

# Economic, Demographic, Deterrent Variables And Crime Rate In India

Gupta, Manish and Sachdeva, Payal

Goa Institute of Management, Goa Institute of Managemnt

13 July 2017

Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/80181/ MPRA Paper No. 80181, posted 17 Jul 2017 16:28 UTC

# ECONOMIC, DEMOGRAPHIC, DETERRENT VARIABLES

# AND CRIME RATE IN INDIA

Manish Gupta, Student Goa Institute of Management

Payal Sachdeva, Student Goa Institute of Management

#### Abstract

Crime has plagued society since time immortal. The crime rate in India has been on rise, therefore, it becomes important to study the factors that impact the crime rate. The purpose of the paper is to investigate the relationship between various economic, demographic and deterrent factors and the crime rate in India. The study focuses on the extent of effects of various factors like population density, sex ratio, minority population, poverty, per capita income, no of police personnel and literacy rate on crime registered under IPC<sup>1</sup> in all Indian states and major union territories. The study covers the data of all the Indian states and major union territories of period 2011. The findings show that these factors are crucial determinants of the rate of the criminal cases registered in India.

Keywords: Crime per capita, Determinants

### I. Introduction

Crime is an evil that affects everybody in a society. Therefore, it is important to study what incite people to commit a crime. From time immortal, it has plagued every society in human history. The history of crime is as old as the history of mankind. The first crime was committed by Cain, the first son of Adam and Eve when he murdered his brother Abel out of jealousy. (Gilani, Rehman, Gill, 2009)

Though there is no universal definition of the crime, Cruzel states that "A crime as an act or omission of human conduct harmful to others which the state is bound to prevent. It renders the deviant person liable to punishment as a result of proceedings initiated by the state organs assigned to ascertain the nature, the extent and the legal consequences of that person's wrongness" (Auolak, 1999)

Gaviria and Pagés, 2002, Mathur, 1977, Stevans, 1983, Meera and Jayakumar, 1995, and Masih and Masih, 1996 states that there are basically three determinants of crime i.e. Economic, Demographic and Deterrent factors. Economic factors include per capita income, poverty level, GDP of the state, unemployment. All of these economic variables have either negative or positive impact in determining crime rate in a state. Demographic variable includes Sex Ratio, Education level, no of schools in a state. We expect that all these demographic factors affect the crime rate in a state. Deterrent variables like probabilities of being arrested and convicted determine the expected returns from crime (Becker, 1968, Ehrlich, 1973, 1975, 1996,

Grogger, 1991). Since deterrent variables represent costs to criminal, we expect a negative relationship between deterrent variables and crime rate. Out of all the deterrent variables like robustness of legal system, police force, no of jails and no of courts in a state, we are considering only two variables i.e. no of jails and no of police personnel in a state because either the data on other variables aren't available or we can't measure it.

As per the data with NCRB, Kerala has the maximum per capita crime in India with 0.00516 cases per individual followed by Puducherry with 0.00351 cases registered per person under IPC. Nagaland has the least number of per capita cases registered in India.

	Per Capita								Per Capita
	IPC		Per Capita		Per Capita		Per Capita		IPC
State	Crimes	State	<b>IPC Crimes</b>	State	<b>IPC Crimes</b>	State	<b>IPC Crimes</b>	State	Crimes
Kerela	0.00516	Haryana	0.0023958	A & N Island	0.002087	West Bengal	0.0015676	Sikkim	0.00098
Punducherry	0.00351	Goa	0.002366	Gujarat	0.002043	Odisha	0.0014608	U.p	0.00098
Chandigarh	0.00336	Karnataka	0.0022509	Jammu	0.001953	Bihar	0.0013092	Meghalaya	0.00093
Delhi	0.00318	Andhra	0.0022415	Maharashtra	0.001823	Punjab	0.0012591	Daman & Diu	0.00092
Madhya Pradesh	0.00299	Chattisgarh	0.0022403	Mizoram	0.001669	Manipur	0.0011823	Uttarakhand	0.00087
Tamil Nadu	0.00267	Assam	0.0021404	Arunachal	0.001653	Jharkhand	0.0010871	Lakshwadeep	0.00068
Rajasthan	0.00241	H.P	0.0020874	Tripura	0.001581	D&N Haveli	0.001085	Nagaland	0.00055

Table 1: Rankings of state on the basis of per capita crime

(Source: Crime in India 2012, National Crime Record Bureau, Ministry of Home Affairs)

This study will help in determining the variables that impact the number of crime in a state. There have been a number of studies in this area but none of them is focused on state wise data. Our paper is different from others because of the number of variables that we have taken into account and also that the data is state wise.

