

Investigating the Impact of Environmental Poverty on Criminal Behavior of Young People in Marginal Areas

Kazem Ghojavand^{*1}

Received 28 August 2017; Accepted 13 February 2018

Abstract

This study was examined to investigate the impact of environmental poverty on the criminal behavior of young people in marginal areas. The population of this study included all the youths in the marginalized schools of Isfahan. Sampling was done randomly. The sample size includes 358 students in marginalized areas. For youth with high PC, significant factors included high levels of attitudes toward agreements and conditions, motivation of treatment, perseverance, and bonding to school/work, as well as low levels of risk in peer relations and education/employment. For youth with limited PC, buffering factors with the strongest effects include self-control and future orientation in school or work. Implications of practice and future research were discussed too.

Keywords: Environmental, Poverty, Criminal behavior, Marginal areas.

^{1*}.Department of Humanistic Sciences, Khomenishhar Branch, Islamic Azad University, Khomeinishahr, Isfahan, Iran, kazem_ghojavand@yahoo.com (Corresponding author)

1. Introduction

The relationship between immigration and crime has long been a controversial issue in public debate and academic research. Although public discourse and classical theorists often link immigration with a heightened risk of deviance, a growing body of research introduced at the beginning of the 20th century shows that immigrant groups generally exhibit lower levels of delinquency and crime than native-born individuals, despite the former's relatively low socio-economic status and concentration in disorganized communities. A comprehensive review of the theoretical development regarding the immigration-crime nexus is thus sorely needed (Bhalla et al., 1997).

In particular, there has been an agreement that "it was not the immigrants themselves but their sons who constituted the big crime problem". The current review thus also aims at addressing the underlying reasons that descendants of immigrants are more likely to become involved in delinquency/crime than their first-generation counterparts (Burton, 2013).

Historical and current studies provide opposing evidence of the culture conflict and subculture explanations. Earlier reports suggested that immigration and crime/delinquency are closely associated because the foreign-born are disproportionately represented in crime statistics. However, these findings have been strongly criticized for not considering the age and gender distributions of the immigrants. Most immigrants are young and male. After taking the relative number of various demographic groups between foreign-born and native-born residents into account, Industrial Commission in the U.S. found that crime rates among the foreign-born are in fact lower than those among the native-born (Antilla, 2015).

This conclusion is supported in a report released by the Immigration Commission a decade later, which argues that immigration may suppress crime rates. The influential Wickersham Report issued by the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement in 1931 drew the similar conclusion that there was little evidence to confirm higher levels of criminal engagement among immigrants than natives. Following the same line of research, contemporary studies have also found that immigrants are less criminal than

their native-born counterparts. Using data derived from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY), Butcher and Piehl examined differences in immigrant and native-born criminal propensities and found that youth born abroad are significantly less likely to be delinquent than native-born youth (Dalton, 2011).

Research conducted on youth shows that experiences of poverty, homelessness, racism, unemployment, abuse, addiction, gender preference and so on generally determine marginalization but not necessarily. Almost one of three young people between the ages of 18 and 24 years is at risk of social exclusion and poverty in the European Union. The notion of social exclusion and social marginalization are enlighten in the paper and propositions for development of effective policy strategies to prevent marginalization are presented. This article deals with analyzing the determinants of social exclusion, ideology of marginalization and educational marginalization (Farber, 1999).

The notion of social exclusion can appear at different levels of human life, affecting not only individual person but also the whole group and is a major problem in the world. “Social exclusion” is a concept which can be characterized and developed in two ways. In a narrow sense it is used as a synonym for income poverty and refers to people who are not connected with the paid labor market or to people in low-wage work. It can be understood broadly – it means much more than poverty, deprivation, income inequity or lack of employment.

The matter is that social exclusion is multidimensional. In contrast to poverty and unemployment which concentrate on households or individuals, social exclusion is mainly concerned with the relationship between the individual and society (Cornish, 2017).

Social exclusion may be a part of capability poverty. A Scottish moral philosopher and a pioneer of political economy, Adam Smith, focuses on the deprivation involved in not “being able to appear in public without shame” which is a good example of capability deprivation. It reflects the importance of participating in community life. The point of Smith is inability to interact freely with others as a significant deprivation itself and some types of social

exclusion must perceive as constitutive components of the idea of poverty (Peace, 2001).

Social exclusion is a process whereby individuals and groups or communities are pushed to the edge of society. This may be the result of discrimination or an unintended outcome of policies. The reasons for the social exclusion of young people are external and internal – their independence doesn't make any possibility to change the situation. Marginalization combines social exclusion and discrimination. It insults human dignity and objects human rights, especially the right to live effectively and equally as other citizens. Families and ethnic groups may be marginalized within localities. Marginalization is a shifting phenomenon. For example, individuals may be satisfied with their social status at some period of time, but when social change takes place, they lose this status and become marginalized. Social marginalization represents the influence of health condition. The impact goes in many directions which intertwinement is evident (Kagan, 2011).

