trash a problem in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see people just hanging around in your neighborhood a problem?</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you perceive abandon buildings or unoccupied buildings to cause a problem in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you perceive dirty gutters as a problem in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you perceive gangs as a problem in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you perceive drug dealings as a problem in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is vandalism a problem in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you perceive unrepaired street lights as a problem in your neighborhood?</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Neighborhood disorder scale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Procedural Fairness scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Load</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The police make decisions about how to handle problems in fair ways.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police treat people fairly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police treat everyone in your neighborhood equally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police accurately understand and apply the law?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police make decisions base upon facts, not their personal biases or opinions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police give honest explanations for their actions to the people they deal with?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Trust scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Load</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust your neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust people you know personally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust people you meet for the first time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust people of another religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust people from different ethnic group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust people from different regions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust people of another nationality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much do you trust people of another nationality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Corruption among other Criminal Justice officials scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor Load</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apart from the police, do you agree that most judges and prosecutors take bribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree or disagree that most prison officers take bribe?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Extraction Method: Maximum Likelihood; Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization
CHAPTER 5

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the current study. The analyses sought to understand the complex relationships between four indicators of police performance and trust in the police, as well as between contextual variables and trust in the police. First, univariate analysis is conducted to display the frequency distribution of responses among the 1024 study participants. Second, a bivariate analysis is presented to determine how the predicting variables of the study relate to citizens’ level of trust in the police. Third, multivariate analyses (Ordinary Least-Squared regression models) are presented to determine the effects of the four indicators of police performance on citizen’s level of trust in the police, controlling for other factors. Finally, multilevel models using Hierarchical Linear Modeling application software are conducted to assess the effects of contextual variables on trust in the police, controlling for individual effects.
Section One

Demographic Distribution of Study Respondents

The demographic distribution of study respondents is presented in Table 2. Most of the respondents (58 percent) were males, with an average age of 28 years (SD = 10.31). The youngest person who participated in the study was 18 years old while the oldest person was 75 years old. Furthermore, 29 percent of the respondents were married and about 53 percent were employed. In terms of respondent's annual household income, only 27 percent claimed they earned more than GHC 10,000. Moreover, 60 percent of the respondents reported having senior high school education or below, with 40 percent reported having obtained more than high school education. Regarding respondents' ethnic background, a slight majority (51 percent) reported belonging to ethnic groups other than the Akan ethnic group. However, about 49 percent of the respondents claimed belonging to the Akan ethnic group.

Majority of the respondents (48 percent) mentioned that, they sometimes hear, listen to or watch news about the Ghana police service on television, in the newspaper or on the radio. This is followed by 22 percent of the respondents who almost always hear news about the police through the media, and 19 percent indicated always. Nevertheless, few respondents (11 percent) either almost never or never hear news about the police through the media.
**Table 2:** Descriptive Statistics of Participants in the Study (N = 1024)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Variables</th>
<th>Mean (SD) / %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (min. = 18 and max. = 75)</td>
<td>28.14 (10.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Household Income: More than GHC 10,000</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School or below</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than Senior High School</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akan</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Exposure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affiliation – Yes</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact with the police – Yes</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in the police</td>
<td>14.67 (4.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>12.08 (3.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived neighborhood disorder</td>
<td>18.52 (3.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural fairness</td>
<td>16.78 (4.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Trust</td>
<td>14.34 (4.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption of other CJ Officials</td>
<td>6.88 (2.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Police corruption subscales:**

Perception:

- Strongly disagree | 7.2
- Disagree | 5.6
- Undecided | 7.5
- Agree | 35.1
- Strongly agree | 44.7

Personal experience | 6.72 (3.21)
Vicarious experience | 4.77 (1.99)
Public acceptance | 5.49 (2.25)

**Police effectiveness subscales:**

- Effectiveness in controlling crime | 14.99 (4.49)
- Effectiveness in providing service | 11.57 (3.36)

*Note:* Values in parentheses are Standard Deviations of the Mean.
Less than half (44 percent) of the respondents mentioned they have political affiliation in Ghana, and only 22 percent of the respondents reported having had some form of contacts with the police. This implies that, majority (78 percent) of the respondents have had no contact with the Ghana police. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate whether they agree or disagree that the police are corrupt. Most of the respondents (45 percent) strongly agreed that the Ghana police are corrupt, 35 percent agreed and about 13 percent either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the police are corrupt. However, about 8 percent of the respondents were undecided and cannot tell whether the police are corrupt or not corrupt.

** Relationship: Predicting Variables vs. Trust in the Police **

To establish the relationship among the study's predicting variables and respondents' trust in the police, a correlation matrix was created (see Table 3). In the table, several independent variables were found to have significant relationship with trust in the police. Police effectiveness in controlling crime ($r = 0.53^{**}$), police effectiveness in providing service ($r = 0.45^{**}$), fear of crime ($0.07^*$) and public acceptance of police corruption ($0.15^{**}$), all had positive and statistically significant relationship with trust in the police. These results show that an increase in any of these variables corresponds to higher levels of trust in the police. For instance, citizens who reported that the police were effective in controlling crime and providing services
expressed having higher levels of trust in the police. Similarly, citizens who accepted police corruption and those who expressed having more fear of being victimized, were more likely to have higher trust in the police.
### Table 3: Relationship among Study Variables (N = 1024)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Trust in the police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Effective in controlling crime</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Effective in providing Service</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Fear of crime</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Personal experience</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Vicarious experience</td>
<td>-.07*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7: Public acceptance</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Perception of police corruption</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Neighborhood disorder</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10: Social Trust</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12: Contacts</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14: Male</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: Employed</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16: Income</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17: Ethnic - Akan</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Married</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19: Education</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: Media Exposure</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>-.11**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21: Political Affiliation</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22: Corruption of other CJ officials</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *p*<.05, **p*<.01, ***p*<.001;
Furthermore, personal experience of police corruption ($r = -0.10^{**}$), vicarious experience ($r = -0.07^{*}$) and neighborhood disorder ($-0.23^{**}$) had negative and statistically significant relationship with trust in the police. These results indicate that, an increased in any of these variables leads to lower trust in the police. For instance, citizens who reported having had a personal experience with police corruption and those having vicarious (indirect) experience were less likely to trust the police. Similarly, people who believed that neighborhood disorder was high were less likely to trust the police. These observations at the bivariate level lend adequate support for the stated hypotheses of the study. Therefore, it can be argued that, performance theory could be used to explain citizen's trust in the Ghana police. However, to substantiate this line of reasoning and to determine whether the observed effects persist in a multivariate context, regression models were conducted. Before conducting these models, it is important to acknowledge the significant relationship some control variables had with trust in the police.

Six control variables had positive and significant relationship with trust in the police. First, the relationship between procedural fairness and trust in the police was significant ($r = 0.62^{**}$), showing that citizens who perceived the police to be procedurally fair were more likely to have higher trust in the police. Contact had significant relationship with trust ($r = 0.12^{**}$), suggesting that, citizens who had any contact with the police were more likely to expressed greater trust compared to those with no contact. Additionally, Akan (ethnic group) had a significant relationship with
trust in the police. People who expressed belonging to the Akan group also expressed higher trust in the police. Moreover, political affiliation ($r = 0.08^*$) and corruption of other criminal justice officials ($r = 0.15^{**}$) both had significant relationship with trust in the police. Individuals who mentioned they have political affiliations and those who perceived that other criminal justice officials were corrupt, were more likely to trust the police. In addition, employed variable was significant ($r = -.09^{**}$), suggesting that those who were employed expressed less trust in the police than the unemployed citizens.

**Factors influencing Trust in the Ghana Police**

Table 4 presents the results of two ordinary least square regression models estimating the effects of several predictors on trust in the police. The first model tests the effects of only the independent variables on trust. The model was found significant, $F (8, 647) = 41.70$, $p < .001$, and explains 34% of the variance in trust in the police. Police effectiveness in controlling crime was found to have a significant influence on trust in the police ($t = 9.97$, $p<.001$). With a positive slope of 0.40, a unit increase in citizen's perception of police effectiveness in controlling crime corresponds to 0.40 unit increase in trust in the police. Police effectiveness in providing services was equally found to significantly predict citizen's trust in the police ($t = 4.95$, $p<.001$). With a positive slope of 0.26, a unit increase in citizen's perception of police effectiveness in providing services results in 0.26 unit increase in trust in the police.
Table 4: Ordinary Least Square Regression Analysis Estimating the Effects of Predictors on Trust in the Police\(^1\) \((N = 1024)\)^2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) (SE)</td>
<td>(t/F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>8.75 (1.20)</td>
<td>7.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Effectiveness subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in controlling crime</td>
<td>0.40 (0.04)</td>
<td>9.97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness in providing service</td>
<td>0.26 (0.05)</td>
<td>4.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Corruption Subscales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Experience</td>
<td>-0.05 (0.05)</td>
<td>-1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious Experience</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.08)</td>
<td>-1.84*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of corruption</td>
<td>0.08 (0.13)</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Acceptance</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.07)</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of Crime</td>
<td>0.40 (0.04)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood disorder</td>
<td>-0.15 (0.04)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Trust</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural fairness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background (Akan)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education- More than high school</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Exposure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation-Yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption among other CJ Officials</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model fit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** \(^1\)Despite being a composite scale that is bounded, an examination of the standardized residuals revealed a normal distribution. \(^2\)Four variables - Age, Male, Income, and Married - were excluded from the analysis because of their very weak and non-significant correlation coefficients. Excluding these variables improved the model fit. Standard Errors are in parentheses, \(*p<.05\); \(**p<.01\); \(***p<.001\).
Furthermore, perception of neighborhood disorder was also significant ($t = -3.91$, $p<.001$), and with a negative slope of -0.15, a unit increase in citizen's perception of neighborhood disorder leads to 0.15 unit decrease in levels of trust. Finally, vicarious experience was the only corruption subscale which had a significant impact on citizen's trust in the police ($t = -1.84$, $p<.05$). With a negative slope of -0.15, a unit increase in vicarious experience corresponds to 0.15 unit decrease in trust in the police.