# II. Review of literature

There have been a lot of studies to establish the relationship between the rate of crime and the factors affecting it. The results have helped us choose the variable that we took.

- Gary Becker (1974) (Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach) presented a model based on the cost of crime. He explained the economics of crime in terms of cost and benefits of a particular crime. He stated that cost of different punishments to an offender can be made comparable by converting them into their monetary equivalent or worth.
- 2. Dreze and Khera (2000) analyzed the effect of gender and demography on the crimes committed and reported in India. The authors stated that education has a moderate influence on the criminal

violence. Murder rate strongly correlates with sex ratio, where a higher sex ratio results into lower murder rate.

- 3. Gumus (2003) studied the effect of per capita income, income inequality, population, and presence of black population on the crime rate in the US and stated that these all are important determinants of the crime rate. Unemployment rate and police expenditures have also an impact on crime but not as much as other stated factors.
- 4. Dubey and Aggarwal (2015) state that political, economic and socio-cultural factors play a vital role in crime and crime control practices in India. They stated that the financial crisis and the current political stalemate in India have contributed to increasing crime rate.
- 5. Dutta and Husain (2009) investigated the impact of deterrent variables like police force & arrest rate and socio-economic variables like poverty & urbanization on crime in India. They concluded that deterrence is likely to have a significant negative impact on crime rates and economic growth is an important determinant of crime rates.

### III. Crime Functions

<u>Poverty level (% of people below poverty line)</u>: One of the most important reasons which may incite crime in human beings is their poor financial condition.

<u>Literacy Rate:</u> The literacy rate is an important variable that may help in determining the crime rate of a state. It is expected that more the literacy rate of a state, the less the crime would be. This is so because as the literacy rate of state increases, there will be less unemployed people and therefore they will not opt for illegal ways to get money. Though this may not be the case always because crime has more to do with psychological factors but a negative relationship can be expected in literacy rate and crime rate.

<u>Net Enrolment Ratio (Upper Primary Level)</u>: In this case, it may be expected that more the enrolment rate, less the crime would be. The reason for this is similar to what literacy rate does in a state.

<u>Per capita schools</u>: No of schools in a state may be related to the education level of its residents. Though the number of people attending the schools is more important to relate it to the crime rate we can assume that more the number of schools, more the opportunity of education to its people.

<u>Rural population</u>: There might be a relationship between the number of people living in rural area<sup>2</sup> and crime rate. It may be expected that more the %age of the population living in rural areas, less the crime would be as the probability of getting caught in a rural area is more because there are fewer people in an area and they know each other well.

<u>Sex Ratio</u>: It can be said that a higher sex ratio (no of males to no of females), more the crime rate in a state. This may be because of the following reasons. More sex ratio may lead to more number of crimes if men are more prone to crime than women because of the maleness effect. Higher sex ratios mean that fewer men can be married, and marriage may discipline men (a civilizing effect) (Korenman & Neumark, 1991; Messner & Sampson, 1991; Barber, 2000; Sampson, Lavb, & Wimer, 2006).

<u>Household Availing bank services:</u> There are not many studies about how the number of household availing bank services may affect crime rate in India but we expect that more the financial independence in a house, less the family members prone to commit a crime. One of the factors from which financial independence come is by having a bank account.

<u>Population Density:</u> It can be argued that more the number of people living in an area, higher are the chances that people will commit a crime. It is because, in a highly dense area, people fight for the limited resources and when they can't get hold of them, they choose the wrong ways to acquire them.

<u>Per capita GSDP (Constant Price)</u>: Gross State Domestic product can be one of the factors which can affect the crime rate in both ways. If crime were a rational thing, we would expect the crime rate to go down if the GSDP is more i.e. if the state is rich enough. But it can have a negative relationship too as the criminals will have more chances to steal or a better reason to kidnap someone affluent.

<u>Per Capita Income (Constant Price)</u>: It can be assumed that less the income of the people of a state, more the crimes would be.

<u>Total police per lakh of the population(Actual)</u>: The robustness of judicial system can be measured by the no of police personnel. We have taken no of police personnel per thousand population. It can be argued that more the police force, less the crime would be. A negative relationship can be expected between the number of police personnel and the crime as the probability of getting caught is increased by more no of police.

