EKOBISTEK JOURNAL

LPPM Universitas Putra Indonesia YPTK Padang
Lubuk Begalung Road, Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia, Pos Code: 25221
Volume: 14, Issue: 4, Page: 176-182, 31/12/2025, e-ISSN: 2527-9483

Economic Determinants Of Criminality in Indonesia's Capital City

Fitri Ramadhani[1]✉, Ismadiyanti Purwaning Astuti[2]

[1,2] Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Economics, Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia

fitriramadhani@students.amikom.ac.id

Abstract

Crime is a social issue that often impacts the well-being of the community. In Jakarta alone, approximately 214 crimes per 100,000 residents were recorded in 2023. This study aims to analyze the impact of economic factors on the crime rate in Jakarta Province during the 2017–2024 period. The independent variables include decent housing, poverty, and education, while the dependent variable is the crime rate. A quantitative approach was employed using secondary data from the Central Bureau of Statistics, analyzed through panel data regression with the Common Effect Model. The findings reveal that decent housing, poverty, education and public spending significantly affect crime rates. Simultaneously, all four independent variables significantly affect crime rates, with the coefficient of determination reaching 86,81%. These results highlight that crime prevention policies in urban areas should primarily focus on improving education quality, while also addressing housing conditions and poverty alleviation as supporting measures.

Keywords: decent housing, poverty, education, crime, Jakarta.

1. Introduction

Crime has become one of the social problems in a region that is complex in nature and has a significant impact on security stability, the economy, and the overall welfare of society [1]. Criminal acts remain an issue that, to this day, are an important responsibility for a country to address immediately. In Indonesia, the number of criminal cases in 2023, according to data from the Central Bureau of Statistics, reached 584,991 with a crime risk level of 214 per 100,000 population. These figures include cases of theft, domestic violence, and murder [2]. This number is considered relatively high and places Indonesia at the 20th position among countries with the highest number of crimes in the world, based on a crime index score of 6.85. Meanwhile, the highest crime index in the world is recorded in Myanmar at 8.15 [3]. Based on these data, it is evident that crime cases in Indonesia cannot be ignored [4].

DKI Jakarta, as a major metropolitan area, is certainly not exempt from the threat of crime. The annual population growth and rapid urbanization have contributed to the increasing potential for criminal acts [5]. Additionally, high population mobility and rising economic inequality are often driving factors behind crime. According to data from the Central Bureau of Statistics in 2023, the number of criminal cases increased by 69.63% compared to the previous year, with 31,523 cases recorded throughout the year [6]. This rise in crime cases illustrates that criminality is not a trivial matter and has become a real threat to social stability and public security, especially in urban areas.

There are many factors that contribute to crime in a region, including rapid urbanization, economic inequality within society, population density, and the lack of effective police presence, all of which can increase crime rates [7], [8]. In addition, the average wages of laborers, the minimum district/city wage (UMK), and government spending also have a significant influence on crime levels [9]. Limited access to education is another factor that contributes to the rise of criminal activity, particularly in urban areas [10].

Crime is also closely related to economic conditions. Economic disparities and high unemployment rates often trigger an increase in criminal activity in certain regions. When individuals struggle to meet basic needs or feel they lack opportunities to improve their living standards, they may become driven to commit criminal acts [11].

Rapid urbanization also leads to high population growth, which is often not balanced by sufficient job opportunities. As a result, social inequality emerges, increasing the likelihood that individuals facing economic hardship may engage in criminal behavior. The most common types of crime in urban communities

Submission: 02-12-2025 | Accepted: 19-12-2025 | Publication: 31-12-2025 | doi: 10.35134/ekobistek.v14i4.963

include theft, fraud, and assault. These crimes often do not involve physical attacks but instead involve taking money or valuable items belonging to others [10].

Previous studies also support the factors that influence crime, namely unemployment, economic inequality, and poverty, all of which have a significant impact on crime rates in metropolitan cities [10]. Unemployment itself affects the level of poverty in a region. When unemployment increases, it can raise the poverty rate. In addition, education level indirectly influences poverty rates. Unfortunately, previous studies were still limited to the aspects of unemployment, poverty, and education level as potential factors affecting crime rates, so it is necessary to consider other factors that may also influence crime levels in metropolitan areas [12].

