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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Major delinquency among adolescents in Turkey consists of acts such as serious fights, illicit substance use, robbery, hooliganism, theft, damaging government property, vandalism, or painting graffiti (Johnston, O’Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2006; Johnston, O’Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2009; Lyman & Potter, 2003; Rehn, Room, & Edwards, 2001; Ögel, Tamar, & Çakmak, 1999; Türkiye Büyük Millet Meclisi, 2008). To a certain extent the effects of anti-societal behavior are considered a primary source of negative influence on both parents and adolescents, particularly concerning psychological and emotional stress (TBMM, 2008).

Minor delinquency includes smoking cigarettes, snuffing, and drinking alcohol. These three acts are considered as less severe delinquent actions by the Turkish Penal Code. According to Turkish health department findings (2003), approximately 9.1% of Turkish juveniles younger than 18 years of age tend to use cigarettes. On the other hand, according to Rehn, Room, and Edwards (2001), Turkish juveniles’ alcohol use has increased approximately 175% over the last decade and this is the highest rate among European countries.

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) data in the Unites States from 1998 to 2008 reveal that 45% of all violent crime and 56% of all property crime arrests are committed by persons younger than 25 years of age. Similarly, in Turkey findings from 3,435 juvenile convicts indicate that Turkish juveniles are mostly engaged in property crimes, while 40% of adolescents committed the crime of robbery (TURKSTAT, 2010). It is noteworthy to recognize one-third of the Turkish population is comprised of youth under 18 years of age. Southeastern Turkey has
the highest levels of both poverty and inequality (Keyder, 2005). The perpetrators of delinquent acts are typically the poor, uneducated, and unemployed residing in southeastern Turkey (Today’s Zaman, 2012).

Numerous studies have attempted to understand and accurately calculate delinquency rates among adolescents (Bakaev, 2004; Delikara, 2002; Hibbel et al., 2004; McCarthy & Casey, 2008; Savina, 2008). Studies have determined that adolescents who engage in delinquency may have disengaged from their parents, received harsh treatment within the family, be susceptible to negative influence by friends, be unsatisfied with and have a negative attitude toward school or experience failure in school, or be subject to interpersonal violence, substance use, and social economic barriers. Eitzzen, Zin and Smith (2011) further argue that coming from lower class neighborhoods or families and experiencing economic deprivation have dire consequences for adolescents. Adolescents coming from disproportionately poor families may engage in delinquent acts more frequently than those from higher classes. However, there are few sociological studies associated with delinquency among adolescents in Turkey and more research is needed.

In terms of providing possible solutions to social problems, many previous studies have employed Hirschi’s (1969) social bonding theory in order to identify social bonding variables’ influence on the probability of involvement in delinquency among adolescents in the United States and Western Europe. Investigation of differences in the relationship between peers and delinquency, school attachment, religious attachment, involvement in conventional activities, and approved moral order in non-western societies such as Turkey are needed to highlight the sociological problems of preventing inaccurate cross-cultural generalizations.
Although some studies have examined both delinquent acts and marijuana use among Turkish juveniles, no attention within this still-growing body of research has yet been directed toward the components of social bonding effects on the likelihood of predicting minor and major delinquency among Kurdish teenagers in southeastern Turkey. Unfortunately, these related studies do not provide enough information specifically concerning why Kurdish teenagers in southeastern Turkey engage in delinquent acts.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation is to test Hirschi’s social bonding theory to examine the mediating effect of social bonding on delinquent behavior among Kurdish teenagers. Kurdish teenagers were used as a case study to test the usefulness of this theory. Participants were selected from one Gülen movement affiliated school and one public or non-Gülen affiliated school. There is a lack of research regarding how Kurdish adolescents are involved in delinquent behavior as portrayed in the popular Turkish media. Thus, it also helps to explain Turkish society’s chaotic conditions in southeastern Turkey particularly with respect to Kurdish teenager’s involvement into the Kurdish Worker’s Party (PKK)\(^1\).

Research Questions

This dissertation addresses the following questions:

1. Which social bonding components have effects on the likelihood of minor delinquency among Kurdish teenagers in southeastern Turkey?

\(^1\) Despite academic disagreements on the definition of terrorism, the PKK has been designated as a terrorist organization by Turkey, the United States, and the European Union (Koc, 2013).
2. To what extent does social bonding impact the likelihood of minor delinquency among Kurdish teenagers when controlling for age, gender, religious preference, father’s education and mother’s education?

3. Which social bonding components have effects on the likelihood of major delinquency among Kurdish teenagers in southeastern Turkey?

4. To what extent does social bonding impact the likelihood of major delinquency among Kurdish teenagers when controlling for age, gender, religious preference, father’s education and mother’s education?

Significance of the Study

Social bonding theory, developed and mainly tested in an American and western European context, needs additional exploration of its efficiency in a non-western, especially Islamic society. For that reason, social bonding theory should be tested in non-western societies to better understand the factors that influence crime and delinquency in developing, culturally diverse social structures (Eker, 2010). Nevertheless, the amount of empirical studies testing the relationship between social bonding and delinquency remains insufficient (Delikara, 2002; Kaner, 2002; Ögel et al., 2003; Ögel et al., 2004; Ögel, Tamar, Evren, & Çakmak, 2001; Ögel, Taner, & Eke, 2006; Taşçı, Atan, Durmaz, Erkuş, & Sevil, 2005). In addition, the sociological literature on social bonding has focused exclusively on attachment -one of the four components of social bonding theory- (Delikara, 2002; Kaner, 2002; Özbay, 2004, 2008: Özbay & Özcan, 2006, 2008).

The proposed study contributes to our understanding of social bonding theory’s explanatory power among Kurdish teenagers by focusing on its applications in a non-western, Turkish Islamic society. There is no literature testing the relationship between social bonding theory and delinquency among Kurdish teenagers. No studies have focused on the impact of
social bonding on the likelihood of antisocial behavior by Kurdish teenagers. This would contribute to the social bond theory by focusing on the development of Kurdish teenagers’ attachment to Turkish conventional society.

Plan of Work

Chapter II presents the pertinent literature on Hirschi’s social bonding theory, including its origins, basic tenants, role and its contributions. Chapter II includes a more detailed examination of social bonding and its components of attachment, involvement, commitment and belief, as well as these components’ influences on delinquency. Finally, it will address the literature on the relationship between social bonding theory and juvenile delinquency. Chapter III describes the research methodology, data collection, sample and study instruments. In addition, it also identifies the dependent and independent variables and the relevant hypotheses. Chapter IV presents descriptive statistics and the results of regression analyses. Chapter V provides an overall assessment of the findings of the present research on social bonding with respect to the Turkish cultural context. Finally, in Chapter VI a brief summary of this study addressing the findings of Hirshi’s social bonding theory and its potential contributions with respect to concerning policy implications are presented. It also identifies the limitations of this study and makes recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter describes the theoretical origins and development of Hirschi’s social bonding theory. Initially, it examines the role of social bonding theory and its contribution to our understanding of acts of deviance and crime. Following the introduction of social bonding theory, this chapter reveals a more detailed discussion of the components of attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief as related to social bonding theory. This chapter also discusses the impact of these social bonding theory components on juvenile delinquency and illuminates the implications of this theory for intervening to prevent juvenile deviant actions. For societies to function optimally, it is imperative individuals be willing to abide by societal agreed upon norms and conventional activities, behavior, and rules, including both legal behaviors and avoiding disrespectful behaviors so as to meet society’s expected obligations. Finally, this chapter reviews the contribution of previous studies concerning juvenile delinquency in Turkey.

Theoretical Origin of Social Bonding Theory

Developed by Hirschi in 1969, social bonding theory has sparked much research (Akers & Sellers, 2008). Hirschi (1969) claimed that deviance arising from inadequate social bonding could serve as a positive force for reinforcing ideas of right and wrong within a society. As a result of the costs of deviance to society, it has become essential for society to understand the social bonding theory, and the impacts of inadequate bonding on deviance. In this regard, a social bonding analysis of deviance beginning with society as a whole, rather than examining or
focusing on the individual, is recommended. In other words, in this perspective, one identifies the source of deviance within the context of the nature of the society. Yet, in doing so, the investigator applying this perspective must disregard individual and biological explanations.

Hirschi (1969) began to study this issue because he questioned the motivations for committing crimes. According to Hirshi, when individuals are weakly attached to society, criminal activity, and deviance emerges. Hirschi’s concern was based on the view of an individual’s involvement as this correlates to their society. In this respect, a teenager’s strength of commitment to conventional society becomes a central variable. The stronger the commitment, the lower the likelihood of committing deviant acts. When commitment is higher, the individual has more to lose in terms of acceptance and social capital. In turn, the person with less commitment to society has less to lose, and therefore is more likely to commit crimes or carry out deviant acts. In addition to one’s emotional commitment to society, another factor is the teenager’s association with a business or economic activity. A person who is less engaged with meaningful activities may engage in deviant behavior. Finally, Hirschi (1969) believed societies had rules and each person in society was obligated to follow these rules.

Social bonding theory was developed in an American cultural context. However, Kurdish culture reflects different norms, values and beliefs. It was my expectation that this dissertation would reveal how the Kurdish culture promotes strong social bonds. Based on the past literature, it was thought Kurdish teenagers who were found to be more attached to conventional Turkish society would be less likely to engage in delinquent acts.
Attachment

The first element of social bonding theory is attachment: The most important attachments are based on how an individual’s parental figures influence and shape their lives. This helps to shape a person’s values relative to those held in society, and may influence how they choose to view their individualistic lives as “normal.” Since parents often exert the greatest amount of influence on the child, parents or other role models can have a most significant impact on the nature of the child’s upbringing and his or her eventual roles in society. The attachment part of this theory is critical in view of the fact that children do not always forge positive influential bonds with their parents and instead rely on peers to avoid deviating from society’s norms. Hirshi (1969) also proposed that schools play an important role in influencing society’s conventional values. Middle-class children see themselves as better than lower-class children, and are taught in schools (schools, being a normative middle- or upper-class institution) that they must strive to be smarter than those less fortunate than themselves so as to not fall to that lower level. Middle-class children also tend to demoralize lower-class children who already experience poorer academic-readiness skills and lower levels of school achievement (Mcloyd & Duke, 1998). This attitude is learned from the school environment and can even dictate how teachers act. Mcloyd and Duke (1998) reported that these negative effects can render attempts at education beyond high school more difficult for lower-class students by making lower-class students believe they are not worthy of higher education and by increasing their experience of acute and chronic stressors. This standard of living that results from an interaction of all these factors can be passed down from one generation to the next (Hirschi, 1969).
This hierarchical environment also results in individuals who do not conform to societal norms, thus decreasing their overall attachment to family and friends over time. A decreased tendency for the individual to not conform to societal norms can be the result of job status, marital status, and a general lack of effective personal support systems. When an individual has a support system including family, friends, and ties that may bind them to society, then conformity goes up and crime goes down (Hirschi, 1969).

Parental Attachment and Delinquency

Sociologists have theorized about the importance of social attachment along with individual cohesion for some time (Deflem, 2007; Durkheim, 1938). Merton (1938) first introduced this new theoretical approach regarding social anomie in a publication named the “Social Structure and Anomie.” Similar to Durkheim’s ideas on anomie, Merton asserted that a social system’s malfunctioning was certainly influential as regards individuals in the sense that it may generate anti-social behavior due to the, “dissociation of culturally defined goals and socially structured means” (Merton, 1938, p. 674). It has since been determined that individuals must achieve strong social attachments in order to thrive.

Such societal influences should begin in the home with the parents and these have a direct influence on children as they mature. In order to abide by societal norms parents must achieve conformity and pass this on to their children. If this is not accomplished in the home then these children may begin a new division of a non-conforming generation by entering into criminal activities. Many of these children may then find themselves involved in gang-related activities because this is where they find their “fit” in society; this involvement in turn, leads to
non-conformity with the “normal” society and greater involvement in the criminal justice system. These children also continue to not meet “normal” conformity standards by not completing their education and by their basic failure to thrive within their communities (Thornberry, 1987). Individuals who follow the path of societal norms may still find it difficult to generate the required income needed to take care of their personal and family needs. Yet these individuals still appear to find greater personal satisfaction in life while conforming to societal norms in spite of poverty.

Parents who conform to societal norms and pass these values on to their children find that their children thrive in society (McLanahan & Booth, 1991). Open conversation between children and parents (including taboo topics) also appears to have a direct connection to the child’s ability to function well in society. Parents who exhibit a strong support system within both the family and community convey this trait to their children where it becomes the expected family norm, leading to both familial and societal conformity for the child (McLanahan & Booth, 1991).

The literature reveals that a low level of attachment in family relationships is one of the most significant predictors of delinquency (Hirschi, 1969). Lack of trust also negatively affects parental intimacy and attachment. What matters most is not necessarily that a child is attached to his or her parents or school environment, but that he or she feels attachment to a figure who displays strong, positive intentions and life decisions. A child who feels a strong attachment to a law-abiding parent who acts in a neighborly manner is much more likely to become a functional citizen of society than a child who feels a strong attachment to a delinquent parent who does not share the same views as the “normal” community. The issue is not solely based on the level
of attachment the child feels towards his or her surroundings, but also the quality of the standards set by those surroundings (Hirschi, 1969).

Social norms are embraced through dialogue between parents and children (McLanahan & Booth, 1991; Rankin & Kern, 1994). Coleman (1990) posits that the child’s norms, individual obligations and duties in society will rely on the relationships between adults and children. Effective interactions and open dialogue between parents and children can largely be attributed to parents’ important influence on children in terms of shaping their life course (Wright et al., 2001).

Scholars such as Hirschi (1995), McCord (1982), Nye (1958), and Shaw and McKay (1932) have discussed factors including the family structure, the role of female-headed households, disrupted families, and parental monitoring in their delinquency-associated research. They concluded that the effect of single-parent homes on delinquency is the most powerful of these factors. Other studies reported in a meta-analysis of 50 different studies that examined the effects of broken families on delinquency (McLanahan & Booth, 1991; Rankin & Kern, 1994; Thornberry, Smith, Rivera, Huizinga, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1999), demonstrated family disruption is significantly related to delinquency and that broken homes have a significant impact on delinquency. Rankin and Kern (1994) found that a child living within a single-parent home is more likely to commit crimes than a child living in an intact home. These studies suggest that the relationship between family structure and the probability of involvement in delinquent acts might have a direct negative effect among minors.

On the other hand, Sampson and Wilson (1995) also illuminated factors explaining the issue of race and violent crimes that remain controversial, such as the ecological concentration
of ghetto poverty, racial segregation, residential mobility and population turnover, family
disruption, and the dimension of local social organization. Social disorganization is transmitted
into ghetto environments through the effects of ethnic heterogeneity, family disruption, and
residential mobility, among other factors. The theory of social disorganization acknowledges
the ecological concentration of poverty. A ghetto environment fosters situations such as
joblessness, racial segregation, and poverty. The proportion of black families raised in single-
parent families is over 50% (Sampson & Wilson, 1995).

This issue is also affected by family income, although not always directly. A family’s
income will not necessarily predict the level of child delinquency, but families who struggle to
put food on the table will undoubtedly struggle to maintain control of their children (Agnew,
1992). Agnew (1992) argues that it is incredibly difficult to feed a regular-sized family on a
minimum wage, meaning many lower-class parents are required to take second or third jobs.
This leaves less time for parental guidance and quality time with children. Similarly, Samson and
Wilson (1995) imply that it would seem virtually impossible for a hard-working parent from a
low-income family to provide the care and attention needed to produce well-adjusted children,
even without considering the staggering rate of divorce and single-parent families in the lower
class.

Not only do parents in broken families need to work with ex-spouses in order to
coordinate the care and mentoring of their children, but they must work even harder to
support themselves - this leaves even less time to watch after their offspring (Cao, Cao, & Zhao,
2004; Hannon & DeFronzo, 1998). Studies find that parental income is directly related to
juvenile delinquency (Hannon & DeFronzo, 1998).
Hoffman (1994) found that juveniles who reported greater attachment to parents and spending more time with parents were less likely to report higher levels of marijuana use than juveniles who reported less attachment to parents and spending less time with parents. Another empirical research study produced similar findings in relation to the effects of parental attachment on delinquency. In terms of the relationship between parental attachment and delinquency, Hoffman (1995) found that juveniles who experienced parental divorce or remarriage of their single parent reported less attached to their parents and spent less time with them, while juveniles tended to spend more time with delinquent peers who were more likely to report higher levels of substance use.

In another study employing the National Youth Survey, Wright et al. (2001), found that juveniles who spent more time with their parents and received more parental efforts for their educational success were less likely to report lower levels of delinquency than those who spent less time with their parents and received less parental support. Likewise, Salmi and Kivivuori (2006) found consistent similar findings regarding the negative association between parental support and juvenile delinquency. Furthermore, in relation to the effects of stronger parent-child interactions (or relationships) on delinquency, Wright and Fitzpatrick (2006) found that teenagers with stronger parent-child relationships and school affiliations tended to exhibit lower levels of delinquency including engaging in serious delinquent activities.

Peer Relations and Delinquency

Peer relationships are another important aspect of attachment in Hirschi’s social bonding theory. According to Hwang and Akers (2003), minors with strong and close socially
conforming peer friendships are less likely to be involved in delinquency than those who have few close friends.

Sutherland and Cressey (2006) found a direct relationship between peer influence and delinquent behaviors. That is, if the adolescent’s friends exhibited non-conforming behavior this increased the likelihood that the individual would conform to pressure from peer relations exhibited by friends rather than those exhibited by society (Hwang & Akers, 2003). Parental involvement includes functions such as limiting access to friends who may be exhibiting delinquent behavior. Parents who screen their children’s friends find that limiting involvement with friends who exhibit high risk behaviors prevents their own children’s involvement in the criminal justice system.

Within the past decade an increasing number of influential scholars have argued for the existence of a relationship between the influence of peers and delinquent behavior (Haynie, 2001; Svensson, 2003; Weerman & Bijleveld, 2007; Weerman & Smeenk, 2005; Osgood & Anderson, 2005; Svensson & Oberwittler, 2010; Rose & Rudolph, 2006; Wong et al., 2010). This issue is considered one of the most debated topics in the social sciences, including criminology and sociology (Agnew, 2009; War, 2002). Many studies have also taken into account the role of peers among boys and girls by examining the influence of delinquent behavior in detail (Agnew, 2009; Eliot, 2010; Weerman & Hoeve, 2012; Junger-Tas et al., 2004; Moffitt et al. 2001). Eliot (2010) found that involvement in delinquency among girls and boys differed in terms of biological differences, cultural expectations and role patterns, competitiveness, and vulnerability.
Sutherland and Cressey (2006) found that the reverse was also true; children who were involved with overachieving friends tended to be overachievers. These children’s involvement in school programs as their highest level of societal involvement at this age was accordingly above and beyond what may have been required. Similarly, Sutherland and Cressey (2006) found that individuals learn criminal acts or deviance via relationships with individuals or peers from the same group; this highlights the importance of strong attachments to positive versus negatively achieving peers in the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

Nevertheless, available evidence proposes there is a significant relationship of drug addicted friendships and the initiation of drug use (Simons-Morton & Chen, 2006). Simons-Morton and Chen, (2006) found that among students who attended 6th and 9th grades who were involved in social networks with delinquent peers were more likely to be associated with substance use. In illuminating the relationships between peer attachment and delinquency, they also reported that drug-addicted minors tend to assemble with drug users’ friends. According to the findings from data from a 21 year longitudinal study of a birth cohort of New Zealand children, it should also be noted that juveniles who reported greater attachments to deviant peers were more likely to be abuse nicotine, marijuana, and alcohol, and be involved in violent crimes and property crimes (Fergusson, Swain-Campbell, & Horwood, 2002).

As outlined above, in terms of the role of the interaction with dissimilar persons, Rice, Donohew, and Clayton (2003) stated that group members may apply pressure towards newcomers by influencing their attitudes and behaviors. This could potentially provide both negative and positive outcomes for juveniles. Minors who report greater attachment to
highly motivated and successful peers tend to attach to their school and teachers (Hanish, Barcelo, Martin, Fabes, Holmwall, & Palermo, 2007). On the other hand, minors who report greater involvement in gang groups are more likely to report involvement in delinquent actions (Aseltine, 1995).

As demonstrated above, sustaining group homogeneity and discounting unusual behaviors among delinquent peer groups are main factors influencing delinquency (Hoffman, Sussman, Unger, & Valente, 2006; Steglich, Snijders, & Pearson, 2010). Several studies have examined the significant effect of the time spent with delinquent friends on the assimilation level of juveniles (Poelen et al., 2007). According to Poelen et al. (2007), non-delinquent adolescents who spent more time with delinquent peers were more likely to pursue the consent of peers for integration. In explaining why a higher level of peer influence and assimilation made non-delinquent adolescents seek approval of delinquent peers, the answer was related to them receiving greater pressure from their delinquent peers.

It has been found that adolescents who socialize with more delinquent friends are consistently more likely to report involvement in more deviant behaviors than adolescents who report a lower degree of attachment to delinquent friends (Ennett, Bailey, & Federman, 1999). Ennett, Bailey, and Federman (1999) also found that adolescents who report having friendship or relations with drug-addicted peers are more likely to report drug use compared to those having no friendship relations with drug-addicted peers. Likewise, Gordon et al. (2004) indicated that adolescents who reported greater attachment to gangs were more likely to report involvement in more deviant acts. However, once those adolescents abandoned their gangs, they were less likely to report involvement in delinquency.
School Attachment and Delinquency

Within the context of the relationship between school attachment and juvenile delinquency, studies have found that a child’s school attachment significantly reduces the likelihood of delinquency (Cao, Cao & Zhao, 2004; Hirschi, 1969).