In the second model, control variables were included to determine the effects of the independent variables when controlling for the effects of other variables. The model was significant, $F (17, 638) = 39.42$, $p < .001$, and explains 51% of the variance in trust in the police. After controlling for the effects of other variables in the model, police effectiveness in controlling crime remained statistically significant ($t = 6.98$, $p<.001$). With a positive slope of 0.25, a unit increase in citizen's perception of police effectiveness in controlling crime corresponds to 0.25 unit increase in trust in the police. Similarly, police effectiveness in providing service was significant ($t = 2.66$, $p<.01$) even after accounting for the effects of other variables. With a positive slope of 0.13, a unit increase in citizen's perception of police effectiveness in providing service results in 0.13 unit increase in trust in the police. Likewise, perception of neighborhood disorder remained significant ($t = -3.84$, $p<.001$), and with a negative slope of -0.13, a unit increase in citizen's perception of neighborhood disorder leads to 0.13 unit decrease in levels of trust. Moreover, vicarious experience also maintained its significance ($t = -
2.32, p<.05). With a negative slope of -0.17, a unit increase in vicarious experience corresponds to 0.17 unit decrease in trust in the police.

In addition to the effects of the independent variables, six control variables were also found to predict citizen's level of trust in the police. Procedural fairness was significant (t = 12.31, p<.001) and with a positive coefficient of 0.40, a unit increase in procedural fairness results in a 0.40 unit increase in trust in the police. Contact was significant (t = 3.80, p<.001), a positive coefficient of 1.22 indicates that citizens who had contacts with the police were more likely to trust the police than those with no contact. Akan had a significant impact on trust in the police (t = 2.52, p<.05) and with a positive coefficient (0.66), individuals who belonged to the Akan ethnic group expressed higher levels of trust in the police compared to those who belonged to other ethnic groups. Moreover, education (t = 2.58, p<.05), media exposure (t = -2.57, p<.05) and corruption among other criminal justice officials (t = 3.81, p<.001) all had statistical significance with trust in the police. Persons who possessed more than high school education were more likely to express higher trust in the police than those who possessed high school education or less. Similarly, citizens who perceived other criminal justice officials to be corrupt were more likely to trust the police compared to those who perceived other criminal justice officials not to be corrupt. Conversely, persons who were more frequently exposed to the media were less likely to trust the police than those who were less frequently exposed to the media.
These models have no problem with multicollinearity issues, as the correlation matrix (see Table 2) and the variance inflation factor (VIF) statistics (see Appendix E) indicate. In the correlation matrix, there is no correlation coefficient which is 0.7 or above. A coefficient of this value would have been an issue. Similarly, there is no VIF value which is extremely high; all the values are low and less than 2.0.

**Section Two**

This section of the analysis examines the effects of contextual variables on trust in the police. However, before testing contextual effects, it is worthwhile to demonstrate whether the 25 neighborhoods being studied differ significantly in terms of their aggregate rates of trust in the police. To demonstrate significant differences among the neighborhoods, ANOVA analyses were conducted. Furthermore, I conducted series of ANOVA analysis to determine whether the neighborhoods also differ in terms of the four contextual variables (aggregate fear of crime, disorder, income, and education - more than high school) whose effects were examined. Being able to establish significant differences among the 25 neighborhoods will solidify and validate any conclusion that may be made based on the results of the contextual analysis.
Exploring significant differences among the 25 neighborhoods

To explore significant differences among the 25 neighborhoods on the five dimensions, ANOVA analyses and effect size calculations were conducted (see Table 5). The first column represents the results of neighborhoods’ aggregate trust in the police. The test revealed significant group differences ($F = 9.610$, df: 24, $p < .001$). A post hoc Bonferroni comparison was conducted to determine each group impact. This analysis indicated significant mean differences among the neighborhoods, suggesting that the neighborhoods do differ in terms of their levels of trust in the police. The effect size calculations ($\eta^2 = .193$) indicate that the neighborhood variable explains 19% of the variance in trust in the police.

The second column presents the results of the neighborhoods' aggregate levels of fear of crime. With an effect size of .135, neighborhood explains about 14% of the variance in fear of crime. The ANOVA test revealed significant group differences ($F = 6.25$, df: 24, $p < .001$). Since the F-test was significant, a post hoc Bonferroni comparison was conducted to determine each group impact. The analysis revealed significant mean differences, indicating that the neighborhoods differ in terms of their aggregate levels of fear of crime.

The third column presents the results of the neighborhoods' aggregate levels of neighborhood disorder. The test revealed significant group differences ($F = 8.13$, df: 24, $p < .001$). This suggests that the 25 neighborhoods do differ in terms of their

---

12 A separate set of ANOVA analyses also revealed significant difference among the five cities (where these neighborhoods were selected) regarding their aggregate levels of trust, fear of crime, disorder, education (more than high school) and average income. The results of these analyses are not provided.
aggregate levels of disorder. A post hoc Bonferroni comparison revealed significant mean differences among the groups. For example, the analysis demonstrates that neighborhoods A and M; A and O; B and L; B and M; B and N; B and O; C and M; C and O; D and L; D and M; as well as D and N significantly differ. The effect size calculations ($\eta^2 = .180$) indicate that the neighborhood variable explains 18% of the variance in disorder.

Similarly, ANOVA analysis of the neighborhoods' aggregate rates of residents possessing more than high school education (column four) revealed significant group differences ($F = 5.35$, df: 24, $p<.001$). A post hoc Bonferroni comparison conducted revealed significant mean differences among the neighborhoods, suggesting that the neighborhoods do differ in terms of average number of individuals who have attained more than high school education. Neighborhood explains about 12% of the variance in more than high school education.

Finally, column five presents the results of the neighborhoods' average income. The test revealed significant group differences ($F =1.81$, df: 24, $p<.001$). A post hoc Bonferroni comparison conducted revealed significant mean differences among the groups. The effect size calculations ($\eta^2 = .056$) suggest that the neighborhood variable explains 6% of the variance in aggregate income.
Table 5: Neighborhood-Level Variations in Aggregate Trust in the Police, Fear of Crime, Disorder, More than high school and Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Fear of crime</th>
<th>Disorder</th>
<th>More than high school</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14.88 (3.67)</td>
<td>11.31 (3.57)</td>
<td>18.39 (4.22)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.42)</td>
<td>0.18 (0.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.44 (4.04)</td>
<td>12.05 (2.99)</td>
<td>16.44 (3.55)</td>
<td>0.16 (0.37)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>13.22 (5.90)</td>
<td>11.07 (3.19)</td>
<td>18.19 (4.23)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.44)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>16.98 (3.70)</td>
<td>10.34 (3.61)</td>
<td>16.00 (4.60)</td>
<td>0.20 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13.00 (5.06)</td>
<td>11.67 (3.14)</td>
<td>18.26 (3.82)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.43)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15.57 (4.99)</td>
<td>13.26 (3.83)</td>
<td>17.85 (4.28)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>13.90 (4.77)</td>
<td>11.48 (3.83)</td>
<td>17.59 (3.29)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.47)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>14.12 (4.30)</td>
<td>11.85 (3.95)</td>
<td>19.20 (3.12)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>14.74 (4.08)</td>
<td>12.72 (3.80)</td>
<td>18.94 (3.86)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.37)</td>
<td>0.60 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15.22 (3.59)</td>
<td>11.48 (3.97)</td>
<td>17.17 (3.68)</td>
<td>0.69 (0.47)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>17.47 (3.91)</td>
<td>11.58 (2.72)</td>
<td>16.87 (3.65)</td>
<td>0.35 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.58 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>12.63 (4.06)</td>
<td>10.13 (3.43)</td>
<td>21.07 (2.32)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.41 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>11.40 (3.65)</td>
<td>10.74 (3.18)</td>
<td>22.53 (2.61)</td>
<td>0.51 (0.51)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11.04 (2.90)</td>
<td>12.94 (3.27)</td>
<td>20.72 (3.07)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.34 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>13.12 (3.56)</td>
<td>12.17 (3.16)</td>
<td>21.53 (3.21)</td>
<td>0.37 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.32 (0.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>12.92 (4.76)</td>
<td>10.47 (3.62)</td>
<td>17.51 (3.44)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.47)</td>
<td>0.35 (0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>14.80 (4.61)</td>
<td>12.00 (3.66)</td>
<td>18.13 (3.92)</td>
<td>0.35 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.44 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>13.86 (4.30)</td>
<td>11.83 (3.46)</td>
<td>18.75 (4.11)</td>
<td>0.50 (0.51)</td>
<td>0.34 (0.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>15.57 (3.59)</td>
<td>12.18 (3.06)</td>
<td>18.61 (2.87)</td>
<td>0.52 (0.51)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>15.81 (4.23)</td>
<td>11.71 (3.61)</td>
<td>18.26 (3.17)</td>
<td>0.24 (0.44)</td>
<td>0.46 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>18.20 (2.80)</td>
<td>15.16 (1.62)</td>
<td>17.51 (2.44)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.51)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>16.70 (3.09)</td>
<td>14.58 (2.68)</td>
<td>18.50 (3.55)</td>
<td>0.53 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.50 (0.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>16.86 (3.40)</td>
<td>13.36 (2.88)</td>
<td>18.00 (2.88)</td>
<td>0.40 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.36 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>18.00 (4.08)</td>
<td>13.80 (3.03)</td>
<td>18.45 (3.71)</td>
<td>0.61 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.33 (0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16.00 (2.22)</td>
<td>14.88 (2.00)</td>
<td>17.93 (2.17)</td>
<td>0.56 (0.51)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F-score     | 9.61 | 6.25 | 8.13 | 5.35 | 1.81
p-value     | <001 | <001 | <001 | <001 | <001
η²           | .193 | .135 | .180 | .118 | .056

Note: Actual names of the neighborhoods have been replaced with alphabetical letters due to confidentiality reasons. Standard deviations are in parentheses and η² (Eta squared) = effect size

Overall, the ANOVA analysis on trust in the police indicated significant neighborhood variations. The question left to be answered is: Could these variations be due to the variation that exists among the neighborhoods in terms of their aggregate
rates of fear of crime, disorder, education, and income? This question needs further exploration.

**Contextual Effects of Trust in the Ghana Police Service**

To examine contextual effects of citizens’ trust in the police, a multilevel modeling technique was employed using Hierarchical Linear Model (HLM) software. Four models were created and the results are presented in Table 6.

