

## Navigating the Complexities of Criminological Theory: Current Obstacles and Emerging Pathways

---

Igbokwe Nkemakolam Chijioke

---

**Igbokwe Nkemakolam Chijioke**

Department of Sociology, University of Port Harcourt,  
Rivers State, Nigeria.

Email: igbkemars@gmail.com

---

### Abstract

This study examines the complex relationship between criminological theories and their practical application in understanding crime, shaping criminal justice policies, and guiding law enforcement practices. Criminological frameworks including classical, positivist, and contemporary models such as strain theory and routine activity theory offer foundational insights into criminal behavior and legislative development. However, their applicability is often constrained by sociocultural, economic, and political contexts that diverge significantly across regions and eras. Many theories, particularly those rooted in Western contexts, may not adequately explain crime patterns in non-Western societies or in light of emerging crime forms such as cybercrime and terrorism. Additionally, ethical challenges such as potential discrimination resulting from biological or psychological theories, and privacy concerns from predictive policing further limit policy adoption. The study also explores socio-political influences on policing, emphasizing issues like racial profiling and police militarization. Empirical evidence highlights systemic biases that undermine public trust and necessitate reforms in law enforcement. The research advocates for a contextual and interdisciplinary approach in refining criminological theories to address evolving crime trends and to foster equitable, effective justice systems.

**Keywords:** Socio-Political, Sociocultural, Political, Psychological Theories

---

### Introduction

The establishment of crimes, the analysis of criminal behaviour, and the understanding of the working of the criminal justice system have their credibilities with the aid of criminological theories. They include classical, positivist, or modern theories, or those developed in the context of social disorganization, strain, and routine activity, which would in turn directly influence the formulation of laws, law enforcement, or crime prevention programs and the constitution of new policies (Lilly, Cullen & Ball, 2019). The setting for putting these theories into practice, however, is severely hindered. Criminal behaviour has shown influence from sociocultural, economic, and political changes which often run contradictory to these theories.

Criminological theories are more often subject to varying degree of contextual constraints. Theories emerge from a cultural, historical and socio-economic context, and their claim to universality becomes matter of debate. For example, strain theory posits that crime arises in the context of social push towards attaining economic success (Onyige, 2018). The theory might find little explanatory power in understanding crimes in rich countries where such economic pressure is absent. Some theories propounded in the western context

are likely to find little use in explaining crime trends in non-western societies that are informed by their own cultural norms and legal systems.

Ethical and practical hindrances have limited the extension of certain criminological ideas toward being implicated in policy and law enforcement. Individual traits, according to biological and psychological theories of crime, can predispose an individual to criminal behaviour; therefore, if such policies are argued from these theories, they would be open to discrimination with respect to racial profiling or genetic determinism. The implementation of predictive policing-based crime analysis, grounded in criminological theories such as routine activity theory, underscores serious ethical issues regarding privacy, surveillance, and potential bias in processing crime data (Brayne, 2021).

Moreover, increasing changes in crime have posed challenges for the applicability of established criminological theories. Radical transformation of crime due to the emergence of cybercrime, terrorism, and global-organized crime seems to found many classical criminological frameworks inadequate in explaining criminal behaviours deviating from the orthodox operation of street crime models (McGuire, 2012). Hence, constant upgrades and adjustments are now crucial for theories of criminology to be applied to the new trend of crime. With these constraints in perspective, criminologists and practitioners must then assess theories contextually while concurrently adopting interdisciplinary means toward ameliorating efficient crime prevention and control.

However, notwithstanding a few reservations, the following significant challenges have implications for law enforcement, the making of policies, and the criminal justice system in general. The following are socio-political influences on policing: Policing is affected directly by socio-political influences that shape and mould law enforcement policies and practices and public perceptions on them. Among the crucial socio-political claims on policing are police militarization and racial profiling. These issues have been debated widely, activism taken, and policy affirmative reforms made to ensure that accountability, fairness, and community trust prevail in law enforcement.

