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The conduct of young adults has long been a concern in societies. The primary objective of this study was to gain greater understanding of what influences the deviant behavior of young adults in Turkey. Factors assessed in their background included family rituals, self-esteem, religiosity and deviant behavior. It was expected that levels of family rituals, religiosity, self-esteem and other risk factors would be significantly different between incarcerated youth and youth not incarcerated. Overall, these higher levels of family rituals, religiosity, and self-esteem plus lower levels of other risk factors were expected to negatively affect young people’s engagement in deviant behavior in Turkey.

Walter Reckless’ containment theory provided a framework for this study. The non-probability sample of Turkish youths consisted of 205 incarcerated respondents and 200 college students. Each responded to four survey instruments, the Family Rituals Questionnaire, the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory, the Religious Background and Behavior Questionnaire, and a Family Information Inventory. Data were gathered cross-sectionally from January through March of 2007.

The incarcerated respondents significantly practices less family rituals and had lower levels of religiosity than the college students but they did not differ significantly on self-esteem. Furthermore, overall participation in family rituals was associated with decreased likelihood of committing deviant behavior. Religiosity, which was measured by expression of a God consciousness and performance of formal religious practices,
had mixed results. While having a God consciousness decreased the likelihood of committing deviant behavior, performing formal religious practices increased the likelihood of committing deviant behavior. Moreover, higher levels of self-esteem played no significant role in reducing deviant behavior.

No significant support was found for Reckless’ emphasis on the role of inner containment as an element of social control. However, support was found for the outer containment variable of family rituals playing a significant role in reducing deviant behavior for the respondents. Future research should further explore the role of family rituals, self-esteem and religiosity as well as other relevant risk factors in explaining deviant behavior through longitudinal research designs.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The concept of crime has been a part of all societies. In almost all societies, deviance acts considered to be crimes have been categorized according to the characteristics of the offenders. For example, age is one of the most important factors that affect the definition of such deviance acts. In this respect, the deviant acts committed by juveniles have been the focus of special attention.

Juveniles who commit such serious deviant acts are kept in separate facilities away from their families. However, in terms of the socialization process, family is accepted as the most important social institution. Hence, keeping the “criminal” juveniles away from their families will significantly affect their socialization process. Under these circumstances, the costs of crime include both the lives of the offenders and those of victims. So, a society must find ways to keep its members in a healthy socialization process, especially the juveniles who are the future of that society.

According to Yavuzer (1994), “the most important factor that distinguishes juvenile delinquency from adult crimes is the social, psychological and biological transition process that these individuals go through at these specific ages” (p. 33). The problems that are faced by the juveniles and adolescents in this transition period will more likely affect their future lives.

The World Health Organization (WHO) defines an adolescent as a person between 10 and 19 years of age. On the other hand, a juvenile is legally defined almost all around the world as a person less than 18 years of age. Although Turkish Criminal law has no legal definition for young adults, criminals between the ages of 18 and 21 to
are kept in separate places from criminals who are older than 21 years of age.

Supporting this policy, in a recent study Campbell, Ramey, Pungello, Sparling, and Miller-Johnson (2002) also defined young adulthood as a stage of life trajectory between the ages of 18 and 21. On the other hand, Erikson (1950) defined young adult as a person between the ages of 19 and 40. According to Jesser, Donovan and Costa (1994), “unlike entry into adolescence, where there are clear biological demarcations, becoming a young adult is determined largely by social processes and personal definitions related to roles” (p. 398).

In the present study the ages of the respondents range from 13 to 21, so this study focuses on the adolescents and young adults in Turkey. However, the average age of the respondents is 17.8, so it would be possible to say that an extended definition of the term young adult will be used in the present study. Even though there is a slight difference between the actual definition and the current use of the term in the present study, the term young adult will be used through the study to keep the discussion simple and consistent.

Essentially, the present study is about the deviant behaviors of adolescents and young adults in Turkey with a special emphasis on the effects of family rituals, self-esteem, and religiosity. This will be done through a partial replication of the prior research by Emmett (2000) and Roberts (2002) conducted in the United States.

The primary objective of this dissertation research is to try to extend knowledge about the deviant behavior of young adults, through using recently gathered data from young adults in Turkey on their background including family rituals, self-esteem, religiosity and deviant behavior. Secondly, the results from the analysis of these data
will also be compared to United States data already gathered from young adults on these aspects and reported by Roberts (2002) and Emmett (2000).

This problem, the conduct of young adults, has long been a concern for different societies (Burgess, 1926). Their challenges to tradition and violent behavior have often been attributed to the declining influence of the family (Popenoe, 1993). The family’s declining influence has been associated with shifting cultural values, and many contend, disintegrating societal standards (Adams, 1995). William J. Goode (1963), in his classic, *World Revolutions and Family Patterns*, described the emergence of families that would have less influence over individuals. These changes were most evident in western industrialized nations but a good deal of evidence suggests they were happening worldwide. Despite different baselines and varied rates, amounts, and directions of change between nations, Goode (1963) found evidence that a convergence process was occurring worldwide. Families were becoming more democratic, smaller, less stable, and more diverse and individuals were becoming more independent of family influence. Yet the importance of families’ influence on children’s development is still recognized (Lamb, 2004).

Studies are needed to assess the extent to which families influence the lives of children after they are young adults (Russell & Hwang, 2004). In this light, the concept of family culture affords insights into the dynamics of families and the conduct of young adults (Seward, 1994). Family members teach, interpret, and enforce cultural expectations. In the process, families develop a unity that is more than a sum of the interacting personalities. This unity is a social group bounded by culture, a microcosm of the society’s culture. Every family’s unique culture consists of the interrelated norms
shared by its participants, including their common values, rules, rituals, religious beliefs, and expectations. Together these define the family's boundaries and direct its members' conduct.

The current ambiguity, conflicting contentions, and ongoing changes with regard to being a young adult mean that for most individuals identity is problematic. Earlier views and routines are being questioned. The resulting reflection, negotiation, and reappraisal by families and young adults expose the interplay between motivation, behavior, and social structure. Transitions are critical times both for young people's identity development, into adults and for cultural definitions of adulthood. (Seward, 2007, p. 9)

Studying the details of young people's families, through previously gathered data, will assess how family rituals, self-esteem, (Roberts, 2002) and religiosity (Emmett, 2000) contribute to a better understanding of young people's conduct.

Significance of the Study

There are at least two potentially significant contributions of this study to the literature on family and deviant behavior. First of all, replicating a combination of two previously conducted studies in the United States (Emmet 2000, Roberts 2002) in Turkey will provide a test of their findings in a very different society. As a part of this test, two research instruments will be introduced into Turkish research. Specifically, this study will be the first thesis or dissertation to have used the Family Rituals Questionnaire and the Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory - 2 in Turkey.

A detailed search conducted at the Turkish Higher Education Council's Center for Thesis and Dissertation Research revealed that these two instruments have never been
used in a thesis or dissertation in Turkey. The center has a collection of all theses and dissertations that have been submitted to Turkish Universities since 1987.

Unfortunately, in Turkey, juvenile delinquency has received insufficient theoretical attention (Golcuklu, 1962; Ozbay & Ozcan, 2006; Taskiran & Agaoglu, 1943; Turk Kriminoloji Enstitusu, 1953; Ulugtekin, 1991; and Yavuzer, 1981). Due to Turkey’s unique sociocultural environment, the present study, guided by a social control perspective, will make a significant contribution to the literature.

Family and religion are the most trustworthy social institutions in Turkey (Erguder, Esmer, & Kalaycioglu, 1991). Ozbay and Ozcan (2006) elaborated on the effects of these institutions on juveniles. They summarized that the two main reasons that families still exercise strong control over juveniles are the lack of strong individualism among juveniles and financial dependence on the family through college graduation.

Similarly, environmental factors such as schools and neighbors still exercise relatively strong control over juveniles. Furthermore, strong conformist traditions and relatively higher levels of religiosity are other factors that contribute to preventing juvenile delinquent acts (Ozbay & Ozcan, 2006).

A second possible significant contribution would be in the field of comparative studies. To better understand and/or differentiate among the patterns that different cultures have, comparative studies stand out on the list as the best approach. The comparative approach to the study of society has a long tradition. Indeed, the use of comparative analysis has been an integral element of sociological thought since the
discipline’s classical era, with the works of Durkheim (1817) and Weber (1905) providing premier examples.

The original partially replicated studies were conducted in the United States. Collecting similar data on the same variables in Turkey will impact the understanding of the differences between two societies. Since the present study compares data on two different nations, this cross-national study conforms to Kohn’s (1989) category of nation as context of study. It is the most powerful type of comparative research in the sense that it allows comparisons of distributions and, more importantly, patterns of covariation among variables measured at the individual or other intrasocietal level across societies. This allows for an assessment of whether society makes a difference in these patterns (Kohn, 1989). In that sense, the present study will provide another opportunity to explore and understand the issues related to the cross-national research designs.

Beside these contributions, a possible outcome of the present study would be the long term development objective of improved well-being for children and families by suggesting ways to improve family relationships. Providing families more and better opportunities to be involved with their children has been shown to enhance children’s socio-emotional development and conformity (Rohner & Veneziano, 2001). Positive interaction between a parent and child promotes a child’s physical well-being, perceptual abilities, and mutually supportive relationships with others (Hwang & Lamb, 1997). When children have a close and warm relationship with their parents, their cognitive, sex-role, and psycho-social developments are enhanced (Lamb, 2004). When parents get more involved with their children, they also enhance their own well-being and other family relationships (Palkovitz, 2002). Information from the study should help
family members and professionals who work with families to better understand and deal with young adulthood.

Research Questions

Related to the research objectives, this dissertation will address two basic questions.

1. How do the relationships between family rituals, self-esteem, religiosity, and young people’s deviant behavior compare between incarcerated and non-incarcerated young adults in Turkey?

2. How do young people’s family rituals, religiosity, and self-esteem affect their engagement in deviant behavior?

Hypotheses

In this study, two hypotheses are developed to test the relationships that are based on the theoretical framework, the literature review, and the research objectives. These hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1: Family rituals, religiosity, self-esteem and other risk factors will be significantly different between non-incarcerated respondents and incarcerated respondents in Turkey.

Hypothesis 2a: Family rituals, self-esteem and religiosity are positively related to each other in Turkey (see Figure 1).

Hypothesis 2b: Family rituals, self-esteem and religiosity negatively affect young people’s engagement in deviant behavior in Turkey (see Figure 1).
In order to present different aspects of the problem at hand, the dissertation was organized in five chapters. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the research problem. How researchers conceptualize and operationalize variables significantly affect the outcome of the research, and these two linked processes are presented in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3 respectively. The conceptualization process is presented in Chapter 2. Two main sections of the second chapter are the theoretical framework and major concepts. Operationalization of the present study is provided in Chapter 3 through the presentation of methodological considerations such as; the research design, participants, survey instruments and techniques of data analysis. Chapter 4 contains the results of the data analysis. The final chapter discusses the results of the data as they relate to the stated hypotheses, identifies the limitations of the study, and suggests areas for further research.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND CONCEPTUALIZATION

The purpose of this section is to provide a detailed discussion of the theoretical framework and the other major concepts that are utilized in this study. In the first part of the chapter a detailed discussion of the control theory tradition is presented. This is followed by a discussion of major concepts. This section starts with a detailed discussion of deviant behavior, followed by a discussion of family rituals, self-esteem, and religiosity. Finally, a detailed discussion of other related risk factors will also be presented.

Theoretical Framework

Although social control is a major concept in the sociology of deviance, it has also always been an integral part of general sociology. “Originally, the concept was defined broadly as any structure, process, relationship, or act that contributes to the social order” (Liska, 1997, p. 39). We need to explain characteristics that distinguish between two types of social control processes.

According to Cullen and Agnew (1999, p. 161) sociological explanations of deviant behavior [the authors used the word “crime”] have been dominated by three main traditions: social structural, social processing, and social control theories. The focus of this study is the social control theory tradition.

Social control theories make the opposite assumptions to those made by both social structural and social processing theories (Einstadter & Henry, 2006). In essence, while social structural and social processing theories seek to explain the motivation of criminal and deviant behavior, social control theories are concerned with why people
obey the rules and laws that regulate society (Anderson & Dyson, 2002). Social control theories rest upon the compliance of every person in society with shared standards of conduct (Horowitz, 1990).

The social control theory tradition is perhaps the most prominent criminological theoretical tradition (Anderson & Dyson, 2002). In a recent study Stitt and Giacopassi (1992) identified social control theories as the most widely used and tested theories to explain adolescent rule-breaking behavior in criminology. Moreover, survey data from American criminologists revealed that social control theories are the most popular theory of crime and delinquency (Agnew, 2003).

In general, social control theory asserts that some youths conform to norms in response to certain forces that control and regulate human behavior (Hirschi, 1969; Nagasawa, Qian, & Wong, 2000). The social control theories focus on restraints and assume that delinquency will occur unless prevented by strong social controls. The focus of social control theories is on strategies that regulate human behavior toward conformity to society's rules (Hirschi, 1969; Reckless, 1973b). Specifically, the theories target the influence of the family, school, moral values, and peers on controlling behavior.

One basic distinction is between internal and external control processes. “The internal control refers to a process whereby people adhere to social norms because they believe in them, feeling good, self-righteous, and proud when they do adhere to them and feeling bad, self-critical, and guilty when they do not” (Liska, 1997, p. 39). Liska (1997) also stated that socialization is another term to define this process.
According to Liska and Messner (1999) the internal process is weakened by normative conflicts, cultural change, and social mobility.

Liska (1997) also defined external control as:

a social process whereby people conform to norms or rules because they are rewarded with status, prestige, money, and freedom when they do adhere to them and are punished with the loss of them when they do not. This process is sometimes termed coercive, external, or just social control. (p. 39)

Liska and Messner (1999) also stated that external control is weakened by cultural conflicts and a lack of primary relationships.

Roberts (2002) summarized four basic assumptions of control theories as follows:

First, social control theories assume that all humans have the propensity to be deviant. Second, if deviance is normal, then some controls are necessary to hold it in check. Third, delinquency or deviance assumes the absence of some sort of control mechanism(s). Finally, it is assumed that there is a societal consensus about expected norms and values. Therefore, the essence of control theories is that during socialization, there are weak personal or weak social control factors that contribute to delinquency. (p. 40)

Among different social control theories, Walter Reckless’ (1961) containment theory will be the primary theory used to explore the relationships between the research variables. The research concepts of “Family Rituals”, “Self-Esteem”, and “Religiosity” will be used along with other concepts to conduct this study focusing on Reckless’ containment theory. Even though the present study does not test Reckless' containment
theory, it uses this theory to guide the research. Beside Roberts’ (2002) research, which will be replicated in this study, Bynum (2000) and Miles (2001) used Reckless' containment theory as their theoretical framework. Furthermore, two recent studies by Costello and Dunaway (2003) and Wright, Caspi, Moffitt, and Paternoster (2004) used or referred to this theory.

Social Control Theory Tradition

In their discussion of control theories, Cullen and Agnew (1999) stated that, even though Shaw and McKay are accepted as the pioneers of the tradition of control theories by linking the degree of control to neighborhoods, Hirschi’s (1969) social bond theory is the most well-known statement using this perspective. As Anderson and Dyson, (2002) put it; Hirschis’ work was mainly influenced by the writings of Durkheim, Reiss and Nye, Reckless, and Sykes and Matza. In fact the origins of social control theories can be traced far back to Durkheim’s concept of anomie.

Durkheim is arguably the pioneer of social control theory (Anderson & Dyson, 2002). According to Durkheim (1897), rapid changes in the structure of society, such as transformation from an agricultural society to an industrial society, a feudal system to a capitalist system, have caused anomie within the society. Anomie does not only mean normlessness, but also the collapse of social solidarity. While the traditional way of life was changing to modern life, or in other words, while mechanical solidarity was dissolving, the regulations of the traditional norms and values lost their effect on individuals.

However, for Durkheim (1897) the collective conscience of society and the integration among individuals weakened and led to individualism in urban areas.
However, during the transition from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity, the bonds between the individuals and their loyalty to the norms and values of the society weaken. For Durkheim, increasing rates of deviance are the consequence of anomie, which is the result of rapid social change.

Merton (1938) basically developed further Durkheim’s theory of anomie that traces its source to the breakdown of social structure and introduced his famous model whereby social institutions in their normal operation are the source of anomie. Furthermore, Merton (1968) also sees deviance as a method of adaptation to social structure.

Merton (1938) argues that anomie is a consequence of the double faceted structure whereby normal social institutions are functional for certain sub-groups, and at the same time dysfunctional for a certain segment of the population. Merton adopts the anomie concept as part of his effort to suggest that biological explanations of deviant behavior are inadequate to explain social reality and that, instead, structural conditions should be considered as inducing deviation from prescribed patterns of conduct (Featherstone & Deflem, 2003). To illustrate his theory of anomie, Merton (1968) argues that social disorder occurs when society or the social structure holds high ideals of values for all its members, yet some members of that society are structurally barred from living up to those ideals.

The question that Durkheim (1897) and Merton (1968) were trying to answer was “why do individuals commit crime?” However, as stated before, social control theorists tried to explain why people don’t become deviant especially when opportunities exist and there is peer pressure to commit deviant acts (Shoemaker, 2005).
The influence of the Chicago school showed itself in every contemporary criminological theory, including the social control theories. The Chicago theorists applied an ecological perspective to study the patterns of deviance in physical space in the city of Chicago. This was a macro level approach in which the causes of human conduct were basically explained by all factors external to the individual. The core argument of their ecological theory maintains that “ecological conditions associated with urban life disrupt traditional social control, thereby promoting unconventional and deviant behavior” (Liska & Messner, 1999, p. 58).

More precisely speaking, “when the concept of social disorganization was introduced it was considered to be the underlying condition that explained the convergence of a variety of forms of deviant conduct in identifiable ecological territories” (Jensen, 2003, p. 3). Burgess’s (1925) concentric zones theory is a good example for its attempts to examine the overlapping patterns between the environment and both deviant and non-deviant human conduct. This also accepted an examination of the link between the environment and the culture.

Social disorganization theory was applied to the explanation of crime, delinquency and other social problems by sociologists at the University of Chicago in the early 1900s. It basically attributes high rates of deviance to weak conventional institutions that are unable to exert much control over people.

Influenced by these arguments, Shaw and McKay attempted to link the degree of control to neighborhoods, where the stress was on the idea of social disorganization. Shaw and McKay (1942) used the term social disorganization to describe “neighborhoods in which control had weakened and criminal traditions rivaled
conventional institutions” (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 41). They believed that juvenile delinquency could be understood only by considering the social context in which youths lived.

Borrowing heavily from Burgess’ (1925) concentric zone theory, Shaw and McKay (1942) confirmed that delinquency flourished in the zone in transition and it was inversely related to the zone’s affluence and corresponding distance from the central business district. In particular, youths who lived in the socially disorganized neighborhood were more vulnerable to engaging in deviant behavior. Although Shaw and McKay (1942) contributed to social control theories, their focus was on the neighborhoods which were marked by a lack of social control, and furthermore, are related to social control theories through their description of how weakening controls lead to delinquency.

Following the same tradition, Reiss (1951) proposed the theory of “Personal and Social Controls”, suggesting that delinquency occurred in juveniles as a result of personal and social failures. Reiss (1951) defined self control as “the ability of the individual to refrain from meeting in ways which conflict with the norms and rules of the community” (p. 196), while he conceptualized social control as “the ability of social groups or institutions to make norms or rules effective” (p. 196). According to Reiss (1951), conformity can be a result of either the acceptance of rules, or submission to those rules.

Instead of trying to identify the causes of delinquency, Reiss (1951) aimed to develop an instrument to predict delinquent behavior. If he could identify the factors that occur prior to delinquent behavior, it would be easier to predict it. For Reiss (1951) the
chief concern with respect to predictors was failure to submit to social controls, the “why” of such action being less important.

Similarly, Nye (1958) proposed that criminal behavior should be more common when we consider that goals can be achieved more easily and more quickly through criminal acts when compared to normative behavior. So, even though complying with normative behavior seems more problematic, in that sense, why is criminal behavior less common in society? For Nye (1958), instead of looking for positive factors that cause criminal behavior, it is more meaningful to view crime as the result of ineffective social control. When there is ineffective social control, criminal behavior is the available way to achieve those goals faster and easier.

According to Nye (1958), family, one of the primary groups, is the most effective driving force of social control over adolescents. Family can generate four categories of social control that he believed would prevent juvenile delinquency. These categories of social control are: direct control, indirect control, internalized control, and control through alternative means of need satisfaction. Direct control is imposed through punishments or restraints by external forces, which have the ability to influence individuals’ behaviors. These external forces can be stated as the parents, teachers, or the police. Indirect control is the “extent of affection and identification integrating the individual with authority figures in general and parent in particular” (Nye, 1958, p. 26). Internalized control occurs if an individual can limit his/her actions without considering the level of direct control. Control through alternative means of need satisfaction occurs when the social system presents a variety of legitimate ways to decrease the attraction to nonconformity.
Nye (1958) claims that even though varying types of social control operate independently, they have a cumulative effect over individual's behavior. In Durkheim's terms, the combination of integration and regulation decreases the risk of nonconformity.

Reckless’ Containment Theory

Walter C. Reckless began developing a containment theory in 1956 by “focusing on a youth’s self conception as an insulator against delinquency” (Jensen, 2003a, p. 3). He elaborated on Reiss and Nye’s internal and external concepts, expanding control theory by introducing containment theory. While Nye (1958) focused on family, Reckless (1973b) tried to find an answer to a similar question by focusing on youth in disorganized areas. Reckless (1973b) asked the question why some youth in disorganized areas did not become delinquent. Like Durkheim (1897), he believed that historical transformation caused individualism. Thus, self-factors may explain delinquent behavior. His search for self-factors, led him to focus on individuals and finally he proposed his containment theory.