Model 1 is the null model which included only the grand mean centered outcome variable (trust in the police). The results revealed that, the group mean level of trust in the police is positive and higher than the grand mean (14.80 vs. 14.67). The model was significant (t = 38.63, p<.001), indicating that there is a significant variation in trust in the police at level 2\(^{13}\).

In model 2, four level 1 grand mean centered variables - Akan ethnicity, more than high school, perception of procedural fairness, and media exposure - were added to determine their total effect on citizens trust in the police. The intercept indicates that the levels of trust possessed by citizens who were Akans, have attained more than senior high school education, perceived the police to be fair, and have less frequent media exposure, were slightly above the group mean (14.69***). The Akan variable was significant (t = 2.37, p<.05), and with a coefficient of 0.63, citizens who belonged to the Akan ethnic group have more trust in the police than those who belonged to

\[X^2 = 231.715, p<.001\]

Further, by examining the final estimation of variance components, it was revealed that the assumption of the independence of errors has been violated since the intercept1 was significant (\(X^2 = 231.715, p<.001\)). This calls for the need to run Multilevel Model instead of running Ordinary Least-Squared Regression to test contextual effects.
other groups. Similarly, more than senior high school was significant (t = 2.24, p<.05). The coefficient was positive (0.39), indicating that, compared to citizens who possessed senior high school education or less, those who have more than senior high school education have more trust in the police.

In addition, procedural fairness had a significant influence on trust in the police (t = 18.42, p< .001), and having a positive coefficient of 0.57, a unit increase in perception of procedural fairness results in 0.57 increase in trust in the police. Finally, media exposure was equally significant (t = -1.90, p<.05), and with a negative coefficient (-0.26), citizens who frequently experience the police through the media have lower trust in the police. Model 2, which contains only individual level variables, explained decent amount of variability in trust in the police at both level 1 and level 2. Specifically, the model explained 33% of the variance in trust in the police at level 1 and 68% at level 2.

To determine the level 2 contextual effect and the level 1 within-neighborhood effect, four grand mean centered variables - mean (aggregate) fear of crime, mean (aggregate) disorder, mean (aggregate) income and mean (aggregate) more than high school - were added in model 3. The intercept indicates that citizens who were Akans, perceived the police to be fair, have less frequent media exposure, and live in neighborhoods with the grand mean level of fear of crime, disorder, income and more than high school, possessed levels of trust in the police that were slightly above the group mean (14.70). Mean (aggregate) disorder was significant (t = -3.96, p<.001) and
the coefficient was negative (-0.40). The negative coefficient suggests that, irrespective of individual's perception of disorder, citizens who live in neighborhoods with greater aggregates of disorderly conducts, tend to have lower trust in the police compared to those who live in neighborhoods with lower aggregates of disorderly behavior. Similarly, Mean (aggregate) more than senior high school was significant (t = 2.73, p<.05), suggesting that, regardless of individual's educational background, citizens who live in neighborhoods with greater proportion of residents possessing more than senior high school education, tend to have higher trust in the police than those who live in neighborhoods with few residents having more than senior high school education.

Moreover, three level 1 grand mean centered variables remained significant in model 3 after controlling for level 2 contextual variables. The Akan variable was significant (t = 2.02, p<.05), and with a coefficient of 0.55, citizens who belonged to the Akan ethnic group have higher trust in the police than those who belonged to other groups. Furthermore, procedural fairness had a significant influence on trust in the police (t = 17.97, p<.001), and having a positive coefficient of 0.56, a one unit increase in perception of procedural fairness results in 0.56 increase in trust in the police. In addition, media exposure was significant (t = -1.89, p<.05), indicating that, citizens who frequently experience the police through the media have lower trust in the police. This model also explained fair amount of the variability in trust in the police at both levels. At level 1, the model explained 33% of the variance in trust in the police and at level 2, it significantly explained 82%.
Table 6: Hierarchical Linear Model Analysis of Trust in the GPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Null</td>
<td>Total Effect (L1 Grand)</td>
<td>Contextual Effect (L1 &amp; L2 Grand)</td>
<td>Between Effect (L1 Group, L2 Grand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>14.80 (.38)</td>
<td>14.69 (.23)</td>
<td>14.70 (.17)</td>
<td>14.77 (.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[38.63]***</td>
<td>[63.21]***</td>
<td>[86.56]***</td>
<td>[67.42]***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-2: Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Fear of crime</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.02 (.13) [1.18]</td>
<td>0.50 (.18) [2.82]**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Disorder</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.40 (.10) [-3.96]***</td>
<td>-.79 (.15) [-5.39]***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.31 (1.84) [.71]</td>
<td>4.11 (1.96) [2.10]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean More than HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.06 (1.29) [2.73]*</td>
<td>1.79 (1.83) [0.98]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1: Individual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akan</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.63 (.28) [2.37]***</td>
<td>0.55 (.27) [2.02]*</td>
<td>0.56 (.30) [1.88]*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than HS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.39 (.17) [2.24]***</td>
<td>0.30 (.18) [1.63]</td>
<td>0.30 (.18) [1.61]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural fairness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.57 (.03) [18.42]***</td>
<td>0.56 (.03) [17.97]***</td>
<td>0.60 (.03) [17.73]***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Exposure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.26 (.14) [-1.90]***</td>
<td>-.23 (.14) [-1.73]*</td>
<td>-.26 (.14) [-1.89]***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-1 (r)</td>
<td>16.43</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>10.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-2 (u0)</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model Fit Statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviance Statistics</td>
<td>5632.802</td>
<td>4699.294</td>
<td>4684.193</td>
<td>4693.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Est. Parameters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001. Standard Errors in parenthesis; t-ratios in blanket

Model Specification: **Model 1** = TRUSTij = Y00 + u0j + rij; **Model 2** = TRUSTij = Y00 + Y10 * AKANij + Y20 * POSTSENIij + Y30 * PROCEDURij + Y40 * MEDEXij + u0j + rij; **Model 3** = TRUSTSCAij = Y00 + Y01 * FEARCRIMij + Y02 * DISORDERij + Y03 * INCOME_Mij + Y04 * POSTSENIij + Y10 * AKANij + Y20 * POSTSENIij + Y30 * PROCEDURij + Y40 * Q112jij + u0j + rij; **Model 4** = TRUSTij = Y00 + Y01 * FEARCRIMij + Y02 * DISORDERij + Y03 * INCOME_Mij + Y04 * POSTSENIij + Y10 * AKANij + Y20 * POSTSENIij + Y30 * PROCEDURij + Y40 * MEDEXij + u0j + rij
To examine between-neighborhood effects, four group-mean centered level 1 variables and four grand mean centered level 2 variables were added in model 4. The intercept indicates that citizens who were Akans, perceived the police to be fair, have less frequent media exposure, and live in neighborhoods with the grand mean level of fear of crime, disorder, income and more than high school, possessed levels of trust in the police that were slightly above the group mean (14.77). Three grand mean centered level 2 variables were found to influence trust in the police significantly.

Mean (aggregate) fear of crime was significant \( (t = 2.82, p<.01) \) and the coefficient was positive (0.50). The positive coefficient suggests that, irrespective of individual's perception of fear of crime, citizens who live in neighborhoods with greater aggregates of fear of crime, tend to have higher trust in the police compared to those who live in neighborhoods with lower aggregate fear of crime. Mean (aggregate) disorder was significant \( (t = -5.39, p<.001) \) and the coefficient was negative (-0.79), implying that, irrespective of individual's perception of disorder, citizens who live in neighborhoods with a greater aggregate level of disorderly conduct, tend to have lower trust in the police compared to those who live in neighborhoods with lower aggregates of disorderly behavior. Similarly, mean (aggregate) income was significant \( (t = 2.10, p<.05) \), suggesting that, regardless of individual's income level, citizens who live in neighborhoods with high average income (or earnings) tend to have higher trust in the police than those who live in neighborhoods with low average income.
Likewise, three level 1 grand mean centered variables remained significant in model 4 after controlling for level 2 contextual variables. The Akan variable was significant (t = 1.88, p<.05), and with a coefficient of 0.56, citizens who belonged to the Akan ethnic group have higher trust in the police than those who belonged to other groups. Furthermore, procedural fairness had a significant influence on trust in the police (t = 17.73, p<.001), and having a positive coefficient of 0.60, a one unit increase in perception of procedural fairness results in 0.60 unit increase in trust in the police. In addition, media exposure was significant (t = -1.89, p<.05), indicating that, citizens who frequently experience the police through the media have lower trust in the police. This model explained 33% of variance in trust at the individual level and 65% at the neighborhood level.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the current study, and demonstrates how the findings relate to the study hypotheses. The discussion also focuses on the extent to which results support the main theoretical underpinnings of this study. Furthermore, this chapter highlights key limitations, implications for policy, and directions for future research. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of the key findings observed.

Discussion

The present study used representative data collected in twenty-five neighborhoods selected from five cities in selected administrative regions of Ghana to: first, test the performance theory of trust for its applicability in Ghana; and second, examine contextual effects on Ghanaians levels of trust in the police. Three theoretically based research questions and four theory-driven hypotheses developed around specific indicators of police performance guided this study. The findings obtained revealed three observable patterns in the Ghanaian socio-cultural context.

The first observable pattern was that, findings from the study support the general assumption that citizens' trust and confidence in institutions increase as their
perceptions of institutional performance increase (Bouckaert et al., 2002; Espinal et al., 2006). This assumption was derived from the performance theory, which has been used to explain variations in trust in the police. Proponents of performance theory believed that individuals who think governmental institutions perform up to acceptable standards tend to express greater levels of trust and confidence in such institutions (Bouckaert et al., 2001, 2002; Brown & Couter, 1983; Maarten Van Crean, 2012). Contrary, these authors argued that those who perceive agencies to perform poorly will nevertheless have lower confidence in their institutions.

Studies conducted elsewhere, especially in the Western societies, have assumed a positive relationship between citizens’ attitudes and police performance (Maxon et al., 2003; Weitzer et al., 2008; Weitzer & Tuch, 2002). According to these authors, trust in the police decreases if the police fail to perform their duties as related to ensuring quality of life and preventing crime in the communities. Likewise, other police scholars have suggested that citizens will express less than favorable attitudes when they believe that crime rates, disorder, and fear of crime are high (Blumstein & Wallman, 2000; Sampson et al., 1997). These are some of the indicators citizens use to judge police performance in their neighborhoods.