<u>No of jails</u>: No of jails per capita is one of the determinants that tell the robustness of judicial system of a state. Therefore we can expect a negative relationship between number of jails and the crime rate.

<u>Minority Population:</u> We will take the % of minority population as one of the determinants of the crime rate. Though there is no previous study that is done on this topic with reference to India. But, there are studies in the US which postulate that because of increase in black population (minority population in the US) the crime rate increases. Glaeser and Sacerdote (1999: 8, 15, 24), (Grogger and Willis (2000), Krivo and Peterson (1996), Cullen and Levitt (1999)). Blumstein et al. (1986) state that fraction of blacks is an important predictor of crime. This is one of the reasons it's important to study the % of the minority population of a state.

## IV. Limitations

This paper only covers the reported crime under IPC and neglects the ambit of total crime including unregistered crimes as data is not available on them. The problem is if police- recorded crime is higher in a region, it does not follow that actual crime is also higher (Vollaard and Hamed 2012). The absence of a direct link between crime and its recording by police also makes it difficult to determine what factors affect crime. But we have tried to find a correlation between a number of recorded IPC crimes and factors affecting them.

### V. Methodology

The objective of the study is to find a relationship and effects of demographic, economic and deterrent variable on the crime rate of Indian states and major Union Territories through quantitative research using secondary data. We have obtained data on these variables from various sources like Census of India,2011, Reserve Bank of India publications and National Crime Record Bureau Compendium. The data has 32 data points (28 states and 4 Union Territories). Data related to economic factors of three Union Territories in India is not calculated and computed by the agencies hence, data related to Lakshadweep, Dadar and Nagar Haveli and Daman and Diu wasn't taken into consideration for the analysis at all. We first calculated significance value(p) and Pearson correlation of all the variables that we took into account for our study. After performing p test and Pearson correlation test, we did a collinearity test to find the set of variables

which explains almost the same variability in the outcome and kept only one of those highly correlated variables. Finally, Linear Regression was performed to compute a general equation to estimate the future value of Per capita crime rate in India.

# VI. Analysis

A correlation analysis was done on per capita IPC crimes (PCIPC), Population Density (PD), Sex Ratio (SR), Household Availing Bank Services (HABC), Minority population share (MN), Per Capita Schools (PCS), Rural Population (RP), Net Enrolment Ratio in upper primary school (NER), Police Per Lakh (PPL), Jails Per Capita (JPC), Literacy Rate (LR), Per Capita Income at constant price (PCI), Per Capita GSDP (PCGSDP) and Poverty Rate (PV) at 90% confidence level.

	PCIDC Pearson Correlation	PCIDC Significance
PD	.413	.009
SR	.245	.089
HABS	.333	.081
MN	336	.030
PCS	414	.009
RP	559	.000
NER	.150	.207
PPL	254	.080
JPC	059	.374
LR	.530	.001
PCI	.472	.003
PCGSDP	.447	.005
PV	140	.222

Table:2 Pearson Correlation and Significance Values

The table shows that Population density, Sex Ratio, Household availing bank services, Net enrolment ratio in primary schools, Literacy rate, Per capita income and Per capita GSDP at a constant price are positively related to the Per capita crimes registered under IPC in India. An increase or decrease in anyone of these Independent variables will result into increase or decrease in the Per capita crime registered in India. On the other hand, Minority Population, Per Capita schools, Rural population, Police per lakh of population, jails per capita and poverty rate are negatively related to per capita crimes which means there is an indirect relationship and an increase in these variables will result into decrease in per capita crime in India. All the independent variables with P value of 0.1 or more will be rejected for further analysis as it signifies there is no relationship between independent variable and Per capita crime so the poverty rate, jails per capita and net enrolment ratio will not be considered for further analysis as the sig. is above 0.1.

