

STRATEGIES FOR COMBATING THEFT-BASED CRIME THROUGH ANALYSIS OF INEQUALITY AND POVERTY: A CONCEPTUAL AND PRACTICAL REVIEW

Gunawan Widjaja

Fakultas Hukum Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta
widjaja_gunawan@yahoo.com

Junior B. Gregorius

Fakultas Hukum Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Jakarta

Abstract

This study aims to examine strategies for combating theft using an analysis of economic inequality and poverty through a literature review. The study examines the complex relationship between social inequality, poverty, and theft, and identifies strategic interventions that have been implemented in a socio-economic context to reduce theft rates. The findings reveal that inequality and poverty are critical factors driving criminal behaviour, necessitating effective interventions that integrate preventive, repressive, and socio-economic empowerment approaches. Strategic recommendations include multi-stakeholder collaboration, improved education, strengthened social systems, and the use of security technology. This approach not only addresses the symptoms but also the root causes of theft crime to create a safe, fair, and inclusive environment.

Keywords: Theft crime, economic inequality, poverty, eradication strategies, literature review, socio-economic interventions.

Introduction

Theft is one of the most common crimes and has a significant impact on public safety and welfare. This phenomenon not only causes material losses but also threatens the sense of security of individuals and communities. In recent decades, theft crime rates have shown complex and diverse trends in various regions, demanding serious attention from various parties. The government, law enforcement agencies, academics, and the community must understand the various factors that drive this crime in order to formulate effective strategies to combat it (Morselli, 2021).

One of the main factors often associated with an increase in theft cases is economic inequality and poverty. Inequality can create a wide social gap between rich and poor groups, leading to tension and a sense of injustice (Petrosino, 2014). Meanwhile, poverty is a strong motivator that drives individuals to commit theft in an effort to meet their unmet basic needs.

Therefore, a deep understanding of the relationship between inequality, poverty, and crime is essential in developing interventions that target the root causes (Sampson, 2012). Previous studies have shown that socio-economic factors play a major role in criminal behaviour, particularly theft.

Criminological theories, such as strain theory and social inequality theory, explain the mechanisms through which economic pressure and social inequality can push individuals to engage in criminal activities (Blevins, 2023). However, not all individuals living in poverty commit crimes, so other factors such as opportunity, social norms, and the prevailing justice system must also be considered.

Strategies to eradicate theft through a socio-economic approach have great potential, especially if supported by appropriate policies and multi-stakeholder involvement. This approach does not only focus on law enforcement and repressive measures, but also on preventive efforts such as economic development, education, and community empowerment.

This is important so that the solutions produced are not only short-term, but also sustainable and capable of addressing the root causes of crime (Pradinie & Setiawan, 2011). Inequality and poverty, as two interrelated aspects, are often central to discussions about the causes of social crime. When the gap between social groups widens, access to economic opportunities becomes limited for the majority of the community.

This situation can exacerbate social instability and increase the risk of criminal behaviour. Therefore, examining the impact of inequality on crime is highly relevant for expanding understanding and seeking innovative solutions (Holzer, 1991).

Equally important is to look at how social and institutional factors play a role in preventing or exacerbating theft. The availability of education, social services, a fair law enforcement system, and community participation are key elements that need to be considered in the design of crime prevention strategies.

In some cases, discriminatory or unequal policies only deepen injustice and increase the likelihood of crime (KSB Police, 2025). Several countries have implemented various social and economic intervention programmes aimed at reducing theft and poverty-related crime.

A holistic approach that involves improving the economic conditions of the community while strengthening the legal system has shown positive results (Bulungan Police Criminal Investigation Unit, 2025). Therefore, it is important to analyse these examples of good practices to obtain an overview of strategies that can be adapted to the local context.