Urban crime is also closely related to housing conditions, where inadequate housing access can trigger criminal activity. This includes strategic location and security in the surrounding residential area [13]. Meanwhile, poverty and increasing household expenditure can potentially lead to a rise in criminal acts. Economic factors and inequality remain the main causes of crime in urban areas [14]. Moreover, unequal access to education may lead individuals to commit crimes because limited knowledge may prevent them from considering the consequences of engaging in criminal behavior.

Increasing household expenditure can certainly contribute to the rise of poverty levels in Indonesia. When expenses are not balanced with equivalent income, unemployment rates will continue to increase. Communities with better economic conditions generally have access to adequate housing and more balanced spending. Conversely, when most people experience poor economic conditions, unemployment may continue to rise [14].

Therefore, in this study, the researcher includes additional factors that may potentially influence crime rates in the capital city. The researcher also conducts a more specific analysis by considering the time span and geographical scope of the research. Data were collected from 2017 to 2024, adjusted to the respective cities within the DKI Jakarta region. Hence, the research question formulated in this study is: what economic factors influence crime rates in DKI Jakarta during the period 2017–2024. Meanwhile, the purpose of this study is to identify the economic factors that affect crime rates in DKI Jakarta.

2. Methods

This study employs a quantitative research approach using numerical data and statistical analysis for hypothesis testing and examining the relationships among the variables in the study. The quantitative method in this research utilizes a panel data regression model, which is an econometric and statistical technique that combines time series and cross-section data. The empirical testing was conducted using the EViews 13 application, beginning with the selection of the appropriate regression model based on the results of the Chow test, Hausman test, and Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test.

The research variables consist of independent variables, namely adequate housing (X1), poverty (X2), education level (X3), and household expenditure (X4), while the dependent variable is crime (Y). The data collection method used documentation by obtaining data for each variable from 2017 to 2024 in the DKI Jakarta region, divided by the administrative cities within the province, namely Kepulauan Seribu, South Jakarta, East Jakarta, Central Jakarta, West Jakarta, and North Jakarta.

Table 1. Indicators of Data Used in the Study

Variable	Indicator
Adequate Housing (HLK)	Level of accessibility to adequate housing in the DKI Jakarta region
Poverty (KMS)	Poverty rate in the DKI Jakarta region
Education Level (TPK)	Average years of schooling of the population in the DKI Jakarta region
Household Expenditure (PLM)	Average monthly expenditure per capita in the DKI Jakarta region

Selection of Panel Data Regression Model

Before conducting the regression analysis, a model selection process was carried out to determine the most appropriate panel data model. The models compared were the Common Effect Model (CEM), Fixed Effect Model (FEM), and Random Effect Model (REM). These three models were evaluated using the Chow Test, Hausman Test, and Lagrange Multiplier Test to identify the most suitable model for the study. The selected model is the one whose probability value meets the criteria of each test (< 0.05 or > 0.05 according to the respective rules), ensuring that the model used in the subsequent analysis fully adheres to the principles of panel data regression model selection.

3. Results and Discussions

Result

Model Estimation

The following are the estimation results of the three panel data regression models, namely the Common Effect Model (CEM), Fixed Effect Model (FEM), and Random Effect Model (REM).

Table 2. Model Estimation

Variable	Comon Effect Model		Fixed Effect Model		Random Effect Model	
	(Std. error)	(t-statistic)	(Std. error)	(t-statistic)	(Std. error)	(t-statistic)
C	-31.42466)	0.0000	- 6.468590	0.6213	-30.73954	0.0000
	(6.121663)	(-5.133354)	(13.02330)	-0.498102)	(6.355823)	(-4.836848)
HLK	0.858142	0.0006	0.258728	0.3935	0.575593	0.0075
	(0.203557)	(2.893925)	(0.267639)	0.927640)	(0.204995)	(2.808559)
KMS	-0.954427	0.0424	0.286372	0.7143	-0.724115	0.0419
	(0.382429)	(-2.091980)	(0.776415)	0.368932)	(0.345223)	(-2.097653)
TPK	7.938759	0.0000	4.757634	0.9689	7.833133	0.0000