Table 3.	$\Gamma$	)escrintive	- St	atistics
1 4010 5.	$\mathbf{\nu}$	cscriptiv		austics

Descriptive	e Statistics
-------------	--------------

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
PerCapitalPCCrimes	.001999424	.000944491	32
Populationdensity	1043.844	2482.8457	32
SexRatio	943.313	53.4666	32
HouseoldsAvailingbanks ervices	61.469	16.1197	32
Minority	.323709375	.269192794	32
PerCapitaSchools	.001443887	.000832245	32
RuralPopulation	.638229	.2096126	32
Totalpoliceperlakhofpop ulation	344.2859	311.69506	32
PerCapitaGSDP	.005242773	.003240036	32
LiteracyRate	69.1316	10.51754	32

#### Table 4: Model Summary

#### Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.774 <sup>a</sup>	.599	.435	.000709785

 a. Predictors: (Constant), LiteracyRate, Minority, SexRatio, PerCapitaSchools, Populationdensity, HouseoldsAvailingbankservices, Totalpoliceperlakhofpopulation, PerCapitaGSDP, RuralPopulation

Δ	N	o	v	Δ	а
		~			

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.000	9	.000	3.655	.006 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	.000	22	.000		
	Total	.000	31			

a. Dependent Variable: PerCapitalPCCrimes

 Predictors: (Constant), LiteracyRate, Minority, SexRatio, PerCapitaSchools, Populationdensity, HouseoldsAvailingbankservices, Totalpoliceperlakhofpopulation, PerCapitaGSDP, RuralPopulation

# Table 6: Coefficients Table

		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients			90.0% Confidence Interval for B						
Model		В	Std. Error	Beta	t Sig.		Lower Bound	Upper Bound					
1	(Constant)	004	.004		-1.075	.294	011	.002					
	Populationdensity	9.001E-008	.000	.237	.847	.407	.000	.000					
	SexRatio	6.352E-006	.000	.360	1.690	.106	.000	.000					
	HouseoldsAvailingbanks ervices	1.076E-005	.000	.184	.875	.392	.000	.000					
	Minority	.000	.001	026	126	.901	001	.001					
	PerCapitaSchools	152	.205	134	739	.468	505	.202					
	RuralPopulation	002	.002	417	976	.340	005	.001					
	Totalpoliceperlakhofpop ulationActual	.000	.000	270	-1.343	.194	.000	.000					
	LiteracyRate	2.415E-005	.000	.269	.955	.350	.000	.000					
	PerCapitaIncomeConsta ntprice	.000	.000	591	924	.366	.000	.000					
	PerCapitaGSDP	.090	.177	.310	.509	.616	215	.395					

a. Dependent Variable: PerCapitalPCCrimes

A multi collinearity test was performed prior to linear regression and collinearity was found between per capita income and per capita GSDP hence, per capita GSDP was rejected for the further calculations of linear regression.

The value of mean and std. deviations in Table 3 reflects the average of all the variables and it can be inferred that there is no uniformity among states in terms of population density, police per lakh of population and minority population.

The value of R in Table 4 indicates the relationship between the combination of variables and the dependent variable. 0.774 clearly shows that there's a high degree of relationship between the independent variables and the number of cases registered under IPC in India. Adjusted R is 0.435 which clearly means that 43.5% of the dependent variable i.e. per capita crime can be explained by independent variables.

The Table no 5 shows that the independent variables statistically significantly predict the dependent variable, F(9, 22) = 3.655, p = 0.006 indicates that it's a good fit and, overall, the regression model statistically significantly predicts the outcome variable.

In Table 6 unstandardized coefficient represents how Per Capita IPC Crimes varies because of an independent variable when all the other variables are kept constant. The general equation to predict the per capita IPC crimes can be derived from the B values.

Y = -0.004 + 9.002(Population Density) + 6.352(Sex Ratio) + 1.076(% of household availing bank services) - 0.152(Schools Per Capita) + 2.415(Literacy Rate) - 0.02(Rural Population) + 0.09(Per Capita GSDP) B values also clearly distinguish the variables with a stronger impact on per capita crimes from variables with a relatively weaker relationship. A higher **B** value represents a stronger effect on per capita crime because of an independent variable.

## VII. Conclusion

The study focused on the prevailing crime rate in India including all its states and union territories. It can be concluded that Kerala has the highest crime rate whereas Nagaland has the minimum crime rate in India.

The analysis reflects a fairly strong relationship between Population density, Sex ratio and Literacy Rate and Per capita crime under IPC in India and these factors play an utmost important role in determining the crime rate. Factors like Per capita gross state domestic product and per capita schools form a relationship with per capita crime but don't effect it by a large margin. Rural population share and minority population play a very negligible role in determining the criminal cases registered in India

## VIII. Recommendations:

- To keep check on the crime rate in India; Population density, Sex ratio and Literacy Rate are needed to be adequately addressed by the policy makers.
- 2. Rather than just opening schools (increasing per capita number of schools), the policy makers need to make sure that people are attending schools (increasing literacy rate). As per the results, literacy has an impact on curbing the crime rate and not per capita Schools.