Some empirical studies report that if a tie with school and family is weak or shattered then this could cause a person to engage in minor delinquency activities (Ford, 2009; Hirschi, 1969; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Lin & Dembo, 2008). Not only do parents face enormous obstacles in giving their children proper guidance, but they have a much harsher environment to protect their children from to begin with. Individuals living in poverty cannot afford to live in nice neighborhoods with lower crime rates or good public schools. Areas of poverty are more often inhabited by drug dealers and criminals, all of which can negatively influence children who are not under adequate family supervision. However, these criminals may not be the only negative influence these children are subjected to.

Chamlin and Cochran (2007) confirm that when noneconomic institutions such as the family, schools, and polity are strong then the effects of economic pressure on both property crimes and violent crimes are weaker. A child’s home life is not the only place where he or she will learn what behaviors are deemed socially acceptable. A major place of moral development is the educational environment, particularly for adolescents. They build both positive and negative connections with their peers and teachers, and constantly observe the actions of others in order to determine how they should act. This effect is also somewhat biased based on class, although usually not intentionally. Lower-class students are often “picked on” by their
classmates and teachers from more financially successful families, building a negative connection with the ideals of individuals who tend to have more conventional lives.

When a child is pigeonholed as a no-good lower-class citizen that child is forced to interact with the only people left who understand his or her plight. These social outcasts are typically more prone to delinquent behaviors simply because they have fewer people who care deeply about their futures. For example: a child is presented with the opportunity to steal money from the school’s office. When considering whether or not to go through with it the child will more than likely consider what the school faculty and administration will think if they do. If the child is already convinced that these effective higher powers are already set against him or her then he or she will be considerably more likely to participate in the aforementioned delinquent activity (Buysse, 1997).

There are consistent findings in the literature regarding the effects of school attachment and effects on delinquent behaviors. In fact, Coleman articulates six different ways school attachment is affected: relations among students, among teachers, among parents, between teachers and students, between students and parents, and between teachers and parents. Coleman (1990) indicates that greater attachment between students, parents, and teachers is an explanatory predictor of students’ achievement.

In terms of parental monitoring, it has been consistently found that higher amounts of parental monitoring have a more positive affect on an adolescent’s behavior than limited monitoring. In reference to students’ behaviors, Coleman (1990) stated an adolescent who attended a private school was more likely to report a higher degree of parental monitoring than an adolescent that attended a public school.
School activities play a major role in inhibiting students from antisocial behaviors (Payne, Gottfredson, & Gottfredson, 2003). It has been consistently found that students who join in school activities report greater attachment to the school and their teachers, which impedes students from involvement in delinquent activities (Payne, Gottfredson, & Gottfredson, 2003). With respect to school attachment, (Bryk et al., 1994) found that adolescents who reported a higher level of participation in school activities reported a lower level of discipline problems and less involvement in gang activities.

Research also provides support for the statement that school attachment is negatively associated with deviant behaviors (Buysse, 1997). There is substantial evidence in the literature that greater attachment to school decreases the number of smoking students (Donohew et al., 1999). Likewise, a strong relation with non-delinquent peers and teachers has been proven to have an important effect on lowering levels of property crimes (Nakhaie & Sacco, 2009). Hence, these explanations imply there is likely to be a strong association between a student’s level of school attachment and their well-being.

Another empirical research study produced similar findings in relation to the effects of school attachment, parental attachment and religious attachment on students’ well-being behavior. Coleman (1990) claimed that the achievement of Catholic schools was based on the greater attachment of the parents of these children to the school and religion. In reference to parental attachment, adolescents’ parents who attend religious activities in a Catholic school report a higher amount of parental monitoring and religious attachment than those who attend public schools. These premises, therefore, imply positive outcomes for the relationship
between school attachments, participating in religious activities, parental attachment and students’ well-being.

Attachment to peers, schools, religion, teachers, and parents can help an individual to better understand the rules and norms of society. These components will also establish a mechanism that decides what is or is not normal within society.

Religious Attachment and Delinquency

Hirschi and Stark (1969) found that minors who reported greater attachment to basic moral values and an acceptance of conventional authority were less likely to use marijuana or alcohol. Their findings revealed that “the church is irrelevant to delinquency because it fails to instill in its members love for their neighbors” (1969, p. 212).

Previous literature demonstrates that an individual’s religiosity (measured in terms of religious involvement such as religious service attendance, participation in religious, events and opinions regarding the importance of religion) influences the likelihood of delinquent activity (Hawkins et al., 1988; Jessor, 1976; Johnson et al., 2001). Hawkins et al. (1988), and Johnson et al. (2001) found that adolescents who report greater attachment to religion are less likely to report involvement in delinquency specifically illicit drug use than adolescents who are less attached to religion.

religiosity is less likely to be associated with delinquency than a child who reports weak attachment to religion when controlling for social demographic variables such as the child’s gender, family structure, size, parental income, ethnicity, and parental education. In turn, these findings reveal that a child’s religiosity has a significant direct effect on delinquency.

Ross argues that social institutions foster social control (as cited in Deflem, 2007). Similar to Durkheim, Ross places his emphasis on social institutions such as religion and specifically education (as cited in Deflem, 2007). Ross perceives that these social institutions apply to everyone in society rather than solely to criminals who violate normative expectations. Ross’s analysis of social control is developed within a background of awareness of social problems such as urbanization, poverty, alcoholism, and prostitution (as cited in Deflem, 2007).

The concept of religiosity has been tested as a key predictor of deviance during adolescence (Thornberry & Khron, 1997). Data from the National Survey of Children (NSC) analyzed religiosity’s effect on deviance by examining reconstituted, disrupted, and stable families. Zill, Furstenberg, Peterson, and Moore (1990) conducted a three-wave panel study in 1976, 1981, and 1987 respectively from 48 contiguous states. Items associated with religiosity related to the frequency of children’s attendance at religious services (including Sunday school or other religious class, how much they liked or disliked going to church or synagogue, and the importance of religion and belief in the Holy Scriptures from the Bible) were used to measure the concept of attachment to religion. The study’s findings revealed that individuals with greater attachment to religion during childhood and adolescence were less likely to report involvement in delinquent acts than individuals with weak attachments.

2 Religiosity can also be measured by responses to survey questions that ask about frequency of praying, frequency of reading the holy texts, religious services attendance and taking part in religious activities other than services.
Participation in religious organizations provides social interaction among individuals. In these religious activities are viewed as constructive activities for individuals to meet individuals from diverse social backgrounds and interact with each other. Besides that, these activities include a kind of extracurricular education, which is linked to moral values (Putnam, 2000). According to Putnam (2000), adolescents with strong moral values are less likely to report involvement in delinquent activities than those with weak moral values. Thus, adolescents who are attached to religion or participate in religious activities tend to inhibit themselves from deviant behaviors.

Commitment

Individuals need to abide by societal agreement to conventional forms of behavior, rules and norms, including both legal behavior and avoiding disrespect by meeting society’s expected obligations in order to have a functional society. This idea connects to attachment because the values we learn from attachment can be used throughout the remainder of our lives to obey society’s normal functions. When we learn the difference between right and wrong (at least in the way we are taught) this has a significant effect on how we place ourselves within “normal” society. For example, if a child is reared with regular exposure to drugs, it would not be surprising if he or she became involved with drugs when older because of the greater likelihood that he or she was taught that drug use is normal in society (Burton et al., 1995).

Commitment refers to achieving good grades in core subjects, spending more time on homework, and pursuing future and educational ambition activities (Hirschi, 1969; Sigfusdottir, Thorlindsson, & Bjarnason, 2007; Thorlindsson, Bjornson, & Sigfusdottir, 2007; Thorlindsson &
Vilhjalmsson, 1991). These factors can prevent adolescents from engaging in deviant acts. The aforementioned studies assert that individuals with strong commitments to these ambition factors are not likely to have time available to engage in deviant behaviors (Alston, Debra, & Karen, 1996; Hirschi, 1969).

*Involvement*

Involvement is the third component of Hirschi’s social bonding theory and is defined as the choice for an individual to become involved in socially acceptable or conventional behaviors versus deviant or counter-normal behavior. The amount of time and effort an individual puts into these activities are key factors in support of this theory (Hirschi, 1969). The difference between the amounts of conventional activities a person engages in will affect his or her engagement in deviant activities. People will have more time to consider deviant activities if they do not engage in sports, school, or other conventional activities (Williams & McShane, 2004). Likewise, this ties into a person’s family involvement in social life.

A number of tests have indicated that this theory finds support in explaining various types of deviance among teenagers. A variety of additional studies sustain the assertion of a causal relationship between involvement in conventional activities and criminality. Hirschi (1969) and Akers (2000) both proposed that a lower degree of involvement in conventional activities is consistent with engaging in criminal activity.

Sims (2002) used the involvement element of Hirschi’s social bonding theory to investigate employee delinquency. According to Hollinger (1986), involvement can be analyzed as organizational tenure. Likewise, Sims (2002) found that organizational tenure is a
noteworthy factor in the probability of employee delinquency. Sims’ study revealed that employees with longer tenure were more likely to have better involvement in the organization than those with shorter tenure. However, tenure seems to be a better measurement of organizational commitment since those workers would also have better benefits including retirement funds and higher salaries, vacation pay, and promotion opportunities. As such, these employees do not want to jeopardize their benefits by breaching their responsibilities toward the organization. Salaries tend to be higher with longer term employment; as are retirement, disability and vacation benefits, and promotion opportunities are often linked to tenure. Tenure may consequently be a better measure of commitment than involvement.

Moreover, Lin and Dembo (2008) posit that involvement in school-based, community-based, faith-based, and other conventional activities will not leave any time available to commit crimes. Findings from an analysis of the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse revealed that greater involvement in club activities, school activities, church activities and events, and neighborhood organizations was correlated with lesser involvement in marijuana use.

The literature on the relationship between involvement in conventional activities and delinquency has not gained sufficient attention, and the components of the social bonding theory have not been equally examined in previous studies (Kempf, 1993). The literature on social bonding primarily focuses on family attachment, whereas the least investigated and researched component of social bonding refers to individual involvement in delinquent behaviors among adolescents (Hindelang, 1973; Kempf, 1993).

Barber, Stone, and Eccles (2005), indicated a strong negative relationship between the effects of involvement in conventional activities on problem behaviors. The effects of
participation in conventional activities such as going to social clubs (Fleming et al., 2008; Thorlindsson & Bernburg, 2006,) participation in sports (Thorlindsson & Bernburg, 2006) on adolescents are highly constructive in quite a few ways, such as having them occupied by engaging in challenging tasks, expressing their skills, having a vital social network, getting a positive identity, building friendships, and constructing social boundaries. Likewise, Marsh and Kleitman (2003) discussed the fact that involvement in conventional activities tends to generate perceptions of control.

There is solid evidence that the effects of leisure activities are instrumental in constructing adolescents’ common values (Barber et al., 2005; Marsh & Kleitman, 2003). Another factor regarding common values is related to how adolescents’ friendship groups are determined by participating in leisure activities including going to parties, going to the movies, hanging out with friends, participation in sports clubs, riding for fun, going out in the evenings, going to youth centers and participating in entertainment with live music. Juveniles who participate in extracurricular activities tend to have more intellectual friends and less drug-addicted friends than those who do not attend such activities (Eccles & Barber, 1999).

Therefore, the previous research findings in relation to the effects of leisure activities or greater involvement in conventional activities on delinquent behavior appear conclusive.

Belief in Conventional Moral Order

The fourth and final element of Hirschi’s social bonding theory is that if a person is involved in society it will be unlikely that he or she will be motivated to deviate from their groups’ common values (Hirschi, 1969). It is believed that individuals should not question why society accepts certain behaviors, but not others, as long as they participate in the acceptable
safe zone. This acknowledges the approval of social values and rules so that a person feels as if obeying the rules is the right thing to do (Akers, 2000; Alston, Debra, & Karen, 1995; Hirschi, 1969). This tendency to follow normality without question is the final stage of social bonding and connects back with the other three stages. Bonds exist in all aspects of society and can be discussed at any juncture (Hirschi, 1969). When any of these bonds are broken then deviance or a shift from normality can occur (Hirschi, 1969).

Individuals who possess a strong attachment to society and the community follow the rules and the norms of society, thereby having better long-term outcomes (Akers, 2000; Hirschi, 1969). The results of societal conformity are decreased crime rates and these individuals tend to have respect for both themselves and the community. Non-conforming individuals who lack societal attachment may find themselves involved in criminal activities, stereotyped by law enforcement and shunned by their communities (Akers, 2000; Alston, Debra, & Karen, 1995; Hirschi, 1969).

Existing studies have examined the influence of perceived family values, family systems, and peer approval of substance use and their relationship to delinquency (Alson & Turer, 1994; Kaplan, Martin, & Robbins, 1982). Jestor (1976) found that the effects of these factors either reduced or increased engagement in delinquency. His study showed that reduced family and friend approval for substance use was negatively associated with delinquency. Another empirical study from a three-wave survey conducted in 1971, 1972, and 1973, respectively, including a sample of 3,148 high school students in Houston, Texas, USA suggested that the multiple aspects of feeling rejection by the family and the likelihood of substance use were both associated with delinquency (Kaplan, Martin, & Robbins, 1982).
Sociodemographic Variables Related to Delinquency

When assessing the probability of delinquency among adolescents, the literature describes a number of factors, including: age, gender, parental education, religion preferences, and parental income as socio-demographic control variables. However, there is no mention of political preferences among adolescents. Estimating the crime frequency for the group of minors’ political preferences may not apply as a control variable since previous literature sources have generally not examined the issue of a minor’s political views (Kempf, 1993; Wadsworth, 2000).

Most previous studies have examined the direct effect of age on delinquency. Many studies have concluded there is a strong relationship between the age of a teenager and the use of alcohol, becoming involved in serious physical fights, larceny of an item valued at more than fifty dollars, sexual offenses, and vandalism (Cattarello, 2000; Kierkus & Baer, 2002; Wadsworth, 2000). Age is considered one of the most effective control factors in the explanation of delinquency (Hartjen & Priyadarsini, 2003) and is significantly related to delinquency.

Gender is considered one of the most influential significant control variables. Previous studies have reported that gender has the greatest impact on delinquency followed by age and parental income. In general, males are more likely to be engaged in delinquency; in contrast, females are less likely to be involved in delinquency (Hartjen & Priyadarsini, 2003; McNulty & Bellair, 2003; Svensson, 2003; Thaxton & Agnew, 2004; Vazsonyi & Pickering, 2003, Yilmaz,
However, Hirshi’s social bonding theory is criticized by scholars for not involving females in analyses of juvenile delinquency (Chesney-Lind, 1997).

Sampson and Wilson’s (1995) study examined the link between the issues of race and violent crime. They employed a theoretical strategy that incorporated structural cultural arguments regarding race, crime, and urban inequality in American cities (1995). They found that race and violent crimes were both vital to the study since statistics revealed differences between the leading causes of death among young black males and the lifetime risk of being murdered compared to white males (U.S. Department of Justice). These statistics among young black males were also worse when compared to residents of rural Bangladesh. These statistics generally clearly indicated that African Americans were frequently incarcerated in association with the drug war and street crime (Sampson & Wilson, 1995). Similarly, Weber, Miracle and Tom (1995) focused on family bonding and delinquency, placing their emphasis on the impact of racial and ethnic differences among US youth. They sought to understand the cultural sensitivity of Hirschi’s social bonding theory among different ethnic race groups.

According to Hirchi (1969) these factors cause individuals to become involved in varying forms of crime and delinquency behaviors. In impoverished neighborhoods, black individuals are not attached to others. The question is, “what is their commitment to the neighborhood?” This issue is followed by questioning their involvement in community activities, and finally how this person’s beliefs fit with the morals and norms of the community? Control theory responds to the highlighted questions in explaining that some people and some groups or organizations typically have more control over their lives compared to other individuals, groups, or organizations.
In their analysis of religious preferences and religiosity, Hirschi and Stark (1969) found that attachment to basic moral values was strongly related to delinquency among minors. Their previous study conducted on 434 male and 421 female senior class students in three Pacific Northwest high schools located in predominantly white neighborhoods found a moderately strong relationship between religion and the likelihood of delinquency among adolescents (Burkett & Mervin, 1974). Hirschi’s examination of religion and delinquency was criticized for not finding a clear relationship between these measures since illegal acts are no longer condemned by all segments’ or secular religious groups (Burkett & Mervin, 1974). They replicated Hirshi’s and Stark’s examination and found a moderately strong relationship between religion and the likelihood of delinquency among high-school students (Burkett & Mervin, 1974).

Previous Social Bonding and Patterns of Juvenile Delinquency Studies in Turkey

The influence of social bonding components on delinquency rates have been taken into account by many Turkish scholars, particularly for delinquency prevention efforts among high school students (Özbay & Özcan, 2008; Ögel, Tamar, Evren & Çakmak, 2001). Prevention programs have been established in order to reduce crime rates, and to generate accountable data from both private and governmental organizations.

Özbay and Özcan (2008) compared male and female delinquency by examining the role of social bonding components. Addressing the issue of the association between social bonding components and male and female delinquency in the context of Turkey, Özbay and Özcan (2008) used data collected from 1,710 high school students from the central districts of Ankara,
Turkey. Özbay and Özcan (2008) found that male adolescents were more likely to engage in delinquent acts than female adolescents when concerning attachment to teachers, attachment to conventional others, school commitment, and spending 15 or more hours on homework per week. Their findings support the view that the social bonding variables of attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief accordingly have a greater impact among male high school students than female high school students. However, this information may not be suitable for understanding crime and delinquency in the context of Kurdish structures. In this present study, I addressed this gap by examining the mediating effect of social bonding on delinquent behaviors among Kurdish teenagers.

Ögel, Tamar, Evren, and Çakmak (2001) conducted a study using a sample of 18,599 Turkish tenth grade students in 15 Turkish cities in 1998. Their findings revealed that variation rates of delinquent acts such as tobacco, alcohol, and drug use was different among cities of Turkey among high school students. According to Table 1, the more delinquent cities are Izmir, Diyarbakir, Istanbul, and Mugla, respectively.
Table 1

*Lifetime Marijuana Use Prevalence by Cities, Turkish Tenth Grade Students, 1998*

(N = 18,599)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Lifetime marijuana use ratio (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adana</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>2159</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antalya</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denizli</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diyarbakir</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erzurum</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskisehir</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>7341</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kocaeli</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malatya</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugla</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sivas</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trabzon</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ögel, Taner, and Eke (2006) also used data collected from 3,483 students in 43 high schools in Istanbul, Turkey in 2004 to study tobacco, alcohol, and drug use among the tenth grade high school students. Their findings revealed that the participation rate in delinquent acts varied among high schools in Istanbul. Approximately 40% of high school students had used marijuana between 2 and 5 times within their lifetime. Similar to the previous literatures’ replicated findings, gender and age were significantly related to the probability of delinquency. Male students were more likely to engage in delinquent acts than female students.

Research related to high school students is consistently reported regarding apprehension, theft, and robbery in order to examine delinquent behavior in high school and its effect on society. Ögel et al. (2003) and Ögel et al. (2004) found that marijuana usage was higher in private schools. Students from private schools are expected to come from well-
educated and higher social economic status families. The relationship between delinquent peer affiliations, parental income, and delinquent behavior in the private schools resulted in serious delinquency.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion provided above, the literature reviewed demonstrates that social bonding theory has extensively contributed to the understanding of teenagers’ deviant actions. Social bonding theory has received much attention by researchers who have highlighted the effects of strong social relationships with parents, teachers and other sources of conventional socialization on delinquency. Social bonding theory specifies ways to control and measure delinquency by focusing on and explaining why adolescents with greater attachment, involvement, commitment and belief are less likely to be involved in delinquent activities.
CHAPTER III
DATA, METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

Chapter III provides detailed information concerning the research methodology, sample, data collection, informed consent, study instruments. The chapter also explains the dependent and independent variables. Finally, it concludes with the data analysis.

Data Source

The relationship between social bonding and the likelihood of major and minor delinquency among Kurdish teenagers was tested. Data on the nature/degree of social bonding and self-reported major and minor delinquencies were collected from a sample 100 Kurdish teens attending a Gülen affiliated school and 100 Kurdish teens attending a public (non- Gülen) school. Data measured the four elements of the social bond, self-reported major and minor delinquency, and also included demographic information such as gender, age, ethnicity, education, and parents’ education level.

Sample

The sample consisted of 100 Kurdish teens attending a Gülen affiliated school (Private Çaglayan Murat Anatolian Science High School- in Şanlıurfa, Turkey), and 100 Kurdish teens attending a public or non- Gülen school (the Public High School in Diyarbakır, Turkey). This served as a comparison group. Schools were selected through availability sampling and personal contacts of the researcher. Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa are one of the largest and major
cities in eastern Turkey. Overall, crime rates in Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa are higher than that of other cities in the eastern part of Turkey.

Within the Public High School, an average of 32 students are assigned per classroom. There are five classrooms from the 10th grade group, four from the 11th grade group, and four from the 12th grade group. After sorting 13 classrooms in order, the RAND function were used in Excel to select cases randomly. My random sample, without replacement, consisted of 10, 5, 9, and 7 which were 12A, 10E, 11D and 11B. Without replacement, once an object was picked, it can never be picked again. From randomly selected classes, every available student in that classroom who was eligible for survey or had obtained parental consent was surveyed. Sampling continued until 100 participants had been surveyed. This study was unable to reach a sample size of 100 students; instead, the survey continued gathering responses from the fifth random selection which was classroom 10B.