For instance, Racial Profiling in Policing refers to law enforcement practices in which some people are targeted unequally on the basis of their race, ethnicity, or perceived identity and not on the basis of strong evidence of wrongdoing. Such a practice is historically and systemically biased, consequently ending up with a distrust between law enforcement and marginalized communities. Empirical research shows that racial minorities, especially Black and Hispanic ones, have higher chances of getting stopped, searching, and arresting than White ones (Gelman, Fagan and Kiss, 2007). Stop-and-frisk policies in the U.S. have, for example, been criticized for their disproportionate targeting of African American and Latino populations, with many accusing law enforcement officials of violating civil liberties through discrimination

Profiling in races has been observed on a socio-political scale beyond mere within-and-individual effects to community relationships and their collective impact on how people generally view police legitimacy. Movements like Black Lives Matter (BLM) are known for raising claims regarding racial injustices where policing is concerned in the name of legal reforms and accountability. Some jurisdictions have introduced bias training, body cameras, and revised stop-and-search policies designed to ameliorate such discriminatory issues vis-a-vis restoring said trust to their communities. Racial profiling remains a contentious issue. Though these measures are put into action, the prattle seems to persist about the existence of built-in implicit biases leading law enforcement into wanting further structural changes in recruitment,

training, and accountability mechanisms. The challenge is to establish a proper balance between proper proactive policing and protections under the Constitution against discrimination and unlawful surveillance. Police militarization in particular refers to the increasingly militaristic qualities of police forces in civilian law enforcement in terms of equipment, weaponry, and tactical applications. It has been fuelled by policies like the 1033 Program in the United States, which enables local police departments to obtain surplus military equipment such as armoured vehicles, assault rifles and tactical gear.

Though challenged by a few, the policy has been justified in terms of anti-terrorism, drug enforcement, and riot control. Conversely, as critics say, this militarization creates ideological distance from the image of the police as guardians of the community. Research shows that increasingly militarized police forces are more likely to apply aggressive tactics that increase rather than decrease tensions (Mummolo, 2018). The glaring spotlight on police militarization during events like the 2014 riots in Ferguson, where police confronted protesters against the killing of Michael Brown, increased public concern. The pictures of armoured cars, tear gas, and riot gear gives rise to questions about what an acceptable balance should be between public safety and civil liberties.

In response, policy makers and advocacy groups have sought, in general, restrictions on the transfer of military-grade equipment, greater oversight, and a shift toward community policing models. Several cities have established crisis intervention models and de-escalation training to limit militarized uses of force. There are many political and socio-cultural facets that are affecting police practice today, including racial profiling and militarization of the police. Thus, these are policy issues that should provoke reform, including methods of bringing officers to account, and approaches supportive of community policing. By so doing, police ensure a transparent and fair system of operation that would ultimately restore an appreciable degree of public trust, providing for safety while respecting civil rights.

Integration of Artificial Intelligence and predictive analytics in law enforcement have, therefore, the ability to act as a catalyst in developing modern police strategies in line with revised trends in data-driven decision-making. According to some definitions, predictive policing utilizes advanced algorithms to examine historical crime data in order to identify patterns that can, in turn, be used not just to forecast criminal behaviours, which might enhance public safety through resource allocation and deployment strategy development (Perry et al. 2013). This will definitely sharpen the focus for law enforcement to target crime effects through better resource allocation, better deployment of officers, and possibly deterring criminal acts before they actually occur.

According to Onyige (2018) that we are living in postmodern times marked with fragmentation and diversity wherein the present-day society seems to be moving with rapid and constant change. Similarly, AI-based surveillance systems have defined themselves as the next generation in modern policing, including facial recognition technology, big data analytics, and machine learning algorithms, to realize surveillance and data analysis in public spaces looking for potential threats (Joh, 2019). The systems can integrate and analyze data from a now-magnified range of sources, including street cameras and social media, allowing law enforcement to interrogate suspicious activity and lead on persons of interest in real time. Not to mention the promise with which many authorities find enticing the possibility of more efficient detection and effective crime prevention, thus immediately plunging into action in hopes of the improvements it might give in public safety.

Furthermore, these new technologies come with the burden of more weighty ethical concerns. Privacy is

one of the major public issues, with people now continuously under observation. Close to that is the concern about bias in algorithmic learning processes, history-data being the training material of algorithms would result in deep-rooted systemic inequalities that would lead to differential targeting of marginalized communities. Rising concerns that now face law enforcement agencies in the increasing use of AI systems are those of accountability; who is responsible if an algorithmic mistake results in wrongful arrest or identification?

