

Socio-economic Dimensions of Police Work in the Society: An Impact Analysis

Abul Barkat
Mohammad Sogir Hossain Khandoker
Golam Mahiyuddin, Nurunnahar
Faisal M. Ahamed



Human Development Research Centre



Police Staff College Bangladesh

Socio-economic Dimensions of Police Work in the Society: *An Impact Analysis*

Prepared by

Abul Barkat, *PhD*¹
Mohammad Sogir Hossain Khandoker, *PhD*²
Golam Mahiyuddin, *MPH*³, Nurunnahar, *MS*⁴
Faisal M. Ahamed, *MS*³



Human Development Research Centre

Road 8, House 5, Mohammadia Housing Society
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-1207, Bangladesh
Phone: +88 017 0074 3020, (+88 02) 58150381, Fax: 58157620
Email: info@hdrc-bd.com, Web: www.hdrc-bd.com

Prepared for



Police Staff College Bangladesh

Mirpur-14, Dhaka, Dhaka-1206

Dhaka: April 2019

¹ Study Team Leader; Professor, Department of Economics and Founding Chair, Department of Japan Studies, University of Dhaka & Chief Advisor (Hon.), Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

² Consultant, HDRC, and Professor, Department of Finance, Jagannath University, Dhaka

³ Consultant, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

⁴ Sr. Research Associate, Human Development Research Centre (HDRC)

Acknowledgements

We express our deep gratitude to the relevant officials of Police Staff College Bangladesh for entrusting Human Development Research Centre (HDRC) to carry out this important study on socio-economic dimension of police work in the society: An impact analysis.

We owe our profound gratitude to Sk. Md. Maruf Hasan, BPM, PPM, Rector of Police Staff College Bangladesh for his cooperation and all out support towards the study.

We extend our deepest gratitude to (Late) Rawshan Ara Begum, PPM, NDC, former Rector of Police Staff College Bangladesh for her very timely decision about the urgency to conduct this study on socio-economic dimension of police work in the society: An impact analysis and for her unstinted support extended throughout the study.

We are truly grateful to Mr. Md. Golam Rasul, MDS, Academic and Research of Police Staff College Bangladesh, as well as Subject Matter Expert of this study for his valuable input, constructive advice and support at various stages of the study including finalization of questionnaires and methodology of the study.

We are especially indebted to Mr. Mohammad Shahjahan, PPM, Director, Research and Publication of Police Staff College Bangladesh as well as Liaison Officer of the study, for his valuable input, constant help, constructive advice and profound cooperation as well as all out support towards the study.

We gratefully acknowledge the cooperation from all the surveyed Police Officers, Superintendents of Police of the sample districts, as well as Officer-in Charge of the sample police stations for supporting and providing us with required information.

We are overly indebted to the respondent police officials of sample police stations, who have allowed us to interview them and provided support through their time and cooperation during the process of data collection. We are thankful to the field team members of HDRC for their commendable work done with utmost sincerity in study areas.

We also acknowledge all the in-house staff of HDRC whose constant support and sincere efforts helped compilation of scattered and raw data and information into a research in order to deliver this report.

Abul Barkat, PhD
Mohammad Sogir Hossain Khandoker, PhD
Golam Mahiyuddin, Nurunnahar, Faisal M. Ahamed

Dhaka: April, 2019

Acronym and Abbreviations

AAP	Airport Armed Police
AASI	Armed Assistant Sub Inspector
AC	Assistant Commissioner
ACP	Assistant Commissioner of Police
AD	Assistant Director
ADC	Additional Deputy Commissioner of Police
Addl DIG	Additional Deputy Inspector General of Police
Addl IG	Additional Inspector General of Police
Addl SP	Additional Superintendent of Police
ADG	Additional Director General
AIG	Assistant Inspector General
APBn	Armed Police Battalion
ASI	Assistant Sub-Inspector
ASP	Assistant Superintendent of Police
ATSI	Assistant Town Sub Inspector
AUD	Australian Dollar
BC	Before Christ
BCA	Benefit-Cost Analysis
BCR	Benefit-Cost Ratio
BCS	Bangladesh Civil Service
BCU	Basic Command Unit
BMP	Barishal Metropolitan Police
BOI	Bureau of Investigation
BPM	Bangladesh Police Medal
CBA	Cost-benefit Analysis
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television
CDMS	Criminal Database Management System
CEA	Cost-Effectiveness Analysis
CER	Cost-Effectiveness Ratio
CID	Criminal Investigation Department
CJS	Criminal Justice System
CMP	Chattogram Metropolitan Police
CPF	Community Policing Forum
CSA	Cost-Savings Analysis
CSI	Colorado Symptom Index
CUA	Cost-Utility Analysis
CV	Coefficient of Variation
DB	Detective Branch
DC	Deputy Commissioner of Police
DCI	Data Collection Instrument
DCP	Deputy Commissioner of Police
DD	Deputy Director
DG	Director General
DIG	Deputy Inspector General of Police
DMP	Dhaka Metropolitan Police
EA	Economic Analysis
EM	Electronic Monitoring
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FIR	First Information Report
GD	General Diary
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
GRP	Railway Police