Within the Private Çaglayan Murat Anatolian Science High School, an average of 21 students are assigned per classroom. There are five classrooms for the 10th grade group, the 11th grade group, and the 12th grade group. After sorting the 15 classrooms respectively, the RAND function was used in Excel for random selection. My random sample, without replacement, consisted of the numbers 11, 10, 5, 6, and 12 which were then represented by classrooms 12A, 11E, 10E, 11A and 12B. From five randomly selected classes, every available student who was eligible for the survey or had parental consent in that classroom was surveyed. This study was unable to reach a sample size of 100 students; instead, the survey continued gathering responses from the fifth random selection which was 12C.

---

3 In Turkey, the second year of high school is equivalent to the 10th grade. The third year of high school is equivalent to the 11th grade, and the fourth year of high school is equivalent to the 12th grade.
Informed Consent

For this project, two different consent forms were prepared. One was the Kurdish Teenagers Consent Form. It was administered to Kurdish teenagers under 18 years of age. The form required potential participants to acquire written permission from a parent or guardian prior to participating in the survey. This form was provided to the parent/guardian and contains information. Written permission from the parents/guardians was obtained through school administrators and personnel. The second consent form was the Kurdish Adult Consent Form. It was for Kurdish participants over the age of 18. It asked participants to confirm that they are over the age of 18 and have legal authority to consent.

All participation in this project was anonymous. Both consent forms indicated that participation was strictly voluntary and confidential, and participants may withdraw from the survey at any time. The consent form was provided in Turkish. When the consent form was read, the researcher asked if they fully understood the proposed research and if they had any questions regarding the project. The consent forms had been written at an eighth grade reading level to better ensure that participants fully understood the proposed research and the scope of what they were consenting to.

Instruments

The survey consisted of 57 multiple-choice questions. The question format was patterned after previous studies, such as Kristjansson (2008) and the original questionnaire developed by Travis Hirschi (1969).
Data Collection

The researcher obtained permission from each school principal before quantitative data collection began. The school principal also obtained parental permission for minors. The school principal or teacher distributed parental permission forms to the students during class or a study hour. The respondents had to be in at least in his or her second year of high school in order to participate in this study. The researcher provided contact information including telephone number and email address in order to answer any questions or concerns regarding the survey. Either a teacher or the principle distributed the survey. The anticipated length of time required to complete the survey is a maximum of forty-five minutes.

The survey was completed during student study time conducted in a semi-informal classroom by students with signed consent forms or written parental consent forms. Eligible students were instructed to attend a particular study time that would allow them to complete the form with complete anonymity. In the consent form students were informed that no one would be able to know how they responded to the questions and their names would never be used, as well as that their participation in the study was strictly voluntary and confidential. If students felt uncomfortable at any time during the course of the survey they could decline to answer any question or end the survey entirely. Students who did not wish to participate or who did not have permission were gathered in another semi-informal classroom and permitted to work on their own projects at this time.

School administrators and personnel contacted parents during a routine or special parent-school conference where their child’s school progress and activities were discussed. The consent forms were provided to parents who permitted their child to participate in the survey.
Parents who could not attend the meeting were to be called by a school administrator and their child would be sent home with the consent form, which explains voluntary participation. Students were required to submit the signed consent form to their study hall teacher. Although parents may permit their teenager to participate, the teenager had the choice whether or not to participate of his or her own free will. Students who did want to participate but did not have written parental consent were not allowed to participate in the survey.

At the completion of the study time, the surveys were collected by the teacher at one point in time during November 2012 and placed in a signed and sealed envelope. The envelope was given to the school administrator and then mailed securely to the researcher. The researcher will maintain the data in a locked cabinet at the University of North Texas. The data is only available to those involved in the research. The surveys will be destroyed after three years from the completion of the study.

Measurement of the Variables

The dependent, independent, and control variables are measured by employing either five single or eleven composite measures which rely on the social bonding theory developed by Travis Hirschi and previous research by Kristjansson (2008). One hundred ten variables are coded in the same direction in order to analyze the research hypotheses. Nominal variables such as gender and involvement in the Gülen movement (variable label) were dichotomized. This study constructed eleven indexes, also known as composite measures, by averaging the response items. These items are listed below. The effects of the range of the averaged composite measures and the range of the original single measures are the same. However, the
averaged measures are easier to interpret than the summed ones (Sweet & Martin, 2011).

Internal consistency is employed to evaluate the consistency in response to seven items. Cronbach’s (1951) coefficient alpha (α) is the most common technique for measuring internal consistency. In this project Cronbach’s coefficient alphas were engaged in order to measure the reliability of each index independently. According to the literature Cronbach’s alpha values of .70 or higher are commonly recognized as acceptable values (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003). However, Pett, Lackey, and Sullivan (2003) note that lower reliability coefficient values are also accepted if including an item in an index is advocated by either a specific theory or previous research.

**Dependent Variables: Minor and Major Delinquency**

There are two dependent variables for this research project: Involvement in minor delinquency and involvement in major delinquency. A student is classified as minor delinquent if he or she reports having been involved in any minor delinquent action within the past thirty days. The inspected data are non-normal since the distributions of both dependent variables are highly skewed. Meyers, Gamst, and Guarino (2006) recommend the log transformation technique in order to normalize the problem. The log transformation technique is employed but positive skewness remains in the distribution of both dependent variables. In addition, logistic regression is appropriate for all types of predictor variables, such as interval/ratio, ordinal and dummy variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). The first dependent variable was measured at the interval-ratio level. Response categories to minor delinquency index range from “3 occasions” to “18 or more.” It was dichotomized then it was
coded as 0-1. Thus, it is set to 1 (1 = one or more times) if the respondent indicates involvement in any minor delinquent action and zero (0 = never) otherwise. For minor delinquency, three potential scale items are set including: smoking cigarettes (Q31), snuffing (Q33), and drinking alcohol (Q32). These three acts are considered as less severe actions by the Turkish Penal Code and are not subject to investigation by Turkish law enforcement agencies. Detailed information regarding minor delinquency is shown in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you smoked cigarettes in the last 31 days? (Q31)</td>
<td>1= Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= 1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= 2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= 3 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= 4 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6= &gt; 5 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you drunken alcohol during the last 30 days? (Q32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you snuffed in the last 30 days? (Q33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first dependent variable minor delinquency has acceptable reliability (reliability coefficient value of .706) for all three items of the composite measure score when using the conventional threshold of .70.

A student is classified as a major delinquent if he or she reports having been involved in any major delinquent action within the past twelve months. The second dependent variable is measured at the interval-ratio level and coded as 0 to 1. This variable is set to 1 (1=one or more times) if the respondent has been involved in delinquent action, and zero (0=never) otherwise.

Seven potential scale items are set covering major delinquency within the past 12 months including: larceny equal to less than the cost of four pounds of baklava (Q39), larceny
equal to more than the cost of four pounds of baklava (Q40), physically injuring another person (Q34), getting into a physical fight (Q35), breaking and entering a car (Q38), damaging property (Q36), and painting graffiti (Q37). These six offenses are determined as major crimes by the Turkish Penal Code and Turkish law enforcement agencies will investigate the case if any of these delinquent crimes occur. Detailed information regarding major delinquency is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

2nd Dependent Variable: Major Delinquency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months, how often did you physically injure someone else? (Q34)</td>
<td>1= Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months, how often did you get into a fight in which someone was hurt? (Q35)</td>
<td>2= 1 time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months, how often did you damage property on purpose that did not belong to you? (Q36)</td>
<td>3= 2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months, how often did you paint graffiti or signs on someone else’s property or on a public building? (Q37)</td>
<td>4= 3 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months, how often did you break into a car to steal something? (Q38)</td>
<td>5= 4 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months, how often did you steal something worth less than four pounds of baklava? (Q39)</td>
<td>6= &gt; 5 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the last 12 months, how often did you steal something worth more than four pounds of baklava? (Q40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second dependent variable major delinquency has acceptable reliability (reliability coefficient value of .721) for all seven items of the composite measure score when using the conventional threshold of .70.
Independent Variables

In this study, the components of social bonding theory attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief were used as independent variables.

Attachment

Five measures were used to exemplify attachment: peer attachment (Hwang & Akers, 2003), school attachment (Akers, 2000; Hirschi, 1969; Hwang & Akers, 2003; Kempf, 1993), religious attachment (Hirschi & Stark, 1969; Hwang & Akers, 2003, Shoemaker, 2009), and the relationship between parents and teenagers (Akers, 2000; Hirschi, 1969; Hwang & Akers, 2003; Kempf, 1993). The first three measures address various aspects of peer, school, and religious attachment respectively. Peer attachment was measure by responses to Items 5a, 5b, 5c, and 5d on the questionnaire. Items 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, and 1e measure the concept of school attachment. Items 2a, 2b, 2c, and 2e measure religious attachment. The last two address aspects of family attachment measured by responses to Items 3a, 3b, 4a, 4b, 4c, and 4d.

Detailed information regarding attachment is shown in Table 4.

All five attachment indexes have at least an acceptable level of internal consistency. The Cronbach’s alpha for parental attachment has acceptable reliability coefficient values of .797, for parental supervision .818, for school attachment .798, and for religion attachment and peer attachment .851 and .846 respectively.
Table 4

**Independent Variables: Attachment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Attachments</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| How easy or hard would it be for you to receive the following from your friends? | 1= Very Difficult  
2= Rather Difficult  
3= Rather Easy  
4= Very Easy |
| • Caring and warmth (Q5A)                                                  |                                     |
| • Advice about school (Q5B)                                               |                                     |
| • Advice about other issues (projects) of yours (Q5C)                      |                                     |
| • Assistance with things (Q5D)                                            |                                     |
| **School Attachment**                                                     |                                     |
| How well do the following statements apply to you?                        |                                     |
| • I like my school (Q1A) (reverse coded)                                  | 1= Applies always to me  
2= Applies often to me  
3= Applies sometimes to me  
4= Applies seldom to me  
5= Applies almost never to me |
| • I want to quit school (Q1B)                                             |                                     |
| • I want to change school (Q1C)                                           |                                     |
| • I do not get along with fellow students (Q1D)                           |                                     |
| • I do not get along with the teachers (Q1E)                              |                                     |
| **Attachment to Religion**                                                |                                     |
| How well do the following statements apply to you? (reverse coded)        |                                     |
| • I pray to God on a regular basis (Q2A)                                  | 1= Applies almost never to me  
2= Applies seldom to me  
3= Applies sometimes to me  
4= Applies often to me  
5= Applies always to me |
| • I regularly read in the holy writs of my faith (Q2B)                     |                                     |
| • I regularly attend religious services (Q2C)                             |                                     |
| • I regularly take part in religious activities other than services (Q2D) |                                     |
| **Parental Monitoring**                                                   |                                     |
| How well do the following statements apply to you?                        |                                     |
| • My parents know who I am with when I am away from home? (Q3A)           | 1= Applies very poorly to me  
2= Applies rather poorly to me  
3= Applies rather well to me  
4= Applies very well to me |
| • My parents know where I am in the evening when I am away from home? (Q3B) |                                     |
| **Parental Attachment**                                                   |                                     |
| How easy or hard would it be for you to receive the following from your parents? | 1= Very Difficult  
2= Rather Difficult  
3= Rather Easy  
4= Very Easy |
| • Caring and warmth (Q4A)                                                 |                                     |
| • Advice about school (Q4B)                                               |                                     |
| • Advice about other issues (projects) of yours (Q4C)                      |                                     |
| • Assistance with things (Q4D)                                            |                                     |
Involvement

The survey included five items analyzing how much time students spent on sport activities in school, participation in sports clubs, and activities away from home (Akers, 2000; Hwang & Akers, 2003; Hirschi, 1969; Kempf, 1993). These were measured by responses to Items 6, 7, 8a, 8b, and 8c on the questionnaire. The Cronbach’s alpha for the involvement index was acceptable (α = .70).

Respondent affiliation with the Gülen movement is a dummy variable and has two categories. It is coded "yes" for involvement with the Gülen movement and coded "no" if there is no involvement. This is measured by response to Item 9 on the questionnaire. Another item identifies the amount of time associated with Gülen movement related activities in school. This is measured by response to Item 11 on the questionnaire. Detailed information concerning different dimension of involvement is depicted in Table 5.

Commitment

Students were asked five sets of items in order to measure the concept of commitment in regards to the importance of getting good grades in core subjects (Akers 2000; Hwang & Akers, 2003). These questions concerned grades in math, language, and time spent on homework every day, as well as future and educational ambitions (Akers, 2000; Kempf, 1993). Commitment was measured by responses to Items 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18 on the questionnaire as formulated and adapted from previous studies (Akers, 2000; Hirschi, 1969). Detailed information regarding commitment is depicted in Table 6.
### Table 5

**Independent Variables: Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often do you go to the movies? (Q6)</td>
<td>1= Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Less than a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= 2 or 3 times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= Once or twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= Almost everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you play sports (such as soccer or basketball) in a sport club or team? (Q7)</td>
<td>1= Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= 3 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= 4-6 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6= &gt; 6 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you do the following?</td>
<td>1= Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= A few times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= A few times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= A few times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= 1-2 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6= &gt; 3 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Spend time downtown during the evening or on the weekends (Q8A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Go to a party (Q8B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Go to entertainments with live music (Q8C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the Gülen Movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you involved in the Gülen movement in any way? If no skip to question 12. (Q9)</td>
<td>0= No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1= Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much time do you spend on the Gülen movement related activities? (Q11)</td>
<td>1= Not involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Less than half hour a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= About one hour a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= About two hours a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= About hours a day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6= About four hours or &gt; a day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

*Independent Variables: Commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much time do you usually spend on homework every day? (Q14)</td>
<td>1= I never do any homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Less than half an hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= About half an hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= About one hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= About two hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6= About three hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7= About four hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8= &gt; 4 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What have your grades been in native language this semester? (Q15)</td>
<td>1= Less than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What have your grades been in mathematics this semester? (Q16)</td>
<td>2= About 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= About 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= About 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= About 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think you will do after graduating from high school? (Q17) (reverse coded)</td>
<td>1= Look for a job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Go to professional school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Go to University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important is it to you to earn a university degree? (Q18) (reverse coded)</td>
<td>1= Not important at all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2= Fairly unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3= Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4= Fairly important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5= Very important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Belief

Three group of items concerned approval levels toward legal norms (Akers, 2000; Alston, Harley & Lenhoff, 1995), parental reactions against stealing something worth more than four pounds of baklava, and parental reactions toward drinking alcohol. Approval level for legal norms was measured by responses to Items 23a, 23b, 23c, and 23d on the questionnaire. Parental reactions toward stealing were measured by responses to Items 21 and 22 on the questionnaire. Detailed information regarding belief is displayed in Table 6. The Cronbach’s
alpha for the parental reaction index was highly reliable (α = .903), and the Cronbach’s alpha for the legal norm index was sufficient (α = .785).

Table 7

**Independent Variables: Belief**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parental Reaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you think your parents would react if you stole something worth more than four pounds baklava? (Q21)</td>
<td>1= Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you think your parents would react if you would drink alcohol? (Q22)</td>
<td>2=Somewhat satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you think your parents would react if you would drink alcohol? (Q22)</td>
<td>3= They would not care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you think your parents would react if you would drink alcohol? (Q22)</td>
<td>4= Somewhat against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do you think your parents would react if you would drink alcohol? (Q22)</td>
<td>5= Totally against</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Norms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One can break most rules if they don’t seem to apply to you (Q23a).</td>
<td>1= Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I follow whatever rules I want to follow (Q23b.)</td>
<td>2= Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sometimes one needs to break rules in order to succeed (Q23c)</td>
<td>3= Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Following rules does not guarantee success (Q23d)</td>
<td>4= Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Following rules does not guarantee success (Q23d)</td>
<td>5= Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Control Variables**

To analyze the effects of each of the social bonding components, gender, age, father’s education level and mothers’ education level are included as a control for their moderating effects on likelihood of major and minor delinquency among Kurdish teens who have attended the Gülen affiliated school in Şanliurfa and the public school in Diyarbakır, Turkey.
The respondent’s gender is dichotomized. The respondent’s age is measured in years. The minimum participation age is 16 for this study. Therefore, age ranges between 16 and 18. Detailed information regarding control variables is shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>RESPONSE CATEGORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your sex? (Q41)</td>
<td>0= Female 1= Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How old are you? (Q42)</td>
<td>1= 16 2= 17 3= 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the highest level of schooling your</td>
<td>1= No schooling 2= Graduated from primary/secondary high school 3= Started vocational high school but has not finished 4= Graduated from vocational high school 5= Started university but has not finished 6= Graduated from a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father completed? (Q55) (reverse coded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the highest level of schooling your</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother completed? (Q56) (reverse coded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses

Independent variables
Social Bonding Components
Attachment Involvement Commitment Belief

Dependent Variables
Self-Reported Delinquency

Major Delinquency

Minor Delinquency

Figure 1. Conceptual model.

Using Hirschi’s social bonding theory and its four components, the following research hypotheses regarding the first dependent variable, minor delinquency were tested:
H1: Kurdish teenagers who report greater attachment to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others- are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who are less attached to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others-.

H2: Kurdish teenagers who report greater involvement in conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who report a lower degree of involvement in conventional activities.

H3: Kurdish teenagers who report greater commitment to conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teens who report a lower degree of commitment to conventional activities.

H4: Kurdish teenagers who report greater belief in conventional moral order are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who report a lower degree of belief in conventional moral order.

The following research hypotheses regarding the second dependent variable, major delinquency, were tested:

H5: Kurdish teenagers who report greater attachment to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others- are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who are less attached -to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others-.

H6: Kurdish teenagers who report greater involvement in conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who report a lower degree of involvement in conventional activities.

H7: Kurdish teenagers who report greater commitment to conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who report a lower degree of commitment to conventional activities.

H8: Kurdish teenagers who report greater belief in conventional moral order are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who report a lower degree of belief in conventional moral order.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Chapter IV presents the results of the analysis, including descriptive statistics, in order to gain an initial understanding of the nature of the collected data. These descriptive statistics include the variances, and ranges of variables in the analyses, as well as the distribution of responses. Secondly, the findings of the binary logistic regression analyses are presented, assessing the impacts of social bonding theory’s components on the likelihood of involvement in minor or major delinquency.

Table 9 presents the descriptive information concerning the frequency distributions, as well as the minimum and maximum values for all social bonding variables and control variables used in the regression analysis. The sample consisted of 200 cases and the data did not include any missing values.

