

RE-ASSESSING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGION AND JUVENILE  
DELINQUENCY

by

JENNIFER BIDDLE

A Dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School-Newark

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Program in Criminal Justice

written under the direction of Dr. Edem Avakame

and approved by

---

Dr. Edem Avakame, Chair

---

Dr. Robert Apel

---

Dr. Andres Rengifo

---

Dr. Jane Siegel, Outside Reader

Newark, New Jersey

May, 2013

©2013

Jennifer Biddle

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

## ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

### Re-Assessing the Relationship Between Religion and Juvenile Delinquency

By Jennifer Biddle

Dissertation Director:  
Dr. Edem Avakame

Using data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, the research examines the nature of the relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency. The research reveals that individual-level religiosity negatively relates to individual-level delinquency. The current study indicates that there is a significant correlation between religiosity and delinquency. The omnibus concept of religiosity was significantly related to delinquency along with the individual measures. This research provides support for the idea that religion is a multifaceted concept with many dimensions that should be examined as an index and separately. Also, while studies have varied in their estimation of the types of delinquent offenses that are reduced by religion (Baier and Wright 2001; Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith 2009; Cochran Wood and Arneklev 1994; Rodell and Benda 1999), the current research maintains that religiosity affects a wide variety of delinquency including truant, property and violent offenses. In addition, the research indicates found that family bonds, friends and contextual variables do not diminish the inverse relationship between religiosity and delinquency. Finally, religiosity reduced delinquency in both Wave I and Wave II indicating that religiosity influences delinquent behavior over time.

## Preface

Although the majority of adolescents indicate that they are involved in religion in some capacity, researchers and practitioners are reluctant to not only explore the relationship between religiosity and delinquency but to also look at how religiosity can assist in reducing juvenile delinquency. Because religiosity can be difficult to quantify and define, researchers have not properly evaluated the multifaceted concept and have shied away from evaluating its benefits. The purpose of this dissertation is to highlight the importance of religiosity as a potential reduction strategy for adolescent delinquency. Practitioners and policymakers that are interested in understanding the etiology and prevention of delinquency should pursue the role of religiosity to address delinquency to reduce delinquency among adolescents.

## Acknowledgement

A project of this magnitude requires a network of support and I am thankful to my committee members, Dr. Andres Rengifo, Dr. Robert Apel and Dr. Jane Siegel for their continued support and guidance throughout this process. I am especially grateful to Dr. Edem Avakame for all of the time and effort he spent on this project.

## Table of Contents

Chapter I – Introduction.....	1
Chapter II – Review of the Existing Literature.....	16
A. Introduction.....	16
B. Religion.....	16
C. Theoretical framework.....	21
D. Previous Research .....	55
E. Summary.....	57
Chapter III - Methodology and Research Design.....	60
A. Research Design.....	60
B. Unit of Analysis.....	63
C. Variables .....	63
a. Dependent Variables .....	63
b. Independent variables.....	65
c. Control Variables.....	70
D. Analysis Strategy.....	75
Chapter IV- Data Analysis .....	76
Chapter V - Conclusion.....	118
A. Interpretation of results .....	118
B. Generalizations.....	126
C. Limitations and Study Threats to Validity.....	127
D. Implications.....	128
References .....	130
Appendix I .....	139

## Tables

Table 1. Unstandardized Descriptive Statistics for Dependent and Independent Variables	page 74
Table 2. Bivariate Correlations	page 76
Table 3. Parameter Estimates - Religiosity	page 77
Table 4. Parameter Estimates- Believe Scriptures are the Word of God	page 78
Table 5. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 78
Table 6. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 79
Table 7. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer	page 79
Table 8. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups	page 80
Table 9. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 80
Table 10. Parameter Estimates- Believe Scriptures are the Word of God	page 81
Table 11. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 82
Table 12. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 83
Table 13. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups	page 84
Table 14. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer	page 85
Table 15. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 86
Table 16. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 86
Table 17. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attended Religious Services	page 87
Table 18. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 87
Table 19. Parameter Estimates - Frequency of Prayer	page 88
Table 20. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 88
Table 21. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 89
Table 22. Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God	page 90
Table 23. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 90
Table 24. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 91
Table 25. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer	page 91
Table 26. Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Religious Groups	page 92
Table 27. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 93
Table 28. Parameter Estimates- Scripture is the Word of God	page 93
Table 29. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 94
Table 30. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 94
Table 31. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 95
Table 32. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 95
Table 33. Summary Chart of Individual Religious and Delinquency Variables	page 104
Table 34. Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the word of God	page 139
Table 35. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attended Religious Services	page 139
Table 36. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 140
Table 37. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer	page 140
Table 38. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 141
Table 39. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 141
Table 40. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 142

Table 41. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 142
Table 42. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer	page 143
Table 43. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 143
Table 44. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 144
Table 45. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 144
Table 46. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 145
Table 47. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 145
Table 48. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 146
Table 49. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 146
Table 50. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 147
Table 51. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 147
Table 52. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 148
Table 53. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 148
Table 54. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 149
Table 55. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 149
Table 56. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 150
Table 57. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 150
Table 58. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 151
Table 59. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 151
Table 60. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 152
Table 61. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 152
Table 62. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 153
Table 63. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 153
Table 64. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 154
Table 65. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 154
Table 66. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 155
Table 67. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 155
Table 68. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 156
Table 69. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 156
Table 70. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 157
Table 71. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 157
Table 72. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 158
Table 73. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 158
Table 74. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 159
Table 75. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 159
Table 76. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 160
Table 77. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 160
Table 78. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 161
Table 79. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 161
Table 80. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 162
Table 81. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 162
Table 82. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 163
Table 83. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 163
Table 84. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 164
Table 85. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 164
Table 86. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 165

Table 87. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 165
Table 88. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 166
Table 89. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 166
Table 90. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 167
Table 91. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 167
Table 92. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 168
Table 93. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 168
Table 94. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 169
Table 95. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 169
Table 96. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 170
Table 97. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 170
Table 98. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 171
Table 99. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 171
Table 100. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 172
Table 101. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 172
Table 102. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 173
Table 103. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 173
Table 104. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 174
Table 105. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 174
Table 106. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 175
Table 107. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 175
Table 108. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 176
Table 109. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 176
Table 110. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 177
Table 111. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 177
Table 112. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 178
Table 113. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 178
Table 114. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 179
Table 115. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 179
Table 116. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 180
Table 117. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 180
Table 118. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 181
Table 119. Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God	page 181
Table 120. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services	page 182
Table 121. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 182
Table 122. Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer	page 183
Table 123. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 183
Table 124. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 105
Table 125. Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God	page 106
Table 126. Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attended Religious Services	page 107
Table 127. Parameter Estimates - Religious Importance	page 108
Table 128. Parameter Estimates - Frequency of Prayer	page 109
Table 129. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups	page 110
Table 130. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 111
Table 131. Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the word of God	page 111
Table 132. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attended Religious Services	page 112

Table 133. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 112
Table 134. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer	page 113
Table 135. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 113
Table 136. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 114
Table 137. Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the word of God	page 115
Table 138. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attended Religious Services	page 115
Table 139. Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance	page 116
Table 140. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer	page 116
Table 141. Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups	page 117
Table 142. Parameter Estimates – Religiosity	page 118

## Chapter I – Introduction

According to numerous surveys and public opinion polls, religion plays an important role in the lives of adolescents in the United States (Smith, Dentón, Faris and Regnerus, 2002; Smith, Faris, Denton, and Regnerus 2003, Smith 2005; Gallup 2002; Harris 2009; Denton, Pearce and Smith 2008). Based on data from the National Longitudinal study of Adolescent Health and the Gallup Youth Survey religion among U.S. adolescents is relatively high and is an important aspect of their lives (Harris, 2009; Gallup 2002). In 2000, the Gallup Youth Survey showed that more than half of adolescents ages 13-17 indicated that religious beliefs were very important to them (Gallup 2002). Similarly, the National Study of Youth and Religion indicated that 78 percent of adolescents reported believing in God (Denton, Pearce and Smith 2008). According to these data sources, many adolescents attend religious services and activities routinely (Harris, 2009; Gallup 2002; Denton, Pearce and Smith 2008). The Gallup Youth Survey indicated that over 50 percent of youth attended religious services in the past week (Gallup 2002). Similarly, while examining descriptive findings of adolescent religious participation using three nationally reputable surveys of youth, Smith, Denton, Faris and Regnerus (2002) found that the majority of youth affiliate with a religious group and about half of American adolescents participate in religious services on a routine basis. Adolescents have also indicated the importance of religious institutions in providing them with assistance. The National Study of Youth and Religion indicated that almost 50 2003; Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Adamczyk and Palmer 2008).

Religious institutions also teach the importance of developing respect for

authority and provide a belief system based on a specific moral directive (Smith 2003; Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004). Many studies have indicated that religion has a positive influence on behavior (Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Cochran et al. 1994; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Sloane and Potvin, 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993; Rodell and Benda 1999; Baier and Wright 2001; Johnson, Tompkins, & Webb, 2002; Johnson, 2001, Simons et al. 2004). Specifically, studies have found that religious youth do better in school (Regnerus 2000; Regnerus, Smith, and Fritch 2003; Mckune & Hoffmann, 2009; Adamczyk and Palmer 2008; Jeynes 2003). Regnerus, Smith, and Fritch (2003) found that even after controlling for other reliable predictors of academic success, religious students scored higher on standardized math and reading tests than non religious students. Similarly, Jeynes (2003) indicate that religious adolescents performed better on most academic measures those non-religious adolescents even after controlling for a variety of factors including socioeconomic status. Studies also indicate the religious youth are healthier and have lower levels of depression and suicide (Johnson, Tompkins, & Webb, 2002; Johnson, 2001, Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Nooney 2005; Donahue & Benson, 1995; Zhang & Jin, 1996; Blum 1997; Ji, Perry and Clarke-Pine 2011; Donahue 1995, Smith 2003; Wallace and Forman 1998). Ji, Perry and Clarke-Pine (2011) found that religious teenagers with intrinsic, orthodox, and theocentric religion were more likely to embrace church guidelines and less likely to experience depression. Similarly, Wallace and Forman (1998) found that religious youth are more likely to take care of their bodies and less likely to participate in unhealthy

behaviors.

In addition to promoting positive health outcomes, some studies indicate that religion reduces juvenile delinquency (Stark, 1996; Stark, Kent, & Doyle, 1982; Desmond and Soper 2009; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Cochran, Wood and Arneklev 1994; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Potvin and Sloane, 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993; Rodell and Benda 1999; Baier and Wright 2001, Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough 2000; Longest and Vaisey 2008, Rohrbaugh and Jessor 1974; Adamczyk and Palmer 2008; Baier and Wright 2001). Specifically, several studies indicate that religious adolescents are less likely to smoke cigarettes (Adamczyk and Palmer 2008; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen, 1984; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008), drink alcohol (Bahr and Hoffmann 2010; Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen, 1984; Simons, Simons and Conger, 2004; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Desmond and Soper 2009; Simons et al. 2004) use marijuana and other drugs (Adamczyk and Palmer 2008; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen, 1984; Desmond and Soper 2009; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008) and engage in illegal activities (Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough 2000; Baier and Wright 2001; Benda, Pope, and Kelleher 2006; Johnson, Larson, Spencer, Li and Jang (2000) than adolescents who were not religious. In a review of over 300 studies assessing the relationship between religion and delinquency, Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough (2000) found that overall religion reduced various forms of delinquency. In their evaluation, the researchers found only one study in which religiosity increased the level of delinquency and this study used religiosity as a control variable whereas the other studies used religiosity as a central variable that was being measured.

Similarly, in a meta-analysis of 60 studies, Baier and Wright (2001) maintain that several studies identify a statistically significant relationship in which religion reduces delinquency.

Despite the abundance of literature on the relationship between religion and delinquency, there are a number of limitations. Although most researchers agree that the most comprehensive studies specify a relationship grounded in theory, many studies lack a theoretical framework (Bahr and Hoffman 2008; Cretacci 2003; Regnerus 2003). Without a theoretical framework, studies have not been able to systematically test theoretical constructs that may explain the relationship between religion and delinquency. In addition, the nature of the relationship remains unclear (Baier and Wright 2001; Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Rodell and Benda 1999). While certain studies maintain that religion affects the level of delinquency (Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Cochran et al. 1994; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Potvin and Sloane, 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993; Rodell and Benda 1999; Baier and Wright 2001), other researchers have suggested that religion has minimal or no impact (Hirschi and Stark 1969; Ellis and Thompson 1989).

For studies that have concluded that there is an inverse relationship between religiosity and juveniles' delinquency (Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Cochran et al. 1994; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Potvin and Sloane, 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993; Rodell and Benda 1999; Baier and Wright 2001), there is

conflicting data on whether religiosity directly affects delinquency rates or whether the relationship is indirect or spurious. In support of a direct relationship, Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li (2001) found that the effects of religion on delinquency remain significant even after controlling for delinquent associations, beliefs, and sociodemographic variables. The authors conclude that the effects of religiosity on delinquency are neither indirect nor spurious (Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001). Similarly, in an evaluation of moral beliefs and religiosity, Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith (2009) found that although the strength of moral beliefs affects the level of delinquency, religion can still reduce delinquency even when it is not accompanied by a belief that the behavior is wrong (Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith 2009).

Although it is plausible to conclude that children who believe in religion and attend religious services are less likely to be involved in delinquent activity as a direct social control mechanism, there are other influences that may impact the relationship. This implies an indirect relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency. Some studies have concluded that religiosity has an indirect effect on delinquent behavior (Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Stylianou 2004; Burkett and Warren 1987; Cochran et al. 1994). In their research, Simons, Simons and Conger (2004) found that peers had a substantial impact on adolescents' behavior. Specifically, through the influence of peer relations' religion decreases the occurrence of delinquent behavior.

While some studies indicate an inverse relationship between religion and adolescent delinquency there are also a number of studies that have found that religion has minimal or no impact on reducing delinquency (Hirschi and Stark 1969; Ellis and Thompson 1989; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Cochran, Wood and Arneklev 1994;

Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009 Ellis 1987; Burkett & White, 1974; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Marcos et al 1986; Marcos and Bahr 1988). Hirschi and Stark (1969) found that adolescents that attended church and believed in religion were just as likely to be involved in delinquency as those that were not involved in religion. While the authors concluded that individuals that went to church had different feelings about religious issues than those that did not attend church, they concluded that their outlooks had no relationship to delinquency (Hirschi and Stark 1969). Similarly, Cochran, Wood and Arneklev (1994) concluded that when social control and arousal variables are combined with religious effects, religiosity is no longer significant to delinquency. Specifically, the authors conclude that the direct influence of religion on assault, vandalism, illicit drug use, and truancy becomes insignificant when other factors of control are included in the analysis (Cochran, Wood and Arneklev 1994). Likewise, Bahr, Hawks and Wang (1993) found that religious importance is not associated with peer drug use after controlling for parental monitoring and family drug use.

In addition to the lack of consensus regarding the relationship between religion and delinquency, studies have varied in their estimation of the types of delinquent offenses that are reduced by religion (Baier and Wright 2001; Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith 2009; Cochran Wood and Arneklev 1994; Rodell and Benda 1999). For example, in a sample of 528 adolescents who regularly attend church, Rodell and Benda (1999) found that religiosity reduces the level of alcohol use but has little effect on crime. Similarly, Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith (2009) found that although religion reduces the level of marijuana use and drinking for adolescents, the authors did not find a significant effect for hitting and property offenses. In addition, Cochran Wood and

Arneklev (1994) indicate that when elements of social control are taken into account, the relationship between religion and delinquency is reduced to nonsignificance for assault, theft, vandalism, drug use, and truancy but religion continues to reduce the use of tobacco and alcohol.