The present study included four indicators of police performance in its analysis to examine their independent effects on citizens’ trust. Interestingly, the findings of previous studies are well supported by the findings from the Ghanaian sample. First, the study observed a positive relationship between the two subscales of police effectiveness
- effectiveness in controlling crime and effectiveness in providing service - and citizens' levels of trust. This result indicates that Ghanaians, who believed the police to be effective in performing duties such as controlling crime and providing needed services to the communities, tend to trust the police. Conversely, those who perceive the police to be ineffective in performing such duties will demonstrate lower levels of trust in the police. These observations do not only support the study's first hypothesis that police effectiveness will positively affect citizens' trust, but also consistent with previous studies (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Tankebe, 2008). However, it must be mentioned that some researchers disagree with the conclusion that police performance is an essential driving force behind citizens' evaluations of the police (see Tyler 2005).

Second, the results revealed significant adverse effect of citizens' perception of neighborhood disorder on trust in the police. Such observation supports the study's third hypothesis that perceptions of neighborhood disorder will have an adverse effect on citizens' trust. Since neighborhood disorder has been linked to police performance, perceptions of disorderly conducts in the communities will inadvertently imply that the police are ineffective. Like studies conducted in other social contexts (Dowler & Sparks, 2008; Dowler, 2002; Sprott & Dood, 2009), this study noted that Ghanaians who perceive disorderly behavior to be rampant in their communities, will undoubtedly possess lower confidence in the police. However, those who think otherwise will have increased faith in the Ghana police.
Furthermore, the study found an effect for vicarious experience of police corruption on individuals’ evaluations of the police. Ghanaians who observe the police taking bribes from other citizens will express lower trust in the police. Similarly, those who are told about other persons' experiences with police corruption will also evaluate the police less favorably. Thus, the observation is consistent with prior studies (Hakhverdian & Mayne, 2012; Kim & Voorhees, 2011; Tankebe, 2012), and also partly supports the study’s fourth hypothesis that citizens experiences of police corruption will have adverse effect on confidence in the police. A plausible explanation for the negative effect of corruption on trust could be that citizens generally believe corrupt practices such as bribe-taken; refusal to arrest; and refusal to prosecute hinder the police from fulfilling the mandates required by law. Hence, are perceived to be ineffective in the performance of their day-to-day duties. Intuitively, if police officers are sighted by the public coercing motorists [offenders] and allow them to go without invoking the law or seen demanding money from a citizen before rendering services, will be a signal of non-performance.

However, the study did not find any effect for personal experiences of police corruption. Though this lack of observation is surprising, it is consistent with Tankebe's (2010) findings. It can be argued that, even though police corruption may seem to be widespread in Ghana, most of the corrupt practices occur only when there is a contact with the police. Moreover, since few Ghanaians, however, have direct contact with the police on any given day; the number of people who directly experience police
corruption would be low. Also, most of the corrupt practices take place during traffic stops, and once again, few Ghanaians commute in their cars. Most people in Ghana patronize commercial means of transportation ('trotro' or taxi). This suggests that, majority of Ghanaians will become observant of police corruption via vicarious exposure than by becoming actual victims of police corruption. As observers, they tend to be influenced by what they see or hear, and spread the 'gospel' across the society quickly. Ghanaian society, like other collectivist societies, promotes communal values and shared experiences. In this kind of society, a single negative experience with the police, spread quickly in the neighborhood to the extent that those who did not directly experience or witness the incident will get to know of its occurrence. For that reason, the few direct experiences of police corruption will have tremendous indirect impact on citizens' evaluation through vicarious or secondary interactions.

Finally, fear of crime did not have any effect on citizens' confidence in the police. Due to the non-significance, the study failed to provide support for the hypothesized relationship between fear of crime and trust. This implies that Ghanaians perception of fear of crime does not impact on their evaluation of the police. Such observation further complicates the complex relationship that previous studies have found between the variable and citizens' attitudes toward the police. To reiterate, previous studies do not agree on the exact nature of the relationship. Some authors believed that fear of crime influence citizens' evaluations, and that, higher perceptions of fear of crime reduces confidence and trust in the police (Kaariainen, 2008; Reisig & Parks, 2000; Reynolds et
al, 2008). Other researchers hold the view that, fear of crime does not change public attitudes toward the police (Zevitz & Rettammel, 1990). The present study offer recent evidence to support the latter perspective on fear of crime and trust in the police at the individual level.

The second pattern that can be seen from the results of the present study is that procedural justice theory can also be used to explain variations in Ghanaian’s trust. Ghanaians may consider police effectiveness and other performance indicators in assessing the police. However, they are also concern about how the police treat individuals; this can as well influence their opinions of the police. Individuals who believe to be fairly treated by the police rate the police favorably, whereas those who feel unfair treatment, rate the police less favorably. This conclusion is well supported by the findings of this study as well as consistent with prior studies (Jonathan-Zamir et al., 2013; Mazerolle et al., 2013; Tyler, 2011). Fairness of treatment is not limited to how the procedures officers use in exercising authority are fair (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler & Huo, 2002) but also include the opportunity given to individuals to participate in addressing their own problems (Tyler, 2000). There is ample evidence showing significant positive effect of citizens’ participation in the decision-making process in institutional settings (Houlden, 1980; Shapiro & Brett, 1993). When citizens are allowed to participate and communicate their thoughts about issues confronting their neighborhoods to authorities, they tend to think the procedure as satisfying, and subsequently, feel to be treated fairly (Fitzgerald et al., 2002).
Related to the observation about procedural fairness, is the finding that residents who have had any form of contact with the police - being police-initiated or citizen-initiated - tend to trust the police more than those who have had no contact. This is also consistent with previous research (Reisig & Park, 2000). An explanation could be that citizens who contact the police are more likely to be treated fairly, as a result, more likely to be satisfied with the police than those with no contact who may lack first-hand experience with the police. In explaining what influence citizens' ratings of the police, Tyler (2005) believes that fairness is more important than performance. The author, therefore, advised police officers to adhere to procedural standards of exercising their authorities if they want to maintain trust. Contrary to Tyler's (2005) argument that fair treatment is more important in predicting citizens' attitudes than performance, this study believes that both performance and procedural fairness are important indicators of citizens' evaluations of the police. Therefore, I argue that maintenance of trust is contingent upon effective police performance as well as fair treatment of citizens. Citizens everywhere want to be respected by the police, participate in the resolution of community problems, and expect quality performance from the men and women legally mandated to protect them and their property. These expectations combine to shape their subjective views of the police.

The final pattern observed was the effects of community characteristics in explaining variations in aggregate levels of trust in different neighborhoods. The twenty-five neighborhoods studied differ significantly in their levels of trust in the
police. Some neighborhoods have higher trust in the police, while others have lower trust in the police. One purpose of the present study was to explore theoretical explanations for these variations. That is, the study aimed to answer the questions: why do some neighborhoods trust the police more than other neighborhoods; and what will make a person living in a specific neighborhood possess more or less trust in the police, controlling for his/her personal views?

Using advanced multilevel modeling, the study addressed these questions by observing the effects of three contextual variables on neighborhoods' confidence in the police. Community rate of disorder exerted significant negative influence on the level of trust of people living in the area, controlling for their individual characteristics, such as ethnic background, perception of fairness, and exposure to the media. This result implies that Ghanaians who live in neighborhoods with higher rates of disorder will indicate lower confidence in the police irrespective of their perceptions of the police. Citizens' levels of trust, therefore, vary base on the area they live. The observation is consistent with prior studies that found similar results in other social contexts (Dowler & Sparks, 2008; Maxon et al., 2003; Sprott & Dood, 2009). According to Maxon et al. (2003), residents who believed that disorder is on the increase in their neighborhoods expressed disapproval of the police, and were more critical about the manner the police perform their duties.

Additionally, community levels of income and education were also found to affect neighborhood-level of confidence in the police. The effect of aggregate community
income was positive, indicating that neighborhoods possessing higher average income will have greater confidence in the police compared to those with lower average income. At the individual level, citizens who reside in higher average income neighborhoods will show more confidence in the police regardless of their opinions of the police. Similarly, neighborhood-level of education influenced how citizens perceived the police. People who live in neighborhoods where majority of the residents are highly educated will be more likely to show greater confidence in the police.

Possible explanations for these results could be gleaned from the assumptions of the conflict theory. Supporters of this theory have argued that the interests of dominants class - which in this case would be the highly educated and high income earners in the society - are protected by the police, whereas the lower class individuals - the less educated and lower income earners - are continuously monitored by law enforcement officials (Chambliss & Seidman, 1971; Das, 1983). It is, therefore, obvious that communities where the highly educated and high-income citizens live will receive favorable treatment from the police, which might lead to favorable trusting relationship between the two groups. Conversely, areas where the lower class citizens are concentrated may experience biased treatment and aggressive enforcement strategies which might deteriorate relationship between the police and such communities. According to researchers (Gaddidon & Jordan, 2013; Wu et al., 2009; Weitzer & Tuch, 2006), the deteriorated relationship may lead to the expression of negative views about the police. This line of reasoning also fits well into the ecological contamination
explanation of police action on the street (Alpert & MacDonald, 2001; William & Reisig, 2003; Kane, 2002). These authors have collectively argued that police tailor their behavior based on the specific neighborhoods they serve. Therefore, if police officers work in dangerous neighborhoods, they are tempted to use force more often.