Reckless (1961) proposed containment theory, which explains “delinquency as the interplay between two forms of control known as inner (internal) and outer (external) containments” (DeMelo, 1999, p. 24). Reckless' basic premise was that the psychological (internal) and social (external) factors work together to contribute to conforming behavior. According to this perspective “every individual has a containing external structure and a protective internal structure. Both of these structures buffer, protect, and insulate an individual against delinquency” (DeMelo, 1999, p. 24).
According to Reckless (1961) inner containments, which are self components, are more important than outer containments, which are one’s social environment.

According to the conceptual structure of Reckless’ containment theory, there are pushes from within the individual, such as: resentment, hostility and anger, along with outer pulls, such as: poverty, discrimination, and association with gang members that push or pull individuals to commit delinquent behavior. These internal and external forces “produce delinquent behavior unless they are counteracted by containment” (Kelley, 1996, p. 327). Delinquent behavior or crime is highly likely to occur, if the motivations of deviant acts are strong and containment is weak (International Encyclopedia of Justice Studies, 2007).

“Individualization of the self” was one of Reckless’ (1973b) primary foci. For him, self was not important in primitive societies. With the division of labor in the society, new alternatives were presented to the individuals. Finally, individuals took differing identities as a consequence of the large number of choices that they have (Reckless, 1973b). Furthermore, he suggested that while internal factors push an individual toward crime, external factors pull him/her toward deviance. He emphasizes that not only are external factors important for understanding nonconformity, but also internal factors should be taken into account. To clarify his point of view on internal factors, he uses the analogy of malaria. Even under extreme exposure to malaria, not everybody does get it and their resistance level differs (Reckless, 1973b).

Containment theory attempts to explain conforming behavior as well as delinquency (Reckless, 1973b). According to Reckless, there are two dimensions of containment: inner containment and outer containment. Although the two dimensions
are separated by definition, they are very much interrelated. His classification of “inner containment” as pulling factors toward crime and “outer containment” as pushing factors is crucial to understanding his theoretical framework. The focal point of inner containment is on one’s self-concept, and the focal point for outer containment is on the various social institutions with which individuals come in contact (Reckless, 1973a). Reckless (1973a) furthermore states that:

> We are interested in the influence of certain institutions (outer containment) but only as the individual's attitudes and perceptions toward these institutions are incorporated into the individual's attitudes toward self (inner containment). In other words, an individual's self-concept is in part made up of his perceptions of the environment and institutional structures therein. (p. 195)

The variation in responses of individuals is due to the different possibilities of balance between inner and outer containment. Thus, Reckless viewed control theory both personal and social. However, he preferred to focus on inner containment rather than focusing on outer containment.

*Outer Containment*

According to Reckless (1973b), in different types of societies the factors which bind individuals to the group show variation. However, he emphasizes three of them;

- “Reasonable limits,
- Meaningful; roles and activities, and
- Several complementary variables such as reinforcement by groups and significant supportive relationships, acceptance, [and] the creation of a sense of belonging and identity” (Lilly, 2006, p. 89).
Also, successful family life, membership in organizations, interest in the activities of the community, and good peers are the characteristics of external containment. Reckless (1973b), claims that “if a group or organization can get its members to internalize their rules, it would be doing an excellent job of containing” (p. 470). However, poverty, conflict, minority group status, external restrains, limited excess to opportunities, attraction and distractions are the pulls in that society which lead individual to deviant behavior (Reckless, 1973b). Outer containment is apparent in both tribal communities and strong religious populations. In individualized modern societies, there is less containment particularly for adolescents. Limits of behavior are not well defined; roles are less definite, which finally generates lower frustration tolerance levels (Reckless, 1973b).

*Inner Containment*

According to Reckless (1973b), successful acquisition of a society's rules regarding acceptable behavior is a prerequisite for the development of inner containment. Although the social environment, or in other words external factors, may have effect on individual’s behavior, those factors should be filtered by the individual (Hogan & Mookherjee, 1981). Thus, a good self-concept is believed to be the main preventative factor of deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 2005). According to Reckless (1973b), individuals who have strong inner containment carry a good self-concept, a well-developed superego, ego strength, and a high frustration tolerance. Also external factors, such as the family, should help the individual develop these factors. As the inner control is formed, individuals need fewer outer controls (Thompson & Dodder, 1983).
According to Reckless (1973b), in addition to a good self-concept, inner containment is also dependent upon goal orientation. Unlike strain theories, containment theory suggests that established legitimate goals provide a sense of direction which would, in turn, lead to conformity. Containment theory assumes that these goals are obtainable for all individuals and will decrease the ambitions of individuals (Lilly et al., 2007).

Frustration tolerance is another factor of inner containment. Reckless (1973b) realizes that individuals try to control their biophysical motives. This control also may create frustration as a result of different opportunities that are available to them (Lilly et al., 2007). Individuals form varying levels of frustration tolerance. According to Reckless (1973b), increasing individualism is a reason for lower levels of frustration tolerance.

Norm retention is another factor of inner containment. Norm retention refers to “adherence to, commitment to, acceptance of, identification with, legitimating of defense of values, norms, laws, codes, institutions and customs” (Reckless, 1967, p. 476). For Lilly et al. (2007, p. 91) it is not the norm retention, but “norm erosion,” which is the main problem leading to delinquency.

Containment theory does not cover all delinquent behaviors, such as crimes that emerge as a consequence of strong inner pushes, such as personality disorders, anxieties, and compulsions. Reckless’ containment theory excluded the offenders on the periphery, including those who committed crimes because of some organic brain dysfunction, psychological disorders, or whose deviant behavior was part of the social norm for their group.
Social Control Theory Tradition after Reckless

Although Hirschi was not the first to propose a social control theory, his book “Causes of Delinquency” (1969) became the most cited book in criminology (Jensen, 2003a, p. 12). Compared to Reckless’ containment theory in which a list of internal and external containments were presented, Hirschi’s version of social control theory was quite parsimonious. In its most basic explanation what Hirschi argued was that social bonds contain four elements that could constitute significant barriers to youths’ involvement in delinquency. Those four elements are attachment to significant others, commitment to traditional types of action, involvement in traditional activities, and beliefs in the moral values of society. “Hirschi (1969) asserted that when youths are strongly attached to parents, peers, and school, committed to customary lines of action, engaged in conventional activities, and believe in the validity of the moral values of society (normative beliefs), delinquency is less likely to occur” (Ozbay & Ozcan, 2006, p. 713).

Hirschi and Gottfredson published “A General Theory of Crime” in 1990, setting forth a related but different control theory, self-control theory. “They argued that the crimes people could commit varied by age, but that the individual “tendency” to do so is a product of self-control established through the interaction with parents and others during childhood” (Jensen, 2003a, p. 12). Hirschi and Gottfredson (1994) defined self-control as the “tendency to avoid acts whose long-term costs exceed their momentary advantages” (p. 3). According to them, people who are low in self-control are “free to enjoy the quick and easy and ordinary pleasures of crime without undue concern for the pains that follow from them” (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 2001, p. 90).
According to Jensen (2003a), “at present, self-control theory has not been shown to have superior explanatory power over Hirschi’s earlier social bond theory” (p. 15). This perspective is not a newer version of Hirschi’s social control theory and it has its own critics. Furthermore, he summarized these criticisms in two groups. First of all, while Hirschi challenged the psychological theories in Causes of Delinquency, in his 1990 work with Gottfredson, “the central focus is on just such states” (Jensen, 2003a, p. 14). The second criticism also relates to the diversion that he had with his first theory. Again, in his social bond theory Hirschi clearly distinguished between four different forms of bonds, however in his new work he lumped the internal barriers under the rubric of self-control.

In an earlier study Pratt and Cullen (2000) also identified some problems related with the empirical status of Gottfredson and Hirschi’s self-control theory. They reported that a lack of self-control: (1) was always significantly and positively related to and analogous with criminal activity; (2) did not consider the measurement tactic used to assess the theory; and (3) was not always the sole or strongest predictor of criminal and analogous activity.

Moreover, in two separate recent studies both Piquero and Bouffard (2007) and Wikström and Treiber (2007) offered a new point of theoretical extension to Gottfredson and Hirschi’s (1990) concept of self-control. They both offered that self-control should be considered in a situational manner (a factor in the process of choice) rather than as an individual trait.

Towards the end of 20th century new perspectives emerged in the study of deviance and two of them included the concept of control. The first one is the “power-
control" theory introduced by Hagan, Gillis and Simpson in 1987. Basically, “power-control theory integrated ideas from feminist theories with ideas from social control theory to explain variations in “common delinquency” by gender and parental occupation” (Jensen, 2003a, p. 15). The second one is the “control-balance” theory introduced by Charles Tittle (1995). The central premise of his theory was “the amount of control to which people are subject relative to the amount of control they can exercise affects the probability that they will commit specific types of deviance” (p. 142).

In the coming years, as suggested by Jensen (2003) the social control theory tradition may have some issues such as; integration with social learning theories, clarification of basic concepts and further tests related to the most current perspectives of this tradition.

Weaknesses of Social Control Theories

Even though control theories have received significant empirical support, this tradition also has its critics. Anderson and Dyson (2002) summarized four key criticisms in four key issues. According to them, social control theories:

➢ fail to properly explain why children in the middle and upper classes engage in crime,
➢ make the case that those in the lower class are improperly socialized,
➢ do not explain why some people engage in delinquency while young, but becoming law-abiding adults,
➢ are also criticized for not explaining why bonds weaken or fail to develop from the beginning (Anderson & Dyson, 2002, p. 197).
Social control theorists have also been criticized because of their emphasis on self-concept as a deterrent to deviant behavior (Shoemaker, 2005). Agnew (1985) also found there was less empirical support for social control theory when a longitudinal analysis of delinquent behavior was conducted.

Conclusion

In the current study, in accordance with Roberts (2002), the Family Rituals Questionnaire (FRQ) will be used as a measure of outer containment while the self-esteem index will be used as a measure of inner containment. In addition to these two concepts, the measure of religiosity (Emmett, 2000) will also be included as another form of inner containment. In the next section a detailed discussion of each of these concepts and other relevant risk factors will be provided.

Major Concepts

The major concepts and risk factors affecting the deviant behavior will be discussed in this section. Since deviant behavior is the focus of this study, the section will begin with the discussion of the deviant behavior. Following this part, detailed discussions of other major concepts of the study, including family rituals, self-esteem, and religiosity, will be presented. Finally, other relevant risk factors affecting the likelihood of engaging in deviant behavior will be discussed.

Deviant Behavior

In general “deviance” can be defined as the concept that encompasses a variety of forms of human behavior that have been defined in a society as wrong, bad, immoral or illegal (Jensen, 2003). According to Orcutt (2004, online document), “most of the
disagreement over the concept of deviance appears to boil down to a choice between two alternative definitions: a normative definition versus a relativistic definition of deviance”. Similarly, Liska and Mesner (1999), Siegel (2001) and Lindsey and Beach (2004) employed the terms deviance as norm violation and deviance as social definition.

**Normative Definition and Related Perspectives**

From a normative perspective it is possible to define deviance or deviant behavior broadly as the violation of norms (Badham, Garrety, Morrigan, Zanko, & Dawson, 2003; Chris, Paul, & Scott, 1996; Fritsche, 2002; Joinson & Dietz-Uhler, 2002; Katz, 1972; Markova, 2006) in a particular context.

Most observers would agree with this broad view because “norms” are central to the existence of societies. But even with a definition of deviance as norm-violating behavior, one should clearly explain the norms that are violated. It is relatively an easy task when it comes to define those norms for serious crimes, such as, suicide, or murder. However, the definition problem is in the norms that are not strongly agreed upon as the serious crimes (e.g., laws versus customs).

One of these perspectives is the essentialist approach. According to Goode (1996) the essentialist definition of deviance, or deviance as objectively given, sees actions as wrong not because they violate a given society’s or group’s norms, rules, or laws, but because they are objectively wrong or absolutely evil. “They violate a law of nature, or science, or rules of God” (Goode, 1996, p.7). Goode, furthermore states that according to this perspective the quality of deviance resides in the act, not in how it is judged by the people and there is no variation across time or place in terms of evil or
deviance. Even though it is easy to disprove, the essentialist approach asserts that, what is evil and deviant at one time and in one place is evil and deviant at all times and in every place.

On the other hand, it is also necessary to focus on the normative consensus concerning the definition of deviance. Although there is relativity among cultures and over time, it also possible to find widely accepted norms for some forms of behavior than others. For example, International Police Organization (INTERPOL) is the world’s largest police organization with 186 member countries. Interpol and its member countries recognizes such offenses as human trafficking, terrorism and sex offenses against children as crimes and they work together to prevent and combat against these crimes. This shows that even though there is relativity over the definitions, there is also consensus to some degree. The main focus of this perspective is their emphasis on inalienable or universal human rights.

Relativistic Definition and Related Perspectives

How one defines deviance is “in the eyes of the beholder.” Simmons (1969) reported the results of a study where he asked “Who is deviant?” Based on various answers that he got to this question he concluded that; “So deviance, like beauty, is in the eyes of the beholder” (Simmons, 1969, p. 4). One of the intriguing things about research in the sociology of deviance is how the definition of deviance changes. Who has the power to define deviance and who or what helps the definition change over time (Chambliss, Doyle, & Reeves, 2004), and which definition is more reliable and valid over the other definitions? These questions demonstrate the complexity and difficulty of studying deviance from an objectivist perspective.
The most important aspect of this process is the effect of the broader culture of a society. Obviously, part of the answer lies in powerful institutions. The mass media, legislators, courts, and law enforcement agencies are critically involved in the definition of what constitutes deviance (Chambliss et al., 2004). But, these institutions are also working with the toolkit provided by the broader culture.

Beyond these, however, social movements are also critical factors. For example, gay rights movement had an effect on the definition of homosexuality. The Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2007 (LLEHCPA; also known as the Matthew Shepard Act), HR 1592, passed the House of Representatives on May 3, 2007. This was accepted as a victory of the Gay and Lesbian Rights Movement, because this bill expanded the 1969 United States federal hate-crime law to include crimes motivated by a victim's actual or perceived gender, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability. Similar examples can also be given about the civil rights movement and feminist movement as well.

If one tries to observe and understand the most basic themes in the sociology of deviance, it is possible to see some general ideas within this specific field. First of all, even though the objectivist approach would disagree, it is generally agreed that the specific forms or instances of conduct that fall under the definition of deviance or deviant behavior vary over time and among societies. This is the most important part of the definition of deviance from this perspective. Whichever theoretical perspective one may use, at the end, even the definition within the same tradition will eventually vary. This highlights the cultural and temporal relativity of the definition of deviance. One of the major problems and difficulties of cross-cultural study of deviance is that even the
objective components of an ordinary crime, such as robbery, have different definitions in different countries and legal systems.

Another aspect of this process is, of course, the key players in a society. This is obviously a conflict perspective: we should acknowledge that in the process of defining what is deviant or not, some groups will have more influence than others. For example governments have the ultimate power to decide on the definition of crime, which is a special form of deviance. Also there are other social institutions or moral enterprises, like religion, which have an obvious power over the definition of morality.

According to Shelden and Brown (2003), this tendency - creating crime perception - may be because of the efforts of trying to control a society in chaos and establish a moral panic-oriented life to increase profits, establish social control, practice certain motivations, and achieve political goals via criminal justice policies and the highly motivated perception of crimes. Crime control as an industry may be profitable for certain people, institutions, or groups who hold the power and interest in society.

An approach that is relevant to this definition of deviance is constructionism. This perspective examines how reality is socially constructed, through the examination of face-to-face relations and the use of symbols in communication and the ways of attaching meanings to those symbols. According to this perspective involvement in forms of deviance is not randomly distributed (Robins & Wish, 1977). The individual’s social location, which is shaped and determined by different variables such as socialization, social learning, social control mechanisms, and other social influences and constraints, has a profound impact on the definition of deviance (Jensen, 2003).
This perspective on deviance was very popular in the late 20th century. It “focuses on the construction and application of deviant labels and their consequences for those so labeled” (Jensen, 2003, p. 6). Rubington and Weinberg (2005, pp. 1-2) note that social constructionists take deviance as “subjectively problematic” as opposed to “objectively given.” Goode and Ben-Yehuda (1994) propose that “to the constructionist, definitions have no absolute, objective validity” (p. 32) and that “reality depends on perspective, and perspective is to a degree arbitrary” (p. 33).

Each of these perspectives provides different and to a certain degree “conflicting” definitions and explanations on deviance. They shed light on various aspects of the same phenomenon and it is in the interest of a researcher to be aware of the similarities and differences between these perspectives to adequately address the issues at hand.

Rituals

Rituals, by definition are social acts of symbolic significance that are performed on certain occasions prescribed by tradition (Wiggins, Wiggins, & Zanden, 1994). Rituals involve patterned, repetitive social interactions that include agreed-upon roles for the participants (Fiese, 1992), as well as an assignment of symbolic meaning to the interactions at individual and societal levels (Emmett, 2000). Adding up almost all of these characteristics Alexander (2004) provides an extensive definition of rituals.

Rituals are episodes of repeated and simplified cultural communication in which the direct partners to a social interaction and those observing it, share a mutual belief in the descriptive and prescriptive validity of the communication’s symbolic contents and accept the authenticity of one another’s intentions (Alexander, 2004, p. 527).
Rituals are little things that we as people do constantly to show the significance and importance in our lives (Insoll, 2004). Kanagy and Kraybill (1999) referred to these constant [the authors used the word “stable”] patterns of behavior as rituals. Rituals also assume many forms: as simple as shaking someone’s hand or as complicated as a religious ceremony. Rituals can vary from culture to culture and they are the components in society that make cultures what they are today (Feuchtwang, 2007). Each culture may perform the same ritual in a different way.

Rituals affect individuals, groups and society as a whole and humans have a great attraction to rituals (Roberts, 2004). The rituals feel “natural” or “normal” to the person partaking in them (Peregrine, 2001). In addition to calling the rituals “natural” or “normal”, Goffman (1967) suggested that rituals are also essential for: “(a) mobilizing individuals to participate in interaction, (b) making individuals cognizant of the relevant rules of irrelevance, transformation, resource use, and talk, (c) guiding individuals during the course of the interaction, and (d) helping individuals correct for breaches and incidents” (Roberts, 2002, pp. 55-56).

**Family Systems**

It is the nature of a family that its members are intensely connected emotionally (Bowen, 2003). Family systems theory, according to Broderick (1993) views the family as a functioning whole, with integrated parts that work to maintain a state of equilibrium. “The theory considers communication and interaction patterns, separateness and connectedness, loyalty and independence, and adaptation to stress in the context of the whole as opposed to the individual in isolation” (Christian, 2006, p. 2). So, in order to
understand fully the dynamics of a family, a holistic orientation rather than linear orientation is necessary.

Roberts (2002) lists five core assumptions of the family systems theory based on an extensive research. Citing Bradshaw (1998), Cheal (1991), and Ritzer (1992), Roberts (2002) identifies these core assumptions as follows:

1. A system must be understood as a whole instead of by its component parts:
   Family systems theory views the family as a whole, with the primary focus on the interaction among family members (Whitchurch and Constantine, 1993). So, the functioning of the family members is interdependent.

2. Systems are multilevel and can be applied to all levels of the social world:
   According to Fiese et al, (2002) the study of family systems lies at the intersection between individual-level and family-level factors, thus helping us to understand the reciprocal relationship between the individual and the family system. Additionally, every family system contains a number of small groups within itself, which are usually made up of 2-3 people.

3. Systems are self-reflexive: Human systems are characterized by their ability to make themselves and their own behavior the focus of examination; this is self-reflexivity (Whitchurch and Constantine, 1993). According to family systems theory, the goal of a family system is to maintain equilibrium (Cheal, 1991). The tendency of systems to keep doing things as they have already been done is known as the system’s equilibrium. This equilibrium could be maintained through feedback loops, boundaries, family rules, and family
rituals and traditions (Bradshaw, 1988). The interactions that take place within the family system are reciprocal.

4. Systems are inherently integrative: The family is one element of human life. Just like any other social institutions, it is an integral part of the society. Slesnick and Prestopnick (2005) and Henggeler and Borduin (1995) suggest the individuals are nested in a social ecology within a complex of interconnected systems. These systems include individual, family, and extra-familial (peer, school, and neighborhood) factors which are related with each other.

5. All open, ongoing systems consist of patterned, interactive processes with emergent properties: Family systems have boundaries and can be viewed on a continuum from open to closed systems (Morgaine, 2001). Boundaries are related to the limits of any system and they are used to identify what or who is “in” or “out of” the family (Walsh and Giblin, 1988). Slesnick and Prestopnick (2005) argued that the family systems theory sees the family as an open system. Researchers have found that families who are receptive to outside information while continuing to maintain their boundaries will continue to evolve and adjust to changes in the environment (Cheal, 1991).

Researchers have suggested that family rituals provide one mechanism through which family boundaries are established and maintained (Broderick, 1993; Pipher, 1996). Family rituals have the potential to bind family members to each other and to connect the family to the outside social environment (Wolin and Bennett, 1984). Moreover, according to Fingerman and Berman (2000), when there is change in the
family, rituals often keep a family together during times of change and stress. Cheal (1991), on the other hand, suggests that family rituals provide a communication mechanism through which families express their feelings about one another.

**Family Rituals**

Families are not free from rituals and there are many reasons for performing rituals. As cited in Emmett (2000) and Roberts (2002), Bossard and Boll (1950), as being among the first family researchers, defined a family ritual as something that includes a recurrent event, taking place with the members of the family as participants, with prescribed behaviors, and with a sense of historical continuity and meaning through repetition. In more recent studies family rituals are defined as repetitive behaviors involving two or more family members (Fiese et al., 2002).