As the conversations concerning those technologies advances, it is entirely timely that the policymakers open a discussion with law enforcement and the public about finding a balance between enhancing security and necessary civil rights. This will require serious regulation, transparency of AI systems and their use, and continuous monitoring to achieve this balance such that their benefits are not at the expense of fundamental freedoms. Indeed, these promises should be measured against the difficult journey of navigating the challenging ethical landscape so as to not violate the very tenets of justice and equality that the legal system was believed to uphold in the name of safety, although AI and predictive analytics seems to be redefining the face of law enforcement.

Strong ethical arguments behind algorithmic bias and discrimination are growing on society's standards as against the implications artificial intelligence and machine learning hold within decision-making processes. Studies usually show that predictive policing systems reflect and often accelerate existing racial and socioeconomic disparities within crime data to disproportionately target marginalized communities (Richardson et al. 2019). Such decision support systems, however, meant to improve resource allocation for police forces, are actually built on historically present records on crimes which is believed to have been compromised. for a long time through discriminatory policing practices. Thus, AI model design is confronted with a serious contention as regards to its effectiveness in breaking the bounds of systemic inequalities (Benjamin 2019).

The use of facial recognition technology has, for instance, been found to misidentify racial minority groups greater than the majority, causing wrongful arrest upon already heavily policed communities, which increases scrutiny on these communities (Buolamwini & Gebru 2018). This misidentification implies horrible consequences to the misidentified person, such as psychological trauma, job loss, ill social stigma, and eventually engendering a widespread climate of distrust and fear between the already marginalized communities and law enforcement institutions. Their pervasive use perpetuates the cycle of policing within these areas, often making them further targets of constant scrutiny and surveillance in the eyes of law.

The consequences even spread on to hiring issues, loaning issues, and even the healthcare system. From algorithms used in hiring that may discriminate on race or gender, a lot of other talents are deprived of going into respectable workplaces, yet another source of inequity. Predictive algorithms may also exhibit biases against under-represented populations in the health treatment/health outcome realm because they don't address their status in the future.

Thus, in order to formulate frameworks for implementing fairness and accountability in AI development as well as for credibly testing algorithmic bias and transparency in data, stakeholders must include technologists, policymakers, and community advocates. Another factor would entail jointly engaging affected communities to see through the lens of their lived experience. Taking steps to remedy algorithmic bias can really get the ball rolling towards technology being an ally rather than an enemy to redressing an equitable future.

These technologies also, therefore, bear greater social import when it comes to the changing relationship between the citizenry and the state. The minute the algorithms become more sophisticated, they can not only identify individuals but start to predict certain behaviours for very substantive reasons from their historical record, thereby leading to profiling and discrimination. Consequently, an environment arises in which an individual may alter her/his behaviour due to fear of observation, thus creating a hostile setting for free expression and dissent to flourish.

In addition, the absence of common rules to govern the use of these technologies may lead to inconsistent applications such that disadvantaged communities might be subjected to undue and disproportionate surveillance measures. Moreover, misuse of data still remains a serious issue under which hacking or illegal access to the surveillance system would lead to compromised personal privacy because of releasing sensitive information.

At the same time, the continued progress made by technology brings with it an additional challenge for policymakers to genuinely engage in a dialogue-they, civil rights organizations, and the technological experts- towards formulating a serious framework that emphasizes transparency, accountability, and protection of civil liberties. Society can only make this through partnership since that is the only way by which the benefits that come with technology advancement do not suffocate fundamental human rights but will also promote the environment under which innovation and personal freedoms can survive together.

Besides, the great challenge of ethical accountability and transparency is posed. Many predictive policing and AI-surveillance systems are black boxes, functioning as such, wherein their decision-making processes are shadowy and not readily interpretable from the public point of view, as well as from law officials (Pasquale, 2015). Thus, in contrast with police or administrative decisions supported by these AI systems, it becomes really hard to analyze whether the action decisions are really accurate and fair. Furthermore, it becomes extremely challenging to hold someone accountable if an incorrect arrest or unjustified targeting occurs as the involvement of multiple parties (technology developers, law enforcement and policymakers) dilutes accountability (Crawford & Schultz, 2019).

Lack of accountability and transparency is another primary ethical concern. Most predictive policing and AI surveillance systems use operations described as "black boxes," meaning, decisions individuals have reached may not be much clear or interpretable to the public or even law enforcement officials (Pasquale, 2015). Such opaqueness also creates problems around evaluating fairness and subscribing quality status to policing decisions like AI-driven arrests. When something goes wrong, for instance, a wrongful arrest or foregrounded targeting, accountability is very complicated, as no one takes care of responsibility between the developers of the technology, law enforcement agencies, and policymakers (Crawford & Schultz, 2019). Together with many other ethical dilemmas, hence, there is a rush for strong regulatory frameworks and ethical ideals in AI, along with public debates on the right modes of predictive policing and AI surveillance.