3. The policy makers of Kerala need to pay attention to the reasons for crime rate as it has the maximum per capita crime among all the states and UTs of India.

AUOLAK, MAJEED AHMED (1999), Prison Administration in Pakistan. Lahore: S and S Publishers.

BARBER, NIGEL, "The Sex Ratio as a Predictor of Cross-National Variation in Violent Crime," *Cross Cultural Research* 34 (2000), 264–282,

BECKER, G.S., (1968) 'Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach', Journal of Political Economy

BOURGUIGNON, EHESS AND DELTA (1999), Crime, Violence and Inequitable Development , *Annual* World Bank Conference on Development Economics, Washington, D.C., April 28-30, 1999.

BLUMSTEIN, ALFREID, JACQUELINE COHEN, JEFFREY A. ROTH, AND CHRISTY A. VISHER. (1986). 'Criminal Careers' and Career Criminals, Washington D.C.: *National Academy Press*.

CULLEN, JULIE B. AND LEVİTT STEVEN D. (1999). Crime, Urban Flight, and the Consequences for Cities, *the Review of Economics and Statistics*, 81 (2), 159-169.

DRÈZE, J. AND KHERA, R. (2000), Crime, Gender, and Society in India: Insights from Homicide Data. *Population and Development Review* 

DUBEY AND AGGARWAL (2015) Crime, Crime Rates and Control Techniques: A Statistical Analysis, *lawoctopus.com* 

DUTTA, M. AND HUSAIN, Z. (2009). Determinants of crime rates: Crime Deterrence and Growth in postliberalized India

EHRLICH, I. AND G.D. BROWER (1987) 'On the Issue of Causality in the Economic Model of Crime and Law Enforcement: Some Theoretical Considerations and Experimental Evidence'. *American Economic Review*, 77 (2): 99-106.

GAVÍRÍA, ALEJANDRO and CARMEN PAGÉS. (2002). Patterns of Crime Victimization in Latin American Cities, *Journal of Development Economics*, 67, 181-203,

GLEASER, EDWARD L. and SACERDOTE, BRUCE. (1996). Why is there more crime in cities? *NBER Working Paper* # 5430, January.

GILLANI ,REHMAN ,GILL (2009), Unemployment, Poverty, Inflation and Crime Nexus: Cointegration and Causality Analysis of Pakistan *Pakistan Economic and Social Review* ,Volume 47, No. 1 (Summer 2009), pp. 79-98

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, NATIONAL INSTITUTION FOR TRANSFORMING INDIA, Retrieved on July 01, 2017, from *NITI: National Institution for transforming India*, http://niti.gov.in/content/population-number-male-female-rural-urban

GROGGER, J., (1991) 'Certainty vs. Severity of Punishment'. Economic Inquiry, 29: 297-309.

GROGGER, JEFF AND WILLIS, MICHAEL (2000). The emergence of crack cocaine and the rise in urban crime rates, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 82 (4), 519-529.

GUMUS, ERDAL, Crime in Urban Areas: An Empirical Investigation. *Akdeniz I.I.B.F. Dergisi*, Vol. 4, No. 7, pp. 98-109, May 2004

IYER, LAKSHMI AND TOPALOVA, PETIA B., Poverty and Crime: Evidence from Rainfall and Trade Shocks in India (September 2, 2014). *Harvard Business School BGIE* Unit Working Paper No. 14-067

KORENMAN, SANDERS, AND DAVID NEUMARK, "Does Marriage Really Make Men More Productive?" *Journal of Human Resources* 26 (1991), 282–307.

KRIVO, LAUREN J. AND PETERSON, RUTH D. (1996). Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and Urban Crime, *Social Forces*, 75 (2), 619- 650.

MASİH, ABUL M.M. and MASİH RUMİ. (1996). Temporal causality and the dynamics of different categories of crime and their socioeconomic determinants: evidence from Australia, *Applied Economics*, 28, 1093-1104.

MATHUR, VİJAY K. (1977). Economics of crime: An investigation of the deterrent hypothesis for urban areas, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*.

MEERA, AHAMED KAMEEL and JAYAKUMAR, MALİYAKAL D. (1995). Determinants of crime in a developing country: a regression model, *Applied Economics*, 27, 455-460.