HDRC	Human Development Research Centre
HH	Household
HSC	Higher Secondary Certificate
IC	Investigation Centre
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IGP	Inspector General of Police
IO	Investigation Officer
IPA	Indian Police Act
IPS	Indian Police Service
JC	Joint Commissioner HDRC
KII	Key Informants Interview
KMP	Khulna Metropolitan Police
LAPD	Los Angeles Police Department
LGI	Local Government Institutions
MDS	Member Directing Staff
MoHA	Ministry of Home Affairs
NDC	National Defense College
NPA	National Police Agency
NPSC	National Public Safety Commission
OC	Officer-in-Charge
PBI	Police Bureau of Investigation
PIO	Police Internal Oversight
PPM	President Police Medal
PPSC	Prefectural Public Safety Commission
PRP	Police Reform Program
PS	Police Station
PTSD	Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
QALY	Quality-Adjusted Life Year
RAB	Rapid Action Battalion
RBI	Reducing Burglary Initiative
RMP	Rajshahi Metropolitan Police
RPMP	Rangpur Metropolitan Police
SAF	Special Armed Force
SB	Special Branch
SDPO	Sub-Divisional Police Officer
SI	Sub-Inspector
SMP	Sylhet Metropolitan Police
SMS	Scientific Methods Scale
SP	Superintendent of Police
SPBn	Special Security and Protection Battalion
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
SrASP	Senior Assistant Superintendent of Police
SrAC	Senior Assistant Commissioner of Police
SrAD	Senior Assistant Director
SRP	Superintendent of Railway Police
SS	Special Superintendent
SSC	Secondary School Certificate
SWAT	Special Weapons and Tactics
TI	Traffic Inspector
TSI	Town Sub-Inspector
TV	Television
UK	United Kingdom
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
US	United States
USD	US Dollar
VIP	Very Important Person

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements

Acronym and abbreviations

Executive Summary i-vi

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION 1

1.1	Background of the Study	1
1.2	Statement of the Problem	3
1.3	Objectives of the Study	4
1.4	Rationale of the Study	4
1.5	Conceptual Framework	4

Chapter 2: METHODOLOGY 5

2.1	Study Questions	5
2.2	Sample Design	5
2.3	Sampling and Sample Size	5
2.3.1	Sample Size of Police Stations	5
2.4	Study Methods	7
2.5	Sample Summary	8
2.6	Analysis Plan	8
2.6.1	Data Processing and Analysis	8
2.6.2	Monetization of Impacts	8
2.6.3	Qualitative Data Analysis	8
2.7	Limitations	9

Chapter 3: POLICING IN BANGLADESH: CONCEPT AND CONTEXT 10

3.1	Concept of Police	10
3.2	History of Bangladesh Police	10
3.3	Branches, Units and Ranks of Bangladesh Police	11
3.4	Women Police in Bangladesh	13
3.5	Community Police	13
3.6	Beat Policing	13
3.7	Recruitment Process of Bangladesh Police	14
3.8	Functions of Police	14

Chapter 4: LITERATURE REVIEW: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POLICING SYSTEM IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES 15

4.1	UK Policing System	15
4.2	USA Policing System	17
4.3	France Policing System	19
4.4	Japan Policing System	19
4.5	Indian Policing System	21

Chapter 5: PRINCIPLES OF ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF POLICE SERVICES..... 23

5.1	What is Economic Analysis?	23
5.2	How Can Economic Evaluation Help the Police Services?	24
5.3	Forms of Economic Analysis	24
5.4	Estimating Costs of an Intervention: The Proposed Tool	28

Chapter 6: STUDY FINDINGS..... 33

6.1	Background Characteristics of the Respondents	33
6.1.1	Police Officers	33
6.1.2	Victims of Crime	33
6.2	Crime and Related Information: Perception of police officers	35
6.2.1	Occurrence, Causes of Crimes and Ways Forward	35

