

The Analysis Of Relationship Between Crime And Poverty For The Test Of Culture Of Poverty In Turkey¹

Ayşe Nur Çiftçi, İskender Gümüş

Bağımsız Araştırmacı, PhD, MA, MSc, BA, BA, BA. Çalışma Ekonomisi ve Endüstri İlişkileri ABD. Edirne /Türkiye, E-mail: draysenurciftci@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0003-0928-644X

Doç. Dr., Kırklareli Üniversitesi, İİBF, Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, Email: iskender.gumus@klu.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-1428-0512

Article Info

Article history:

Received: 12/12/2023

Revised: 24/12/2023

Accepted: 29/12/2023

Keywords: Social politics, social work, crime, poverty, culture of poverty.

JEL Codes: I30, D60, B55

Abstract

In the culture of poverty approach, it is argued that the poor form a subculture. Crime is common in this subculture. It is claimed that there is a strong link between poverty and crime. In the culture of poverty approach, it is argued that the poor are considered as potential criminals. It is pointed out that an approach that sees the poor as potential criminals will be biased. It is a basic assumption that the culture of poverty is universal. In other words, the relationship between poverty and crime is expected to be similar in every part of the world. The starting point in the preparation of this study is to test the validity of the universal claim in the culture of poverty approach. The analyzes carried out with the 2019 TURKSTAT data supported that the relationship between poverty and crime in Turkey is very limited, and that it is seen in a few types of crime. However, it was expected that there would be a relationship between crime and poverty in many more types of crime. Therefore, Turkey cannot provide serious evidence for the poverty and crime relationship of the culture of poverty approach. This reinforces that the culture of poverty approach does not have a universal feature.

Türkiye’de Yoksulluk Kültürünün Suç Ve Yoksulluk İlişkisinin Analiziyle Sınanması

Makale Bilgisi

Makale Tarihsel Süreci:

Geliş Tarihi:12/12/2023

Düzeltilme Tarihi:24/12/2023

Kabul Tarihi:29/12/2023

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal politika, sosyal çalışma, suç, yoksulluk, yoksulluk kültürü.

JEL Kodları: I30, D60, B55

Özet

Yoksulluk kültürü yaklaşımında yoksulların bir alt kültür oluşturdukları savunulmaktadır. Bu alt kültürde suç yaygındır. Yoksulluk ve suç arasında güçlü bağın olduğu iddia edilir. Yoksulluk kültürü yaklaşımında yoksulların potansiyel suçlu olarak kabul edildikleri savunulur. Yoksulları potansiyel suçlu olarak gören bir yaklaşımın yanlış olacağına işaret edilir. Yoksulluk kültürünün evrensel özellikte olduğu temel bir varsayımdır. Yani yoksulluk ve suç ilişkisinin dünyanın her yerinde benzer şekilde olması beklenir. Bu çalışmanın hazırlanmasındaki çıkış noktası da, yoksulluk kültürü yaklaşımındaki evrensel iddianın geçerliliğini test etmektir. 2019 yılı TÜİK verileriyle gerçekleştirilen analizler, Türkiye’de yoksulluk ve suç ilişkisinin çok sınırlı olduğunu, bir kaç suç türünde görüldüğü desteklenmiştir. Halbuki olması beklenen, çok daha fazla suç türünde suç ve yoksulluk arasında ilişkinin olmasıydı. Dolayısıyla Türkiye, yoksulluk kültürü yaklaşımının yoksulluk ve suç ilişkisine ciddi bir kanıt sunamamaktadır. Bu da yoksulluk kültürü yaklaşımının evrensel özelliğe sahip olmadığını güçlendiriyor.

¹ Çiftçi, A. N. ve Gümüş, İ. (2023). The analysis of relationship between crime and poverty for the test of culture of poverty in Turkey, *Uluslararası Sosyal ve Ekonomik Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 4(2), 249-268. DOI:10.62001/gsijses.1404003

INTRODUCTION

The number of studies based on the culture of poverty in Turkey is extremely low. Existing studies generally consist of compilation-specific studies based on the explanation of the narrative of the theory. In addition, references to the culture of poverty are commonly avoided in studies in the national literature. The primary purpose of this study is to determine the extent of the culture of poverty in Turkey and to create content for social work interventions to combat culture of poverty. Thus, it is expected to contribute to fill the literature gap to a certain extent. The importance of the study stems from its potential both to contribute to policy makers for social work interventions and to partially fill the existing gap in the literature.

The preliminary assumption in the study is that the culture of poverty is a social problem that needs to be tackled. The second assumption is that since every country and every society has its own unique structure, the elements of the culture of poverty it will contain will also vary. In other words, it is very difficult to act from a general assumption on a universal scale. However, this does not preclude the initial assumption that the culture of poverty is a social problem that needs to be tackled. In this study, it was tested whether there is a relationship between culture of poverty and crime and crime types.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Crime and Culture of Poverty

In the approach that the culture of poverty theory creates a subculture that will lead to the transmission of poverty between generations, it is assumed that high crime rates are also higher in these subcultures compared to other segments. Therefore, it is important to determine the relationship between poverty rates and crime in obtaining evidence about the existence of a culture of poverty in a society. The only indicator representing poverty is not limited to the poverty rate, but also unemployment, low income, and income inequalities are prominent among the poverty indicators. Accordingly, a literature review was carried out with a summary of the studies that analyze the effects of poverty rates, unemployment, income level and income inequality on crime rates.

Flango and Sherbenou (1976) focused on identifying indicators related to crime based on 59 socioeconomic and demographic variables in 840 cities in the USA. According to the results of principal component analysis, it was concluded that poverty and urbanization have the highest relationship with crime. It has been determined that the relationship between socioeconomic variables and crime is higher in big cities with a population of over 100 thousand than in smaller cities. In other words, the relationship between poverty and crime is getting stronger especially in big cities. Parker and Smith (1979) analyzed FBI data for the USA and concluded that an increase in the poverty index was strongly positively correlated with an increase in the number of homicides, first-degree homicides, and had a low positive correlation with the number of non-primary homicides. Brown (1982) found that poverty had an aggravating effect on both crimes against property crimes and violent crimes in the determinants of violent and crimes against property crimes committed in Chicago slums, and the severity of impact on violent crimes was found to be higher than on crimes against property. Cabrera-Barona and et.al (2019) found that the relationship between crime and poverty in Ecuador is valid in large metropolitan areas rather than rural or small cities. In the study, it was concluded that the crime rate decreased as the share of poor households in total households, which were insufficient to meet their basic needs, decreased. As the authors point out, this situation may be caused due to the fact that social cohesion and interaction in rural areas, despite the deep poverty, is much stronger than urban areas and that the interaction of trust between people has a limiting effect on crime. Duncan and et.al (2011) found that those who lived in childhood poverty in

the USA decreased the success in the labor market and increased the rates of outside of marriage childbearing and arrests.