The research to date also suffers from a series of methodological limitations. Specifically, researchers have argued that previous studies have varied in their estimation of religious influence due to varying conceptual definitions (Baier and Wright 2001; Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough 2000; Benda and Corwyn 1997; Burkett, 1993; Evans et al., 1995; Tittle & Welch, 1983; Welch, Tittle, & Petee, 1991; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Burkett, 1993; Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006). In a review of over 300 studies assessing the relationship between religion and delinquency, Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough (2000) found that more than half of the studies assessed used only one or two measures of religiosity. For many of these studies, church attendance was the only measure of religion (Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough, 2000). Studies that use a single measure of religion such as church attendance only explain one element of religious behavior and do not adequately assess the complexity of religiosity (Burkett, 1993; Evans et al., 1995; Tittle & Welch, 1983; Welch, Tittle, & Petee, 1991; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Burkett, 1993; Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006). According to Benda, Corwyn and Flynn (2001) and Benda, Pope and Kelleher (2006) church attendance only includes the opportunity to hear religious teachings and is not a measure of importance. It is only measuring physical attendance and attendance is not a measure of significance, interest or motivation in religion (Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Burkett, 1993; Evans et al., 1995). Benda and

Corwyn (1997) go on to say that when a single measure such as church attendance is used, the typical conclusion that religion is related to status offenses is supported. Also, church attendance among adolescents is often the result of parental expectation and control (Tittle & Welch, 1983; Welch, Petee, & Tittle, 1991; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006). Most children are exposed to religious practices through their parents and early religious involvement is typically an extension of parental influence (Harms, 1944; Sloane and Potvin 1985). Benda, Pope and Kelleher (2006) maintain that church attendance is not an adequate measure of religiosity because adolescents attend church because of parental influence and social opportunities not because of their beliefs and commitment. Adamczyk and Palmer (2008) indicate that religious affiliation is less important than religious importance and attendance for explaining the relationship between religion and sex. Similarly, Longest and Vaisey (2008) found that religious affiliation is mediated when indicators of religiosity are included in the analysis and is no longer significantly related to marijuana. In an examination of maternal religiosity, Pearce and Axinn (1998) found that religious importance in the mother's life was associated with higher levels of bonding between the mother and child than was church attendance or affiliation.

Although many studies include few measures of religiosity, most researchers agree that multiple measures are essential to understanding this multifaceted concept (Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li 2001; Longest and Vaisey 2008; Burkett and Warren 1987). Studies that have included multiple measures of religiosity have provided mixed results (Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough 2000; Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006). Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough (2000) found that studies that

demonstrated reliable measures of religious commitment were more likely to find a relationship between religiosity and juvenile delinquency than those studies that did not assess the reliability of their measures. Similarly, Benda, Pope and Kelleher (2006:80) indicate that religiousness which included “(1) how religious are you, (2) how religious is your family, (3) how religious do you wish your family would be, (4) how important is religion in your life and, (5) do you believe in God” has stronger inverse relationships to delinquency than church attendance. In contrast, other studies have found that when studies utilize multiple measures of religiosity and church attendance, the relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency is insignificant (Benda and Corwyn 1997; Cretacci 2003). Benda and Corwyn (1997) found that when they controlled only for demographic factors, they found a significant relationship between religion and crime but when they used hierarchical regression procedures and elements of control were added to demographic factors the relationship between religion and status offenses was not significant.

Other studies maintain that the relationship is dependent on the methodological approach used (Benda and Corwyn 1997; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li 2001; Benda 1995; Bahr, Hawks, & Wang, 1993; Longest and Vaisey 2008; Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway 1983). Burkett and Warren (1987) maintain that the typical analysis includes the bivariate association between a single measure of religion such as church attendance and a certain type of deviant involvement. Using basic techniques such as bivariate or chi square analysis ignores the complexity of the relationship, the methods used are often too simplistic to assess the complex causal relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency (Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li

2001; Longest and Vaisey 2008; Burkett and Warren 1987). Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li (2001) maintain that few researchers have looked at religion as a latent variable that can be measured by multiple indicators which is appropriate for a multidimensional concept such as religion. Similarly, Sloan and Potvin (1986) indicate that when studies evaluate the relationship between religion and delinquency use statistical methods such as chi-square, the findings are not significant for certain forms of delinquency and highly significant for others. The authors maintain that when more sensitive advanced statistical measures such as odds ratios are used, religion is significant for all forms of delinquency.

In contrast, other studies have found that when more advanced statistical procedures are incorporated into the analysis and important variables are controlled for, the relationship between religion and delinquency decreases or becomes insignificant (Longest and Vaisey 2008; Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway 1983; Burkett and Warren 1987). In an evaluation of the relationship between religion and initiation into marijuana use, Longest and Vaisey (2008) found that traditional measures of social control such as parental monitoring that correlated with lower probabilities of initiation became nonsignificant in the multivariate models. Similarly, Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway (1983) and Burkett and Warren (1987) find that the bivariate relationship between delinquency and religion becomes non significant after controlling for family and peer relationships in multivariate analysis (Benda 1995; Bahr, Hawks, & Wang, 1993). In addition to using unsuitable measures, studies fail to control for important influences that may affect the relationship such as peer influences (Burkett and Warren 1987). Benda and Corwyn (1997) found that when elements of control theory were added into the analysis with hierarchical regression procedures, the relationship between religion and

delinquency is no longer significant.

In summary, despite the abundance of literature on the relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency, researchers have not undertaken a focused effort to establish a theoretical relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency using advanced statistical procedures. Although some studies have identified an inverse relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency (Baier and Wright 2001; Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith 2009; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Rodell and Benda 1999; Smith 2003; Cochran et al. 1994; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Potvin and Sloane, 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993) other studies have indicated that religion has minimal or no impact on delinquency (Hirschi and Stark 1969; Ellis and Thompson 1989). For studies that have found a relationship, it is unclear whether religion directly affects juvenile delinquency or if the relationship is mediated by other factors (Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith 2009; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Cochran et al. 1994; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Potvin and Sloane, 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993; Rodell and Benda 1999; Baier and Wright 2001).

The purpose of the current research is to clarify the nature of the relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency. Since studies have disagreed as to whether a relationship exists and the circumstances in which the relationship is significant, the current research will investigate whether a relationship exists and explain the conditions in which the relationship is significant. In addition to clarifying the relationship, the current research includes numerous religious, delinquency and contextual variables in

order to develop a better understanding of the specific variables that influence the relationship.

Research indicates that there are numerous factors that reduce juvenile delinquency (Smith, Dentón, Faris and Regnerus, 2002; Smith, Faris, Denton, and Regnerus 2003, Smith 2005; Gallup 2002; Harris, 2009; Denton, Pearce and Smith 2008). Studies have consistently shown that a nurturing family, positive friendships, education and prosocial opportunities all play a role in protecting a juvenile from delinquent interaction (Baier and Wright 2001; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Rodell and Benda 1999; Smith 2003; Cochran et al. 1994; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Potvin and Sloane, 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993). Since religion provides a similar framework of being a positive influence on delinquent behavior, further investigation would provide clarification of the role that religiosity plays in reducing delinquency. If religiosity reduces delinquency among juveniles, than a discussion on the constructive role of religiosity in American life is necessary. Specifically, a discourse among policy makers as to how to incorporate religious components into delinquency reduction programs is essential. Such discussions would promote understanding among citizens of different faiths while simultaneously using the components of religiosity that promote positive outcomes and prevent delinquency. Since the best delinquency prevention strategies are comprehensive, reduce risk and developing protective factors, religiosity would enhance the protective factors that reduce delinquency. Researchers have found that collective strategies with multiple protective programs, rather than those

that address single risk factors have an impact on reducing delinquency (Johnson, De Li, Larson, & McCullough, 2000).

The most comprehensive studies of the relationship between religion and delinquency specify a causal relationship grounded in theory (Bahr and Hoffman 2008; Cretacci 2003; Regnerus 2003), include multiple measures of religion (Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li 2001; Longest and Vaisey 2008; Regnerus 2003; Cretacci 2003; Wallace et al. 2007; Burkett and Warren 1987; Nonnemaker, McNeely and Blum 2003) and advanced statistical procedures (Longest and Vaisey 2008; Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway 1983; Regnerus 2003; Nonnemaker, McNeely and Blum 2003; Burkett and Warren 1987; Wallace et. al 2007). Although the majority of studies assessed by Baier and Wright (2001) used in school samples, the statistical technique that was typically used to analyze the data was ordinary least squares (OLS) regression which does not take into account the contextual influence of the environment. Other studies have failed to include an explanation of how religion related to delinquency. For example, although Nonnemaker et al. (2003) provide a detailed analysis of the effect of various types of religiosity and delinquency, the authors fail to ground their hypothesis within a theoretical framework that explains the causal inference.

In order to expand the current research, using multiple measures of individual religiosity and controlling for a variety of social factors that may influence the relationship, the proposed study seeks to assess whether the religion reduces juvenile delinquency. In addition the research will explore whether the relationship between religiosity and delinquency is significant when we look at various forms of religiosity and delinquency and other factors that may influence the relationship such as family and peer

relationships.

The current research will attempt to answer several questions about the relationship between religiosity and juvenile delinquency. First, after controlling for sex, race, parental marital status, involvement in extracurricular activities and neighborhood characteristics, is individual religiosity related to adolescent delinquency? Since previous studies have disagreed on whether a statistically significant relationship exists, it is important to answer this question. Second, what impact does peer and family variables have on the relationship between religiosity and delinquency. Although peers and family are two of the strongest predictors of delinquency, researchers have not considered how peer and family variables influence the relationship between religion and delinquency. Consequently, there continues to be debate about whether the relationship between religiosity and delinquency is spurious (Cochran, Wood, & Arneklev, 1994; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren 1987; Smith 2003; Burkett and Ward 1993; Hadaway, Elifson, and Petersen 1984; Stylianou 2004; Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway 1983; Benda 1995). Third, does the association between religiosity and delinquency depend on the type of delinquent behavior? Since previous research is not consistent regarding the types of offenses that are reduced by the presence of religion, exploring the types of offenses that are reduced by religiosity is important. Fourth, what impact do contextual level variables have on individual delinquency? Contextual level variables are important to identify the environment in which adolescents are a part of and how the environment influences individual level religiosity and delinquency. Fifth, will the relationship between religion and delinquency remain significant over time? Previous studies have not looked at whether relationship between religion and delinquency

remains stable over time.

## Chapter II – Review of the Existing Literature

### A. Introduction

This section begins with a discussion of religion, which includes important definitions and components. The theoretical framework highlights the importance of the research purpose and illustrates the theoretical basis for a relationship between religion and delinquency. A comprehensive discussion of the relevant literature includes an overview of the research on religion and delinquency, measures of religion and delinquency and the literature on peer and family relations as it relates to religion and delinquency. The chapter concludes with the theoretical and empirical limitations of previous research studies.

### B. Religion

Throughout history, religion has been important in explaining many of the questions that human beings have regarding the existence of the world around them. Practically all civilizations and cultures identify and subscribe to religious beliefs and practices. Religion is a complex feature of human existence that looks to identify purpose and meaning of life (Livingston 2005). Religious institutions designate the types of behaviors that are acceptable and sanction behavior that violates the sacred code. Throughout history, human beings have tried to find meaning in symbols that represent a variety of things including the Chinese Tao, the Indian Bhrahman and the God of many western societies. Although the source of what is revered varies, the purpose of religion is to provide a sense of security and instill in us that if we follow specific rules, our life will have meaning and we will be protected (Livingston 2005). Human beings want to believe and know that their life has meaning and purpose.

People often seek religion in order to explain the world. Since the world is often full of pain, anxiety and distress and we are often confronted with feelings of despair and anxiety, religion provides a sense of peace and enlightenment. The spiritual aspect of human nature seeks to find peace and meaning. An individual can handle present struggle with the expectation that the future will have a change in fortune if they believe in and trust their spiritual beliefs. Religion can stress belief and practice or both. Monaghan and Just (2000) maintain that religious beliefs assists individuals in dealing with problems of human life that are continuous and painful by providing them with a framework to accommodate frustrations and cope with hardship.

In order to achieve salvation, Livingston (2005) has indicated four paths to salvation that all historical religions recognize which includes faith, disciplined action, meditation and insight. Faith is the mental acceptance of an unobserved reality but also encompasses the heart, mind, body and soul. The entire being relies on the divine through unconditional love. Disciplined action includes the everyday, practical approach to religion. Most religious believers follow some pattern of religious behavior. Actions may include attending religious services on a daily or weekly basis, praying a certain number of days or performing the social duties. Meditation and insight consist of a mental development that is processed through a series of moral and physical regulations. Individuals that can achieve complete meditation can achieve spiritual freedom and enlightenment. The ultimate goal is salvation, to be delivered from a world that is filled with strife and to enter the divine whether it be in the form of an afterlife or an improved status.

### *Definitions*

There is not one universally accepted definition of religion. Even religious scholars and theorists find it difficult to agree upon a comprehensive definition. Dictionary definitions typically describe religion as a collection of shared beliefs. Definitions also typically include views that are related to moral values and seek to explain the origins of creation and provide a meaning to life.

A definition suggested by James Livingston (2008:10) holds that “Religion is that system of activities and beliefs directed toward that which is perceived to be of sacred value and transforming power”. Other sociologists prefer to evade definitions of religion and instead discuss it in terms of an ideal type. According to Muehlhauser (2009), religion describes the ineptness of the human condition and promotes a relationship with the supernatural. In addition, religion designates a path to salvation and includes ritualistic behavior and practice within the community (Muehlhauser 2009). Although some religions do not encompass all of these elements, most religions share many of these elements. Each religion has certain characteristics that are distinctive and specific beliefs and practices that set them apart from other religions. An interesting definition by the *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (MacMillan Publishing Company, 2006) includes traits of religions rather than indicating that all religions include specific aspects. The definition proclaims that the more indicators that are present within a belief system, the closer it resembles something that is religious. Some of these traits include the belief in supernatural beings, a difference between sacred and profane objects, ritual acts, moral code, a moral code, feelings of awe, sense of mystery, sense of guilt, adoration as it relates to religion, prayer, purpose of the world and a social group that shares similar

beliefs.

Religions often include specific symbols, narratives and specific traditions. Many religions have organized activities including worship services and membership requirements. According to Livingston (2005) there are no modern societies that do not have religious practices but there are individuals from within those societies that choose not to affiliate with the religious activities. An important aspect of human life that illustrates the importance of religion is the treatment of its dead. The treatment of our dead through burial and ceremony indicates that there is a belief that death is only the end of a physical life and that a renewed life is about to begin. The first known civilizations, the Neanderthal and Cro-Magnon prehumans, positioned food and instruments during the burial of the deceased.

Many modern scholars have begun to focus not on what religion is but rather on what it does. An important aspect of religion is the spread of the moral community. This includes rules on what behavior is morally acceptable and behavior that is forbidden. Morality is an important part of religion because persons who subscribe to religion aspire to transform themselves. People want their mind, bodies and souls to be worthy of redemption. Many religions, such as the Jewish and Muslim religions include an entire derivative on moral obligations, rituals, penalties and responsibilities to society. For example, the most important elements of Islamic life are known as the "Five Pillars of Islam," and must publically declare that there is no God except Allah and that Muhammad is God's messenger, to pray five times a day at certain times, to fast from food, drink, and sexual intercourse during the daylight hours of the month of Ramadan, pledge a portion of one's income for poor-relief annually and to perform the pilgrimage to

Mecca once in one's lifetime (Livingston, 2005).

### *Religious Components*

Although scholars have struggled to properly define religion, it is evident that religion is as old as human kind. According to Livingston (2005) the earliest members of our species, the Neanderthal and Cro-Magnon life attempted to please the spirits and performed burial rites on the dead, indicating a belief in the afterlife. Symbols in the form of objects, sounds, animals, rituals or spiritual signs that stand for something give a constant reminder of beliefs that are already known through religion. Religious statements are often communicated and furthered through the use of symbols. All religious communities have a religious language that proclaims how the spiritual and earthly world interact. Rituals are often a part of religious tradition and they are used as a form of communication and unity. A ritual is “an agreed-on and formalized pattern of ceremonial movements and verbal expressions carried out in a sacred context” (Livingston, 2005:81). Often, rituals use body movement, which is thought to connect the mind, body and soul to oneself and to others. Rituals also bring individuals together as a community and focus on a shared set of values. From a functionalist perspective, rituals are a part of a larger system that serves to remind individuals of their commitments and beliefs while bringing together the community that shares similar beliefs and values. Rituals also explain a pattern of beliefs and reinforce this behavior. Sacred scriptures prescribe religious beliefs and values through a variety of forms including poetry, law and history among others. Sacred scriptures are thought to exert a power and are meant to guide readers on the principles of the religion. In addition, scriptures provide answers on how to deal with issues in life.

An aspect of human nature is to seek answers to questions about the uncertainty and powerlessness of how the world works. Weber (1930) maintained that religion is an important causal factor that has an impact on social actions. Weber (1930) maintains that religion has been instrumental in the development of societies and impacts the landscape of the society, including the political and economic structure. Weber (1930) begins *The Protestant Ethic* by focusing on the association between certain religious affiliations, specifically Protestantism, and business success. He suggests that there may be a causal relationship between business success and religion because individuals that work hard at their craft are perfecting God's work and are contributing to the greater good of society, thereby being blessed by God. At the center of Weber's writings is a causal assertion about the impact of religious beliefs on practices and the impact they have on social institutions.