6.2.2	Security Status of Living Place	36
6.2.3	Perceived Responsibility as a Police Officer	37
6.2.4	Time of Occurrence of the Crime	37
6.2.5	Time Spend in Prevention and Controlling of Crimes	37
6.2.6	Reporting of Crime to Police	38
6.2.7	Average Number of Cases could be occurred in Absence of Police.....	38
6.2.8	Factors Responsible for Non-reporting of Cases	39
6.2.9	Loss and Damage of Property Due to Robbery and Dacoity	39
6.2.10	Risk of Psychological Trauma and Social Damage Due to Robbery and Dacoity.....	40
6.2.11	Risk of Physical Injury Due to Robbery and Dacoity.....	40
6.3	Crime and Related Information: Perception of the Victims	41
6.3.1	Occurrence of Crime and Current Status	41
6.3.2	Causes of Crimes and Way Forward.....	41
6.3.3	Status on Sense of Security in Living Place.....	42
6.3.4	Experience of Crime	43
6.3.5	Place and Time of Occurrence of the Crimes	44
6.3.6	Money Value of Property Loss by Types of Crime	44
6.3.7	Time Taken by the IOs to Reach Crime Scene	45
6.3.8	Satisfaction of Victims with Police in Dealing Reported Cases	45
6.3.9	Various Types of Damage of the Victims in Property Crimes.....	46
6.3.10	Service Consulted and Cost of Consultation.....	47
6.3.11	Property Crime and Psychological Reactions	47
6.3.12	Adoption of Personal Security Measures and Related Cost.....	48
6.3.13	Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction with Current Policing System	48
6.4	Opinion of the OCs and Senior Level Officers on Crime and Crime Related Issues in Their Jurisdiction	49
6.4.1	Background Characteristics of OC and Other Senior Level Officers	49
6.4.2	Prevalence of Crime.....	49
6.4.3	Causes of Crimes	50
6.4.4	Prevention of Crimes: Ways forwarded.....	50
6.4.5	Status of Comfort for Living in Their Area of Policing.....	51
6.4.6	Factors Responsible for Better Living with Comfort.....	51
6.4.7	Time Spent for Control and Prevention of Property Crime	52
6.4.8	Reporting of Crime in Police Station	52
6.4.9	Barriers of Reporting.....	52
6.4.10	Property Damage/Loss Due to Property Crime.....	52
6.4.11	Property Crime: Threat and physical injury	53
6.4.12	Property Crime: Psycho-social impairment	53
6.4.13	Suggestion of OC and Surveyed Senior Level Police Officers towards Better Policing	54
	6.4.13.1 Suggestions forwarded by the OCs	54
	6.4.13.2 Suggestions forwarded by the ASPs/ACPs.....	54
	6.4.13.3 Suggestions forwarded by the SPs/DCPs.....	54
6.5	Cost Effectiveness and Benefit-cost Analysis.....	55
6.5.1	Benefit-cost Analysis (BCA) Methodology.....	55
6.5.2	Steps Conducted on Evaluation	56
6.5.3	Identification of Target Activities.....	57
6.5.4	Identification of Inputs and Outputs/Outcomes	57
6.5.5	Identifying and Quantifying Inputs and Valuing Input in Money	57
6.5.6	Identify Output, Outcomes and Quantifying Outcomes	61
	6.5.6.1 Valuing outputs/outcomes – measurement of benefits	61
6.5.7	Cost Effectiveness Analysis.....	63
6.5.8	Benefit-Cost Analysis	64
6.5.9	Limitations of Benefit-Cost Analysis	65

Chapter 7: RECOMMENDATIONS FORWARDED AND CONCLUSION	67
7.1 Policy Recommendations.....	67
7.1.1 Develop Internal Expertise in the Field of Economic Analysis.....	67
7.1.2 Create Standards and Standardized Procedures for Evaluation and Methodological Processes in Economic Analysis	68
7.1.3 Develop a Network of Economic Analysis Stakeholders	69
7.1.4 Standardize Reporting Procedures for Economic Analysis.....	69
7.1.5 Improvement or Incorporate Areas.....	70
7.1.5.1 <i>Improve the expenditure estimates for victim support services</i>	70
7.1.5.2 <i>Improve financial funding for the affected family</i>	70
7.1.5.3 <i>Improve estimates for defensive expenditure</i>	70
7.1.5.4 <i>Incorporate cost of death</i>	70
7.1.5.5 <i>Incorporate separate provision for children</i>	70
7.1.5.6 <i>Incorporate rehabilitation program for offender</i>	70
7.2 Conclusion	71
REFERENCES	73