PLM	(1.974157) 1.238463 (0.428797)	(4.046668) 0.0139 (2.965182)	(0.141697) 0.659024 (0.904208)	-0.646879 0.4740 0.728245)	(2.809242) 1.121917 (0.512066)	(3.706511) 0.0220 (2.376484)
F-statistic	70.78153		33.42732		56.51125	
(F-statistic)	0.000000		0.000000		0.000000	
R-Squared	0.868149		0.887585		0.840175	
Adj. R-Squared	0.855884		0.861294		0.825308	

Source: Processed Data from Eviews 13 (2025)

The results in Table 2 show that the estimated effects of adequate housing, poverty, education level, and household expenditure are significant in both the common effect model and the random effect model, as indicated by probability values < 0.05.

Model Selection Test

The model selection test was conducted after estimating the three models to determine the most appropriate model to be used in this study.

Table 3. Model Selection Test

Model Test	Statistic	Prob > chi²	Selected Model
Chow Test	1,335422	0,2703	*Common Effect Model* (CEM)
Hausman Test	5,249857	0,2626	*Random Effect Model* (REM)
Lagrange Multiplier Test	1,423158	0,2329	*Common Effect Model* (CEM)

Source: Processed Data from Eviews 13 (2025)

Based on the sequence of tests, the Chow Test shows a probability value greater than 0.05, namely 0.2703, indicating that the appropriate model is the Common Effect Model (CEM). The Lagrange Multiplier Test also shows a probability value greater than 0.05, namely 0.2329, so the selected model is the Common Effect Model (CEM). Meanwhile, the Hausman Test shows a probability value greater than 0.05, namely 0.2626, indicating that the selected model is the Random Effect Model (REM).

From the three tests, this study adopts the Common Effect Model (CEM). The Common Effect Model uses the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) approach and is one of the widely used methods for estimating parameter values in linear regression equations. When the selected model is CEM, it is necessary to conduct classical assumption tests, including multicollinearity and heteroscedasticity tests [15].

Panel Data Regression Test

The following are the results of the panel data regression test conducted by the researcher using the Common Effect Model:

Table 4. Panel Data Regression Test Results

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-31.42466	6.121633	-5.133354	0.0000
HLK	-0.588142	0.203557	-2.889325	0.0060
KMS	-0.695427	0.332425	-2.091980	0.0424
TPK	7.988759	1.974157	4.046668	0.0002
PLM	1.238463	0.482797	2.565182	0.0139
R-squared	0.868149	Mean dependent var		2.394792
Adjusted R-Square	0.855844	S.D. dependent var.		1.445146
S.E. of regression	0.548615	Log likelihood		-36.65184
Sum Squared resid	12.94208	F-statistic		70.78153
		Prob(F-Statistic)		0.000000

Source: Processed Data from Eviews 13 (2025)

Based on Table 4, the results show the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The constant value of –31.42 indicates that when the variables of adequate housing, poverty, and education level are assumed to be zero, the crime rate tends to have a negative value. The coefficient of adequate housing is –0.588, meaning that every one-unit increase in adequate housing will reduce the crime rate by 0.588, assuming other variables remain constant. Academically, this indicates that the better the public's access to adequate housing, the lower the tendency for crime to occur.

The poverty coefficient of –0.695 shows that a one-unit increase in poverty is followed by a decrease in crime by 0.695. The education level coefficient of 7.989 indicates that each one-unit increase in education level is followed by an increase in crime by 7.989, assuming other variables remain constant. The household expenditure coefficient of 1.238 shows that every one-unit increase in household expenditure leads to an increase in crime by 1.238, assuming other variables remain constant. Increasing household expenditure that is not accompanied by sufficient income can create a greater potential for crime.

The coefficient of determination test is a measurement that shows how much of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables in the regression model, expressed as a percentage as an indicator of model fit. The calculation results show that the R-squared value is 0.868149 or approximately 86.81%. This means that about 86.81% of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables in the regression model, while the remaining 13.19% is explained by other factors outside the model.