MESSNER, STEVEN F., AND ROBERT J. SAMPSON, "The Sex Ratio, Family Disruption, and Rates of Violent Crime: The Paradox of Demographic Structure," *Social Forces* 69 (1991), 33–53

NATIONAL CRIME RECORDS BUREAU (2012) Compendium\_2012\_part\_04\_06.Retrieved July 01,2017 from NCRB: National Crime Records Bureau p-198; http://ncrb.nic.in/StatPublications/CII/CII2012/Statistics2012.pdf

OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR GENERAL & CENSUS COMMISSIONER, INDIA, *Census\_2011*, retrieved July 01, 2017, from

http://censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-results/data\_files/india/Final\_PPT\_2011chapter7.pdf

PRASAD (2013), A Comparison of Victim-Reported and Police-Recorded Crime in India, *Economic & Political Weekly*, August 17, 2013 vol xlviII no 33

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA (2013) *Publications\_Sept\_2013*. Retrieved July 01, 2017, from https://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/PublicationsView.aspx?id=15283

ROEDER, EISEN, BOWLING: "What caused the crime decline", *Brennan center for justice*. Retrieved July 01, 2017, from

 $https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/What\_Caused\_The\_Crime\_Decline.pdf$ 

SAMPSON, ROBERT J., JOHN H. LAUB, AND CHRISTOPHER WIMER, "Does Marriage Reduce Crime? A Counterfactual Approach to Within-Individual Causal Effects," *Criminology* 44 (2006), 465–508

STEVANS, L. K. (1983). Urban Property Crime and the distribution of Income, Dissertation, *Oklahoma State University*, May.

TANG, C. F. (2009). The linkages among inflation, unemployment and crime rates in Malaysia. *International Journal of Economics and Management*, *3*(1), 50-61.

TELES, VLADIMIR K., (2004) "The Effects of Macroeconomic Policies on Crime." *Economics Bulletin*, Vol. 11, No. 1 pp. 1–9

VOLLAARD, B AND J HAMED (2012): "Why the Police Have an Effect on Violent Crime After All: Evidence from the British Crime Survey", *Journal of Law and Economics*, 55(4): 901-24.