2. Determinants of Social Exclusion

The main determinants of social exclusion are poor levels of education, living in remote geographical areas and discrimination because of monetary poverty, personal characteristics, unemployment and experience of juvenile delinquency. By discrimination we usually mean the treatment of a person based on the group to which a person belongs and not taking into consideration of personal achievements.

Several studies on the consequences of school failure point out that dropping out of school which can result in lower employment rates, lower lifetime earnings, less risk aversion and lower satisfaction in life. Unemployment is a powerful threat for young people that lead to psychological discomfort and low self-esteem. Absence of education for a long period of time is resulted in social and political marginalization of young people. There are three types of social practices and attitudes which result in exclusion (Paolini, 2014).

a) Mobilization of institutional prejudice: This refers to the existence of “a predominant set of values and rituals and institutional procedures that operate systematically and consistently to benefit certain persons and groups at:

b) Expense of others”;

b) Unruly practices: This refers to the gaps between rules and their implementation;

c) Social closure: This is the way in which “social collectiveness seek to maximize rewards by restricting access to resources and opportunities to a limited circle”

One can think of three main categories of the social aspects of exclusion:

a) Access to social services (such as health and education);

b) Access to the labor market (precariousness of employment);

c) The opportunity for social participation and its effects on the social fabric (juvenile delinquency, homelessness, and so on) (Klasen, 1984).

3. Ideology of Marginalization

Poverty is one of the main reasons or consequences of marginalization. It is almost unavoidable characteristic of all types of marginalized population groups (Farber, 1999).

The two dimensions of marginalization, such as disempowerment/social dislocation and poverty/economic dislocation can be considered as primary material insults. The first is the definition of one's identity by others: the ideological definition of one's marginalized identity based on the interest of the dominant groups in the society. Besides, we can notice that the situation of the marginalized persons is portrayed as a result of their own characteristic features (Omidvar, 2013).

The problems that people face are then seen as of their own making. The phenomenon is naturalized; it can be understood not only as a social aspect, but also as something which can to be expected in the person. This phenomenon has been called 'blaming the victim'. For example, it has been suggested that personality characteristics develop in a specific cultural context (Psacharopoulos, 2007).

4. Educational Marginalization

Educational marginalization is understood as the status of an individual who has an educational level sufficiently lower than average to feel like marginalized in the society in general and in the labor market in particular because of her/his educational gap. Before identifying as educationally marginalized, it is important to look at the levels of educational attainment by country, age and gender. There are some facts worth noticing (Klasen, 1984).

a) In some countries, education attainment is easy at all educational levels

b) The share of individuals with primary education or below is

c) In some countries, the share of university graduates is similar to that of more advanced economies (Egypt, Iran), whereas it is dramatically lagging behind in other countries (Kosovo, Syria). Azerbaijan, China, Mongolia, and Nepal are in an intermediate position.

d) In some countries, women experience some disadvantages with respect to men, whereas in other countries, the share of women who attain primary education or below is greater than that of men (Sagric, 2016).

e) With few exceptions (Azerbaijan, Egypt, Iran), women reach higher educational levels than men, in terms of high secondary and tertiary education. Education can be a source of exclusion and marginalization for young people and children. (Ryan, 2016).

5. Methodology

In this study χ^2 - test and logistic regression are used to fulfill the aforementioned objectives. Cox (1958) is the pioneer of logistic regression model. This model was developed by Walker and Duncan (1967) and Cox (1970). It can be used not only to identify risk factors but also to predict the probability of success. This model expresses a qualitative dependent variable as a function of several independent variables both qualitatively and quantitatively (Fox, 1984). In this analysis, environmental poverty is considered as a dependent variable. The statistical population included all the youths in the marginalized schools of Isfahan. Sampling was done randomly. The sample size included 358 students of the marginalized areas.

6. Results and Discussion

Table 1. Number of students in the sample according to sex and school

....	Male	Female	Total
Alborz	12	5	17
Bahrami	10	9	19
Babae	16	15	31
Dinarvand	11	18	29
Dastan	24	19	43
Emad	11	23	34
Farhadi	15	18	33
Frodastan	16	15	31
Moein	12	7	19
Mohager	13	4	17
Ostad Moin	15	10	25
Sharyati	11	15	26
Sepedar	9	10	19
Hemati	7	8	15
Total	182	176	358

Source: Original research data

Table 2. Family Structure/ Headship

School	Both parents	Only mother	Only father	Other	Total
Alborz	8	5	1	3	17
Bahrami	5	9	3	2	19
Babae	25	3	0	3	31
Dinarvand	13	4	2	10	29
Dastan	22	15	1	5	43
Emad	18	7	4	5	34
Farhadi	15	10	2	6	33
Frodastan	10	14	2	5	31
Moin	6	10	1	2	19
Mohager	6	3	1	7	17
Ostad Moin	12	9	3	1	25
Sharyati	10	10	2	4	26
Sepedar	9	6	0	4	19
Hemati	10	2	1	2	15
Total	169	107	23	59	358