The last neighborhood variable which had a significant influence on community's trust in the police was average fear of crime in the neighborhood. Interestingly, the effect was positive, indicating that neighborhoods having high rates of fear of crime have higher confidence in the police. Stated differently, residents who live in neighborhoods where fear of crime is high, tend to have greater confidence in the police irrespective of their personal opinions of the police. This finding is surprising, given the abundant studies that have observed a negative relationship between fear of crime and attitudes toward the police at the individual level (Cao et al., 1996; Kaariainen, 2008; Zhao et al., 2002). These authors believed that an increase in fear of crime will result in a decrease in attitudes. However, one might also be tempted to think that, at the community level, if citizens perceive fear of crime to be high in communities they reside, they may tend to see the police to be the only source of security. To ensure maximum security and protection, citizens inadvertently develop greater trust in the police.
Understanding the Effects of the Neighborhood Variables in Ghana

The observed effects of the community variables in the Ghanaian context can be better understood with an exploration of the social development prevailing within specific neighborhoods in Ghana. Social change – modernization, industrialization, and urbanization – has led to a complex division of labor, migration, and production and distribution of goods and services (Amuzu & Leitmann, 1991; Asiama, 1984) as well as altered the patterns of people’s routine activities and lifestyles (Appiahene-Gyamfi, 2002). Moreover, the process of social change has widened the gap between the rich and the poor, and has created a phenomenon known as persistence differentiated neighborhoods in modern Ghana. The rich and the poor live in different locations with different levels of development. Though, it can be argued that differentiated neighborhoods have existed during the colonial days, the problem today is worse than what existed in the past. This phenomenon has serious implications for policing, since police officers tend to treat people based on where they stay or work. Residents in affluent neighborhoods, by virtue of their influence and power, are accorded with much respect and offered friendly treatment by the police. In contrast, those who live in poor neighborhoods – popularly known as ghettos or slums – are treated harshly and sometimes with no respect.

Residential neighborhoods in Ghana are broadly categorized as: the low-income, middle-income, and high-income areas. These categories are differentiated primarily by factors such as housing conditions, availability of facilities and the level of security. For
example, in the Accra metropolitan area, housing conditions in the low-income neighborhoods are depressed with social and engineering infrastructure. Buildings in these neighborhoods are usually dilapidated and often made of poor quality materials – mud, untreated timber and zinc roofing sheets for walling (see Accra Metropolitan Assemble website: www.ama.ghanadistricts.gov.gh). According to the Assemble, about 58% of the city’s population reside in the low-income areas, such as Osu, Nungua, Chorkor, Jamestown, Nima, Abeka, Sukura, just to mention a few. These areas in the city are notoriously characterized by inadequate housing infrastructure, poor drainage systems, erosion and high population concentration. In addition, layouts are haphazard and there are no proper streets running through the neighborhoods. Houses and buildings are scattered everywhere, and there is no room for easy maneuvering. These kinds of layouts create the platform for illicit activities to flourish but do not support police activities such as patrolling – bike, vehicular and foot patrols (Appiahene-Gyamfi, 2003). Majority (if not all) of the residents in the poor neighborhoods do not have access to telephones at home, and as Appiahene-Gyamfi (2003) noted, the lack of access to telephones by residents prevents crime reporting to the police. To complicate matters, most of the poor neighborhoods in Ghana are located far from police stations and this further limits the residents’ ability and desire to physically walk-in to make complaints or report to the police.

Comparatively, the middle-income areas are generally planned, and buildings are made with quality materials. Housing conditions are much better than those in the low-
income neighborhoods and residents in these neighborhoods make up 32% of the city’s population. The middle-income neighborhoods include areas such as Kanda Estates, Abelemple, Tesano and Dansoman Estates. Most buildings in these areas are government owned and are mainly occupied by government workers. The areas are semi-planned with streets which sometimes support police operations.

However, the high-income areas, also called the affluent neighborhoods, are well planned and structured, and have well developed infrastructure. Residents in this neighborhoods form 10% of the city’s population and are mostly the wealthiest people in the society – academics, businessmen and women, politicians, foreigners, diplomats, and those who have lived in either US or Europe. Because of their wealth and money, residents in these neighborhoods enjoy maximum security, often provided either by the police security apparatus or by private security agency. Appiahene-Gyamfi (2003) has observed that homes with police or private security guards experienced fewer burglary incidents. Furthermore, the patterns of layout in the rich neighborhoods support police patrolling activities, as a result, there is an increased police presence at all times. Additionally, residents have access to telephones which makes it easy for them to make phone call-ins to the police to report criminal incidents.

Situations in all the three categories of neighborhoods differ, and have different effects on residents’ relationship with the police. For instance, the prevailing circumstances in the low-income neighborhoods: No police presences, not being able to reach the police, coupled with ill-manner the police treat residents; significantly and
negatively affect residents’ relationship with and attitudes toward the police. It is, therefore, not surprising that residents in such neighborhoods will express negative feelings and distrust in the police service. Conversely, the rich, who enjoy maximum security, are recognized with respect, and can easily reach the police, have different, mostly favorable attitudes toward the police in Ghana.

**Study Limitations**

The present study is not without limitations, and these must be acknowledged. First, the study is examined factors influencing citizens' level of trust in the Ghana police and attempted to generalize its findings to the entire population of Ghana. However, the study excluded the opinions and attitudes of individuals living in the rural areas of Ghana. This hinders the study's ability to generalize its findings to the entire population. In the light of these limitations, it is recommended in advance that future research will be conducted examine the opinions of individuals living in the rural areas of Ghana about the Ghana police.

Second, though the study made the attempt to measure many of the variables that were assumed by research to influence citizens' trust in the police; it was not able to include all the relevant variables in its analysis. As a result, the effects of variables such as citizen-initiated and police-initiated contacts, crime victims' experiences, and proximity of police stations on Ghanaians' trust in the police are still not known.
Therefore, it is suggested that future research should be completed to take into consideration those factors not examined in this study.

**Policy Recommendations**

Findings of the present study have practical implications for the GPS, and as a consequent, several recommendations can be offered to improve public opinion and attitudes toward the police. Boateng (2013) suggested a framework for the development and maintenance of public trust in the Ghana police service. He argued that, since public attitudes are driven by several factors, some of which the police have no control (see also Boateng, 2012), the best approach to build and maintain public trust in the police is to adopt a multidimensional perspective. "This approach reflects the idea that there is no single most effective way of building citizen trust in the police. Instead, a constellation of approaches can collectively result in sustained public trust in the police" (Boateng, 2013:9). The approach also requires that other agencies such as the courts and government departments must be involved in developing favorable attitudes. Based on this framework, however, the present study recommends the following strategies for developing trust in the GPS.

Findings from the study revealed that citizens value police performance, and as a result, their behavior toward the police is affected by how well they believe the police are performing their duties. Citizen satisfaction with police work is a positive indicator of trust in the police (Reynolds et al., 2008; Wu & Sun, 2009). Therefore, dissatisfaction
with the services provided by the police will have severe implications for police work. Dissatisfaction simply implies that the public is not satisfied with police services partly because of apparent ineffectiveness or nonperformance on the part of the police. A lack of police services in the neighborhood can also result in citizen dissatisfaction with the work of the police.

Currently, this is a major issue in Ghana because majority of the people are deprived of police services. There are more than six hundred police stations in Ghana, however, these stations are located far from the communities and are hard to access. Residents, who want to make complaints to the police, have to journey several miles before reaching a police station. For example, most towns in the Kumasi metropolitan area, including Ahenema Kokoben, Dichenso, Brahabebuni, and Ash Town have no police stations. Boateng (2013) has noted, police stations in the urban areas are mostly located far from residences and accessing them for the purpose of reporting criminal conducts becomes a problem (Boateng, 2013). He further added that the lack of accessible police stations in the communities is even worse in the rural areas of Ghana, where police stations are hardly found. Added to these issues is the broken communication system that the police have in place to facilitate crime reporting. Ghana Police have a direct public numbers to aid public accessibility to the police. However, when people call the police using this communication system, rarely will the call go through or will the caller receive someone willing to talk. This makes people frustrated and not interested in utilizing the system. To enhance police performance and increase
public satisfaction, police administrators must develop efficient and reliable communication systems that will ensure increased public accessibility to the police. Quick response to citizens when called for help as well as providing needed services in the communities will help to improve citizen's attitudes toward the police.

Secondly, since fair treatment is an important indicator of citizens' attitudes toward the police, it is suggested that, as the police aim at ensuring effective performance in order to satisfy the public, they must also endeavor to treat citizens fairly, respectfully and transparently. Ensuring this can yield some dividends for the police. Such dividends may include fewer police-citizen confrontations, fewer challenges on police authority and an overall positive image of the police. Goldsmith (2005) has examined several factors that could undermine trust in the police. These factors include neglect, indifference, incompetence, venality, extortion, discrimination, intimidation, inconsistency, excessive use of force and brutality (page 454-6). If the police are to have high public trust, they must work hard to eliminate these factors in their day to day activities.

Relatedly, it is recommended that the police need to foster positive relationships with the communities they serve. Apart from eschewing unethical behavior, which undoubtedly destroys their good relationship with the community, police administrators should also hold open meetings and seminars with the public to mutually discuss issues of relevance. These types of meetings will allow the public to express their grievances and feelings about the police and their activities while the police attempt to address
such complaints. In addition to organizing meetings and seminars, the police must also properly train their officers and equip them with skills necessary in ensuring positive interaction with citizens. Good communication skills are essential for ensuring positive interaction. People can quickly form negative views of the police based on the outcome of their interactions with a single officer. Therefore, the police must strive to avoid negative encounters with the public.

Public trust must be built on the foundation of a strong police culture that values integrity and holds officers accountable for their behavior. Police misconduct, e.g., bribe-taking and extortion of money, plays an important role in eroding public trust (Boateng, 2013; Goldsmith, 2005; Sabet, 2012). Therefore, the Police Service must strive to maintain high ethical and accountability standards. According to Boateng (2013), individual police officers, irrespective of rank, must be held accountable for what they do on the street or in the station/department. I noted that, the Internal Affairs Unit of the Service must play an important role in ensuring that officers are held accountable for their actions. "The unit must institute stringent disciplinary and accountability measures, punish officers who behave unethically, and reward those who behave pro-socially" (Boateng, 2013:10). Punishments could include but are not limited to demotion, dismissal, unfavorable transfer, and prosecution. Whereas rewards could take the form of promotion, increase salary, bonuses, and open recognition at special police ceremonies or events.
Furthermore, ensuring a sustained trust in the police also requires the involvement of other governmental agencies because factors that contribute to eroding trust in the police are not solely caused by the police. Inter-agency collaboration is necessary to ensure trust in the police. In Ghana, agencies like the Electricity Company of Ghana (ECG) can team up with the police to reduce fear of crime in the communities. Specifically, the police, as the agent of security in the country, can negotiate with the government for the provision of streetlights in unlighted areas where fear of crime, disorder and to some extent, crime rates are considered to be high. Once this is done, quick response from the electricity company would be necessary to ensure that such areas are provided with streetlights. It is worth mentioning that the police cannot provide lights in these areas without the custodians of power in the country getting involved.