### C. Theoretical framework

For early control theorists such as Durkheim (1951 [1897], 1984 [1893]), human behavior is shaped by societal influence. Accordingly, the two essential ingredients to human nature are the social self that wishes to be a part of society and the primal self that seeks personal unrestrained gratification (Durkheim 1984 [1893]). Durkheim (1984 [1893]) described how social solidarity and cohesion assist in fully humanizing the primal individual. Being an integral part of society and maintaining social cohesion will make an individual morally complete and provide a sense of purpose. From a moral perspective, in the absence of social solidarity individuals will not be whole. Individuals that are not morally complete are more likely to deviate from the rules of society and become delinquent.

Durkheim's writings during the 19<sup>th</sup> century chronicled the changing structure of European societies. He maintained that prior to the industrial revolution, societies were able to self regulate. Individuals developed a common set of beliefs and aspirations and worked together to achieve their goals. In Durkheim's (1984 [1893]) view, social solidarity was maintained by integration and regulation. Integration was the social forces that drew people together and the unity of people based on common beliefs and faith. It was not by chance that individuals were brought together: there are social forces at work. The sustained beliefs and common practices lead to strong social bonds. Durkheim (1984 [1893]) referred to regulation as the social forces of constraint that attach individuals to norms. The efforts of individuals need to be properly coordinated in order to achieve common goals and for society to function properly. In the wake of the industrial revolution individuals began to strive for individual success. When integrative and regulatory functions failed, common values and bonds were weakened. He argued further that as society modernized, a strong emphasis was placed on achieving individual prosperity and success (Durkheim 1951 [1897]). Without restraining individual success, the social fabric of the society was threatened, with individual's no longer working for the collective good of society, but instead worked to achieve their individual success. In one of his classic, works *Suicide*, Durkheim (1951 [1897]) described this as anomie, the breakdown of institutional norms that resulted in the deregulation of human action. Society was no longer able to regulate itself and individuals could no longer trust in the system. In addition to the diminished influence of the institutional norms, Durkheim warns that individuals that aspire for their own individual economic success will never be satisfied or fulfilled; they will never be morally complete. For many, the only way to

escape from the present circumstances was suicide. Durkheim (1984 [1893]) maintained that morality plays an important role in establishing order and was essential to the formation of social cohesion:

“Everything which is a source of solidarity is moral, everything which forces man to take account of other men is moral, everything which forces him to regulate his conduct through something other than the striving of his ego is moral, and morality is as solid as these ties are numerous and strong” (Durkheim: (1984[1893]: 331).

In essence, morality was the key to regulating behavior and assisted in bringing people together. In an analysis of Durkheim’s work, Mazman (2008) suggests that morality is what informs individuals of the societal expectation regarding their behavior. All societies need morality in order to regulate and protect society and within each society there is a moral order that informs people what behaviors are acceptable and what behaviors are not (Mazman 2008). According to Durkheim (1984 [1893]) individuals that were religious had a strong moral fabric and were able to function efficiently as part of the society. Specifically, he maintained that the guidelines of behavior are embedded within religious instruction. Religion is instrumental in shaping and directing our morality. Consequently, the law was viewed as a tangible way to carry out religious objectives that serve as an indicator of morality. Research consistently shows that religiosity has a significant effect on moral beliefs (Burkett and Ward 1993; Curry 1996; Francis 1997; Hadaway, Elifson, and Petersen 1984; Stylianou 2004). Burkett and Ward (1993) maintained that the reason people will refrain from delinquent activity such as marijuana use is because they believe it is morally wrong. The authors concluded that the threat of legal action had little to do with the decision not to use marijuana; it was based on whether they believed the behavior was immoral (Burkett and Ward 1993).

Durkheim's early work looked at how the culture and social organization of society was reflected in the law (Smith 2008). The law is the most visible symbol of social solidarity and represents how society stabilizes itself. Crime was considered a normal aspect of society that violated the collective beliefs. Many of the early forms of criminality were based on religious discipline and as a result, numerous laws were put into place based on religious authority (Smith 2008). Durkheim maintained, "offences against the gods are offences against society" (Durkheim, 1984 [1893]: 50). In essence, law violations and religious violations were the same. Durkheim (1984 [1893]) also emphasized that when crime occurred, people were intimately affected by it and had strong feelings of anger, frustration and hurt. Crime was not an individual act; the entire society was affected by the actions of an individual.

In one of Durkheim's last major works, *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, he focused on the relationship between religion and social interaction. Durkheim defines religion as:

"A unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden--beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called a Church, all those who adhere to them" (Durkheim (1984[1893]: 29).

Religion brings people together and provides them with a sense of what is right and wrong. In addition, it promotes common beliefs and values among its participants, creating social solidarity and maintaining social order (Durkheim, (1951[1897])). The relationship between religion and delinquency was a focal concept in the theory of social control (Durkheim, (1951[1897])). Studies of adolescent delinquency draw upon and extend Durkheim's interest in social integration by using social control theory to explain

how religion discourages delinquency among adolescents (Baier and Wright 2001; Tittle and Welch 1983; Pearce and Haynie 2004). Durkheim maintained that the existence of religion was based on the social bonds that were made within society and that in order for religion to survive these bonds needed to remain important and renew themselves (Wallace and Bruce 1984). Religiosity has the ability to induce conformity and social cohesion. People are willing to put their individual needs aside for the greater good of society. Bainbridge and Stark (1981) recognize the importance of discussing religion as a social institution that promotes social cohesion and commitment. The authors conclude that individuals that were part of a religious environment decreased their likelihood of delinquent behavior because they had interpersonal bonds with group members (Bainbridge and Stark 1981). In addition, the concepts of integration and conformity are reflected in the early stages of control theory. Tittle and Welch (1983) find that participation in religious activities reinforces moral assurance and constrains involvement in delinquent behavior. Stated conversely, individuals that lack the control and attachment to conventional religious society are more likely to be deviant.

Similar to the concepts of human nature discussed by Durkheim (1984 [1893]), Reiss' (1951) theory of personal and social controls defines personal control as "the ability of the individual to refrain from meeting needs in ways which conflict with the norms and rules of the community" (Reiss 1951:196) and defines social control as "the ability of social groups or institutions to make norms or rules effective" (Reiss 1951:196). Both theorists emphasize the individual desire to achieve gratification and the ability of society or social groups to control individual needs. In addition, both perspectives discuss one of the central components of control theory, which is that there is no specific source

of motivation that leads to delinquency. Accordingly, motivation is natural and universal for all human beings; it is the process of social learning and socialization that regulates behavior. Specifically as it relates to delinquency, both theorists indicate that all individuals have the potential to deviate from the norms of society and become delinquent but society or primary groups have the ability to regulate such behavior. In an effort to develop an instrument that would predict juvenile delinquency, Reiss (1951) expands the ideas of social control by focusing on the social processes that occur prior to delinquent activity. The focus was not on explaining delinquency but rather the factors that need to occur prior to the delinquent activity. Specifically, Reiss (1951) maintains that

“Delinquency results when there is a relative absence of internalized norms and rules governing behavior in conformity with the norms of the social system to which legal penalties are attached, a breakdown in previously established controls, and/or a relative absence of or conflict in social rules or techniques for enforcing such behavior in the social groups or institutions of which the person is a member” (Reiss, 1951:196).

For example, parents that do not teach their child how to conform to the rules of society and do not adequately supervise their child create a risk factor for delinquency. As a consequence, the child becomes a teenager that associates with delinquent peers. The delinquent peer group is viewed as a “functional consequence” of the failure of proper parenting (Reiss, 1951:197).

Although Reiss’s theory did not specify the mechanisms that lead to conformity, he did identify how the failure of primary groups to provide reinforcement for non-delinquent roles and morals was crucial to the explanation of delinquency. Reiss (1951) maintained that the institutions that assist in the development of personal controls are primary groups such as family, neighborhood and school. Primary groups exercise

control over the non-delinquent child by providing non-delinquent social roles and by utilizing mechanisms that make conventional norms and rules effective (Reiss 1951). Consequently, the child learns how to be a conventional part of society and is shielded from learning delinquent behavior.

Recent studies have looked at how the presence of religion improves other primary groups and reduces potential delinquency (Mahoney et al. 2001; Willgerodt 2008; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Potvin and Sloane 1985; Skogan 1990; Jang and Johnson 2001; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001). The impact of religious involvement on family has consistently shown that religious association has a positive impact on family relations and reduces delinquency (Mahoney et al. 2001; Willgerodt 2008; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Potvin and Sloane 1985). Regnerus and Burdette (2006) found that as religious involvement increased, a positive relationship among family also increased. This relationship remained significant despite the influence of drug use and other delinquent activity. In addition, the authors found that delinquency is more likely when the quality of family relationships decline (Regnerus and Burdette 2006). Similarly, numerous studies have found that the community in which a child is raised influences their behavior (Skogan 1990; Wilson and Kelling 1982; Shaw and McKay 1942; Jang and Johnson 2001). Specifically, the presence of delinquent influences and the lack of social control contribute to neighborhood disorder and delinquent behavior among adolescents (Skogan 1990; Shaw and McKay 1942; Jang and Johnson 2001). Despite the influence of neighborhood disorder on delinquency, Jang and Johnson (2001) maintain that even if a neighborhood suffers from disorder, there are numerous layers of social

control such as the family and church that can protect adolescents from the effects of the neighborhood disorder.

Other studies have looked at how religion acts as a primary group and reduces the potential for juvenile delinquency directly (Sloane and Potvin 1985; Burkett and Ward 1993; Smith 2003; Desmond and Soper 2009; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Rodell and Benda 1999; Baier and Wright 2001). Individuals that believe in or are involved in religious practices will internalize conventional norms and values (Smith 2003; Desmond and Soper 2009; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004). Simon, Simons and Conger (2004) indicate that since religion is more likely to espouse specific prohibitions against behaviors, religious adolescents would be more likely to follow rules and less likely to engage in morally unacceptable behavior such as delinquency and drug use. Similarly, Burkett and Ward (1993) conclude that any aspect that provides individuals with a sense of belonging such as religion reduces the impact of legal sanctions. Religion also provides a network of support and reinforces positive behavior (Simon, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren 1987; Casey and Beadnell 2010; Elliott et. al. 1989). Sloane and Potvin (1985) found that communities in which the majority of adults and children were religious were less likely to be delinquent than communities that did not have a strong religious affiliation. In addition, individuals that experienced religion as children were more likely as adolescents and adults to continue to be involved in religious activity and were less likely to be involved in delinquency than adolescents that had not been raised in a religious household (Sloane and Potvin, 1985).

In addition to the classical theoretical formulations of the relationship between religion and delinquency, there have been a number of contemporary developments.

During the 1960's, social institutions such as organized religion and the family were challenged. Individuals viewed the existing social system as restricting their individual growth and advancement (Lilly, Cullen and Ball 2011). There was some indication that criminology was moving away from the ideas of differential association and strain theory and looking for new viewpoints to dominate criminological thought (Lilly, Cullen and Ball 2011). Criminologists were no longer focusing on what motivated individuals to commit crime but rather began to look once again at how society assisted in the development and socialization of individuals. In 1969 Travis Hirschi wrote the *Causes of Delinquency*, which focused on the loss of social control over individuals. Building on the central tenants of control theory illustrated by Reiss (1951) and Durkheim 1984[1893], Hirschi's social bond and delinquency theory (1969), maintained that control resides in a person's ties to conventional society or social bonds. Similar to the ideas of Durkheim 1984[1893] and Reiss (1951), Hirschi (1969) maintained that there are no specific sources of motivation that lead to deviating from conventional norms or delinquency. Human nature seeks easy and immediate gratification and if that can be gained by delinquent activity, than delinquency will occur. Since control theorists maintain that motivation to be deviant is inherent in human beings, it is a waste of resources to concentrate on reducing motivation because it will always be there. Instead, Durkheim 1984[1893], Reiss (1951) and Hirschi (1969) focused on the socialization of individuals. Although Durkheim 1984[1893] focused on socialization through society, Reiss (1951) focused on primary groups for socialization and Hirschi (1969) focused on the social bonds that induce conformity, all three emphasize the importance of proper socialization in order to constrain delinquent impulses.

To explain conformity, Hirschi (1969) stressed four control variables, each of which represented a major social bond to explain why people, who are all equally motivated to seek immediate gratification in the easiest way possible, refrain from doing so. The four main elements to Hirschi's theory are attachment, commitment, belief and involvement. By attachment, Hirschi (1969) refers to the extent to which a person is emotionally attached to others. Attachment also involves effective communication and interaction with conventional society. The main attachments are with parents, peers, teachers, religious leaders, and other members of a community. The greater the level of attachment, the less likely delinquency will occur. Attachment suggests a prosocial relationship in which children care what their parents and others think of them. Youth will behave in ways that conform to society because they have learned how to properly behave and they follow the example that is being set for them. In addition to the positive relationships, role models provide supervision for youth. Parents, teachers and community leaders know where a child is and what they are doing. Children do not want to disappoint their prosocial attachments because they now have a stake in conformity. Commitment refers to "the rational component in conformity" (Hirschi, 1969:20). Individuals that consider delinquency are at risk for losing positive investments made through conventional behavior. For example, a young adult in college that starts to use drugs risks losing the positive reputation that he has developed, the ability to earn a valuable education and the positive networks that have been formed. Hirschi (1969) maintains that through the acquisition of goods through conventional means, conformity can be induced and can reinforce one's commitment to social bonds (Hirschi 1969). Because they invest so much into a positive lifestyle, they do not want to risk their future

by doing something wrong. Involvement focuses on the conventional activities that a person participates in. According to Hirschi (1969), children that participate in conventional activities are denied access to criminal opportunities. Structured activities take away chances to offend and make delinquency less likely. The child that is doing homework and playing sports lacks the opportunity to commit delinquent acts (Hirschi 1969). In addition, children that are involved in structured activities lack access to delinquent peers. They are less likely to associate with delinquent peers because they are not part of their network of friends. Belief refers to the respect and acceptance of the value system within society (Hirschi 1969). Although individuals may not agree with every law, they refrain from breaking the law because they believe in and respect the system itself. Hirschi (1969) recognized that individuals vary in the depth and magnitude of their belief, and this variation is subject to the degree of attachment to systems representing the beliefs in question. For example, parents that teach their child to respect the police and seek positive interaction wherever possible convey a message of respect for law enforcement to the child. In contrast, parents that do not teach their child the importance of the police and limit the child's exposure to positive aspects of policing inhibit a high level of attachment and respect for police organizations. Establishing and maintaining the validity of law requires constant social reinforcement (Hirschi 1969). As adolescents develop they need to be continuously reminded to follow the rules of society and not to deviate and become involved in delinquent behavior. Children that conform obey the law because they respect it and see it as legitimate whereas delinquent children have no belief in the moral validity of society's standards. As a result, delinquency occurs in the absence of conventional beliefs that prohibit delinquency.

Research has consistently shown that positive attachment to family and peers, involvement and commitment to conventional activities and a belief in conventional society help to control delinquency (Hirschi 1969; Costello & Vowell 1999; Dukes & Stein, 2001; Jang and Johnson 2010; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Bahr et al., 1993; Chu, 2007; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Smith, 2003, Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993). Specifically as it pertains to religion, numerous studies have found that religion serves as a factor of social control that reduces delinquency (Chu, 2007; Johnson, Jang, Larson, Spencer and Li 2001); Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Benda and Corwyn 2001; Jang & Johnson, 2001).

An important aspect of adolescent bonds is their attachment to family, friends and other people within their community. Social control theory maintains that a higher level of attachment to the church and the people that associate with it, the lower the level of delinquency. Numerous studies have confirmed that juveniles are less likely to be involved in delinquency if they are attached to friends and family associated with the church (Chu, 2007; Johnson, Jang, Larson, Spencer and Li 2001; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Benda and Corwyn 2001). Adamczyk and Palmer (2008) claim that adolescents that are friends with youth that adhere to religious rules regarding drug use will be less likely to use marijuana because they are concerned about what their friends think of them. Adolescents that violate the religious norms and use marijuana risk losing those relationships. Similarly, Desmond and Soper (2009) found that even when religion is not associated with strong moral beliefs it will protect

adolescents from delinquent peers and provide youth with a network of religious peers and adults who watch over their behavior, which, in turn, reduces delinquency.

In addition to the attachment to individuals, commitment and involvement in religious activities leaves less time for engaging in delinquent activity and provides a network of support that protects juveniles from individuals associated with delinquent activity (Chu, 2007; Johnson, Jang, Larson, Spencer and Li 2001; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Desmond and Soper 2009). Simons, Simons and Conger (2004) found that involvement in a positive social network such as a religious institution decreased the risk of an adolescent engaging in delinquent behavior because they lacked exposure to delinquent activity. In addition, a commitment to a religious organization provides a sense of belonging and a dedication to legitimate goals (Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren, 1987). Religion gives children the opportunity to learn skills such as discipline and respect that help them succeed in school (McKune and Hoffmann 2009; Jeynes 2003).