### **Comparative Evaluation of Policing Models: Implications for Law Enforcement Effectiveness.**

An evaluation of the various models indicates that there are specific strengths and weaknesses in each of them regarding law enforcement personnel. Traditional policing, which is generally understood to mean a reactive method of addressing crime after it occurs, continues to maintain a visible presence in neighbourhoods throughout the United States. Yet as the balance tips toward the drawbacks of traditional policing, the inability of such policing to get community members involved will breed mistrust and



alienation. According to Agwanwo(2014) ‘the police is an organized body of civil officers in a city, town, district, state and so on whose particular duties are preservation of lives and property, detection of crimes, and enforcement of the laws.

Community policing, on the other hand, seeks to mend this breach by fostering police-community cooperation and collaboration in solving crime problems. This proactive model contains such programs as neighborhood watch, outreach, and initiatives geared toward improving relationships and encouraging public cooperation. Unfortunately, the commonly inconsistent implementation of community policing programs, coupled with various levels of commitment to community policing from the police agencies, often stand in the way of the success of community policing.

Problem-oriented policing attempts to analyse and identify the major underlying causes of crime. With crime mapping and data analysis being just what POP is all about, various identified problems enable police forces to regain and redirect attention to specific problems and tailor interventions accordingly.

This approach is mostly thought to work favourably; however, it is training-intensive and requires operational support on-site, which some police departments may not be able to afford.

Traditionally aiding the decision-making process about resource allocations, intelligence led policing is evolving now into a framework that fosters crime prevention through enhancing policing operational activities. However, ethical considerations can complicate these processes through the technological issues of privacy and overreliance on data, which could potentially alienate community segments.

The next-generation predictive policing might also be called the next-generation law enforcement model, where the application of advanced algorithms and historical data aims to ascertain plausible criminal activity. If efficiently deployed for crime-fighting, whatever that means, this can revolutionize crime prevention; however, it is also bringing in questions regarding the accuracy of these predictions and possible bias in data interpretation. Inasmuch as the effectiveness of such models is being put under scrutiny, important considerations arising from an analysis of them should be as to whether or not the crime-reduction goals set forth are being outweighed by their other impacts concerning trust, equity, and justice within the community. As long-range and fully functioning policing frameworks are coming into being, dialogues are required among police, communities, and researchers to ensure that these are turned into adaptive strategies which can be leveraged as vital lead steps in the move toward safer and more congenial communities.

## References

- Agwanwo, D. E. (Ed.). (2014). *A political economy of policing in Nigeria (Volume 1)*. University of Port Harcourt Press.
- Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after technology: Abolitionist tools for the new Jim Code*. Polity Press.
- Brayne, S. (2021). *Predict and surveil: Data, discretion, and the future of policing*. Oxford University Press.
- Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). *Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 81, 1-15.
- Crawford, K., & Schultz, J. (2019). AI systems as state actors: Accountability under the law. *Fordham Law Review*, 89(1), 83-110.
- Gelman, A., Fagan, J., & Kiss, A. (2007). An analysis of the New York City police department's stop-and-frisk policy in the context of claims of racial bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(479), 813-823. <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214506000001040>

- Joh, E. E. (2019). Artificial intelligence and policing: First questions. *Seattle University Law Review*, 41, 1139-1158.
- Lilly, J. R., Cullen, F. T., & Ball, R. A. (2019). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences (7th Ed.)*. SAGE Publications.
- McGuire, M. (2012). *Technology, crime and justice: the question concerning technomia*. Willan.
- Mummolo, J. (2018). Militarization fails to enhance police safety or reduce crime but may harm police reputation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(37), 9181-9186. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1805161115>
- Onyige, C. D. (2018) *Introduction to sociology of deviant behavior*. 2nd edition. University of Portharcourt press limited.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press.
- Perry, W. L., McInnis, B., Price, C. C., Smith, S. C., & Hollywood, J. S. (2013). Predictive policing: The role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations. RAND Corporation.
- Richardson, R., Schultz, J. M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Dirty data, bad predictions: How civil rights violations impact police data, predictive policing systems, and justice. *New York University Law Review Online*, 94, 15-56.