Type of Crime and Demography of the Inmates

Hasnida[1], Namora Lumongga Lubis[2], Etti Rahmawati[1], Juliana Irmayanti Saragih[1]
[1] Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Jalan Dr.T.Mansyur No. 7 Medan, Indoensia
[2] Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indoensia

Keywords: Type of crime, demograpphy of inmates.

Abstract: This research aimed to describe the types of crimes viewed from the level of education, employment status, marital status, and the involvement of family members in crime. Survey method was used to get research data, and contingency correlation technique was used to know the relation between five variables that was studied. The results of the analysis showed that the level of education and employment status had a significant correlation to the type of crime in prisoners. In contrast, marital status and the involvement of family members in crime did not have a significant correlation to the type of crime in prisoners.

1 INTRODUCTION

The number of crimes in the last three years has increased, amounted to 325,317 cases (2014); 352,936 cases (2015) and 357,200 cases (2016) (Aprillan, 2017; Badan Pusat Statistik, 2016). The crime committed by a person had various types, ranging from mild levels such as the act of stealing sandals to serious crimes such as conducting murders. Type of crime committed cannot be separated from the background of the culprit. Research showed that there were several factors that was quite prominent as the source of a person committing a crime such as economic problems (Pieszko,2016), education (Lochner & Moretti,2004) occupation (Lageson & Uggen, 2013), and history of family members involved in crime (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). This research aimed to describe the types of crimes viewed from the level of education, employment status, marital status, and the involvement of family members in crime.

2 METHODS

This research was a survey research which used a quantitative approach. Respondents in this study are newly admitted prisoners of *Tanjung Gusta* penitentiary and were undergoing *Masa Pengenalan Lingkungan* (MaPenaLing) socialization. 101 respondents were selected non-randomly as sample of this research. Interviews were used as data collection techniques to obtain the data of the five variables that were studied. Descriptive statistics covering frequency and percentage, as well as correlation contingency were used as data analysis techniques to describe the condition of the five variables and the link between them.

Table.1. Description of Research Variables

Variables		n (%)
Education	No Formal Education	9 (8.9)
	Elementary School	19 (18.8)
	Junior High School	21 (20.8)
	Senior High School	38 (37.6)
	Diploma Degree	2 (2.0)
	Bachelor Degree	10 (9.9)
	Master Degree	1 (1.0)
	Doctoral Degree	1 (1.0)
	Total	101 (100.0)
Occupation	Job Holder	23 (22.8)
	Nonpermanent Worker	67 (66.3)
	Unemployed	11 (10.9)
	Total	101 (100.0)
Marital status	Not Married	39 (38.6)
	Married	52 (51.5)
	Divorced	10 (9.9)
	Total	101 (100.0)

Table.1. Description of Research Variables (cont.).

Variable		n (%)
Involvement of Family Members	None	84 (83.2)
	Yes	17 (16.8)
	Total	101 (100.0)
Cases	Drugs	57 (56.4)
	Trafficking	5 (5.0)
	Morality	9 (8.9)
	Murder	7 (6.9)
	Robbery & Murder	2 (2.0)
	Domestic Violence	1 (1.0)
	Gambling & Morality	1 (1.0)
	Corruption	8 (7.9)
	Robbery	7 (6.9)
	Gang Fights	1 (1.0)
	Fraud	3 (3.0)
	Total	101 (100.0)

3 RESULTS

The total number of respondents involved in the study was amounted to 101 people. Of the 101 respondents of prisoners who are in prison, 11 types of crimes were committed by them such as drugs, trafficking, morality, murder, robbery and murder, domestic violence, gambling and morality, corruption, robbery, gang fights and fraud and caused them to go to jail. The variables seen in this study are divided into five types: education level, employment status before entering prison, marital status, family members' involvement in crime and type of crimes.

The description of education level shown in Table 1 shows that most respondents have high school education level (37.6%) followed by junior high school (20.8%) and elementary school level (18.8%). For jobs prior to jail admission, 66.3% were nonpermanent worker, 22.8% were job holder and 10.9% were unemployed. Married status had the most respondent (51.5%) followed by unmarried status amounted to 38.6% and divorced status amounted to 9.9%. Family members involved in crime were about 16.8% compared with uninvolved family members (83.2%). The three most notable types of crime are drugs (56.4%) followed by morality (8.9%) and corruption (7.9%).