Classical Assumption Test

When using the Common Effect Model (CEM), classical assumption tests are required to ensure that the data used is valid and suitable for research before conducting regression analysis. In this study, multicollinearity and heteroscedasticity tests were carried out. The multicollinearity test shows that there is no multicollinearity in the data. This is indicated by the correlation values: HLK and KMS at 0.2407 < 0.85, KMS and TPK at 0.77324 < 0.85, TPK and PLM at 0.787228 < 0.85, and HLK and PLM at 0.423756 <

0.85. Meanwhile, the heteroscedasticity test, based on the probability values of the variables decent housing (HLK), poverty (KMS), education level (TPK), and community expenditure (PLM), shows that all variables have values greater than 5%, indicating that the data is free from heteroscedasticity.

Discussion

The Effect of Adequate Housing on Crime in DKI Jakarta

The results of the study show that the coefficient of the adequate housing variable is -0.588142, which means that every increase in the quality of adequate housing has the potential to reduce crime rates in DKI Jakarta. However, the t-statistic value of -2.889325 with a probability of 0.0060 is smaller than the t-table value of 2.015 (in absolute terms). This indicates that the influence of adequate housing on crime is statistically significant, even though the direction of the relationship is negative. A negative relationship suggests that the more adequate the housing owned by the community, the lower the crime rate in the area.

The adequate housing variable measures the level of housing feasibility in terms of environmental conditions, strategic location, and the health and comfort of the dwelling. A higher level of housing adequacy is assessed to lower crime rates. The negative relationship indicates that the more adequate the housing, the lower the crime that occurs in the region. The findings of this study support previous research which stated that adequate housing plays an important role in shaping a safe and orderly social environment [16]. Proper, healthy, and well-organized housing conditions can reduce psychological stress, increase the sense of security, and strengthen positive social interactions within the community. Conversely, inadequate housing often creates slum-like environments that are prone to conflict, lack social supervision, and are vulnerable to criminal activity. Thus, the availability of adequate housing can reduce crime potential by creating a more stable and conducive social environment.

The Effect of Poverty on Crime in DKI Jakarta

The results of the study show that the poverty coefficient is -0.695427, which means that an increase of one unit in poverty is instead followed by a decrease in crime. However, the t-statistic value of -2.091980 with a probability of 0.0424 is smaller than the t-table value of 2.015, indicating that the effect of poverty on crime is negative and statistically significant.

These findings contradict previous research, which concluded that poverty is often viewed as one of the main factors driving criminal behavior [17]. Limited access to decent employment, low income, and the inability to meet basic needs can create social frustration and push individuals to seek shortcuts through criminal acts. This condition may also weaken social control, as impoverished communities tend to focus on fulfilling daily necessities [18].

Nevertheless, poverty in urban areas may not fully demonstrate a direct linkage with crime. Individuals living under severe poverty do not necessarily have the intention to commit criminal acts, as they may still consider the consequences of engaging in unlawful behavior. Therefore, this variable does not show a positive correlation with crime potential in a given region.

The Effect of Education on Crime in DKI Jakarta

The results of the study indicate that the level of education has a significant influence on crime in DKI Jakarta. The regression coefficient of 7.989 suggests that each one-unit increase in education is instead followed by an increase in crime rates. Furthermore, the t-statistic value of 4.046668 with a probability of 0.0002 far below the 0.05 significance level and exceeding the t-table value of 2.015 confirms that the education variable has a significant effect on crime. Thus, there is a meaningful relationship between education and crime, although the direction of the relationship does not always align with common assumptions

The results of this study support previous research, which explained that education serves as an important instrument in shaping individual behavior, morality, and skills [19]. Access to quality education enables individuals to obtain broader employment opportunities, enhances legal awareness, and strengthens self-control. Conversely, low levels of education are often associated with limited job skills, poor understanding of social norms, and weak critical-thinking abilities, all of which can increase the risk of engaging in criminal acts.