Similarly, external controls are needed to ensure proper behavior of police officers in Ghana. The courts can play a significant role in several ways, including facilitating the prosecution of officers charged with misconduct as well as restraining the police from engaging in unwarranted acts, especially during arrests and interrogations. Likewise, citizen review boards charged with hearing complaints about police misconduct and unlawful behavior, and endowed with the powers of subpoena, can significantly build citizens' trust in the police by ensuring professional standards of behavior among officers. Further, it is recommended that other government officials
such as prosecutors, judges, and correctional officers, be subjected to similar ethical scrutiny since their behavior indirectly affects citizen's rating for the police.

The final recommendation is that, the police must develop strong collaborative relationship with researchers. This relationship is essential because researchers and academicians can play an indispensable role in building and maintaining trust in the police. Their role is crucial because researchers can help the police gauge the extent of public satisfaction with police services. This will enable the police to boost their performance when public dissatisfaction is high. Similarly, through extensive surveying, researchers can provide the police with vital information about specific areas of the city where fear of crime and disorder are high, whether these phenomena are actually increasing or diminishing, and how to reduce fear of crime among community members as well as neighborhood disorder. Based on this, it is recommended that, to maintain citizen trust in the police, police administrators should foster a strong collaborative relationship with researchers. Such collaboration will be useful and vital to the police organization given the nature of information researchers can provide to enhance police performance and relationship with the public.
Concluding Remarks

Overall, this study has served two main purposes. First, it has provided support for the application of the performance theory in explaining the causes of trust and distrust in the Ghana police. Ghanaians attitudes toward the police, in large part, are dictated by the extent to which they believe the police are performing their duties. Police ineffectiveness in Ghana is dated to the colonial era where the police were made to perform specialized duties in the communities. According to police historians (Ward, 1948; Gillespie, 1955), such duties included the protection of trade routes for the European traders in the Gold Coast (presently, Ghana), and the protection of the ruling and propertied class. At the time, a mandate instigated by the then Governor- George Maclean - postulated "no police should be stationed where there were no Europeans" (Gillespie, 1955; 36). These behaviors made the local police highly ineffective as they were not assigned to perform crime control related duties or other civil duties in the communities where the local Ghanaians lived.

Today, though the police no longer perform the aforementioned specialized roles, they are consistently rated as ineffective in several areas of their performance. Ghanaians rate the police highly when they believe that the local police operate efficiently in controlling crime - burglary, assaults, theft - as well as providing assistance and services to the community. In addition, this study has demonstrated that
procedural fairness is as important in explaining trusting relationship between the people and the Ghana police as performance theory. This conclusion is inconsistent with Tyler's (2005) assertion that fairness is a crucial consideration in explaining attitudes than performance. Ghanaians would like to see officers treating citizens fairly and respectfully, as well as being effective in performing their duties.

Second, in recognizing that trust in the police could be affected by factors beyond the individual variables, this study investigated into the effects of neighborhood characteristics on trust, and has substantially found answers to the questions: Why do some neighborhoods have greater trust in the police than other neighborhoods? What makes an individual living in a particular area trust more or less the police regardless of the individual's perceptions? Answers to these thought-provoking questions lie in the influence of neighborhood rates of disorder, average neighborhood income/earnings and the average number of educated residents in the neighborhoods. For instance, it can be argued that a person who resides in an area with higher rates of disorder, lower average neighborhood income, and greater number of un- or less-educated residents will express lower rates of trust in the police than a person living in an area with lower rates of disorder, higher average income and more considerable number of residents highly educated. In short, community contexts are as important as individual perceptions in explaining attitudes toward the police.

The recommendations made above and the conclusions from the study may seem obvious, and could have been advocated without any research, but the value of
this study is that both recommendations and conclusions are supported by systematic empirical research and findings.
References

Accra Metropolitan Assemble official website, http://www.ama.ghanadistricts.gov.gh


Ghana Police Act, 1970

Ghana Population and Housing Statistics, 2000

Ghana Police official website: www.ghanapolice.info/main.htm


Society. Glasgow: Centre for the Study of Public Policy, University of Strathclyde.


APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

This is a request for completely voluntary participation, and your responses will remain totally confidential, only the researcher at the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology at Washington State University who is conducting this survey as part of a Ph.D. dissertation study will see your answers. You may leave blank any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. You are assured that the university will maintain the confidentiality of all survey results. If you have any questions or concerns regarding the study, you may contact the researcher at 804-836-0416. Thank you in advance for your participation in this important effort to learn about citizens' opinions about the Ghana Police Service.

Francis D. Boateng, Doctoral Candidate, Washington State University

Otwin Marenin, Supervising Faculty, Professor, Washington State University

Instructions

This survey asks questions about citizens' opinions about the attitudes and work of the Ghana Police Service. The questionnaires will take between 20 to 30 minutes to complete. The survey allows you to express your candid opinions and provide information about your experiences with the Ghana Police anonymously. PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE; your name will not be attached to the responses you give. By answering the questions on the survey, you will help the researcher learn about how Ghanaians feel about the Ghana Police. There are no right or wrong answers on the questions included in this survey. Thoughtful and honest responses will give the researcher the most valuable form of information. PLEASE CHECK ONLY ONE ANSWER PER QUESTION.

To complete the questionnaire: Please use a BLUE or BLACK ink pen. Be sure to read all the answer choices before marking your answer. Answer each question by placing a legible check mark or "X" in the blanket to the right of your answer, as follows:

Strongly disagree (X)
SECTION A: For the following items, kindly indicate whether you strongly disagree, disagree, agree, or strongly agree.

1. Overall, I trust the police in my neighborhood to protect lives and properties.
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

2. The police can be trusted to make decisions that are right for the people in your neighborhood.
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

3. The police in your neighborhood are generally honest.
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

4. I have absolute confidence that the police can do its job well.
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

5. The police care about the well-being of everyone they deal with.
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )
SECTION B: Please indicate the frequency with which the police engage in certain behavior in your neighborhood.

1. The police make decisions about how to handle problems in fair ways.
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )

2. The police treat people fairly.
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )

3. The police treat everyone in your neighborhood equally.
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )

4. The police accurately understand and apply the law?
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )

5. The police make decisions base upon facts, not their personal biases or opinions?
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )
6. The police give honest explanations for their actions to the people they deal with?
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )

SECTION C: Please indicate the frequency with which you or someone you know is satisfied with the outcomes of police actions.

1. The outcomes that you or someone you know received from the police are fair?
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )

2. In general, how often do you think the outcomes people receive from the police are what they deserve under the law?
   1. Never (    )
   2. Almost never (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Almost always (    )
   5. Always (    )

SECTION D: The following items measure the extent to which the police are effective in controlling crimes in your neighborhood. For each item, kindly indicate the extent to which you think the police are effective.

1. The police are effective in controlling violent crime in your neighborhood?
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )
2. The police are effective in controlling **public disturbances** in your neighborhood?
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

3. The police are effective in controlling **burglary** in your neighborhood?
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

4. The police are effective in controlling **theft** in your neighborhood?
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

5. The police always provide assistance to the general public when needed?
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

6. The police respond quickly when they are called for help?
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

7. The police are always ready to provide satisfactory assistance to victims of crime.
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )
8. When the police stop people, they usually handle the situation well
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

9. The police are effective at arresting crime suspects in your neighborhood
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

SECTION E: The following items measure the extent to which you are afraid of crime in your neighborhood. For each statement, indicate your agreement or disagreement

1. I am afraid to walk in my neighborhood at day time by myself
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

2. I am afraid to walk in my neighborhood at night time by myself
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

3. I feel safer to stay outside my neighborhood than to stay in my neighborhood
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )
4. The level of security in my neighborhood is very low
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

5. Overall, I am afraid to be attacked in my neighborhood.
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

SECTION F: in the following section, I would like to ask you questions about your experiences of police corruption.

1. Do you agree that most police officers take bribe?
   1. Strongly disagree (    )
   2. Disagree (    )
   3. Undecided (    )
   4. Agree (    )
   5. Strongly agree (    )

2. If you either agree or strongly agree, how often do you think police officers take bribe?
   1. Sometimes (    )
   2. Almost always (    )
   3. Always (    )

3. In the past, have you paid money or made a promise to a police officer to overlook your unlawful behavior?
   1. Not at all (    )
   2. Rarely (    )
   3. Sometimes (    )
   4. Many times (    )
4. In the past, have the police demanded money from you even though you did not engage in unlawful behavior?
   1. Not at all  (  )
   2. Rarely  (  )
   3. Sometimes  (  )
   4. Many times  (  )

5. The police refused to investigate, arrest, charge or prosecute you because of your personal relationship with a police officer.
   1. Not at all  (  )
   2. Rarely  (  )
   3. Sometimes  (  )
   4. Many times  (  )

6. Have you used somebody related to a police officer to prevent a case being pursued against you?
   1. Not at all  (  )
   2. Rarely  (  )
   3. Sometimes  (  )
   4. Many times  (  )

7. Have you witnessed anybody making payment to a police officer to overlook his/her unlawful behavior?
   1. Not at all  (  )
   2. Rarely  (  )
   3. Sometimes  (  )
   4. Many times  (  )

8. Do you know of any situation where the police refuse to investigate, arrest, charge or prosecute someone because of his/her relations to a police officer?
   1. Not at all  (  )
   2. Rarely  (  )
   3. Sometimes  (  )
   4. Many times  (  )
9. It is not wrong for an officer to accept small gifts from the public.