This study will also highlight the indicators of social inequality and poverty that have been used in academic and government studies. Understanding these indicators is useful for measuring the effectiveness of policies and for mapping areas that are vulnerable to theft-based crime. Thus, interventions can be more focused and targeted. In addition, challenges in implementing crime eradication strategies are equally important to discuss. Many programmes fail to achieve their targets due to a lack of coordination between agencies, insufficient funding, or resistance from the community.

Therefore, an evaluation of these obstacles will be an integral part of the research to provide recommendations for future policy improvements.

Finally, a deep understanding and appropriate strategies in combating theft-based crime will greatly help create a safer and fairer social environment and improve the overall quality of life for the community. Therefore, this research has significant relevance in the context of social development and national security enhancement.

Research Method

The research method used in this study is a literature review, which aims to analyse the relationship between inequality, poverty, and theft-based crime by reviewing various literature in the form of books, scientific journals, research reports, and other related documents. The selection of literature was based on the relevance of the topic, the credibility of the sources, and the recency of the publication date, to ensure that the data and theories used are accurate and in line with the latest developments (Eliyah & Aslan, 2025). Data analysis was conducted qualitatively through a thematic synthesis approach to identify patterns, differences, and successful strategies as well as implementation challenges in efforts to eradicate theft-based crime, so as to provide applicable and evidence-based recommendations for policymakers and relevant stakeholders (Webster & Watson, 2020).

Results and Discussion

The Relationship Between Economic Inequality, Poverty, and Theft Crime

The relationship between economic inequality, poverty, and theft is closely linked to complex interactions between social, psychological, and structural factors. Economic inequality refers to the unequal distribution of resources and wealth within a society, while poverty is a condition in which individuals or groups lack the financial means to meet their basic needs.

These two phenomena are not only indicators of social inequality, but also triggers for various forms of crime, including theft (Clarke, 1992). Many empirical studies in various countries and contexts show a positive correlation between high levels of income inequality and increased rates of property crime, particularly theft.

Societies with large gaps between rich and poor groups tend to experience higher rates of theft. This pattern is supported by macro data analysis and explained through various theories in criminology and sociology (Kubrin & Stewart, 2006). One of the main explanations lies in the theory of relative deprivation. This theory states that individuals who feel disadvantaged when compared to those around them—not only in terms of absolute poverty—tend to experience feelings of disappointment, frustration, and injustice. These negative emotions can drive some individuals to commit theft as a form of compensation or resistance against social norms they perceive as unfair or exclusionary (Lyman, 2022).

Economic poverty itself contributes directly to crime rates in several ways. When basic needs such as food, shelter, and healthcare are not met, some people may resort to theft to survive. The link between economic despair and crime is further strengthened when opportunities for legitimate advancement, such as education and employment, are severely limited, creating a cycle in which poverty fuels crime, which in turn perpetuates poverty (Nisa, 2024).

Structural and community factors play a significant role in this relationship. Communities with high levels of poverty often lack adequate resources, experience social disorganisation, and have weak law enforcement or social control mechanisms. These factors create an environment where crime, particularly theft, becomes more common and difficult to control (Dulkiah & Nurjanah, 2018).

Criminal behaviour economic models also provide important insights. According to rational choice theory, as inequality increases, the potential gains from theft also rise for those in the lower economic strata, due to the abundance of wealthy and valuable targets. The large disparity between the potential gains from crime and legitimate work further encourages theft (Chantiqa, 2024).

Empirical research also emphasises that while not all poor people commit crimes, those living in communities with high income inequality and low social mobility face greater pressure or temptation to engage in theft. Social theories such as social disorganisation and strain theory highlight the cumulative influence of poor socio-economic conditions and cultural marginalisation in triggering criminal behaviour (Pradinie & Setiawan, 2011).

Children and adolescents raised in poor environments are at higher risk of engaging in theft and related crimes. Factors such as the absence of role models, unstable family structures, exposure to crime, and limited educational opportunities create conditions in which such actions become normal or even adaptive strategies for survival or social status (Sampson, 2012). Furthermore, income inequality not only increases the frequency of theft but can also influence its severity. Studies indicate that greater inequality may lead to larger amounts of goods stolen per incident, as criminals perceive higher potential gains. This exacerbates feelings of insecurity and distrust within the community as a whole (Slocum, 2013).