List of Figures

Figure 1.1: Schematic diagram of conceptual framework.....	4
Figure 2.1: Qualitative data analysis procedure	9
Figure 6.1: Distribution of police officers by role of police for improvement of community security system (in %)	36
Figure 6.2: Distribution of police officers by common property loss/damage due to robbery and dacoity (in %)	40
Figure 6.3: Distribution of police officers by type of injuries are likely to be experienced by the victims in case of robbery and dacoity (in %)	40
Figure 6.4: Distribution of the victims of crimes by perception about the current situation of crimes in their areas compare to past few years (in%)	41
Figure 6.5: Distribution of the victims of crime by reasons of improving security system in their area than the past (in %)	43
Figure 6.6: Distribution of victims of crime by sense of security (in%)	43
Figure 6.7: Distribution of the victims of crime by level of satisfaction with police officer in handling reported cases of property crime last time (in %)	46
Figure 6.8: Distribution of the victims by average cost of property and other damage due to property crime last time (in Taka)	47
Figure 6.9: Percentage distribution of the victims by level of satisfaction on policing system in their area	48
Figure 6.10: Distribution of OCs and senior police officers by opinion about damage in property crime (in %)	53

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Distribution of sample PSs, police officers and victims	6
Table 2.2: Distribution of KII	7
Table 2.3: Distribution of sample summary.....	8
Table 5.1: Example of crime-related studies using four different types of EA methods	28
Table 5.2: Types of proactivity	31
Table 5.3: Application of major evaluation techniques for different types of proactivity	32
Table 6.1: Percentage distribution of police officers by demographic characteristics	33
Table 6.2: Percentage distribution of victims of property crime by demographic characteristics ...	34
Table 6.3: Percentage distribution of police officers by reported incidence of crimes in the sample areas.....	35

Table 6.4:	Distribution of police officers by major causes of crimes in the sample areas.....	36
Table 6.5:	Percentage distribution of the police officer by their major activities as a police officer.....	37
Table 6.6:	Percentage distribution of the police officers by proportion of time they are likely to spend for property crime out of their total working hours of policing activities	38
Table 6.7:	Average number of reported and not reported cases in police station by types of property crimes	38
Table 6.8:	Police officer reporting about the projected number of property crime had there been no police	39
Table 6.9:	Percentage distribution of police officers by factors that are likely to prevent victims of criminal offences in reporting to police station	39
Table 6.10:	Percentage distribution of the victims by type of crimes committed in the sample areas	41
Table 6.11:	Percentage distribution of the victims of crime by major causes of crime in their area ..	42
Table 6.12:	Percentage distribution of the victims by exact time of the day and night when the last incidence of theft/burglary/robbery/dacoity was committed.....	44
Table 6.13:	Percentage distribution of the surveyed victims by their statement about the monetary value of stolen and robbed property	45
Table 6.14:	Percentage distribution of the surveyed victims by their statement about the time taken by the IOs to reach the crime scene after reporting to PS	45
Table 6.15:	Percentage distribution of the victims by damage occurred due to incidence of property crime last time	46
Table 6.16:	Percentage distribution of the victims by mental reactions they experienced personally after the incidence of property crime last time.....	47
Table 6.17:	Percentage distribution of the victims by use of personal security measures	48
Table 6.18:	Percentage distribution of the victims by reasons of dissatisfaction on policing system in their area	48
Table 6.19:	Background characteristics of the OCs and senior police officers	49
Table 6.20:	Distribution of OCs and senior police officers by prevalence of major crimes in their jurisdictions	50
Table 6.21:	Distribution of OCs and senior police officers by common causes of crimes in their jurisdictions.....	50
Table 6.22:	Distribution of OCs and senior police officers by major determinants for prevention of crime	51
Table 6.23:	Perception of OCs and senior police officers about people's level of comfort for living in their policing area (as compared to past 2-3 years).....	51
Table 6.24:	Distribution of OCs and senior police officers by proportion of time they usually spent in preventing crime	52
Table 6.25:	Distribution of OCs and senior police officers by opinion whether all cases of crimes are reported or not.....	52
Table 6.26:	Distribution of OC, ASP/ACP and SP/DCP by opinion on threat or physical injury is likely experienced by the victims of property crime.....	53
Table 6.27:	Distribution of OCs, ASPs/ACPs and SPs/DCPs by opinion on possible psycho-social impairment of victims due to property crime	53
Table 6.28:	Total direct costs.....	58
Table 6.28A:	Direct costs per crime	59
Table 6.29:	Indirect costs per crime.....	60
Table 6.30:	Cost of work damage (per crime)	60
Table 6.31:	Cost of emotional damage (per crime)	60
Table 6.32:	Cost of medical care (per crime).....	61
Table 6.33:	Cost of familial damage.....	61
Table 6.34:	Cost of broke the lock on the grill, door, cashbox, etc. (per crime).	61
Table 6.35:	Cost for police (per crime).....	61
Table 6.36:	Cost for lawyer (per crime).....	61