Another discussion topic in the literature on the poverty-crime relationship is that economic inequalities, which lead to deprivation instead of poverty, encourage crime, while poverty alone does not have such an impact. For example, Ehrlich (1975) found that an increase in income inequality in the USA increases theft, robbery, and automobile theft. Carroll and Jackson (1983) found that income inequality had an increasing effect on break-in, burglary and general crime rates, and unemployment had an increasing effect on burglary and general crime rates in cities outside the Southern regions of the USA. Blau and Blau (1982) argue that there is a positive correlation of up to 30% between violent crime and poverty in 125 large metropolitan areas in the USA, but this relationship is mainly related to the severity of economic inequalities rather than poverty. According to them, poverty is the result of severe economic inequalities, and it is not direct poverty that increases violent crime, but also economic inequalities that cause poverty. Hsieh and Pugh (1983) found that there is a positive correlation in all coefficients except only 2 of the 76 correlation coefficients calculated between poverty and income inequality and all kinds of violent crime in the USA. Moreover, 80% of the positive relationship detected is at least at moderate severity. In other words, violent crimes and poverty or income inequality increase or decrease together. Bharadwaj (2014) determined that poverty and unjust income increase in India has an increasing effect on crimes against property crimes. Shah and et.al (2019) found the crime-increasing effect of poverty and unemployment among adults and youth in Pakistan, caused by a low-income background shaped by poverty and unemployment. There are also studies that reach contrary results to the common findings in the literature. For example, Pare and Felson (2014) argued that poverty, not inequality, is effective in the increase in crime rates. Accordingly, no relationship could be found between economic inequality and crime in 63 countries. However, there is a criminal relationship with poverty. Therefore, rather than the falsification of the relationship between crime and inequality, it is the infeasibility to provide evidence.

The findings obtained in studies on the relationship between unemployment, which is one of the main actors that cause poverty, and crime, show that unemployment, one of the determinants of poverty, has an increasing effect on crime, just like income poverty and inequality. For example, Fougère et al. (2010) concluded that the increase in unemployment in France increases crime. The study also found that youth unemployment also increased crime. While drawing attention to the increasing effect of unemployment on crime types, especially theft and drug related crimes, author suggests that it would be effective to determine strategies focusing on youth unemployment in the fight against crime. Ata (2011) concluded that unemployment has an increasing effect on crime in 27 EU countries. Effiom et al. (2014) found that unemployment drives crime in Nigeria.

Studies reversing the poverty-crime relationship have revealed that, this time the practices aimed at fighting poverty and the improvement in poverty resulted in a decrease in crime. For example, Berk et al. (1980) found that even small payments to former convicts in Texas and Georgia in the USA reduce the likelihood of recidivism, while unemployment increases the likelihood of perpetration. Fırat (2015) conducted a field study with 29 ex-convicts in Elazığ and concluded that poverty had an increasing effect on crime both in the pre-prison and post-prison period. Chioda et al. (2016) concluded that family aids for the poor in Sao Paulo, Brazil, reduce the tendency to commit crimes among adolescents aged 16-17 who go to high school. Anser et al. found that pro-poor growth reduced crime rates in sixteen countries from 1990 to 2014.

In some other studies, the effects of the negative structure shaped by poverty that led to crime were investigated. Bilgin (2012) determined that a significant portion of the children working on the streets of Diyarbakır are exposed to violence on the street, one in five are sexually harassed, turn to substance abuse, and are pushed into crime. Kaya and Bozkurt (2011) found a positive relationship between crime rates and the number of green card holders, which symbolizes poverty, between 1993 and 2009 in Turkey. Atila and Çetinkaya (2020) showed that economic crises have an increasing effect on crime in Turkey.

Types of Crime and Culture of Poverty

While examining the effects of poverty on crime, a significant part of the literature is tested by distinguishing according to crime types. Accordingly, crime types are firstly divided into two as crimes against property crimes and violent crimes. Then, both crimes against property and violent crimes are divided into sub-crimes. In the literature, the sub-headings of crimes against property are listed as robbery, theft, break-in, auto theft, and tax evasion. Murder, vandalism, terrorism and rape take the first place in violent crimes.

Smith and Jarjouro (1988) determined the impact of poverty on the types of crime, albeit with varying weight, based on victimization data in 57 neighborhoods. Patterson (1991) also obtained similar results, and it was seen that absolute poverty in particular had a strong relationship with crime rates in the neighborhood, although it varies according to the type of crime. Ludwig et al. (2001) concluded that living in slums in the USA increases crime among young people, while moving to low-poverty neighborhoods reduces violent crime and increases crimes against property. Sachside et al. (2010) found that income inequality and unemployment have a significant increasing effect on crime in Brazil. Ajide (2021) found a significant relationship between unemployment and growth and crime rates in both the long and short run in Nigeria. It has been seen that crime is not the cause of economic indicators, but economic indicators are the cause of crime. The findings show that the increase in unemployment increases the crime rates, and the increase in the growth, which indicates the poverty trend, decreases the crime rate.

When the studies focusing on the relationship between violent crime and poverty are examined, Krohn (1976) found a correlation between homicide, poverty and inequality in the USA. The severity of the relationship between homicide and inequality is stronger than the relationship between poverty and homicide. Williams (1984) identified the increasing effect of economic inequalities, racial inequalities, African-American population weight and population size on homicides in the USA. Bailey (1984) found that poverty, low income, and relative inequality were positively associated with homicide rates. Regression analyzes also identified the increasing effects of poverty, low income, relative inequality, and the proportion of the African-American population on homicide rates for all three years of 1950, 1960, and 1970. Kapuscinski et al. (1998) concluded that overall unemployment had an increasing effect on homicide in Australia between 1921 and 1987, with male unemployment. Parker and Pruitt (2000) found that African-American and Caucasian homicide rates in the USA diverge under the influence of poverty, and although poverty and poverty intensity have an effect on Caucasians' homicide rates, traditional poverty has an increasing effect on homicides committed by in African-Americans.

In other words, while all forms and severities of poverty does not affect African-Americans, but the most severe one does, sensitivity to poverty is at the highest level among Caucasians. Stretesky et al. (2004) show that the spatial poverty cluster in 236 cities in the USA has a very limited determinant on rape, robbery and assault, whereas it is a much stronger determinant on homicide rates. Lee and Holoviak (2006) found that unemployment did not affect crime types in the same way in Japan,

Australia and South Korea. Overall unemployment in Japan leads to an increase in white-collar crimes (such as bribery, embezzlement, abuse) and homicide, but does not affect other types of crime. In contrast, unemployment in Australia increases crimes against property, which consists of theft, theft of motor vehicles and robbery. In South Korea, which is at a lower level of development compared to the other two countries, this time it leads to an increase in the overall crime rate, violent crime rate and in crimes that cause property damage. Therefore, the same situation can lead to different effects in different countries. In his study, Piazza (2011) found that countries that make economic discrimination against minority groups make themselves vulnerable to local terrorism, and that the poverty of minority groups rather than the general economic conditions in the country has an increasing effect on terrorism. In their analysis covering 59 countries, Pare and Felson (2014) found that the highest correlation with the homicide rate is between the poverty index, and that poverty, underdevelopment, and income inequality increase crime over homicides.

When the analysis is repeated for developed countries, the effect of income inequality cannot be determined, while the crime-increasing effect of poverty is confirmed. Kalesan et al. (2016) analyzed the ethnicity of children hospitalized due to firearm related wound or injuries. In the study, the incidence of intentional shooting was 8.5 times higher in African-American children and 4.5 times higher in Hispanic children than in Caucasian children, and in unintentional cases it was higher in Caucasian children. It was concluded that racial risk ratios did not change according to neighborhood welfare. In other words, while income was seen as ineffective in shooting with a firearm, the determinant of racial differences was encountered. Based on 191 countries, Coccia (2017) concluded that the increase in income inequality worldwide has an increasing effect on violent crimes. Özdemir et al. (2018) in his study based on 50 countries, it was found that the level of human development, life expectancy, schooling rate and schooling duration, and political stability index had a reducing effect on terrorism. Cheteni et al. (2018) concluded that there is a strong relationship between drug-related crime and poverty in South Africa, and that as poverty increases, so does drug-related crime. Cantillano et al. (2022) found that homicide rates decreased as economic growth increased in Chile over the past one hundred and thirty years.