# Appendix

									Total police		Total police per				
						Per	Rural		per lakh of		lakh of	Per Capita	Per	Poverty level(% of	
	Population	Per Capita IPC	Houseolds A	vailing		Capita	Population	Net Enrolment Ratio:	population(A		population(Actu	Income(Constant	Capita	people below	
State	Density	Crimes	Sex Ratio bank service	5	<b>Minority Population</b>	Schools	(%)	Upper Primary Level	ctual)	Per Capita Jalis	al)	price)	GSDP	poverty line)	Literacy Rate
Andhra	308	0.002241526	992	53.1	0.1154	0.00125	0.6651088	61.95	107.32	0.000001417	107.32	40366	0.00451	9.2	60.47
Arunachal	17	0.001653393	920	53	0.7096	0.00229	0.7732942	87.12	550.9	0.00000723	550.9	37417	0.00412	34.67	54.34
Assam	397	0.002140377	954	44.1	0.3853	0.00167	0.8591961	74.93	176.18	0.000000962	176.18	21406	0.00238	31.98	63.25
Bihar	1102	0.001309152	916	44.4	0.1731	0.0007	0.887003	52.7	64.08	0.00000530	64.08	13632	0.00139	33.74	47
Chattisgarh	189	0.002240312	991	48.8	0.0675	0.00218	0.767561	67.78	169.03	0.000000979	169.03	27156	0.0031	39.93	64.66
Goa	394	0.002366019	968	86.8	0.3392	0.00148	0.3782708	51.12	292.54	0.000002058	292.54	102844	0.01435	5.09	82.01
Gujarat	308	0.00204312	918	57.9	0.1143	0.00086	0.5741758	48.77	110.27	0.000000414	110.27	52708	0.00605	16.63	69.14
Haryana	573	0.002395803	877	68.1	0.1254	0.00096	0.6520507	57.93	179.75	0.00000749	179.75	59221	0.00655	11.16	67.91
H.P	123	0.00208736	974	89.1	0.0483	0.00287	0.8995547	82.51	200.04	0.000002042	200.04	47106	0.0057	8.06	76.48
Jammu	124	0.001952677	883	70	0.7156	0.00219	0.7279364	80.8	541.63	0.000001116	541.63	27607	0.00309	10.35	55.52
Jharkhand	414	0.001087112	947	54	0.3217	0.00134	0.7594723	69.65	164.56	0.00000819	164.56	21734	0.00237	11.26	53.56
Karnataka	319	0.002250915	968	61.1	0.16	0.00125	0.614299	61.71	138.84	0.000001669	138.84	39301	0.00458	20.91	66.64
Kerela	859	0.005155705	1084	74.2	0.4527	0.00041	0.5228128	68.75	131.14	0.000001557	131.14	49873	0.00579	7.05	90.86
M.P	236	0.002990376	930	46.6	0.0911	0.0021	0.7236868	71.54	104.61	0.000001694	104.61	. 22382	0.00252	31.65	63.74
Maharashtra	365	0.00182341	925	68.9	0.2017	0.00087	0.547689	69.76	124.86	0.000001913	124.86	62729	0.0069	17.35	76.88
Manipur	122	0.001182325	987	29.6	0.5861	0.00149	0.6979406	84.44	846.42	0.00000735	846.42	23298	0.00264	36.89	70.53
Meghalaya	132	0.000929485	986	37.5	0.8847	0.00327	0.7992461	59.16	386.93	0.000001350	386.93	35932	0.00362	11.87	62.56
Mizoram	52	0.001669089	975	54.9	0.9725	0.00349	0.484904	74.51	1044.81	0.000006416	1044.81	. 36732	0.00418	20.87	88.8
Nagaland	119	0.000546803	931	34.9	0.9125	0.00128	0.7103199	69.31	1069.78	0.000005554	1069.78	40957	0.00434	18.88	66.59
Odisha	269	0.001460807	978	45	0.0637	0.00205	0.8332166	64.41	106.16	0.000002003	106.16	25708	0.00306	32.59	63.08
Punjab	550	0.001259122	893	65.Z	0.6151	0.00084	0.6250596	71.76	249.95	0.00000938	249.95	44752	0.00537	8.26	69.65
Rajasthan	201	0.002413576	926	68	0.1151	0.00156	0.7510853	54.97	105.43	0.000001734	105.43	25616	0.00286	14.71	60.41
Sikkim	86	0.000980766	889	67.5	0.4224	0.00194	0.7503225	42.81	642.48	0.000003291	642.48	47655	0.00599	8.19	68.81
Tamil Nadu	555	0.002673715	995	52.5	0.1242	0.00062	0.5155221	90.91	150.97	0.000001858	150.97	51928	0.00543	36.96	73.45
Tripura	350	0.001580754	961	79.2	0.166	0.0012	0.7382259	83.51	1012.07	0.000003269	1012.07	37216	0.00387	14.05	73.19
U.P	828	0.000977721	908	72	0.2027	0.00109	0.7771815	47.13	74.62	0.00000321	74.62	17349	0.00198	29.43	56.27
Uttarakhand	189	0.000867274	963	80.7	0.1703	0.00225	0.6944505	70.35	160.61	0.000001087	160.61	44723	0.00505	11.28	71.62
West Bengal	1029	0.001567603	947	48.8	0.2946	0.00067	0.6810642	67.72	66.03	0.00000602	66.03	32228	0.00348	19.98	68.64
A & N Island	46	0.00208715	878	89.3	0.3055	0.00099	0.6432816	62	790.55	0.000010528	790.55	54992	0.00785	1	81.3
Chandigarh	9252	0.003358346	818	80.1	0.1922	0.00017	0.0275001	64.02	542.67	0.000000948	542.67	99487	0.01494	21.81	81.94
D&N Haveli	698	0.001085013	775	56.7	0.0607	0.00095	0.5338265	93.1	100	0.000002917	100			39.31	57.63
Daman & Diu	2169	0.000922148	618	65.4	0.095	0.00054	0.2483667	62.37	130.85	0.000008233	130.85			9.86	78.18
Delhi	11297	0.003184639	866	77.7	0.1832	0.0003	0.0250291	72.89	448.32	0.000000597	448.32	108876	0.01144	9.91	81.67
Lakshwadeep	2013	0.000682922	946	85.3	0.9723	0.00075	0.2191715	73.13	308.22	0.000062084	308.22			2.77	86.66
Punducherry	2598	0.003505123	1038	64	0.127	0.00057	0.3168762	80.21	263.6	0.000003214	263.6	79333	0.00829	9.69	81.24

(Source: NCRB Compendium 2012for crime rate; NITI Aayog Census report for population of male and female ;and rural and urban and % of people availing bank services; Census 2011 for Population and Population Density; Reserve Bank of India Publications for Number and percentage of population below poverty line; )

(The NCRB Compendium,2012 nowhere clearly explains how the number of cases in the state of Jammu and Kashmir been counted as IPC isn't applicable there. For the purpose of this study, we are considering the number mentioned in the report.)