1. Strongly disagree (  )
2. Disagree (  )
3. Either agree or disagree (  )
4. Agree (  )
5. Strongly agree (  )

10. An officer must sometimes use prohibited means to accomplish enforcement of the law or make an arrest.

1. Strongly disagree (  )
2. Disagree (  )
3. Either agree or disagree (  )
4. Agree (  )
5. Strongly agree (  )

11. Apart from the police, do you agree that most judges and prosecutors take bribe?

1. Strongly disagree (  )
2. Disagree (  )
3. Undecided (  )
4. Agree (  )
5. Strongly agree (  )

12. If you either agree or strongly agree, how often do you think judges and prosecutors take bribe?

1. Sometimes (  )
2. Almost always (  )
3. Always (  )

13. Do you agree or disagree that most prison officers take bribe?

1. Strongly disagree (  )
2. Disagree (  )
3. Undecided (  )
4. Agree (  )
5. Strongly agree (  )

14. If you either agree or strongly agree, how often do you think prison officers take bribe?

1. Sometimes (  )
2. Almost always (  )
3. Always (  )
SECTION G: I would like to ask you how you perceive the following as a problem in your neighborhood using the responses 1 = not a problem, 2 = minor problem, and 3 = major problem.

1. Is litter/trash a problem in your neighborhood?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2 Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )

2. Do you see people just hanging around in your neighborhood a problem?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2 Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )

3. Is vandalism a problem in your neighborhood?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2 Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )

4. Do you perceive abandon buildings or unoccupied buildings to cause a problem in your neighborhood?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2 Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )

5. Do you perceive dirty gutters as a problem in your neighborhood?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2 Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )

6. Do you perceive gangs as a problem in your neighborhood?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2 Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )

7. Do you perceive unrepaired street lights as a problem in your neighborhood?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2 Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )
8. Do you perceive **drug dealings** as a problem in your neighborhood?
   1. Not a problem (  )
   2. Minor problem (  )
   3. Major problem (  )

**SECTION H:** in the following section, I would like to ask you questions about your contacts with the police in the last 12 months.

1. Do you remember having any type of direct contact with the police in the past 12 months?
   0. No contact (  )
   1. Contact (  )

**SECTION I:** I now want to ask you how much you trust various groups of people. Using the responses 1 = no trust at all, 2 = not very much, 3 = somewhat, and 4 = trust completely, could you tell me how much you trust:

1. How much do you trust your neighbors?
   1. No trust at all (  )
   2. Not very much (  )
   3. Somewhat (  )
   4. Trust completely (  )

2. How much do you trust people you know personally?
   1. No trust at all (  )
   2. Not very much (  )
   3. Somewhat (  )
   4. Trust completely (  )

3. How much do you trust people you meet for the first time?
   1. No trust at all (  )
   2. Not very much (  )
   3. Somewhat (  )
   4. Trust completely (  )

4. How much do you trust people of another religion?
   1. No trust at all (  )
   2. Not very much (  )
   3. Somewhat (  )
   4. Trust completely (  )
5. How much do you trust people from different ethnic group?
   1. No trust at all ( )
   2. Not very much ( )
   3. Somewhat ( )
   4. Trust completely ( )

6. How much do you trust people from different regions?
   1. No trust at all ( )
   2. Not very much ( )
   3. Somewhat ( )
   4. Trust completely ( )

7. How much do you trust people of another nationality?
   1. No trust at all ( )
   2. Not very much ( )
   3. Somewhat ( )
   4. Trust completely ( )

SECTION J: in this section, I would like to ask you questions about the media.

1. How often do you hear, listen to or watch news about the Ghana police on television, in the newspapers or in the radio?
   1. Never ( )
   2. Almost Never ( )
   3. Sometimes ( )
   4. Almost always ( )
   5. Always ( )

SECTION K: Demographic characteristics of respondents
1. Please what is your current age?
   ........................................................

2. What is your gender?
   0. Female ( ) 1. Male ( )
3. What is your current employment status?
   1. Permanently employed (   )
   2. Temporary employed (   )
   3. Self employed (   )
   4. National Service personnel (   )
   5. Unemployed (   )
   6. Student (   )
   7. Retired (   )

4. How much, on average does your household earns in a year?
   1. Less than GHC 5,000 (   )
   2. 5,000 – 10,000 (   )
   3. 10,001 – 15,000 (   )
   4. More than 15,000 (   )

5. What is your ethnic background?
   1. Akan (   )
   2. Ewe (   )
   3. Ga (   )
   4. Mole-Dagban (   )
   5. Others (Specify).........................................................

6. Please what is your marital status?
   1. Married (   )
   2. Never married/Single (   )
   3. Separated (   )
   4. Divorce (   )
   5. Widow/Widower (   )

7. What is the highest level of education completed?
   1. No formal education (   )
   2. Junior High School (   )
   3. GED or Senior High School Diploma (   )
   4. Higher National Diploma (   )
   5. Bachelor degree (   )
   6. Graduate/professional degree (   )

8. Do you have affiliation to any political party?
   0. No (   )
   1. Yes (   )
9. If yes, what is your political affiliation?

1. National Democratic Congress-NDC  (  )
2. New Patriotic Party-NPP  (  )
3. Convention People’s Party-CPP  (  )
4. Other (Specify)....................................................

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!
## APPENDIX B

### POPULATION BY AGE, REGION, ANDSEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Greater Accra</th>
<th>Volta</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Ages</td>
<td>12,034,845</td>
<td>12,033,787</td>
<td>1,137,774</td>
<td>1,135,247</td>
<td>1,050,112</td>
<td>1,042,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>370,320</td>
<td>360,881</td>
<td>35,828</td>
<td>34,866</td>
<td>35,746</td>
<td>35,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>335,319</td>
<td>319,283</td>
<td>32,585</td>
<td>30,903</td>
<td>32,503</td>
<td>31,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>339,998</td>
<td>327,887</td>
<td>32,040</td>
<td>31,397</td>
<td>32,004</td>
<td>30,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>320,142</td>
<td>308,865</td>
<td>31,357</td>
<td>30,668</td>
<td>30,667</td>
<td>29,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>314,306</td>
<td>311,013</td>
<td>31,037</td>
<td>30,916</td>
<td>28,931</td>
<td>29,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>287,566</td>
<td>277,768</td>
<td>27,305</td>
<td>26,821</td>
<td>26,013</td>
<td>25,722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>1,559,632</td>
<td>1,539,320</td>
<td>155,228</td>
<td>150,777</td>
<td>142,769</td>
<td>140,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>572,896</td>
<td>558,714</td>
<td>56,290</td>
<td>55,143</td>
<td>55,288</td>
<td>54,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>258,049</td>
<td>248,800</td>
<td>25,152</td>
<td>24,205</td>
<td>24,141</td>
<td>23,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>311,144</td>
<td>296,052</td>
<td>30,571</td>
<td>29,218</td>
<td>29,574</td>
<td>28,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>269,017</td>
<td>268,900</td>
<td>26,713</td>
<td>26,708</td>
<td>26,013</td>
<td>25,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>266,039</td>
<td>265,600</td>
<td>26,450</td>
<td>26,323</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>25,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>307,502</td>
<td>297,835</td>
<td>29,026</td>
<td>28,055</td>
<td>27,732</td>
<td>27,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>247,471</td>
<td>248,052</td>
<td>24,263</td>
<td>24,211</td>
<td>23,104</td>
<td>25,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>239,108</td>
<td>235,598</td>
<td>23,175</td>
<td>22,262</td>
<td>21,801</td>
<td>23,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>391,233</td>
<td>398,003</td>
<td>39,990</td>
<td>38,706</td>
<td>38,692</td>
<td>38,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>215,798</td>
<td>218,139</td>
<td>21,202</td>
<td>20,438</td>
<td>19,766</td>
<td>20,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1,477,525</td>
<td>1,435,515</td>
<td>145,176</td>
<td>141,957</td>
<td>139,658</td>
<td>135,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>307,502</td>
<td>297,835</td>
<td>29,026</td>
<td>28,055</td>
<td>27,732</td>
<td>27,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>247,471</td>
<td>248,052</td>
<td>24,263</td>
<td>24,211</td>
<td>23,104</td>
<td>25,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>239,108</td>
<td>235,598</td>
<td>23,175</td>
<td>22,262</td>
<td>21,801</td>
<td>23,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>391,233</td>
<td>398,003</td>
<td>39,990</td>
<td>38,706</td>
<td>38,692</td>
<td>38,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>215,798</td>
<td>218,139</td>
<td>21,202</td>
<td>20,438</td>
<td>19,766</td>
<td>20,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>1,100,737</td>
<td>1,231,764</td>
<td>114,060</td>
<td>113,795</td>
<td>112,178</td>
<td>105,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>253,266</td>
<td>303,054</td>
<td>24,474</td>
<td>23,789</td>
<td>18,425</td>
<td>22,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>173,819</td>
<td>199,900</td>
<td>17,640</td>
<td>19,263</td>
<td>13,518</td>
<td>16,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>197,261</td>
<td>230,097</td>
<td>20,027</td>
<td>22,574</td>
<td>16,659</td>
<td>20,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>189,384</td>
<td>225,134</td>
<td>19,884</td>
<td>22,153</td>
<td>14,842</td>
<td>18,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>130,124</td>
<td>148,063</td>
<td>12,893</td>
<td>13,477</td>
<td>10,054</td>
<td>11,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>943,317</td>
<td>1,084,895</td>
<td>94,015</td>
<td>105,558</td>
<td>73,491</td>
<td>89,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-69</td>
<td>262,693</td>
<td>317,738</td>
<td>25,870</td>
<td>23,839</td>
<td>18,401</td>
<td>23,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td>155,840</td>
<td>139,482</td>
<td>13,666</td>
<td>12,288</td>
<td>10,748</td>
<td>11,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>158,441</td>
<td>178,577</td>
<td>16,822</td>
<td>17,212</td>
<td>12,725</td>
<td>15,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>117,818</td>
<td>131,665</td>
<td>11,481</td>
<td>12,128</td>
<td>9,453</td>
<td>11,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>115,969</td>
<td>121,623</td>
<td>11,428</td>
<td>11,221</td>
<td>9,268</td>
<td>10,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>790,294</td>
<td>888,503</td>
<td>79,265</td>
<td>81,699</td>
<td>60,685</td>
<td>71,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>218,355</td>
<td>242,672</td>
<td>22,355</td>
<td>23,501</td>
<td>16,857</td>
<td>20,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>126,545</td>
<td>115,663</td>
<td>13,070</td>
<td>12,278</td>
<td>10,965</td>
<td>12,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>109,032</td>
<td>118,476</td>
<td>11,073</td>
<td>11,203</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>10,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>139,109</td>
<td>155,702</td>
<td>13,391</td>
<td>15,551</td>
<td>11,509</td>
<td>14,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>83,418</td>
<td>90,329</td>
<td>8,570</td>
<td>8,189</td>
<td>6,729</td>
<td>7,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>676,768</td>
<td>744,635</td>
<td>70,438</td>
<td>71,694</td>
<td>54,840</td>
<td>64,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>135,524</td>
<td>142,894</td>
<td>12,942</td>
<td>13,254</td>
<td>11,562</td>
<td>12,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>52,320</td>
<td>60,886</td>
<td>6,948</td>
<td>7,410</td>
<td>6,724</td>
<td>7,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Population:**