Table 6.37: Reported unreported multiplier.....	62
Table 6.38: Total program costs (in Taka).....	62
Table 6.39: Number of crime.....	63
Table 6.40: Absence presence multiplier.....	63
Table 6.41: Number of crime averted.....	63
Table 6.42: Cost effectiveness ratio or Cost per crime.....	64
Table 6.42a: Cost per crime in the UK, Australia and Bangladesh.....	64
Table 6.43: Benefit-cost ratio (BCR).....	65

List of Boxes

Box-5.1: Example of cost-effectiveness analysis.....	25
Box-5.2: Example of cost utility analysis.....	26
Box-5.3: Example of benefit-cost analysis.....	27

ANNEXURE:

Annex-1: Data Tables.....	79-110
Annex-2: Data Collection Instruments (DCIs).....	111-158
Annex-3: Research Team.....	159-160

Executive Summary

Introduction: Police has not only been an integral part of this state, but also an important branch of the criminal justice system. The members of this disciplined force are working to ensure law and order and to well accomplish other functions which laws enjoin them to do. The Bangladesh Police has gone through phases of growth and development. However, the demand for police services has increased at a rate faster than the growth and expansion of the service delivery capacity of the police. Although the annual budget on policing has been increasing in the last 5 fiscal years, the per capita expenditure on policing is too low compared to other developed countries. But the investment on policing is a profit for any nation and government has to consider it. For that, it is necessary to quantify the economic value of police work which will help to calculate the return on police investment. Nonetheless, in Bangladesh no study has so far been conducted on the evaluation of police work in terms of her social and economic value. Therefore, the accompanying study is a pioneering one, which attempts to accomplish this knowledge gap in our police services.

Objectives of the study: The general objective is to assess the impact of socio-economic dimensions of police work in the society. Specific objectives are (i) to identify the limit of resources used for police work, (ii) to apportion all resources by types of crime, (iii) to identify the policing outcomes (i.e., number of crimes) by types of crime, (v) to identify the control figure by types of crime, (vi) to identify the tangible and intangible cost of crime, (vi) to estimate cost-effectiveness ratio by types of crime (theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity), and (vii) to conduct benefit-cost analysis by types of crime (theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity).

Study Findings

Crime and related issues: Perception of police officers

Background characteristics of police officer: The majority (83.7%) of police officers are male and a large part of them (58.1%) are between age of 31 and 40 years whereas another one-fourth (23.3%) are between 41-50 years. A 44.2 percent of the respondents are master degree holders. The remaining 44.2 percent has passed the secondary school certificate (SSC) examination. The majority (62.8%) of them joined in police service for 9 years or more. Some 55.8 percent of respondents joined in police service as constable and the other 44.2 percent as Sub Inspectors (SI) of police. However, duration of work of the majority (62.8%) of police officer is between 6 months and 2 years.

Background characteristics of the victims of crime: Most (89.2%) of the surveyed victims are male and more than half (56.3%) of them are between 18 and 40 years with mean age of 42.9 years. The vast majority (90.4%) of them are married and living in the sample areas for more than 10 years. One-fifth (21%) of the victims are either illiterate or has education below primary level. On the other hand, one-fourth (25%) are either bachelor or master degree holder. A noticeable percentage (38.3%) of them are businessman, followed by 13.2 percent working in the private organization.

Incidence, causes and prevention of crimes: Commonly reported crimes are theft (95.3%), drug dealing (90.7%), domestic violence (81.4%), violence against women and children (69.8%), and burglary 67.4%). Most frequently (> 60%) reported causes of these crimes are abuse of drugs and alcohol, poverty and unemployment. To mention, other causes include lack of social awareness of policing programme, too lenient punishment, and lack of justice. The majority of police officers feel that crimes can be prevented by increasing the number of police personnel or by increasing the patrolling, raising awareness of people on crime prevention

approaches and maintaining the law and order properly. Other options are good public-police partnership, surveillance on professional criminals and installation of CCTV.

Security status of living place: Almost all (97.7%) of the surveyed police officers feel that community environment as a living place is either better or excellent. Current initiatives of police to establish and maintain good relation with local residents could be the best possible way to have such environment as believed by over two-third (66.7%) of police officers interviewed. Reported other possibilities are quick response to call, increased patrolling, and police efforts to raise people's awareness on crime prevention.