Drugs type of crimes were committed by respondents with no formal education (2%), primary school (9.9%), junior high (14.9%) and high school (26.7%) education levels. Trafficking type of crimes were conducted by respondents of elementary school (4.0%) and high school (1.0%) level. Morality type of crimes were committed by respondents with non-school (2.0%), primary school (1.0%), junior high (2.0%) and senior high (3.0%) education levels. Robbery type of crimes were conducted by respondents with non-school (2.0%), primary school (2.0%), junior high (2.0%) and senior high (1.0%) education level. Fraud type of crimes were conducted by respondents with Diploma (1.0%) and Master Degree (1.0%) education level. Corruption type of crimes were conducted by respondents with bachelor degree level of education (5.9%).

Drugs (7.9%), corruption (7.9%) and fraud (3.0%) type of crimes tend to be conducted by respondents with permanent employment status. While Drugs (48.5%), trafficking (5%), morality (8%), murder (7%), and robbery (6.0%) tend to be conducted by respondents who have temporary jobs or unemployed.

Respondents who did not have family members involved in crime tends to commit drugs (45.5%), trafficking (4.0%), morality (6.9%), corruption (7.9%) and fraud (3.0%) type of crimes. In addition, respondents who had family members involved in crime tends to commit drugs types of crimes (10.9%).

Respondents with unmarried status tends to commit drugs (26.7%) and morality (5.0%) type of crimes. Respondents with married status tends to commit drugs (23.8%), corruption (7.9%), robbery (5.9%), and murder (4.0%). In addition, respondents with divorced status tends to commit drugs type of crimes (5.9%).

Table 2. Cross Tabulation between Variables

Variables						Cases (%)							
		Drugs	Trafficking	Morality	Murder	Robbery & Murder	Domestic Violence	Gamble & Morality	Corruption	Robbery	Gang Fights	Fraud	Total (%)
Education	No Formal Education	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.00)	3 (3.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	9 (8.90)
	Elementary	10 (9.90)	4 (4.00%)	1 (1.00)	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	19 (18.80)
	Junior High	15 (14.90)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	21 (20.80)
	Senior High	27 (26.70)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	38 (37.60)
	Diploma Degree	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	2 (2.00)
	Bachelor Degree	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (5.90)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	10 (9.90)
	Master Degree	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)
	Doctoral Degree	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)
	Total	57 (56.40)	5 (5.00)	9 (9.00)	7 (7.00)	2 (2.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	8 (8.00)	7 (7.00)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	101 (100.00)
Involvement of Family Members	None	46 (45.50)	4 (4.00)	7 (6.90)	6 (5.90)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	8 (7.90)	7 (6.90)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	84 (83.20)
	Yes	11 (10.90)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	17 (16.80)
	Total	57 (56.40)	5 (5.00)	9 (8.90)	7 (6.90)	2 (2.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	8 (7.90)	7 (6.900)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	101 (100.00)
Occupation	Job Holder	8 (7.90)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	8 (7.90)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	23 (22.80)
	Nonpermanent Job	41 (40.60)	5 (5.00)	8 (7.90)	6 (5.90)	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	4 (4.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	67 (66.30)
	Unemployed	8 (7.90)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	11 (10.90)
	Total	57 (56.40)	5 (5.00)	9 (8.90)	7 (6.90)	2 (2.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	8 (7.90)	7 (6.90)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	101 (100.00)
Marital Status	Not Married	27 (26.70)	2 (2.00)	5 (5.00)	2 (2.00)	2 (2.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	39 (38.60)
	Married	24 (23.80)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	4 (4.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	8 (7.90)	6 (5.90)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	52 (51.50)
	Divorced	6 (5.90)	2 (2.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	10 (9.90)
	Total	57 (56.40)	5 (5.00)	9 (8.90)	7 (6.90)	2 (2.00)	1 (1.00)	1 (1.00)	8 (7.90)	7 (6.90)	1 (1.00)	3 (3.00)	101 (100.00)

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 Educations and Type of Crimes

Based on Table 2, if the categorization of education levels is made into two levels, namely low (no formal education up to high school level) and high (Diploma to Doctoral Degree level), it can be seen that there was a tendency for respondents who have a low level of education tend to commit drugs, trafficking, morality, murder, and robbery crimes. While respondents who had higher education, had a

tendency to commit corruption and fraud crimes. This is supported by the results of analysis with Contingency Correlation which found that there is a very significant relationship between education level and type of crime (c = 0.776; p = 0.00).