When the studies focusing on the relationship between crimes against property and poverty are examined, Skogan (1974) concluded that there is a positive correlation between poverty and robbery in the USA. Cohen (1981) found that the increase in the poverty rate in the USA has an increasing effect on the crime rates of crimes against property like theft, break-in and robbery. Jacobs (1981), in his study in which questions the determinants of urban crime, concluded that income inequality had a much higher effect on theft and large-scale theft than other determinants. In the study of Napoliten (1993), in which author tests the effect of poverty on crimes against property, such a relationship could not be detected in cities with low population density, while that in cities with a high population density, poverty is moderately effective in crimes against property. Carmichael and Ward (2001) determined that increased male unemployment in England and Wales; has an increasing effect on poverty-related crimes like theft, forgery, criminal damages and general crime rates Raphael and Winter-Ebmer (2003) found the increasing effect of unemployment on crimes against property in the USA. However, authors pointed out that the effect of unemployment in violent crimes remained rather weak. Based on the findings, authors attributed the contraction in crimes against property in the 1990s to the decline in unemployment rates. Edmark (2005) found that unemployment had an increasing effect on crimes against property, especially theft, car theft, and bicycle theft in Sweden. Lin (2008) found that a 1% increase in unemployment in the USA led to an increase of 1.8% in crimes against property, while author concluded that 30% of the change in crimes against property in the 1990s was

due to the change in unemployment. Janko and Popli (2015) found no evidence that unemployment has a long-term effect on crime types in Canada. However, it has been determined that it provides a short-term increasing effect on crimes against property. Imran et al. (2018) found that there was a positive cointegration between crimes against property rates and relative poverty rates between 1965 and 2016 in the USA. Based on the findings, author concluded that relative poverty for the USA causes the formation of crimes against property in the long run. Papaioannou (2017) questioned the causal relationship between precipitation and crime types in British colonies in South and Southeast Asia between 1910 and 1940. The findings show that there is a causal relationship between poverty and crime. Findings show that poverty increase rates of both crimes against property like robbery, petty thefts and cattle theft; and violent crimes like murder, massacre, and assault

In studies focusing on poverty and its determinants and the combined effects of both crimes against property and violent crimes in the literature, McKeown (1948) analyzed the relationship through correlation analysis between annual income, monthly rental income, and real estate income of those working in cities with a population of more than 250 thousand in the USA, and murder, massacre, aggravated assault, and theft. This study is dated 1948 and the data subject to analysis belongs to the year 1939-40. For this reason, it is one of the first studies on the relationship between crime and poverty. The findings obtained in the study have a negative relationship with the average annual income per capita and murder - massacre and aggravated assault. However, there are very low correlation values with theft, that is, crimes against property. As for the relationship between rental income and crime types, was slightly weaker than the severity than the relationship with the annual income of the employees. The relationship severity with real estate capital income is the weakest of them all. If we accept the decrease in income as impoverishment, the result of the negative relationship between income and crime is that crime increases as income gets poorer, that is, as income decreases. However, what stands out in this preliminary study is that although there was a moderate relationship between impoverishment and violent crimes in the US big cities of the 1940s, the relationship between crimes against property and impoverishment was very weak under the conditions of that period. Cantor and Land (1985) found that unemployment increased murder, and assault out of violent crimes; while it increased theft, robbery and auto theft out of crimes against property in US. Lieberman and Smith (1986) conducted a correlation analysis between unemployment, less than 5 years of education in the population over the age of 25, the proportion of single-mother-headed households, the proportional weight of poor households, and violent crime rates and crimes against property rates. The findings show that poverty, single mother households and low education are positively related to violent crimes, while poverty and unemployment are positively related to crimes against property. Papps and Winkelman (2000) found that unemployment in New Zealand has an increasing effect on both crimes against property types and violent crime types. Fajnzylber et al. (2002) found that an increase in income inequality between countries leads to an increase in both robbery and murder rates. The increase in economic growth and the increase in average income leads to a decrease in both murder and robbery rates. Therefore, the summary of the findings obtained in the study, that economic inequality and impoverishment have an increasing effect on murder and robbery from violent crimes. Hooghe et al. (2011) found that unemployment strongly affects crime rates in Belgian municipalities. It has been concluded that income inequality, one of the poverty indicators, increases crime against property, but has a reducing effect on violent crimes. The decrease in average income, that is, impoverishment, has an increasing effect on both violent crimes and crimes against property. Loureiro (2012) determined that family aids made within the scope of fighting poverty in Brazil and public social aids for the poor both reduce poverty and reduce child

abduction, robbery, and theft. However, it was not possible to detect a significant effect on homicide rate reduction.

Crime Drivers and Culture of Poverty

There are many factors that drag the individual to commit crime, from psychological discomfort to political ideologies, from economic factors to the environment. However, most of these factors are directly or indirectly related to poverty. Even in the most unrelated psychological factors, the inability to provide medical and other interventions that will provide a solution to the individual's mental disorder can be effective. The main reason for this non-intervention is often poverty or lack of education, which leads to poverty as well. In that case, it is expected that there will be a significant relationship between crime drivers, poverty, and the culture of poverty. Under this title, a literature review has been made on the basis of three crime drivers related to poverty, which crime is related to: 1) The relationship between crime and education, 2) The relationship between crime and family (non-family) structure, 3) The relationship between crime and immigrants / ethnicity.

When the literature focusing on the relationship between crime and education is examined, Yang et al. (1974) found that education had an impact on the change in crime rate in Ohio. Tittle and Rowe (1974) concluded that there is a negative correlation between crime rates and median education level in both towns and cities in Florida. Batiuk et al. (1997) found that having a university education in Ohio reduces the tendency to re-offend. Lochner (1999, 2004) concluded that decline in school achievement and being African-American increase the likelihood of committing crimes in the United States. In a different model, author concluded that parental tertiary education, severity of crime punishments in the State, school success, and having a full (unbroken) family reduced the likelihood of male delinquency. In another model, being a high school graduate, was found to decrease the probability of committing both violent and crimes against property crimes compared to being a high school dropout. Hansen (2003) found that in England and Wales, living in a family, the comfort of a new home, being wealthy-rich reduce the probability of being involved in crimes against property, and the family getting in trouble with the police increases truancy from school. Cömertler and Kar (2007) found that income level, education level, birth rate, population density and urbanization affect crime rates in Turkey. Durusoy et al. (2008) concluded that; unemployment, immigration, being a primary school graduate, population density, urbanization increases crimes against property in Turkey; whereas being a vocational school and higher education graduate, and household size has a reducing effect on crimes against property. Groot and van den Brink (2010) found that the increase in the education period of the parents, the relationships with their parents, and the religious belief reduce the violent crime. In addition, personal education period reduces shoplifting, vandalism and violent crimes; whereas it increases the crime of tax evasion. Grott and van den Brink (2010) found that education in the Netherlands reduces violent crimes such as shoplifting, vandalism, threats, assault and injury, but increases tax evasion. Kaya (2011) determined the positive effects of unemployment, immigration and GDP per capita on theft and looting crimes. However, author determined that the effect of schooling reduces crime. Macin et al. (2011) found that legally increasing school leaving age in England and Wales by increasing length of education, led to a decrease in crimes against property. This finding was repeated according to both the gender-neutral population and the male and female population. Meghir et al. (2012) concluded that in Sweden, the length of study of both the individual and the parents reduces the likelihood of arrest and conviction. A similar study was carried out for Italy by Buonanno and Leonida (2006). In the study, it was concluded that the education period in Italy has a reducing effect on crimes against property, theft and all crime rates. Bell et al. (2016) found that the increase in the school leaving age in the USA has