Perceived responsibility as a police officer: Largely, police officers are rightly aware about their primary responsibility of maintaining law and orders and protection of life and property of citizen. Additionally, majority has reported that patrolling, arrest of criminal, case filing, VIP protection, crime investigation as well as recording criminal data in CDMS, attending court has undoubtedly become important activities in their daily policing endeavors.

Time of occurrence of crime and time spend to control crimes: Property crime (theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity) is largely committed between 6 pm and 6 am of the day. Reportedly, police officers usually spend 5.7, 4.6, 4.3 and 5.1 percent time of their total duty hours for prevention of theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity respectively.

Reporting of crime to police: Almost all (97.7%) police officers acknowledge that all crimes are not reported to police or police station. According to police officers, non-reported cases of theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity are 2246, 675, 174 and 68 which are 5.9, 4.7, 4.2 and 3.8 times higher than the reported cases in last year.

Factors responsible for non-reporting of cases: Some (33-40%) of the police officers feels that harassment in the court, fear of retaliation from the criminal, and preference of mutual settlement are primarily responsible for keeping away the victims from reporting. Oftentimes, fear of police harassment, fear of spending money without any fruitful gain, lack of awareness, fear of political influence, disliking to attend court, skepticism of getting justice, fear of demeaning self-respect are treated as prominent reasons for non-reporting of cases.

Crimes in Absence of Police: According to police officer, in absence of police, hypothetical incidences of theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity are likely to be numbered as 7,127; 23,333; 593 and 247 respectively. Thus, in other words, on an average 165.7 thefts, 542.6 burglaries, 13.8 robberies and 5.7 dacoity could be committed in each PS per annum in absence of police.

Loss and damage of property due to robbery and dacoity: Almost all (97.7%) of the surveyed police officers perceive that the most common property loss of the victims is cash money followed by jewelry (83.7%) and electronics (58.1%).

Risk of psychological trauma and social damage: Possibility of psychological trauma and social damage of the community is reported by 97.7% percent of the police officers.

Risk of physical injury: The most common (93%) physical injury likely to occur due to robbery and dacoity is stab injury followed by gun-shot injury (55.8%).

Occurrence of crime and current status: According to the victims, commonly reported crimes are theft, abuse and trafficking of drugs, and burglary.

Crime and crime related issues: Perception of victims

Occurrence of crime and current status Most common (98.2%) incidence of crime that happened in the respondents areas is theft followed by trafficking and abuse of drugs (84.4%), burglary (62.9%). To mention others are domestic violence, robbery, violence against women and children, dacoity and to some extent, rape and murder. The majority (62.3%) of victims

consider that currently crime has gone down a little, however, a few (16.2%) contemplate that the incidence of crime has much reduced compared to past few years.

Causes of crime and way forward: Findings unraveled that prime (72.5%) cause of crime in the sample areas is trading and abuse of drugs followed by lack of justice (71.9%), unemployment (69.5%), and poverty (50.9%). Other perpending factors are too lenient sentencing, lack of proper enforcement of law and orders and less punishment in comparison with severity of crime.

Most (91%) of the victims of property crime believe that crime can be prevented if law and orders is maintained properly. Another widely reported (71.9%) approach is to increase the police patrolling at community level followed by reducing the use of drugs alcohol in the society (52.1%) and increasing the number of law enforcer (47.9%).

Status on sense of security in living place: The majority (65.9%) of victims feel better in residing at their present living place as compared to past 2-3 years largely (76.2%) due to dynamic role of police than before, increased awareness of the community people about security (71.3%), and increased patrolling of police (56.6%).

Over three-fifth (61.1%) of the victims feel safe or very safe walking alone in their neighbourhood after dark. More importantly, 73.6 percent consider very safe or fairly safe staying alone at their home during night. On the other hand, those who do not feel safe are due to fear of thieves and hijackers, fear of violence from drug addicts, lack of sufficient street light and infrequent police patrolling.

Experience of crime: Reportedly, 39.5 percent of the victims experienced theft, 36.5 percent burglary, 20 percent robbery and an identical percentage experienced dacoity. On average, the gap between the experience of theft, burglary, robbery and decoity and the survey are 4.3, 5.0, 3.7 and 4 months respectively.

Place and time of occurrence of the crimes: Theft, burglary and dacoity are primarily committed at home and followed by at business centre. Whereas, robbery is commonly (45%) committed on the road, followed by few at home, at the bus or railway station and while travel by rickshaw. Except with a little variation, most of the crimes as ventilated in the study were committed between 6 pm and 6 am.