Environmental level analysis shows that poor communities are often disproportionately victimised by theft, not only because of economic conditions, but also because of weak social institutions, low collective efficacy, and high levels of population instability. This cycle of victimisation and mistrust exacerbates the situation, making it difficult for communities to escape the grip of crime (Molnar, 2008).

Addressing the interplay between inequality, poverty, and theft requires a comprehensive policy response. The focus should not be solely on law enforcement and punitive measures, but should also prioritise reducing structural inequalities, expanding access to education and employment, and strengthening community support systems.

By targeting the root causes and conditions that support theft, communities can move towards greater security and social harmony (Benson, 2003).

Although there is ample evidence linking inequality and poverty to theft, it is important to recognise that these factors are not the sole determinants of criminal behaviour. Cultural norms, drug use, mental health, and broader social policies also influence crime rates.

Nevertheless, reducing economic inequality remains a key strategy in long-term crime prevention (Bingenheimer, 2005). Policy makers are encouraged to implement measures that promote the equitable distribution of resources, increase social mobility, and address systemic barriers that perpetuate poverty and inequality.

Interventions such as targeted social safety nets, progressive taxation, community development programmes, and investment in education and public health can reduce the drivers of theft and create more inclusive and secure communities (Ludwig & Duncan, 2012).

Thus, the relationship between economic inequality, poverty, and theft is complex and interdependent. High levels of inequality and prolonged poverty erode social cohesion, foster dissatisfaction, and drive criminal activity, particularly theft. Long-term solutions require a comprehensive approach that addresses both the symptoms and the structural causes of inequality and underdevelopment, thereby creating conditions for a more just and secure society.

Practical Strategies for Combating Theft

The eradication of theft requires a comprehensive strategy that integrates preventive, repressive, and socio-economic development approaches. Although law enforcement remains important, prevention through the development of socio-economic support systems is equally central to preventing the recurrence of similar crimes.

Cross-sector collaboration between the government, police, community, and business actors is fundamental to the success of such strategies (Kelly, 2000). The first step is to increase physical surveillance in areas prone to theft by installing high-quality CCTV cameras, concave mirrors in shop corners, and adequate lighting.

These tools serve as early detection devices and deterrents, as the presence of cameras can reduce the likelihood of theft. In addition to physical infrastructure, regular training for employees and security personnel is crucial (Duflo & Banerjee, 2017). They must be trained to recognise suspicious behaviour, interact politely but alertly with customers, and follow procedures in the event of theft. With these improved skills, shops and public institutions can build a culture of security and rapid response to incidents (Sugiarti, 2014).

The implementation of anti-theft technology, such as electronic security tags or sensor-based alarm systems, is effective in securing valuable items. These systems deter

theft attempts while facilitating action in the event of a violation. Investing in state-of-the-art equipment will serve as a long-term preventive measure that also provides business benefits (Kain, 1968).

Another strategy is designing an environment that supports natural surveillance. Store or building layout should minimise blind spots, place high-value items in areas under direct surveillance, and ensure controlled access. An open and easily monitored environment reduces the likelihood of theft (Sampson, 2012).

Limiting the number of items on display and keeping cash to a minimum in open areas can reduce the risk of large-scale theft. Digitising transactions, such as using POS systems to reduce cash on hand, has proven to reduce the appeal for criminals. Quick and appropriate action when theft occurs is vital to prevent recurrence. Every incident must be well documented, reported immediately to the relevant authorities, and accompanied by CCTV footage or witness statements. Active collaboration with law enforcement agencies is important to deter perpetrators from repeating their actions elsewhere (Nilsson & Estrada, 2006).