In terms of belief, religion promotes living a life of moral virtue that includes honesty, respect for others and respect for the law (Ludwig 1989). According to Smith (2003), religion supports and supplies moral direction and promotes self-control. As youths internalize these directives they begin to make choices in their lives that are based on their moral framework (Smith, 2003). The belief system of most religions seeks to provide participants with a positive non-delinquent moral framework. Behavior that violates the moral order leads to discontent and estrangement from God (Simons, Simons and Conger 2004). In addition, religiosity increases the likelihood that an adolescent will

accept conventional beliefs (Jang and Johnson 2010; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993). Living a life of moral virtue, respecting others and accepting conventional beliefs reduces the likelihood of delinquent behavior (Jang and Johnson 2010; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Desmond and Soper 2009). Simons, Simons and Conger (2004) indicate that children that believed in religion were more likely than their non-religious counterparts to indicate that such activities as drinking alcohol, having sex and shoplifting were morally wrong. Similarly, Burkett and Ward (1993) concluded that the reason youth refrain from delinquency is because they believe the behavior is wrong, not because of the threat of legal sanctions.

Control theories have been instrumental in explaining how religion affects delinquency. Studies on the causes of crime routinely look at how elements of control such as attachment to society and involvement in conventional activities decrease the risk of criminal involvement (Jang and Johnson 2010; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Costello & Vowell 1999; Dukes & Stein, 2001; Jang and Johnson 2010; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Bahr et al., 1993; Chu, 2007; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Smith, 2003). Some studies that have focused on religion as a component of social control that increases positive attachment to conventional society and promotes prosocial involvement and commitment to society have shown that religion reduces delinquent activity (Jang and Johnson 2010; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Costello & Vowell 1999; Dukes & Stein, 2001; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Jang and

Johnson 2010; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Bahr et al., 1993; Chu, 2007; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Smith, 2003). In order to assess the mechanisms by which religiosity influences drug use, Bahr and Hoffmann (2008) use social control to illustrate the causal model. Specifically, “the explanatory variables are bonding to a faith community and its members, involvement in a network of support, and commitment to a religious organization. This bonding, involvement, and commitment tend to constrain tendencies to use drugs” (Bahr and Hoffmann 2008:763).

Studies also indicate that religiosity can reduce involvement in delinquency through the development of strong moral beliefs (Smith 2003; Desmond and Soper 2009; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004). According to Smith (2003) religion supports and supplies moral direction and promotes self-control. As youths internalize these directives they begin to make choices in their lives that are based on their moral framework (Smith, 2003). Desmond and Soper (2009) reveal that religiosity significantly reduces marijuana use when adolescents believe the behaviors are wrong. Similarly, using data from the Iowa Youth and Families Project, Simons, Simons and Conger (2004) indicate that children that believe in religion are more likely than their non-religious counterparts to indicate that such activities as drinking alcohol, having sex and shoplifting were morally wrong.

For studies that have identified an inverse relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency, the nature of the relationship remains unclear (Baier and Wright 2001; Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009; Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Smith 2003; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Benda and Corwyn, 2001; Rodell and

Benda 1999). Specifically, the data is inconsistent on whether religiosity directly affects delinquency (Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Desmond and Soper 2009; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Jang & Johnson 2001; Chadwick and Top 1993; Chu 2007; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008) or whether the relationship is indirect (Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Stylianou, 2004; Burkett and Warren 1987; Cochran et al. 1994; Ellis 1987; Ellis and Thompson 1989; Cochran et al. 1994).

### *Direct*

Some studies have found that religion decreases juvenile delinquency even after controlling for factors including peer and family relationships, moral beliefs, sociodemographic status and neighborhood disorder (Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001; Desmond and Soper 2009; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Albrecht, Chadwick and Alcorn 1977; Jang & Johnson 2001; Chadwick and Top 1993; Chu 2007; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Francis 1996). In an evaluation of the effect of religion on the relationship between religion and delinquency, Benda, Corwyn and Flynn (2001) indicate that variables such as peer influence only enhance the relationship between religion and crime but without it, the relationship still remains significant. Similarly, in an evaluation of moral beliefs and religiosity, Desmond and Soper (2009) found that although the strength of moral beliefs affects the level of delinquency, religion is still instrumental in reducing delinquency even when it is not accompanied by a belief that the behavior is wrong (Desmond and Soper 2009). Specifically, even when religious adolescents do not believe that smoking marijuana is wrong they are still less likely to use it than adolescents that are not religious (Desmond and Soper 2009).

In an evaluation of the relationship between religiosity and neighborhood

disorder, Jang & Johnson (2001) hypothesize that individuals living in disorganized areas are less likely to be religious because religion promotes and maintains order in institutions, including the church (Jang & Johnson 2001). The authors hypothesize that neighborhood disorder decrease the attachment to social institutions including the family, and allows access to illegitimate opportunities (Jang & Johnson 2001). However, their results indicate that religiosity protects adolescent from illicit drug use despite neighborhood disorder (Jang & Johnson 2001). Similarly, Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li (2001) found that the effects of religion on delinquency remain significant even after controlling for delinquent associations, beliefs, and sociodemographic variables. The authors conclude that the effects of religiosity on delinquency cannot be completely explained by social control and social learning variables, which indicates that the relationship is neither indirect nor spurious (Johnson, Jang, Larson and Li 2001).

#### *Indirect*

Although there is evidence to suggest a direct relationship, other researchers have concluded that religiosity has an indirect effect on delinquent behavior (Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren 1987; Smith 2003; Burkett and Ward 1993; Hadaway, Elifson, and Petersen 1984; Stylianou 2004; Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway 1983; Benda 1995). Simons and Conger (2004) found that through the influence of moral commitments and peer relations, religion decreases delinquent behavior. Religion promotes moral commitment, which acts as an agent of social control to reduce delinquent behavior. Similarly, Burkett and Ward (1993) and Evans (1995) found that the threat of legal sanctions is irrelevant and that the reason that adolescents refrain from delinquent behavior is because they believe it is morally wrong and a

violation of their religious beliefs. Therefore the authors conclude that moral beliefs mediate the relationship between religion and delinquency.

Other studies have looked at how peers mediate the relationship between religion and delinquency. Simons, Simons and Conger (2004) and Burkett and Warren (1987) found that religion reduces criminal involvement through peer networks. The authors maintain that adolescents establish their friendship networks by associating with adolescents that share similar beliefs and values. Similarly, Burkett and Warren (1987) indicate that religion is one of the criteria that adolescents use to select their friends.

#### *Minimal or No Relationship*

Although some studies have identified a relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency, there are also a number of studies that have found that religion has minimal or no impact on reducing delinquency (Hirschi and Stark 1969; Ellis and Thompson 1989; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Cochran, Wood and Arneklev 1994; Desmond, Soper, Purpura and Smith 2009 Ellis 1987; Burkett & White, 1974; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Marcos et al 1986; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Marcos and Bahr 1988). Hirschi and Stark (1969) found that adolescents that attended church and believed in religion were just as likely to be involved in delinquency as those that were not involved in religion. While the authors concluded that individuals that went to church had different feelings about religious issues than those that did not attend church, they concluded that their outlooks had no relationship to delinquency (Hirschi and Stark 1969). Bahr, Hawks and Wang (1993) found that religious importance is not associated with peer drug use after controlling for parental monitoring and family drug use. Similarly, Cochran, Wood and Arneklev (1994) concluded that when social control and arousal variables are

combined with religious effects, religiosity is no longer significantly associated with delinquency. Specifically, the authors conclude that the direct influence of religion on assault, vandalism, illicit drug use, and truancy becomes insignificant when other factors of control are included in the analysis.

Various studies have also found that when advanced statistical procedures are incorporated into the analysis, the relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency becomes insignificant (Longest and Vaisey 2008; Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway 1983; Burkett and Warren 1987). In an evaluation of the relationship between religion and initiation into marijuana use, Longest and Vaisey (2008) found that traditional measures of social control such as parental monitoring that correlated with lower probabilities of initiation became nonsignificant in the multivariate models. Similarly, Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway (1983) and Burkett and Warren (1987) find that the bivariate relationship between delinquency and religion becomes non significant after controlling for family and peer relationships in multivariate analysis (Benda 1995; Bahr, Hawks, & Wang, 1993).

### *Measuring religion*

In order to measure religion, studies have relied on measures of religious participation (Higgins and Albrecht 1977; Albrecht, Chadwick and Alcorn 1977; Benda & Corwyn, 1997; Wallace et al., 2007; Bahr, 1998; Bahr et al., 1993; Chu, 2007; Cochran, 1993; Jang & Johnson, 2001), beliefs (Hadaway, Elifson and Petersen 1984; Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006; Bahr, Hawks, & Wang 1993; Brownfield and Sorenson 1991; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Chu, 2007; Jang & Johnson, 2001) and affiliation (Hadaway, Elifson and Petersen 1984; Brown, Parks, Zimmerman, & Phillips, 2001; Ford

& Kadushin, 2002; Brownfield and Sorenson 1991).

Some studies indicate that adolescents who attend religious services regularly are less likely to be delinquent than those who do not (Higgins and Albrecht 1977; Albrecht, Chadwick and Alcorn 1977; Benda & Corwyn, 1997; Wallace et al., 2007; Bahr, Hawks, & Wang, 1993; Chu, 2007; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Benda & Corwyn, 1997; Tittle and Welch, 1983; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Brownfield and Sorenson 1991). Using self-report data from over 1300 high school students, Higgins and Albrecht (1977) found a moderate negative relationship between church attendance and delinquent behavior. Specifically, the authors conclude that church attendance reduces adolescent involvement in violent, status and property offenses and alcohol and drug use. The authors also found that church attendance was positively correlated with respect for the `juvenile court system, which in turn was negatively associated with delinquency. While using multiple measures of religious attitudes and participation, Albrecht, Chadwick and Alcorn (1977) found that church participation was a moderately strong predictor of delinquent behavior. Although the authors included a number of measures to calculate religiosity, the authors found that church participation was the strongest predictor in reducing delinquent behavior, especially victimless deviance. Other studies have found that when compared to other measures of religiosity, church attendance has a greater influence on delinquency than measures of religious attitudes and beliefs (Evans et. al, 1995; Tittle and Welch, 1983; Jang & Johnson, 2001).

Other studies indicate that using a single measure of religion such as church attendance only explains one element of religious behavior and does not adequately assess the complexity of religiosity (see reviews, Burkett, 1993; Evans et al., 1995; Tittle

& Welch, 1983; Welch, Tittle, & Petee, 1991; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Burkett, 1993; Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006). According to Benda, Corwyn and Flynn (2001) and Benda, Pope and Kelleher (2006) church attendance only includes the opportunity to hear religious teachings and is not a measure of importance. Benda, Corwyn and Flynn (2001) also indicate that church attendance is only measuring physical attendance and attendance is not a measure of significance, interest or motivation in religion (Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Burkett, 1993; Evans et al., 1995). Using bivariate correlations, Benda, Pope and Kelleher (2006) indicate that religiousness, which included the importance of religion and belief in God, has stronger inverse relationships to delinquency than church attendance. Also, church attendance among adolescents is often the result of parental expectation and control (Tittle & Welch, 1983; Welch, Petee, & Tittle, 1991; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006). Most children are exposed to religious practices through their parents and often early religious involvement is an extension of parental influence (Harms, 1944; Sloane and Potvin 1985). Benda, Pope and Kelleher (2006) maintain that church attendance is not an adequate measure of religiosity because adolescents attend church because of parental influence and social opportunities not because of their beliefs and commitment.

Other researchers maintain that religious importance and beliefs are a direct measure of religiosity that regulates church attendance and behavior (Benda, Pope and Kelleher 2006; Bahr, Hawks, & Wang 1993; Regnerus and Burdette 2006). Regnerus and Burdette (2006) report that adolescents who indicate that religion is important to them had a better relationship with their families. In contrast, when the authors used church attendance as the measure of religiosity, church attendance did not predict improved

family relations (Regnerus and Burdette 2006). The authors concluded that religious importance is more instrumental in increasing the quality of family relationships than church attendance.

Other research has looked at the importance of religious affiliation (Regnerus 2007; Bielo 2004; Adamczyk and Palmer 2008; Brownfield and Sorenson 1991; Amey, Albrech, & Miller, 1996; Foshee & Hollinger, 1996). In a sample of over 800 adolescents, Brownfield and Sorenson (1991) found individuals with religious affiliation were less likely to use marijuana and cocaine than those who reported no religious affiliation. Similarly, in an evaluation of individual and friends' religiosity or born-again identity on marijuana initiation, Adamczyk and Palmer (2008) found that individual and friends' born-again identity will have a stronger relationship with marijuana initiation than individual and friends' level of religiosity.

Additional studies have indicated that while religious affiliation is useful it is also only one aspect of religiosity (Regnerus 2007; Adamczyk and Palmer 2008; Longest and Vaisey, 2008; Regnerus and Burdette 2006). Adamczyk and Palmer (2008) indicate that religious affiliation is less important than religious importance and attendance for explaining the relationship between religion and sex. Longest and Vaisey (2008) found that religious affiliation is mediated by the inclusion of the indicators of religiosity, and is no longer significantly related to marijuana initiation in the model. Similarly, in an examination of maternal religiosity, Pearce and Axinn (1998) found that religious importance in the mother's life was associated with higher levels of bonding between the mother and child than was church attendance or affiliation.

Although most studies include only a few measures of religiosity, researchers

maintain that multiple measures are more useful in assessing the construct validity of religiosity (Johnson, Jang, Larson, Spencer and Li 2001; Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li, 2001; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001). Benda, Corwyn and Flynn (2001) indicate that in order to fully measure religiosity factors such as the influence of parents on adolescent church attendance, social motivations for attendance, and the importance of religion all must be considered. In a review of the literature on religion and delinquency, Johnson, Jang, Larson, Spencer and Li (2001) found that studies that included four or more measures of religion provided a more complete picture of the dimensions of religiosity.

#### *Measures of Delinquency*

Research indicates that the effects of religion on delinquency depends on the type of delinquent activity being assessed (Bahr, 1998; Chu, 2007; Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen, 1984; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Albrecht et al., 1977; Benda 1994; Burkett, 1993; Cochran et al. 1994; Cochran & Akers, 1989; Stark & Bainbridge, 1997; Bahr, 1998; Cochran, 1993; Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen, 1984; Albrecht et al., 1977; Benda 1994; Burkett, 1993; Cochran et al. 1994; Cochran & Akers, 1989). Specifically, the research is not consistent regarding the types of offenses that are reduced by the presence of religion. Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen (1984) indicate that how delinquency is operationalized is very important in assessing the relationship between religion and delinquency among youth. Benda, Pope and Kelleher (2006) found no significant differences between the effects of religiousness on underage alcohol consumption, use of other drugs, and delinquency whereas Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith (2009) found that youth are less likely to drink alcohol and use marijuana than their religious counterparts. Although the authors identified a significant relationship between religion and alcohol and drug

use, the relationship was not significant for property offenses or hitting.

A substantial number of studies have evaluated the influence of religion on substance use. Specifically, many studies have found that adolescents that are religious are less likely to use illegal substances (Regnerus and Elder 2003; Bahr, Maughan, Marcos and Li 1998; Chu, 2007; Cochran, Wood and Arneklev 1994; Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen, 1984; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Bahr, Maughan, Marcos and Li 1998; Wallace et al. 2007). Using a variety of drug and religiosity measures, Hadaway, Elifson, & Petersen (1984) indicate that higher levels of religious involvement and activity decreases the level of illegal drug use. Similarly, using data collected from over 13,000 students in grades 7-12, Bahr, Maughan, Marcos and Li (1998) found that students that were religious were less likely to use alcohol, marijuana and amphetamines and depressants and were less likely to have friends that used drugs. Although most studies have looked at the impact of religion on delinquency on youth that are at a high risk for delinquency, Regnerus and Elder (2003) found that religion is effective in reducing alcohol and drug use for low-risk youth and can steer youth away from potential delinquency. Wallace et al. (2007) also found that the higher adolescents' level of religiosity, the less likely they are to be current tobacco users, to engage in binge drinking, or to have used marijuana in the past year. The authors also found that as religiosity within the school increased, the rate of cigarette use, drinking alcohol, and marijuana use decreased (Wallace et al. 2007). Similarly, although Cochran, Wood and Arneklev (1994) conclude that religiosity is reduced to insignificance for a variety of delinquent behaviors once control indicators are included in the model, the authors found that tobacco and alcohol remained significant.