Satisfaction of victims with police in dealing reported cases: A large segment of the victims are satisfied with current attitude of police in handling the reported cases. Such satisfaction is more pronounced among the victims of robbery (84.2%) followed by dacoity (80%) and theft (75%). Those, who are not satisfied are largely due to failure of police officer in recovering the stolen property, unable to catch the offender and reluctant to take proper action after filing the case report (GD/FIR).

Types of property loss: In one-fifth (21.2%) items stolen due to theft were cash money and domestic animals (cow, goat, poultries etc.) followed by electronics (TV, audio-video devices, camera, mobile phone etc.) whereas in 19.7 percent of thefts, properties were motor bike (13.8%) and jewelries. In case of burglary, frequently reported stolen items were cash money (57.4%) followed by electronics, and jewelry. The most common (80%) property lost due to robbery was cash money followed by loss of electronics such as TV, audio-video device, camera, mobile phone, laptop/desktop etc. (65%). In dacoity, reported main loss of property of the victims was cash money followed by jewelry and electronics (80%).

Service consulted and cost of consultation: Out of 66 victims of theft and 60 of burglary interviewed, merely 8 victims of theft, 1 of burglary and 1 of robbery has consulted with lawyer. In addition to Lawyer, 3 victims of burglary consulted with local welfare service/social

worker. To other end, 6 victims of robbery and 12 of dacoity out of 20 in each interviewed had to consult with medical services for physical injuries. Apart from medical consultation, 2 victims of dacoity went to psychologist for consultation. Instead, one of the victims of dacoity consulted with social worker and another one with social organization.

The average cost of medical consultation for robbery was Taka 36,166 per person and that of dacoity was Taka 10,292 per person. More so, the average cost of a victim of dacoity for consultation with psychologist was Taka 2,000, for welfare services and for social organization were Taka 2,000 and Taka 1,500 respectively. The cost for lawyer consultation for a victim of theft, burglary and robbery was Taka 15,625, Taka 1,500 and Taka 10,000 respectively.

Money value of property loss by type of crimes: In most of the property crimes, common stolen materials are cash money, jewelry, and electronic goods. Reported average money value of property loss due to theft was Taka 22,348.50, of the burglary Taka 32,418.03, of the robbery Taka 86,500 and that of dacoity was Taka 111,500 in the last year.

Property crime and psychological reactions: Reportedly, the most common psychological reactions of the victims were shock, fear, depression and panic. Other mentionable reactions were feeling vulnerable, disturbance in sleeping at night, weeping/shedding tears.

Adoption of personal security measures and related cost: The study indicates that half (53.3%) of the victims of property crime have taken various security measures personally. Most widely (68.5%) used action was enough lighting at residence and business place followed by fencing around the house (49.4%). Other reported measures are: appointment of security guard personally and at apartments, installation of CCTV in sensitive places, stay inside the shop during night, and use of lock where necessary.

Various types of damage of the victims in property crimes: According to victims, estimated average cost of property damaged due to theft is Taka 540.53, burglary Taka 12,011.95, robbery Taka 6,516.50 and for dacoity Taka 19,595. Likewise, estimated cost of work loss due to theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity are Taka 373.48, Taka 920.98, Taka 964.50, and Taka 2,592.50 respectively. The average cost of emotional damage due to theft, burglary, robbery and dacoity are Taka 227.27, Taka 3,885.25, Taka 615 and Taka 2,350 in orders.

Opinion of OCs and senior level officers on crime and related issues: In the opinion of OCs and senior level police officers, most widely prevalent crime in their jurisdictions was theft, followed by burglary, abuse of drugs, domestic violence, violence against women and children. They sensed that primarily abuse of drugs and alcohol followed by unemployment, poverty and too lenient punishment for committing crime are the common reasons for occurring these crimes in their areas.

According to the OCs, increased manpower, frequent patrolling of the community and maintenance of law and order are the primary requirements for prevention of crime. On the other hand, SP/DCP ponder that along with increased manpower, police-community partnership and elimination of drugs and alcohol abuse in the society are the crucial determinants for prevention of crime.

Most of the OCs and senior level officers believed that security status under most of their jurisdictions has improved than it was 2-3 years before. In this connection, they think that such improvement is mainly due to increased number of police personnel in police stations, increased patrolling of police, and results of beat policing initiative together with increased community awareness on crime and its prevention.