Respondent Characteristics

As indicated in Table 9, there were a total of 200 Kurdish teenagers in the study, with 57% of them being male and 43% being female. Kurdish teenagers’ ages ranged from 16 to 18 years and the average age was 17 years. The majority of fathers’ education levels were “graduated from primary/secondary high school” (74.5%), whereas approximately 62% of the mothers’ education levels were “graduated from primary/secondary high school.” Respondents indicated 11% of their fathers and 28% of their mothers did not attend school.
Table 9

Descriptive Statistics  \((N = 200)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Like my school Recoded</th>
<th>Quit school</th>
<th>Change school</th>
<th>Not get along with fellow students</th>
<th>Not get along with fellow teachers</th>
<th>Pray on a regular basis</th>
<th>Read the Holy writs</th>
<th>Attend Religious Services</th>
<th>Take part in Religious activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applies always to me</td>
<td>134 (67%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>11 (6.5%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
<td>113 (56.5%)</td>
<td>102 (51%)</td>
<td>82 (41%)</td>
<td>61 (30.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies often to me</td>
<td>23 (11.5%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>13 (6.5%)</td>
<td>21 (10.5%)</td>
<td>43 (21.5%)</td>
<td>46 (23%)</td>
<td>38 (19%)</td>
<td>56 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies sometimes to me</td>
<td>33 (16.5%)</td>
<td>25 (12.5%)</td>
<td>27 (13.5%)</td>
<td>23 (11.5%)</td>
<td>42 (21%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>27 (13.5%)</td>
<td>34 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies seldom to me</td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>41 (20.5%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>42 (21%)</td>
<td>126 (63%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>13 (6.5%)</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>25 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies almost never to me</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>125 (62.5%)</td>
<td>120 (60%)</td>
<td>104 (52%)</td>
<td>126 (63%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>27 (13.5%)</td>
<td>24 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Minor delinquency</th>
<th>Major delinquency</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gülen Movement</th>
<th>Play Sports</th>
<th>Downtown</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Live Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (No)</td>
<td>183(91.5%)</td>
<td>172(85.1%)</td>
<td>92(45.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Yes)</td>
<td>17(8.5%)</td>
<td>28(13.9%)</td>
<td>108(53.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ( 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>54(27%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ( 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>91(45.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td>55(27.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52 (26%)</td>
<td>61 (31%)</td>
<td>95 (47.5%)</td>
<td>97 (48.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (18%)</td>
<td>46 (23%)</td>
<td>33 (16.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>41 (20.5%)</td>
<td>48 (24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52 (26%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58 (29%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three times a week or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-six times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than six times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Caring and warmth</th>
<th>Advice about school</th>
<th>Advice about other issues</th>
<th>Assistance with things</th>
<th>Caring and warmth</th>
<th>Advice about school</th>
<th>Advice about other issues</th>
<th>Assistance with things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>9 (4.5%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>13 (6.5%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Difficult</td>
<td>9 (4.5%)</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>25 (12.5%)</td>
<td>17 (8.5%)</td>
<td>17 (8.5%)</td>
<td>17 (8.5%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>21 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Easy</td>
<td>52 (26%)</td>
<td>66 (33%)</td>
<td>55 (27.5%)</td>
<td>58 (29%)</td>
<td>46 (23%)</td>
<td>52 (26%)</td>
<td>45 (22.5%)</td>
<td>42 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>130 (65%)</td>
<td>98 (49%)</td>
<td>104 (52%)</td>
<td>115 (57.5%)</td>
<td>133 (66.5%)</td>
<td>124 (62%)</td>
<td>105 (52.5%)</td>
<td>126 (63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>parents know who I am with</th>
<th>parents know where I am</th>
<th>Grades in native language</th>
<th>Grades in mathematics</th>
<th>Attend Movies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applies very poorly to me</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies rather poorly to me</td>
<td>13 (6.5%)</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies rather well to me</td>
<td>26 (13%)</td>
<td>25 (12.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applies very well to me</td>
<td>153 (76.5%)</td>
<td>157 (78.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everyday</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>34 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 2</td>
<td>60 (30%)</td>
<td>48 (24%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 3</td>
<td>58 (29%)</td>
<td>65 (32.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About 4</td>
<td>58 (29%)</td>
<td>35 (17.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-two times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times a month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (19.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65 (32.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>One can break most rules if they don’t seem to apply to you</th>
<th>Advice about other issues</th>
<th>I follow whatever rules I want to follow</th>
<th>one needs to break rules in order to succeed</th>
<th>Following rules does not guarantee success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 (Female)</td>
<td>87 (43.15%)</td>
<td>87 (43.15%)</td>
<td>87 (43.15%)</td>
<td>87 (43.15%)</td>
<td>87 (43.15%)</td>
<td>87 (43.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Male)</td>
<td>113 (55.9%)</td>
<td>113 (55.9%)</td>
<td>113 (55.9%)</td>
<td>113 (55.9%)</td>
<td>113 (55.9%)</td>
<td>113 (55.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Easy</td>
<td>32 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (10.5%)</td>
<td>23 (11.5%)</td>
<td>33 (16.5%)</td>
<td>33 (16.5%)</td>
<td>33 (16.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>28 (14%)</td>
<td>49 (24.5%)</td>
<td>59 (29.5%)</td>
<td>59 (29.5%)</td>
<td>59 (29.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>17 (8.5%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>12 (6%)</td>
<td>32 (16%)</td>
<td>32 (16%)</td>
<td>32 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Difficult</td>
<td>20 (10%)</td>
<td>56 (28%)</td>
<td>35 (17.5%)</td>
<td>29 (14.5%)</td>
<td>29 (14.5%)</td>
<td>29 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rather Easy</td>
<td>109 (54.5%)</td>
<td>77 (38.5%)</td>
<td>81 (40.5%)</td>
<td>47 (23.5%)</td>
<td>47 (23.5%)</td>
<td>47 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Categories</th>
<th>parents reaction against stealing</th>
<th>parents reaction against drinking alcohol</th>
<th>Time spend on homework</th>
<th>the highest level of schooling father completed</th>
<th>the highest level of schooling mother completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They would not care</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>36 (18%)</td>
<td>36 (18%)</td>
<td>36 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat against</td>
<td>1 (.5%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>64 (32%)</td>
<td>64 (32%)</td>
<td>64 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally against</td>
<td>190 (95%)</td>
<td>187 (93.5%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I never do any homework</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>18 (9%)</td>
<td>19 (9.5%)</td>
<td>19 (9.5%)</td>
<td>19 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than half an hour</td>
<td>64 (32%)</td>
<td>64 (32%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About half an hour</td>
<td>36 (18%)</td>
<td>36 (18%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About one hour</td>
<td>64 (32%)</td>
<td>64 (32%)</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About two hours</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>37 (18.5%)</td>
<td>55 (27.5%)</td>
<td>55 (27.5%)</td>
<td>55 (27.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About three hours</td>
<td>19 (9.5%)</td>
<td>19 (9.5%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About four hours</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
<td>15 (7.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than four hours</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Schooling</td>
<td>22 (11%)</td>
<td>55 (27.5%)</td>
<td>149 (74.5%)</td>
<td>149 (74.5%)</td>
<td>149 (74.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from primary/secondary/high school</td>
<td>123 (61.5%)</td>
<td>123 (61.5%)</td>
<td>123 (61.5%)</td>
<td>123 (61.5%)</td>
<td>123 (61.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started vocation high school but has not finished</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>11 (5.5%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from vocation high school</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
<td>5 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started university but has not finished</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduated from a university</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows 14% of Kurdish teenagers reported major delinquent action within the past twelve months. Additionally, 8.5% of respondents reported minor delinquent action within the past thirty days. The majority of Kurdish teenagers reported a high level of parental attachment. The items ranged from 1 ("very difficult") to 4 ("very easy"). For example, approximately 90% of Kurdish teenagers responded “rather or very easy” on the item indicating caring and warmth from parents. Similar results were evident for advice regarding school. Eighty-six percent responded “rather or very easy” regarding parental advice about school. Seventy-five percent of surveyed teenagers responded “rather or very easy” to the item measuring parental advice regarding other issues. Likewise, 75% of Kurdish teenagers responded “rather or very easy” on the item related to parental assistance with any concerns or tasks. These scores suggest that Kurdish teenagers tend to feel supported by their parents in terms of caring, warmth, advice concerning school and other issues, and assistance with tasks.

Table 9 includes the percentages for items measuring parental monitoring of teenagers. We see that approximately 90% of Kurdish teenagers reported “applies rather well to me” or “applies very well to me” in response to the item indicating whether their parents were aware of “where they were.” Likewise, 91% of Kurdish teenagers stated that their parents were aware of “who they were with in the evenings.”

Moreover, Table 8 shows that Kurdish teenagers reported high levels of attachment to school, religion, and peers. The majority of teenagers (78.5%) responded “applies often or always” to the item pertaining to whether they liked their school. This result was consistent with the remaining school attachment items. When asked if they intend to quit school, 83.5% of teens replied “applies seldom or almost never” Again, a majority of teenagers (78.5%)
responded “applies seldom or almost never” in response to whether they intend to change schools. Seventy three percent responded “applies seldom or almost never” when asked whether they did not get along with other students. Finally, 73.5% of Kurdish teenagers responded “applies seldom or almost never” in response to whether they did not get along with teachers. Overall, Kurdish teenagers do not tend to have negative feelings toward their schools, classmates, and teachers. Additionally, they do not want to quit or change schools.

The majority of teenagers (78%) responded “applies often or always to me” to the item indicating that they prayed on a regular basis. The majority of teenagers (74%) responded “applies often or always to me” in response to the item asking whether they regularly read the holy texts of their faiths. Furthermore, 60% of Kurdish teenagers responded “applies often or always to me” when asked about attendance at religious services. Finally, over one-half (58.5%) of participants responded “applies often or always” in response the item asking if they regularly took part in religious activities other than services. It appears that Kurdish teenagers regularly pray, read the holy writs of their faith, attend religious services, and take part in religious activities.

The largest percentage of Kurdish teenagers reported a high level of peer attachment. All of the peer attachment items ranged from 1 ("very difficult") to 4 ("very easy"). For example, approximately 91% of Kurdish teenagers responded “rather or very easy.” on the item that asked if they could receive caring and warmth from their peers. Similarly, 82% of Kurdish teenagers responded “rather or very easy” regarding their ability to get advice concerning school from their peers. About 80 % of Kurdish teenagers responded “rather or very easy” to the survey item measuring their ability to receive advice regarding other issues from their
friends. Finally, approximately 87% of respondents responded “rather or very easy” on their ability to receive assistance with any concerns or tasks from their friends. These scores on the items related to peer attachment demonstrate Kurdish teenagers “often” receive caring, warmth, advice concerning school and other issues, and assistance with tasks from their friends.

The results in Table 9 indicate “involvement in conventional activities” tended to vary depending on the activity. Approximately 53% of Kurdish teenagers go to the movies between “less than once” and “two or three times” a month. Similar patterns emerged for participation in sport clubs. Forty-seven percent of Kurdish teenagers tended to participate in such clubs between “once and twice” a week. Approximately 37% of participants spend time downtown during the evening or on weekends, between “a few times a year” and “a few times a month.” This suggests the majority of Kurdish teenagers do not tend to spend time downtown during the evening or on weekends. Approximately 44% of Kurdish teenagers acknowledged partying “a few times a year” or “a few times a month” while approximately 48% indicated they are almost never involved in partying. Likewise, approximately 49% of Kurdish teenagers almost never go to listen to live music, while approximately 41% of Kurdish listen to live music “a few times a year” or “a few times a month.” Finally, just over half (54%) of Kurdish teenagers had been involved in the Gülen movement in some manner.

According to the data shown in Table 9, Kurdish teenagers tend to score more moderately on “commitment” measures. Approximately 51% of survey respondents spent “about one or two hours” per day (on a 1 to 8 hour scale) on homework. For grades in their native language, 59% of Kurdish teenagers scored 3 or 4 (on a 5 point scale) when indicating
their native language grades during the semester. For grades in mathematics, 56.5% of Kurdish teenagers scored 3 or 4 when indicating their mathematics grade. These results suggest participants tend to have better grades in Turkish.

As indicated in Table 9, approximately 66% of Kurdish teenagers either disagreed or strongly disagreed that one could break most rules if they do not seem apply to you, and approximately 67% of respondents either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they follow whatever rules they want. Similarly, 58% of Kurdish teens either disagreed or strongly disagreed that sometimes someone needs to break rules in order to succeed. Finally, 46% of Kurdish teenagers either disagreed or strongly disagreed that following the rules does not guarantee success. Two items measured parental reactions to teenagers’ deviant actions, with one item concerning stealing something worth more than four pounds of baklava and the other item pertaining to drinking alcohol. Approximately 96% of Kurdish teenagers said their parents would be “somewhat or totally against” their teenagers’ stealing something worth more than four pounds of baklava. Also, approximately 97% of Kurdish teenagers said their parents would be “somewhat or totally against” the teens’ drinking alcohol.

Bivariate Correlation Coefficients

Table 10 presents the bivariate correlation coefficients (r), calculated from a study of the mediating effects of social bonding variables on minor and major delinquent behaviors among 200 Kurdish teenagers in Grades 10 through 12 from public school in Diyarbakır, Turkey and private school in Şanlıurfa, Turkey. Beginning with column one Minor Delinquency, each correlation coefficient was observed using the following values to indicate strength, < .30 =
weak, .30 ~ .69 is moderate, and ≥ .70 is strong (Allison, 1999; Knoke, Bohrnstedt, & Mee, 2002).

There is a weak, negative, and significant relationship between Minor Delinquency and all Attachment items ($p \leq .05$ and $p \leq .01$). Similarly, there is a weak, negative, and significant relationship between Major Delinquency and Attachment, Involvement, and Belief items ($r = p \leq .05$ and $p \leq .01$). Moving across the Table to each remaining column, there is a moderate, positive, and significant correlation between School Attachment and Parental Attachment ($r = .584, p \leq .01$). Table 10 portrays a similar significant, positive and moderate correlation for Religion Attachment and Teenager’s Grades in Native Language ($r = .591, p \leq .01$). In addition, there is a moderate, positive, and significant correlation between Going to listen to Live Music and Participation in the Gülen movement ($r = .621, p \leq .01$). It appears that consistently a Kurdish teenager with a higher level of school attachment tends to have a higher level of attachment to their parents, their religion, involvement in conventional activities, and approval of the legal norms, as well as more participation in the Gülen movement.

The strongest associations in Table 10 are between School Attachment and Religion Attachment ($r = .621$) and Participation in the Gülen movement ($r = .656$). The remaining results are similar and the results are shown in the appendices. Table 10 shows that there is no strong relationship among the variables since the values are not greater than .70. (Allison, 1999; Knoke, Bohrnstedt, & Mee, 2002).
Table 10

Pearson Bivariate Correlations (N = 200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minor delinquency</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Major delinquency</td>
<td>.545**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Attachment</td>
<td>-.228**</td>
<td>-.371**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parental Attachment</td>
<td>-.179*</td>
<td>-.195**</td>
<td>.584**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parental Monitoring</td>
<td>.214**</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>-.335**</td>
<td>-.357**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Peer Attachment</td>
<td>-.230**</td>
<td>-.233**</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.557**</td>
<td>-.382**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Religion Attachment</td>
<td>-.192**</td>
<td>-.200**</td>
<td>.621**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>-.423**</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How often do you go to the movies?</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How often do you play sports (such as soccer or basketball) in a sport club or team?</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.508**</td>
<td>.367**</td>
<td>-.196**</td>
<td>.423**</td>
<td>.482**</td>
<td>.288**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Spend time downtown during the evening or on the weekends</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.193**</td>
<td>.290**</td>
<td>-.0128</td>
<td>.323**</td>
<td>.198**</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.303**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Go to a party</td>
<td>-.147*</td>
<td>-.225**</td>
<td>.366**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>-.232**</td>
<td>.324**</td>
<td>.392**</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.466**</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Go to entertainments with live music</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-.194**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.383**</td>
<td>-.189**</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>.495**</td>
<td>.211**</td>
<td>.435**</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>.434**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How much time do you usually spend on homework every day?</td>
<td>-.149*</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.145**</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>-.0115</td>
<td>.160**</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-.0111</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>.168*</td>
<td>-.0111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What have your grades been in native language this semester?</td>
<td>-.251**</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>-.434**</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.591**</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td>.197**</td>
<td>.311**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What have your grades been in mathematics this semester?</td>
<td>-0.116</td>
<td>-.213**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
<td>.337**</td>
<td>-.214**</td>
<td>.386**</td>
<td>.507**</td>
<td>-.0045</td>
<td>.410**</td>
<td>.196**</td>
<td>.240**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Approval of Legal Norms</td>
<td>-.231**</td>
<td>-.251**</td>
<td>.559**</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>-.363**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.586**</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.400**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parental Reaction</td>
<td>-.0114</td>
<td>-.146*</td>
<td>.190**</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>.234**</td>
<td>.183**</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.224**</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Gülen Movement</td>
<td>-0.252**</td>
<td>-.282**</td>
<td>.656**</td>
<td>.499**</td>
<td>-.409**</td>
<td>.481**</td>
<td>.501**</td>
<td>.176*</td>
<td>.520**</td>
<td>.261**</td>
<td>.506**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Male</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>-.0048</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
<td>.159*</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How old are you?</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>.230**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>.274**</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.170*</td>
<td>.150*</td>
<td>.219**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Father Education</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>.221**</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>-.223**</td>
<td>.237**</td>
<td>.354**</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.257**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mother Education</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>.269**</td>
<td>-.230**</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td>.254**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>.358**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 10 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minor delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Major delinquency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. School Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parental Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parental Monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Peer Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Religion Attachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How often do you go to the movies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How often do you play sports (such as soccer or basketball) in a sport club or team?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Spend time downtown during the evening or on the weekends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Go to a party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Go to entertainments with live music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How much time do you usually spend on homework every day?</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What have your grades been in native language this semester?</td>
<td>.392**</td>
<td>.232**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What have your grades been in mathematics this semester?</td>
<td>.364**</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>.579**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Approval of Legal Norms</td>
<td>.443**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>.479**</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Parental Reaction</td>
<td>.143*</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>.253**</td>
<td>.194**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Gülen Movement</td>
<td>.602**</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>.558**</td>
<td>.549**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Male</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. How old are you?</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>.208**</td>
<td>.239**</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>.312**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>.319**</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Father Education</td>
<td>.235**</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>.195**</td>
<td>.155*</td>
<td>.256**</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>.347**</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mother Education</td>
<td>.327**</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>.264**</td>
<td>.250**</td>
<td>.385**</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>.576**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Data Screening

The data were examined for multicollinearity. To address multicollinearity issues, the variance inflation factor (VIF) was estimated for each variable in all models, since binary logistic regression is greatly sensitive to high intercorrelation among the variables. A widely used cutoff for the variance inflation factor is 5 (Menard, 2010; Mertler & Vannatta, 2005 & 2010). According to Menard (2010), and Mertler and Vannatta (2005, 2010), a tolerance value of less than 0.1 indicates the presence of multicollinearity. Tolerance values for the predictor variables included in the regression were assessed through linear regressions. For all models, the tolerance values for each variable included in the regressions were higher than .1 and variation inflation factor values were less than 5, which resulted in no observed multicollinearity problem among the predictor variables (Menard, 2010; Mertler & Vannatta, 2005 & 2010).

Multivariate Analysis

Binary logistic regression is the most appropriate method when the dependent variable is dichotomous and measured at a nominal level (Foster, Barkus & Yavorsky, 2006; Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000; Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). In this study, binary logistic regression was employed to estimate the probabilities of both major delinquency and minor delinquency, while using a series of independent and control variables. This technique analyzes the effects of one or more predictors on a dichotomous variable (Foster, Barkus, & Yavorsky, 2006; Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000; Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006; Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). Logistic regression can be used once the predictors are not linearly associated and normally distributed (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). In addition, Mertler &
Vannatta (2010) state that a linear relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables are not needed in order to use logistic regression methodology. An important advantage of logistic regression is that it is appropriate for all types of predictor variables, such as interval/ratio, ordinal and dummy variables (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007).

The inspected data are non-normal since the distributions of both dependent variables, major and minor delinquency, are highly positively skewed. Barnett and Mencken (2002), Meyers, Gamst, and Guarino (2006), Sampson and Groves (1989), Sun, Triplet and Gainey (2004) recommend the log transformation statistical technique in order to normalize the problem. Accordingly, the log transformation technique was employed but the non-normality problem was not resolved (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Positive skewness remains in the distribution of both dependent variables. The results should be interpreted with this in mind.

The simultaneous technique was adopted as the regression method in the binary logistic regression analyses (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006). In the simultaneous method, all of the predictor variables are included at once in the logistic regression analyses (Meyers, Gamst & Guarino, 2006). The simultaneous method was employed for all models. For each dependent variable, two different models were assessed. In the first model, the impacts of social bonding theory’s components on the likelihood of involvement in minor or major delinquency were examined individually. In the second model, all of the social bonding variables and socio-demographic and control variables were introduced and regressed on the predicted variable.

None of the variables used in the analyses has a missing value, nor were there any outlying values from the sample. Two-hundred students were used for the binary logistic
regression analyses to estimate the probability of minor and major delinquency. The statistical significance of the findings was generated from all four models by setting .05 as the alpha level and using a one-tail test.

Binary Logistic Regression: Results for Minor Delinquency

Table 10 presents results of the logistic regression assessing the probability of minor delinquency. In Model 1, Kurdish teens’ report of having been engaged in any minor delinquent acts within the past thirty days (coded 1 = yes; 0 = no) was regressed on the social bonding variables.

As illustrated in Table 11, Model 1 includes all social bonding items: the five attachment items (school attachment, religious attachment, parental monitoring, parental support, and peer attachment), the five involvement items (going to the movies, participation in sport clubs, time spent downtown on the weekends, and participating in entertainment with live music), the three commitment items (time spent on homework, language score, and math score), the two belief items (parental reaction and legal norms), and involvement with the Gülen movement. Model 1 is statistically significant (Model $\chi^2 = .211, p < .05$), accounting for approximately 48% of its variation in the likelihood of minor delinquency (pseudo $R^2 = .478$).

In Model 2 (Table 11) all social bonding items and control variables were regressed on the likelihood of minor delinquency. Model 2 is statistically significant (Model $\chi^2 = .261, p < .05$). The model explains approximately 59.2% of the variation in the likelihood of involvement in minor delinquency among Kurdish teenagers, with a pseudo $R^2$ of .592, which was 11% greater than the first model without the control variables. Moreover, Model 2 is better fitting
compared to Model 1 based on the -2 log likelihood ratio (55.820, \( p < .05 \)), showing that the addition of the sociodemographic or control variables improves the ability of the model to explain variation in Kurdish teens’ probability of participation in minor delinquency.

Table 11

*Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Odds of Minor Delinquency, Kurdish Adolescents, 2012, (N=200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attachment</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious attachment</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental monitoring</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>.382</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer attachment</td>
<td>-.365</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the movies</td>
<td>-.278</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in sport clubs</td>
<td>-.118</td>
<td>.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent downtown on the weekends</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a party</td>
<td>-.570</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating entertainments with live music</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the Gülen Movement</td>
<td>-3.306*</td>
<td>1.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on homework</td>
<td>-.469*</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language score</td>
<td>-.546</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math score</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental reaction</td>
<td>-.258</td>
<td>.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal norms</td>
<td>-.702*</td>
<td>.324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s education level</td>
<td>-.529</td>
<td>.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education level</td>
<td>1.613*</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>3.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>68.973</td>
<td>55.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model X²</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke Pseudo R²</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p \leq .05 \) One-Tailed Test.
Hypotheses for Minor Delinquency Scale

Hypothesis 1: Hypothesis 1 is that Kurdish teens who report greater attachment to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teens who are less attached to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others. Surprisingly, the five attachment items (school attachment, religious attachment, parental monitoring, parental support, and peer attachment) were not supported. Similar to Model 1, Table 10 shows that none of the attachment items affects probability of minor delinquency in Model 2. Hypothesis 1 was not supported even after introducing the control variables.

Hypothesis 2: Hypothesis 2 concerns the impact of Kurdish teens’ involvement in conventional activities. However, unpredictably, the five involvement items (going to the movies, participation in sport clubs, time spent downtown on the weekends, and participating in entertainment with live music) were not supported in Model 1. In addition, only going to the movies had a statistically significant, negative effect on the probability of minor delinquency, when the controls were added to Model 2 \((B = -.278, p < .05)\). More specifically, all else being equal, Table 10 shows that the likelihood of Kurdish teens’ involvement in any type of minor delinquent actions decreased by 44.4% with each level of increase in going to the movies. Hypothesis 2 is therefore partially supported in Model 2.