According to Fiese et al. (2002), the study of family routines and rituals is important for three basic reasons. First, such study represents a focus on the whole family process as a group, involving multiple family members, not only the individuals. Second, family life provides the cultural environment for the family routines and rituals that can help us to understand cross cultural differences. Third, these rituals and routines are at the intersection between individual-level and family-level factors, which help us to understand the reciprocal relationship between the individual and the family system.

**Dimensions of Family Rituals**

Researchers also recognize specific dimensions of family ritual life. For example, Kiser (2007) listed six dimensions of family rituals based on the studies conducted by Fiese and Wamboldt (2000) and Schuck and Bucy (1997). These dimensions are: (1)
ritualization, (2) routine practices or structure, (3) ritual importance or meaning, (4) deliberateness or persistence, (5) adaptability or flexibility, and (6) preparatory events. Kiser (2007) defines these dimensions as follows:

Table 1

*Dimensions of Family Rituals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritualization</td>
<td>Refers to the extent that the family enjoys a dynamic ritual life. Ritual observance encompasses various features of family ritual behavior: breadth across ritual activities (based upon having at least a modicum of rituals), elaboration of rituals, and continuity over time in the observation of the selected rituals. Often characterized on a continuum from under-ritualized to over-ritualized. Under ritualized family have few family rituals, often minimizing important milestones and family events while over-ritualized families have strict, rigid rules for carrying out rituals along with inflexible expectations regarding participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine practices</td>
<td>Characterized by regularity of activity, who is responsible for planning and follow through, who does what, where the ritual occurs, when it occurs and how often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ritual importance or Meaning</td>
<td>Refers to the extent that the family's ritual and routine life supports a collective value and belief system. Meaning making refers to the role of rituals and routine in the creation of understanding regarding what is important to the family and what explanations the family uses to justify both positive and negative events that affect them. It encompasses the symbolic meaning of ritual behaviors to the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberateness or Persistence</td>
<td>Commitment of the family to maintaining rituals despite obstacles. On this dimension, family rituals range from disrupted to distinctive. Disrupted rituals occur when family ritual practices have been interrupted, avoided, missed, or lost due to family problems or stressful events while distinctive rituals occur when family rituals are kept separate from family problems and carried out regardless of stressors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability or flexibility</td>
<td>Ability of the family to adapt rituals to meet the needs of the individual or the entire family over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory events</td>
<td>Characterized by very elaborate and complex planning and groundwork to non-existent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, two of the dimensions of family rituals, routine and meaning, have received considerable support across a number of studies (Fiese & Tomcho, 2001). In her study Roberts (2002) reported that it was the meaning and not the routine of family rituals that indicate whether they serve a positive or negative function for adolescents. For example, meaningful family rituals have been associated with positive outcomes, including greater marital satisfaction (Fiese & Kline, 1993), higher adolescent self-esteem (Fiese, 1992), and better adjustment for boys in single-parent families (Brody & Flor, 1997).

Functions of Family Rituals

Roberts (2002) suggests that family rituals have the potential to serve very important functions for the family. Carrying out regular, meaningful family rituals requires and demonstrates an investment in family relationships (Leon & Jacobvitz, 2003). Rituals are also a key element in establishing solidarity and the collective consciousness within large and small social groups. According to Marshall (2002), social integration and a sense of unity are among the most noted outcomes and functions of rituals. Familial rituals help us understand the degree of cohesiveness within this social unit. “Family rituals often involve the coming together of family members who live apart, and this may provide the opportunity for messages reflecting the availability of support by others in the family” (Howe, 2002, p. 128). On the other hand, it has been emphasized that family rituals must have a certain degree of breadth and encompass a variety of settings in order to be effective (Fiese, 1993).

These rituals are so essential that families with ritual disruption are more likely to have offspring with problematic behaviors later in life (Amodeo & Griffin, 1997). For
instance, Denham (2002) reported that in infants and preschoolers, children are healthier and their behavior is better when there are established rituals. Each family is capable of creating new rituals based on past experiences. According to Compan, Moreno, Ruiz, and Pascual (2002), generational rituals can give a sense of belonging and respect across generations. This sense of belonging takes place by learning these rituals from our parents and then passing them on to our children (Rappaport, 1999). Familial dysfunction was also found to be more related to adult self-esteem (Werner and Broida, 1991).

One of the functions of family rituals is to provide support and containment for strong emotions (Roberts, 1988). For example, family rituals appear to serve a protective function as well, especially for the psychosocial development of children of alcoholic parents (Roberts, 2002). Their importance for the health and adjustment of family members has been emphasized theoretically and empirically (Haugland, 2005). The constructive use of rituals provides one way that families maintain their health and the health of their individual members (Kiser, Bennett, Heston, & Paavola, 2005).

Beside these functions Roberts (2002) also noted that rituals serve to mark transitions from one stage of life to another, establish, clarify and maintain family roles, boundaries, and rules, and finally to portray how family members relate to each other through the shaping, expressing and maintaining of important relationships, as other significant functions of the family rituals.

Research on Family Rituals

Research on family rituals using the FRQ, just like Emmett’s (2000) study, has basically been in the areas of clinical and non-clinical psychology. Emmett (2000)
reported that the research on family rituals included research on topics such as the therapeutic uses of ritual, interventions for early childhood, and importance of family ritual on pain. Kiser (2007) also states that family rituals have been used in the research on psychosocial adjustment in children, families dealing with chronic physical illness, pain, and disability, psychiatric disturbance, and changes in membership. Furthermore Roberts (2002) included other areas as examples of research that have been done on family rituals, such as: family rituals and healthy family practices, higher adolescent satisfaction with family life, marital satisfaction, health-related anxiety symptoms in adolescents, and intergenerational recurrence of alcoholism.

Unfortunately, research on family rituals has not focused on the relationship between family rituals and its possible effect on deviant behavior. In fact, a review of literature identified only one study that was done to examine this association, and that study was conducted by Roberts (2002). Instead of exploring the association between family rituals and deviant behavior, sociological research has generally focused on the meanings and development of family rituals within the family system and their effect on the relations between family members. There may be two explanations why this has been neglected. It could be that deviance researchers are by and large unaware of this part of family systems research and thus missed this possible link. On the other hand, family researchers could also be unaware of the research on deviance.

Fiese et al. (2002) reviewed 50 years of research on family routine and family ritual, stated that it may be a time to celebrate the accomplishments for the scientific evidence to suggest that family routines and rituals play a central role in family life and they can be considered a reasonable vehicle for promoting healthy families during the
21st century. Howe (2002) agrees that it is a significant accomplishment, but he also states that the challenge for the future will be an examination of routines and rituals in relation to emerging research paradigms in family psychology such as attachment theory, developmental transitions, and the transactional nature of family and individual health (Fiese et al., 2002).

Parallel to these arguments I also suggest that the examination of routines and rituals should also be extended to the study of deviant behavior. As noted before deviance researchers thus far have neglected this aspect of family life. The focus was on the risk factors at the family level such as income, number of children, living arrangements, and structure of the family. However, further study of routines and rituals can reveal the dynamics of the families that not only affects the conduct of the children but also the conduct of adult members of the families. Instead of just focusing on the characteristics of the family, also focusing on the dynamic processes such as rituals taking place within the family might contribute to the development of deviance theory.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although the definition of rituals may vary, the relative meaning remains the same. And even though rituals may be religious or secular, it is evident that they affect everyone in some way or another. Whether we participate or practice rituals individually, in a group such as our family or local community, we all play some role. Rituals will continue to reshape and establish individuals and society as a whole.

This study proposes that individuals who report positive experiences with family rituals are less likely to commit deviant behaviors. The regulation of behavior within the family contributes to social control within and outside the family (Reiss, 1981). Berger
(1963) contends that the family may play a more important role as an agent of social control in society than any other institution.

One theory of deviance that incorporates the family as an important agent for contributing to conforming behavior is Reckless' (1973b) containment theory. Families contribute to the development of these factors in both direct and indirect ways. Families contribute directly to social control through the opportunities they provide for conforming activities both within and outside the family. Families contribute indirectly through their impact on the psychological factors that shape children's self-concept and self-esteem. Hence, the FRQ will be used to measure the concept of family rituals and explain the effect of outer containment on deviant behavior among young adults.

Self-Esteem

In its most general terms, self-esteem is the concept that reflects the emotional or evaluative component of one's self-knowledge (Hook, 2007). Wiggins et al. (1994) described self-esteem as the process by which we evaluate our specific characteristics and our self identities as good, bad, acceptable or unacceptable. On the other hand, Sheslow (2005) described self-esteem as wanting respect from others and needing self respect. The focus of the following review of the literature regarding self-esteem will be on the application of this construct to understanding offending behavior rather than providing an exhaustive review of the field.

According to these definitions, the way people treat others helps to form how we personally feel about ourselves. For example, if someone is constantly told how great they are as a person, it is more likely that they will have a positive image of themselves.
However, someone that constantly receives negative treatment will most likely have negative self-esteem (Sheslow, 2005).

The development of self-esteem can also be explained as a reflexive behavior. Cooley (1902) labeled this process as the 'looking-glass-self.' According to Cooley (1902) children’s conceptions of themselves are influenced by seeing themselves reflected in other people’s attitudes and behaviors toward them. “A lot of our self-image is based on interactions we have with other people and our life experiences. This mental picture (our self-image) contributes to our self-esteem” (Johnson and Ferguson, 1991, p. 15).

The self-esteem of a person develops in early childhood and usually stays with a person through his/her adult life. Self-esteem may benefit or diminish the individual, especially a child, therefore affecting society as a whole. According to Blyth and Traeger (1983) the major part of developing self-esteem occurs during childhood. Being praised and listened to, spoken to with respect, being successful in sports or school and having trustworthy friends are childhood experiences that lead to positive self-esteem.

Furthermore Oesterreich (1995) states that starting in infancy, we judge the ability to be loved by our parents by the way they hold, nurture, change, and feed us. Through middle school, high school, and parts of adulthood, self-esteem is created by the way that others judge us.

Collins (2002) focused especially on the importance of adolescence and stated that through these years, self-esteem and personal dignity increases in importance compared to all other stages of development. Low self-esteem can easily form during adolescence. This is a critical time in life when identities are being formed and young
people are significantly influenced by others. Similarly, Brandon, Herzog, Irvin, & Gwaltney (2004) also assert that as adulthood comes about, the feedback from others becomes less important. There is a change from external sources of feedback to more of an internal way of judging our own character. With adulthood, we create our own measurement through our values, accomplishments, morals, and success.

One of the important aspects of self-esteem is its degree. In literature the degree of self-esteem is generally explained by two opposite concepts, such as negative – positive or low – high self-esteem. In this study the terms low self-esteem and high self-esteem will be used to describe the degree of self-esteem. It is generally accepted that there are significant benefits to high self-esteem. On the other hand, low self-esteem is thought to be a pathway to personal misery, failure and even violent behavior.

According to Hook (2007), popular culture presents high self-esteem as a panacea that ensures personal happiness, stable relationships, and even financial success.

Another important aspect of self-esteem is its stability. For example, Battle (1992) suggests that once self-esteem is established, it is generally stable over time and resistant to change. On the other hand, there is also some research focusing on the health and the stability of self-esteem. For example, Baumeister, Heatherton and Tice (1993) examined the stability of self-esteem as a separate variable in their research. Moreover, Kernis et al., (1993) and Kernis et al., (1989) suggest that instability of self-esteem impacts high and low self-esteem individuals differently. In a more recent study Ragg (1999) also reported that an unstable self-concept was the strongest predictor of battering.
The issue of stability of self-esteem is often seen in studies that focus on high self-esteem. In a more recent study, Kernis (2005) differentiated between two types of high self-esteem: secure high self-esteem and fragile high self-esteem. According to Kernis (2005) secure self-esteem reflects positive feelings of self-worth that are well anchored and secure, and that are positively associated with a wide range of indices of psychological health and well-being indices. In contrast, fragile high self-esteem reflects “positive feelings of self-worth that are vulnerable to threat, as they require continual bolstering, protection, and validation through various self-protective or self-enhancement strategies” (Kernis, 2005, p. 1590). People with fragile high self-esteem are very proud of who they are, they feel superior to most other people, and they are willing and able to defend themselves against possible threats to their positive self-view.

Research has show that people with low and high self-esteem react differently to various situations including conflict, negative feedback, and personal relationships. On the other hand, “evidence for the role of self-esteem in delinquency is quite contradictory” (Baumeister, Campbell, Krueger, & Vohs, 2003, p. 23). In the following section a summary of some of the more important findings on the relationship between self-esteem and deviant behavior will be presented.

**Self-Esteem and Deviant Behavior**

As stated above, result of studies that conducted on the relationship between self-esteem and delinquency is quite contradictory. Jang and Thornberry (1998) stated that there have been mixed findings on the role of self-esteem in deviant behavior. Furthermore, according to Shoemaker (2005) conflict theorists have argued that this is because the influence of social inequalities that exist in the social environment are often
ignored when examining the relationship between self-esteem and deviant behavior. A possible explanation of this issue could be that the researchers who use individualistic concepts of this nature tend to be psychologists or those who are psychologically oriented, and as such are not trained in or tuned into looking at the importance of sociological variables such as this. In addition, sociologists who are interested in understanding rates and patterns of deviance rightly question the utility of psychological concepts to explain patterned behavior. For example, Emler (2001) stated that there are two basic arguments that predict a straightforward association between low self-esteem and delinquent behavior:

According to the first of these arguments people who are convinced they are worthless have no self-esteem to lose from any opprobrium they might attract by breaking the law. The second argument states that young people with a low sense of their own worth are more susceptible to influence of this kind. The flip side of this assumption is that; people with high self-esteem avoid crime because they anticipate that it would damage their sense of their own worth. (p. 18)

Some studies found a modest relationship between these variables. Jensen (1973) found some relation between low self-esteem and delinquency. Two more recent studies also reported a weak to moderate effect size of self-esteem on delinquency. While a cross-sectional study conducted by Neumark-Sztainer, Storey, French, and Resnick (1997) indicated a moderate effect size; McCarthy and Hoge (1984) reported a very weak effect size of self-esteem on delinquency. Kaplan (1980) found among the middle-class children and among girls that the “children who were not already involved in deviant activities and whose initial self-esteem was low were more likely to become
involved in deviance subsequently” (p. 47). However, it is not surprising that psychological variables would show essentially weak effects in terms of being able to explain aggregate phenomena.

One of the best examples of an association between self-esteem and delinquency is found in the research conducted by Trzesniewski, Donnellan, Robins, Moffitt, and Caspi in 2002. They found significant correlations between self-reported delinquency and three different measures of self-esteem. Baumeister et al. (2003) praised this research as being the “best available evidence for a positive link between low self-esteem and subsequent delinquent behavior” (p. 23), because of the study’s large sample size, longitudinal design, and multiple methods measurement of behavior.

The contradiction between the results of the relationship between self-esteem and deviant behavior remains the same when it comes to the relationship between degree of self-esteem and deviant behavior. For example, Baumeister, Tice, and Hutton (1989) stated that violence results from a high level of self-esteem. However, low self-esteem can also cause many problems. Those with low self-esteem were often given messages that failed experiences meant they were failures of their whole self. Low self-esteem can lead to several issues. According to Biro, Striegel-Moore, Franko, Padgett, and Bean (2006) low self-esteem is associated with adverse outcomes, such as depression, substance abuse, and antisocial behavior. In fact, individuals with low self-esteem are more easily influenced compared to those with high self-esteem (Tang & Reynolds, 1990). Those with lower self-esteem will be less confident and secure in their actions or ideas so they will seek cues from their environment to assist them. They will also more likely seek approval of others around them and be more willing to go along
with the others and what they think and do. However, there are also other studies that reported no relationship between self-esteem and delinquency. For example, Zieman and Benson (1983) and Jang and Thornberry (1998) failed to find any relation between self-esteem and delinquency in their studies.

Three different studies reported different results by analyzing the American Youth in Transition data set. The contradiction is more obvious in these studies that used the same data set. In the first study, Rosenberg and Rosenberg (1978) claimed to find an effect of self-esteem on delinquency. However, Bynner, O'Malley, and Bachman (1981) and Wells and Rankin (1983) reanalyzed the same data set by using other statistical techniques and found little evidence that self-esteem influenced delinquency.

However, the effect of self-esteem appeared to vary by type of deviant behavior. For example, Vega, Zimmerman, Warheit, and Apospori (1993) identified low self-esteem as one of ten risk factors for “illicit drug” use among adolescents in the United States. Moreover, for alcohol abuse the findings are very consistent. Alcoholics have been found to have lower self-esteem. For example, Maney (1990) found that higher alcohol consumption was correlated with lower self-esteem.

Another example of deviant behavior which has been shown to be related to self-esteem is teenage pregnancy. For example in their studies Werner and Smith (1977), Plotnick (1992), and Keddie’s (1992) all reported that teenage pregnancy was associated with lower self-esteem. Even though the evidence is strong in this case there are also other studies that found no association. For example, Vernon, Green, and Frothingham (1983) found no association between level of self-esteem and subsequent likelihood of teenage pregnancy.
Overall, there is some support for the traditional view that low self-esteem may contribute to deviant behavior (Baumeister et al., 2003). Even though the association between self-esteem and deviant behavior varies among the studies discussed here, “it is almost always negative, suggesting that the effect is present, although probably quite weak” (Baumeister et al., 2003, p. 24). However, we also need to note that the apparent relationships could be correlational, not necessarily causal.

Self-Esteem and Other Risk Factors

In the literature there is also some suggestion that the effect of self-esteem on deviant behavior may be mediated by other risk factors (Felson & Zielinski, 1989; Klein, Elifson, & Sterk, 2007; Krider, 2002; Messina & Messina, 2007; Patchen, 1999; Roberts, 2004; and Swann, Chang-Schneider, & McClarty, 2007). Because of such arguments, a brief discussion on how self-esteem affects some of the risk factors that are part of this research will be presented in this section.

Religion provides a greater sense of self identity and self-esteem for some people. According to Roberts (2004), religion provides a meaning function and a belonging and identity function. The meaning function refers to the provision of meaning in life. Even in suffering, there can be meaning in life. The belonging and identity function provides group members with a greater sense of solidarity and a great sense of self-esteem. In fact, people derive much of their self-esteem from group membership. Members of an ethnic group share in a sense of high self-esteem or low self-esteem, depending on the status of their group (Wiggins, et al., 1994).

Members of marginalized groups can feel a greater sense of power, prestige and control by identifying with powerful groups. Other group members compare their group
to other groups in an effort to make their own group appear superior. The more self-esteem an individual can gain from identifying with a group, the more likely individuals are to identify with that group (Patchen, 1999).

Self-esteem has a lot to do with an individual's support system. If one has a positive support system then it is more than likely that person will have high self-esteem, but if one has a negative support system then it is more than likely that person will have low self-esteem (Felson & Zielinski, 1989). “Healthy self-esteem originates in the environment found in the: family, school, peer group, work place, and community” (Messina & Messina, 2007, Online article).

One significant life event that has a profound effect on children’s self-esteem is parental divorce. Studies have shown that children whose parents are divorced still display the effects of the divorce 2-3 years after it occurs, and “these children were two to four times more likely to be seriously disturbed emotionally and behaviorally than children from intact families” (Krider, 2002, Online article). Because self-esteem is built throughout childhood, events such as divorce can disturb a child’s self-esteem due to the child blaming him/herself for the divorce and harboring these emotions through adolescence and then adulthood. Divorce can also affect children’s future relationships, causing them to be cautious whom they get emotionally close to due to the fear of “messing up” a relationship.

For a child who is abandoned or neglected, self-esteem is almost always negative. “By being treated in a manner that conveys no sense of mattering to others and no sense of worth, many neglected persons fail to develop any true sense of self-esteem (i.e., neither poor nor good self-esteem is developed, since the person becomes
disinclined to think in terms of him/herself) and, therefore, invest no value in themselves or their futures” (Klein et al., 2007, p. 49).

Swann et al., (2007, p. 91) states that there is a “cyclical interplay” between self-esteem, behavior, and the social environment. In fact, research shows that high self-esteem can produce positive outcomes, not just on an individual level but also on society as a whole. Just as self-esteem influences society, society also affects self-esteem. Ultimately, self-esteem was found to be the second leading factor in eating disorders (Shea and Pritchard, 2006).

**Conclusion**

“Many researchers have sought to link self-esteem to violence, aggression, and antisocial tendencies” (Baumeister et al., 2003, p. 24). Based on the results of these studies it would be fair to conclude that “low self-esteem has no coherent effect on delinquency” (Emler, 2001, p. 83). The results are mixed, at best. At all events, evidence from the other longitudinal studies (Bynner et al., 1981; McCarthy & Hoge, 1984) is mixed. “A recurring theme in their reports is that low self-esteem is but one among several risk factors, and often one of the less important” (Emler, 2001, p. 85).

However, “the lack of independent prediction does not necessarily undermine the value of self-esteem: Self-esteem may have important effects on delinquency that happen to be mediated by other variables” (Baumeister et al., 2003, p. 23). Better causal models are needed to see if effect is indirect. For example, “perhaps low self-esteem people are more likely to engage in delinquency because they are more likely to disengage from school and take risks” (Baumeister et al., 2003, p. 23).
Because of the factors that have been discussed in this section, a measure of the concept of self-esteem has been included as the first of the two measures that were used in this study as a part of the inner containment variables. Together with the religiosity measure, this measure was used to operationalize the effect of inner containment on deviant behavior among young adults.