In contrast, a number of studies have found that either drug use is not reduced by

the presence of religion or only certain types of drug use are reduced (Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Benda 1994; Cochran, Wood and Arneklev 1994; Burkett and White 1974). Bahr and Hoffmann (2008) found that individual religiosity reduced the level of cigarettes, heavy drinking, and marijuana use but not the use of other illicit drugs. Similarly, Burkett and White (1974) found that religion reduced the level of alcohol use but had no effect on other forms of delinquency. Cochran, Wood and Arneklev (1994) conclude that when elements of social control such as family cohesion and parent monitoring are controlled for, the relationship between religion and delinquency becomes insignificant for illegal drug use.

Other studies have found that adolescents that consider religion to be important are less likely to have sexual intercourse before marriage (Meier 2003; Rostosky et al. 2004; Regnerus 2007; Adamczyk 2009; Adamczyk and Felson 2006). Researchers have noted that premarital sex is a high-risk behavior for adolescents that leads to other forms of delinquency. Religious institutions typically teach adolescents to refrain from sexual behavior. Adamczyk (2009) found that adolescents that are involved in religious activities are more likely to accept religious prohibitions against premarital sex and agree to the teachings of the religious institution (Adamczyk 2009). Also, in an analysis of how peers influence teen's sexual behaviors Adamczyk (2009) found that adolescents that delayed having sexual relations were more likely to be religious and to have religious friends.

A number of studies indicate that behaviors which disobey ascetic principles such as alcohol use and status offenses are more likely to be affected by religiosity than more serious forms of delinquency such as crime (Burkett 1993; Albrecht et al., 1977; Benda

1994; Burkett, 1993; Cochran, Wood and Arneklev 1994; Cochran & Akers, 1989; Stark & Bainbridge, 1997; Benda, 1997; Burkett, 1993; Rodell and Benda 1999). Other studies argue that the significance of religiosity depends on the seriousness of the offense (Benda, 1997; Burkett, 1993; Rodell and Benda 1999). In a study of 528 adolescents from ten Protestant churches, Rodell and Benda (1999) find that religiosity is more important in predicting alcohol use than to crime. Still other studies maintain that religion has a stronger relationship to victimless delinquent activities than to crimes against people or property (Burkett and White 1974; Albrecht et al. 1977; Elifson et al. 1983).

Although the current research on religion and delinquency has been largely inconsistent and suffer from a number of limitations, there are a handful of well designed studies that best test the effect of religion on delinquency.

Using the Add-Health Wave 1 data Bahr and Hoffman (2008) examined the relationship between religiosity, peer drug use, and adolescent drug use among 4,983 Utah adolescents and the 13,534 respondents from Add Health. The authors found that adolescents who were religious were less likely to smoke, drink heavily, and use marijuana than adolescents who were not religious. Although the research found that marijuana was associated with marijuana use, religion was not associated with other drug types. The authors also found that adolescents in highly religious schools were less likely to smoke than adolescents in low religious schools. Individual religiosity was not affected by a high school level religiosity, indicating that individual religiosity was more important than contextual level school religiosity. The use of these two data sources included suitable measures of parent-adolescent bonds and multilevel models used to estimate the extent to which school-level religiosity is associated with adolescent drug

use. In their research, Bahr and Hoffman (2008) confirmed that individual religious variables are more important in studying the relationship between religion and delinquency as supported by other studies that have consistently shown the same conclusions (Regnerus 2003). Although the researchers used advanced statistical procedures and provided a strong theoretical argument, the research failed to look at how other types of delinquency are influenced by religiosity.

Also using Add-Health data, Haynie (2002) provided a rigorous evaluation of peer delinquency based on networks of adolescent friendships. Applying differential association's assertion that if the number of favorable definitions outweighs those that are unfavorable, there is less delinquency (Sutherland, 1947), they found that the proportion of delinquent friends in a respondent's network is most strongly associated with respondents' subsequent delinquency. The author found that most adolescents' friendship networks included both delinquent and non-delinquent friends. Although this study provides important information of the makeup of peer networks, future research would benefit from exploring potential influences on adolescent friendship networks such as religion.

Nonnemaker, McNeely & Blum, 2003 (2003) looked at the public and private domains of religiosity. In addition to measuring religiosity in terms of attendance, beliefs and affiliation, the researchers described two types of religiosity, public and private. The public religiosity variable included how often youth attend religious services and how often youth participate in religious group activities (Nonnemaker, McNeely & Blum, 2003). The private variable included regularity of prayer and the importance of religion. Although both public and private religiosity were associated with fewer negative health

behaviors such as ever having sexual intercourse and substance use, private religiosity was more protective against initial substance use, while public religiosity had a stronger association with frequent use (Nonnemaker, McNeely and Blum, 2003). Although the researchers successfully modeled the effect of religiosity on the probability that an adolescent is an experimental or occasional substance user compared to being a non-user, the study failed to include a theoretical framework. In addition, there are numerous studies that indicate that religious variables should not be grouped because they are measuring different aspects of religious involvement (Johnson, Jang, Larson, Spencer and Li 2001; Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li, 2001; Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001).

In a study that looked at the relationship between religion and delinquency as both an individual and group characteristic, Regnerus (2003) found that at the individual level, adolescents that attended weekly religious services were less delinquent than adolescents that did not attend weekly services. In addition, at the contextual level delinquency was lower in schools with an increased proportion of conservative Protestants. The study maintained that individual religious variables had a greater influence on delinquency than the contextual variables. Although this study identified both individual and contextual variables, it failed to scrutinize the individual religious variables by only including “attending religious services” and “born again Christian” as the independent religious variables. The current research also did not look at the influence friends and parents potentially have on religious and delinquent variations.

#### *Religion, Peer Association and Delinquency*

Numerous studies indicate that one of the most important predictors of delinquency is the association with delinquent peers (Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993;

Elliott, Huizinga and Ageton 1985; Brunelle, Cousineau, Brochu 2005; White, Tice, Loeber, & Stouthamer-Loeber 2002; Ayers, Williams, Hawkins, Peterson, Catalano, Abbott 1999; Choo, Roh, Robinson, 2008; Wright, Entner, Caspi, Moffitt, & Silva, 2001; Haynie 2002; Maxwell 2002; Adamczyk and Felson 2006; Maxwell 2001; Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990; Reed and Wilcox 1997; Elliott et al. 1989; Warr 1993; Reid and Dishion 1992; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Huizinga et al. 1995). Huizinga et al. (1995) indicate that when adolescents associate with friends that use drugs, they are more likely to use drugs themselves. Similarly, Bahr and Hoffman (2010) concluded that when adolescents had close friends who used alcohol, they were significantly more likely to have used alcohol than adolescents whose friends did not drink, and they were more likely to have participated in heavy drinking. Studies also indicate that the friends that youth associate with directly affect their opportunities for delinquent activity. In an examination of the proximal effects of alcohol and drug use on adolescent illegal activity, White, Tice, Loeber, & Stouthamer-Loeber (2002) maintained that those who reported committing illegal acts under the influence reported committing offenses with other people and being arrested more often than those who did not.

Studies have also evaluated the relationship between peers and initiation of delinquent behavior (Adamczyk and Palmer 2008). Adamczyk and Palmer (2008) found that adolescents who have friends that have tried marijuana are more likely to start using themselves. Specifically, the authors concluded that a one-unit increase in the proportion of friends who use marijuana is associated with more than double the odds of initiating marijuana use.

In addition to enhancing delinquent activity, studies indicate that when

adolescents associate with non delinquent friends, they are less likely to be involved in delinquent activity (Elliott et al. 1989; Warr 1993; Reid and Dishion 1992; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Elliott, Huizinga and Menard 1989; Bahr, Maughan, Marcos, and Li 1998; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Burkett and Warren 1987; Simons et al. 2004; Maxwell 2001). During adolescence children begin to develop their own identities and the role of peers becomes important in shaping their identity. Adolescents spend less time with their parents and more time with their peers. Research on the development of adolescent friendships has shown that youth associate with friends that share similar beliefs and interests (Elliott et al. 1989; Warr 1993; Reid and Dishion 1992; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Elliott, Huizinga and Menard 1989). Similarly, researchers have indicated that youth who are committed to conventional values are more likely to associate with non-delinquent peers (Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Elliott, Huizinga and Menard 1989). Simons, Simons and Conger (2004) found that committing to conventional beliefs and affiliating with conventional peers reduces delinquent behavior.

Certain studies have maintained that peers mediate the relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency (Bahr, Maughan, Marcos, and Li 1998; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Burkett and Warren 1987; Simons et al. 2004). Specifically, studies have found that religious institutions provide a platform for adolescents to share and promote their beliefs (Burkett and Warren 1987; Simons, Simons and Conger, 2004; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008). Simons et al. (2004) indicate that adolescents that are religious believe that delinquent behavior is morally wrong and are more likely to associate with friends that have similar moral beliefs. Burkett and Warren (1987) found that religion has an indirect effect on smoking tobacco and marijuana and alcohol use through the

selection of peers. When the interaction terms were added to the model, the relationship between religiosity and peers was significant. The authors concluded that when religiosity was high, cigarette, alcohol and marijuana use was low among peers and adolescent's substance use was also low. The authors conclude that youth use religion as a criteria for selecting friends and religion protects adolescents from the effects of peer use on marijuana, drinking and cigarette use (Burkett and Warren 1987).

In addition, religious institutions provide an environment in which adolescents are shielded from delinquent activities because they are involved in conventional activities, which typically includes adult supervision. Through interaction with their friends, adolescents learn about their friends' beliefs regarding a variety of behaviors including premarital sex, delinquency and religion (Stark 1996; Lefkowitz, et al. 2004; Adamczyk 2009). Adamczyk (2009) found that teens that are having sex associate with fewer religious friends than children that are not having sex. The author also concluded that teens with more religious friends are less likely to transition to sexual intercourse than adolescents in more secular friendship groups (Adamczyk 2009:6).

Other researchers have indicated that peer influence does not mediate the relationship between religion and juvenile delinquency (Benda, Corwyn and Flynn 2001; Benda, 1997, 1999). Benda, Corwyn and Flynn (2001) maintain that by including intercorrelated factors in the structural equation model the suppressed variance in religion is removed which reveals that peer associations did not mediate the relationship between religion and delinquency.

#### *Religion, Family and Delinquency*

Prior research has consistently shown that positive family relationships decrease

the risk of adolescent delinquency while weak attachments increase the likelihood of delinquency (Kafka and London 1991; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Rhodes and Reiss 1970; Hundleby and Mercer 1987; Sampson and Laub 1993; Conger and Simons 1997; Ellison and Sherkat 1993; Curtis and Ellison 2002; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Tittle and Welch 1983; Cornwall 1987). Since a number of studies have maintained that religion promotes a positive message about the role of family and promotes family cohesion and children's respect for authority (Ellison and Sherkat 1993; Curtis and Ellison 2002; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Tittle and Welch 1983; Cornwall (1987), it is important to investigate how family religiosity influences delinquency. Numerous studies have evaluated how religion influences the family (Burkett 1993; Ellison and Sherkat 1993; Curtis and Ellison 2002; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Tittle and Welch 1983; Cornwall 1987). Parents play an important role in establishing their children's beliefs and religious commitment (Burkett 1993; Ellison and Sherkat 1993; Curtis and Ellison 2002; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Tittle and Welch 1983; Cornwall 1987).

According to Regnerus and Burdette (2006), participation in religious activities increases the time that parents and children spend together in an environment that supports the positive role of the family, encourage commitment to the family dynamics, support respecting parents, provides moral directives to resolve conflict and promotes boundaries between parents and children. Regnerus and Burdette (2006) concluded that when religiosity increases, the relationship between parents and children improves. Similarly, in a study of religious dynamics between parents and children, Rossi and Rossi (1990)

indicate that when parents and children report similar values, including religious values, they report having a closer relationship to each other. In concurrence, Pearce and Axinn (1998) find that when mothers and children agreed on the importance of religion, they reported higher quality relationships than mothers and children that differed on the importance of religion in their lives.

Studies have also concluded that family mediates the relationship between religion and delinquency (Rhodes and Reiss 1970; Hundleby and Mercer 1987; Litchfield, Thomas, & Li, 1997; Burkett 1993; Bahr and Hoffmann, 2008; Baier and Wright, 2001; Wallace et al., 2007; Bahr and Hoffman 2010; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Pearce and Haynie 2004; Burkett 1993; Potvin and Sloane 1985; Bar, Maughan, Marcos and Li 1998). Using data from over 20,000 high school students, Rhodes and Reiss (1970) concluded that parental participation in religious activities reduced their children's participation in delinquent activity. Similarly, in an analysis of the role of family in adolescent drug use, Hundleby and Mercer (1987) found that although peer relationships were an important predictor of adolescent drug abuse, family dynamics lowered the risk of adolescent drug use. The data suggest that the combination of parenting style and religiosity might help counter the influence of peers toward heavy alcohol use (Bahr and Hoffmann, 2008; Baier and Wright, 2001; Wallace et al., 2007; Bahr and Hoffman 2010). Using two longitudinal data sets, Litchfield (1997) looked at religiosity as an intervening variable between parenting and alcohol and marijuana use among adolescence. The authors found that as religion increased, the level of bonding between parents and their children increased, while drug use decreased.

Studies indicate that parents have an important role in shaping the religiosity of

their children (Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Pearce and Haynie 2004; Burkett 1993; Potvin and Sloane 1985; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Simons, Simons and Conger, 2004; Beaman, Whitbeck and Simons 1992; Wilcox 1998). Religious parents encourage children to be involved and committed to religion, thereby reducing the level of delinquency. Pearce and Haynie (2004) found that delinquency is less likely when both the mother and child have a high level of religiosity. The authors found that if either the mother or child has a low level of religiosity, delinquency increases (Pearce and Haynie 2004). Other studies have looked at whether religious parents have a better quality of parenting that reduces adolescent delinquency (Pearce and Haynie 2004; Burkett 1993; Potvin and Sloane 1985; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Simons, Simons and Conger, 2004; Beaman, Whitbeck and Simons 1992; Wilcox 1998; Brody, Stoneman, and Flor 1996). Religion promotes commitment to family, love and respect for family and personal responsibility, which are all aspects that increase the quality of family (Wilcox 2002). Wilcox (1998) found that parents that are religious are more likely to have parenting styles that are supportive than parents that are not religious. Parents that supervise their children, provide a supportive environment and discipline their children consistently reduce the level of delinquency among children (Sampson and Laub 1993; Conger and Simons 1997). Although Simons, Simons and Conger (2004) did not find a direct correlation between parents' religiosity and delinquent behavior, the authors did find that religion impacts the quality of parenting in turn reduces adolescent delinquency. Specifically, parents that are religious reduce antisocial behavior among adolescents by promoting religious commitment among their children. In addition, religious commitment among parents promotes positive beliefs and pro-social peer associations (Simons,

Simons and Conger 2004).

#### D. Previous Research

Despite the abundance of literature on the relationship between religion and delinquency, there are a number of limitations of the research. First, there is a significant disconnect between the theoretical framework and the research that has been conducted on the relationship between religion and delinquency. Although most researchers agree that the most comprehensive studies specify a relationship grounded in theory, many studies lack a theoretical framework (Bahr and Hoffman 2008; Cretacci 2003; Regnerus 2003). For example, although Nonnemaker et al. (2003) provide a detailed analysis of the effect of various types of religiosity and delinquency, the authors fail to ground their hypothesis within a theoretical framework that explains the causal inference. According to control theory religion should operate as an agent of control that serves to diminish the possibility of delinquency. We expect that individuals that believe in or are involved in religious practices would have less exposure to delinquent behaviors and attitudes. In addition, since religion provides youth with a commitment to a positive social institution, attachment to its members and provides opportunities for involvement in conventional activities, religion should reduce delinquent activity. Furthermore, involvement in a religious institution ought to increase the likelihood that youth will participate in non-delinquent activities. Despite these theoretical assumptions, researchers have had a difficult time identifying a plausible mechanism to explain the association between religion and delinquency. The mechanisms for the current analysis are bonding to members of a faith-based community, involvement in a support network, and commitment and belief in a religious organization.

Second, the literature has had numerous methodological limitations. Specifically, researchers have argued that previous studies have varied in their estimation due to varying conceptual definitions (Baier and Wright 2001; Benda and Corwyn 1997). Benda and Corwyn 1997; Burkett and Warren 1987) indicated that the significance between religion and delinquency was largely dependent on how delinquency is measured and the types of delinquency that were assessed. Also, many studies only use a single measure of religiosity, church attendance (Benda and Corwyn 1997; Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough 2000). In a review of over 300 studies assessing the relationship between religion and delinquency, Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough (2000) found that more than half of the studies assessed used only one or two measures of religiosity. Johnson, Byron, Li, Larson and McCullough (2000) also found that studies that demonstrated reliable measures of religious commitment were more likely to find a relationship between religiosity and juvenile delinquency than those studies that did not assess the reliability of their measures. include multiple measures of religion (Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li 2001; Longest and Vaisey 2008; Regnerus 2003; Cretacci 2003; Wallace et al. 2007; Burkett and Warren 1987; Nonnemaker, McNeely and Blum 2003) and advanced statistical procedures (Longest and Vaisey 2008; Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway 1983; Regnerus 2003; Nonnemaker, McNeely and Blum 2003; Burkett and Warren 1987; Wallace et. al 2007). Using multiple measures of both religion and delinquency will provide a clearer picture as to the types of religiosity that influence delinquency and the types of delinquency that are influenced by religion.