a reducing effect on crimes against property, violent crimes and all types of crimes. For non-African-Americans, education decreased crimes against property more whereas it decreased violent crimes for African-Americans more. Dündar and Kesbiç (2020) determined the increasing effect of unemployment and income level in crimes against property in Turkey, whereas schooling had a reducing effect on crime. Mulamba (2021) found the mitigating effect of education on the crimes against property like street robbery and house theft in municipalities in South Africa.

When studies focusing on the relationships between crime and family structure are examined, Cho (1972) found a positive relationship between single-digit family weight in single mother parenting and murder, robbery, assault, and rape in the USA. The severity of the positive correlation between homicide, robbery, and single-parent household weight is much higher than that of forced assault and rape. In addition, it was concluded that the single-digit family weight, in which the mother is a parent, is positively related to suicide rates as well as murder and robbery. Machale and Johnson (1977) concluded that the positive relationship between divorce and crimes against the state and crimes against property in Germany, where rapid urbanization took place in 1885 and 1912, accelerated in time and increased. Vigderhous and Fishman (1977) in their study based on twenty-one countries, concluded that divorce increases suicide rates. Cohen and Johnson (1982) found a moderate positive correlation between general crime rates and divorce over five-year periods in rural France between 1875 and 1889. However, this correlation stems from crimes against property rather than personal crimes, and it was concluded that there is a strong positive correlation between crimes against property and divorce. Sampson (1986) found that the increase in divorce rates in the USA has an increasing effect on both murder and robbery. Diversifying the analysis based on gender, author concluded that divorce had an increasing effect on robbery rates for both men and women. In addition, the increasing effect of divorce on robberies has been reaffirmed in all alternatives, without exception, in the discrimination of men and women who commit robberies as African-American and Caucasian according to age and ethnicity. Crutchfield (1989) found that there is a moderate to high positive relationship between divorce rates and murder, assault, rape, robbery and violence in Seattle, USA. Therefore, it is seen that there is a strong relationship between violent crimes and divorces. Sampson and Laub (1990) found that marriage reduces crime and deviance for all three main age groups, this time with reverse reading. Boor and Bair (1990) concluded in their study that divorce has a positive correlation with crime and suicide. However, according to the findings of this analysis, the relationship between divorce and suicide is much stronger than the relationship between divorce and murder. Messners and Sampson (1991) concluded that for 153 cities in the USA, single-parent family size had an increasing effect on homicide and robbery. Kposowa et al. (1995) concluded that in cities with a population of more than 100 thousand people, divorce has an increasing effect on crime. In the analysis, author encountered the existence of the crime-increasing effect of divorce on all types of violent and crimes against property. Kennedy et al. (1998) found a positive relationship between divorce rate and crime rate in Russia. Roberts and Lafree (2001) concluded that while divorce reduces the probability of committing murder in Japan, it has an increasing effect on the probability of robbery. Stretesky and Lynch (2004) found that the divorce rate in American towns increases both violent crime and property-related crime. Hochstetler et al. (2002) in his analysis based on FBI data, found that an increase in the male divorce rate led to an increase in embezzlement and general violent crime. Stolzenberg and D'Alessio (2007) concluded that divorce was positively associated with spousal victimization and ex-spousal victimization in 244 US cities. Relationship violence is higher in spousal victimization than in ex-spousal victimization. Wong (2011) found that separation and divorce increase violent crime in Canadian provinces. Authot could not detect the same effect in theft and vandalism. Van de Weijer et al. (2016) found that over the 47-year period in the United States,

there was an increase in both violent and non-violent crime with divorce. Errol et al. (2021) found that over two centuries in sixteen countries, predominantly European countries, divorce increased general, violent and crimes against property. Divorce is effective in murder, assault and robbery among violent crimes. Abanoz (2022) concluded that 1 unit increase in crude divorce rate leads to 0.68 increase in average crime in Turkey.

From the studies focusing on the relationship between minority groups, which are the carriers of the culture of poverty, who feel the crime and poverty most deeply, the literature review is firstly made from the perspective of crime and immigrants/refugees. Accordingly, Hannon (2011) in his study, in which he tested the theory of crime opportunities for two cities in the USA, found that theft and motor vehicle theft had a high positive relationship with poverty, but this relationship showed an inverse relationship with foreign-borns and the weight of those in the 15-24 age group. In his analysis for the USA, Green (2016) found no relationship between the volume of immigrants and drug-related arrests, but a low but significant relationship between illegal immigrants and drug-based arrests. Dehos (2021) focused on the determination of the relationship between the weight of asylum seekers and refugees coming to Germany in the population and crime rates according to crime types. The findings of the study show that there is a relationship between the population weights of refugees and non-violent crimes against property.

In studies focusing on the relationship between crime and ethnic groups, Walt and Jason (2017) found that racial status was associated with the arrest of women in the USA. African-Americans are more likely to be arrested than Caucasians. The length of time in jail is also approaching twice that of Caucasian women for African-American women. Unemployment of incarcerated women in the last six months before incarceration is considerably higher for African-Americans than Caucasians. There was no difference between races in making a living before imprisonment through illegal means such as prostitution. Boateng et al. (2020) failed to confirm the existence of a significant relationship between migrants/refugees and crime in 21 European countries. McCann and Boateng (2020) are among the important determinants of the opinion of Americans that individual factors such as race, age and religion increase the crime rate of immigrants. Accordingly, the severity of this perception is significant, although varying, in the 45-59 age group, middle-aged Americans, women, African-Americans and Hispanics, all education groups, Catholics, non-religious people, and people living in the South of America. Kızmaz and Bilgin (2012) found that children working on the streets in Diyarbakır city center mostly commit theft and also face substance abuse. Gürbüz (2015) determined that with Ankara Hacıbayram becoming an urban depression area, crime rates have reached seven times compared to Ankara as a whole. In particular, the multiplicity difference in crimes against persons is disproportionately higher than crimes against property.

APPLICATION

Data and Method

Three different data sets were used in the study. The first data for 2019 were men, women, and the total population aged 15 and over, according to NUTS2 and NUT3. The second data was crime and type of crime statistics for 2019 according to NUTS 2 and NUTS3. This data was used to calculate crime rates. The numbers of 14 type of crime, other crime and total crime were determined and proportioned to the population. The new crime rates obtained constituted the crime rate per hundred thousand people. The third data was national income and poverty statistics. The relationship between crime and income variables was tested by correlation analysis. Correlation coefficients are used to measure the direction and severity of the relationship between the variables (Altaş et al. 2012: 1). The

Pearson correlation coefficient is a correlation coefficient that takes values between -1 and +1. (For the method, see Genceli, 1986; Aytaç, 1983).