Religiosity

Religion is a system of beliefs and practices by which groups of people interpret and respond to what they feel is supernatural and sacred (Johnstone, 1975). On the other hand religiosity is generally defined as the degree to which one believes in and is involved in religion. It is also related to the degree of religious commitment. Johnson, Jang, Larson, and De Li (2001) described religiosity as “the extent to which an individual is committed to the religion he or she professes and its teachings, such as the individual's attitudes and behaviors reflect this commitment” (p. 25).

It would be possible to say then that religiosity is capable of influencing an individual cognitively and behaviorally. According to Mokhlis (2006), religious persons have value systems that differ from those of the less religious and the non-religious. “A highly religious person will evaluate the world through religious schemas and thus will integrate his or her religion into much of his or her life” (Worthington et al., 2003, p. 85).

Religion plays a big role within society and has a lot to do with how people act (Insoll, 2004). Mokhlis (2006) cites prior studies as evidence for the influence of religious beliefs on behavior in areas such as parental attachment, clothing styles, eating and drinking, the use of cosmetics, social and political views and sexual behavior. Clearly, motives for participating in religious experiences are linked to religion.
Since religiosity is affecting the individual's behavior then it would be possible to hypothesize that the religious commitment may also be extended beyond religion itself and those people with high religiosity would be expected to exhibit a similar commitment in other aspects of their life, such as commitment to family relations and social and cultural norms. For example, according to Welch, Title, and Petee (1991), research has shown that religiosity is a potent generator of conformity.

Also, given that religion plays a greater role in the daily lives of Muslims (a type of bond that recent studies have used), individual bonds to society are said to be more important in Islamic societies (Ozbay & Ozcan, 2006). For example, Hirschi’s social bond theory did not include religious beliefs, but they are clearly representative of conventional values and also participation in these activities.

In addition, according to rational choice theory, individuals who are seen as strongly religious are more likely to experience shame from deviant acts, and individuals who participate in religion-based social networks are more likely to experience embarrassment from deviant acts (Grasmick et al., 1991). Thus, religious people are deterred from committing crime because of sureness and harshness of informal penalty. In the light of these theories, we can hypothesize that religion has deterrence effect on deviant behavior.

There are numerous studies that report an association between religiosity and deviance. Religious traits and behaviors of parents exercise important influence on their children’s delinquent behavior (Dubin & Dubin, 1965). For example, Regnerus (2003) found that parents’ conservative Protestant affiliation showed consistent direct negative effects on delinquency. Moreover, he also reported that parental religiosity protects girls
better than boys among high school students. In an earlier study Burkett (1993) also found that parents’ religiosity was a significant predictor of an adolescents’ delinquent behavior.

Many research findings show consistently that religious beliefs and practices of adolescents reduce their chance of being delinquent (Akers & Sellers, 2004). In recent studies focusing on adolescents, Benda and Corwyn (2001), Johnson, Jang, Larson, and Li (2001), and Pearce and Haynie (2004) also reported that religiosity is significantly negatively related to crime. Furthermore, Welch, Tittle, and Grasmick (2006) examined whether the ability of personal Christian religiosity to induce social conformity is spuriously due to self-control. They found that personal religiosity and self-control show a statistically significant, independent negative relationship with many of forms of projected misbehavior.

On the other hand, Ellis and Peterson (1995) explored this relationship at a societal level using a dataset from thirteen nations. Their findings suggested that more religious countries had lower crime rates than less religious countries. They also found at the individual level that greater religiosity is associated with lower criminality. Similarly, in another societal level research study, Chadwick and Top (1993) tested the religious ecology hypothesis asserting that religion is negatively related to delinquency only in a highly religious climate. In this study they failed to support the religious ecology hypothesis and they found that religiosity has a strong negative relationship to delinquency in both the high and low religious ecologies.

The research on the effect of religiosity on alcohol consumption and drug use is plentiful and especially consistent. Dudley, Mutch, and Cruise (1987) examined the
factors which predict frequency of drug usage by youth. As a reason for not using drugs, “my commitment to Christ” was the strongest predictor. Moreover, regular participation in family worship, which is a part of family rituals, was most highly related to self-restraint from drugs. In different studies Amoateng and Bahr (1986), Burkett (1993), Benda (2002), Clarke, Beeghley, and Cochran (1990), Hadaway, Elifson, and Peterson (1984), Marcos, Bahr, and Johnson (1986), McIntosh, Fitch, Wilson, and Nyberg (1981), and Perkins (1985) reported varied degrees of significant negative relationship between religiosity and alcohol consumption and/or drug use.

Other than studies focusing on alcohol and drug problems, there are also studies that focused on different forms of deviant behavior. For example, in their study Stack and Kanavy (1983) reported a negative association between the influence of Catholicism (religiosity) and forcible rape. In another study Grasmick, Bursik, and Cochran (1991) examined the relationship between religiosity and taxpayers’ inclinations to cheat. They found that religion’s internal control process inhibits illegal behavior that makes more religious taxpayers to be less likely to cheat.

Johnson, Jang, Li, and Larson (2000) studied the degree to which an individual’s religious involvement significantly mediates and buffers the effects of neighborhood disorder on youth crime. They employed data from the National Youth Survey and focused on Black Americans. They found that the effects of neighborhood disorder on crime among black youth are partly mediated by an individual’s religious involvement. In addition, the involvement of black American youth in religious institutions significantly buffers the effects of neighborhood disorder on crime.
In a recent study, Kerley, Matthews, and Blanchard (2005) found that religiosity directly lessened the likelihood of arguing and indirectly lessened the likelihood of fighting among inmates. They concluded that “the efficacy of religiosity and religious programs for individuals in prison rests on whether they can promote basic social behaviors” (Kerley et al., 2005, p. 443). Their study also showed that religiosity could lessen the incidence of engaging in negative behavior, even in an exceptionally negative context such as a prison institution.

On the other hand, some studies reported weak relationships or no relationship between religiosity and deviant behavior. For example, Hirschi and Stark (1969) found that religion was unrelated to delinquency. In their study Sloane and Potvin (1986) found weak associations for some crimes, and no association for others. In a more recent study Benda and Corwyn (1997) explored the relationship between religion and delinquency among high schools students. When they only control for demographics, while examining measures of church attendance and religiosity, they found that religiosity is only negatively related to status offenses and not to crime.

As this literature suggests, religion is one of the factors that affects the likelihood of engaging in deviant behavior. Furthermore, consistent with the control theory tradition, Nagasawa et al. (2000) also included religious beliefs as mechanisms that ensure adolescents’ conformance to society’s rules along with family, school, moral values, and friends.

In this study, a measure of religiosity will be used as the second aspect of the inner containment, and will be used to help examine the effect of inner containment on deviant behavior among young adults. The role of risk factors in the manifestation of
deviant behavior at the individual, family, and environmental levels will be examined in the next section.

Risk Factors

Researchers want to learn what makes some young people more vulnerable than others to committing deviant acts (Roberts, 2002). In addition to the social control variables of inner and outer containment, studies have identified several social and demographic characteristics that have been classified as risk factors for deviant behavior (Breaking New Ground for Youth at Risk, 1990; Dryfoos, 1990; and Garbarino & Abramowitz, 1992).

A risk factor is a variable that predicts an increased probability of later offending (Kazdin, Kraemer, & Kessler, 1997). Literature on deviant behavior has shown that there are several risk factors associated with the likelihood of engaging in deviant behavior. According to Farrington and Welsh (2007) these factors can be found at the individual, family, and environmental levels.

According to Farrington (2006) “among the most important individual factors that predict offending are low intelligence and attainment, personality and temperament, empathy and impulsiveness” (p. 9). In addition to this, in their discussion of family and environmental factors Farrington and Welsh (2007) note that “the strongest family factor that predicts offending is usually criminal or antisocial parents” (p. 4). Other quite strong and replicable family factors that predict offending are large family size, poor parental supervision, parental conflict, and disrupted families. At the environmental level, the strongest factors that predict offending are growing up in a low socioeconomic status
household, associating with delinquent friends, attending high-delinquency-rate schools, and living in deprived areas.

Other than the major variables of the model, some of the risk factors that are mentioned above are included in this study. Furthermore, other risk factors that are predictors of offending behavior in other research are presented in this study. At the individual level, age, gender and low school attainment are included in this study as a risk factor. At the family level, family size and structure, parental involvement and the household’s socioeconomic status, as well as the parents' deviance are included as predictors of offending. Characteristics of neighborhood in which one grew up and associating with delinquent friends are the environmental risk factors that are included in this study.

As previously mentioned in the discussion of containment theory, Reckless (1973b) included some of these risk factors in his model. Namely, he included family structure, socioeconomic status, and type of neighborhood as outer containment variables. In the remainder of this section, a discussion of these factors and their relation to deviant behavior will be presented.

Risk Factors at the Individual Level

First of all researchers have found that young people are more likely to engage in criminal activities than older persons (Mooney, Knox, & Schacht, 1996; Shoemaker, 2005). As Simons, Simons, and Wallace (2004) put it, “results from a variety of longitudinal studies show that children who are aggressive and noncompliant during elementary school are at a risk for adolescent and adult crime” (p. 16). Moreover, according to Flanagan and Maguire (1990) criminal and delinquent behavior rises
dramatically during adolescence, peaks at about 16 or 17, and then declines over the remainder of the life span.

Another important aspect of the age factor is early pregnancy. According to Smith et al. (2000), since involvement in juvenile delinquency predicts an increased likelihood of an early pregnancy, the link between teenage parenting and juvenile delinquency may be one aspect of the link between criminal parents and delinquent children. However, Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter, and Silva (2001) state that family risk factors would have different effects at different ages. So, the same risk factor might have different degrees of effect on the child based on the child’s age.

In terms of the impact of gender on offending, Reid (1997) found that men were more likely than women to commit crimes. Recent research indicates that men account for 83% arrested for violent crimes and 72% arrested for property crimes (Bartollas & Miller, 2001). Boys are also more likely than girls to commit crimes among juveniles. However, “the female proportion of delinquency cases increased steadily from 19% in 1991 to 26% in 2002” (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006, p. 161). With relation to the other risk factors, it has been documented that the socialization process works differently for boys and girls (MacDonald & Parke, 1986; Cerulo, 1997; Ferree & Hall, 2000; Macfie, Houts, McElwain, & Cox, 2005; Ishak, Tamis-LeMonda, & Adolph, 2007). So, family and environmental factors might be expected to have different effects on boys and girls. For example, boys are more likely to receive physical punishment from parents (Smith & Brooks-Gunn, 1997). Supporting this perspective, Moffitt et al. (2001) also found that boys were exposed to more risk factors.
West (1993) found that low school attainment successfully predicted chronic offenders. Moreover, as a result of their research, Loeber and Dishion (1983) concluded that educational attainment is one of the most important predictors of offending. In two different studies that were conducted in 1992, Farrington found similar results between low school attainment and offending. In the first study Farrington (1992) stated that low school attainment predicted both juvenile and adult convictions. Furthermore, in his second study he found that low school attainment predicted self-reported delinquency almost as well as convictions (Farrington, 1992a). Kruttschnitt, Heath, and Owens (1986) found similar results, concluding that poor performance in school was significantly associated with violent crime in adulthood.

Similarly, other researchers have found that positive attachment to school, higher academic achievement, and involvement in school activities is associated with lower rates of delinquency (Hirschi, 1969; Empey & Lubek, 1979). Also, school failure was found to be associated with delinquent behavior (Cohen, 1955; Lynam, Moffitt, & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1993).

**Risk Factors at the Family Level**

The association between risk factors at the family level and child outcomes has been widely studied. Researchers have confirmed that family factors are important predictors of offending. Loeber and Dishion (1983) and Loeber and Stouthamer-Lober (1986) found that separation from a parent, parental rejection of children, poor parental supervision, large family size, and antisocial parents are among the most important risk factors at the family level. In addition, Lipsey and Derzon (1998) found that low
socioeconomic status of the family is also one of the best explanatory predictors of offending.

One of these risk factors at the family level is the structure of the family. Snyder and Sickmund (2006) reported that “seven out of ten juveniles in the U.S. live with married parents” (p. 10). In general, the research finds that children who are separated from a biological parent are more likely to offend than children from intact families (Farrington & Welsh, 2007). “Juveniles who lived with both biological parents had lower lifetime prevalence of law violating behaviors than did juveniles who lived in other family types” (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006, p. 72). Broken homes could be the result of divorce, parent abandonment, a deceased parent, a parents’ alcohol/drug problem or any other reason that has pulled the parents apart from each other and created a risky environment for the teenager (Rebellon, 2002). Wells and Rankin (1991), and Rankin and Kern (1994) suggested that there is a strong relationship between broken homes and delinquency.

Research has found that men who grow up in non-intact families enter lower status occupations than men who grow up in intact families, and there is less intergenerational inheritance in non-intact families (Biblarz & Raftery, 1993). Astone and McLanahan (1991) found that those who lived with single parents and stepparents when growing up reported that their parents had lower educational expectations of them, provided less monitoring of school work, and less supervision of social activities than children who grew up in intact families. Simons et al. (2005) also found that divorced fathers and mothers were twice as likely as married parents to provide less monitoring, less consistent discipline and to place fewer demands on their children.
“The non-intact homes are more strongly related to delinquency when they are caused by parental separation or divorce rather than by death” (Farrington, 2006, p. 25). Flowers (2001) found that broken homes increase the likelihood of involvement in delinquency by exerting financial pressure on the children who live in them.

Another important factor that is related with the family is the degree of parental involvement. According to Newson and Newson (1989) low parental involvement in the child’s activities predicts delinquency. In addition, West and Farrington (1973) also found that having a father who never joined in the boy’s leisure activities doubles his risk of conviction.

The relationship between parental deviance and juvenile delinquency has been established (McCord 1977; Robins 1979; Reid, 1997; Geismar & Wood, 1986). “Having a convicted father, mother, brother, or sister predicted a boy’s own convictions, and all four relatives were independently important as predictors” (Farrington, Barnes, & Lambert, 1996, p. 47). Furthermore, Lauritsen (1993) found considerable sibling resemblance in delinquency rates.

The association between parental deviance and juvenile deviance is even stronger when both parents are involved in criminal behavior (Robins, West, & Herjanic, 1975). Roberts (2002) reported that a national survey of institutionalized juveniles revealed twenty-five percent of them had fathers who had been incarcerated, nine percent had mothers who had gone to jail, twenty-five percent had a sibling who had served time, and thirteen percent had extended family members who had been in jail. Over fifty percent of the juveniles reported that they have had family members who have
been or are currently incarcerated. A later study revealed that a third of the adult prisoners had family members who had been incarcerated (Stark, 1996).

However, Sampson and Laub (1993) found that maternal and paternal deviance did not predict a boy's delinquency after controlling for other family factors including poor supervision, harsh discipline, parental rejection, low attachment, and large family size. McCord (1977) also found that cold and rejecting parents tend to have delinquent children. Moreover, parents’ substance use has also been found to predict delinquency of children (Loeber, Farrington, Stouthamer-Loeber, & Van Kammen, 1998). Similarly, Plass and Hotaling (1995) showed that children who had who had run away from home as children were more likely to runaway than those, whose parents had no such experience during their childhood.

The socioeconomic status of the individual is viewed as a major risk factor. Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960) are among the first major figures who found an association between socioeconomic deprivation and delinquency. One of the most important variables that explain the socioeconomic status of a family is its income level. According to McClanahan (1985) income level is one of the most significant variables associated with family structure. Socioeconomic status appears to influence family functioning in different ways. McLeod and Shanahan (1993) found that poverty can contribute to higher rates of psychological distress in children.

For example, Whitbeck, Hoyt, and Ackley (1997) provide evidence of a positive association between parental unemployment and parental violence toward children. In addition, McLoyd (1989) indicates that the family poverty increases the risk of cruel and contradictory punishment. Moreover, Sampson and Laub found that both receiving
social assistance (1993) and having low socioeconomic status (1994) are also related to harsh and inconsistent parental discipline.

The findings of a subsequent study indicate that low hourly wages in low-income families added to family stress and this was associated with lower levels of self-regulation among adolescents (Brody, Stoneman, & Flor, 1996). Brownfield and Sorenson (1994) also found that economic deprivation is an important predictor of offending. In a more recent study, Ferguson, Swain-Campbell, and Horwood (2004) reported that living in a low socioeconomic family between birth and age 6, predicted delinquency between ages 15 and 21.

**Risk Factors at the Environmental Level**

It has been reported in various studies that crime rates vary with area of residence and there is a clear interaction between individuals and communities in which they live. For example Simpson, Dinitz, Kay and Reckless (1960) reported that whether a particular child becomes delinquent or not depends upon the area where a child lives. Furthermore, Geismar and Wood (1986) stated that the neighborhood in which one spends their formative years provides the physical, social, and economic context in which attitudes and behaviors are formed. Because of these reasons various researches were conducted to explain the relationship between the neighborhood quality and crime.

The focus of the classical research conducted by Shaw and McKay (1942) in Chicago was the distribution of crime rates in different neighborhoods. They found that the juvenile delinquency rate is higher in disorganized neighborhoods. Bursik (1988) also linked high juvenile crime rates with social disorganization of an area. Simcha-
Fagan and Schwartz (1986) listed the basic characteristics of disorganized neighborhoods as high dropout rates, high rates of population turnover, high unemployment, little potential for employment, and high crime rates.

Most recently, Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) reported that the most important neighborhood predictors of offending were concentrated disadvantage, immigration concentration, residential instability, and low levels of informal social control. Their study also shows similarities with the previous studies documenting the effect of neighborhood on deviant behavior. As a result, there is often institutional instability that could contribute to weak socialization.

Additionally, there is another argument containing two beliefs about the relationship between young people and crime. “One is that young people are drawn into crime to the extent that they succumb to the malign influence of less law abiding youngsters” (Emler, 2001, p. 16). Associating with delinquent friends is an important risk factor that predicts offending. According to Kaplan, Johnson and Bailey (1987), “a delinquent inclination leads young people into associations with peers who are similarly inclined” (p. 278).

In their research Yoder, Whitbeck and Hoyt (2003) reported that youth gang members are more likely to come from abusive and dysfunctional families of origin, seek peers who can provide companionship, and social support, in order to survive on their own, and engage in criminal behaviors compared to non-gang youth. Accordingly, Reiss (1988) also stated that delinquent acts tend to be committed in small groups rather than alone. Moreover, Reiss and Farrington (1991) reported that the tendency of
committing crime in groups is strong before the age of 17. They also stated that boys tend to commit their crimes with other boys similar in age and living close by.

Gatti, Tremblay, Vitaro, and Mcduff (2005) also found that young people offended more after joining a gang. This factor is also related with the rejection of the child by the parents. By the same token, it is possible to state that children who are rejected by most of their peers for various reasons might tend to associate with other delinquent children. However, Jang and Thornberry (1998) found that forming friendships with delinquent peers may even have an apparent benefit, since their research revealed that forming friendships with delinquent peers boosted self-esteem.

Research has shown that children can effectively cope with one or two risk factors but when confronted with multiple factors they fare less well. Garbarino and Abramowitz (1992) found that most children could cope with multiple risk factors if there were compensatory forces in their lives. However, experiencing more than two major risk factors could jeopardize children's development and lead to problem behaviors such as early pregnancy, drug use, and delinquent behavior. In this study, all the risk factors identified above will be evaluated for their effect on delinquent behavior.

Conclusion

The theoretical framework and the major research concepts were discussed in two major sections of this chapter. The tradition of social control theory was summarized in the first section at the beginning of Chapter 2. In the next major section discussion of deviant behavior, family rituals, self-esteem, and religiosity were presented. Finally, a detailed discussion of the risk factors at the individual, family, and
environmental levels was presented. Following the discussion of theoretical framework and major research concepts, the methodology of the present study will be the focus of Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The goal of this chapter is to describe the research procedures. To provide this information, the chapter begins with a general discussion of the research design. The next section presents information on the participants. A detailed discussion of the survey instruments and the variables will be presented in the following section. The chapter concludes with the discussion of the procedures for analyzing the data.

Data and Data Collection

This study is designed to replicate and expand on Roberts’ (2002) United States study of the impact of family rituals on deviant behavior among young adults. The data were obtained from two sources. The first sample is from a total of 205 incarcerated juveniles at juvenile correction facilities and the second sample is from a total of 200 college students in Turkey. Detailed information about the participants will be provided in the next section.

While the U.S. sample was designed as a self-administered survey for both subsamples, in the Turkish case social workers in the juvenile correction facilities administered the survey. However, a self-administered survey technique was used for the college subsample just like the U.S. study.

Quantitative data for this study were selected from the Turkish sample that were gathered from January 2007 through March 2007. The data used in this study were collected by a group of researchers as a part of an ongoing research project in Turkey. This study uses the initial data collected for that project. A cross-sectional research design was utilized to examine the relationship between the research variables.
Even though this study used the data gathered from the initial 205 respondents from the incarcerated juveniles, data collection is still going on under the auspices of the administrators and the social workers who are working for the Turkish Ministry of Justice, which is the national institution responsible for the courts and the prison system of the criminal justice system in Turkey. No research can be done without the Turkish Ministry of Justice’s approval in any prison throughout Turkey, and this research is being conducted in all of the juvenile incarceration centers.

Since this study involves human participants, approvals have been received from three different institutions. The data were collected in two separate institutions in Turkey, so approval for human participation was received from the Turkish Ministry of Justice and the Middle East Technical University. Moreover, an additional approval was received from the University of North Texas for the present study.

