

*Commentary***A note on evidence-based policing****Jim Moshar***

Department of Law, Terrace University of Leeds, Leeds, UK.

Accepted 17 September, 2021

DESCRIPTION

The study of crime and aberrant behaviour is known as criminology. Criminology is a behavioural and social science interdisciplinary area that largely depends on the work of sociologists, political scientists, economists, psychologists, philosophers, psychiatrists, biologists, social anthropologists, and law experts. The study of crime in order to develop solutions to prevent it is known as crime science. Crime science differs from criminology in three ways namely, it is focused on reducing crime rather than researching it for its own sake; it focuses on crime rather than offenders; and it is multidisciplinary, relying on scientific technique rather than social theory.

The application of scientific approaches to prevent or reduce social disturbance and identify better ways to prevent, detect, and solve crimes is referred to as crime science. Rather than explaining why offenders offend, crime science analyses crime related events and how they occur, or can be prevented, by attempting to understand the context in which criminal behaviour occurs and what determines an offender's decision to commit a crime on a certain occasion.

Evidence-based policing is a method for police forces to make policy and tactical decisions. Its origins can be traced back to a greater push toward evidence-based approaches. Evidence-based policing proponents stress the need of statistical analysis, empirical research, and, preferably, randomised controlled trials. EBP does not disregard more traditional drivers of police decision-making; rather, it aims to enhance awareness of scientific testing, targeting, and tracking of police resources, particularly in times of budget shortages and increased public scrutiny. In policing actions, policymakers may take into account population-wide priorities. The absence

of violent coercion is linked to happier populations, which could influence the use of force or acts that ostensibly police the law but increase communal violence. Flow-through effects in subsequent offences may be used by law enforcement to make enforcement judgments. For example, according to a 2011 meta-analysis, drug market disruption, such as seizures of illicit commodities or arrests of organised crime leaders, increases levels of community violence and related crimes, much as drug prohibition does. Certain drug-control measures are therefore contraindicated.

Furthermore, research from illegal distribution/trafficking networks suggests that gang membership has no bearing on the movement of resources between violent, rival gangs. Bans on gang membership would be ineffective in terms of achieving community goals. When evidence is used in this way, it can occasionally lead to law enforcement conclusions that go against popular opinion. Gang members, for example, are not forbidden from joining the military in the United States. As a preventative strategy, police may also exchange evidence regarding the repercussions of crime. Politically motivated groups that utilise violent techniques or progress from nonviolent to violent methods, for example, are less likely to achieve government consent, implying that terrorism is ineffective compared to civil activity. Bank robberies, on the other hand, often pay out roughly 15,000 pounds per person. Evidence can be utilised in sentencing as well. The certainty of punishment, and thus the consistency of sentencing, is significantly more effective than the threat or severity of penalty in deterring crime. The use of blinded methods in line ups, in which the officer who gives the images to the witness has no idea which photo is of the culprit, is gaining popularity. The implementation of such blinded processes may help to prevent false suspect identification.

*Corresponding author. Moshar Jim, E-mail: jimm1233@gmail.com.