The basis for the crime data is not the place where the crime was committed, but the province and sub-region where the perpetrator resides. Thus, the basic assumption of the culture of poverty approach, that there is an inverse correlation between income level and crime rates, and that the poor are more prone to crime, was tested. Under this heading, the reporting of the analysis findings was carried out in three stages. At the first stage, the analysis findings of the income/poverty relationship with the crime rates in men according to level 3 and level 2 were reported. In the second stage, this time, the findings on the relationship between crime rates and income/poverty among women were summarized. In the third and final stage, the crime rates in the general population and the income/poverty relationship were analyzed.

The Relationship between Crime and Income Poverty in Men

Correlation analysis findings on the relationship between crime and poverty in men primarily supported the existence of an extremely limited and low severity crime-income/poverty relationship. According to Level 3, it was seen that the crime-income/poverty relationship did not coincide with the culture of poverty theory. According to this, when the crimes that crime level and income level are positively related, albeit of low severity, are examined, it is seen that injury, murder, sexual crimes, threats, use and purchase of drugs or stimulants, damage to property, forgery and other crimes can be listed. These crimes, in which a low positive correlation was established with the income level of the provinces where the perpetrators reside, showed that the crime increased as the income increased. However, there are only two types of crimes that can be seen as related to poverty, and these are identified as manufacturing and trading of drugs or stimulants and smuggling (See Table 1).

Table 1. The Relationship between the Number of Crimes and Income Levels in One Hundred Thousand Based on Male Population Over 15 Years of Age by Crime Types - NUTS 3

Type of Crime	GDP per capita		GDP per capita for 20% of the lowest income	
	TL	LnTL	TL	LnTL
Total				
Homicide				
Assault		0,282*		0,230*
Sexual crimes		0,227*		
Kidnapping				
Crimes related with firearms and knives				
Threat		0,296**		0,247*
Production and commerce of drugs		-0,222*	-0,219*	-0,239*
Use and purchase of drugs	0,245*	0,255*		0,223*
Robbery				
Damage to property		0,272*		0,244*
Smuggling	-0,328**	-0,382**	-0,337**	-0,395**
Swindling				
Forgery	0,380**	0,388**	0,313**	0,332**
Theft				
Other		0,290**		0,232*

* Correlation is significant at the 5% level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 1% level (2-tailed).

The analysis findings performed according to Level 2 showed that the relationship between crime and income / poverty in men was associated with even fewer types of crime. According to this, it was concluded that there is a negative relationship between the production and trade of drugs or stimulants and income levels, while impoverishment and an increase in crime are experienced together. It has been observed that the increase in poverty in looting and fraud from crimes against property and the

increase in theft and the increase in the aforementioned crime types have been experienced together. Although the severity of the relationship between crime and poverty was higher than level 3, it was low as it remained below 0.5. In addition, the detection of this relationship in only four of the sixteen crime types supported the thesis that crime and poverty increase together, which is claimed in the culture of poverty theory, for men in Turkey (Table 2).

Table 2. The Relationship between the Number of Crime Per Hundred Thousand and Income Levels Based on Male Population Over 15 Years of Age by Type of Crime – NUTS 2

Type of Crime	GDP per capita		GDP per capita for 20% of the lowest income	
	TL	LnTL	TL	LnTL
Total				
Homicide				
Assault				
Sexual crimes				
Kidnapping				
Crimes related with firearms and knives				
Threat				
Production and commerce of drugs		-0,414*	-0,426*	-0,482*
Use and purchase of drugs				
Robbery			-0,446*	-0,435*
Damage to property				
Smuggling				
Swindling	-0,405*	-0,441*	-0,464*	-0,529**
Forgery				
Theft	-0,401*		-0,449*	-0,445*
Other				

* Correlation is significant at the 5% level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 1% level (2-tailed).

Findings on the Relationship between Crime and Income / Poverty for Women

When the relationship between crime and income/poverty was questioned according to level 3 for women, it was found that injury, threat, damage to property and forgery showed a positive correlation with income level. However, the correlation strength was generally very low. For the culture of poverty theory at level 3, this theory’s assumption was falsified for women (Table 3).

Table 3. The Relationship between the Number of Crime Per Hundred Thousand and Income Levels Based on Female Population Over 15 Years of Age by Type of Crime – NUTS 3

Type of Crime	GDP per capita		GDP per capita for 20% of the lowest income	
	TL	LnTL	TL	LnTL
Homicide				
Assault	0,246*	0,341**		0,297**
Sexual crimes				
Kidnapping				
Crimes related with firearms and knives				
Threat		0,247*		0,274*
Production and commerce of drugs				
Use and purchase of drugs				
Damage to property	0,230*	0,258*	0,285*	0,302**
Smuggling				
Forgery				
Theft	0,388**	0,403**	0,388**	0,410**

* Correlation is significant at the 5% level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 1% level (2-tailed).

According to level 2, different from level 3, there was a negative and moderate relationship between income and four crime types. It was observed that as poverty increased in general crime rate among women, looting and theft from crimes against property and in other crimes, crime rate also increased.

It was concluded that there was no such relationship in crimes against life, drugs etc. In general, it was determined that women's crime rates were much more limited than men compared to both level 2 and level 3 (Table 4).

Table 4. The Relationship between the Number of Crime Per Hundred Thousand and Income Levels Based on Female Population Over 15 Years of Age by Crime Types – NUTS 2

Type of Crime	GDP per capita		GDP per capita for 20% of the lowest income	
	TL	LnTL	TL	LnTL
Total	-0,462*	-0,404*	-0,467*	-0,404*
Homicide				
Assault				
Sexual crimes				
Kidnapping				
Crimes related with firearms and knives				
Threat				
Production and commerce of drugs				
Use and purchase of drugs				
Robbery	-0,515**	-0,474*	-0,482*	-0,424*
Damage to property				
Smuggling				
Swindling				
Forgery				
Theft	-0,403*		-0,416*	
Other	-0,461*	-0,412*	-0,475*	-0,417*

* Correlation is significant at the 5% level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 1% level (2-tailed).

Findings on the Relationship between Crime and Income / Poverty for the Whole Population

Between crime and poverty in the general population, the only two types of crime that support the assumption of the culture of poverty theory by level 3 are the manufacture and trade of drugs or stimulants, and smuggling. Crimes against life such as injury, sexual offenses, threats; and crimes against property such as damage to property and forgery increased as income increased. Relationship severity also remained low (Table 5).

Table 5. The Relationship between the Number of Crimes and Income Levels in a Hundred Thousand Based on the Population Over 15 Years of Age by Type of Crime - NUTS 3

Type of Crime	GDP per capita		GDP per capita for 20% of the lowest income	
	TL	LnTL	TL	LnTL
Total				
Homicide				
Assault		0,291**		0,239*
Sexual crimes		0,225*		
Kidnapping				
Crimes related with firearms and knives				
Threat		0,303**		0,257*
Production and commerce of drugs				-0,220*
Use and purchase of drugs	0,245*	0,256*		0,222*
Robbery				
Damage to property	0,220*	0,307**		0,286**
Smuggling	-0,321**	-0,375**	-0,330**	-0,387**
Swindling				
Forgery	0,404**	0,411**	0,339**	0,358**
Theft				
Other		0,305**		0,248*

* Correlation is significant at the 5% level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 1% level (2-tailed).