	5	PCIPC	PD	SR	HABS	MN	PCS	RP	NER	PPL	JPC	PCI	PCGSDP	PV	LR
Pearson Correlation	PCIPC	1.000	.413	.245	.333	336	414	559	.150	254	059	.472	.447	140	.530
	PD	.413	1.000	416	.279	184	470	800	.030	.056	179	.674	.636	089	.331
	SR	.245	416	1.000	261	.002	.195	.199	.287	174	017	212	278	.092	.201
	HABS	.333	.279	261	1.000	332	197	375	117	012	.202	.563	.598	640	.481
	MN	336	184	.002	332	1.000	.410	.076	.175	.620	.267	145	139	072	.022
	PCS	414	470	.195	197	.410	1.000	.501	.112	.220	.146	408	382	.093	172
	RP	559	800	.199	375	.076	.501	1.000	051	137	039	871	837	.258	663
	NER	.150	.030	.287	117	.175	.112	051	1.000	.277	.026	035	115	.231	.170
	PPL	254	.056	174	012	.620	.220	137	.277	1.000	.611	.103	.121	110	.296
	JPC	059	179	017	.202	.267	.146	039	.026	.611	1.000	.095	.132	319	.421
	LR	.530	.331	.201	.481	.022	172	663	.170	.296	.421	.680	.662	399	1.000
	PCI	.472	.674	212	.563	145	408	871	035	.103	.095	1.000	.969	463	.680
	PCGSDP	.447	.636	278	.598	139	382	837	115	.121	.132	.969	1.000	442	.662
	PV	140	089	.092	640	072	.093	.258	.231	110	319	463	442	1.000	399
Sig. (1-tailed)	PCIPC		.009	.089	.031	.030	.009	.000	.207	.080	.374	.003	.005	.222	.001
	PD	.009		.009	.061	.156	.003	.000	.435	.381	.164	.000	.000	.314	.032
	SR	.089	.009	•5	.075	.496	.143	.138	.056	.171	.464	.122	.062	.308	.135
	HABS	.031	.061	.075		.032	.139	.017	.261	.474	.134	.000	.000	.000	.003
	MN	.030	.156	.496	.032	125	.010	.340	.170	.000	.070	.215	.225	.348	.452
	PCS	.009	.003	.143	.139	.010		.002	.271	.114	.213	.010	.015	.307	.173
	RP	.000	.000	.138	.017	.340	.002		.391	.227	.415	.000	.000	.077	.000
	NER	.207	.435	.056	.261	.170	.271	.391		.062	.444	.425	.265	.102	.176
	PPL	.080	.381	.171	.474	.000	.114	.227	.062	12.5	.000	.287	.254	.275	.050
	JPC	.374	.164	.464	.134	.070	.213	.415	.444	.000		.303	.236	.038	.008
	LR	.001	.032	.135	.003	.452	.173	.000	.176	.050	.008	.000	.000	.012	
	PCI	.003	.000	.122	.000	.215	.010	.000	.425	.287	.303	•	.000	.004	.000
	PCGSDP	.005	.000	.062	.000	.225	.015	.000	.265	.254	.236	.000		.006	.000
	PV	.222	.314	.308	.000	.348	.307	.077	.102	.275	.038	.004	.006	1.0	.012
N	PCIPC	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	PD	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	SR	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	HABS	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	MN	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	PCS	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	RP	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	NER	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	PPL	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	JPC	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	LR	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	PCI	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	PCGSDP	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32
	PV	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32	32

# **End notes**

<sup>1</sup>The Indian Penal Code (IPC) is the main criminal code of India. It is a comprehensive code intended to cover all substantive aspects of criminal law

<sup>2</sup>The "rural sector" means any place as per the latest census which meets the following criteria,

- A population of less than 5,000
- Density of population less than 400 per sq km and
- more than "25 per cent of the male working population" is engage in agricultural practices.

Source(http://www.archive.india.gov.in/citizen/graminbharat/graminbharat.php)