A high level of education does not necessarily guarantee that a person will refrain from committing crimes. Individuals with higher education levels may even use their intelligence to carry out more structured forms of criminal behavior. However, criminal activity is not solely determined by educational attainment; it is more complex and influenced by various other factors, such as social, economic, and cultural environments, which may lead even highly educated individuals to commit criminal acts [20].

The Effect of Community Expenditure on Crime in DKI Jakarta

The results of the study show that community expenditure has a significant influence on crime in DKI Jakarta. The regression coefficient of 1.238 indicates that each one-unit increase in community expenditure is followed by an increase in crime rates. Furthermore, the t-statistic value of 2.565182 with a probability of 0.0139 well below the 0.05 significance level and exceeding the t-table value of 2.015 confirms that the community

expenditure variable has a significant effect on crime. Thus, there is a clear relationship between community expenditure and criminal activity.

Increasing community expenditure over the years without being accompanied by rising income levels can lead to the emergence of various criminal acts. This occurs because individuals tend to seek various ways to meet their needs. This condition is known as social strain. When someone experiences severe economic pressure, it creates significant psychological stress. Individuals may feel anxious and desperate as their expenses continue to rise, thereby increasing the likelihood of engaging in criminal behavior [21].

However, other studies explain the opposite: increasing community expenditure actually indicates that the welfare of the community is improving. This is certainly in contrast to the findings of the present study, in which rising community expenditure should instead be followed by a decrease in the number of criminal cases [22].

The Influence of Decent Housing, Poverty, Education, and Community Expenditure on Crime in DKI Jakarta

Based on the calculation results, the F-statistic value obtained is 70.78153 with a probability value of 0.000000. Since the probability value is smaller than the significance level of 0.05, it can be concluded that the regression model constructed is statistically significant. This indicates that all independent variables in the model collectively contribute to explaining the variation occurring in the dependent variable.

The condition of the residential environment plays a major role in shaping individual behavior. Inadequate housing is often associated with population density, poor sanitation, and limited access to public facilities. These conditions can create discomfort and increase the potential for social conflict. When the physical environment does not support well-being, individuals become more vulnerable to engaging in criminal acts, either as perpetrators or victims. Therefore, decent housing becomes an important factor in efforts to prevent crime [23].

Poverty is not merely an issue of low income, but also limited access to productive resources such as education and employment. In conditions of poverty, individuals have fewer options to meet their basic needs. This situation increases the likelihood that some members of society may take shortcuts through criminal behavior. Therefore, crime prevention efforts in urban areas cannot be separated from efforts to reduce poverty and improve overall social welfare [24].

Meanwhile, the role of education remains important even though the research findings show a complex relationship. Education serves as a means to enhance the social and economic capacities of the community. However, if the quality of education is not accompanied by equal employment opportunities, it may actually worsen social inequality. This can widen the gap between those who succeed and those who do not, which then creates social pressure and has the potential to increase crime.

Uncontrolled household spending can lead to potential criminal behavior because individuals face social pressures that force them to meet their needs. This makes it possible for someone to resort to various means to fulfill those needs, including engaging in criminal acts. Therefore, education, decent housing, household expenditure, and poverty alleviation must be viewed as a unified set of complementary policies in addressing crime issues in DKI Jakarta [25].

The results of this study also support previous research, which explained that decent housing, poverty, household expenditure, and education are closely related in influencing the level of crime in society [10]. Adequate housing can create a safe social environment, while poverty alleviation can reduce the economic pressures that drive criminal acts. On the other hand, education strengthens moral values and opens access to better life opportunities. These three factors complement one another: decent housing supports the growth of healthy communities, poverty reduction suppresses need-based criminal behavior, and education provides a long-term foundation for building a safer and more empowered society. In addition, reasonable household expenditure that is balanced with income has the potential to reduce criminal acts.