Hypothesis 3: Hypothesis 3 states that Kurdish teens who report greater commitment to conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teens who report a lower degree of commitment to conventional activities. Table 10 indicates that this hypothesis is partially supported \((p < .05)\). Specifically, in Model 1, controlling for other
variables, the probability of Kurdish teenagers’ involvement in any kind of minor delinquent activities is reduced by 38% ([.625 - 1] * 100 = -37.5%) with a one-level increase in how much time the Kurdish teens spent daily on homework.

Table 11 shows that, when control variables were introduced, the amount of time Kurdish teens spent on homework every day remained statistically significant and essentially greater in magnitude ($p < .05$). In Model 2, all else being equal, the probability of Kurdish teenagers’ involvement in any kind of minor delinquent actions decreased by 45% with a one-level increase in the amount of time Kurdish teens spent on homework every day. Hypothesis 3 is partially supported in Model 2 ($p < .05$).

Hypothesis 4: Hypothesis 4 states that Kurdish teens who report greater belief in the conventional moral order are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teens who report a lower degree of belief in conventional moral order. Similarly, belief in conventional moral order has a significant, negative effect on Kurdish teens’ engagement in minor delinquent activities in Model 1. Table 11 indicates that the likelihood of minor delinquency dropped by 55% with a one-unit increase in the approval of legal norms. However, parental reaction was not found to affect probability of minor delinquency. Thus, hypothesis 4 is partially supported in Model 1. In addition, after adding control variables, neither parental reaction nor the approval of legal norms was supported in Model 2.

Sociodemographic variables: In Model 2 the control variables (being male, age, and paternal and maternal education levels) were introduced to predict the probability of involvement in minor delinquency among Kurdish teens. Contrary to expectations, the odds of involvement in minor delinquency were higher among Kurdish teens whose mothers have
higher levels of education \((B = 1.613, p = .05)\). Specifically, Kurdish teens whose mothers have higher levels of education were 5.016 times likelier than Kurdish teens whose mothers have lower levels of education or no schooling to commit any type of minor delinquent actions \(\text{odds ratio} = 5.016\). This result is discussed in-depth in Chapter V.

The remaining sociodemographic or control variables variables—sex, age, and father’s education—are all not significantly related to Kurdish teens’ likelihood of involvement in minor delinquency \((p > .05)\).

Finally, participation in the Gülen movement was also inspected as an independent variable in Model 1. Table 11 indicates that involvement with the Gülen movement has a significant negative effect on Kurdish teens’ participation in minor delinquent activities. More specifically, all else being equal, affiliation with Gülen movement for at least one year, reduced Kurdish adolescents’ likelihoods of engagement in minor delinquent acts by 96%. The results in Model 2 indicate that the effects of engagement with the Gülen movement on the probability of minor delinquency, continued to be supported when controlling for sociodemographic characteristics. With each level increase in Kurdish teenagers’ involvement with the Gülen movement the probability of minor delinquency decreased by 99.5%, which was essentially greater in magnitude.

**Binary Logistic Regression: Results for Major Delinquency**

Table 12 presents the logistic regression models assessing the probability of major delinquency. Two models were estimated. In Model 1, the variable indicating whether or not Kurdish teens have been engaged in any major delinquent action within the past twelve months
In Model 1 the five attachment items (school attachment, religious attachment, parental monitoring, parental support, and peer attachment), the five involvement items (going to the movies, participation in sport clubs, time spent downtown on the weekends, and participating in entertainment with live music) involvement with the Gülen movement, the three commitment items (time spent on homework, language score, and math score), and the two belief items (parental reaction and legal norms) were used to predict the outcome variable. Model 1 is statistically significant (Model $\chi^2 = .274$, $p < .05$), explaining approximately 49% of the variation in the likelihood of major delinquency (pseudo $R^2 = .493$).

In Model 2 the control variables male, age, and paternal and maternal education levels were added in order to predict the outcome variable. Model 2 is statistically significant (Model $\chi^2 = .297$, $p < .05$). The model accounts for approximately 54% of the variation in Kurdish teenagers' probability of involvement in major delinquency with a pseudo $R^2$ of .535, which was 5% greater than the first model, which did not include the control variables. Furthermore, Model 2 is a better fitting model compared to Model 1, based on the -2 log likelihood ratio (91.575, $p < .05$) indicating that the addition of the sociodemographic variables improves the ability of the model to account for the variation in the Kurdish teens' likelihood of involvement in major delinquency.
Table 12  

*Logistic Regression Estimates Predicting the Odds of Major Delinquency, Kurdish Teenagers, 2012, (N=200)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attachment</td>
<td>-1.287*</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>-1.119*</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious attachment</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>1.674</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental monitoring</td>
<td>-.261</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>-.393</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental support</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>1.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer attachment</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.487</td>
<td>.982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to the movies</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>1.181</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>1.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in sport clubs</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent downtown on the weekends</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>1.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to a party</td>
<td>-1.244*</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>-1.323*</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating entertainments with live music</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>1.510</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in the Gülen Movement</td>
<td>-2.919*</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-3.494*</td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on homework</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language score</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math score</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental reaction</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal norms</td>
<td>-.702*</td>
<td>.324</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>-.700*</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.416*</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>4.119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s education level</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>1.221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s education level</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>5.413</td>
<td>2.814</td>
<td>224.216</td>
<td>3.555</td>
<td>3.058</td>
<td>35.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>98.055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model X²</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of freedom</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-Value</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke Pseudo R²</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p ≤ .05 One-Tailed Test.
Hypotheses for Major Delinquency Scale

Hypothesis 5: Hypothesis 5 states that Kurdish teens who report greater attachment to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teens who are less attached to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others. Table 11 indicates that Kurdish teens who report greater school attachment are less likely to report major delinquency than Kurdish teens who report a lower degree of school attachment ($p < .05$). More specifically, all else being equal, the likelihood of teenagers’ involvement in any major delinquent actions decreased by 72% with each one-unit increase in Kurdish teenagers’ school attachment. However, parental attachment was not found to affect probability of major delinquency. Similarly, neither peer attachment nor religious attachment was supported in Model 1.

Once the control variables were added, Kurdish teens who report greater school attachment were less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than teens who report a lower degree of attachment to school: This variable remained both statistically significant and essentially smaller in magnitude ($p < .05$). Specifically, all else being equal, for each level of increase in school attachment, the probability of major delinquent actions decreased by 67.3%. However, similar to Model 1, the effects of attachment to parents (parental monitoring and parental support) are not supported in Model 2.

Hypothesis 6: Hypothesis 6 states that Kurdish teens who report greater involvement in conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teens who report a lower degree of involvement in conventional activities. Table 11 indicates that the likelihood of major delinquency decreased by 71% with each one-unit increase in
Kurdish teenagers’ partying involvement. However, the effects of going to the movies, participation in sport clubs, listening to live music, and time spent downtown during the evening or on the weekends had no statistically significant influence in the same model. Hypothesis 6 was therefore partially supported in Model 1. This result will be discussed in-depth in Chapter V.

Comparing the results in Model 2 to those in Model 1, the effects of the partying involvement item on the probability of major delinquency remain the same when controlling for sociodemographic characteristics. With each one-unit increase in Kurdish teenagers’ partying involvement, the likelihood of major delinquency decreased by 73.4%, essentially greater in magnitude.

Hypothesis 7: Hypothesis 7 states that Kurdish teens who report greater commitment to conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teens who report a lower degree of commitment to conventional activities. However, Table 11 indicates that research Hypothesis 7, regarding the effects of time spent on homework, language score, and math score, were not significant. In addition, commitment to conventional activities had no significant effect on Kurdish teens’ engagement in major delinquent activities in Model 2. Hypothesis 7 was therefore not supported.

Hypothesis 8: Hypothesis 8 states that Kurdish teens who report greater belief in the conventional moral order are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teens who report a lower degree of belief in the conventional moral order. Table 11 indicates that belief in the conventional moral order has a significant negative effect on Kurdish teens’ participation in major delinquent action in Model 1. For example, the odds of
involvement in major delinquency decrease 50% with each one-unit increase in approval for legal norms. Model 2 (Table 11) shows that the effects of legal norms remained negatively and significantly associated with the outcome variable, as in Model 1. Specifically, all else being equal, for each one-unit increase in approval for legal norms, the likelihood of major delinquent actions decreased by 50% in Model 2. Hypothesis 8 is therefore partially supported in Model 2.

Sociodemographic variables: Holding all else equal, being male had a statistically significant effect on the likelihood of Kurdish teenagers’ involvement in major delinquent actions. Kurdish male teens were more likely to be engaged in major delinquent actions than females ($B = 1.416, p = .05$). As predicted, the odds of being involved in major delinquent actions are 4.119 times greater for Kurdish males than Kurdish females (Odds ratio = 4.119). Finally, age does not appear to be significantly related to Kurdish teens’ likelihood of involvement in major delinquency ($p > .05$). Neither the mother’s nor father’s educations had a statistically significant effect on the probability of major delinquency ($p > .05$).

Finally, participation in the Gülen movement was analyzed as an independent variable in Model 1. The results show that Kurdish adolescents who reported that they had been affiliated with the Gülen movement organizations for at least one year are significantly more likely to self-report lower levels of involvement in major delinquency, than those who are non-Gülen affiliated ($p < .05$). All else being equal, affiliation with the Gülen movement for at least one year, reduced Kurdish adolescents’ odds of engagement in serious delinquent actions by 96%.

In Model 2 the impact of affiliation with the Gülen movement remained similar to its effect in Model 1. All else being equal, affiliation with the Gülen movement for at least one
year, decreased Kurdish adolescents’ likelihoods of involvement in serious delinquent acts by 97%, which is a slightly stronger association.

Summary

The descriptive statistics for the sample used in testing my hypotheses are presented in Table 8. The ages of the survey respondents vary between 16 and 18 years of age with a mean of 17 years. Of the 200 Kurdish teenagers in the study, 57% were male and 43% were female. Kurdish teenagers’ mothers’ education levels tended to be relatively lower than fathers’ education levels.

Table 11 shows that the social bonding items “how much time Kurdish teenagers spent on homework” and “the approval of legal norms” were found to affect the probability of minor delinquency in Model 1. After adding the controls, going to the movies had a statistically significant negative effect on the likelihood of involvement in minor delinquency in Model 2. How much time Kurdish teenagers spent on homework remained both statistically significant and essentially greater in magnitude. Interestingly, Kurdish teenagers whose mothers had higher education levels tended to engage in any type of minor delinquent actions more often than teens whose mothers had either lower education levels or no schooling.

Table 12 shows that, in Model 1, the social bonding items school attachment, partying, and the approval of legal norms affect the probability of major delinquency. In Model 2 school attachment, partying, and the approval of legal norms remained both statistically and negatively related with the outcome variable. Kurdish male students were also more likely to have committed major delinquent activities than female students.
Finally, in Model 1 involvement with the Gülen movement had significant negative effects on both minor and major delinquency. In Model 2 it remained statistically significant in terms of its impact on Kurdish teens’ likelihood of involvement in either minor or major delinquency.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Chapter V provides an overall assessment of the social bonding findings examined in this dissertation. It also compares the effects of the social bonding components on the Kurdish adolescents’ probability of involvement in delinquency. Finally, this chapter assesses the contribution of the study to the body of research concerning the impact of bonding on delinquency within the Turkish cultural context.

Discussion

Although some studies have studied both delinquent actions and marijuana use among Turkish juveniles, this study was the first to examine the mediating effect of social bonding on delinquent behavior among Kurdish teenagers while testing Hirschi’s social bonding theory. This study made a particular effort to examine the complexity of beliefs of respondents, and to use this information to explicitly understand why Kurdish teenagers located in southeastern Turkey engage in delinquent activities.

The most central finding of this study is that social bonding theory explains the probability of Kurdish teenagers’ involvement in minor and major delinquency acts. The findings of the study display support for the originally proposed research hypotheses and overall, they are consistent with the findings of previous research, although there are a few exceptions. More specifically, the findings regarding religious attachment and involvement in partying differ from previous research.

Hypotheses 1 through 4 attempted to substantiate whether or not the probability of
Kurdish teenagers’ involvement in any type of minor delinquent action including less severe delinquent actions such as smoking cigarettes, using snuff, and drinking alcohol would be negatively associated with the four elements of Hirschi’s social bonding theory.

Hypotheses 5 through 8 proposed that Kurdish teenagers’ likelihood of involvement in any type of major delinquent actions including serious criminal offences such as larceny equal to or less than the cost of four pounds of baklava, physically injuring another person, getting into a physical fight, breaking and entering a car, damaging property, and painting graffiti would be negatively linked with four components of Hirschi’s social bonding theory.

The proposed research hypotheses in general were supported in that at least one of the involvement items, commitment and belief -going to a party, time spent on homework, and legal norms- with the exception the five attachment indexes, participation in sport clubs, time spent downtown on the weekends, participating in entertainment with live music, language and math scores, and parental reaction had a significant negative effect on Kurdish teenagers’ self-reported involvement in minor delinquent activities.

The proposed research hypotheses stated that some of the theory items school attachment, going to parties, legal norms with the exception of religious attachment, parental monitoring, peer attachment, participation in sport clubs, time spent downtown on the weekends, participating in entertainment with live music, time spent on homework, language and math scores, and parental reaction, would have a significant negative effect on Kurdish teenagers’ engagement in major delinquent activities.

The findings also showed that Kurdish adolescents affiliated with the Gülen movement organizations for at least one year were significantly more likely to self-report lower
delinquency rates in the predicted direction for all models compared to those who were non-Gülen affiliated.

Attachment

There is a body of literature supporting a strong link between attachment and less involvement in delinquent activities (Agnew, 1992; McLanahan & Booth, 1991; Rankin & Kern, 1994; Thornberry, Smith, Rivera, Huizinga, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1999, Weerman & Hoeve, 2012). Among the attachment items cited in the previous literature, school attachment was the only significant factor. It was significant in the expected direction in both models, showing a significant and negative relationship exists between the items of school attachment and the likelihood of involvement in major delinquency. Hypothesis 5 stating that Kurdish teenagers who report greater school attachment are less likely to report involvement in major delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who report a lower degree of school attachment therefore received significant support. Hypothesis 5 continued to be supported after introducing sociodemographic and control variables in the model. Among the social bonding components school attachment had the most robust effect on major delinquent activities, whereas involvement had the strongest effect on major delinquent activities after adding sociodemographic and control variables.

On the other hand, Hypothesis 1 relating to greater attachment to school and minor delinquency did not obtain any significant support. Hypothesis 1 was unsupported after adding sociodemographic and control variables.

The findings concerning school attachment can be used to help explain major
delinquency. These findings revealed that having students spend a considerable amount of their time in school is valuable. After-school programs, additional tutoring, and other activities that are particularly prevalent in Gülen-affiliated schools may help support this relationship.

As demonstrated by other researchers (Bryk et al., 1994; Buysee, 1997; Coleman, 1990; Donohew et al., 1999; Ford, 2009; Lin & Dembo, 2008; Nakhaie & Sacco, 2009), students who have greater attachments to their schools and teachers are less likely to become involved in anti-social activities. Contrary to the previous literature (Buysse, 1997; Donohew et al., 1999), schools also provide an atmosphere for increased minor delinquency. This is because teenagers can easily access tobacco products while hiding in the school toilet, even more so than in public places. It is virtually impossible for adolescents to be invisible in the public realm, particularly during after school hours. Parents and neighborhood friends and family always keep an eye on teenagers’ actions, such as when they are walking home, yelling, or using foul language, and making antisocial inferences through their joking behaviors. If they are not well behaved within the community, students know they would be immediately reported to their parents and relatives. However, this close extended family and neighborhood attachment does not prevent youth from participating in minor crimes. Teenagers who engage in minor delinquency secretly use public restrooms to perform their delinquent behaviors, such as smoking cigarettes. As long as they have a loyal and trusted watchful peer, their delinquent activities will not easily be found out. Even school activities cannot inhibit students from delinquent behaviors. School activities actually provide the means for boys and girls to interact, whereas they might otherwise refrain from delinquent behaviors under the more watchful eyes of the family.
On the other hand, the effect of school attachment is significant for explaining major delinquent actions, which are activities considered to be very serious acts according to the law, school administrators, and families. If an adolescent is attached to their school, they may not want to ruin their future by being involved in a serious fight or damaging school property. Finishing school is considered an important step to save themselves and their parents from poverty. Major delinquent activities are not be tolerated by school administrators. Most of the youth involved in delinquent activities have a very low school attachment however, and they are likely to work as a daily worker, or laborer on someone else’s farm (Özcan, 2012).

Although much of the existing research demonstrates greater attention to the influences of parental support (Broman, Li, & Reckase, 2008; Cavanagh, 2008; Demuth & Brown, 2004), parental monitoring (Ledoux, Miller, Choquet, & Plant, 2002), peers (Farrington, 1995; Fergusson & Horwood, 1996; Hoffman, 1994; Woodward et al., 2002), and religious attachment (Putnam, 2000) on antisocial delinquent behavior, these variables were not found to be related in a significant way in the present study. This study found that the remaining attachment items such as parental support, parental monitoring, and peer attachment did not effectively deter Kurdish adolescents from becoming involved in delinquent activities. Parental support did not have a significant effect on explaining the present findings. This might be due to the fact that all students, including those who became involved either in major or minor delinquents actions had received parental support, as well as close monitoring by their parents. That is, a similar degree of monitoring and support occurred for all Kurdish teenagers. This may mean that delinquent juveniles are still close to their parents as well as their friends, but may also mean that a delinquent adolescent’s parents and peers may have a criminal background.
that influences their behavior. On the other hand, it is expected that Turkish parents are more controlling and authoritarian than parents in Western society (Taylor & Oskay, 1995), and the Turkish community is considered to be a collective community. Some scholars define the Turkish community as a combination of collective and individualistic features that may be linked to delinquent tendencies (Sunar & Fizek, 2004). In terms of the socialization process in the Turkish community, for example, at present, adolescents are becoming more independent and more individualistic according to Sunar (2002), and less subservient to their parents. It should be noted however, that as regards delinquent Kurdish adolescents’ parental, peer attachment and parental monitoring practices, the data did not reveal much of a statistical variation, so the findings are not conclusive.

The hypothesis that Kurdish teenagers who report greater attachment to parents and conventional others are less likely to report involvement in major and minor delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who are less attached to parents and conventional peers was also not supported after adding sociodemographic and control variables to the all models.

Unlike Western societies, individualism is not predominant in Eastern cultures. It should be acknowledged that throughout history, Turkish culture has been connected to both the West and East. Although the Kurdish people, as well as the Turkish people typically value a culture comprising an extended family structure and every member in the family monitors and supervises everyone else, especially the younger family members, attachment to parents is decreasing and an individualistic tendency is increasing among some adolescents in Turkey. This means that some youth are becoming more autonomous and individualistic in the Turkish community and this process may possibly reduce the influence of attachment.
Somewhat surprisingly, there were inconsistent findings concerning the effects of religious attachment on the likelihood of minor or major delinquency. Contrary to previous findings, the direction of the relationships between religious attachment and involvement in major or minor delinquency is positive. However, the hypothesized relationship was not confirmed. This could be due to the fact that Turkish conventional society is very discretely conservative in southeastern Turkey. The findings showed that religion is positively related, but had no significant effect on either major or minor delinquency among Kurdish adolescents. Further research is clearly required to resolve this issue.

This study also makes the direct argument that having no religion or being affiliated with religions other than Islam moderated the relationship between Kurdish teens’ participation in either major or minor delinquent activities. Interestingly, the majority of Kurdish adolescents’ subjective identification of their religious preferences was Muslim (99%)\(^4\). Nevertheless, findings indicated that teenagers involved in either more or less severe delinquent acts were actually religious, rather than irreligious, which seems curious, given that some teenagers who had prayed on a regular basis, read the holy texts of their faiths, attended at religious services were not involved in delinquency. This might be due to the fact that the delinquent adolescent’s adherence to basic moral values, as well as the implications of Islamic rules and understanding their faith is very much open to question.

As noted in the previous sections, however, teenagers with a greater attachment to religion were less likely to be involved in delinquency. However, this study did not confirm the

\(^4\) Turkey particularly, Diyarbakır and Şanlıurfa, is not a place of religious diversity in comparison to American religious diversity. The social and cultural context of Turkish religiosity, when compared to American terms, is best understood in terms of volunteering in organizations, degrees of altruism, and morality.
results of previous research. A possible reason for this inconsistency could be associated with the idea that within the past decade, it has been shown that religiosity may not inhibit anti-traditionalist, anti-Islamic and extreme leftist ideologies. For example, blood feuds are banned by Islam, yet blood feuds are quite common in this territory, suggesting that traditional practices may appear more valued in resolving conflicts than any religious viewpoints or rulings. On the other hand, people involved in the Gülen movement are also considered religious, and the present findings indicate that religious attachment and involvement in the Gülen movement are moderately correlated ($r = .501$). Instead, the PKK and Hezbollah have killed civilians within the region on the basis of their principles. In addition, during the 1990’s the PKK and Hezbollah abused the concepts and practices of religion in southeastern Turkey, it may be that persistent social factors are at the basis of their actions.