As suggested by OCs and senior police officers, better policing invariably needs adequate number of vehicle including modern weapons and enhancement of relevant facilities in each police station, shortening duty hours of police officials at police station, recruitment of police personnel exclusively on merit basis as well as on family background, adequate training on ICT to police personnel and ensuring its use in all aspect of policing. Police also need to be trained up (skilled) to control and prevent all types of crime, political influence on various activities of police should be lessened and attitude of police should be people-friendly.

Cost-effective and benefit-cost analysis: From the perspective of crime prevention, economic analysis of policies and programs is still a fairly new approach. Data are often costly to obtain and analyze, and a thorough benefit-cost analysis (BCA) are both expensive and resource-intensive. The conceptual development of a BCA is the creation of a typology of costs and benefits where each activity is designated as a cost or a benefit. A more appropriate way to classify costs and benefits is to count program activities as costs and all resulting outcomes as benefits.

A cost-effectiveness study collects information on program costs (inputs) and effectiveness (outcomes), then establishes explicit mathematical connections between these variables in order to calculate how much money was spent to achieve these specific outcomes (Marsh et al., 2008; Levin & McEwan, 2001). As input of the study, the total program cost depends on a technique known as cost analysis to determine the sum of all financial inputs to the crime prevention program in terms of administrative costs, capital costs and indirect costs. In the context of economic evaluation, it is important to include only those costs that varies with the decision under review. An evaluation should, therefore, include all those costs, direct or indirect, which are attributable to and differ with the activities. Valuation of outputs and outcomes is a far more complex issue than valuation of inputs because there are usually no direct prices available. A full analysis of benefits would involve determining agreed monetary values for each type of output (e.g. an arrest, a targeted crime ‘saved’) and outcome (e.g. the amount of drug- related harm, the level of fear of crime in the community). Such values would relate to resources saved and/or the increase in the usefulness to or well-being of the community as a whole or, more narrowly, the police.

Cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) assesses the cost of delivering a particular output or impact on crime. For example, the number of “treatments” applied, the number of custodial sentences increased or reduced, or the number of crimes prevented could be estimated and the cost for each assessed.

The cost-effectiveness ratio (CER) is Tk.61,288 for theft, Tk.135,144 for burglary, Tk.426,393 for robbery and Tk. 1,132,655 for dacoity. Simple interpretation of CER is that a theft can be prevented for Tk. 61,288, a burglary can be prevented for the Tk.135,144, a robbery can be prevented for Tk. 426,393 and a dacoity can be prevented for Tk. 1,132,655. For policy makers it is important to know that in general, the lower is the cost effectiveness, the more cost effective is the program, i.e., policy makers need to think about “doing more with less”. However, this does not imply that in doing so, quality shall be compromised.

The benefits of a crime prevention program may accrue in one of the two ways. First, the program might result in fewer crimes and fewer victimizations because some would-be offenders are deterred or some actual offenders are caught. Second, the initiative might change private expenditures on crime prevention, with positive benefits if the program, in turn, is able to reduce spending on crime prevention and safety.

BCA calculates the overall costs and benefits associated with a given program or policy. This is achieved by monetizing all possible costs and benefits, whether these be financial or otherwise.

The data needed for BCAs are often incomplete and costly to collect. Administrative data from public agencies are the cheapest source of data, but they are often collected for purposes other than research.

The benefit-cost ratio of crime prevention is 1.72 for theft, 1.81 for burglary, 1.96 for robbery and 1.98 for dacoity, and the weighted average is 1.85. The interpretation of these calculation conveys, for example, in the case of dacoity that each Taka invested in preventing dacoity is ultimately worth Tk. 1.98 in savings to society from averted dacoity. In other words, there is a 98 percent social return on the initial dacoity-crime investment, which means that this particular crime prevention, i.e., dacoity preventive program will eventually pay for itself. Strictly speaking, whenever the benefit-cost ratio is more than one (1.00) that implies that benefits outweigh the policing cost of crime prevention. The higher is the ratio the better in terms of worth of the program. The conclusion here is simple, that in all four types of crime – theft, burglary, robbery, and dacoity – the policing program is beneficial, and therefore, worth expansion (not to an unlimited scale).

Based on this assessment of the limitations involved in an economic analysis study, decision-makers are contemplating that such an approach should consider the following research and policy recommendations:

Develop internal expertise in the field of economic analysis, create standards and standardized procedures for evaluation and methodological processes in economic analysis, develop a network of economic analysis stakeholders, standardize reporting procedures for economic analysis, improve the expenditure estimates for victim support services, improve financial funding for the affected family, improve estimates for defensive expenditure, incorporate cost of death, incorporate separate provision for children, and incorporate rehabilitation program for offender.