There are a number of reasons to believe that education will affect subsequent crime. The first reason, education increases the legitimacy of legitimate work and increases the chances of avoiding illicit behavior. Second, education can directly affect a person's financial or psychological reward. Finally, education can change preferences in an indirect way,

which may influence a person's decision to be involved or not involved in crime (Lochner & Moretti,2004). In this research, 44.8% of 87 respondents of low education dropped out or did not complete education at the level they were in. Absenteeism or early drop out and criminal behavior in adult individuals is an important issue and dropping out can be linked to unemployment, low income and high crime rates. The relatively low level of academic achievement is a risk factor for criminal behavior, and the predictive validity continues into adulthood (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). In accordance with economic theory, adults have economic motives or interests to be involved in a crime (Lochner & Moretti,2004; Becker,1968; Lochner,2011).

4.2 Occupations and Type of Crimes

Based on the results of the analysis with the Contingency Correlation, it is known that the employment status has a very significant relationship with crimes (c = .602, p = 0.00). Respondents who initially had permanent employment status tends to commit drugs, corruption, and fraud crimes. While respondents who had temporary job or unemployed tends to commit drugs, trafficking, morality, murder, and robbery crimes.

Research that aimed to see the interrelationship between employment status and criminal behavior (Gillespie,1975) was described in terms of theoretical frameworks such as Rational Economic Theory put forward that the income earned by working will reduce the motivation to commit a crime for economic reasons (Becker,1968). Correspondingly, *anomie* and *differential opportunity theories* (Becker,1968) see that criminal behavior will be an attractive option for someone who feels that legal efforts to achieve economic well-being are hampered. Social control theory (Becker,1968) suspected that people who are workers have felt they are in a comfortable position so they will not take an action that risking the comfort that has been obtained. Being a worker also promotes informal social control, which binds individuals to mutual obligations with those around them (Lageson & Uggen, 2013).

In the last two decades, the literature reviewing the relationship between status of unemployed with criminal behavior is continuously developed. Three studies were showed a statistically significant relationship between the status of unemployed with criminal behavior, while 7 other studies found no significant association (Gillespie,1975). The status of an unemployed person has no effect on the likelihood of criminal behavior occurrence (Lageson & Uggen,

2013). On the other hand, other study stated the exact opposite (Gillespie,1975). A job stability is a stronger risk factor than the unemployment rate adulthood (Andrews & Bonta, 2010). In particular, criminal behavior increases with frequent unemployment and a longer period of unemployment experienced by a person adulthood (Andrews & Bonta, 2010).

A poverty for not having an income may encourage someone to commit a crime because they feel they have no way to cope with perceived economic pressures, especially when they did not have a job (Kartono, 2009). Other research showed a significant influence on employment status on the occurrence of criminal behavior in Batang District, Jawa Tengah, where people who did not have a job have greater potential to commit criminal acts than people who work (Dermawanti, Hoyyi,& Rusgiyono, 2013).

4.3 Involvement of Family Members and Type of Crimes

Based on the results of analysis with the Contingency Correlation it is known that the involvement of family members in crime has no significant relationship with the type of crimes (c = 3.14, p = .353). Respondents who do not have family members involved in crime tends to commit drugs, trafficking, morality, corruption, and fraud crimes. In addition, respondents who have family members involved in crime tends to commit drugs crimes.

Many studies stated that there is a significant relationship between the involvement of family members and the type of crime committed. However, this study differs from other studies in which the results showed no significant association between the involvements of family members in crime with the type of crime. This finding supports Sutherland's theory. This renowned Criminologist in 1947 renewed his earlier theory and put more emphasis on all behavior could be learned (*differential social organization theories*) (Sutherland, 1947). This theory contradicted that no evil behavior is passed on from both parents. The pattern of evil behavior is not inherited but learned through communication in an intimate interaction or association. In social contact, there is a learning process that includes crime techniques, motives, encouragement, attitude and rationalization of a crime.

The Social Control Theory of Hirschi seen crime as a result of social institutions losing control over individuals (Hirschi,1969). Weak institutions such as certain types of families, disruption of local

communities, and the destruction of trust in the government and the police, all of which are related to the high crime rate.

4.4 Marital Status and Type of Crimes

Based on the results of analysis with the Contingency Correlation, it is known that marriage status of prisoners in the penitentiary had no significant relationship with the type of crime($c = 0.472$, $p = 0.087$). Respondents with not-married status tends to commit drugs and morality crimes. Respondents with married status tends to commit drugs, corruption, robbery, and murder crimes. In addition, respondents with divorced status tend to commit drugs crimes (5.9%).