Community empowerment has a long-term effect on theft prevention. Community patrols, reporting suspicious situations, and involving local organisations in monitoring the environment have proven to narrow the space for thieves to operate. Strengthening social cohesion in the community can foster a sense of responsibility and mutual protection. Strengthening socio-economic indicators in poor communities also helps reduce theft rates.

Initiatives such as job training programmes, vocational education, business capital assistance, and access to health and education services are root solutions for poverty alleviation, which is closely linked to property crime (Rios, 2023). The implementation of social security and targeted cash assistance programmes can reduce economic pressure on vulnerable groups, thereby reducing criminal motivation.

Government programmes targeting poverty reduction and inequality have shown positive results in reducing theft-based crime in various countries. Education, especially for children and adolescents, plays a vital role in protecting them from environments prone to crime (Zenk, 2011). Schools provide a platform for character building, skills development, and aspiration, thereby reducing the tendency towards deviant behaviour. Equitable access to and quality of education are long-term investments in crime prevention. Social campaigns in the community on the importance of protecting property, awareness of the dangers of theft, and information on the latest methods used by perpetrators must also be promoted. Effective public communication can change collective behaviour in the face of the threat of theft (Skogan, 2015).

Strengthening regulations through strict penalties and a reliable law enforcement system can serve as a deterrent. However, policies must be balanced with rehabilitative approaches, especially for offenders whose primary motives are poverty or economic necessity, thereby breaking the cycle of criminality (Nettle & Saxe, 2023).

Cooperation among business actors, such as joint reporting, collective surveillance through applications or business forums, and integrated security training among fellow entrepreneurs, has proven to enhance the resilience of business communities against theft crimes. Monitoring and evaluation of strategies need to be conducted regularly. Collecting statistical data on theft incidents, reporting cases, analysing trends in modus operandi, and evaluating the effectiveness of policies enables adaptive and evidence-based responses in developing new strategies (Schneider, 2015).

Active participation from the private sector in providing employment opportunities, training, and social partnerships with poor communities also contributes to reducing the root causes of theft, namely economic inequality and unemployment. Finally, integrating theft prevention efforts into national and regional development policies, with the involvement of multiple stakeholders—government, law enforcement, the business world, and civil society—will yield the most optimal results in building a safe and fair environment free from theft (Cozens, 2019).

Thus, a systemic approach, the involvement of all segments of society, and continuous evaluation ensure that strategies to combat theft are not only responsive to incidents but also build a sustainable and evidence-based foundation for prevention.

Conclusion

Strategies to combat theft-based crime through the analysis of inequality and poverty show that effective efforts must be holistic and integrated. Economic inequality and poverty have been proven to be the main factors driving theft, so solutions that rely solely on law enforcement are insufficient in addressing the root causes.

Therefore, it is important to combine preventive, repressive, and socio-economic interventions in order to have a long-term impact. The most successful crime prevention strategies involve various parties, ranging from the government, law enforcement agencies, community groups, to the private sector.

Poverty alleviation programmes, improved access to education and job training, strengthened social protection systems, and the use of security technology are some practical steps that can be adopted and adapted to the local context. These efforts need to be accompanied by monitoring, evaluation, and increased community participation to ensure that the policies implemented are truly effective and sustainable.

Conceptually and practically, addressing theft-related crimes must be based on empirical evidence and cross-sectoral collaboration. By understanding the interplay between inequality, poverty, and crime, and implementing research-based recommendations, it is hoped that a safer, fairer, and more inclusive social environment will be created for all segments of society.