**Involvement**

Hypotheses 2 and 6 postulated that greater involvement in conventional activities would be negatively correlated with the likelihood of both major and minor delinquency actions. The findings partially supported these hypotheses. Going to parties was significantly and negatively related to the likelihood of involvement in major delinquency. Among the other involvement items only going to parties received significant support in the second model, while the other four items (going to the movies, participation in sports clubs, time spent downtown on the weekends, and participating in entertainment with live music) were not significantly associated with major delinquency. The association of going to parties with major delinquency remained significant after introducing the control variables.
Only Hypothesis 6 received significant support from the analyses across both estimated models in terms of the relationship between involvement items and minor delinquency. As predicted, going to the movies had a negative relationship with the likelihood of minor delinquency among Kurdish adolescents. After adding the control variables the relationship between going to the movies relationship and minor delinquency continued to be significant.

According to previous research, teenagers involved with partying are more likely to be involved in delinquent activities (Eccles & Barber, 1999; Wong, 2005). However, my data yielded opposing results. Partying does not necessarily provide opportunities for teenagers to engage in delinquent behaviors in Turkey, where family members and neighbors get together at the social events. Their collective identity becomes stronger, not weaker, while being together in social events such as going to the movies or attending wedding parties of their relatives. Social events in Islamic countries, like Turkey, especially for conservative Kurdish groups, are events where alcohol is forbidden by parents and the community. Children are allowed to participate in local cultural folk dances. However girls and boys are not allowed to dance with each other. Teenagers’ partying activities are highly restricted. Some teenagers disregard conventional activities, family and neighborhood partying, and spend recreational time with family members. These teenagers disregard the society’s values and show less participation in social events. As noted above, partying in Turkey has a different meaning from that used in the West. For Turkish society, parties are considered family-focused and open social events that involve all members of the community, such as weddings and other important social events for entertainment. Unlike other cultures where hanging out with groups of people or spending time drinking alcohol and socializing with selected friends is a more prevalent form of
entertainment. As a result, going to parties appeared to have a negative effect on delinquency rates among adolescents in Turkish conventional society.

Both these findings regarding “involvement items” are therefore in conformity with previous literature (Akers, 2000; Anderson & Hughes, 2009; Barnes et al., 2007; Peretti-Watel & Lorente, 2004; Thorlindsson & Bernburg, 2006; Williams & McShane, 2004). Contrary to previous research, the study found that partying has a negative relationship with delinquent behaviors.

Commitment

The effect of spending time on homework was analyzed in order to understand Kurdish teenagers’ participation in minor delinquent actions. Hypothesis 3 proposed that Kurdish teens who report greater commitment to conventional activities are less likely to report involvement in minor delinquency than Kurdish teenagers who report a lower degree of commitment to conventional activities. Hypothesis 3 concerning the impact of time spent on homework on minor delinquency actions was also supported in the second model, which include sociodemographic and control variables.

Among the social bonding theory commitment items, only time spent on homework was supported. As proposed, Kurdish adolescents who spent more time on homework were less likely to become involved in minor delinquent activities than those who spent less time on homework. The findings are consistent with previous research reporting a negative association between time spent on homework and delinquency (Sigfusdottir, Thorlindsson, & Bjarnason, 2007; Thorlindsson, Bjornson, & Sigfusdottir, 2007; Thorlindsson & Vilhjalmsson, 1991).
Nevertheless, the other commitment items for math and language scores were not significantly associated with either major or minor delinquency in all models. No significant support was found for Hypothesis 7 in all models in terms of the relationship regarding commitment items and major delinquency. Other factors may be present that account for scores. Adolescents involved in major or minor delinquent actions received similar math and language scores when compared to Kurdish teenagers who did not report delinquent activities. This could be attributed to factors such as being from a well-educated family or experiencing well-being in family. In general, language scores were higher for both groups of students, which might be due to the fact that language learning is considered easier to master than math studies. Yet, students who became involved in major or minor delinquency had received a slightly lower math score than students with no involvement in delinquent behaviors. Math achievement seemed difficult for these students in particular. Adolescents who became involved in either major or minor delinquent actions may psychologically fear math and they may not be motivated to do better (Decamillis, 2010).

Belief

The findings present significant support for Hypotheses 4 and 8 concerning both major and minor delinquency. I proposed that there would be a negative relationship between community approval of legal norms for those who report greater belief in the conventional moral order and the likelihood of either major or minor delinquent actions.

Adolescents’ approval of legal norms was the only significant and negative predictor for the probability of either major or minor delinquent behaviors across the three estimated
models. However, the association between approval of legal norms and the likelihood of involvement in minor delinquency disappeared after adding sociodemographic and control variables. These findings partially confirmed a previously proposed hypothesis in the literature.

Parental reaction did not receive significant support in any of the models. This result might be due to the fact that Kurdish parents living within Turkish conventional societies have strong relationship ties with their teenagers. The level of perceived parental reaction to a teenager’s stealing something worth more than four pounds of baklava or drinking alcohol was therefore categorized as ranging between somewhat against and totally against for all teenagers as well as those involved in delinquent behaviors. This result is likely due to the fact that regardless of restrictive parental reactions, juveniles received warm support from their parents, and those who bring home poor math scores may not be receiving the support they seek, even though, at present, parental control of adolescents’ activities is constantly declining in the Turkish community. In addition, if, Kurdish adolescents are becoming more individualistic (Sunar, 2002), and as such they may look down on class mates who do not do well in their studies, and make them feel less wanted. Those who do poorly in school may be less attached to the school, which is a predictor of delinquency.

**Gülen Movement**

Involvement in the Gülen movement had the proposed significant negative impact on participation in major or minor delinquency among Kurdish teenagers in all models. This study’s findings therefore revealed that involvement in the movement had a strong negative relationship with Kurdish adolescents’ delinquent activities.
As predicted, Kurdish teens involved with Gülen-affiliated organizations for at least one year reported higher levels of bonding with conventional society and lower self-reported delinquency levels than Kurdish teens involved with non-Gülen affiliated organizations, which remained significantly associated with either major or minor delinquency after introducing the sociodemographic or control variables in all models. Among all items compared, including the social bonding elements, involvement in the Gülen movement had the most robust effect on involvement in either major or minor delinquent activities.

The Gülen movement appears to have had a strong impact on Kurdish teenagers’ delinquent actions. First, the Gülen movement addresses the principles of justice and universal values instead of ethnic differences. Second, by establishing many charitable organizations that focus on reducing poverty and improving education in the territory, the Gülen movement volunteers are provided with the means to pursue solutions to society’s ills by focusing on eradicating poverty and improving education. Finally, the Gülen movement’s voice has gained widespread acceptance in southeastern Turkey.

Control Variables

Overtly, gender had a significant relationship with the probability of major delinquent behaviors. Findings support the view that Kurdish male teenagers are more likely to be engaged in major delinquency acts than female teenagers. These findings are fully consistent with the previous literature considering gender as one of the most important correlates (Canter, 1982; Hartjen & Priyadarsini 2003; McNulty & Bellair, 2003; Svensson, 2003; Thaxton & Agnew, 2004; Vazsonyi & Pickering, 2003; Yilmaz, 2002). This result is likely due to the fact that smoking
cigarettes and drinking alcohol are considered very common activities for males, while these activities are recognized as conspicuously non-normal activities for female adolescents particularly in southeastern Turkey. Possibly, those males who choose to become involved in smoking and alcohol behaviors to prove they are in control, or to boost their self-image. They may also choose to discount legal rules more readily than those who are succeeding. Females may choose other less obvious coping mechanisms or passive strategies that are more acceptable to society such as socializing. Smoking and alcohol are gateway behaviors for serious drug use, and for more opportunities to lose self-control and carry out delinquent behaviors. Males also tend to be more prone universally to acting out their emotions, or asserting themselves in more violent ways if they feel deprived of social or emotional resources, as well as physical resources, and this behavior is more accepted among men than it is among women, in general.

Researchers have also found that family supervision plays an important role in influencing the behavior of females in Turkey, but not males (Sunar & Fisek, 2004). Similar to Turkey, according to Hagan et al. (1985) family supervision in Western families has a stronger negative impact on female delinquent actions than on male delinquent actions. In the United States, and in some other parts of the world, almost every society aims to control and constrain the actions of women to a greater extent than men. As a result, female juveniles are less likely to engage in delinquent behaviors than male juveniles (Bachman, Johnston, & O’Malley, 1981), whether they are Turkish juveniles or not.

However, the findings did not support any significant associations with age and delinquency in the models concerning its relationship with either major or minor delinquency
behaviors. In contrast to previous findings, this study found that age did not appear to have an effect on delinquency. Age did not appear to explain a significant percentage of the variation in delinquent behavior among Kurdish adolescents.

Contrary to expectations, these findings revealed that the likelihood of participation in minor delinquency acts was higher among Kurdish teens whose mothers had higher levels of education. This result could be due to the fact that educated and more liberated mothers may neglect teenagers’ minor delinquent actions such as viewing smoking cigarettes as a very common activity in Turkish conventional communities. It is possible, however, that more educated mothers might have had less opportunity to supervise their adolescents than less educated mothers since more educated women might have greater job responsibilities and less time to supervise their children. They might also be focused more on their own activities than those of their child, or feel less restrictive towards their child, compared to the stay at home mother who is not exposed to education, and as a result, they might spend less time as a whole on issues such as directing their adolescents’ behavior.

The direction of the relationship was negative for teenagers whose fathers had a high school or lower level education. These teenagers were more likely to be involved in minor delinquency than those whose fathers had some college or higher education. Conversely, father’s education level did not receive any significant support from the analyses in all models. Contrary to its relationship with minor delinquency, mother’s education level was not significantly associated with major delinquency. In turn, fathers in Turkish society play a secondary role in the socialization process of juveniles, so they are not likely to focus directly on setting social behavioral boundaries for their children. In terms of the socialization of Turkish
adolescents, in general, the father usually maintains a distant relationship with his children, and relying on the mother for most socialization (Özbay & Özcan, 2008; Sunar, 2002).

Theoretical Implications

Hirschi’s social bonding theory is quite evident in this research. However, this dissertation has contributed to the field of sociology by providing a cross-national test of social bonding theory. Hirschi (1969) argued that criminal activity and deviance occur when individuals are weakly attached to society. His conclusion is supported by this research. In addition, the study found that school attachment, the approval of legal norms and partying also have a negative relationship with delinquent behaviors within Turkey. The present application of social bonding theory should be observed as a complement to Hirschi’s original analysis because the present findings highlight variations in the extent of the contribution of the extent of Kurdish teenagers’ attachment to engagement in major and minor delinquent activities.

Religious attachment, as measured by religious service attendance, participation in religious events and opinions regarding the importance of religion, affects the probability of delinquent activity (Hawkins et al., 1988; Jessor, 1976; Johnson et al., 2001). However, it is interesting to note that adolescents who report greater attachment to religion are more likely to report involvement in delinquency. It should also be noted that this study failed to find a significant relationship between religious attachment and involvement in delinquent activities. It appears that most of the hypotheses were supported, while attachment to religion and involvement in partying, disputes previous theoretical assumptions.
A growing body of cross-national literature has attempted to test criminological theories in a variety of societies, including China, Russia, the Ukraine, and several European countries. Theories that have been tested in other societies include anomie theory (Cao, 2004; Krohn, 1978; Messner, 1982), Agnew's general strain theory (Bao, Haas, & Pi 2004, 2007; institutional anomie (Messner & Rosenfeld, 1997), institutional anomie theory (Bjerregaard & Cochran, 2008; Cullen, Parboteeah, & Hoegl, 2004; Pratt & Godsey, 2003; Savolainen, 2000) Bonger's theory of Criminality and Economic Conditions (Antonaccio & Tittle, 2007), self-control theory (Vazsonyi & Belliston, 2007), social learning theory (Hwang & Akers, 2003), social bonding (Antonaccio, Botchkovar, & Tittle, 2011; Özbay & Özcan, 2006; Zhang & Messner, 1996) and the routine activities perspective (Messner, Lu, Zhang, & Liu, 2007). Due to the readier availability of data, a significant portion of this research has utilized macro level data on homicide rates e.g., (Messner & Rosenfeld, 1997). An increasing trend has been toward the use of survey data. However, much of this data has been collected from adults and less from adolescents and younger individuals. This dissertation contributes to this literature with additional self-report data drawn from a sample of adolescents. Further, the social bonding perspective remains comparatively less well researched in other societies. This dissertation also addresses this limitation in the cross national literature on theory testing.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter VI provides a summary of this study and addresses the findings of Hirschi’s social bonding theory. Potential contributions of the social bonding findings concerning policy implications are addressed, along with the study limitations and recommendations for related future study.

Summary

The research hypotheses, in general, indicated that the likelihood of Kurdish adolescents’ involvement in minor and major delinquent behaviors was higher for those who were less attached to parents, peers, school, religion and conventional others, and for those who had reported a lower degree of involvement in conventional activities, those who had reported a lower degree of commitment to conventional activities, and those who had reported a lower degree of belief in conventional moral order.

In the first part of the analysis, Hypotheses 1 to 4 were tested in order to determine whether or not the probability of Kurdish adolescents’ involvement in any type of minor delinquent activity was influenced by the four components of social bonding identified by Hirschi. The scale of minor delinquency contains an analysis of the rates of smoking cigarettes (Q31), snuffing (Q33), and drinking alcohol (Q32) which are viewed as less severe actions by the Turkish Penal Code.

In the second part of the analyses, Hypotheses 5 to 8 explored the issue of whether the likelihood of Kurdish adolescents’ engagement in any type of major delinquent activity within
the past 12 months was negatively related to four components of social bonding. This study contributes to the literature on social bonding on delinquency among adolescents. There is some variation among the effects of social bonding items on major and/or minor delinquency. There may be evidence that, in the absence of social bonding, Kurdish teenagers are more likely to report engaging in delinquent behaviors. This study also explored the effects of participation in the Gülen movement on delinquency. The findings of this dissertation have shown that participation in the Gülen movement has a consistently negative impact on both major and minor delinquent behaviors. Overall, the findings indicate that less engagement in meaningful activities, such as after school activities, as well as a weak attachment to society, school, and less approval of legal norms significantly increase the probability of involvement in major or minor delinquent actions among Kurdish adolescents.

**Policy Implications**

The findings of this study address a number of essential policy implications. The results suggest that involvement in conventional activities, which is one of the key elements of social bonding theory, is a promising avenue for preventing Kurdish adolescents from becoming involved in delinquent actions. Along with accessible strategies, Kurdish teenagers’ leisure time activities such as partying and going to the movies played a key role in unraveling delinquency behaviors in southeastern Turkey.

In practice, government administrators should cultivate non-destructive social programs and opportunities as a way to diminish the involvement of Kurdish teens in delinquent behaviors. My results illustrate that some teens’ families are farmers living at the poverty level.
The role of the Turkish government’ policies in fostering the participation and availability of conventional activities offered by states and municipalities is recommended in order to resolve the problem. The Turkish government might accordingly force city municipalities and mukhtars (elected heads of a neighborhood within a city) to stimulate the development of programs such as participation in sport clubs, movie nights, public concerts, coffee nights, reading clubs, and volunteering at aid and relief organizations in order to engage adolescents in these kinds of activities.

Moreover, these aforementioned social activities may improve the understanding of social bonding in the public eye. Involvement in conventional activities both creates and increases the sense of community membership in preventing and solving the delinquent problem behaviors of Kurdish adolescents. According to Sampson et al. (1997), residents’ collective efforts restrain involvement in delinquent behaviors by reducing disadvantages within communities. Efforts such as building recreation centers can therefore be extended to all southern cities and districts within Turkey. These centers will an important entity in the prevention of adolescents’ deviant actions by eliminating residents’ safety concerns.

Replicating earlier research, these findings suggest a greater attachment to school plays a major role in deterring Kurdish adolescents from engagement in delinquent acts (Ford, 2009; Lin & Dembo, 2008). School involvement improves students’ productivity in a positive way and employs their socialization processes positively rather than having schools be viewed as disciplinary institutions (Osgood & Anderson, 2004). Student’s school bonding is most importantly associated with teacher performance and their roles in student success.

Understanding students’ problems would also obviously foster students’ academic
achievement and the development of school attachment (Catalano et al., 2004; Maddox & Prinz, 2003). After-school programs would help integrate Kurdish teenagers back into conventional society. The attractiveness of after-school program activities may prevent students from becoming involved in delinquent activities as previously suggested by other scholars (Cross et al., 2009, Persson, Kerr, & Stattin, 2004). The Turkish Department of Education can therefore play an important part by implementing expanded learning opportunities such as before and after-school programs.

According to researchers, the major reason for teen involvement in delinquent activities and the PKK is that Kurdish adolescents or local people have no opportunities to benefit from the Gülen movement’s cultural and educational activities. The majority of Kurdish adolescents who become involved in delinquent activities did not attend such Gülen movement activities either at all or attended infrequently.

The Gülen movement’ educational, cultural, and charitable activities are critical factors that should be considered in solving delinquency problems among Kurdish adolescents living in southeastern Turkey. Both adolescents and adult residents become involved in a particular social setting by building collective actions and trust in local authorities (Kalyoncu, 2008). Social media and the Turkish parliament both desperately seek an answer for solving the Kurdish problem and how to inhibit youth involvement in the PKK in southeastern Turkey. Yavuz (2003) claims that the Gülen movement has opened so many schools, tutoring centers, and organized numerous aid campaigns to thousands of Kurdish people by bringing funding from western part of Turkey, buts more attention is needed in order to solve the Kurdish problem. Kalyoncu (2007) highlights the fact that thousands of Kurdish people are involved in the Gülen
movement’s activities. Cetin (2010), Ebaugh (2010), Kalyoncu (2007), Koc (2013), and Kirk (2008) argue that the Gülen movement has helped hundreds of Kurdish adolescents from southeastern Turkey’s villages, town, and cities be accepted to university by providing early education; the role of the Gülen movement therefore appears to undermine local support for the PKK. Social media in Turkey harshly critiques the Turkish government’s decision to close centers that provide additional potential university entrance support. After terminating these educational activities, social media were scared of experiencing delinquent Kurdish adolescent willingness to join the PKK in the absence of the Gülen movement.

Limitations

This study has several limitations related to the data collection process, potential bias, cultural applicability, and generalizability. Since the data were collected by each school principal from public schools in Diyarbakır and a Gülen-affiliated school (Private Çaglayan Murat Anatolian Science High School) in Şanlıurfa, Turkey at one point in time during November 2012, this study’s findings cannot identify changes over time.

Another major limitation in this study is that its results cannot be generalized to all Kurdish adolescents living specifically in southeastern Turkey since the available sample does not simply characterize all southeastern adolescents within Turkey. In addition, the study only includes Kurdish adolescents attending public school in Diyarbakır and a Gülen-affiliated school (Private Çaglayan Murat Anatolian Science High School) in Şanlıurfa, Turkey. There is a possibility of missing sampling many delinquent teens who may be more likely to skip school, as well as adolescents held in legal custody. Moreover, opinions given by teenagers not enrolled in
school were not included or represented. This concern also constrains the influence of the analyses and richness of the data.

Furthermore, a major limitation in this study is potential biases that may have occurred during the collection process since the data collected were self-reported. Although there are some delinquent teenagers involved in Gülen movement activities reported at the public school, there are no types of delinquent activities reported from the Gülen-affiliated school. Due to the protection of the school image and unattractive consequences of reporting on this issue, students may not have been willing to disclose their delinquent and anti-societal activities at the Gülen-affiliated school, or the sample may have only been selected from the school’s best students who presented good behavior and academic achievement.

Due to the lack of trust, ethnic differences, and unattractive consequences, the respondents may not truly disclose their thoughts during the survey (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). The researcher too may have influenced the responses in some way. In addition, the sample size was limited to 200 teenagers attending schools, and the cultural applicability of instruments was also difficult. The reading level of Kurdish adolescents might also be a problem, as were the nonrandom sample selections.

Likewise, having other ethnic groups such as Arabs and Turks in the study would have been more representative and each ethnic group would have served as a comparison group. There may be cultural effect within communities, peer groups, and families that may affect higher social bonding as consequences of Turkish cultural membership. Due to these cultural differences, the response correctness of a given group of Kurdish teenagers might be different than that of teenagers in Western societies. Similarly, boys tend to give less accurate results
compared to girls in Western societies (Flood-Page, Campbell, Harrington, & Miller, 2000). This might also be considered another limitation since in Turkish conventional culture teenage boys might more likely to overstate their delinquent actions specifically being involved in a serious fight, alcohol, and smoking which are considered brave activities. Finally, it is thought that researcher bias due to age, appearance, gender, and particularly ethnicity may be significant in the data collection. Participants may therefore not have responded with complete accuracy.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study attempted to test the impact of social bonding on self-reported delinquent behaviors among Kurdish adolescents living in southeastern Turkey. Although the findings support the research hypotheses, the same models can also be used to examine the social bonding theory in other Turkish cities by using different types of data in order to ensure the empirical validity.

Further studies should seek to increase the sample size in order to minimize the potential bias and reliability issues. A sample could also be drawn from a population that represents Kurdish adolescents not only from Turkey, but also from Syria, Iran, and Iraq since significant Kurdish populations also reside in northern Syria, northern Iraq, and south-western Iran. This would also enable researchers to draw conclusions concerning how delinquent activities and rates differ in these countries in terms of cultures, political systems, and ethno-religious identities.

Future studies could also include teenagers who were not enrolled in school due to financial difficulties, since the poverty issue is a serious problem in southeastern Turkey. A child
may not attend school in order to work on the family farm, or work to become a breadwinner at an early age in order to maintain the extended family’s financial life. A larger sample including adolescents not enrolled in school would enable the study to better represent the population. Data confirming higher rates of delinquency in students who are in custody or do not attend school for various reasons should also be included.