According to Level 2, it was seen that the assumption of the theory of culture of poverty was met in four crime types. These were identified as the manufacture and trade of drugs or stimulants, looting, fraud, and theft (Table 6).

Table 6. The Relationship between the Number of Crimes and Income Levels in a Hundred Thousand Based on the Population Over the Age of 15 by Type of Crime- NUTS 2

Type of Crime	GDP per capita		GDP per capita for 20% of the lowest income	
	TL	LnTL	TL	LnTL
Total				
Homicide				
Assault				
Sexual crimes				
Kidnapping				
Crimes related with firearms and knives				
Threat				
Production and commerce of drugs	-0,401*	-0,425*	-0,440*	-0,491*
Use and purchase of drugs				
Robbery	-0,392*		-0,455*	-0,441*
Damage to property				
Smuggling				
Swindling	-0,418*	-0,451*	-0,475*	-0,535**
Forgery				
Theft	-0,427*	-0,400*	-0,476*	-0,461*
Other				

* Correlation is significant at the 5% level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 1% level (2-tailed).

RESULT AND CONCLUSION

Lewis (1959) drew attention to the delinquency of the poor, which is included in the culture of poverty theory, by adding it to the culture of poverty characteristics he determined. There are also many studies in the literature that include the relationship between poverty / impoverishment / income decline and crime (Some studies focusing on the relationship between poverty and crime, regardless of crime type: Flango and Sherbenou, 1976; Carroll and Jackson, 1983; Hsieh and Pugh, 1983; Smith and Jarjoura, 1988; Duncan et al. 2011; Kaya and Bozkurt, 2011; Cabrera-Barona et al. 2019; Shah et al. 2019; Ata, 2011; Effiom et al. 2014).

There is no clarity regarding the relationship between poverty and which types of crimes are correlated with it. A group of studies concludes that poverty is associated with an increase in violent crimes such as murder, assault, and rape (For example, Krohn, 1976; Smith, 1979; Blau & Blau, 1982; Williams, 1984; Bailey, 1984; Kapuscinski et al. 1998; Parker and Pruitt, 2000; Ludwig et al. 2001; Stretesky et al. 2004; Lee and Holoviak, 2006; Piazza, 2011; Pare and Felson, 2014; Kalesan et al. 2016; Coccia, 2017; Özdemir et al. 2018; Cheteni et al. 2018; Cantillano et al. 2022). In a group of studies, it was concluded that poverty is associated with an increase in property-based crimes such as fraud, theft, and extortion (For example, Skogan, 1974; Cohen, 1981; Jacobs, 1981; Napoliten, 1993; Carmichael and Ward, 2001; Raphael and Winter-Ebmer, 2003; Edmark, 2005; Lin, 2008; Fougère et al. 2010; Janko and Popli, 2015; Papaioannou, 2017; Imran et al. 2018). There are also studies showing that poverty is associated with an increase in both violent and crimes against property (For example, Skogan, 1974; Cohen, 1981; Jacobs, 1981; Napoliten, 1993; Carmichael & Ward, 2001; Raphael & Winter-Ebmer, 2001). 2003; Edmark, 2005; Lin, 2008; Janko and Popli, 2015; Papaioannou, 2017; Imran et al. 2018).

According to the application findings for Turkey, the tendency to commit crime or the association of poverty with crime among the poor, who are among the characteristics of the culture of poverty, has

been determined to a limited extent, more in men than in women. Accordingly, the types of crimes in which the relationship between poverty or income reduction and crime increase for men can be determined were low, except for medium-level fraud in five of the sixteen crime types analyzed. These types of crimes can be listed as:

- Manufacture and trade of drugs or stimulants
- Smuggling
- Looting
- Fraud
- Theft

This relationship exists only at a low level between poverty or impoverishment and property crime types.

For women, the relationship between poverty or impoverishment and crime types is lower than that of men and is limited in number. Accordingly, there is a low but significant relationship between poverty or impoverishment and looting and theft for women. In the general crime rate, there is a relationship between poverty and crime for women, albeit at a low level.

The findings support that the poor people's tendency to commit crime, which is one of the important features of the culture of poverty in Turkish society, is extremely limited, and that it is not related to violent crimes.

KAYNAKÇA

- Abanoz, I. N. (2022). The economic anomie and crime in Turkey. ss. 456-476, *Handbook of Research on Cyber Approaches to Public Administration and Social Policy*, New York: IGI Global.
- Ajide, F. M. (2021). Fiscal policy and crime rate in Nigeria. *African Journal of Economic Review*, 9(4), 85-105.
- Altaş, D., Kaspar, E. Ç. ve Ergüt, Ö. (2012). İlişki katsayılarının karşılaştırılması: Bir simülasyon çalışması. *NKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Metinleri*, Tekirdağ.
- Anser, M. K. ve öte. (2020). Dynamic linkages between poverty, inequality, crime, and social expenditures in a panel of 16 countries: Two-step GMM estimates. *Journal of Economic Structures*, 9, 1-25.
- Ata, A. Y. (2011). Ücretler, işsizlik ve suç arasındaki ilişki: Yatay-kesit analizi. *Çalışma ve Toplum*, 4(31), 113-134.
- Atila, M. ve Çelikkaya, S. (2020). Ekonomik krizlerin toplumsal izdüşümü: Türkiye’de yaşanan ekonomik krizlerin işsizlik, suç ve intihara yansımaları. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Vizyoner Dergisi*, 11(26), 245-258.
- Aytaç, M. (1983). Korelasyon katsayılarının geliştirilmesi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi*, 4(2), 209-221.
- Bailey, W. C. (1984) Poverty, inequality, and city homicide rates: Some not so unexpected findings. *Criminology*, 22(4), 531-550.
- Batiuk, M. E., Moke, P. ve Rountree, P. W. (1997). Crime and rehabilitation: Correctional education as an agent of change—a research note. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(1), 167-180.
- Bell, B., Costa, R. ve Machin, S. (2016). Crime, Compulsory schooling laws and education. *Economics of Education Review*, 54, 214-226.
- Berk, R. A., Lenihan, K. J. ve Rossi, P. H. (1980). Crime and poverty: Some experimental evidence from ex-offenders. *American Sociological Review*, 45(5), 766-786.
- Bharadwaj, A. (2014). Is Poverty the mother of crime? Empirical evidence of the impact of socioeconomic factors on crime in India. *Atlantic Review of Economics*, 1, 1-40.
- Bilgin, R. (2012). Sokakta çalışan çocukları bekleyen risk ve tehlikeler: Diyarbakır örneği. *ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 8(15), 79-96.
- Blau, J. R. ve Blau, P. M. (1982). The cost of inequality: Metropolitan structure and violent crime. *American Sociological Review*, 47(1), 114-129.
- Boateng, F. D., Pryce, D. K. ve Chenane, J. L. (2021). I may be an Immigrant, but I am not a Criminal: Examining the Association between the Presence of Immigrants and Crime Rates in Europe. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 22(3), 1105-1124.
- Boor, M. ve Bair, J. H. (1990). Suicide rates, handgun control laws, and sociodemographic variables. *Psychological Reports*, 66(3), 923-930.
- Brown, M. (1982) Modelling the spatial distribution of suburban crime. *Economic Geography*, 58(3), 247-261.
- Buonanno, P. ve Leonida, L. (2006). Education and crime: Evidence from Italian regions. *Applied Economics Letters*, 13(11), 709-713.