Sample

A total of 405 respondents participated in this research. The unit of analysis was the individual. A non-probability sampling technique was used to gather two subsamples with one taken from a prison population and another from a college population. The data from incarcerated respondents were obtained from eight juvenile correction facilities in Turkey, and the data from non-incarcerated respondents were obtained from college students at the Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara. The distribution of the respondents is presented in Table 2.
Table 2

*Distribution of Respondents by City*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ankara</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diyarbakir</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izmir</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malatya</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mersin</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samsun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Non-Incarcerated Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle East Technical University (Ankara)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first sample was taken from the prison population. According to Turkish law children of ages 11 through 17 years are detained in different facilities separate from the detainees who are 18 years old or older. As of December 2006 there were 2016 juveniles incarcerated in these facilities. Since the number of juveniles who are incarcerated is not very large, the juvenile incarceration centers are located only in major cities, such as Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Bursa, Adana, Eskisehir, Samsun, Diyarbakir, Malatya, and Mersin. If a child is sentenced to serve time, then that child is detained in the closest incarceration facility where the child's family resides. So, the
sample taken from these incarceration facilities are related to the place where the child was living. Thus, it is not possible to find a child in an Istanbul detention center who was living in Ankara before he or she was detained. Therefore, rather than selecting the sample from one facility, various numbers of respondents were included in the sample from different cities to represent the population.

For this research the sample for the incarcerated respondents was selected by the administrators and the social workers of each juvenile detention center. Even though the majority of the detention centers throughout Turkey were represented in this sample, the final selection of the respondents was not made randomly, so the sample became a non-probability convenience sample. The incarcerated juveniles in these facilities were asked by the social workers whether they would like to participate in this research. No incentives were offered for participation. The incarcerated juveniles had the option to refuse to participate in the research. The ones who accepted to participate in the research were interviewed by the social workers. The answers were anonymous and only the data were provided to the researchers. The incarceration facilities kept the original questionnaires.

The second sample was taken from the college population. In the Turkish higher education system the students are required to take the National University Entrance Examination after they graduate from high school. Based on the score that a student gets from this exam he or she applies to a university. The students can apply to any of the universities in Turkey and still pay the same amount of tuition regardless of the student’s city of residence. A student pays a fixed tuition in any of these universities. This is the reason why top-ranked universities attract the most successful students. For
example, Middle East Technical University (METU) is one of Turkey’s most competitive universities. Each year, among the students taking the National University Entrance Examination, over 1/3 of the top 1000 students with the highest scores attends METU (METU, 2007). As a result of the demand, most of the departments at METU accept only the top 1% of the approximately 1.5 million students taking the National University Entrance Examination.

In 2006 there were more than 21,000 students who registered at METU. Since the language of education is English in METU, there is a specific department designed to teach English to incoming freshmen. Because of the English requirement the incoming students are required to pass a “Test of English as a Foreign Language” like exam or to pass the English preparatory class, where they only take English courses for one year. So, the students who are attending this course are the equivalent of freshmen in the United States’ college education system. The English Preparatory Department of the School of Foreign Languages is the place where all of the incoming students take English courses together regardless of their undergraduate programs. Besides the incoming students, it is also possible to find other students who are majoring in a foreign language within the same school. Hence, the sample that was taken from the METU was selected from among the students of this English preparatory program.

While the incarcerated respondents were placed in the local detention centers, the non-incarcerated sample is free from the location of the respondent’s previous city. So, by being one of the highest ranked universities in Turkey, METU attracts so many students across Turkey. Hence, based on the structure of the Turkish higher education administrative system, it would be possible to see students from all over Turkey.
especially in metropolitan cities such as Istanbul, Ankara, and Izmir. Because of these reasons, drawing a sample of respondents from a major university will be enough in terms of representing different geographical locations across Turkey.

The college sample was drawn among the English preparatory course students. Just like the incarcerated subsample, the college sample was also a non-probability convenience sample. The professors who were teaching classes in this department were asked by the researchers to administer the questionnaire in their classes. The students were asked by their professors whether they would like to participate in this research or not. No incentives were offered for participation and the students had the chance to refuse participating in this research. The ones who accepted to participate in the research answered the questions during a class hour, so no out-of-class commitments were required from the students. Completed questionnaires were collected after the class and they were handed to the researchers by the professors. The answers were anonymous and data entry was done by the researchers.

The two subsamples in this research differed significantly in terms of their legal and developmental status. These two aspects of the respondents must be acknowledged before analyzing the data. First of all, incarcerated respondents were included because they represented the officially labeled deviant members in the Turkish society. College students were included because they were more likely to represent conforming members of the Turkish society. Second, the significant difference in age also presents a fundamental problem in terms of comparing these two samples. It is obvious that the age difference is the reason for the respondent’s different developmental status.
Survey Instruments

Since this research is a replication of Roberts (2002) and Emmett (2000), the measures used to facilitate replication, which were recognized as reliable and valid, were also taken from their studies. The variables in this study were operationalized through five survey instruments including:

[1] Demographics and Family Information Inventory (DFII) (Short & Nye, 1958; Siegel & Senna, 1981; Thornton, James, & Doerner, 1982; Paternoster & Triplett, 1988),

[2] Family Rituals Questionnaire (FRQ) (Fiese & Kline, 1993),


[4] Religious Background and Behavior Questionnaire (RBB) (Connors, Tonigan, & Miller, 1996), and

[5] Behavior Index, which is the second part of DFII.

All five of the survey instruments had been developed and used in previous studies. The survey instruments used in this study and their relative scale factors are briefly itemized and described in the following table.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographics and Family Information</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 3 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family Ritual Questionnaire (FRQ)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>• Settings:</td>
<td>• dinnertime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• vacations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• religious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• cultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Background and Behavior (RBB)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>• God consciousness</td>
<td>• In past year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Formal Practices</td>
<td>• Over lifetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Index</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Family Information Inventory*

The first part of the Family Information Inventory (FII) was developed as a demographic questionnaire by Roberts (2002), for her study. The FII was included at the beginning of the survey. The FII was used to acquire information about age, gender, academic status, family of origin and other relevant risk factors. In addition, participants were queried about their participation in activities with family members inside the home, participation in activities with family members outside the home, and deviance coming from other sources.
The second part of the FII was developed by Roberts based on Short and Nye (1958), Siegel and Senna (1981), Thornton, James, and Doerner (1982), and Paternoster and Triplett (1988). It was used to measure deviant behavior. The original measurement consisted of eighteen different forms of deviant behavior. However, the Turkish version did not include questions related to sexual activities. These questions are the last three questions of the original measurement. The questions were designed to acquire information on whether the participant; [1] had sex relations with someone of the opposite sex, [2] had sex relations with someone of the same sex, and [3] forced someone to have sex relations against their will. These three questions were not approved by the Turkish Ministry of Justice, on the basis that the participants of this research were younger than 18 years of age and these specific questions were not found appropriate for the respondents.

In the present study, deviant behavior was operationalized through self-reported delinquent behavior. Delinquent behavior has been defined as the violation of the law or the commitment of a status offense by a person under age eighteen (Hawkins, Smith, & Catalano, 2002). The Federal Bureau of Investigation classifies crimes as index crimes (Part I offenses) or non-index crimes (Part II offenses) (United States Department of Justice, 2004).

The eight index crimes are criminal homicide, forcible rape, and aggravated assault (crimes against persons), and robbery, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson (crimes against property). Non-index crimes are all types of crimes not considered as index crimes. On the other hand there is another category of offenses, called status offenses, specifically created for juveniles. Status offenses include those
acts that violate statutes that are only applicable to minors (Conklin, 1998). According to Steinhart (1996) “a status offense is behavior that is unlawful for children, even though the same behavior is legal for adults” (p. 86).

In the present study, the incarcerated respondents and the college students responded to a self-report instrument on delinquent behavior that included index crimes, non-index crimes and status offenses. As stated above, self-reported levels of deviant behavior were identified through the final questions on the FII. Respondents were also asked to report the prevalence and incidence of their own deviant behavior.

*Family Ritual Questionnaire*

The Family Ritual Questionnaire (FRQ) was used both by Roberts (2002) and Emmett (2000). The FRQ is a 56-item, forced choice questionnaire that solicits information about frequency and perceived significance of family activities (Fiese, 1992). Based on the dimensions of ritualization posited by Wolin and Bennett (1984), the FRQ assesses the degree of family rituals according to seven settings. These settings are: mealtime, weekends, family trips/vacations, annual family celebrations and gatherings, special events, religious holidays, and cultural and ethnic traditions.

Table 4

*Settings of the Family Rituals Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settings</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meal time</td>
<td>Shared family meals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekends</td>
<td>Leisure and/or planned activities on nonworking days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Events or activities surrounding any sort of family trip or vacation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settings</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual celebrations</td>
<td>Yearly celebrations: birthday’s, anniversaries, first day of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special celebrations</td>
<td>Celebrations that occur regardless of religion or culture: weddings, graduations, family reunions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious holidays</td>
<td>Religious celebrations: Christmas, Chanukah, Easter, and Ramadan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural celebrations</td>
<td>Celebrations tied to culture and ethnic groups: naming ceremonies, wakes, funerals, baking particular ethnic food</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fiese (1992) and her colleagues (Fiese & Kline, 1993) defined the critical elements of family rituals based on eight dimensions. For each setting there are eight dimensions that are summed across the seven sections to create the dimensions of occurrence, roles, routine, attendance, affect, symbolic significance, continuation, and deliberateness. Items were scored across dimensions and settings, with higher scores indicating more ritualization and more positive meaning within the family (Fiese, 1992; Fiese & Kline, 1993). In addition, Fiese (1992) identified two primary factors of family rituals: a routine factor and a symbolic factor. The routine factor is composed of three dimensions that are related to the roles that family members played when enacting family rituals. These three dimensions constructing the routine factor are the roles, routine, and the continuation dimensions. The symbolic factor is composed of 5 dimensions that are related to how individuals feel about their family rituals. These five components of symbolic factor are the occurrence, attendance, affect, symbolic significance, and deliberateness dimensions (Fiese, 1992; Fiese, Hooker, Kotary, & Schwagler, 1993; Fiese & Kline, 1993; Emmett, 2000; Roberts, 2002). Moreover,
Fiese’s (1992; 1993) studies revealed that the meaning dimension plays a more important role in how family members perceive family rituals than the routine dimension.

Table 5

*Dimensions of the Family Rituals Questionnaire*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>How often an activity occurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>Assignment of roles, duties during activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Regularity in how activity is conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Expectations for whether attendance is mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>Emotional investment in an activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic significance</td>
<td>Attachment of meaning to an activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>Perseverance of activity across generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberateness</td>
<td>Advance preparation and planning associated with the activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FRQ has been used primarily with non-clinical populations, including undergraduate college students, the students’ families, and couples with young children. This is also consistent with the participant population of this study and the previous studies conducted by Roberts (2002) and Emmett (2000).

The FRQ was essential in providing information about the respondents’ family rituals. For the current study, participants were asked to think of how their own family of origin typically interacted during the time when they were growing up. The information was elicited by the FRQ in a two-step process in which participants first were asked to choose one of two statements and then were asked to indicate how true the statement was of their family of origin. While separate indexes can be derived for the seven settings, the underlying dimensions may not be totally orthogonal, and predictive power
of the dimensions taken individually may not be useful (Baxter & Clark, 1996). Thus, the individual elements of the FRQ will not be examined separately.

Fiese and Kline (1993) conducted four studies to establish internal consistency, criterion validity, test-retest reliability, and parent-child agreement. In Study 1, internal consistency was determined through the calculations of Cronbach’s alphas, with the scales ranging from .52 to .90. Subsequent studies confirmed the internal consistency of the FRQ. In Study 2, criterion validity was established by comparing correlations between the FRQ and the Family Environment Scale (FES). A positive correlation was found to exist between the FRQ and the FES subscales measuring cohesion and organization. Study 3 assessed the test-retest reliability of the FRQ. After four weeks, the test-retest reliability was .88. In Study 4 they found that there was an agreement among parents and one child in their perception of family rituals.

*Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory*

The Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory (CFSEI-2) developed by Battle (1992) is also used in this study to measure self-esteem. This scale is a self-report and self-referenced instrument designed for a broad age range. The scale consists of 40 items and four subscales: general self-esteem, social self-esteem, personal self-esteem, and defensiveness (lie subscale). With regard to the sub-scales, general self-esteem refers to the individual’s overall perceptions of their worth (16 items); social self-esteem refers to the individual’s perceptions of the quality of their relationships with peer (8 items); and personal self-esteem refers to the individual’s most intimate perceptions of self-worth (8 items). The lie scale contains 8 items and provides a measure of defensiveness. The items are divided into two groups: those which indicate high self-
esteem and those which indicate low self-esteem. The individual checks each item as either “yes” or “no”. Scores are derived by totaling the number of items checked which indicate high self-esteem, excluding the lie subscale. The total possible self-esteem score is 32 and the highest lie score is 8. A higher score on the lie scale reflects less honest responding. Based on previous studies, the classification of self-esteem scores are presented in the following table:

Table 6

**Classification of Self-Esteem Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Very Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General self-esteem</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>≤ 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social self-esteem</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal self-esteem</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total self-esteem</td>
<td>≥ 30</td>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>20-26</td>
<td>14-19</td>
<td>≤ 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Background and Behavior Questionnaire**

The Religious Background and Behavior Questionnaire (RBB) is a brief measure of religious practices (Connors et al., 1996) that was used by Emmett (2000). Paloutzian and Park (2005) stated that the RBB has good psychometric qualities and it is devoted primarily to measuring private religious and spiritual practices. This 13-item questionnaire taps two factor domains: formal practices and God consciousness. The item content was designed to represent those behaviors traditionally associated with religiosity (Connors et al., 1996). The items also reflect most recent activity and lifetime activity, thus allowing for an indication of change in behavior. Although it does not
strictly reflect participation in Muslim religious activities, the RBB does address behaviors more typically associated with traditional Western religious venues. However Paloutzian and Park (2005) indicated that RBB is less exclusively Christian in focus than many other scales.

The RBB was originally developed for use in a national survey of 1,637 alcohol abusers (Project MATCH Research Group, 1993). The RBB taps relatively unsophisticated religiosity rather than spirituality which makes it an appropriate measure for this study that is addressing young adults.

Variables

This section presents the variables used in this study. The instruments that were discussed in the previous section formed the questionnaire that was developed to gather information related to the research questions. The questions were suggested by the theoretical perspective and previous research. The variables and related composite measures that were formed for each of the survey instruments are presented in this section.

Composite Measures

Creating composite measures from individual items is a common practice in statistical applications. Several alternative composite formation methods have been applied in the literature (Landis, Beal, & Tesluk, 2000). Bagozzi and Edwards (1998) provided descriptions for three alternative composite formation models. These three models are:

1. The total disaggregation model: In this model all relevant items are treated as indicators of the latent construct of interest. The benefit of this model is the
ability to evaluate the effect of each item in a scale.

2. The partial aggregation model: This model involves the combination of items into subsets. The items of each subset are treated as indicators of the latent constructs.

3. The total aggregation model: This model combines all items in a particular scale into a single indicator of the latent construct.

In the present study the partial aggregation and the total aggregation models were used to create composite measures through summing items into several latent constructs or a single latent construct.

Sample size is also an important factor in composite measures. According to Landis et al. (2000) the number of cases must be significantly larger than the number of parameters estimated. Just as there are alternative models for creating composite measures, there are also several different perspectives concerning necessary sample sizes that vary by the statistical procedures. Anderson and Gerbing (1988) stated that a minimum required sample size was 150, whereas Kelloway (1998) suggested that at least 200 observations represented an appropriate minimum. Alternatively, Bentler and Chou (1987) suggested that the ratio of sample size to estimated parameters be between 5:1 and 10:1.

In the present study the sample size is 405, including two subsamples of 200 and 205 participants in each of them. So, based on the criterion provided by Bentler and Chou (1987), Anderson and Gerbing (1988), Kelloway (1998), and Landis et al (2000) the present study has the necessary sample size with regard to construction of
composite measures. In the following sections, composite measures formed for each of the survey instruments are presented.

**Family Information Inventory Variables**

This inventory was taken from Roberts (2002), who also developed it for her research. The first part of the FII contained questions regarding demographic and risk factors, participation in conforming activities with family members both within and outside the household, and participation in extracurricular activities. Except for some of the questions on conforming behaviors, Roberts developed the rest of the questions in this section especially for her study. On the other hand, the second part of FII was a self-report questionnaire on deviant behavior developed by Roberts (2002) based on previous studies by Short and Nye (1958), Siegel and Senna (1981), Thornton, James, and Doerner (1982), and Paternoster and Triplett (1988).

A composite measure was computed along with the partial aggregation model, through summing the individual items to create a latent variable; “Family Activities”, from the first part of FII. Participation in conforming activities with family was measured by questions 19 through 24. Scores for this new variable ranged from 6 to 36, and the reliability of this new variable was measured by Cronbach’s alpha, with a score of .81. Roberts (2002) indicated that these questions were taken from the National Survey of Families and Households.

When the family activities of incarcerated respondents (Mean = 17.33, Standard Deviation = 8.87) and college students (Mean = 17.16, Standard Deviation = 6.22) compared, no statistically significant difference was observed ($t = -0.54$).
On the other hand, 8 composite measures were computed from the second part of the FII. This part of the FII contained a questionnaire with fifteen questions, on the self-reported levels of deviant behavior of the participants. The latent constructs of deviance for this part of the study were determined according to the content and the nature of the deviant behavior, not by empirical findings. The reason for this categorization is the legal definitions of the behavior provided by the criminal laws. So, running factor analysis or measuring the reliability of these composite measures cannot affect the structure of the composite measures since they were determined before the study by the law. Each of the questions had two parts. In the first part of the each question, respondents were asked to report the prevalence and incidence of their own deviant behavior. Following the prevalence and incidence measurement, they were also asked to report if they were caught and if any action was taken as a result of that specific deviant behavior.

The first composite measure of deviance was the prevalence of status offenses committed. There were two questions on the deviance survey related to status offenses. They were questions 1 and 14. After computing the composite measure through summing questions 1 and 14 a dummy variable was created through recoding the variable of “Status Offenses Prevalence” into a new variable for “Status Offenses Incidence”, with 0 representing 0 acts of status offenses committed and 1 indicating that the status offense was committed at least once. This recoded dummy variable “Status Offenses Incidence” was the second composite measure based on the values of questions 1 and 14 on status offenses. The same method was followed with regard to
computing other composite measures for the index crimes, non-index crimes, and total crimes committed by the respondents.

The third composite measure of deviance was the prevalence of index crimes committed. Questions 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, and 12 were the questions on the survey related to index crimes. Once again, after computing the composite measure through summing these six questions, a dummy variable was created through recoding the variable of “Index Crimes Prevalence” into a new variable for “Index Crimes Incidence”; with 0 representing 0 acts of index crimes committed and 1 indicating that the index crimes was committed at least once. This recoded dummy variable of “Index Crimes Incidence” was the fourth composite measure based on the values of six questions on index crimes.

The fifth and the sixth composite measures were computed for the non-index crimes. The fifth composite measure of deviance was the prevalence of non-index crimes committed. Questions 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, and 15 measured the non-index crimes. Once again, after computing the composite measure through summing these seven questions, a dummy variable was created through recoding the variable of “Non-Index Crimes Prevalence” into a new variable for “Non-Index Crimes Incidence”, with 0 representing 0 acts of non-index crimes committed and 1 indicating that the non-index crimes was committed at least once. This recoded dummy variable of “Non-Index Crimes Incidence” was the sixth composite measure based on the values of seven questions on non-index crimes.

The last set of composite measures was computed for the whole questionnaire. The seventh composite measure of deviance was the total number of different deviant
acts committed. The composite measure of the “Total Offenses Prevalence” was computed through summing whole fifteen questions. After computing this new variable, just like the previous types of crimes, a dummy variable was created through recoding the variable of “Total Offenses Prevalence” into a new variable for “Total Offenses Incidence”, with 0 representing 0 act of crime was committed and 1 indicating that a crime was committed at least once. This recoded dummy variable of “Total Offenses Incidence” was the eighth composite measure based on the values of the whole fifteen offenses. This variable is also used as the dependent variable for the regression analysis.

Among the composite measures computed from the second part of FII, the total aggregation model was used for only the last variable on the total number of offenses. Other than this variable, the partial aggregation model was used to compute the composite measure on prevalence and incidence of the status offenses, index crimes, and non-index crimes.

The distribution of fifteen types of delinquent behavior by the categories of crimes used in the present study is presented in Table 7.

Table 7

*Distribution of Delinquent Behavior by Crime Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Category</th>
<th>Type of Delinquent Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Index Crimes</td>
<td>Taken a car for a ride without the owner's permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broken into and entered a home, building, or store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used a weapon in a fight with another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taken something valued at more than 20YTL but less than 700YTL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 7 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime Category</th>
<th>Type of Delinquent Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taken something of larger value (more than 700 YTL). Used force or a weapon to take money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or something of value from another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Index Crimes</td>
<td>Used marijuana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Used drugs or other chemicals to get high for kicks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engaged in a fistfight with another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bought or drunk beer, wine or other alcohol without your parent's permission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driven a car while strongly under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Destroyed or damaged someone else's property on purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gone hunting or fishing without a license (or violated other game laws).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status offenses</td>
<td>Run away from home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missed school without permission of parents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory Variable_

This inventory required simple “yes” or “no” answers. The second edition was standardized on nearly 5,000 subjects throughout the U.S. and Canada (Roberts, 2002). It had been approved for use with individuals ages five through adulthood.

For this study a 6-item subscale was created among the items that were part of the personal self-esteem subscale. This revised personal self-esteem subscale was included in the data analysis process since “personal self-esteem” is defined as that aspect of self-esteem that refers to individuals’ most intimate perceptions of self worth (Burnard, Hebden, & Edwards, 2001). So, the six items that are included in this scale are presented in the following table:
Table 8

Revised Personal Self-Esteem Scale Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number in the questionnaire</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Are you easily depressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Are you usually tense or anxious?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Are your feelings easily hurt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Do you feel uneasy much of the time without knowing why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Are you often upset about nothing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Do you worry a lot?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A composite measure was computed along with the partial aggregation model, through summing these individual items to create a latent variable; “Revised Personal Self-Esteem”. Scores for this new variable ranged from 0 to 6, and the reliability of this new variable was measured by Cronbach’s alpha, with a score of .53. Roberts (2002) indicated that these questions were taken from the National Survey of Families and Households.