Although the current data examines a sufficient number of major delinquent activities, future studies could also embrace other types of minor delinquent activities since only a few are presented in the current data. Less serious delinquent activities such as cheating or bullying could also be counted in the index of minor delinquency to develop additional conclusions. Future research can accordingly test the same research questions after adding other measures of delinquent behavior.

Furthermore, different types of statistical techniques such as ordinary least squares regression analysis and path analysis could have been used to test the mediating effect of social bonding on delinquent behavior among Kurdish teens. Further studies might use Hirschi’s social bonding theory to test the impact of participation in the Gülen movement organization on terrorist organizations such as the PKK and Hezbollah among Kurdish teens. Future studies might then accordingly support the Gülen movement’s collective action as well as its sustained struggle against terrorism, poverty, and lack of education in southeastern Turkey.

Although this study failed to find a clear relationship between religion attachment and involvement in delinquent activities, future research should undertake a more detailed examination of the relationship between religion and involvement in delinquent activities carried out by Turkish adolescents. Southeastern Turkey is more conservative compared to
other locations within Turkey. Hence, a more thorough evaluation of secular versus religious agencies would help determine how and by whom delinquent acts are condemned by Turkish society. In particular, contrary to Hirschi and Stark’s findings this may shed additional light on the social bonding theory’s ability to explain why students who report greater religious attachment tend to become more involved in delinquency in non-western societies. Finally, this dissertation is intended to direct the attention of political leaders who have the necessary vision to generate changes focused on curbing ethnic conflict, decreasing poverty, and education.

Conclusion

This dissertation is the first to test Hirschi’s social bonding theory in order to understand delinquent activities among Kurdish adolescents in southeastern Turkey. This study underlines the importance of social bonding theory in explaining delinquent behaviors among Kurdish adolescents in southeastern Turkey. The social bonding theory was developed and mainly tested in an American and western European context, but must be expanded in order to confirm its empirical validity, generalizability and efficiency in a non-western and particularly Islamic society. This study proves that the social bonding theory developed in western society is applicable to Turkish society in understanding adolescent delinquent behaviors, regardless of the subjects’ geographical locations, norms, values, and beliefs.

I sought to find a clear relationship between social bonding components and either major or minor delinquency in order to understand the effect of social bonding elements on Kurdish teenagers’ delinquent actions. I hypothesized that the relationship between the social
bonding components -attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief- and delinquency should be stronger in the case of Kurdish adolescents who are more attached to conventional Turkish society.

The results regarding school attachment, involvement in conventional activities (going to the movies and going to parties), legal norms, and commitment (spending time on homework) provided significant support for the research hypotheses and were consistent with previous studies. This study verified that Kurdish teens’ greater attachment (to school, parents, peers, and religion), involvement in conventional activities, commitment, and belief were all negatively correlated with the probability of engaging in either major or minor delinquent behaviors when controlling for gender, age, and paternal and maternal education levels. Finally, the Gülen movement was also examined as an independent variable; these findings demonstrated a strong relationship between the Gülen movement and Kurdish adolescents’ probability of involvement in either major or minor delinquent activities.
APPENDIX

SURVEY DOCUMENTS
Title of Study: ANALYZING DELINQUENCY AMONG KURDISH ADOLESCENTS: A TEST OF HIRSCHI’S SOCIAL BONDING THEORY

Student Investigator: Sebahattin Ziyanak, University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Sociology. Supervising Investigator: Dr. Daniel G. Rodeheaver.

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to participate in a research study which involves Hirschi’s social bonding theory to examine the impact of participation in Gülen movement (GM) organizations on delinquent behavior among Kurdish teens.

Social bonding theory questions the motivations for committing crimes. According to Hirschi, when individuals are weakly attached to society, criminal activity and deviance emerges. His concern is based on the view of an individual’s involvement as it is correlated to their society. A teenager’s strength of commitment to society becomes a central variable. The stronger the commitment, the likelihood of committing a crime diminishes. When commitment is higher, the individual has more to lose in terms of acceptance and social capital. In theory, the person with less commitment to society has less to lose; therefore is more likely to commit a crime.

Gülen was a mosque preacher who, in 1982, inspired a group of followers to take his ideals of education and make them a reality by opening private secondary high schools in İstanbul and Izmir. The movement purports to address the common problems, needs, and aspirations of people in southeastern Turkey by opposing ethnic and socioeconomic differences. People involved in the GM are sympathetic to its concepts of taking serious action against problems within Turkey’s Kurdish region. Evidence of this support is primarily expressed via donation and self-sacrifice to the service of fellow humanity.

Study Procedures: You will be asked 57 close ended questions regarding your behavior, educational attainment, and feelings about the Gülen Movement’s social program and activities. The anticipated length of time required to complete the survey is a maximum of forty-five minutes.

Foreseeable Risks: Some of the questions may make you feel uncomfortable. For example, in the last 12 months, how often did you get into physical fight which someone was hurt? If you want, you do not have to answer any question and can end the survey at any time.

Benefits to the Subjects or Others: This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you, but we hope to learn more about your behavior, educational attainment, and feelings about the Gülen movement’s social program and activities. This project may contribute new
knowledge to the social bonding literature. It is expected offer clear designs for non-violent strategies to strengthen multi-ethnic communities.

**Compensation for Participants:** None

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records:** No one will be able to know how you responded to the questions and your name will never be used. Your participation in the study is strictly voluntary and confidential. If you feel uncomfortable at any time during the course of the survey, you can decline to answer any question or end the survey entirely. Data will be maintained in a locked cabinet at University of North Texas campus. Data will be available only to those involved in the research. It will be destroyed after three years from the completion of the study. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study.

**Questions about the Study:** If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Sebahattin Ziyanan or Dr. Daniel G. Rodeheaver, faculty sponsor, at 940-565-2296.

**Review for the Protection of Participants:** This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

**Research Participants’ Rights:** Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- You understand the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to take part in this study, and your refusal to participate or your decision to withdraw will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your participation at any time.
- Your decision whether to participate or to withdraw from the study will have no effect on your grade or standing in this course.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
- You understand your rights as a research participant and you voluntarily consent to participate in this study.
- You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.
Printed Name of Participant

Signature of Participant ________________________________

Date ________________________________
Kuzey Teksas Üniversitesi İnceleme Yönetim Kurulu

Bilgilendirme Onay Belgesi

Bu çalışmaya katılımı onaylamadan önce, bu çalışmanın amacı, katkılarını, riskleri ve nasıl yapılacağı açıklamının okunması ve anlaşılması önemlidir.

**Çalışmanın Başlığı:** “HİRSCHİ’NİN SOSYAL KONTROL TEORİSİ BAGLAMINDA KÜRT GENÇLERİNDE SUÇUN ANALİZİ”

**Öğrenci Araştırmacı:** Sebahattin Ziyanak, Kuzey Teksas Üniversitesi (UNT) Sosyoloji Bölümü. **Yönetici Araştırmacı:** Doktor. Daniel G. Rodeheaver.

**Çalışmanın Amacı:** Hirsch’i’nin Sosyal Kontrol teorisinin incelemek için Gülen Hareketi’nin Kürt Gençlerinin suç işlemesine olumu yada olumsuz etkisini test etmek isteyen çalışmaya davet edildiniz.


**Çalışmanın Prosodürü:** Sizin davranışlarınız, alışkanlıklarınızı, eğitim hedefiniz, duygularınızı ve Gülen Hareketi’nin programları ve aktiviteleri hakkında 57 tane soru sorulacaktır. Anket 45 dakika içinde bitirilmelidir.

**Beklenen Riskler:** Bazı sorular sizi rahatsız edebilir. Mesela, son on iki ay içinde ne kadar siklikla kavga ettiniz? Bilmelisiniz ki sorulara cevap vermek zorunda olmadiğiniz gibi istediginiz zaman anketi bırakabilirsiniz.

**Katılımcıya ve Diger Faydalar:** Bu çalışma size direkt bir fayda sağlayacaktır ama sizin davranışlarınızı, eğitim hedeflerinizi, duygularınızı ve Gülen Hareketi’nin program ve aktiviteleri hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinmeyi umut ediyorum. Bu çalışma sosyal kontrol teorisine yeni bir
bakanın görüşüne getiricek. Bu çalışma etnik kardeşliği üstlediği gibi sorunları çözme noktasında daha iyi stratejiler üreticek.

**Katılımcılar Verilen Ödül :** Yok


**Çalışma Hakkında Sorular:** Çalışma hakkında herhangi bir sorunuz olursa, Sebahattin Ziyanak veya Doktor. Daniel G. Rodeheaver, Fakülte sponsoru, 940-565-2296 nolu telefondan ulaşabilirsiniz.

**Katılımcının Korunması İncelemesi:** Bu araştırma Kuzey Teksas Üniversitesi İnceleme Yönetim Kurulu tarafından gözden geçirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır. Bu konu ile ilgili sorularınız için Kuzey Teksas Üniversitesi İnceleme Yönetim Kurulu’na (940) 565-3940 nolu telefondan ulaşabilirsiniz.

**Araştırmaya Katılanların Hakları:** Asağıdaki imzanız bu belgenin size okunduğunuzu ve aşağıdaki devam eden bilgileri onayladığınızı gösteriyor.

- Sebahattin Ziyanak çalışmaya size açıkladı ve tüm sorularınızı cevapladı Çalışmada oluşabilecek risk ve rahatsızlıklar ve muhtemel katılımcı ödül açıklanmıştır.
- Sunu bilmelisiniz ki bu çalışmada yer almak zorunda değil, yer almamanız durumunda herhangi bir ceza olmadığı gibi herhangi bir hakkınızı kaybolsa söz konusu değildir. Sizin isteğiniz doğrultusunda çalışmaya birakabilirsiniz.
- Çalışmaya katılmamanız yada katılmak devem etmek istemediniz zaman hic bir şekilde ders notunuza bir etkisi olmayacağı gibi alması olduğunuz ders içinde herhangi bir sıkıntı olusturmayacaktır.
- Çalışmanın nicin ve nasıl yapılacağı ve prosedürü anılmış olmalıdır.
- Araştırma kendi rıزانızla katılmak istediginizi kabul ediyorsunuz.
- Size bu formdan bir tane kopya veriliceğin bahsedildi.
Katılınan Adı

Katılanın İmzası   Tarih
Title of Study: ANALYZING DELINQUENCY AMONG KURDISH ADOLESCENTS: A TEST OF HIRSCHI’S SOCIAL BONDING THEORY

Student Investigator: Sebahattin Ziyanak, University of North Texas (UNT) Department of Sociology. Supervising Investigator: Dr. Daniel G. Rodeheaver.

Purpose of the Study: You are being asked to allow your child to participate in a research study which involves Hirschi’s social bonding theory to examine the impact of participation in Gülen movement (GM) organizations on delinquent behavior among Kurdish teens.

Social bonding theory questions the motivations for committing crimes. According to Hirschi, when individuals are weakly attached to society, criminal activity and deviance emerges. His concern is based on the view of an individual’s involvement as it is correlated to their society. A teenager’s strength of commitment to society becomes a central variable. The stronger the commitment, the likelihood of committing a crime diminishes. When commitment is higher, the individual has more to lose in terms of acceptance and social capital. In theory, the person with less commitment to society has less to lose; therefore is more likely to commit a crime.

Gülen was a mosque preacher who, in 1982, inspired a group of followers to take his ideals of education and make them a reality by opening private secondary high schools in Istanbul and Izmir. The movement purports to address the common problems, needs, and aspirations of people in southeastern Turkey by opposing ethnic and socioeconomic differences. People involved in the GM are sympathetic to its concepts of taking serious action against problems within Turkey’s Kurdish region. Evidence of this support is primarily expressed via donation and self-sacrifice to the service of fellow humanity.

Study Procedures: Your child will be asked 57 close ended questions regarding your behavior, educational attainment, and feelings about the Gülen movement’s social program and activities. The anticipated length of time required to complete the survey is a maximum of forty-five minutes.

Foreseeable Risks: Some of the questions may make your child feel uncomfortable. For example, in the past 12 months, how often did you get into physical fight which someone was
hurt? Your child does not have to answer any question. Your child can end the survey at any time.

**Benefits to the Subjects or Others:** This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to your child, but we hope to learn more about your child behavior, educational attainment, and feelings about the Gülen movement’s social program and activities. This project may contribute new knowledge to the social bonding literature. It is expected to offer clear designs for non-violent strategies to strengthen multi-ethnic communities.

**Procedures for Maintaining Confidentiality of Research Records:** No one will be able to know how your child responded to the questions and your child’s name will never be used. Your child participation in the study is strictly voluntary and confidential. The confidentiality of your child’s information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study as only group results will be discussed or presented.

**Questions about the Study:** If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Sebahattin Ziyanak or Dr. Daniel G. Rodeheaver, faculty sponsor, at 940-565-2296.

**Review for the Protection of Participants:** This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.

**Research Participants’ Rights:** Your signature below indicates that you have read or have had read to you all of the above and that you confirm all of the following:

- You understand the possible benefits and the potential risks and/or discomforts of the study.
- You understand that you do not have to allow your child to take part in this study, and your refusal to allow your child to participate or your decision to withdraw him/her from the study will involve no penalty or loss of rights or benefits. The study personnel may choose to stop your child’s participation at any time.
- You understand why the study is being conducted and how it will be performed.
• You understand your rights as the parent/guardian of a research participant and you voluntarily consent to your child’s participation in this study.
• You have been told you will receive a copy of this form.

________________________________
Printed Name of Parent or Guardian

________________________________    ____________
Signature of Parent or Guardian             Date
Student Assent Form

You are being asked to be part of a research project being done by the University of North Texas Department of Sociology.

This study involves Hirschi’s social bonding theory to examine the impact of participation in Gülen movement (GM) organizations on delinquent behavior among Kurdish teens.

You will be asked 57 close ended questions regarding your behavior, educational attainment, and feelings about the Gülen Movement’s social program and activities. The anticipated length of time required to complete the survey is a maximum of forty-five minutes.

If you decide to be part of this study, please remember you can stop participating any time you want to.

If you would like to be part of this study, please sign your name below.

__________________________                                _______________
Printed Name of Student     Date

__________________________                     _______________
Signature of Student                     Date

__________________________                     _______________
Signature of Key Personnel                     Date
Çocugunuz bu çalışmaya katılımını onaylamadan önce, bu çalışmanın amacı, katkılarını, riskleri ve nasıl yapılacağını açıklamalarının okunması ve anlaşılması önemlidir.

**Çalışmanın Başlığı:** “HİRSCHİ’NİN SOSYAL KONTROL TEORİSİ BAGLAMINDA KÜRT GENÇLERİNDE SUÇ ANALİZİ”.

**Öğrenci Araştıracı:** Sebahattin Ziyakan, Kuzey Teksas Üniversitesi (UNT) Sosyoloji Bölümü.

**Yönetici Araştıracı:** Doktor. Daniel G. Rodeheaver.

**Çalışmanın Amacı:** Hirschi’nin Sosyal Kontrol teorisinin incelemek için Gülen Hareketi’nin Kürt Gençlerinin suç işlemesine olumlu veya olumsuz etkisini test etmek isteyen çalışmaya davet edildiniz.


**Çalışmanın Prosedürü:** Sizin davranışlarınız, alışkanlıklarınız, eğitim hedefiniz, duygularınız ve Gülen Hareketi’nin programları ve aktiviteleri hakkında sıklı 57 tane soru sorulacaktır. Anket 45 dakika içinde bitirilmelidir.

**Beklenen Riskler:** Bazı sorular sizi rahatsız edebilir. Mesela, son on iki ay içinde ne kadar sıklıkla kavga ettiniz? Bilmelisiniz ki sorulara cevap vermek zorunda olmadığını gibi istediginiz zaman anketi bırakabilirsiniz.
Katılımcıya ve Diger Faydalar: Bu çalışma size direkt bir fayda sağlamayacaktır ama sizin davranışlarınızı, eğitim hedeflerinizi, duygularınızı ve Gülen Hareketi’nin program ve aktiviteleri hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinmeneyi umut ediyorum. Bu çalışma sosyal kontrol teorisine yeni bir bakış açısı getiricek. Bu çalışma etnik kardeşliği üstelediği gibi sorunları çözme noktasında daha iyi stratejiler üreticek.

Katılımcılara Verilen Ödül: Yok


Araştırmaya Katılanların Hakları: Asagıdaki imzanız bu belgenin size okunduğunu yada sizin okuduğunuzu ve aşağıdaki devam eden bilgileri onayladığınızı gösteriyor.

- Sebahattin Ziyaanak çalışmaya size açıkladı ve tüm sorularınızı cevapladı Çalışmada oluşabilecek risk ve rahatsızlıklar ve muhtemel katılımcı ödülü açıklanmıştır.
- Sunu bilmelisiniz ki çocukunuz bu çalışmada yer almak zorunda değil, yer almaması durumunda herhangi bir ceza olmadığı gibi herhangi bir
hakkının kaybedilmesi söz konusu değildir. Sizin isteginiz doğrultusunda 
cocuğunuzun çalışmaya katılması derhal engellenecektir.

- Çalışmanın niçin ve nasıl yapılacağı ve prosüdürü anlamanız gerekir.
- Katılımcının ebeveyi/ velisi olarak çocuğunuzun araştırmaya katılmasına 
izin verdiğiizi kabul ediyoruz.
- Size bu formdan bir tane kopya veriliceği bahsedildi.

Velinin/Ebeveyin Adı

______________________________
Veli/Ebeveyin İmzası Tarih
Öğrenci Onay Formu

Kuzey Teksas Üniversitesi’nin Sosyoloji bölümünden yapılan araştırmanın bir parçası olmanız istenildi.

Bu proje Hirschi’nin Sosyal Kontrol teorisinin bağlamında Gülen Hareketi’nin Kürt Gençlerinin suç işlesmesine olumlu yada olumsuz etkisini test etmektedir.

Bu çalışma kapsamında size şık 57 tane davranışlarınız, alışkanlıklarınız, eğitim hedefiniz, duygularınız ve Gülen Hareketi’nin programları ve aktiviteleri hakkında sorular sorulucaksınız ve anket maksimum 45 dakika sürecek ve anketin 45 dakika içinde tamamlanması gerekmektedir.

Eğer bu projeye katılmak isterseniz, lütfen sunu biliniz ki isteğinize taktirde katılmaktan vazgeçebiliriniz.

Eğer bu projeye katılmak isterseniz, lütfen aşağıdaki yeri imzalayınız.

__________________________                                _______________
Gencin İsmi                                                Tarih

__________________________                                _______________
Gencin İmzası                                               Tarih

__________________________                                _______________
Personelin İmzası                                          Tarih
Youth in Southeastern Turkey Questionnaires

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). No one will be able to know how you responded to the questions and your name will never be used. Your participation in the study is strictly voluntary and confidential. If you feel uncomfortable at any time during the course of the survey, you can decline to answer any question or end the survey entirely. Please circle the answer or answers that apply to each question, or mark out one box only that applies to each question.

**How well do the following statements apply to you?**

**Q1a)** I like my school
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

**Q1b)** I want to quit school
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

**Q1c)** I want to change school
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

**Q1d)** I do not get along with fellow students
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me
Q1e) I do not get along with the teachers
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

How well do the following statements apply to you?

Q2a I pray to God on a regular basis
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

Q2b I regularly read in the holy writs of my faith
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

Q2c I regularly attend religious services
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

Q2d I regularly take part in religious activities other than services
- Applies to always to me
- Applies often to me
- Applies sometimes to me
- Applies seldom to me
- Applies almost never to me

How well do the following statements apply to you?
Q3a My parents know who I am with when I am away from home?
Applies very poorly to me
Applies rather poorly to me
Applies rather well to me
Applies very well to me
Q3b My parents know where I am in the evening when I am away from home?
Applies very poorly to me
Applies rather poorly to me
Applies rather well to me
Applies very well to me

How easy or hard would it be for you to receive the following from your parents?

Q4a Caring and warmth
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy
Q4b Advice about school
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy
Q4c Advice about other issues (projects) of yours
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy
Q4d Assistance with things
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy

How easy or hard would it be for you to receive the following from your friends?

Q5a Caring and warmth
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy
Q5b Advice about school
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy
Q5c Advice about other issues (projects) of yours
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy
Q5d Assistance with things
☐ Very Difficult ☐ Rather Difficult ☐ Rather Easy ☐ Very Easy

Q6: How often do you go to the movies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or three times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everyday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7: How often do you play sports (such as soccer or basketball) in a sport club or team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often do you do the following?

Q8a Spend time downtown during the evening or on the weekends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8b Go to a party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8c Go to entertainments with live music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9: Are you involved in the Gülen Movement in any way? If no skip to question 12.

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Q10 How did you become involved with Gülen Movement in any way?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged by relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged by friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through neighborhood conversation/meetings (sohbet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q11: How much time do you spend on the Gülen Movement related activities?

Not involved
Less than half an hour a day
About half an hour a day
About one hour a day
About two hours a day
About three hours a day
About four hours or more a day

Q12 Do you attend a Gülen affiliated school? If no skip to question 14.
☐ Yes ☐ No

Q13 Why do you attend this Gülen affiliated school?

My friends go to this school
Quality of the teacher
It is in my neighborhood
My family wants me to go
Because this is Gülen school
Other

Q14: How much time do you usually spend on homework every day?

I never do any homework
Less than half an hour
About half an hour
About one hour
About two hours
About three hours
About four hours
More than four hours

Q15: What have your grades been in native language this semester?

Less than 1
About 2
About 3
About 4
About 5
Q16: What have your grades been in mathematics this semester?