Source: Original research data

Table 3a. Employment status of parent

School	Public Servant	Private Sector	Self Employed/ (Agriculture)	CEPEP/ URP	Students who work	Unemployed / Retired	No response	Total
Alborz	0	1	5	2	0	0	9	17
Bahrami	3	0	4	1	0	2	9	19
Babae	6	9	2	0	0	2	12	31
Dinarvand	3	5	11	0	0	0	10	29
Dastan	2	4	9	2	0	1	25	43
Emad	15	8	7	0	0	0	4	34
Farhadi	10	0	0	0	4	2	17	33
Frodastan	9	7	12	0	0	0	3	31
Moin	5	5	3	2	0	1	3	19
Mohager	2	4	2	0	0	0	9	17
Ostad Moin	10	2	4	0	0	0	9	25
Sharyati	6	1	4	0	5	3	7	26
Sepedar	2	5	6	0	0	0	6	19
Hemati	4	6	2	0	0	0	3	15
TOTAL	77	57	71	7	9	11	126	358

Table 3b . Summary Table

Employment	Number	%
Public Servant	77	22
Private Sector	57	16
Self Employed	71	20
CEPEP/URP	7	2
Students who Work	9	2
Unemployed	11	3
No Response	126	35
Total	358	100%

Source: Original research data

Table 4. Impact of experiences contributed to stress at home

Area of concern (as aspects of poverty)	Percentage of impact on stress
Neglect	10%
Physical Abuse	15%
Sexual abuse	40%
Low material resources	30%
Verbal Abuse	5%

Source: Original research data

Table 5. Summary of the regression model

Standard error estimation	Determination coefficient	Coefficient of determination	Coefficient of correlation	Variables
1/088	0/088	0/093	0/306	The rate of family income and juvenile delinquency in the peripheral region
1/088	0/142	0/146	0/383	The employment rate and delinquency of the young people in the peripheral region
1/150	0/073	0/078	0/279	Social participation and juvenile delinquency in the peripheral region
1/135	0/077	0/082	0/287	Social acceptance and juvenile delinquency
1/143	0/071	0/071	0/236	Adherence to the convictions and delinquency of the young people in the peripheral region

7. Conclusion

Young people may be socially suffering from material deprivation, social and emotional marginalization. “Social exclusion” is a concept which can be defined in two ways. In a narrow sense, it is used as a synonym for poverty and refers to people who are not connected with the paid labor market. In the second sense, it means much more than poverty, deprivation and income inequity or lack of employment. Social exclusion is a process in which individuals, groups or communities are pushed to the edge of society. Marginalization combines social exclusion and discrimination. The main determinants of social exclusion are poor levels of education, living in remote geographical areas because of monetary poverty, personal characteristics, unemployment and experience of juvenile delinquency. Educational marginalization is understood as the status of an individual who has an

educational level sufficiently lower than average to feel like marginalized in the society in general and in the labor market in particular because of her/his educational gap. The result of this study is to find the relationship between the income and crime. On the one hand due to economic problems and lack of income and on the other hand to compare themselves with others who are in town, people tend to commit criminal behavior. Marginalization relates to an immigrant or nonimmigrant. He or she is different from urban population because of lack of expertise and strong financial foundations and non-compliance with environmental and urban culture of the cultural and economic status. People have no enough income because of the different reasons like as illiteracy, dropout in primary, secondary or high school level, irregular employment and jobless. These problems will be pushed them from text to margins. Jobless and having unclear jobs are two factors that motivate people to be committed the criminal behavior and social crimes.

References

1. Antilla A., Uusitalo, A. (2015). Contemporary marginalization and exclusion of young people. *Noura Publications*, 10 (2) 30-40.
2. Bhalla, A., Lapeyre F. (1997). *Development and change*, 28 (1) 413-433.
3. Burton, M., Kagan C. (2013). *Marginalization*. Community Psychology: In pursuit of wellness and liberation, London: MacMillan.
4. Cornish, S. (2017). *Globalization and marginalization*. Australia: Loyola Institute.
5. Dalton, J. H., Elias M. J., Wandersman. A. (2011). *Community psychology: Linking individuals and communities*. Stamford CT: Wadsworth.
6. Farber, B.A., Azar S. T. (1999). *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 2 (1), 515-528.
7. Omidvar, R., Richmond T. (2003). *Immigrant settlement and social inclusion in Canada*, Working Paper Series: Perspectives on Social Inclusion, Laidlaw Foundation.
8. Pastore, F. (2017). Marginalization of young people in education and work: Findings from the school-to-work transition surveys, *Education for All Global Monitoring Report*, 2(1), 3-8.
9. Peace, R. (2001). Social Policy, *Journal of New Zealand*, 16 (1) 26-36.
10. Ryan, W. (2016). *Blaming the victim*. New York: Vintage.