Family Rituals Questionnaire Variables

As also found by Roberts (2002), previous research using the FRQ has determined that the FRQ has both a meaning and a routine component (Fiese, 1992; Fiese, 1993). A discussion of these dimensions was presented in the previous chapter. In order to determine if this was also true for the Turkish sample, a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was conducted on the dimension scores of occurrence, roles, routines, attendance, affect, symbolic significance, continuation, and deliberativeness.
As suggested by Fiese (1992; 1993), Emmett (2000), and Roberts (2002) the dimension scores were summed across the seven settings. Both Emmett (2000) and Roberts (2002) found a two-factor solution using an eigen value of 1 as the criterion. In this study only one factor was found, using an eigen value of 1 as the criterion, for all respondents, the incarcerated respondents, and the college students. Since the total score of the FRQ was also used in the previous analysis, the same variable was also used in the present study. The only difference was that the present study did not offer an additional explanation based on the meaning and the routine dimensions since the present data did not suggest such dimensions.

Based on this result, the only factor found in this study is called “Family Rituals Total Score”. Moreover, the Cronbach’s internal consistency alpha values for the eight variables representing the eight dimensions were; .92 for all respondents, .95 for the incarcerated respondents, and .81 for the college students. Results are presented in the following table.
### Table 9

**Factor Loadings of Rotated Factors on Family Rituals Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRQ Dimensions</th>
<th>Total Respondents (n = 405)</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n = 205)</th>
<th>College Students (n = 200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occurrence</strong> (First variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roles</strong> (Second variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.865</td>
<td>0.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routine</strong> (Third variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.880</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance</strong> (Fourth variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>0.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect</strong> (Fifth variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Symbolic Significance</strong> (Sixth variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuation</strong> (Seventh variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.851</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliberateness</strong> (Eighth variables of the seven settings)</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eigen values</strong></td>
<td>5.241</td>
<td>5.880</td>
<td>3.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of variance explained</strong></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cronbach’s alpha values</strong></td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:* Extraction method: Principal Component Analysis  
Rotation method: Varimax with Kaiser normalization

**Religious Background and Behavior Inventory Variables**

The 11-item RBB inventory assesses lifetime and recent religious and spiritual practices and has demonstrated reliability and validity (Reinert & Bloomingdale, 2000; Freiheit, Sonstegard, Schmitt, & Vye, 2006). The RBB has two subscales: God
consciousness and Formal practices. The Formal Practices subscale of the RBB measures behavioral engagement in religion such as attending worship services and reading about one’s religion, and the God Consciousness subscale assess thinking about God and religion (Freiheit et al., 2006). The God Consciousness subscale has four items: thought of God and praying; both of these are assessed for the past year and ever. Formal Practices has eight items: meditating, attending worship service, reading scriptures or holy writings, and having direct experience of God; each of these is assessed for the past year and ever. The latent constructs for God consciousness and formal practice were computed according to the partial aggregation model, whereas the latent construct for the total RBB scores was computed according to the total aggregation model including all of the relevant items.

Table 10

Religious Background and Behavior Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RBB Components</th>
<th>Computed Variables</th>
<th>Total Respondents (n = 405)</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n = 205)</th>
<th>College Students (n = 200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBB God consciousness</td>
<td>Thought of God and prayed (both of these is assessed for the past year and ever)</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB Formal practices</td>
<td>Attending worship service, reading scriptures or holy writings, and having direct experience of God (each of these is assessed for the past year and ever)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB Total</td>
<td>All of the RBB variables</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The RBB was also examined to address some possible self-report concerns. Because each participant was describing both a level of belief and a level of past and current participation, the possibility existed that self-report might result in inconsistent reporting across time or modality. To examine this issue the correlation matrix of different measures of religiosity is presented in the following table.

Table 11

*Correlation Matrix of RBB Measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - RBB Past religious behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - RBB Present religious behaviors</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - RBB God Consciousness</td>
<td>0.88**</td>
<td>0.65**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - RBB Formal Practices</td>
<td>0.93**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - RBB Total Scores</td>
<td>0.99**</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.87**</td>
<td>0.95**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

When the table is examined it can be seen that the participants were remarkably consistent in both their self-described level of religiosity and in their self-report descriptions of past to current behaviors. These elements all formed a series of relationships that suggest that reported level in one section was consistent with reported level in any of the others; what one said about one’s beliefs and what one practiced both in the past and currently appeared to be consistent. Thus, the total score on the RBB was representative of the score on each individual section, as well.

**Techniques of Data Analysis**

Data collected from this research were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPPSS) version 15.0 for WINDOWS. Different statistical techniques
were used to test the hypotheses. The analysis of data will start with the presentation of descriptive statistics of participants’ demographic characteristics.

In order to test the first hypothesis (*Family rituals, religiosity, self-esteem and other risk factors will be significantly different between non-incarcerated respondents and incarcerated respondents in Turkey*) t-tests will be conducted for all of the major variables and the risk factors for both the incarcerated respondents and the college students.

Since the samples drawn from the incarcerated and non-incarcerated participants were not matched, independent sample t-tests with the Bonferroni correction will be conducted to compare the incarcerated sample to the non-incarcerated sample for the entire major variables and the risk factors. Weisstein (2007) defined the Bonferroni correction as “a multiple-comparison correction used when several dependent or independent statistical tests are being performed simultaneously, but while a given alpha value alpha may be appropriate for each individual comparison, it is not for the set of all comparisons” (Online document). Furthermore, he stated that “to avoid a lot of spurious positives, the alpha value needs to be lowered to account for the number of comparisons being performed” (Online document).

In order to test the hypotheses 2a (*Family rituals, self-esteem and religiosity are positively related to each other in Turkey*) and 2b (*Family rituals, self-esteem and religiosity negatively affect young people’s engagement in deviant behavior in Turkey*) binomial logistic regression analysis will be conducted.

According to Farrington (2000), in the risk factor literature, it is common to dichotomize both the risk factor and the outcome and to measure the strength of the
relationship using logistic regression. “Cross-sectional studies with binary outcomes analyzed by logistic regression are frequent in the literature” (Barros & Hirakata, 2003, p. 3) and it has become very popular among social scientists (Garson, 2006). Binomial logistic regression is a form of logistic regression which is used when the dependent variable is dichotomous and the independent variables are of any type. Garson (2006) further stated that;

Logistic regression can be used to predict a dichotomous dependent variable on the basis of continuous and/or categorical independent variables and to determine the percent of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independent variables, to rank the relative importance of independent variables, to assess interaction effects, and to understand the impact of covariate control variables. (Online article)

Conclusion

The research procedures were described in this chapter. The chapter began with the presentation of the research design, which followed by the information on the participants. A detailed discussion of the survey instruments and the variables related to these instruments were presented. The chapter concluded with the discussion of the procedures for analyzing the data.
CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents results of the data analysis. Questions were developed to gather information on variables related to the research problem. They were suggested by the theoretical framework and previous research. The chapter begins with the information about the demographic characteristics of the participants. In the following section the results of the regression analysis will be presented.

Demographic Characteristics

In this section the demographic characteristics of the participants are presented. Descriptive statistics were generated in order to profile the respondents’ demographic and risk characteristics. As mentioned in Chapter 3, a total of 405 respondents participated in this research. Two subsamples were taken - one from a prison population \((n = 205)\) and a second from a college population \((n = 200)\).

In this section of data analysis the results of two different comparisons are presented. Based on the level of measurement of the relevant variables, either chi-square or t-test was conducted to see whether the incarcerated respondents and college students differed significantly on various characteristics. The responses of the Family Rituals Questionnaire, the Culture Free Self-Esteem Inventory-2, and selected questions from the Family Information Inventory related to participation in conforming activities and deviant behavior were compared.

This procedure was also used to test the first hypothesis of the present study, which is; “Family rituals, religiosity, self-esteem and other risk factors will be significantly different between non-incarcerated respondents and incarcerated respondents in
Turkey." Beside the difference between these major concepts, differences between two subsamples were also explained with regard to other risk factors mentioned in previous chapters.

The analysis of data obtained for the present study starts with the FII. Questions 1 through 7 covered topics related to age, sex, highest grade completed in school, attitude toward school, grades, and family structure. Questions 8 and 9 measured attachment to parents by asking if the respondents would go ahead and do something even if they knew their parents would disapprove. Question 11 asked if the respondent's family had ever been on welfare. The question about welfare was added because it was felt that this was a more objective measure of social class. Questions 12 and 13 were related to the type of neighborhood in which the respondents grew up and the crime rate in that neighborhood.

Parents' deviance was the focus of questions 15 and 16. Questions 17 and 18 asked about deviant friends. Roberts (2002) indicated that these two questions were included because Reckless (1973b) found that delinquent friends were often present at the onset of self-reported delinquency and for officially reported acts of delinquent behavior as well. He considered delinquent friends to be part of the pull of the environment (Reckless, 1973b).

Not all of these variables were used in the subsequent analyses but they were included here to provide additional information about the respondents. The two variables that will not be included in the analysis are the age and gender of the respondents. As discussed in the Chapter 3, the two groups were not comparable with regard to age. So, this difference also resulted in a significant difference between the
college students and the incarcerated respondents. The average age of the incarcerated respondents was 16.22 with a standard deviation of 1.23 years, and the average age of the college students was 19.45 with a standard deviation of 1.4 years. As a result of this difference the college students are significantly older than the incarcerated respondents \( (t = -24.5, p < 0.001) \). Even though the association was very strong \( (\text{Eta} = .94) \), this was basically a result of the age distribution. Since the survey was conducted in the incarceration facilities where the juveniles were serving their time, the highest age was 17. However, the lowest age for the college students was 18.

The second variable that had the same problem is the gender of the respondents. There were 205 male incarcerated respondents and no incarcerated female respondents. There were 93 (47%) male and 104 female (53%) college respondents. This difference in the sample in terms of gender distribution was expected for two reasons. First, as mentioned in Chapter 1, there were only 12 females among 2016 total incarcerated juveniles in Turkey as of December, 2006. Furthermore, research has shown that the female population is less than 15% in the prison systems (Snyder & Sickmund, 2006). According to these two results, even though an attempt was made to make the groups as comparable as possible, both the age and gender of the respondents in these two groups were not comparable.

Since all of the variables mentioned above are categorical variables, except for the age, a chi-square test was conducted to examine whether they were significantly different between the incarcerated respondents and the college students. The result of this test is presented in the following tables, showing that the incarcerated respondents
and the college students were significantly different with regard to all of these categorical variables.

With regard to education, the difference between the two groups was in the predicted direction, with the college students reporting higher levels of education. Data indicated that 76% of the incarcerated respondents did not get education after the 8th grade, 20% of them had dropped out of high school, and 4% got a high school degree. This difference is also obvious in their grades and opinion on school. The percentage of the incarcerated respondents who reported that they did not like school (34%) was more than twice of the college students (15%). Parallel to this, majority of college students (70%) reported that their grades were above average, while the majority of incarcerated respondents (69%) reported that their grades were either average or below average.

Table 12

*Demographics and Family Information Inventory Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n = 205)</th>
<th>College Students (n = 200)</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 8th grade</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-11th grade</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year of college</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; a year of college</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Likes School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *** p < .001
In terms of family structure, contrary to what literature suggested, a significant number of incarcerated respondents (86%) reported that they grew up in intact families, similar to what college students reported (95%). Even though the difference is still statistically significant, the association was very weak and the results suggest that the dominant family structure in Turkey is still the intact family.

There were differences between the incarcerated respondents and the college students with regard to doing something even when their fathers or mothers disapproved, with 45% of the incarcerated respondents reporting that they frequently would do something if their father disapproved compared to 36% of the college students. However, the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed more when it came to their mother’s disapproval, with 53% of the incarcerated respondents and 29% of the college students reporting that they would frequently do something if their mothers disapproved. Even though both results are statistically significant, the association is very weak (Cramer’s $V = .17$) for father’s disapproval, and it is weak (Cramer’s $V = .26$) for mother’s disapproval. Furthermore, to a certain extent, the results confirmed that in both cases, as Hirschi (1969) suggested, the incarcerated respondents were less sensitive to their parents’ expectations than the college students.

With regard to welfare, 30% of the incarcerated respondents reported that their family had been on welfare while 18% of the college students reported that their family had received welfare benefits. This is an indicator that almost 1/3 of the incarcerated respondents spent part of their youth living in poverty, but again even though the difference was statistically significant the association was very weak ($\Phi = .14$).
Table 13

Demographics and Family Information Inventory Variables Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents ( (n = 205) )</th>
<th>College Students ( (n = 200) )</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( n )</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>( n )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived With Both Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Disapproval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/Rarely</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Disapproval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/Rarely</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** \( p < .01 \), *** \( p < .001 \)

The types of communities in which the respondents were reared were significantly different, but there was a very weak association (Cramer’s \( V = .2 \)). Further analysis of this variable revealed that more than 70% of the respondents were reared in cities or metropolitan areas. This is an indicator that the Turkish society is becoming a more urban society. On the other hand, the incarcerated respondents reported significantly higher rates of crime in the neighborhoods in which they grew up. While only 8% of the college students reported that there was a great rate of crime in the neighborhood in which they grew up, this rate has gone up to incredible 38% for the incarcerated respondents. Furthermore this relationship was one of the strongest
among all of the variables (Cramer’s V = .39). In addition, even though the incarcerated respondents were exposed to more crime at home, with only 15% reporting that their fathers were involved with the criminal justice system compared to 8% of the college students and with the incarcerated respondents reporting that only 3% of their mothers were involved with the criminal justice system compared to 6% of the college students, these numbers were not as high as expected and the association in both of these variables were very weak (Cramer’s V = .14 and Cramer’s V = .15 respectively).

In terms of deviant friends, 28% of the incarcerated respondents reported that none of their friends were deviant while 68% of the college students reported that none of their friends were deviant. Finally, only 8% of the incarcerated respondents reported that they were members of gangs while 3% of the college students reported that they were members of gangs. Clearly, these last few variables were indicators that the incarcerated respondents were much more likely to be exposed to and reared in deviant environments, compared to the college students. These results indicated that a larger number of the incarcerated respondents might have experienced multiple risk factors, which, according to Benn and Garbarino (1992), put them at greater peril for committing deviant behavior.
Table 14

Demographics and Family Information Inventory Variables Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n = 205)</th>
<th>College Students (n = 200)</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.55**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>25 (12)</td>
<td>20 (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town</td>
<td>23 (11)</td>
<td>31 (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>78 (38)</td>
<td>44 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
<td>73 (36)</td>
<td>87 (45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Places</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>14 (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Crime Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.85***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>65 (32)</td>
<td>120 (62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>62 (30)</td>
<td>58 (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Deal</td>
<td>78 (38)</td>
<td>15 (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>174 (85)</td>
<td>185 (92)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>10 (5)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>3 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisoned</td>
<td>17 (8)</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Deviance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>200 (97)</td>
<td>190 (95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisoned</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Gang</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17 (8)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>188 (92)</td>
<td>188 (97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>53 (28)</td>
<td>132 (68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Few</td>
<td>100 (53)</td>
<td>50 (26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>12 (6)</td>
<td>4 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>25 (13)</td>
<td>8 (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * p < .05, *** p < .001
The results indicated that the two groups differed significantly on most of the continuous variables in the expected direction. However, some of the variables did not differ between the groups as suggested by the literature.

The next variable analyzed in this section was the number of hours that the respondent worked in a week: 80% of the incarcerated respondents (Mean = 3.78, S.D. = 2.30) had to work in a job to provide financial assistance to their families, compared to 14% of the college students (Mean = 1.24, S.D. = 0.81). The difference between the two groups was statistically significant (t = 14.65, p < 0.01) and there was a strong association (Eta = 0.68). Unfortunately, families who are living in poverty depend on the financial assistance of their children. This obviously hinders the opportunities for getting good education.

With regard to the dimensions of family rituals, all but the “affect” dimension were significantly different between the college students and the incarcerated respondents. Moreover, the total score construct, which was computed through summing up these eight dimensions, was also significantly different between the two groups. There were moderate associations between the variables ranging from Eta = .38 to Eta = .55. These results are consistent with the theory. In every single dimension the college students got higher scores than the incarcerated respondents.

In terms of self-esteem the college students scored slightly higher than the incarcerated respondents. However, the difference was not statistically significant.

Regarding to the Religious Background and Behavior questionnaire, incarcerated respondents scored significantly higher scores on all dimensions compared to the college students. Furthermore, almost all of the incarcerated respondents (98%)
identified themselves as believers or religious individuals, while 85% of the college
students identified themselves as believers or religious individuals.

Table 15

*FRQ, Revised Personal Subscale and RBB Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n = 205)</th>
<th>College Students (n = 200)</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Rituals Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>17.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>16.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>14.86</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>16.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>15.84</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>16.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Significance</td>
<td>14.59</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuation</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberateness</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>18.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family rituals total score</td>
<td>119.48</td>
<td>29.09</td>
<td>136.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Personal Subscale</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Background and Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past religious behaviors</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>7.66</td>
<td>22.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present religious behaviors</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God Consciousness</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>33.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further detailed examination of the variables measuring deviant behavior revealed some remarkable results. There are two basic reasons for focusing on the variables of deviant behavior. First of all, as stated above, in the present study the
dependent variable for hypotheses two is the “Total Offenses Incidence” variable that measured whether the participant ever engaged in deviant behavior. The second reason is the existence of two different dimensions of deviant behavior: prevalence and incidence. Because of these reasons a detailed examination of the deviant behavior has been conducted.

As expected, the descriptive statistics indicate that the incarcerated respondents reported committing a greater variety of deviant behaviors than the college students. However, with regard to status offenses, even though the difference is statistically significant, 66% of the incarcerated respondents reported that they committed status offenses while 44% of the college students also reported that they engaged in such deviant behaviors. But the interesting part is that, approximately 60% of the college students and the incarcerated respondents who reported that they committed status offenses also reported that nothing happened to them as a result of these offenses.

The same was not true for more serious deviant behaviors. With regard to the index crimes, 57% of the incarcerated respondents reported that they committed index crimes, while 17% of the college students reported that they also committed similar crimes. However, even more than the status offenses, 87% of the college students and 81% of the incarcerated respondents also reported that nothing happened to them as a result of committing these crimes.

Similar to the index crimes, 86% of the incarcerated respondents reported that they committed non-index crimes, while 48% of the college students reported that they also committed similar crimes. Moreover, there was a significant difference between these two groups of respondents when it came to the societal reactions and legal
actions taken against them in terms of non-index crimes. With regard to the non-index offenses, 58% of the college students reported that nothing happened to them as a result of committing these crimes, whereas this number is 31% for the incarcerated respondents.

The last construct that measured deviant behavior was the total number of offenses. The interesting part of this construct was that 42% of the college students and 11% of the incarcerated respondents reported that they had not committed any of the 15 offenses that were listed in the questionnaire. So, if we think about that 11% of the incarcerated respondents who reported that they had not committed any of these deviant behaviors, the data that were analyzed for the present study, would have revealed different outcomes if there had been more questions on other offenses as well.

Table 16

**Deviant Behavior Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Incarcerated Respondents (n = 205)</th>
<th>College Students (n = 200)</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deviant Behavior Prevalence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Offenses</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Crimes</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>38.24</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-index Crimes</td>
<td>33.07</td>
<td>105.36</td>
<td>18.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenses</td>
<td>58.26</td>
<td>154.27</td>
<td>41.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deviant Behavior Incidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status Offenses</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Crimes</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-index Crimes</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Offenses</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ** p < .001
Further analysis of deviant behavior variables revealed that the Turkish society and the actors of criminal justice system have been considerably lenient to those offenders, when the results were evaluated in terms of the societal responses and the legal actions taken against the juveniles. These numbers indicate that the actors of criminal justice system and the society in general have not been harsh on status offenses.

Finally, the incarcerated respondents were much more likely to report that an action was taken against them when they committed a non-index crime versus status offenses and index crimes. This result could be interpreted as follows: when these juveniles start getting involved in different offenses and became a known offender or a usual suspect by the law enforcement agencies their likelihood of getting caught increases even for less serious offenses.

The fundamental prediction of labeling theory is that being punished or negatively labeled will increase one’s involvement in future deviant behavior (Smith & Paternoster, 1990; Zimring, 1998; Myers, 2006). However, according to the present study, contrary to what labeling theory suggests, being punished or negatively labeled as an offender might not simply be increasing the likelihood of engaging in future offenses but it might only be increasing the likelihood of being caught by the law enforcement agencies. According to the present study’s findings, a greater percentage of college students than the incarcerated respondents reported that they got away with these offenses. So, not having a negative label would make them “invisible” to the law enforcement agencies and would in turn decreased their likelihood of caught by them.
After analyzing the data it was concluded that, overall, hypothesis 1 was partially confirmed for the respondents, because the incarcerated respondents and college students differed significantly on every variable in the predicted direction except participation in family activities and revised personal self-esteem subscale.

**Regression Analysis**

The major premise of this research was that the independent variables would have separate negative influences on deviant behavior. The results of the chi-square and the t-tests indicated that the respondents differed significantly on most of the variables. As discussed in the previous section the only two variables that did not significantly differ were the two constructs of family activities and revised personal self-esteem subscale. The next step was to determine if these major variables accounted for any of the variability in deviant behavior.

The discussion on the demographic characteristics of the respondents will be followed by logistic regression analyses to explore whether differences in major concepts, which were discussed in details in Chapter 2, could account for variations in deviant behavior. In this section of the present study, a model, presenting the effects of the major concepts on deviant behavior, was developed based on the logistic regression analyses.