- Cabrera-Barona, P. F., Jimenez, G. ve Melo, P. (2019). Types of crime, poverty, population density and presence of police in the metropolitan district of Quito. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 8(12), 558.
- Cantor, D. ve Land, K. C. (1985). Unemployment and crime rates in the Post-World War II United States: A theoretical and empirical analysis. *American Sociological Review*, 50(3), 317-332.
- Carmichael, F. ve Ward, R. (2001). Male unemployment and crime in England and Wales. *Economics Letters*, 73(1), 111-115.
- Carroll, L. ve Jackson, P. I. (1983). Inequality, opportunity, and crime rates in central cities. *Criminology*, 21(2), 178-194.
- Cheteni, P., Mah, G. ve Yohane, Y. K. (2018). Drug-related crime and poverty in South Africa. *Cogent Economics ve Finance*, 6(1), 1534528.
- Chioda, L., De Mello, J. M. ve Soares, R. R. (2016). Spillovers from conditional cash transfer programs: Bolsa família and crime in urban Brazil. *Economics of Education Review*, 54, 306-320.
- Cho, Y. H. (1972). A multiple regression model for the measurement of the public policy impact on big city crime. *Policy Sciences*, 3(4), 435-455.
- Coccia, M. (2017). A Theory of general causes of violent crime: Homicides, income inequality and deficiencies of the heat hypothesis and of the model of CLASH. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 37, 190-200.
- Cohen, D. ve Johnson, E. A. (1982). French criminality: Urban-rural differences in the nineteenth century”, *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 12(3), 477-501.
- Cohen, L. E. (1981). Modeling crime trends: A criminal opportunity perspective. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18(1), 138-164.
- Cömertler, N. ve Kar, M. (2007). Türkiye’de suç oranının sosyo-ekonomik belirleyicileri: Yatay kesit analizi. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 62(2), 37-57.
- Crutchfield, R. D. (1989). Labor stratification and violent crime. *Social Forces*, 68(2), 489-512.
- Dehos, F. T. (2021). The refugee wave to Germany and its impact on crime. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 88, 103640.
- Duncan, G. J. ve öte. (2012). The importance of early childhood poverty. *Social Indicators Research*, 108(1), 87-98.
- Dündar, Ö. ve Kesbiç, C. (2020). Malvarlığına karşı işlenen suçların suç teorilerine göre mekansal analizi. *Balıkesir Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 23(44), 911-936.
- Durusoy, S., Köse, S. ve Karadeniz, O. (2008). Ana sosyo ekonomik sorunlar suçun belirleyicisi olabilir mi? Türkiye’de iller arası bir analiz. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi (elektronik)*, 7(3), 172-203.
- Edmark, K. (2005). Unemployment and crime: Is there a connection? *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 107(2), 353-373.
- Effiom, J. N., Archibong, E. P. ve Ojua, T. A. (2014). An assessment of the impact of poverty on criminal behaviour among youths: A case of akpabuyo local government area, Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3(2), 24-31.

- Ehrlich, I. (1975). On the relation between education and crime. in education, income, and human behavior. pp. 313-338, *Education, Income, and Human Behavior*, der. F. Juster, NBER.
- Errol, Z., Madsen, J. B. ve Moslehi, S. (2021). Social disorganization theory and crime in the advanced countries: Two centuries of evidence. *Journal of Economic Behavior ve Organization*, 191, 519-537.
- Fajnzylber, P., Lederman, D. ve Loayza, N. (2002). Inequality and violent crime. *The journal of Law and Economics*, 45(1), 1-39.
- Fırat M. (2015). Yoksulluk ve suç ilişkisinin sosyolojik analizi: Bir referans çerçevesi (Elazığ örneği). *Birey ve Toplum Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 5(1), 193-224.
- Flango, V. E. ve Sherbenou, E. L. (1976). Poverty, urbanization, and crime. *Criminology*, 14(3), 331-346.
- Fougère, D., Kramarz, F. ve Pouget, J. (2009). Youth unemployment and crime in France. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(5) 909-938.
- Genceli, M. (1986). *Ekonometri ve İstatistik İlkeleri*, İstanbul: Filiz Kitabevi.
- Green, D. (2016). The Trump hypothesis: Testing immigrant populations as a determinant of violent and drug-related crime in the United States. *Social Science Quarterly*, 97(3), 506-524.
- Groot, W. ve Van Den Brink, H. M. (2010). The effects of education on crime. *Applied Economics*, 42(3), 279-289.
- Gürbüz, D. (2015). Türkiye de kentleşme sürecinde çöküntü bölgesi ve suç ilişkisi: Hacıbayram mahallesi örneği. *Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 47, 1-15.
- Hannon, L. (2002). Criminal opportunity theory and the relationship between poverty and property crime. *Sociological Spectrum*, 22(3), 363-381.
- Hansen, K. (2003). Education and the crime-age profile. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43(1), 141-168.
- Hochstetler, A., Kerley, K. R. ve Mason, K. (2002). Structural predictors of embezzlement: A preliminary analysis. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 25(1), 1-22.
- Hooghe, M. ve öte. (2011). Unemployment, inequality, poverty and crime: Spatial distribution patterns of criminal acts in Belgium, 2001–06. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 51(1), 1-20.
- Hsieh, C. C. ve Pugh, M. D. (1993). Poverty, income inequality, and violent crime: a Meta-Analysis of Recent Aggregate Data Studies. *Criminal Justice Review*, 18(2), 182-202.
- Imran, M., Hosen, M. ve Chowdhury, M. A. F. (2018). Does poverty lead to crime? Evidence from the United States of America. *International Journal of Social Economics*. 45(10), 1424-1438.
- Jacobs, D. (1981). Inequality and economic crime. *Sociology and Social Research*, 66(1), 12-28.
- Janko, Z. ve Popli, G. (2015). Examining the link between crime and unemployment: A time-series analysis for Canada. *Applied Economics*, 47(37), 4007-4019.
- Kalesan, B. ve öte. (2016). Race and ethnicity, neighborhood poverty and pediatric firearm hospitalizations in the United States. *Annals of epidemiology*, 26(1), 1-6.