4. Conclusions

Based on the results of the research conducted, it can be concluded that decent housing and poverty have a negative and significant effect on crime in DKI Jakarta. A negative and significant effect indicates that an increase in these variables will actually reduce the level of crime. Meanwhile, education and household expenditure have a positive and significant effect on crime in DKI Jakarta. The higher the values of the education variable and household expenditure, the greater the potential for an increase in crime rates. Crime can occur due to several supporting factors, such as inadequate access to decent housing, which can increase the potential for criminal acts. Meanwhile, high poverty is not entirely the cause of crime because additional factors, such as environmental, economic, and cultural conditions, also drive such behavior. A high level of education may still lead to crime if not balanced with sufficient employment opportunities. In addition, increasing household expenditure can create social pressure that contributes to an individual's tendency to engage in criminal acts.

Based on the research findings, it is recommended that the government and stakeholders in DKI Jakarta focus their policies more on improving the quality and accessibility of education, given that this factor has been

proven to significantly influence crime rates. Higher levels of education need to be balanced with sufficient employment opportunities; therefore, the government is responsible for ensuring adequate expansion of job opportunities for the community. In addition, programs aimed at improving decent housing and reducing poverty must continue to be implemented sustainably as supporting efforts that can strengthen the positive effects in reducing crime when combined with improvements in education.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the lecturers and academic staff of Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta for their guidance, direction, and support throughout the research process. The author also extends appreciation to all parties who assisted in providing the necessary data. All individuals mentioned have given their consent.

References

[1] M. Turner, "Urban Fail: The Need for a Capital-Focused Narrative in Federal Urban Economic Policy," *Univ. Dayt. Law Rev.*, vol. 50, no. 3, p. 4, 2025.

[2] Badan Pusat Statistik, *Statistik Kriminal 2024*. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik, 2025.

[3] A. H. Prasastisiwi, "Indonesia Masuk 20 Besar Negara dengan Indeks Kriminalitas Tertinggi di Dunia," *GoodStats*, 2024.

[4] O. E. Jonathan, "Impacts of Crime on Socio-Economic Development Akinyede Joseph Olusola Tohozin Coovi Aime Bernadin Toko Mouhamadou Inoussa," vol. 2117, pp. 71–81, 2021.

[5] P. F. Cabrera-Barona, G. Jimenez, and P. Melo, "Types of crime, poverty, population density and presence of police in the metropolitan district of Quito," *ISPRS Int. J. Geo-Information*, vol. 8, no. 12, p. 558, 2019.

[6] Badan Pusat Statistik, *Statistik Kriminalitas Provinsi DKI Jakarta 2023*. Jakarta: Badan Pusat Statistik, 2024.

[7] W. Kisiała and I. Rącka, "Spatial and statistical analysis of urban poverty for sustainable city development," *Sustainability*, vol. 13, no. 2, p. 858, 2021.

[8] A. A. Munajat and H. Yusuf, "DINAMIKA KRIMINALITAS URBAN: STUDI TENTANG FAKTOR-FAKTOR YANG MEMPENGARUHI TINGKAT KEJAHATAN DI KOTA BESAR," *J. Intelek Dan Cendikiawan Nusant.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1330–1339, 2024.

[9] N. Istiqomah, "Analisis Determinan Kriminalitas di Kalimantan Timur Dalam Konteks Pembangunan Ibu Kota Nusantara: Pendekatan Regresi Binomial Negatif," *BESTARI Bul. Statisitikan dan Apl. Terkini*, vol. V, pp. 1–11, 2024.

[10] H. Yusuf and S. Zanudin, "PENGARUH FAKTOR SOSIAL EKONOMI TERHADAP TINGKAT KRIMINALITAS DI KOTA METROPOLITAN," *Integr. Perspect. Soc. Sci. J.*, vol. 2, no. 2 Mei, pp. 2505–2516, 2025.

[11] S. NADYA, A. N. MUHAMMAD, R. ARIQ, and K. MUHAMMAD, "Pengaruh Ketimpangan Ekonomi, Tingkat Kemiskinan, Tingkat Pendidikan Dan Tingkat Pengangguran Terbuka Terhadap Kriminalitas Di Indonesia Tahun 2013-2023," *J. NUANSA Publ. ILMU Manaj. DAN Ekon. SYARIAH Учредители Asos. Ris. Ilmu Manaj. dan Bisnis Indones.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 270–284, 2024.