Other studies maintain that the relationship is dependent on the methodological approach used (Benda and Corwyn 1997; Burkett and Warren 1987; Johnson, Jang,

Larson, & De Li 2001). Although the majority of studies assessed by Baier and Wright (2001) used in school samples, the statistical technique that was typically used to analyze the data was ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, which does not take into account the contextual influence of the environment. Typical studies include the bivariate association, the measures (church attendance and some measure of deviant involvement) and the failure to control for the effects of peer influences (Burkett and Warren 1987). For some studies when advanced statistical procedures such as hierarchical regression models are used, church attendance became irrelevant for certain offenses (Benda and Corwyn 1997). Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li (2001) maintain that few researchers have looked at religion as a latent variable that can be measured by multiple indicators, which is appropriate for a multidimensional concept such as religion. Sloan and Potvin (1986) indicate that when studies evaluate the relationship between religion and delinquency using statistical methods such as chi-square, the findings tend to be weak for some forms of delinquency and highly significant for others, whereas when more sensitive advanced statistical measures such as odds ratios are used, religion is significant for all forms of delinquency. Research which uses advanced statistical procedures while assessing the interaction effects of two strong predictors of delinquency, peer and family relations will provide a more accurate assessment of the relationship between religion and delinquency.

#### E. Summary

Although researchers have a difficult time defining and characterizing religion, throughout history religion has influenced individual behavior. Control theories have been instrumental in explaining how religion affects delinquency. Studies on the causes

of crime routinely look at how elements of control decrease the risk of criminal involvement (Jang and Johnson 2010; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Costello & Vowell 1999; Dukes & Stein, 2001; Jang and Johnson 2010; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Bahr et al., 1993; Chu, 2007; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Smith, 2003). Studies that have focused on religion as a component of social control have been instrumental in explaining and testing the relationship between religion and delinquency (Jang and Johnson 2010; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Bahr, Hawks and Wang 1993; Costello & Vowell 1999; Dukes & Stein, 2001; Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Jang and Johnson 2010; Adamczyk and Palmer, 2008; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Simons, Simons and Conger 2004; Bahr et al., 1993; Chu, 2007; Jang & Johnson, 2001; Smith, 2003). Although the literature has looked at the relationship from both a contextual and individual standpoint, research has consistently shown that individual religious influences are more strongly associated with delinquency (Bahr and Hoffmann 2008; Regnerus 2003). In addition, the theoretical framework presented is best interpreted by looking at how individual religiosity influences delinquency and how factors such as family and peer relations impacts the relationship. The specific research questions that will be addressed include:

- Does the involvement, commitment and belief in religiosity influence adolescent delinquency?
- Do peer and family variables influence the relationship between religiosity and delinquency?
- Does the association between religiosity and delinquency depend on the type of delinquent behavior?
- What impact do contextual level variables have on individual religiosity and delinquency?

- Will the relationship between religion and delinquency remain significant over time?

In summary, although the literature on religion and delinquency is quite extensive, the current literature has several limitations. The most comprehensive studies of the relationship between religion and delinquency specify a relationship grounded in theory, use advanced statistical procedures, look at a variety of measures of both religion and delinquency and include factors that influence the relationship such as peers and family. Unfortunately, to date there has not been a study that does all of the above. The current study will evaluate the relationship between religion and delinquency using social control as the theoretical framework and the Poisson loglinear regression model as the analytic strategy. The study also includes multiple measures of both religion and delinquency and evaluates the influence of family bonds, adolescent friends and contextual variables on the relationship between religion and delinquency. Finally, the study looks at whether the relationship between religion and delinquency is consistent or changes over time. The specific hypotheses for the current research include:

- *Hypothesis 1:* Juveniles that are involved, committed and believe in religion are less likely to be delinquent than juveniles that are not religious.
- *Hypothesis 2:* Religion reduces delinquency even after controlling for family and peer relationships.
- *Hypothesis 3:* Adolescents that report religiosity will have a lower level of involvement in property, violent and alcohol/drug offenses.
- *Hypothesis 4:* Contextual level variables will not diminish the effects of religiosity on delinquency.
- *Hypothesis 5:* The relationship between religiosity and delinquency will remain significant over time.

## Chapter III - Methodology and Research Design

### A. Research Design

The research employs data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health<sup>1</sup>) to examine religious differences in adolescent delinquency and the social-contextual factors that contribute to these differences in adolescence. Specifically, the current study examined whether there is a statistically significant relationship between religion and delinquency and whether there is a causal relationship between the two individual and contextual measures of religiosity. Add Health was chosen for the current analysis because it is an invaluable source for providing an abundance of information regarding adolescent behavior.

Add Health is a study of American adolescents in grades 7 through 12. The study was designed to investigate the psychological, social, physical and economic factors that occur in an adolescent's life. Specifically, health related behaviors, educational environment, delinquency; family relationships, social environment and religious characteristics of adolescents are assessed. The data was collected in response to a mandate from the U.S. Congress to fund a study of adolescent health. There were 80 high schools selected for inclusion in the study. In addition, 52 middle schools that were linked to the selected high schools were chosen with an unequal probability of selection, which resulted in a sample of 132 schools. Schools were selected using stratification

---

<sup>1</sup> The Add Health contract and data use agreement require that the following be included:

This research uses data from Add Health, a program project directed by Kathleen Mullan Harris and designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and funded by grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 23 other federal agencies and foundations. Special acknowledgment is due Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Information on how to obtain the Add Health data files is available on the Add Health website (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/addhealth>). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

Note: Use of this acknowledgment requires no further permission from the persons named.

techniques that were based on demographic characteristics such as location, ethnicity and size. The researchers ensured that the school sample was representative of U.S. schools in terms of location, size, type and ethnicity by including systematic sampling methods and stratification techniques into the study design. Six months after the initial in-school interviews, Add Health investigators selected a subgroup of the original in-school sample for more extensive in-home interviews. The Wave I in-home interviews were conducted during 1994 and 1995 and participants were selected from the enrollment rosters of the 132 schools with unequal probability of selection. There were a number of over-sampled groups of adolescents that were recruited for the Wave I interviews. These include the core sample, purposively selected schools, and non-genetic supplements. The in-home sample included a saturated sample that asked respondents to identify up to five friends of each sex from the school roster. This information allows researchers to look at how friends' behaviors and attitudes influence the respondents' behaviors. Add Health also provides information on respondent and friends' religiosity. In addition, the in-school network provides administrative data on whether the school the respondent attends has a religious affiliation and the number of adolescents that report being religious within a school.

Data for the current analysis was taken from the Wave I in-home interviews, Wave II in-home interviews and Wave I contextual data. The dataset for Waves I and II includes information collected in 1994–1996 from Add Health's nationally representative sample of adolescents. The dataset consists of one-half of the core sample, chosen at random, and one-half of the oversample of African-American adolescents with a parent who has a college degree of Wave I and II respondents. Both Wave I and Wave II

respondents in this dataset include approximately 6,500 respondents.

### *Wave I*

Wave I includes data collected between 1994 and 1995. All students who completed the In-School Questionnaire plus those who did not complete a questionnaire but were listed on a school roster were eligible for selection into the core in-home sample. In-home interviews were conducted between April and December 1995. All respondents received the same interview, which was approximately one to two hours long depending on the information that was provided. The majority of interviews were conducted in respondents' homes. All interviews were recorded on laptop computers in order to protect respondents' confidentiality. For interview questions that were not related to sensitive topics, the interviewer read the questions aloud and entered the respondent's answers. For more sensitive topics, the respondent listened through earphones to pre-recorded questions and entered the answers directly. In addition to maintaining data security, allowing respondents to enter their own answers to questions minimized the potential for interviewer or parental influence.

### *Wave II*

Wave II in-home interviews took place from April through August 1996. The second wave surveyed the same students one year after Wave I. The interview was largely analogous to that at Wave I. Interview questions about sun exposure and nutrition questions were added for Wave II. Questions concerning characteristics that should not change, such as ethnic background, were not repeated. The sample for the Wave II in-home interview comprised the respondents to the Wave I in-home interview, with the following exceptions:

- Respondents who were in the 12th grade at Wave I and who were not part of the genetic sample were not interviewed at Wave II.
- Respondents who were in only the Wave I disabled sample were not re-interviewed.
- An additional 65 adolescents who were members of the genetic sample and who had not been interviewed at Wave I were recruited at Wave II.

#### B. Unit of Analysis

The units of analysis for the current research are adolescents in grades 7 through 12 that completed the Wave I in home interview in 1994 and 1995 and the Wave II in home interview in 1996 in the United States.

#### C. Variables

##### a. Dependent Variables

The dependent variable for the current analysis is delinquency. The delinquency variables were recoded into dichotomous variables. The index is comprised of the following behaviors.

##### *Truant Offenses*

To measure truant offenses, respondents were asked “Have you ever received an out of school suspension from school?” Responses ranged from “No” (coded 0), “Yes” (coded 1), “Refused” (coded 6), “Don’t know” (coded 8) and “Have you ever had sexual intercourse? When we say sexual intercourse, we mean when a male inserts his penis into a female’s vagina?” Responses ranged from “No” (coded 0), “Yes” (coded 1), “Refused” (coded 6), “Don’t know” (coded 8), “Not applicable” (coded 9).

### *Alcohol Use*

To measure alcohol use, respondents were asked “ Have you had a drink of beer, wine or liquor-not just a sip or a taste of someone else’s drink more than 2 or 3 times in your life?” Responses ranged from “No” (coded 0), “Yes” (coded 1), “Refused” (coded 6), “Don’t know” (coded 8), “Not Applicable” (coded 9).

### *Tobacco Use*

To measure tobacco use, respondents were asked, “During the past 30 days, on how many days did you use chewing tobacco (such as Redman, Levi Garrett, or Beechnut) or snuff (such as Skoal, Skoal Bandits, or Copenhagen)”. Responses ranged from "No Days" (coded 0), "Refused" (coded 96), “Legit Skip” (coded 97), “Don’t Know” (coded 98), “Not Applicable” (coded 99).

### *Property Offenses*

To assess property damage, students were asked the following questions: “In the past 12 months, “How often did you paint graffiti or signs on someone else's property or in a public place?” and “In the past 12 months, how often did you deliberately damage property that didn't belong to you”? Responses were coded as “Never” (coded 0), “1 or 2 times” (coded 1), “3 or 4 times” (coded 2), “5 or more times” (coded 3). In order to assess theft, students were asked “How often did you take something from a store without paying for it?”, “In the past 12 months, how often did you steal something worth more than \$50?”, “How often did you go into a house or building to steal something?” and “How often did you steal something worth less than \$50?” All responses were coded as “Never”(coded 0), “1 or 2 times” (coded 1), “3 or 4 times” (coded 2), “5 or more times” (coded 3).

### *Violence*

In order to evaluate violent activity, students were given the following statements and asked how often they had done each. “You got into a physical fight”, “You pulled a knife or gun on someone.” and “You shot or stabbed someone.” Responses included “Never” (coded 0), “Once” (coded 1), “More than once (coded 2), “Refused” (coded 6), “Don’t know” (coded 8), “Not applicable” (coded 9). Respondents were then asked, “How often did you get into a serious physical fight?”, “How often did you hurt someone badly enough to need bandages or care from a doctor or nurse?” and “In the past 12 months, how often did you take part in a fight where a group of your friends was against another group?” Responses were coded as “Never” (coded 0), “1 or 2 times” (coded 1), “3 or 4” times (coded 2), “5 or more times” (coded 3). Respondents were also asked “During the past 30 days did you carry a weapon-such as a gun, knife or club-to school?” Responses were coded as “None” (coded 0), “1 day” (coded 1), “2 or 3 days” (coded 2), 4 or 5 days (coded 3), “6 or more days” (coded 4), “Refused” (coded 6), “Don’t know” (coded 8), “Not applicable” (coded 9).

#### b. Independent Variables

Involvement was measured by participation and attendance in religious activities. Participation in religious youth group activities was taken from a question that asked, "Many churches, synagogues, and other places of worship have special activities for teenagers, such as youth groups, bible classes, or choir. In the past 12 months, how often did you attend such youth activities?" Service attendance was obtained from a question that asked, "In the past 12 months, how often did you attend religious services?" The responses for both religious attendance and participation in youth group activities are

"Once a week or more" (coded 1), "Less than once a week/at least once a month" (coded 2), "Less than once a month" (coded 3) or "Never" (coded 4).

Belief was measured by importance and belief in religion. Religious importance was measured with a question that asks, "How important is religion to you?" Responses range from "Very important" (coded 1), "Fairly Important" (coded 2), "Fairly Unimportant" (coded 3) and "Not important at all" (coded 4).

Commitment was measured by the frequency of prayer. Frequency of prayer is measured with a question that asks, "How often do you pray?" Responses range from "At least once a day" (coded 1), "At least once a week" (coded 2), "At least once a month" (coded 3), "Less than once a month"(coded 4), "Never" (coded 5).

Belief in the scriptures was measured by the following question, "Do you agree or disagree that the sacred scriptures of your religion are the word of God and are completely without any mistakes?" Responses include "Agree" (coded 1), "Disagree" (coded 2), "Religion doesn't have sacred scriptures"(coded 3), "Refused" (coded 6), "Legitimate skip (no religion)" (coded 7), "Don't know" (coded 8).

### *Family Bonds*

Numerous studies indicate that strong family bonds decrease the risk of adolescent delinquency while weak attachments increase the likelihood of delinquency (Kafka and London 1991; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Rhodes and Reiss 1970; Hundleby and Mercer 1987; Sampson and Laub 1993; Conger and Simons 1997). Numerous studies have evaluated how religion influences the family (Burkett 1993; Ellison and Sherkat 1993; Curtis and Ellison 2002; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Tittle and Welch 1983; Cornwall 1987). Studies have indicated

that religion promoted the positive role of family and strengthened the relationship between children and their families (Ellison and Sherkat 1993; Curtis and Ellison 2002; Regnerus and Burdette 2006; Pearce and Axinn 1998; Rossi and Rossi 1990; Tittle and Welch 1983; Cornwall 1987; Regnerus and Burdette, 2006). The current research examined whether family bonds affected the relationship between religiosity and delinquency. The following measures were recoded into dichotomous variables to create the family bonds index.

The following questions were asked in order to create an index of family bonds. "On how many of the past 7 days was at least one of your parents in the room with you while you ate your evening meal?" Responses included "No days" (coded 0), "1 day" (coded 1), "2 days" (coded 2), "3 days" (coded 3), "4 days" (coded 4), "5 days" (coded 5), "6 days" (coded 6), "7 days" (coded 7), "Refused" (coded 96), "Legitimate skip" (coded 97), "Don't Know" (coded 98). Respondents were also asked, "How close do you feel to your mother/stepmother/foster mother/etc)?", "How much do you think she (mother) cares about you?", "How much do you feel that your parents care about you?", "How much do you feel that people in your family understand you?" and "How much do you feel that your family pays attention to you?" Responses include "Not at all" (coded 1), "Very little" (coded 2), "Somewhat" (coded 3), "Quite a bit" (coded 4), "Very Much" (coded 5), "Refused" (coded 6), "Legitimate skip (no mom)" (coded 7), "Don't know" (coded 8)."

Questions regarding parental aspirations included, "On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is low and 5 is high, how disappointed would she (mom) be if you did not graduate from college" and "On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is low and 5 is high, how disappointed would

she be if you did not graduate from high school”? Responses range from “Low” (coded 1) to “High” (coded 5), “Refused” (coded 6), “Legitimate skip (no mom)” (coded 7), “Don’t know” (coded 8).

Respondents were also asked to identify whether they participated in the following activities with their mother. “Which of the things listed on this card have you done with your {MOTHER/ADOPTIVEMOTHER/STEPMOTHER/FOSTER MOTHER/etc.} in the past 4 weeks (gone shopping, played a sport, gone to a movie, play, museum, concert, or sports event, talked about your schoolwork or grades, worked on a project for school, talked about other things you're doing in school.” Responses included “No” (coded 0), “Yes” (coded 1), “Refused” (coded 6), “Legitimate skip (no mom)” (coded 7), “Don’t know” (coded 8).