- Ghana: 25,868,104
- Western: 2,844,492
- Central: 1,970,837
- Greater Accra: 1,044,635
- Volta: 1,142,257
- Eastern: 1,290,539
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Ashanti</th>
<th>Brong Ahafo</th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>Upper East</th>
<th>Upper West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,342,615</td>
<td>2,316,052</td>
<td>2,464,218</td>
<td>1,145,271</td>
<td>1,165,711</td>
<td>1,229,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,249,574</td>
<td>1,249,574</td>
<td>506,406</td>
<td>540,140</td>
<td>341,182</td>
<td>360,928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Age</strong></th>
<th><strong>Ages</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **0-4** | 464,878  |
| **5-9** | 535,240  |
| **10-14** | 534,437 |
| **15-19** | 530,845 |
| **20-24** | 462,862 |
| **25-29** | 353,970 |
| **30-34** | 306,496 |
| **35-39** | 232,168 |

| **Total** | 2,302,845 |

---

**Notes:**
- The table represents the population distribution by gender and region for different age groups.
- The data includes categories for Eastern, Ashanti, Brong Ahafo, Northern, Upper East, and Upper West regions.
- Each region's population is broken down by gender and age groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Greater Accra</th>
<th>Volta</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>219,510</td>
<td>247,444</td>
<td>22,162</td>
<td>23,571</td>
<td>16,513</td>
<td>21,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>84,044</td>
<td>82,158</td>
<td>6,412</td>
<td>6,896</td>
<td>7,130</td>
<td>6,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>110,965</td>
<td>123,415</td>
<td>10,314</td>
<td>12,264</td>
<td>10,535</td>
<td>11,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>73,177</td>
<td>81,285</td>
<td>7,762</td>
<td>7,267</td>
<td>6,213</td>
<td>6,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>72,004</td>
<td>79,428</td>
<td>7,665</td>
<td>7,169</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>7,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>572,620</td>
<td>613,736</td>
<td>56,435</td>
<td>57,187</td>
<td>46,570</td>
<td>54,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>72,204</td>
<td>79,428</td>
<td>7,765</td>
<td>7,267</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>7,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>61,504</td>
<td>60,120</td>
<td>5,902</td>
<td>5,402</td>
<td>5,093</td>
<td>5,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>55,659</td>
<td>57,035</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>4,902</td>
<td>4,704</td>
<td>5,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>46,508</td>
<td>49,277</td>
<td>3,879</td>
<td>3,287</td>
<td>3,589</td>
<td>4,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>35,238</td>
<td>35,450</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>28,432</td>
<td>26,777</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>2,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>354,690</td>
<td>438,498</td>
<td>30,129</td>
<td>38,993</td>
<td>26,025</td>
<td>44,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>76,030</td>
<td>80,670</td>
<td>7,563</td>
<td>7,724</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>9,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>59,092</td>
<td>59,840</td>
<td>6,260</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>6,757</td>
<td>6,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>41,863</td>
<td>39,907</td>
<td>4,181</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>3,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>52,265</td>
<td>49,950</td>
<td>4,538</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td>5,034</td>
<td>4,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>28,432</td>
<td>26,777</td>
<td>2,075</td>
<td>1,972</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>2,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>32,238</td>
<td>30,450</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>27,019</td>
<td>27,377</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>2,064</td>
<td>2,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>227,850</td>
<td>248,750</td>
<td>19,097</td>
<td>19,441</td>
<td>20,411</td>
<td>25,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>53,796</td>
<td>70,742</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td>4,975</td>
<td>8,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>21,131</td>
<td>22,097</td>
<td>1,922</td>
<td>1,598</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>2,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>21,039</td>
<td>21,534</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>2,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>25,510</td>
<td>27,102</td>
<td>2,342</td>
<td>2,135</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>2,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>15,544</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>1,553</td>
<td>1,451</td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>30,238</td>
<td>30,450</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>2,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>66,051</td>
<td>104,315</td>
<td>5,391</td>
<td>8,759</td>
<td>5,465</td>
<td>11,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>22,177</td>
<td>21,958</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>2,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>25,829</td>
<td>31,367</td>
<td>2,254</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>2,477</td>
<td>2,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>16,996</td>
<td>21,699</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>1,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>14,859</td>
<td>22,482</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>149,512</td>
<td>241,818</td>
<td>12,026</td>
<td>14,973</td>
<td>13,219</td>
<td>20,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>38,855</td>
<td>55,084</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>4,033</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>6,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>15,033</td>
<td>19,588</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>1,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>13,028</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>1,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>15,708</td>
<td>18,882</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>8,763</td>
<td>10,222</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-79</td>
<td>89,149</td>
<td>116,804</td>
<td>6,846</td>
<td>7,479</td>
<td>7,517</td>
<td>11,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,264</td>
<td>13,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,219</td>
<td>15,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,676</td>
<td>11,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ghana</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Greater Accra</th>
<th>Volt</th>
<th>Eastern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>34,546</td>
<td>60,194</td>
<td>2,418</td>
<td>4,542</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>7,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>6,668</td>
<td>7,722</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>9,133</td>
<td>12,366</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>6,124</td>
<td>8,217</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>5,886</td>
<td>8,228</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 - 84</td>
<td>62,357</td>
<td>96,727</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>6,983</td>
<td>5,247</td>
<td>10,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>13,928</td>
<td>23,974</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>3,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>5,457</td>
<td>8,156</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>4,591</td>
<td>6,258</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>4,756</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td>5,395</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 - 89</td>
<td>32,937</td>
<td>59,433</td>
<td>2,632</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>2,942</td>
<td>5,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>12,233</td>
<td>21,905</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>2,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>2,359</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>3,946</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>1,273</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 - 94</td>
<td>19,004</td>
<td>32,977</td>
<td>1,437</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>3,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3,792</td>
<td>6,517</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>2,998</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,719</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95+</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>14,393</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>1,878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eastern</th>
<th>Ashanti</th>
<th>Brong Ahafo</th>
<th>Northern</th>
<th>Upper East</th>
<th>Upper West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,185</td>
<td>4,900</td>
<td>10,306</td>
<td>3,568</td>
<td>5,707</td>
<td>6,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,064</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,880</td>
<td>1,535</td>
<td>2,078</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,803</td>
<td>9,682</td>
<td>16,374</td>
<td>6,015</td>
<td>8,656</td>
<td>6,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,004</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>4,546</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>1,991</td>
<td>2,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>921</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>1,042</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,704</td>
<td>5,459</td>
<td>9,056</td>
<td>2,379</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>3,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,990</td>
<td>1,984</td>
<td>4,359</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>2,157</td>
<td>1,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,556</td>
<td>3,053</td>
<td>6,335</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>2,923</td>
<td>2,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>952</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,039</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>2,590</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>1,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX C

**MAJOR OFFENCES REPORTED TO THE POLICE: 2000 - 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Robbery</th>
<th>Murder</th>
<th>Defilement</th>
<th>Rape</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1,061</td>
<td>1,012</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>4,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>4,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2,001</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>4,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>5,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>5,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1,673</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>5,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>5,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,532</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>5,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>6,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1,642</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>6,599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** This includes Heroin, Cocaine, and Indian hemp. Source: Statistics & Information Technology Unit (SITU), CID Headquarters, Accra.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attempted Murder</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manslaughter</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causing Harm</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>2673</td>
<td>2838</td>
<td>3020</td>
<td>3002</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>4021</td>
<td>3407</td>
<td>3596</td>
<td>3368</td>
<td>3527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>85738</td>
<td>91093</td>
<td>90179</td>
<td>90551</td>
<td>90560</td>
<td>81313</td>
<td>86075</td>
<td>94558</td>
<td>88332</td>
<td>89407</td>
<td>84562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>53467</td>
<td>63741</td>
<td>60310</td>
<td>57377</td>
<td>57160</td>
<td>55001</td>
<td>57644</td>
<td>64501</td>
<td>63636</td>
<td>61711</td>
<td>59627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>10936</td>
<td>13093</td>
<td>13701</td>
<td>14657</td>
<td>14049</td>
<td>12561</td>
<td>14263</td>
<td>15542</td>
<td>16513</td>
<td>18906</td>
<td>18364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abduction</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>823</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>153,423</td>
<td>171,636</td>
<td>167,993</td>
<td>166,623</td>
<td>166,020</td>
<td>153,218</td>
<td>163,500</td>
<td>179,654</td>
<td>173,018</td>
<td>174,385</td>
<td>167,024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Statistics & Information Technology Unit (SITU), CID Headquarters, Accra.*
### APPENDIX E

**COLLINEARITY ANALYSIS OF STUDY VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police are effective in controlling crime</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police are effective in providing assistance</td>
<td>.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience of corruption</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious experience of corruption</td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public acceptance</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of police corruption</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of neighborhood disorder</td>
<td>.941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police are effective in controlling crime</td>
<td>.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police are effective in providing assistance</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of crime</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal experience of corruption</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious experience of corruption</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public acceptance</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of police corruption</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of neighborhood disorder</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Trust</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Fairness</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact</td>
<td>.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic background</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Exposure</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Affiliation</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corruption among other CJ officials</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** VIF = Variance Inflation Factor. Since the VIF values are low for all the variables, there is no concern for multicollinearity issues in the models.
APPENDIX F

SAMPLE DISTRIBUTION BY CITIES AND NEIGHBORHOODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Neighborhood</th>
<th>Number Distributed</th>
<th>Number Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood: A</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood: F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood: K</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood: P</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood: U</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1250</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,024</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Due to confidentiality reasons, the names of the cities and neighborhoods have been represented by numbers and alphabets respectively.