[12] J. P. Schleimer *et al.*, "Unemployment and crime in US cities during the coronavirus pandemic," *J. urban Heal.*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 82–91, 2022.

[13] R. G. Kaisuku and S. Yuliani, "Penerapan Konsep Lingkungan Anti-Kriminalitas pada Strategi Desain Kampung vertikal di Kota Sorong," *J. Ilm. Mhs. Arsit.*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1076–1087, 2024.

[14] F. Armin, "Analysis of the effects of education, unemployment, poverty, and income inequality on crime in Indonesia," in *4th Padang International Conference on Education, Economics, Business and Accounting (PICEEBA-2 2019)*, Atlantis Press, 2020, pp. 368–374.

[15] S. Rondonuwu, J. D. Prang, and M. S. Paendong, "Analisis Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Tingkat Pengangguran di Provinsi Sulawesi Utara Menggunakan Metode Regresi Data Panel," *d\'Cartesian J. Mat. dan Apl.*, pp. 32–37, 2022.

[16] S. K. Jawa, H. Herdi, P. L. Lamawitak, and T. F. Q. Patty, "Improving the Economic Welfare of Members through Productive Loan Services at KSP Kopdit Guru Kelubagolit," *Neo J. Econ. Soc. Humanit.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 221–235, 2024.

[17] M. I. Shahid, "The Relationship between Poverty and Crime: A Comprehensive Analysis," *J. Soc. Signs Rev.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 34–44, 2023.

[18] N. F. Rahmah, A. N. Kharisma, and E. Halimatusadiyah, "FAKTOR SOSIAL EKONOMI SEBAGAI PREDIKTOR PERILAKU KRIMINAL," *J. Ekon. Sos. Hum.*, vol. 6, no. 02, pp. 369–375, 2024.

[19] Z. Triff, "FORMATION OF MORAL VALUES IN THE CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT," *Jurnalul Lib. Conştiinţă*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 853–861, 2024.

[20] D. Amilia and P. Ridwan, "Analisis Tingkat Pendidikan, Pengangguran, Kemiskinan dan Ketimpangan Pendapatan Terhadap Tingkat Kriminalitas Di Provinsi Bengkulu.," *J. Pendidik. Indones.*, vol. 5, no. 12, 2024.

[21] S. Septriani, "The Impact of Economic Conditions on Criminality in Indonesia," *Eur. J. Dev. Stud.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 68–74, 2024.

[22] A. S. Wicaksono, "Analisis pengaruh faktor ekonomi terhadap kriminalitas di Kabupaten/Kota Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta," *J. Kebijak. Ekon. Dan Keuang.*, pp. 50–57, 2023.

[23] L. Sugiharti, M. A. Esquivias, M. S. Shaari, L. Agustin, and H. Rohmawati, "Criminality and income inequality in Indonesia," *Soc. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. 142, 2022.

[24] F. N. Hariyantia, R. Purtomo, and R. N. Wilantari, "The effect of economic growth and demographic condition on criminality in East Java Province," *J. Ekon. dan Bisnis Airlangga Vol.*, vol. 31, no. 1, 2021.

[25] Z. Fan, F. Zhang, B. P. Y. Loo, and C. Ratti, "Urban visual intelligence: Uncovering hidden city profiles with street view images," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, vol. 120, no. 27, p. e2220417120, 2023.

Biographies of Authors

Fitri Ramadhani is a student at Universitas Amikom Yogyakarta. She was born on October 30, 2003, in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. She is majoring in Economics under the Faculty of Social Economics. She can be reached by email at fitriramadhani@students.amikom.ac.id

Ismadiyanti Purwaning Astuti is a lecturer in the Economic Program in faculty of Economic and Social at Amikom Yogyakarta University, Indonesia. She earned him Bachelor's Degree from Sebelas Maret University in the Economic Development Program in Faculty of Economic and Business. Then she graduated master degree from Gadjah Mada University in the Economics Program in Faculty of Economic and Business. She graduated doctoral degree at Diponegoro University in the Economic Program in Faculty of Economic and Business. Ismadiyanti Purwaning Astuti welcomes communication and collaboration, and she can reached via email at ismadiyanti@amikom.ac.id.