Respondents were then asked whether they agreed with the following statements, "Your mother encourages you to be independent", "You are satisfied with the way your mother and you communicate with each other" and "Overall, you are satisfied with your relationship with your mother". Responses included "Strongly agree" (coded 1), "Agree" (coded 2), "Neither agree nor disagree" (coded 3), "Disagree" (coded 4), "Strongly disagree" (coded 5), “Refused” (coded 6), “Legitimate skip (no resident mom)” (coded 7), “Don’t know” (coded 8).

Finally, respondents were asked, “How much do you feel that you and your family have fun together?” Responses included "Not at all" (coded 1), “Very little” (coded 2), "Somewhat" (coded 3), "Quite a bit" (coded 4), "Very Much" (coded 5), "Does not apply" (coded 6), "Refused" (coded 96), "Don't know" (coded 98).

## *Relationships with Friends*

### *Prosocial Bonds*

There have been a number of studies that have concluded that juveniles tend to select their friends based on similar interests and values. Specifically, studies have found that religion diminishes the affiliation with delinquent peers (Simon, Simons and Conger year 2004; Elliott et. al. 1989; Burkett and Warren 1987) and that adolescents who are religious are less likely to associate with youth that are involved in delinquency (Adamczyk 2009; Adamczyk and Felson 2006; Simon, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren 1987; Casey and Beadnell 2010). Although there are a few studies that have looked at the association between religious peers and individual delinquency, studies have varied in the degree of influence and include relatively small samples (Simon, Simons and Conger 2004; Burkett and Warren 1987; Casey and Beadnell 2010; Elliott et. al. 1989). An important question for researchers is whether religiosity adds explanatory power beyond the amount explained by peer associations using a large sample with multiple indicators of religion and delinquency. Specifically, the current research evaluated whether prosocial relationships influence religiosity and delinquency. Similarly, the research looked at whether non-religious respondents were more likely to have delinquent friends than religious respondents. The following measures were recoded into dichotomous variables to create the family bonds index. In order to assess the impact of friends on religiosity and delinquent behavior, respondents were asked “During the past week, how many times did you just hang out with friends?” Responses included “Not at all” (coded 0), “1 or 2 times” (coded 1), “3 or 4 times” (coded 2), “5 or more times” (coded 3), “Refused” (coded 6), “Don’t know” (coded 8).

For the primary male friend, respondents were asked “Did you go to {NAME-male}'s house during the past seven days?”, “Did you meet {NAME- male} after school to hang out or go somewhere during the past seven days?”, “Did you spend time with {NAME-male} during the past weekend?”, “Did you talk to {NAME- male} about a problem during the past seven days?, “Did you talk to {NAME -male} on the telephone during the past seven days?” Responses include "No" (coded 0), "Yes" (coded 1), "Refused" (coded 6), "Legitimate skip" (coded 7), “Don’t Know” (coded 8).

For the primary female friend, respondents were asked “Did you go to {NAME-female}'s house during the past seven days?”, “Did you meet {NAME- female} after school to hang out or go somewhere during the past seven days?”, “Did you spend time with {NAME-female} during the past weekend?”, “Did you talk to {NAME- female} about a problem during the past seven days?, “Did you talk to {NAME -female} on the telephone during the past seven days?” Responses include "No" (coded 0), "Yes" (coded 1), "Refused" (coded 6), "Legitimate skip" (coded 7), “Don’t Know” (coded 8).

### *Antisocial Bonds*

In order to assess delinquency among friends, respondents were asked, “Of your 3 best friends, how many smoke at least 1 cigarette a day?”, “Of your 3 best friends, how many drink alcohol at least once a month? “and “Of your 3 best friends, how many use marijuana at least once a month?” “No Friends” (coded 0), “One Friend” (coded 1), “Two Friends” (coded 2), “Three Friends” (coded 3) "Refused" (coded 6), “Don’t Know” (coded 8), “Not Applicable” (coded 9).

### c. Control Variables

Previous research has suggested that there are several variables that are related to

religion and delinquency, which are included in the analysis to account for potential spuriousness. These include gender (Miller & Stark, 2002; Van Gundy, Schieman, Kelley, & Rebellón, 2005) race (Johnson et al., 2000; Van Gundy et al, 2005), age, neighborhood safety, parental marital status and extracurricular activities.

### *Gender*

Gender is an important variable to control for because studies indicate that delinquency is more predominant among boys than girls (Hawkins, Graham, Williams, & Zahn, 2009), and girls tend to be more religious than boys (Hoffmann & Johnson, 1998; Hawkins, Graham, Williams, & Zahn, 2009). It is essential to control for gender because research such as Hirschi and Stark's (1969) study found a significant relationship between church attendance and delinquency but after controlling for gender, the relationship became insignificant. In order to obtain information on gender, the interviewer was required to ask the following question. "Interviewer, please confirm that R's sex is (male) female. (Ask if necessary)". The variable was recoded as follows: "female" (coded 0), "male" (coded 1).

### *Race*

Studies regarding how race effects the relationship between religion and delinquency have been inconclusive. Certain studies have found that blacks have a higher level of religiosity than whites and are less likely to consume alcohol and use other drugs such as marijuana (Brown, Parks, Zimmerman, & Phillips, 2001; Armeij, Albrecht, & Miller, 1996). Other studies have found that when religiosity was controlled for, both religious blacks and whites were more likely to use illegal substances but the relationship between religiosity and drug use was stronger among whites than blacks (Wallace,

Brown, Bachman, and Laveist, 2003). In order to avoid spuriousness, interviewers were required to code the race of the respondent based on their own observation. Race was then recoded as “White” (coded 0) and “Non white” (coded 1).

#### *Neighborhood Safety*

Numerous studies indicate that the environment in which an adolescent is raised affects their level of delinquency (Jang & Johnson, 2001; Tarter, Vanyukov, Kirisci, Reynolds and Clark, 2006). In order to control for neighborhood safety, respondents were asked “Do you usually feel safe in your neighborhood?” Responses included “No” (coded 0), “Yes” (coded 1), “refused” (coded 6) and “don’t know” (coded 8).

#### *Parental Marital status*

Several studies have found that parental marital status is related to delinquency. Specifically, research has found that children whose parents are married are less likely to be involved in delinquency (Hayatbakhsh, Najman, Jamrozik, Konrad; Mamun, Alati, 2006; Klein & Forehand, 1997). In order to control for parental marital status, the questionnaire asked parents of the adolescents to identify their marital status. Respondents’ parents were asked “ What is your current marital status?” Responses were recoded to include “ Married” (coded 0) and “Not married” (coded 1).

#### *Extracurricular activities*

Recent studies have provided mixed results as to whether adolescents that are involved in conventional extracurricular activities such as a sport are less likely to be involved in delinquency (Farb, Feldman; Matjasko, 2012). In order to assess the influence of religiosity on delinquency it is important to control for other prosocial activities that may reduce delinquent behavior. Respondents were asked whether they

participated in any extracurricular activities. Responses were recoded as “No Extracurricular activities” (coded 0) and “Extracurricular activities” (coded 1).

### *Contextual Variables*

The constructed contextual database uses the Census of Population and Housing, 1990, Summary Tape file 3A (STF 3A). The following contextual variables were used in order to document the environment in which the respondents and to evaluate the contextual influence on individual religiosity and delinquency. Urbanicity was calculated as “Completely Urban” (coded 1), “Not Completely Urban” (coded 2), “Unstable Estimates” (coded 8), “Geocode Missing (coded 9). Modal race included “White” (coded 1), “Black “ (coded 2), “Other” (coded 3), “Unstable Estimates” (coded 8), “Geocode Missing (coded 9). Sex Composition included “Heavily male” (coded 1), “Balanced” (coded 2), “Heavily Female” (coded 3), Unstable Estimates” (coded 8), “Geocode Missing (coded 9). Modal marital status included “Never Married” (coded 1), “Married” (coded 2), “Separated/Divorced” (coded 3), Unstable Estimates” (coded 8), “Geocode Missing (coded 9). Proportion under poverty comprised “Low” (coded 1), “Medium” (coded 2), “High” (coded 3), Unstable Estimates” (coded 8), “Geocode Missing (coded 9). Proportion of females in the labor force included “Low” (coded 1), “Medium” (coded 2), “High” (coded 3), Unstable Estimates” (coded 8), “Geocode Missing (coded 9).

Unstandardized descriptive statistics for all of the independent and dependent variables are depicted in Table 1.

Table 1.  
Unstandardized Descriptive Statistics for Dependent and Independent Variables

Construct	Variable	Min	Max	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cronbach Alpha Unstd	Cronbach Alpha Std	Valid N
Delinquency	Composite	0	69	4.7590	6.42495	.671	.734	6278
Religiosity	Composite	5	20	9.5822	3.50358	.776	.780	5352
Attend Religious Services		1	4	1.98	1.062			5610
Importance of Religion		1	4	1.64	.759			5614
Prayer		1	5	2.03	1.283			5614
Attend Religious Youth Group Activities		1	4	2.77	1.242			5612
Scriptures are word of God		1	3	1.25	.482			5362
Friends Prosocial	Composite	0	13	7.7118	3.00193	.692	.716	5378
Friends Antisocial	Composite	0	9	2.4994	2.61712	.749	.751	6272
Family Bonds	Composite	19	66	47.0705	5.13673	.626	.657	6029
Control Variables:								
Sex		<sup>2</sup> 0	1	.4839	.49978			6503
Race		<sup>3</sup> 0	1	.3396	.47362			6498
Concern for safety		<sup>4</sup> 0	1	.05	.209			6435
Parent - Marital Status		<sup>5</sup> 0	1	.2985	.45765			5638
Extracurricular Activities		<sup>6</sup> 0	1	.0912	.28788			6504
Urbanicity		1	2	1.48	.500			6428
Modal Race		1	3	1.23	.502			6420
Sex Composition		1	3	2.00	.429			6428
Modal Marital Status		1	3	1.90	.310			6406
Proportion under Poverty		1	3	1.68	.818			6428
Proportion of Females in the labor force		1	3	1.99	.570			6281

<sup>2</sup> 0=Female; 1=Male

<sup>3</sup> 0=White; 1=Non White

<sup>4</sup> 0=No concern for safety; 1= Yes concern for safety

<sup>5</sup> 0=Married; 1=Not Married

<sup>6</sup> 0=No Extracurricular Activities; 1=Extracurricular Activities

#### D. Analytic Strategy

To examine the relationship between adolescent religiosity and delinquency, we used a Poisson loglinear regression model, controlling for sex, race, concern for safety, parental marital status and extracurricular activities. The Poisson loglinear regression model is a type of regression model that uses modeling count variables and overdispersed count outcome variables. In addition, the model assumes that the mean is equal to the variance. Because most high school students have little experience with delinquency, making the data positively skewed, the Poisson loglinear regression model is suitable for the current analysis. In addition, because the Poisson distribution provides an approximation to the binomial for the analysis of rare events in which the sample size is large, we are able to use it for high school students that have been involved in delinquent behavior.

## Chapter IV- Data Analysis

The results from the bivariate correlations examining the relationship between religiosity, family bonds, relationships with friends and delinquency outcomes are summarized in Table 2. The relationship between delinquency, religiosity, family bonds and relationships with friends is statistically significant ( $p < .01$ ). Religiosity and family bonds reduced the level of delinquency while both prosocial and antisocial friends were associated with higher levels of delinquency. The bivariate correlation indicated that as religiosity and family bonds increased, delinquency decreased.

Table 2.  
Bivariate Correlations

		Delinquency	Family bonds	Friends prosocial	Friends antisocial	Religion
Delinquency	Pearson Correlation	1	-.190**	.135**	.383**	-.118**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	6278	5860	5236	6162	3105
Family Bonds	Pearson Correlation	-.190**	1	-.087**	-.248**	-.204**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	5860	6029	5037	5843	2996
Friends Prosocial	Pearson Correlation	.135**	-.087**	1	.252**	-.075**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	5236	5037	5378	5226	2642
Friends Antisocial	Pearson Correlation	.383**	-.248**	.252**	1	-.265**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	6162	5843	5226	6272	3084
Religiosity	Pearson Correlation	-.118**	-.204**	-.075**	-.265**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	3105	2996	2642	3084	3181

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$  (two-tailed tests)

## Religion and Delinquency

In order to evaluate whether a statistically significant relationship remained when advanced statistical procedures were used, the analysis looked at whether the relationship between religiosity and delinquency remained using the Poisson regression linear model, see Table 3. The results indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship inverse relationship between religiosity and delinquency. As religiosity increased, delinquency decreased.

Table 3.  
Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.233	.0452	.000***
Religiosity (Scale)	-.055	.0034	.000***
	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

The next step in the analysis was to tease apart the components of the religiosity index to determine whether there was a statistically significant relationship with delinquency and the direction of the relationship. The following analyses assess the relationship between each measure of religiosity and the delinquency index that was constructed.

### *Believe Scriptures are the Word of God*

Belief that scriptures are the word of God is significantly related to delinquency with “religion doesn’t have sacred scriptures” as the reference group, see Table 4.

Respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God were less likely to be delinquent than respondents that indicated that scriptures were not the word of God. In addition, regardless of whether the respondent agreed or disagreed that scriptures are the word of God, believing that religion has sacred scriptures is significantly related to delinquency.

Table 4.  
Parameter Estimates- Believe Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.849	.0461	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.344	.0470	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.246	.0489	.000***
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Believe Scriptures are the Word of God

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

#### *Past year attend religious services*

The parameter estimates of the generalized linear model indicate that the relationship between attending religious services and delinquency is statistically significant with “Never” attending religious services as the reference group, see Table 5. Specifically, the data shows that children that attend religious services once a month or more are less likely to be delinquent than children that did not attend religious services.

Table 5.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.814	.0208	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.443	.0241	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.228	.0261	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.161	.0266	.000***
[Never=4]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

#### *Religion Importance*

Religious importance is significantly related to delinquency with religion “not being important at all” as the reference group, see Table 6. Although religious importance is significantly related to delinquency, it is in the opposite direction than was hypothesized. Specifically, respondents that considered religion fairly important, were more likely to be delinquent.

Table 6.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.923	.0355	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.563	.0374	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.300	.0374	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.057	.0482	.186
[Not Important at all=4]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### *Frequency of Prayer*

The model indicates that praying was significantly related to delinquency with “Never” praying being the reference group, see Table 7. Specifically, respondent that prayed were less likely to be involved in delinquency.

Table 7.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.866	.0249	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.531	.0278	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.294	.0292	.000***
[At least once a month=3]	-.105	.0329	.001***
[Less than once a month=4]	-.087	.0342	.011**
[Never=5]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### *Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups*

The parameter estimates of the generalized linear model indicate that involvement in religious youth group activities is significantly associated with delinquency with “never” as the reference group, see Table 8. Respondents that attended religious youth groups once a month or more was significantly related to delinquency.

Table 8.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.625	.0117	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.285	.0205	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.078	.0218	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.066	.0223	.003**
[Never=4]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

The next set of analyses includes control variables in order to determine whether the relationship between religiosity and delinquency remains significant.

### *Religiosity Index*

The religiosity index was significantly associated to delinquency, see Table 9. As religiosity increased, delinquency decreased controlling for sex, race, parental marital Status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities.

Table 9.  
Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.2838	.0766	.000***
Religiosity	-.050	.0035	.000***
[Race=.00]	-.005	.0239	.828
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.307	.0233	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.121	.0377	.001***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.266	.0474	.000***
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.705	.0215	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

*Believe Scriptures are the Word of God*

The belief that religion has sacred scriptures is significantly related to delinquency with “religion doesn’t have sacred scriptures” as the reference group, see Table 10. Respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God were less likely to be delinquent than respondents that indicated that scriptures were not the word of God. In addition, regardless of whether the respondent agreed or disagreed that scriptures are the word of God, believing that religion has sacred scriptures is significantly related to delinquency controlling for sex, race, parental marital status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities.

Table 10.  
Parameter Estimates- Believe Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.528	.0653	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.340	.0470	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.246	.0489	.000***
[Religion Doesn’t Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Sex=.00	-.740	.0162	.000***
Sex=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Race=.00	.063	.0177	.000***
Race=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00	-.276	.0175	.000***
Marital Status=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Concern for Safety=0	-.201	.0379	.000***
Concern for Safety=1	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
extracurricular=.00	.002	.0274	.931
extracurricular=1.00	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Believe Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Parental Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

*Past year attend religious services*

The parameter estimates of the generalized linear model indicate that the relationship between attending religious services and delinquency is statistically significant with

“never” attending religious services as the reference group, see Table 11. Specifically, the data shows that children that attend religious services are less likely to be delinquent than children that did not attend religious services controlling for sex, race, parental marital status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities. In addition, the more often children attend religious services the less likely they are to be delinquent. Although respondents that attended religious services once a week were the least likely to be delinquent, attending religious services at all reduced delinquency.