References

- Benson, M. L. (2003). Neighborhood disadvantage, individual economic distress and violence against women in intimate relationships. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024985101724>
- Bingenheimer, J. B. (2005). Neighborhood context and the development of aggression in adolescence. *American Journal of Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2004.049379>
- Blevins, K. R. (2023). Unpacking preventive policing: Towards a holistic framework. *European Journal of Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14613557231163403>
- Chantiqa, B. (2024). Pengaruh Kemiskinan Terhadap Tindak Kriminalitas di Kota Bekasi. *CONCEPT*, 3(2).
- Clarke, R. V. (1992). Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies. *Journal of Security Administration*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-13002-0_43
- Cozens, P. M. (2019). Crime prevention in urban spaces through environmental design. *Cities*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102526>
- Duflo, E., & Banerjee, A. (2017). "Hunger makes a thief of any man": Poverty and crime in British colonial Asia. *European Review of Economic History*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ereh/hew013>
- Dulkiah, M. & Nurjanah. (2018). Pengaruh Kemiskinan Terhadap Tingkat Kriminalitas di Kota Bandung. *JISPO*, 8(2).
- Eliyah, E., & Aslan, A. (2025). STAKE'S EVALUATION MODEL: METODE PENELITIAN. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Indonesia*, 3(2), Article 2.
- Holzer, H. J. (1991). The spatial mismatch hypothesis: What has the evidence shown? *Urban Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420989120080031>
- Kain, J. F. (1968). Housing segregation, Negro employment, and metropolitan decentralization. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1885893>
- Kelly, M. (2000). Inequality and crime. *Review of Economics and Statistics*. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003465300558666>
- Kubrin, C. E., & Stewart, E. A. (2006). Predicting who reoffends: The neglected role of neighborhood context in recidivism studies. *Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2006.00049.x>
- Ludwig, J., & Duncan, G. (2012). Moving to Opportunity and crime: Evidence from a randomized housing voucher experiment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2012.714523>
- Lyman, M. D. (2022). Poverty, Inequality, and Crime: A Social Disorganization Approach. *American Journal of Sociology*. <https://doi.org/10.1086/699687>
- Molnar, B. E. (2008). Neighborhood predictors of concealed firearm carrying among children and adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health*. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2006.097191>
- Morselli, C. (2021). Why do inequality and deprivation produce high crime and low trust? *Scientific Reports*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-80897-8>
- Nettle, D., & Saxe, R. (2023). Desperation and inequality increase stealing: Evidence from experimental microsocieties. *Royal Society Open Science*. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.230830>

- Nilsson, A., & Estrada, F. (2006). Exposure to Property Crime as a Consequence of Poverty. *Scandinavian Journal of Social Welfare*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14043850500342009>
- Nisa, W. K. (2024). Pengaruh Tingkat Kemiskinan Terhadap Tingkat Tindak Kriminalitas di Indonesia. *Jurnal AMP*.
- Petrosino, A. (2014). What Works in Community Crime Prevention? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9209-1>
- Polres KSB. (2025). *Sukses Operasi Gabungan Tindak Kriminal—Polres KSB*. polresksb.com
- Pradinie, Y., & Setiawan, E. (2011). Pengaruh Kemiskinan Terhadap Kriminalitas di Surabaya. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 10(19), 378–387.
- Rios, V. (2023). Economic inequality and crime: The role of social resistance. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2023.101868>
- Sampson, R. J. (2012). *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. University of Chicago Press. <https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226733883.001.0001>
- Sat Reskrim Polres Bulungan. (2025). *Strategi Sat Reskrim Polres Bulungan Dalam Memberantas Kejahatan*. reskrimpolresbulungan.com
- Schneider, S. (2015). *Crime Prevention: Theory and Practice*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.1201/b17615>
- Skogan, W. G. (2015). Disorder and crime: Does broken windows matter? *Criminology and Public Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12112>
- Slocum, L. A. (2013). Neighborhood structural characteristics, victimization, and routine activities: A multilevel analysis. *Social Science Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2012.10.004>
- Sugiarti. (2014). *Hubungan Antara Kemiskinan dan Kriminalitas*.
- Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2020). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4132319>
- Zenk, S. N. (2011). Distance to store, food environment, and crime in urban neighborhoods. *Health & Place*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2010.09.009>