Less than 1
About 2
About 3
About 4
About 5

Q17: What do you think you will do after graduating from high school?

I will go to University
I will go to professional school
I will look for a job

Q18: How important is it to you to earn a university degree?

Very important
Fairly important
Not Sure
Fairly unimportant
Not important at all

Q19: Which one of the following best describes your goal/s for being in the Gülen Movement? Circle all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not involved</th>
<th>To get higher educational services</th>
<th>To become a good example of Muslim</th>
<th>Take services to my friends</th>
<th>To do best</th>
<th>To earn God’s support</th>
<th>To become successful</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q20a I talk up the Gülen Movement to my friends as a great organization.
[ ] Strongly agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Not sure  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly disagree

Q20b I am proud to tell others that I am part of the Gülen Movement.
[ ] Strongly agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Not sure  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly disagree

Q20c I find that my values and the Gülen Movement’s values are very similar.
Q20d I am willing to put in a great deal of effort in order to help the Gülen Movement be successful.
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

Q21: How do you think your parents would react if you stole something worth more than four pounds baklava?
Very satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
They would not care
Somewhat against
Totally against

Q22: How do you think your parents would react if you would drink alcohol?
Very satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
They would not care
Somewhat against
Totally against

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Q23a One can break most rules if they don’t seem to apply to you
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly disagree
Q23b I follow whatever rules I want to follow
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly disagree
Q23c Sometimes one needs to break rules in order to succeed
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly disagree
Q23d Following rules does not guarantee success
☐ Strongly agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly disagree

These questions focus on what you think about the Gülen Movement.

Q24: What are the main sources of information through which you were exposed to the Gülen Movement: Circle all that apply.

| Media (Newspaper, magazine) | Internet | Advertisement | Books | Family | Friends | Word of Mouth |
Q25: Which of these best describe the Gülen Movement? Circle all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gülen Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fethullah Gülen, enthusiasm to serve people and God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundamentalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover for the CIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar, intellectual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran’s version of Islam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q26: In the last 12 months how many times have you met someone involved with the Gülen Movement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 times a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost everyday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q27: Do you have family in the Gülen Movement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of my family</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more family members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q28: Do you have friends in the Gülen Movement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of my friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5 or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These questions ask about some of your major actions.
Q29: During the last 30 days, did you ever stay away from school just because you were sick?
Never
Once
Twice
3-4 times
5-6 times
More than six times

Q30: During the last 30 days, did you ever stay away from school just because you had other things that you wanted to do?
Never
Once
Twice
3-4 times
5-6 times
More than six times

Q31: How many times have you have smoked cigarettes in the last 30 days?
Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q32: How often have you drunken alcohol during the last 30 days?
Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q33: How often have you snuffed in the last 30 days?
Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times
Q34: In the last 12 months, how often did you physically injure someone else?

Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q35: In the last 12 months, how often did you get into a fight in which someone was hurt?

Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q36: In the last 12 months, how often did you damage property on purpose that did not belong to you?

Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q37: In the last 12 months, how often did you paint graffiti or signs on someone else’s property or on a public building?

Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q38: In the last 12 months, how often did you break into a car to steal something?

Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q39: In the last 12 months, how often did you steal something worth less than four pounds of baklava?

Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Q40: In the last 12 months, how often did you steal something worth more than four pounds of baklava?

Never
1 time
2 times
3 times
4 times
More than five times

Three Pages to Go

Please answer the following questions. These will help me to understand your responses.

Q41: What is your sex?

☐ Male ☐ Female

Q42: How old are you? Number in years only

___________________

Q43: What is the name of your school? ______________________________________________

Q44: Which best describes your ethnicity.
Kurdish □ Turkish □ Other (specify)________________

Q45: What is your current year in school?

High School 4th year
High School 3rd year
High School 2nd year
Other (specify)

Q46: What is your current average?

__________

Q47: Where were you born?

Diyarbakır
Sanliurfa
Istanbul
Other (specify)____________________________

Q48: What is your religion?

Islam
Zerdust
Christianity
None________
Other________

Q49: What party do you support most?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>AKP (Justice Development Party)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BDP (The Peace and Democracy Party)</td>
<td>CHP (Republican People’s Party)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP (Nationalist Movement Party)</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q50: Which category best describes where your family lives?

Village
Town
City
Other

Q51: Which category best describes your family?
Lower Class
Working Class
Middle Class
High Class

Q52: What best describes your parents’ marital status?

Married, live in same household
Divorced
Separated
Widowed
Single-parent
Other (explain)__________________________

Q53: What is your father’s job?

Unemployed
Laborer
Farmer
Manufacturing/Business
Military
Professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher)
other

Q54: What is your mother’s job?

Unemployed
Housewife
Farmer
Manufacturing/Business
Professional (doctor, lawyer, teacher)
other

Q55: What is the highest level of schooling your father completed?

Graduated from primary/secondary/high school
Started vocational high school but has not finished
Graduated from vocational high school
Started university but has not finished
Graduated from a university
I don't know/doesn't apply

Q56: What is the highest level of schooling your mother completed?

Graduated from primary/secondary/high school
Started vocational high school but has not finished
Graduated from vocational high school
Started university but has not finished
Graduated from a university
I don't know/doesn't apply

Q57: In the last 12 months which are the best to apply? Check all that apply.

Live at home full time
Live at school full time
Live at home part time (i.e. holiday, weekends, summer)
Live at school part time (i.e. school term – fall/spring)
Other (specify)__________________________

Thank you for your participation and time you have spent on providing the responses.
Güneydoğu Anadolu Gençlik Anketi


Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır?

Q1a) Okulumu seviyorum
   • Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
   • Sıklıkla uyar
   • Bazen uyar
   • Ender olarak uyar
   • Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Q1b) Okuldan ayrılmak istiyorum
   • Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
   • Sıklıkla uyar
   • Bazen uyar
   • Ender olarak uyar
   • Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Q1c) Okulumu değiştirmek istiyorum
   • Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
   • Sıklıkla uyar
   • Bazen uyar
   • Ender olarak uyar
   • Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Q1d) Arkadaşlarım ile iyi anlaşamıyorum
   • Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
   • Sıklıkla uyar
   • Bazen uyar
   • Ender olarak uyar
   • Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Q1e) Öğretmenlerim ile iyi anlaşamıyorum
   • Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
   • Sıklıkla uyar
   • Bazen uyar
   • Ender olarak uyar
• Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır?

Q2a Düzenli olarak Allah’a ibadetimi yaparım

• Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
• Sıklıkla uyar
• Bazen uyar
• Ender olarak uyar
• Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Q2b Düzenli olarak kendi inancına ait yazılar okurum

• Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
• Sıklıkla uyar
• Bazen uyar
• Ender olarak uyar
• Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Q2c Düzenli olarak dini programlara katılırım

• Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
• Sıklıkla uyar
• Bazen uyar
• Ender olarak uyar
• Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Q2d Düzenli olarak dini ibadetlerden çok dini aktivitelere katılırım.

• Hemen hemen her zaman uyar
• Sıklıkla uyar
• Bazen uyar
• Ender olarak uyar
• Hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz

Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır?

Q3a Ebeveynim evden dışarı çıktığında aksamları kimlerle oldugumu bilir?

Benim durumuma tamamman uygundur
Benim durumuma oldukça uygundur
Benim durumuma pek uymuyor
Benim durumuma hiç uymuyor
Q3b Ebeveynim akşamları nerede olduğumu bilir?

Benim durumuma tamammen uygundur
Benim durumuma oldukça uygundur
Benim durumuma pek uymuyor
Benim durumuma hiç uymuyor

Aşağıdaki davranışları ailenizden görmek ne kadar kolay ya da ne kadar zordur

Q4a Sıcaklık ve ilgi
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Q4b Okul ile ilgili tavsiyeler
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Q4c Başka konular (projeler) hakkında tavsiyeler
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Q4d Diğer başka şeylerde yardım
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Aşağıdaki davranışları arkadaşlarınızdan görmek ne kadar kolay ya da ne kadar zordur?

Q5a Sıcaklık ve ilgi
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Q5b Okul ile ilgili tavsiyeler
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Q5c Başka konular (projeler) hakkında tavsiyeler
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Q5d Diğer başka şeylerde yardım
☐ Çok zor  ☐ Zor  ☐ Kolay  ☐ Çok kolay

Q6: Ne kadar sııklıkla film seyretmeye gidersiniz?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neredeyse hiç</th>
<th>Ayda birden az</th>
<th>Yaklaşık ayda bir kez</th>
<th>Ayda iki yada üç kez</th>
<th>Haftada bir yada iki kez</th>
<th>Hemen hemen her gün</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q7: Bir spor kulübünde yada takımında ne kadar sııklık futbol yada basketbol gibi sporları yaparsınız?

| Neredeyse hiç | Haftada bir kez | Haftada iki kez |
Aşağıdaki faaliyetleri ne kadar sıklıkla yaparsınız?

Q8a Hafta sonları yada akşamları şehir merkezinde vakit geçirmek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neredeyse hiç</th>
<th>Yılda bir kaç defa</th>
<th>Ayda bir kaç defa</th>
<th>Haftada bir kaz defa</th>
<th>Haftada üç yada daha fazla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q8b Partiye gitmek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neredeyse hiç</th>
<th>Yılda bir kaç defa</th>
<th>Ayda bir kaç defa</th>
<th>Haftada bir kaz defa</th>
<th>Haftada üç yada daha fazla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q8c Müsikli eglenceye gitmek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neredeyse hiç</th>
<th>Yılda bir kaç defa</th>
<th>Ayda bir kaç defa</th>
<th>Haftada bir kaz defa</th>
<th>Haftada üç kez veya daha fazla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


☐ Evet ☐ Hayır

Q10 Gülen Hareketine nasıl girdiniz?

Bağlı degilim
Yakınlarının tavsiyesi ile
Arkadaşlarınım tavsiyesi ile
Mahalle sohbet ve toplantılarında
Hakkında kitaplar okuyarak
Gülen’in sohbet kasetlerini dinleyerek
Diğer

Q11: Gülen Hareketi’nin aktivitelerinde ne kadar zaman harcarsınız?
Bağlı degilim
Günde yarım saat'ten daha az
Yaklaşık günde yarım saat
Yaklaşık günde bir saat
Yaklaşık günde iki saat
Yaklaşık günde üç saat
Yaklaşık günde dört saat ve fazlası

Q12 Gülen Hareketi’nin ideolojisine uyariant bir okula mı gidiyorsunuz? Eğer cevabınız hayır ise
14. Soruya geçiniz
☐ Evet ☐ Hayır

Q13 Neden Gülen Hareketinin ideolojisine uyuyor bir okula gidiyorsunuz?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arkadaşları bu okula gidiyor</th>
<th>Öğretmenlerin kalitesi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benim mahallemde</td>
<td>Ailem gitmemi istiyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cünkü bu bir Gülen okulu</td>
<td>Diğer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q14: Ödev yapmak için genelde HER GÜN ne kadar zaman harciyorsunuz?

Hiç ödev yapmam
Yarım saat'ten az
Yarım saat civarı
1 saat civarı
2 saat civarı
3 saat civarı
4 saat civarı
4 saatten fazla
Q15: Bu dönem dil ve anlatım dersinden aldığınız notlar kaçtır?

1’in altında
2 civarı
3 civarı
4 civarı
5 civarı
Q16: Bu dönemin matematik dersinden aldığı notlar kaçtır?

1’in altında
2 civarı
3 civarı
4 civarı
5 civarı

Q17: Bu okuldan mezun olduktan sonra ne yapmayı düşünüyorsunuz?

Üniversiteye gitmeyi
Meslek okulu (yüksekokula) gitmeyi
Calışmaya başlamayı/ İş aramayı

Q18: Üniversite diplomasına sahip olabilmek sizin için ne kadar önemli?

Cok önemli
Az önemli
Emin değilim
Az önemseniz
Cok önemseniz siz

Q19: Gülen Hareketinin içinde olmanızın sebebini Aşağıdakilerden hangisi/hangileri en iyi tanımlar?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bağlı değilim</th>
<th>Eğitim için yardım almak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>İyi bir Müslüman olmak</td>
<td>Arkadaşlarımı yardım etmek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En iyisini yapmak</td>
<td>Allah rizasını kazanmak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Başarılı olmak</td>
<td>Diğer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aşağıdaki ifadelerle ne ölçüde katılyorsunuz?

Q20a Arkadaşlarına Gülen Hareketinin çok güzel bir organizasyon olduğunu söylüyorum.
[ ] Tamamen katılıyorum  [ ] Katılıyorum  [ ] Bilmiyorum  [ ] Pek katılmıyorum  [ ] Hiç katılmıyorum

Q20b Gülen Hareketini bir ferdi olduğunu başkalarına söylerken gurur duyuyorum.
Bu sorular Gülen Hareketi ile ilgilidir.

Q20c Gülen hareketi’nin değerleri ile kendi değerlerimi çok yakından buluyorum.
☐ Tamamen katılıyorum  ☐ Katılıyorum  ☐ Bilmiyorum  ☐ Pek katılmıyorum  ☐ Hiç katılmıyorum

Q20d Gülen Hareketi’nin başarısı için çaba sarfetmek istiyorum.
☐ Tamamen katılıyorum  ☐ Katılıyorum  ☐ Bilmiyorum  ☐ Pek katılmıyorum  ☐ Hiç katılmıyorum

Q21: Eğer 2 kilo baklava degerinde bir şey calarsanız ailenezen size karşı tepkisi ne olur?

Cok memnun olur
Az memnun olur
Umursamaz
Az tepki gösterir
Cok tepki gösterir

Q22: Eğer içki içerseniz ailenezen size karşı tepkisi ne olur?

Cok memnun olur
Az memnun olur
Umursamaz
Az tepki gösterir
Cok tepki gösterir

Aşağıdaki ifadelere ne ölçüde katılıyorsunuz?

Q23a Bana uymayan kurallara uymam.
☐ Tamamen katılıyorum  ☐ Katılıyorum  ☐ Bilmiyorum  ☐ Pek katılmıyorum  ☐ Hiç katılmıyorum

Q23b Uymak istediğim kurallara uyarım.
☐ Tamamen katılıyorum  ☐ Katılıyorum  ☐ Bilmiyorum  ☐ Pek katılmıyorum  ☐ Hiç katılmıyorum

Q23c Bazen başarıya ulaşmak için kuralları cignemek gerekir.
☐ Tamamen katılıyorum  ☐ Katılıyorum  ☐ Bilmiyorum  ☐ Pek katılmıyorum  ☐ Hiç katılmıyorum

Q23d Kurallara uymak başırsızı garantı etmez.
☐ Tamamen katılıyorum  ☐ Katılıyorum  ☐ Bilmiyorum  ☐ Pek katılmıyorum  ☐ Hiç katılmıyorum

Bu sorular Gülen Hareketi ile ilgilidir.

Q24: Gülen Hareketini hangi bilgi ve kaynaklar ile tanıma imkanını buldunuz: Uygun olanları işaretleyiniz.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medya (Gazete, Dergi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q25: Aşağıdakilerden hangisi Gülen Hareketini en iyi açıklar?

**Gülen Hareketi**

| Fethullah Gülen, Allah’a ve insanlara hizmet etme aşkı |
| Asiri Dinci |
| Allah sevgisi |
| Gizli CIA ajanı |
| Eğitmen entellektüel |
| Bilge |
| Iran versiyonu İslam |
| Tarikat |
| Başkaarılar için yaşamak | **Diğer** (Lütfen açıklayınız) |

Q26: Son 12 ay içinde kaç kez Gülen Hareketi mensubu birisi ile görüştünüz?

| Neredeyse hiç |
| Haftada bir kez |
| Haftada iki kez |
| Haftada üç kez |
| Haftada 4 yada 6 defa |
| Haftada 6 ‘dan fazla |

Q27: Gülen Hareketi içinde ailenizden birey var mı?

| Ailemden kimse yok |
| Ailemden 1 kişi |
| Ailemden 2-3 kişi |
| Ailemden 4-5 kişi |
| Ailemden 6 kişi yada fazlası |

Q28: Gülen Hareketi içinde arkadaşlarınızdan birisi var mı?

| Arkadaşlarınızdan kimse yok |
| Arkadaşlarınızdan 1 kişi |
| Arkadaşlarınızdan 2-3 kişi |
| Arkadaşlarınızdan 4-5 kişi |
Arkadaşlardan 6 kişi yada fazlası

Aşağıdaki sorular sizin bazı hareketleriniz hakkındadır.

Q29: Son 30 gün içinde kaç defa hastalık nedeniyle okula gidemediniz?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
İki kez
Üç kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q30: Son 30 gün içinde kaç defa başka isleriniz olduğu için okula gidemediniz?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
İki kez
Üç kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q31: Son 30 gün içinde kaç defa sigara icitiniz?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
İki kez
Üç kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q32: Son 30 gün içinde ne kadar sıklıkla sarhoş olursunuz?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
İki kez
Üç kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q33: Son 30 gün içinde ne kadar sıklıkla uyuşturucu madde (ot, marihuana vb.) kullandınız?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
Iki kez
Üc kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q34: Son 12 ay içinde ne kadar sıkalık fiziksel şiddet uyguladınız?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
Iki kez
Üc kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q35: Son 12 ay içinde ne kadar sıkalık birisini yaraladığınız bir kavgayı yaptınız?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
Iki kez
Üc kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q36: Son 12 ay içinde ne kadar sıkalık kasten size ait olmayan bir şeylere zarar verdınız?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
Iki kez
Üc kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q37: Son 12 ay içinde ne kadar sıkalık size ait olmayan bir şeylere yada halka ait mallara zarar verdiniz?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
Iki kez
Üc kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q38: Son 12 ay içinde ne kadar sıkalık hırsızlık yapmak için araba soydunuz?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
Iki kez
Üç kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q39: Son 12 ay içinde ne kadar sıklıkla iki kilo baklava degerinden az bir şey çaldınız?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
İki kez
Üç kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası

Q40: Son 12 ay içinde ne kadar sıklıkla iki kilo baklava degerinden fazla bir şey çaldınız?

Hiçbir zaman
Bir kez
İki kez
Üç kez
Dört kez
Beş kez ve fazlası
Anketi Bitimine Son Üç Sayfa

Lütfen Aşağıdaki soruları cevaplayınız. Cevaplarınızı konuyu anlamama yardımcı olucak.

Q41: Cinsiyetiniz nedir?

□ Erkek □ Kız

Q42: Kaç yaşındasınız? Sadece yıl olarak yazınız.

___________________

Q43: Okulunuzun adı nedir?

__________________________________________

Q44: Ethnik kimlinizi Aşağıdakilerden en iyi hangisi açıklar?

Kürt □ Türk □ Diğer (Açıklayınız)__________________________

Q45: Kaçinci sınıfınız?

12.sınıftayım
11.sınıftayım
10.sınıftayım
Diğer (Açıklayınız)

Q46: Okul ortalamanız nedir?

Q47: Nerede Dogdunuz?
Diyarbakır
Şanlıurfa
İstanbul
Diğer (Açıklayınız)

Q48: Dininiz nedir?
İslam
Zerdüşt
Hristiyan
Hiçbiri
Diğer

Q49: En çok hangi siyasi partiyi destekliyorsunuz?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parti</th>
<th>Tanım</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiçbirişi</td>
<td>AKP (Adalet ve Kalkınma Partisi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDP (Barış ve Demokrasi Partisi)</td>
<td>CHP (Cumhuriet Halk Partisi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP (Milliyetiç Hareket Partisi)</td>
<td>Diğer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q50: Aşağıdakilerden hangisi ailenizin yaşadığı yeri en iyi tanımlar?
Köy
Kasaba
Şehir
Diğer

Q51: Aşağıdakilerden hangisi ailenizin durumuna en iyi uymaktadır?
Fakir
İşçi sınıfı
Orta sınıf
Zengin

Q52: Anne-babanızın medeni durumunu en iyi hangisi tanımlar?
Evlı, aynı evde yaşyorlar
Bosandılar
Evlı ama ayrı yaşyorlar
Dul
Tek Ebeveyn
Diğer (açıklayınız)__________________

Q53: Babanızın meslegi nadir?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşsiz</th>
<th>Evkadını</th>
<th>Çiftçi</th>
<th>İşçi</th>
<th>Asker</th>
<th>İş adamı (doktor, avukat, öğretmen)</th>
<th>Diğer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q54: Annenizin meslegi nadir?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>İşsiz</th>
<th>Evkadını</th>
<th>Çiftçi</th>
<th>İşçi</th>
<th>İş kadını (doktor, avukat, öğretmen,..)</th>
<th>Diğer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q55: Babanızın eğitim durumu nedir?

İlkokul/ortaokul/lise mezunu
Meslek lisesini yarıda bıraktı
Meslek lisesi mezunu
Üniversiteyi yarıda bıraktı
Üniversite mezunu
Bilmiyorum

Q56) Annenizin eğitim durumu nedir?

İlkokul/ortaokul/lise mezunu
Meslek lisesini yarıda bıraktı
Meslek lisesi mezunu
Üniversiteyi yarıda bıraktı
Üniversite mezunu
Bilmiyorum

Q57) Aşağıdaki ifadelerden hangisi son 12 aydaki durumunuza nekadar uymaktadır?

Sürekli olarak evimde ikamet ettim.
Sürekli olarak okulda ikamet ettim.
Kismen evde ikamet ettim. (tatiller, hafta sonları, yaz süresince,..)
Kısment okulda ikamet ettim (ilk dönem, son dönem,....)
Diğer (Açıklayınız)____________________________________

Ankete zaman ayırıp katıldığınız için teşekkür ederim
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