**Regression Model**

Hypotheses 2a and 2b stated in Chapter 1 suggested that family rituals, religiosity, and self-esteem would be positively related to each other, and they would negatively affect young people’s engagement in deviant behavior in Turkey. Consistent
with Reckless’ containment theory and as suggested by these hypotheses, a model was constructed using logistic regression.

Four independent variables were included in the model to represent the major variables. “Family Rituals Questionnaire Total Scores” was included in the model as the indicators of outer containment. On the other hand, two constructs from the “Religious Background and Behavior Questionnaire”, namely, “God Consciousness” and “Formal Practice” constructs, as well as the “Revised Personal Self-esteem Subscale” were included in the model as the indicators of inner containment. The dependent variable of this analysis is the “Total Offenses Incidence”.

Before running the logistic regression for the whole sample the data were checked for multicollinearity and outliers, and no problem was detected for these issues. The correlation matrix for the independent variables is presented in table 17. The result of the regression analysis is presented in table 18.

Table 17

**Correlation Matrix of Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - FRQ Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - RBB God Consciousness</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - RBB Formal Practices</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - CFSEI Revised Personal</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

Logistic Regression Estimates for Deviant Behavior in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRQ Total Scores</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSEI Revised Personal Subscale</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB God Consciousness</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB Formal Practices</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood: 393.45
Model $\chi^2$: 22.85**
Pseudo $R^2$: 0.09
Degrees of freedom: 8
N: 358

* $p \leq .05$ and ** $p \leq .001$

Notes: The odds ratio is the antilog of the B

When the model is examined, it is possible to see that the model chi-square indicated that significance value was less than 0.05. So we can conclude that the research model adequately fitted the data.

The pseudo r-squared statistics are based on comparing the likelihood of the current model to the "null" model (one without any predictors). “Larger pseudo r-square statistics indicate that more of the variation is explained by the model” (Center for Family and Demographic Research, 2006, Online document), from a minimum of 0 to a maximum of 1. Two different pseudo r-squared statistics were provided by SPSS: Cox and Snell r-squared statistic and the Nagelkerke r-squared statistic. The maximum value of the Cox and Snell r-squared statistic is actually somewhat less than 1; the Nagelkerke r-squared statistic is a correction of the Cox and Snell statistic so that its
maximum value is 1. So, the value of Nagelkerke r-squared statistic is reported as the pseudo r-squared statistic of the research model. Based on these results, we can conclude that, together the four variables included in the model, accounted for only 9% of the variation in deviance of the respondents.

However, further individual analysis of these four variables indicated different results. The individual effect of “Family Rituals Questionnaire Total Scores”, “God Consciousness” and “Formal Practice” on deviant behavior is statistically significant, while the individual effect of “Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory Revised Personal Self-Esteem Subscale” is not statistically significant. The odds ratio values of each of the predictors shown in the table are used to make predictions. Each of these values represented the ratio-change in the odds of engaging in deviant behavior for a one-unit change in the predictor.

The results indicated that, all other things being equal, engaging in family rituals and having a God consciousness had significant negative effects, while performing formal religious practices had a significant positive effect on the likelihood of engaging deviant behavior. On the other hand, CFSEI Revised Personal Subscale also had a negative effect on deviant behavior, but this relationship was not statistically significant. The odds of engaging in deviant behavior are 2% lower for each one-point increase on the family rituals index and 7% lower for each one-point increase on God consciousness measure. On the other hand, the odds of engaging in deviant behavior are 8% higher for each one-point increase on the formal religious practices measure.

Further analysis with the same variables was also conducted for the two subgroups: the incarcerated respondents and the college students. The reason for this
analysis was to see whether the effect of independent variables on deviant behavior were different for these two subgroups. The results of this analysis did not produce any statistically significant relationship for either group. The model $\chi^2$ of two separate analyses were not significant, so both of the models did not fit the data. The results of binary logistic regression analysis for the incarcerated respondents are presented in table 19, while the results of binary logistic regression analysis for the college students are presented in table 20.

Table 19

*Logistic Regression Estimates for Deviant Behavior among Incarcerated Respondents in Turkey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRQ Total Scores</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSEI Revised Personal Subscale</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.66*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB God Consciousness</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB Formal Practices</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood: 115.32
Model $\chi^2$: 9.37
Pseudo $R^2$: 0.10
Degrees of freedom: 8
N: 173

* $p \leq .05$

Notes: The odds ratio is the antilog of the B
Table 20

Logistic Regression Estimates for Deviant Behavior among College Students in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRQ Total Scores</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFSEI Revised Personal Subscale</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB God Consciousness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB Formal Practices</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood 244.55
Model $\chi^2$ 8.08
Pseudo $R^2$ 0.04
Degrees of freedom 8
N 185

Notes: The odds ratio is the antilog of the B

Conclusion

The results could be interpreted to mean that the respondents reporting more family rituals and God consciousness are less likely to engage in deviant behavior. On the other hand, performing formal religious practices was associated with committing higher deviant acts. Further analysis also revealed that the research model did not have a statistically significant explanatory power for the subgroups. Consequently, the data gathered in Turkey partially confirmed both hypothesis 2a and hypothesis 2b for the respondents, because the formal practices part of religiosity did not negatively affect young people’s engagement in deviant behavior in Turkey. Moreover, self-esteem did not significantly contribute to any of the variability in engaging deviant behavior.

Further elaboration on the results of data analysis that were presented in Chapter 4 will be provided in the following chapter. The focus of Chapter 5 will be the discussion...
of the findings and their implications for future studies. Moreover, the findings of the Turkish study will also be compared with the findings of Emmett’s (2000) and Roberts’ (2002) studies that were conducted in the United States.
CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to extend knowledge about the deviant behavior of young adults through using recently gathered data from young adults in Turkey. Specifically, this study proposed that individual experiences such as favorable perceptions of family rituals, higher levels of religiosity and self-esteem, would reduce participation in deviant activities.

The discussion of the results of the present study will be organized by reviewing the specific findings and also comparing the Turkish and American studies. This will be followed by the limitations of the study. The final portion of the discussion will be devoted to the implications of the results and suggestions for future research in this area.

Discussion of Hypotheses

Since this study was a partial replication of two studies that were previously conducted in the United States, the choice of measurement tools was as important a factor as in those two studies. To measure the major concepts and other risk factors, four instruments were used. The Family Information Inventory (FII) had two major parts. The first part of the FII was developed by Roberts (2002), with the questions on various risk factors as well as participation in activities with family members, and deviance coming from other sources. On the other hand, the second part of FII was a self-report questionnaire on deviant behavior developed by Roberts (2002) that was based on the previous studies. This measure was taken from Roberts (2002) and replicated in the present study.
The Family Rituals Questionnaire (FRQ) was essential in providing information about the respondents’ family rituals. The FRQ is one of the first tools designed to measure level of ritualization in families. This measure was used both by Emmett (2000) and Roberts (2002) and replicated in the present study.

The Culture-Free Self-Esteem Inventory (CFSEI-2) was used to measure self-esteem levels of the respondents. For the present analysis a 6-item subscale was used, which was created among the items that were part of the personal self-esteem subscale. This measure was taken from Roberts (2002) and replicated in the present study.

The Religious Background and Behavior Inventory (RBB) were used to assess lifetime and recent religious and spiritual practices of the respondents. God consciousness and formal practice subscales were used in the analysis. This measure was taken from Emmett (2000) and replicated in the present study.

Different statistical analyses were conducted based on the data obtained through these instruments. The following section discusses the hypotheses with regard to these findings, addresses the similarities and differences between the Turkish and the American studies, and identifies possible explanations.

It was suggested in hypothesis 1 that family rituals, the level of religiosity, self-esteem and other relevant risk factors would be significantly different between college students and incarcerated respondents. The results of the data analysis indicate that incarcerated respondents and college students differed significantly on family rituals and level of religiosity while they did not differ significantly on self-esteem. This result was expected, as previous literature indicated that the relationship between self-esteem and
deviant behavior is mixed. However, the differences in family rituals and performing formal religious activities in committing deviant behavior were not evident.

As suggested by the first hypothesis, on average, those respondents who reported higher levels of family rituals, higher levels of religiosity and higher levels of self-esteem also reported less deviant behavior. Incarcerated respondents and college students differed significantly on family rituals, religiosity and self-esteem. However, the difference on self-esteem was not a statistically significant difference. In addition to these major factors, the incarcerated respondents and college students differed on all of the variables measuring the risk factors except for participation in family activities.

The results of this section are almost identical on most of the variables, except gender, to what Roberts (2002) found for the American sample. As discussed earlier, the gender distribution of the respondents was biased in the present study because there were no incarcerated female respondents in the Turkish sample. However, there are also very important differences. For example, measures of self-esteem and family activities were significantly different in Roberts' study between the incarcerated individuals and the college students, while these differences were not statistically significant in the present study.

Moreover, the most important difference regarding to the research question at hand, was the different results in terms of prevalence of deviant behavior. Roberts (2002) found that the prevalence of deviant behaviors, such as status offenses, index crimes, non-index crimes, and total offenses were significantly different between the incarcerated respondents and college students. However, even though the mean score of deviant behavior prevalence in the same categories of acts were higher for the
incarcerated respondents than the college students in Turkey, the differences were not statistically significant. On the other hand, the differences in terms of deviant behavior incidence scores were statistically significant for these two groups in both of the studies.

This is also the main reason why incidence scores were used as the dependent variable in testing hypotheses 2a and 2b. Another important reason why the composite measure of deviant behavior incidence was used is that establishing links between independent variables and each of fifteen forms of deviance separately would increase the likelihood of measurement error. As a result, combining the fifteen forms into a single scale seemed a better strategy.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b suggested that the family rituals, level of religiosity, and self-esteem would be positively related to each other and they would negatively affect young people's engagement in deviant behavior in Turkey. Concurrent with Reckless' (1973b) containment theory, this study also proposed that the outer containment variables such as family rituals and inner containment variables such as religiosity and self-esteem would be negatively related to deviant behavior.

The original hypothesis developed by Emmett (2000) and which is hypothesis 2a in the present study, suggested that a relationship would be found between the FRQ and the RBB. This suggestion was supported by Emmett's analysis, which found that increase or decrease on the FRQ scores were matched by similar increases or decreases on scores from the RBB. However, even though the present study also found a significant relationship between FRQ and RBB scores, this relationship was in the opposite direction: increase in the FRQ scores were associated with a decrease on RBB scores and vice versa. Further analysis of the correlation matrices also revealed
that there were also differences with regard to the FRQ dimensions. For example, Emmett failed to find a significant relationship between RBB scores and FRQ’s dinner and annual celebrations dimensions, while the present study found a significant relationship on these dimensions but failed to find significant relationships between the RBB scores and the FRQ’s affect and deliberateness dimensions. The results were in opposite directions and different dimensions had significant relationships in both studies. Obviously, the strength of such relationships was based on the different FRQ dimensions. In conclusion, the results are mixed and both studies do not appear to support a consistent relationship between religiosity and ritualization.

Furthermore, hypothesis 2b, which was developed by Roberts (2002), was also partially supported in the present study. The findings of Roberts’ study provided support for the idea that participation in family rituals and religiosity would decrease the likelihood of committing deviant behavior. The present study partially supported this idea. This study demonstrated that participation in family rituals also decreased the likelihood of committing deviant behavior. However, religiosity, which was measured by having a God consciousness and performance of formal religious practices, had mixed results. While having a God consciousness decreased the likelihood of committing deviant behavior, performing formal religious practices increased the likelihood of committing deviant behavior. One explanation for this result could be that the level of religiosity was measured after the individual committed the crime and was locked up in an incarceration facility which might in turn make the individual perform more formal religious practices in that confined environment.
Another part of hypothesis 2b was about the respondent’s self-esteem, which was also a part of Roberts (2002) original hypothesis. A measure of self-esteem was used in this study as part of Reckless’ (1973b) containment theory and the present study proposed that higher levels of self-esteem would reduce deviant behavior.

Roberts (2002) reported a significant positive relationship between these variables. In the present study, parallel to Roberts’ (2002) findings, there was a positive relationship between family rituals, performing formal religious practices and self-esteem. However, contrary to what Roberts (2002) found, God consciousness and self-esteem had a negative relationship.

Furthermore, contrary to what was suggested in hypothesis 2b, the results of the present study indicated that higher levels of self-esteem played no significant role in reducing deviant behavior. This result confirms the similar findings reported by Roberts (2002).

Therefore, similar to what was reported by Roberts (2002), there was no significant support for Reckless’ emphasis on the role of inner containment as an element of social control. However, the outer containment variable of family rituals was significant in reducing deviant behavior for the respondents.

Based on the above discussions of the hypotheses, the most significant findings of the study could be summarized as follows:

1. Family rituals and religiosity played very small but statistically significant roles in explaining deviant behavior.

2. Self-esteem had no statistically significant relationship with deviant behavior.

Several conclusions can be drawn from these results. First, the outer
containment variables played a small role in explaining deviant behavior. The results of this study suggest that, although the relationship was small, there is some association with reporting higher levels of family rituals and committing less deviant behavior.

Second, the inner containment variable of self-esteem had no statistically significant explanatory power for deviant behavior, which was contrary to what Reckless (1973a) had predicted. In addition to self-esteem, the other inner containment variable, religiosity also provided mixed results. For example, God consciousness had negative effect just like family rituals, while performing formal religious practices had a significant positive effect on deviant behavior.

The differences in the results could be attributed to environmental factors being more influential than internal family processes in contributing to deviant behavior, although the family process variables were significant. These results differed from Reckless’ (1973b) proposal that inner containment variables were better predictors of deviant behavior than outer containment variables. In this case, the outer containment variables were better able to explain deviant behavior.

The present study showed that the causes of deviant behavior are complex and varied, and are often external to the individual. As discussed in previous chapters, research has indicated that multiple risk factors may put children at greater risk for deviant behavior and certainly, the incarcerated respondents experienced more risk factors and higher levels of them. Thus, there was only partial support for Reckless’ containment theory also in this study. There were also some limitations of the study and the following section identifies and discusses these limitations.
Limitations of the Present Study

Several limitations related to the research methods and theoretical framework warrant review in order to gain further perspective on the findings. First of all, the research design was cross-sectional. With cross-sectional research, the data are gathered at one point in time, and as a result, the information gathered may not reflect the full scope and experiences of the respondents. Cross-sectional research is a commonly used method of study in sociological observation. Neuman (2007) defined it as “a form of research in which a researcher examines a single point in time or takes a one-time snap-shot approach” (p. 81). However, a longitudinal research design is required to document long-term trends or changes over time.

Another important problem of cross-sectional designs is the timing of the research. Because of the research design, what we have done is to measure the risk factors after conducting the deviant act. However, as mentioned in the previous chapter risk factors predicted later offending. The controversy here is about the timing of the measurement. For example, we measured the relationship between self-esteem and deviant behavior. But we do not know the level of self-esteem before the respondent engaged in the deviant behavior. So, we cannot be sure whether the level of self-esteem is increased, decreased, or stayed stable after the respondent had engaged in the deviant behavior. Low self-esteem could lead to deviant behavior, or deviant behavior could have resulted in low self-esteem. Think about drug use for instance; where low self-esteem could be a result rather than a cause of drug abuse. We cannot really measure this problem with a cross-sectional research. Longitudinal rather than cross-sectional researches are needed to study them.
Another problem with cross-sectional design is the retrospective bias. As mentioned above, when data are collected on only one occasion, it is called a cross-sectional study. However, data could be collected on one occasion, but the information obtained could be dealing with previous times. This is called a retrospective study (Moss & Goldstein, 1979). Again, due to the design of the research, the respondent’s recollections of childhood or previous years may be affected and biased by the deviant act which in fact comes after the risk factors.

In this cross-sectional study data were collected through surveys, which also introduced some limitations to the study. “Survey research is the most widely used data collection method” (Strand & Weiss, 2005: p. 123). “Survey is a research technique that utilizes a questionnaire to collect data on a sizable number of subjects” (Thomas & Smith, 2003, p. 57). Even though it seems easy for most people, conducting a proper survey requires a great deal of preparation (Dobbin et al., 2001). Nardi (2006) argues that “performing the entire process correctly is a skill that requires intellectual creativity” (p. 29).

The survey instruments used in the present study were all intended to be self-administered, although in this study social workers administered the instruments to the incarcerated respondents. “Surveys are appropriate for research questions about self-reported beliefs or behaviors” (Freeman, 2007, p. 357). The purpose in administering self-report crime surveys is “to get respondents to read the questions and mark down how many times they have committed a serious offense and gotten away with it” (O’Connor, 2005, Online document). There is always going to be a margin of error, but the general information is gained and used in studies that help us learn more about how
to function in society. On the other hand, according to Hemenway (1997) this margin of error issue may be more important in some cases. He stated that the “self-report surveys of rare events easily lead to huge overestimates of the true incidence of such events and people could lie or exaggerate on these questionnaires (falsification), particularly if the event in question has some potential social desirability” (Hemenway, 1997, p. 1444).

Golub, Johnson, Taylor, and Liberty (2002) probably provided one of the best summaries of the limitations of self report data when they found,

After comparing answers to criminal records checks and urinalysis screens, things like marijuana use were most often accurately disclosed while involvement in violent crime was least often disclosed, but if prior conviction matched self-reported data on prior convictions, then there was reason to believe that the rest of the data was fairly reliable. (O’Connor, 2005, Online document)

For the present study, we do not have alternative mechanisms to cross-check the outcomes of the self-reports, especially for the deviant behaviors, so there was the risk of exaggeration.

On the other hand, the specific participant population may have been responsible for some of the ambiguity of the findings. While there were variations within the range of experience of the participants, that variation may be less than in the general population. College students may have more shared than differing characteristics, thus making statistical significance difficult to obtain.

The study did not show differences on the level of self-esteem. This problem is also related to the retrospective characteristic of the research design. Because when
the respondents answered the questions on the self-esteem inventory, they were directed to respond as they would have been before the age of 18. However, they were probably more likely to have reported their current feelings. As a result, it might be hard to predict the influence of self-esteem on deviant behavior when measured from a retrospective perspective.

Similar issues are also applicable to religiosity. As a result of this major weakness of cross-sectional designs, in which religiosity, self-esteem and delinquency are assessed at the same time point, any self-reported delinquency predates current self-esteem and religiosity. Consequently, any associations found between self-esteem, religiosity and deviant behavior could be just reasonably interpreted as an influence of delinquency on self-esteem and religiosity than the reverse.

Another limitation is related to the theoretical framework. Agnew (1991) suggested that cross-sectional studies greatly exaggerated the relevance of social control theories. His suggestion was that social control theories might better explain deviance in middle adolescence than among older adolescents. He concluded that researchers should view delinquency as an age-related phenomenon and should consider different predictor variables for different stages of development.

Related to this limitation, the measurement of deviant behavior is also another issue that must be addressed. Measurement deal with important aspect of categorizing deviant behavior. Paternoster and Triplett (1988) suggested that self-reported delinquent behavior would be better understood if it were divided into two categories: prevalence data and incidence data. Furthermore, Ball, Ross, and Simpson (1964)
stated that the accurate delineation of the incidence and prevalence of juvenile delinquency is an indispensable prerequisite to analysis of adolescent behavior.

Using prevalence rates or incident rates is associated with different advantages and disadvantages. For example, according to Schulz (1999) “sometimes an individual is victimized repeatedly, as in the case of domestic violence and child abuse. Prevalence rates alone can underestimate crime occurrence and the severity of a crime's effect on an individual” (Online document). On the other hand, Schulz (1999) stated that “incidence rates more accurately reflect amount of crime. Ten rapes or beatings of a spouse are ten crime occurrences even though the victim is the same person. Earlier studies equated the number of victims with the number of crimes underestimating the actual number of crimes” (Online document).

According to Westfelt and Estrada (2005) prevalence data may be regarded as being somewhat more reliable because of the fact that an additional degree of uncertainty is introduced when the number of incidents or offences is estimated. They categorize these uncertainties in two groups. First, there is the problem of duplicate reporting. If a number of individuals are victims of the same event, then this event is counted several times. Second, there is always a higher risk for memory lapses when the number of incidents is very high.

The deviant behavior studied in this research was only that which was reported by the respondents, in contrast to recorded data. As Sutherland and Cressey (1974) stated, individuals have a greater or lesser ability to be caught and reported as violators. Surveying people about their own criminal activity has been a less formal way to gain information about criminal behavior (Tittle, 1995). Various self-report measures of
deviance have been developed to explore deviant acts that may never have been revealed through official reported statistics. Much self reported crime indicates that a large percentage of deviant acts go unreported (Roberts, 2002). As a result, some researchers think that self-report measures of criminal activity may provide additional information about criminal behavior (Reid, 1997).

Policy Recommendations

Despite its limitations, the present study also makes contributions to the efforts aim at reducing deviant behavior. Since the present study found significant support for the outer containment and other risk factors, it would be logical to recommend programs to increase behavior that would raise scores on the outer containment dimension. If family researchers, family educators, school personnel, criminal justice officials, and researchers want to reduce deviant behavior, the risk factors should be acknowledged and addressed.

Many who deal with delinquency problem have been preoccupied with treatment or therapy after the fact. But establishing prevention program should be another option. For example, after school programs in the United States or in the Turkish case establishing similar programs and summer camps.

The basic goal of such programs should be on the “development of attributes suggested in containment theory. It would follow that if it were possible to increase scores on containment scales there would be a chance that delinquency behaviors would be prevented. Whereas this cause and effect relationship should be considered with caution, it should not be ignored” (Richards & Myers, 1987, p. 45). Reckless and Dinitz (1972) suggested a similar solution, but they also listed some basic difficulties in
these programs, such as; “attracting an appropriate population, high costs, and difficulties in identifying non-delinquent activities which were attractive to potential participants” (Richards & Myers, 1987, p. 46).