- Kapuscinski, C. A., Braithwaite, J. ve Chapman, B. (1998). Unemployment and crime: Toward resolving the paradox. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 14(3), 215-243.
- Kaya, M. V. ve Bozkurt, İ. (2011). İşsizlik, kişi başına milli gelir (yoksulluk), suç oranı ve yeşil kart: 1993–2009 Türkiye örneği. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 30, 133-140.
- Kennedy, B. P., Kawachi, İ. ve Brainerd, E. (1998). The role of social capital in the Russian mortality crisis. *World Development*, 26(11), 2029-2043.
- Kızmaz, Z. (2012). Gelişmekte olan ülkelerde suç: Suç oranlarının artışı üzerine sosyolojik bir çözümleme. *Mukaddime*, 5, 51-74.
- Kposowa, A. J., Breault, K. D. ve Harrison, B. M. (1995). Reassessing the structural covariates of violent and property crimes in the USA: A county level analysis. *British Journal of Sociology*, 46(1), 79-105.
- Krohn, M. D. (1976). Inequality, unemployment and crime: A Cross-national analysis. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 17(3), 303-313.
- Lee, D. Y. ve Holoviak, S. J. (2006). Unemployment and crime: An empirical investigation. *Applied Economics Letters*, 13(2), 805-810.
- Lewis, O. (1959). *Five Families*, New York: Basic Books.
- Lieberman, L. ve Smith, A. B. (1986). Crime rates and poverty—A reexamination. *Crime and Social Justice*, 25, 166-177.
- Lin, M. J. (2008). Does unemployment increase crime? Evidence from US data 1974–2000. *Journal of Human Resources*, 43(2), 413-436.
- Lochner, L. (1999). *Education, Work, and Crime: Theory and Evidence*, Rochester Center for Economic Research Working Paper, No. 465.
- Lochner, L. (2004). Education, work, and crime: A human capital approach. *International Economic Review*, 45(3), 811-843.
- Loureiro, A. O. (2012). Can conditional cash transfers reduce poverty and crime? Evidence from Brazil. *Evidence from Brazil (January 30, 2012)*.
- Ludwig, J., Duncan, G. J. ve Hirschfield, P. (2001). Urban poverty and juvenile crime: Evidence from a randomized housing-mobility experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116(2), 655-679.
- Machin, S., Marie, O. ve Vujic, S. (2011). The crime reducing effect of education. *The Economic Journal*, 121(552), 463-484.
- Mccann, W. S. ve Boateng, F. D. (2020). An examination of American perceptions of the immigrant-crime relationship. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 45(6), 973-1002.
- Mchale, V. E. ve Johnson, E. A. (1977). Urbanization, industrialization, and crime in imperial Germany: Part II. *Social Science History*, 1(2), 210-247.
- Mckeown, J. E. (1948). “Poverty, Race and Crime”, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1931-1951)*, 39(4), 480-484.

- Meghir, C., Palme, M. ve Schnabel, M. (2012). *The Effect of Education Policy on Crime: an Intergenerational Perspective* (No. w18145). National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper, Cambridge, No. 18145.
- Messner, S. F. ve Sampson, R. J. (1991). The sex ratio, family disruption, and rates of violent crime: The paradox of demographic structure. *Social Forces*, 69(3), 693-713.
- Mulamba, K. C. (2021). A spatial analysis of property crime rates in South Africa. *South African Journal of Economics*, 89(3), 329-347.
- Neapolitan, J. (1994). Poverty and property crime: The moderating effects of population size and concentration. *Sociological Spectrum*, 14(2), 181-191.
- Özdemir, A., Eser, M. ve Erol, H. (2018). Küresel terörizm ve yoksulluk ilişkisi. *Social Science Development Journal*, 3(12), 434-446.
- Papaioannou, K. J. (2017). Hunger makes a thief of any man: Poverty and crime in British Colonial Asia. *European Review of Economic History*, 21(1), 1-28.
- Papps, K. ve Winkelmann, R. (2000). Unemployment and crime: New evidence for an old question. *New Zealand Economic Papers*, 34(1), 53-71.
- Pare, P. P. ve Felson, R. (2014). Income inequality, poverty and crime across nations. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 65(3), 434-458.
- Parker, K. E. ve Pruitt, M. V. (2000). Poverty, poverty concentration, and homicide. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81(2), 555-570.
- Parker, R. N. ve Smith, M. D. (1979). Deterrence, poverty, and type of homicide. *American Journal of Sociology*, 85(3), 614-624.
- Patterson, E. B. (1991). Poverty, income inequality, and community crime rates. *Criminology*, 29(4), 755-776.
- Piazza, J. A. (2011). Poverty, minority economic discrimination, and domestic terrorism. *Journal of Peace Research*, 48(3), 339-353.
- Raphael, S. ve Winter-Ebmer, R. (2001). Identifying the effect of unemployment on crime. *The Journal of Law and Economics*, 44(1), 259-283.
- Rivero-Cantillano, R. ve öte. (2022). Interpersonal violence in Chile, c. 1880s–2010s: A tale of delayed but successful convergence. *Social Science History*, 49, 1-27.
- Roberts, A. ve Lafree, G. (2004). Explaining Japan's postwar violent crime trends. *Criminology*, 42(1), 179-210.
- Sachsida, A. ve öte. (2010). Inequality and criminality revisited: Further evidence from Brazil. *Empirical Economics*, 29(1), 93-109.
- Sampson, R. J. (1986). Crime in cities: The effects of formal and informal social control. *Crime and Justice*, 8, 271-311.
- Sampson, R. J. ve Laub, J. H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55(5), 609-627.

- Shah, N., Soomro, B. A. ve Mirjat, A. J. (2019). An investigation of the impact of poverty and unemployment on criminal behaviour among youths: An empirical approach. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology*, 11(1), 54-67.
- Skogan, W. G. (1974). The validity of official crime statistics: An empirical investigation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 55(1), 25-38.
- Smith, D. A. ve Jarjoura, G. R. (1988). Social structure and criminal victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 25(1), 27-52.
- Stolzenberg, L. ve D'alessio, S. J. (2007). The effect of divorce on domestic crime. *Crime ve Delinquency*, 53(2), 281-302.
- Stretesky, P. B. ve Lynch, M. J. (2004). The relationship between lead and crime. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 45(2), 214-229.
- Stretesky, P. B., Schuck, A. M. ve Hogan, M. J. (2004). Space matters: An analysis of poverty, poverty clustering, and violent crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(4), 817-841.
- Tittle, C.R. ve Rowe, A.R. (1974). Certainty of arrest and crime rates: A further test of the deterrence hypothesis. *Social Forces*, 52(4), 455-462.
- TURKSTAT, *Adrese Dayalı Nüfus Kayıt Sistemi Sonuçları*, <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/>, Date: 26.12.2021.
- TURKSTAT, *Gelir Dağılımı ve Yaşam Koşulları İstatistikleri*, <https://biruni.tuik.gov.tr/medas/>, Date: 23.12.2021
- TURKSTAT, *İBBS 3. Düzeyde, Daimi İkametgah ve Suç Türüne Göre Ceza İnfaz Kurumuna Giren Hükümlüler, 2011-2020*, <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/DownloadIstatistikselTablo?p=tDDab9wf86xS0mHYrsjjwkE8vSWRNxs7HOxBA2sIojwwIclX8Rk33hLKQaejA827>, Date: 27.12.2021.
- Van De Weijer, S. G. ve öte. (2015). The effects of parental divorce on the intergenerational transmission of crime. *Societies*, 5(1), 89-108.
- Vigderhous, G. ve Fishman, G. (1977). Socioeconomic determinants of female suicide rates: A cross-national comparison. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 7(2), 199-211.
- Walt, L. C. ve Jason, L. A. (2017). Predicting pathways into criminal behavior: The intersection of race, gender, poverty, psychological factors. *ARC Journal of Addiction*, 2(1), 1.
- Williams, K. R. (1984). Economic sources of homicide: Reestimating the effects of poverty and inequality. *American Sociological Review*, 49(2), 283-289.
- Wong, S. K. (2011). Reciprocal effects of family disruption and crime: A panel study of Canadian municipalities. *W. Criminology Reiew*, 12(43), 15-34.
- Yang, S. W. ve Howard, P. G. (1974). *An Ecological Study of Crime in Rural Ohio*, Ohio, US: Ohio Farm Bureau Federation.