Past studies on the relationship between a person's marital status and criminal predisposition still showed some different results. A person's marriage bond will indeed be an obstacle to committing a criminal act, in which couples can be a social control of the tendency to commit a crime (Andersen, Andersen, & Skov,2015; Monsbakken, Lyngstad, Skardhamar, 2012). On the other hand, several researches showed different results, including in this research where the relationship between marital status and type of crime was not found significantly. This can be explained by the findings that the tendency to commit crimes will actually increase when couples, especially the wife, had been involved with certain criminal acts (Wyse, Harding, & Morenoff, 2014) Romantic Relationships and Criminal Desistance: Pathways and Process.. This finding is reinforced that marriage will reduce the likelihood of criminal behavior only if the couple did not have a history of criminal behavior (Sampson, Laub, Wimer, 2006). The findings also reinforced this conclusion by stating that quality marriages will reduce the level of criminal behavior, particularly the strong bond between husband and wife (Sampson, Laub, Wimer, 2006). Early marriage would actually increase criminal behavior especially when individuals married under 21 years of age Monsbakken, Lyngstad, Skardhamar, 2012).

5 CONCLUSIONS

Looking at 11 types of crimes, except for prisoners with education from level of diploma degree to doctoral degree, drugs was the most frequent criminal act. Prisoners with nonpermanent job and unemployed, tends to be involved in drugs crimes, higher than 10 other types of crime. On the other hand, prisoners with permanent employment status

tends to commit corruption. Drugs crime tend to be committed by prisoners regardless of marital status and the history of family members' involvement in committing a crime.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Aprillan, S. (2017). 2016, Jumlah Kejahatan di Indonesia Meningkat. Diakses melalui https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2017/12/23/2016-jumlah-kejahatan-di-indonesia-meningkat

Badan Pusat Statistik (2016). Statistika Kriminal 2016. Badan Pusat Statistika - Jakarta Indonesia.

Pieszko, G. (2016). The influence of socio - economic factors on crime. *Journal Of Humanities And Social Science* (IOSR - JHSS), Vol. 21, Issue 9, pp. 18-21.

Lochner, L & Moretti, E. (2004). The Effect of Education on Crime: Evidence from Prison Inmates, Arrests, and Self-Reports. *American Economic Review* , Vol. 94, No. 1, pp. 155-189.

Lageson, S & Uggen, C. (2013). How Work Affects Crime—And Crime Affects Work—Over The Life Course in C.L. Gibson and M.D. Krohn (eds.), *Handbook of Life-Course Criminology: Emerging Trends and Directions for Future Research*. Springer Science Business Media New York.

Andrews, D.A & Bonta, J. (2010). *The psychology of criminal conduct*. Fith edition. Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., New Providence, NJ.

Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(2), pp.169-217.

Lochner , L. (2011). Non - Production Benefits of Education: Crime, Health, and Good Citizenship. In Hanushek, Machin and Woessman, (Eds.), *Handbook of Economics of Education*, vol.4. Elsevier.

Gillespie, R .1975. Economic Factors in Crime and Deliquency: A Critical Review of The Empirical Evidence. Department of Justice. Nat'l Inst. Of Law Enforcement and Criminal. Justice. Supra note 15.

Kartono, K. 2009. *Patologi Sosial*, Jilid 1. PT. Raja Grafindo Persada: Jakarta.

Dermawanti, Hoyyi, A., Rusgiyono A. *Factors affecting criminality in Batang Regency Year 2013 With Path Analysis*.

https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/97283 -ID-faktor-faktor-yang-mempengaruhi-kriminal.pdf (Retrieved June 30, 2018)

Sutherland, E. L.(1947). *Differential Association Theory*. Retrieved June 30, 2018 http://criminology.fsu.edu/crimtheory/

Hirschi, T. (1969). The causes of delinquency. Berkeley: The University of California Press

Hirschi, T. (1969). The causes of delinquency. Berkeley: The University of California Press

Andersen, S.H., Andersen, L.J., Skov, P.E. (2015). Effect of Marriage and Spousal Criminality on Recidivism. *Journal of marriage and family.* Vol.77 (2), pp.496-509.

Monsbakken, C.W., Lyngstad, T.H. & Skardhamar, T., (2012). Crime and the Transition to Marriage: The Role of the Spouse's Criminal Involvement. *Discussion paper. No.678*

Sampson, R.J., Laub, J.H., Wimer, C. Does Marriage Reduce Crime ? A Counterfactual Approach to Within-Individual Causal Effect. *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 44*(3), 465-508.

Wyse, J. JB., Harding, David J., Morenoff, J.D. Romantic Relationships and Criminal Desistance: Pathways and Process. *Socialogical forum.* Vol.29 (2), pp.365-385.