A recent example of a similar program was initiated by the Rize police department in Turkey. A website that broadcast news on police (Polis Haber, 06/29/2007) reported that the Rize police department initiated a summer program to prevent juveniles from engaging in deviance throughout the summer season. In this program the police department offers a free bicycle course for the students and at the end of the summer they donate the bicycles to the students who need financial assistance. Even though this may seem like a simple project, through this project the police can establish contact with children and can give additional education on other issues.

The advantage of considering a theory such as containment is that programs can be designed specifically to address the areas that need to be improved. Specific activities can provide clear and straightforward means for improving performance on outer and inner containment scales.

Richards and Myers (1987) listed some criterion that should be applied to such programs as follows:

1. There must be an assessment of the individual's appropriateness for the program.
2. There must be a willingness and commitment to participate in the program.
3. There should be opportunities to work as a group to solve common problems.
4. The participants must be engaged in activity that is both concrete and physical.

5. It is necessary to carry out an evaluation of the participant's performance in the program and an evaluation of how well the program met its objectives. (p. 50)

By developing appropriate programs and offering the programs regularly desired long term effects are possible. These programs do not need to be carried out for long periods; however they should be planned around a specific goal and must be held at regular intervals over the long term.

**Recommendation for Future Research**

The results of this study indicated that the incarcerated respondents and the college students differed significantly on several of the variables. This tells researchers that there may have been some significant differences in the lives of incarcerated respondents and college students at the individual, family, and environmental levels. Future research should focus more on the risk factors at these three different levels.

The problems associated with the cross-sectional design of the research might be prevented through conducting longitudinal studies. A longitudinal design can control the timing of the research to establish causality between the risk factors and deviant behavior. With a longitudinal research design, it is possible to repeat measures and follow the same people over time. Since risk factors are suppose to predict later offending, longitudinal rather than cross-sectional studies are needed to more accurately assess there impact.
However, in longitudinal studies sample size often becomes an important issue. Generally, larger samples enable more sophisticated analyses and may provide better evidence. Thus, one needs a rather large initial sample to include enough deviant and non-deviant respondents later on to compare statistically with each others. This reason by itself, along with the financial problems associated with a longitudinal study, explains the rareness of longitudinal studies in deviant behavior. Furthermore, not only having larger sample sizes, but also the development of more equally-represented groups of incarcerated respondents and college students should yield more clearly differentiated results.

Finally, the connection between religiosity and the full range of family rituals merits more research attention. A clear grasp of these two concepts may have much to offer to the explanation of how self, family, and the larger society are connected.
APPENDIX A

FAMILY RITUALS QUESTIONNAIRE
FAMILY RITUALS QUESTIONNAIRE

On the following pages are descriptions of family rituals and traditions. Every family is somewhat different in the types of rituals and traditions that they follow. In some families rituals and traditions are very important but in other families there is a more casual attitude towards rituals and traditions.

On the top of each page you will find a heading for a family setting. Think of how your family typically acted or participated during these events. Read the two statements and then choose the statement that is most like the family that you grew up in. After choosing the statement that is most like your family decide if the statement is really true or sort of true for your family. Circle the statement which best describes the family that you grew up in. Circle only one statement in each row.

When thinking of your family think of yourself, your parents, and your brothers and sisters. Some of the family settings may also include other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins. However, try and answer the questions as they best relate to your immediate family when you were growing up.

INSTRUCTIONS
1. Read both statements then choose the statement most like your family.
2. Decide if the statement is really true or sort of true of your family and circle the most appropriate statement.
3. There should be only one circled statement per line.

EXAMPLE:
MEALTIME

Think about a typical mealtime in your family when you were growing up. Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really    sort of 1. My family regularly ate meals together. OR My family rarely ate meals together. sort of     really true       true     true
really    sort of 2. In my family everyone had a specific role and job to do at mealtime. OR In my family at mealtime people did different jobs at different times depending on needs at mealtime. sort of     really true       true     true
really    sort of 3. In my family mealtime was flexible. Members ate whenever they could. OR In my family everything about meals was scheduled; meals were at the same time every day. sort of     really true       true     true

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS TO EACH STATEMENT SO PLEASE TRY AND CHOOSE THE STATEMENT THAT MOST CLOSELY DESCRIBES YOUR FAMILY.
MEALTIME

Think about a typical mealtime in your family when you were growing up.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really true
sort of true
1. My family regularly ate meals together. OR My family rarely ate meals together.

really true
sort of true
2. In my family everyone had a specific role and job to do at mealtime. OR In my family at mealtime people did different jobs at different times depending on needs at mealtime.

really true
sort of true
3. In my family mealtime was flexible. Members ate whenever they could. OR In my family everything about meals was scheduled; meals were at the same time every day.

really true
sort of true
4. In my family, everyone was expected to be home for meals. OR In my family you never knew who would be home for meals.

really true
sort of true
5. In my family family felt strongly about eating meals together. OR In my family it was not that important if people ate together.

really true
sort of true
6. In my family mealtime was just for getting food. OR In my family mealtime was more than just a meal; it had special meaning.

really true
sort of true
7. In my family mealtime was pretty much the same over the years. OR In my family mealtime changed over the years.

really true
sort of true
8. In my family there was little planning around mealtime. OR In my family mealtime was planned in advance.
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WEEKENDS

Think of a typical weekend with your family when you were growing up. Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

| really true | sort of true | 1. My family rarely spent weekends. | OR | My family regularly spent weekends together. |
| really true | sort of true | 2. In my family everyone had a specific job to do on weekends. | OR | In my family there were no assigned jobs on weekends. |
| really true | sort of true | 3. In my family there were set routines and regular events on weekends. | OR | In my family there were no set routines or events on the weekend. |
| really true | sort of true | 4. In my family everyone was expected to come to weekend events. | OR | In my family members pretty much came and went as they pleased on weekends. |
| really true | sort of true | 5. In my family weekends were pretty casual, there were no special feelings about them. | OR | In my family there were strong feelings about spending weekend time together as a family. |
| really true | sort of true | 6. In my family spending time together at weekend events was special. | OR | In my family there were no special family weekend events. |
| really true | sort of true | 7. In my family weekend activities have shifted over the years. | OR | In my family weekend activities have remained pretty much the same over the years. |
| really true | sort of true | 8. In my family there was much discussion and planning around weekends. | OR | In my family there very little discussion or planning around weekends. |
FAMILY TRIPS/VACATIONS

Think of typical family trip/vacation you spent with your family when you were growing. Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Really True</th>
<th>Sort Of True</th>
<th>1. My family regularly spent time together on family trips/vacations.</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>My family rarely spent time together on family trips/vacations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Really True</td>
<td>Sort Of True</td>
<td>2. In my family everyone had a job or task to do on family trips/vacations.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>In my family people did what needed to be done and took turns on family trips/vacations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True</td>
<td>Sort Of True</td>
<td>3. In my family there were times for something new and there were no routines on family trips/vacations.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>In my family there set routines on family trips/vacations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True</td>
<td>Sort Of True</td>
<td>4. In my family it was OK if some members decided not to go on family vacations.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>In my family it was everyone would go on family vacations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True</td>
<td>Sort Of True</td>
<td>5. In my family people felt strongly that family trips/vacations were important family events.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>In my family there was a more casual attitude toward family trips/vacations; no one cared that much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True</td>
<td>Sort Of True</td>
<td>6. In my family trips/vacations were just a time to relax or catch up on work.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>In my family, the family trip/vacation was more than a trip; it was a family togetherness time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True</td>
<td>Sort Of True</td>
<td>7. In my family there is a history and tradition associated with &quot;The Family Trip/Vacation&quot;.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>In my family, trip/vacation activities are more spontaneous and change from year to year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really True</td>
<td>Sort Of True</td>
<td>8. In my family there was little planning around family trips/vacation; we just went.</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>In my family there was lot of planning and discussion around family trips/vacation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNUAL FAMILY CELEBRATIONS AND GATHERINGS

Think of celebrations that your family had every year when you were growing up. Some examples would be birthdays, anniversaries, Mother's Day, Father's Day, Fourth of July, Thanksgiving, New Years, and perhaps the first or last day of school.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really true sort of true  1. My family had regular and several annual celebrations. OR In my family there were few annual celebrations or they were rarely observed.

really true sort of true  2. In my family people didn't have assigned jobs for each celebration. OR In my family everyone had a certain job to do during family celebrations.

really true sort of true  3. In my family these celebrations had no set routines; it was hard to know what would happen. OR In my family these celebrations were pretty standard; everyone knew what to expect.

really true sort of true  4. In my family every one was expected to be there for the celebration. OR In my family annual celebrations were not a time for all members.

really true sort of true  5. In my family there were strong feelings at annual family celebrations. OR In my family annual celebrations were more casual; people weren't emotionally involved.

really true sort of true  6. In my family annual family celebrations were important milestones to be celebrated in special ways. OR In my family not a lot of fuss was made over annual family celebrations; members may have celebrated but it was nothing particularly special.

really true sort of true  7. In my family the way annual family celebrations are observed has changed from year to year. OR In my family the traditional ways of celebrating annual family celebrations have rarely changed.

really true sort of true  8. In my family there was a lot of planning and I discussed around these family celebrations. OR In my family there was little planning and discussion around these family celebrations.
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SPECIAL EVENTS

Think of some special events that happened in your family when you were growing up, that may occur in many families regardless of religion or culture. Some examples would be confirmations, weddings, graduations, special achievements, and retirement parties. Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

1. In my family there were rarely special events. OR In my family there were several special events.

2. In my family people didn't have certain jobs or roles to do at special events. OR In my family people had certain jobs to do at special events.

3. In my family there was a set routine at these events; everyone knew what would happen. OR In my family there was not a routine; every event was different.

4. In my family it was hard to know who would be there for special events; whoever could would show up. OR In my family everyone was expected to attend special events.

5. In my family special events were times of high emotions and feelings. OR In my family special events were pretty low-key; there weren't a lot of strong emotions.

6. In my family special events had deep meaning for the family. OR In my family special events were the same as other occasions.

7. In my family special events have shifted over the years. OR In my family special events are traditional and are carried across generations.

8. In my family there was a lot of planning and discussion around these special events. OR In my family there was little planning and discussion around these special events.
RELIGIOUS HOLIDAYS

Think of how your family celebrated religious holidays such as Christmas, Lent, Holy Week, Chanukah, Easter, Passover, and Ramadan when you were growing up.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

really  sort of 1. My family rarely celebrated religious holidays. OR My family regularly celebrated religious holidays.
true   true

really  sort of 2. In my family there were no set jobs; people did what they could during religious holidays. OR In my family everyone had a certain job to do during religious holidays.
true   true

really  sort of 3. In my family there was a set routine during religious holidays; everyone knew what to expect. OR In my family there were few routines during religious holidays; activities changed from year to year.
true   true

really  sort of 4. In my family, everyone was expected to be there during religious holidays. OR In my family it was not expected to know who would be around during religious holidays; whoever could would show up.
true   true

really  sort of 5. In my family religious holidays were more casual, there weren't a lot of strong feelings. OR In my family religious holidays were times of strong feelings and emotions.
true   true

really  sort of 6. In my family religious holidays had special meaning for the family. OR In my family religious holidays were more just like a day off.
true   true

really  sort of 7. In my family religious holidays were traditional with activities passed down thru generations. OR In my family religious holiday activities shifted across the years.
true   true

really  sort of 8. In my family there was little planning or discussion around religious holidays. OR In my family there was a lot of planning and discussion around religious holidays.
true   true
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CULTURAL AND ETHNIC TRADITIONS

Think of some cultural and ethnic traditions related to your heritage or background culture that your family observed when you were growing up. Some examples may be baptisms, naming ceremonies, festivals, wakes, and funerals. Also, the celebration of special holidays such as Cinco de Mayo, Kwanza, and St. Patrick's Day.

Choose the statement that is most like your family when you were growing up. Then circle whether it is "really true" or "sort of true" for your family.

1. My family rarely observed cultural traditions. OR My family regularly observed cultural traditions.

2. In my family there were set jobs for people to do during these events. OR In my family there were no set jobs for people to do during these events.

3. In my family there was flexibility in the ways these events were observed. OR In my family there were set routines and everyone knew what to expect during these events.

4. In my family every one was expected to attend these events. OR In my family only a few members were in attendance to represent the family.

5. In my family these events were very emotional and family members experienced strong emotions. OR In my family these events were more casual events with family members less emotionally involved.

6. In my family these events didn't have much meaning for the family. OR In my family these events took on a special meaning and significance.

7. In my family these events have stayed pretty much the same across generations. OR In my family these events were flexible and changed over the years.

8. In my family there was little planning on the part of the family; details were left to people outside the family. OR In my family there was a lot of planning and discussion among family members.

Finally, if you have either good or bad family practices, rituals, or traditions that were not addressed in this questionnaire, please describe them on the back of this page.
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CULTURE-FREE SELF-ESTEEM INVENTORY

Please fill in the square completely for each question. If the question describes how you usually feel, fill in the square in the "yes" column. If the question does not describe how you usually feel, fill in the square in the "no" column.

1. Do you have only a few friends? ................................................................. Yes  No
2. Are you happy most of the time? ................................................................. Yes  No
3. Can you do most things as well as others? .................................................. Yes  No
4. Do you like everyone you know? ................................................................. Yes  No
5. Do you spend most of your free time alone? .................................................. Yes  No
6. Do you like being a male? / Do you like being a female? ................................ Yes  No
7. Do most people you know like you? ............................................................. Yes  No
8. Are you usually successful when you attempt important tasks or assignments? Yes  No
9. Have you ever taken anything that did not belong to you? ............................... Yes  No
10. Are you as intelligent as most people? ......................................................... Yes  No
11. Do you feel you are as important as most people? .......................................... Yes  No
12. Are you easily depressed? ........................................................................... Yes  No
13. Would you change many things about yourself if you could? ......................... Yes  No
14. Do you always tell the truth? ........................................................................ Yes  No
15. Are you as nice looking as most people? ....................................................... Yes  No
16. Do many people dislike you? ......................................................................... Yes  No
17. Are you usually tense or anxious? ............................................................... Yes  No
18. Are you lacking in self-confidence? .............................................................. Yes  No
19. Do you gossip at times? ................................................................................ Yes  No
20. Do you often feel that you are no good at all? ............................................... Yes  No
21. Are you as strong and healthy as most people? ............................................ Yes  No
22. Are your feelings easily hurt? ....................................................................... Yes  No
23. Is it difficult for you to express your views or opinions on things? ............. Yes  No
24. Do you ever get angry? ................................................................................. Yes  No
25. Do you often feel ashamed of yourself?
26. Are other people generally more successful than you are?
27. Do you feel uneasy much of the time without knowing why?
28. Would you like to be as happy as others appear to be?
29. Are you ever shy?
30. Are you a failure?
31. Do people like your ideas?
32. Is it hard for you to meet new people?
33. Do you ever lie?
34. Are you often upset about nothing?
35. Do most people respect your views?
36. Are you more sensitive than most people?
37. Are you as happy as most people?
38. Are you ever sad?
39. Are you definitely lacking in initiative?
40. Do you worry a lot?
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RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND AND BEHAVIOR

1. Which of the following best describes you at the present time? (Check one)
   - _____ Atheist   • I do not believe in God.
   - _____ Agnostic   • I believe we can't really know about God.
   - _____ Unsure   • I don't know what to believe about God.
   - _____ Spiritual   • I believe in God, but I'm not religious.
   - _____ Religious   • I believe in God and practice religion.

2. For the **past year**, how often have you done the following? (Circle one number for each line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Once / month</th>
<th>Twice / month</th>
<th>Once / week</th>
<th>Twice / week</th>
<th>Almost daily</th>
<th>More than once / day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thought about God</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended worship service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read-studied scriptures, holy writings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had direct experiences of God</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Have you ever in your life:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Yes, in the past, but not now</th>
<th>Yes, and I still do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Believed in God?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayed?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended worship services regularly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read scriptures or holy writings regularly?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had direct experiences of God?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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FAMILY INFORMATION INVENTORY

Please answer the following questions about yourself and the family you grew up in. Circle the answer that best fits you and your family.

1. How old are you? ___________________

2. What is your sex? 1 = Male 2 = Female

3. What is the last grade you completed in school? ___________________

4. In general, did you like school? 1 = yes 2 = no

5. What kind of grades did you typically get in school? (Choose one)
   1 = excellent (all As)
   2 = good (As and Bs)
   3 = average (Bs and Cs)
   4 = poor (Ds and Fs)
   5 = failing (Fs)

6. Did you grow up with both of your natural parents living at home? 1 = yes 2 = no
   If you answered yes to this question, skip to question number 9.

7. If you did not live with your natural parents, who did you live with?
   1 = mother only
   2 = father only
   3 = mother and stepfather
   4 = father and stepmother
   5 = grandmother
   6 = grandparents
   7 = aunt
   8 = aunt and uncle
   9 = other (please explain)______________________________________

8. If you thought your father would disapprove of something you wanted to do, how often would you go ahead and do it anyway?
   1 = never/rarely 2 = occasionally 3 = frequently 4 = doesn’t apply

9. If you thought your mother would disapprove of something you wanted to do, how often would you go ahead and do it anyway?
   1 = never/rarely 2 = occasionally 3 = frequently 4 = doesn’t apply

10. What was your father’s job?
    1 = worker
    2 = temporary worker
    3 = state official
4 = farmer  
5 = own business  
6 = other  
7 = Unemployed

11. Was your family ever on welfare when you were growing up? 1 = yes 2 = no

12. In what type of community did you live while growing up?  
   1 = the country  
   2 = a small town  
   3 = a city  
   4 = the suburbs  
   5 = a large metropolitan area  
   6 = my family lived in several different places

13. How would you describe the crime in the neighborhood in which you grew up?  
   1 = little or no crime  
   2 = some crime  
   3 = a great deal of crime

14. Has anyone in your family committed a crime? 1 = yes 2 = no  
   If you answered yes to this question, skip to question number 17.

15. Check any of the following that has happened to your father.  
   1 = arrested  
   2 = placed on probation  
   3 = imprisoned  
   4 = none of the above

16. Check any of the following that has happened to your mother.  
   1 = arrested  
   2 = placed on probation  
   3 = imprisoned  
   4 = none of the above

17. Were you a member of a gang? 1 = yes 2 = no

18. Of the friends you hung around with, how many ever committed a crime?  
   1 = none  
   2 = a few  
   3 = some  
   4 = most

19. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you in leisure activities away from home (picnics, movies, sports, shopping, etc.)  
   1 = Never or rarely  
   2 = Once a month or less  
   3 = Several times a month  
   4 = About once a week  
   5 = Several times a week  
   6 = Almost everyday
20. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you at home working on a project or playing together?
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

21. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you having private talks?
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

22. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you attending parent-teacher organization meetings or other school activities?
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

23. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you attending church activities?
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday

24. When you were growing up, did your parents spend time with you with team sports or youth athletic clubs?
   1 = Never or rarely
   2 = Once a month or less
   3 = Several times a month
   4 = About once a week
   5 = Several times a week
   6 = Almost everyday
25. Check all of the following activities you participated in when you were between the ages of 12 and 18?
   1 = none
   2 = sports
   3 = school activities like Band, Cheerleading, Drama, Choir
   4 = civic organizations/volunteer activities (Scouts)
   5 = church groups
   6 = dance/ballet/twirling/gymnastics
   7 = other, please explain ____________________

26. How often did you participate in these activities?
   1 = never/rarely
   2 = once a month or less
   3 = several times a month
   4 = about once a week
   5 = several times a week
   6 = almost everyday

27. Were you ever employed or did you work for pay between the ages of 12 and 18?
   1 = yes
   2 = no

   If your answer is yes, how many hours per week did you usually work?
   1 = less than 6 hour per week          5 = 31-40 hours per week
   2 = 6-10 hours per week              6 = more than 40 hours per week
   3 = 11-20 hours per week             7 = part-time summer only
   4 = 21-30 hours per week             8 = full-time summer only
BEHAVIORS

Write in the number of times you committed the following behaviors before your 18th birthday. If you did not commit the behavior, put a 0 in the blank and go to the next question. If you committed a behavior, write in the number of times you committed it. If you were not caught, go to the next question. If you were caught, circle all of the actions that were taken.

How many times?

_____  1. Run away from home.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0 =none 1=sent home  2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)______________________________________________

_____  2. Taken a car for a ride without the owner's permission.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0 =none 1=sent home  2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)______________________________________________

_____  3. Used marijuana.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0 =none 1=sent home  2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)______________________________________________

_____  4. Broken into and entered a home, building, or store.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0 =none 1=sent home  2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)______________________________________________

_____  5. Used drugs or other chemicals to get high for kicks.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0 =none 1=sent home  2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)______________________________________________

_____  6. Engaged in a fistfight with another person.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0 =none 1=sent home  2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)______________________________________________

_____  7. Bought or drunk beer, wine or other alcohol without your parent's permission. Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0 =none 1=sent home  2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)______________________________________________
8. Used a weapon in a fight with another person.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________

9. Taken something valued at more than 20 YTL but less than 750 YTL.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________

10. Taken something of larger value (more than 750 YTL).
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________

11. Driven a car while strongly under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________

12. Used force or a weapon to take money or something of value from another person.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________

13. Destroyed or damaged someone else’s property on purpose.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________

14. Missed school without permission of parents.
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________

15. Gone hunting or fishing without a license (or violated other game laws).
Circle all that occurred to you if you were caught:
0=none 1=sent home 2=arrested 3=jailed 4=probation 5=imprisoned
6=other (please explain)__________________________________________
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