Table 11.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.439	.0504	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.370	.0245	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.192	.0263	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.095	.0267	.000***
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Sex=.00	-.731	.0162	.000***
Sex=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Race=.00	.016	.0179	.367
Race=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Parental Marital Status=.00	-.250	.0176	.000***
Parental Marital Status=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Concern for Safety=0	-.182	.0380	.000***
Concern for Safety=1	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
extracurricular=.00	4.936E-005	.0274	.999
extracurricular=1.00	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Parental Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular.

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### *Religion Importance*

Religious importance is significantly related to delinquency with religion “not being important at all” as the reference group, see Table 12. Respondents that considered religion “fairly important” and “very important” were significantly related to delinquency. Specifically, the more important that respondents considered religion, the less likely that they were to be delinquent. Respondents that considered religion “very important” were least likely to be involved in delinquent behaviors controlling for sex, race, parental marital status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities.

Table 12.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.610	.0596	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.490	.0380	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.272	.0376	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.056	.0432	.198
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Sex=.00	-.714	.0163	.000***
Sex=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Race=.00	-.007	.0181	.698
Race=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00	-.262	.0175	.000***
Marital Status=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Concern for Safety=0	-.217	.0380	.000***
Concern for Safety=1	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
extracurricular=.00	-.005	.0274	.868
extracurricular=1.00	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Parental Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular.

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### *Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups*

The parameter estimates of the generalized linear model indicate that involvement in religious youth group activities is significantly associated with delinquency with “never” as the reference group, see Table 13. Respondents that

attended religious youth groups once a week or more was significantly related to delinquency controlling for sex, race, parental marital status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities. The data indicates that the more often respondents attended youth group activities, the less likely they are to be involved in delinquency.

Table 13.

Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.292	.0481	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.241	.0206	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.028	.0219	.204
[Less than once a month=3]	-.035	.0224	.122
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Sex=.00]	-.734	.0162	.000***
Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Race=.00]	.051	.0177	.004**
Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00	-.275	.0175	.000***
Marital Status=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Concern for Safety=0	-.199	.0380	.000***
Concern for Safety=1	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Extracurricular=.00	-.002	.	.937
Extracurricular=1.00	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Parental Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular.

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### *Frequency of Prayer*

The model indicates that respondents that prayed at least once a month or more was significantly related to delinquency with never praying being the reference group, see Table 14. Specifically, the more often the respondent prayed, the less likely they were to be involved in delinquency controlling for sex, race, parental marital status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities. Respondents that prayed at least once a day were the least likely to be involved in delinquency.

Table 14.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.508	.0531	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.402	.0283	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.206	.0293	.000***
[At least once a month=3]	-.065	.0330	.047*
[Less than once a month=4]	-.042	.0342	.223
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Sex=.00	-.700	.0163	.000***
Sex=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Race=.00	.007	.0179	.690
Race=1.00	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.268	.0175	.000***
Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Concern for Safety=0	-.222	.0380	.000***
Concern for Safety=1	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
extracurricular=.00	-.010	.0274	.720
extracurricular=1.00	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Parental Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### Controlling For Family Bonds

The religiosity index and the individual measures of the religiosity index were all significantly associated to delinquency controlling for family bonds, see Tables 15-20.

As religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious

importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth group activities increased,

delinquency decreased controlling for family bonds. The relationship between

religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious

importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth group activities and delinquency

remained significant with the inclusion of family bonds.

Table 15.  
Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	4.424	.1132	.000***
Religiosity	-.036	.0036	.000***
[Race=.00]	.039	.0240	.108
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.276	.0234	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.103	.0377	.006**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.231	.0474	.000***
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.717	.0215	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Family Bonds]	-.038	.0020	.000***
(Scale)			

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity, Sex, Race, Marital Status, concern for safety, extracurricular, Family Bonds

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 16.  
Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	4.485	.0843	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.268	.0418	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.197	.0437	.000***
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.025	.0264	.336
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.747	.0153	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.081	.0161	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.225	.0162	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.167	.0348	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Family bonds	-.045	.0014	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Scripture is the Word of God, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, family bonds

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 17.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attended Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	4.239	.0769	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.195	.0230	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.066	.0244	.006**
[Less than once a month=3]	-.035	.0249	.155
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.027	.0264	.306
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.739	.0153	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.056	.0164	.001***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.215	.0163	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.156	.0348	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Family bonds	-.043	.0014	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attended Religious Services, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, family bonds

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 18.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	4.303	.0809	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.272	.0367	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.091	.0362	.012*
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	.038	.0415	.362
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.028	.0264	.290
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.727	.0153	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.029	.0165	.082
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.219	.0162	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.173	.0348	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Family bonds	-.043	.0014	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), – Religious Importance, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, family bonds

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 19.  
Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	4.254	.0777	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.177	.0266	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.031	.0276	.267
[At least once a month=3]	.058	.0308	.058
[Less than once a month=4]	.038	.0321	.241
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.033	.0264	.217
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.724	.0154	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.048	.0164	.003**
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.226	.0162	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.168	.0348	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Family bonds	-.044	.0014	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, family bonds

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 20.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	4.250	.0761	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.142	.0192	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	.043	.0203	.034*
[Less than once a month=3]	-.026	.0213	.213
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.024	.0264	.370
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.743	.0153	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.077	.0161	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.227	.0162	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.167	.0348	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
family bonds	-.045	.0014	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, and Concern for Safety, family bonds

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### Controlling For Prosocial Friends

The religiosity index and the individual measures of the religiosity index were all significantly associated to delinquency controlling for prosocial friends, see Tables 21-26. As religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth group activities increased, delinquency decreased controlling for prosocial friends. Although the relationship between religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth group activities and delinquency remained significant with the inclusion of prosocial friends, there was a positive relationship between prosocial friends and delinquency in all of the models.

Table 21.  
Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.165	.0833	.000***
Religiosity	-.047	.0035	.000***
[Race=.00]	-.068	.0241	.005**
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.297	.0233	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.140	.0377	.000***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.175	.0474	.000***
[Concern for Safety =1]	0	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.746	.0216	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
[Friends Prosocial]	.077	.0036	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular, Friends Prosocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 22.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
-----------	---	----------------	--------------

(Intercept)	1.953	.0670	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.371	.0465	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.283	.0484	.000***
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.022	.0268	.412
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.739	.0157	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.014	.0172	.427
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.245	.0166	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.187	.0367	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Friends prosocial (Scale)	.077	.0026	.000***
	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, friends prosocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 23.

Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.845	.0534	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.363	.0238	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.200	.0254	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.113	.0258	.000***
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.017	.0269	.536
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.730	.0158	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.061	.0175	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.217	.0167	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.168	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
friendsprosocial (Scale)	.075	.0026	.000***
	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, friends prosocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 24.

Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.011	.0617	.000***

[Very Important=1]	-.472	.0362	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.263	.0357	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.081	.0413	.050*
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.011	.0268	.688
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.714	.0158	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.080	.0176	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.228	.0166	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.198	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
friendsprosocial	.074	.0026	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, friends prosocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 25. Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.895	.0559	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.383	.0271	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.198	.0280	.000***
[At least once a month=3]	-.049	.0316	.118
[Less than once a month=4]	-.045	.0330	.178
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.008	.0269	.753
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.699	.0159	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.066	.0174	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.233	.0166	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.207	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Friends prosocial	.075	.0026	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, friends prosocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 26.

Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Religious Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.691	.0515	.000***

[Once a week or more=1]	-.241	.0202	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.041	.0214	.054
[Less than once a month=3]	-.046	.0215	.032
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.017	.0269	.533
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.732	.0157	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.029	.0172	.091
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.241	.0166	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.181	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
friendsprosocial (Scale)	.076 1	.0026	.000***

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, extracurricular, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, friends prosocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### Controlling For Antisocial Friends

Except for attending youth group activities, the religiosity index and the individual measures of the religiosity index were significantly associated to delinquency controlling for antisocial friends, see Tables 27-32. As religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer increased, delinquency decreased controlling for antisocial friends. Attending youth group activities was not significantly related to delinquency while controlling for antisocial friends. Although the relationship between religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and delinquency remained significant with the inclusion of prosocial friends, there was a positive relationship between prosocial friends and delinquency in all of the models.

Table 27.  
Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.694	.0832	.000***
Religiosity	-.009	.0038	.017*
[Race=.00]	-.067	.0239	.005**
[Race=1.00]	0	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.200	.0234	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.144	.0377	.000***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.164	.0474	.001***
[Concern for Safety =1]	0	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.691	.0215	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
[Antisocial (Scale)]	.158	.0037	.000***

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular, Friends Antisocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 28.  
Parameter Estimates- Scripture is the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.868	.0655	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.220	.0466	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.281	.0484	.000***
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.682	.0157	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.055	.0171	.001***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.148	.0167	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.159	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.008	.0268	.771
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Friends antisocial (Scale)	.165	.0026	.000***
	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Scripture is the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular, friends antisocial

Table 29.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.734	.0505	.000***

[Once a week or more=1]	-.124	.0243	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.043	.0256	.089
[Less than once a month=3]	-.076	.0258	.003**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.680	.0157	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.075	.0174	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.138	.0169	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.154	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.011	.0269	.693
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Friends antisocial (Scale)	.162	.0027	.000***
	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular, friends antisocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 30.

Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.823	.0591	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.188	.0366	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.135	.0358	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.014	.0413	.727
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.675	.0158	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.087	.0175	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.144	.0167	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.164	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.011	.0269	.690
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Friends antisocial (Scale)	.160	.0027	.000***
	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular, friends antisocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 31.

Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.830	.0531	.000***

[At least once a day=1]	-.218	.0273	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.107	.0281	.000***
[At least once a month=3]	-.052	.0316	.099
[Less than once a month=4]	-.088	.0331	.008**
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.666	.0158	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.091	.0173	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.144	.0167	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety =0]	-.174	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.015	.0269	.583
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Friends antisocial	.160	.0026	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular, friends antisocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 32.

Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.610	.0482	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.012	.0206	.561
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	.134	.0216	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	.050	.0215	.020*
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.684	.0157	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.059	.0172	.001***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.148	.0168	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.160	.0367	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.001	.0269	.957
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Friends antisocial	.165	.0027	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, and Concern for Safety, extracurricular, friends antisocial

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### Individual Type of Delinquency and Religiosity

The next set of analyses examined the relationship between each individual type of delinquency and each measure of religiosity; see Appendix I. Table 33 provides a summary of the delinquent offenses that were significantly related to the religious measures.

#### *Burglarize a Building*

Burglarizing a building was not significantly related to attending religious services but was significantly related to scriptures are the word of God, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Respondents that maintained that religion has sacred scriptures were less likely to burglarize a building. Similarly, the more important that the respondent considered religion, the less likely they were to burglarize a building. Respondents that prayed at least once a day and attended religious youth group activities frequently were less likely to burglarize a building. As religious importance, frequency of prayer, youth group attendance and belief in scriptures increased, burglarizing a building decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Past 12 Months Damaged Property*

Damaging property in the past 12 months was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Specifically, respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God damaged property in the past 12 months less than respondents that maintained that religion doesn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, the more often respondents attended religious services and religious youth group activities, the less likely the respondent was to damaged property in the past 12 months.

Respondents that considered religion important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to damage property in the past 30 days. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, importance, frequency of prayer, youth group attendance increased, damaging property in the past 12 months decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Last 30 Days Chewed Tobacco*

Chewing tobacco in the past 30 days was significantly related to scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Respondents that believe that religion has sacred scriptures was inversely related to chewing tobacco in the last 30 days. Although attending religious services was significantly related to delinquency, it was in the opposite direction than was hypothesized. Specifically, attending religious services once a month or more increases chewing tobacco in the past 30 days. As frequency of prayer and youth group attendance increased, chewing tobacco in the past 30 days decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Drink Alcohol >2-3 Times*

Drinking alcohol more than 2-3 times was significantly related to attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Specifically, respondents that attended religious services and youth groups and prayed frequently were less likely to drink alcohol. In addition, respondents that maintained that religion was very important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to drink alcohol. As religious service attendance, religious importance, frequency of prayer and

youth group attendance increased, drinking alcohol more than 2-3 times decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Ever Had Sex*

Ever had sex was significantly related to attending religious services, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Specifically, the more often respondents attended religious services, prayed and attended religious youth group activities, the less likely the respondent was to have ever had sex. As religious service attendance, frequency of prayer and youth group attendance increased, ever having sex decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Past 12 Months Painted Graffiti*

Painted graffiti in the past 12 months was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Specifically, respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God were involved in graffiti less than respondents that maintained that religion doesn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, the more often respondents attended religious services and religious youth group activities, the less likely they were to have painted graffiti in the past 12 months. Respondents that considered religion important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to have painted graffiti in the past 12 months. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, importance, frequency of prayer, youth group attendance increased, painting graffiti in the past 12 months decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Received Out of School Suspension*

Receiving an out of school suspension was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Specifically, respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God were less likely to receive an in school suspension than respondents that maintained that religion doesn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, the more often respondents attended religious services and religious youth group activities, the lower the out of school suspension. Respondents that considered religion important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to receive an out of school suspension. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, importance, frequency of prayer, youth group attendance increased, out of school suspension decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Got Into a Physical Fight*

Physically fighting was significantly related to attending religious services and religious importance. Specifically, the more often respondents attended religious services, the less likely they were to be in a physical fight. In addition, respondents that considered religion very important were less likely to be involved in a physical fight. As religious service attendance and importance increased, physical fighting decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Pulled a Knife or Gun on Someone*

Pulling a knife or gun on someone was significantly related to religious importance and participation in religious youth group activities. As religious importance and participation in youth group activities increased, pulling a knife or gun on someone decreased. Respondents that believed that religion was important and attended religious

youth group activities at least once a month were less likely to pull a knife or gun on someone after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

### *Serious Physical Fight*

Serious physical fighting was significantly related to attending religious services, religious importance and frequency of prayer. As religious service attendance, religious importance and frequency of prayer increased, being involved in a physical fight decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

### *Seriously Injure Someone*

Seriously injuring someone was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer, attend religious youth groups. Specifically, respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God were involved in seriously injuring someone less than respondents that maintained that religion doesn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, the more often respondents attended religious services, the less likely the respondent was to seriously injure someone. Respondents that considered religion important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to seriously injure someone. Respondents that attended youth religious activities were less likely to seriously injure someone than respondents that did not attend religious activities. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, importance and frequency of prayer increased, seriously injuring someone decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

### *Shoplift*

Shoplifting was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Specifically, respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God were involved in shoplifting less than respondents that maintained that religion doesn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, the more often respondents attended religious services and religious youth group activities, the less likely they were to shoplift. Respondents that considered religion important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to shoplift. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, importance, frequency of prayer, youth group attendance increased, shoplifting decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Shot/Stabbed Someone*

Shot or stabbed someone was significantly related to attending religious services and attending youth groups. Respondents that attended religious services, regardless of the frequency, and religious youth group activities were less likely to shoot or stab someone. As religious service attendance and youth group attendance increased, shooting or stabbing someone decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Steal a Car*

Stealing a car was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Specifically, respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God stole a car less than respondents that maintained that religion doesn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, the more often respondents attended religious services and

religious youth group activities, the less likely they were to steal a car. Respondents that considered religion important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to steal a car. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, religious importance, frequency of prayer and youth group attendance increased, stealing a car decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

*Steal Worth <\$50*

Stealing something worth less than \$50.00 was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth groups. Respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God were less likely to steal something less than \$50.00 than respondents that maintained that religion didn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, the more often respondents attended religious services and religious youth group activities, the less likely they were to steal something worth less than \$50.00. Respondents that considered religion very important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to steal something worth less than \$50.00. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, religious importance, frequency of prayer and youth group attendance increased, stealing something worth less than \$50.00 decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

*Past 12 Months Steal Worth >\$50*

Stealing something in the past 12 months worth more than \$50.00 was significantly related to belief that scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, and frequency of prayer. Specifically, respondents that agreed that scriptures are the word of God stole something in the past 12 months worth more than \$50.00 less

than respondents that maintained that religion doesn't have sacred scriptures. In addition, respondents that attended religious services were less likely to steal something worth more than \$50.00 than respondents that did not attend religious services. Respondents that considered religion important and prayed at least once a day were less likely to steal something worth more than \$50.00. As belief in scriptures, religious service attendance, importance and frequency of prayer increased, stealing something worth more than \$50.00 decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Take Part in a Group Fight*

Take part in a group fight was significantly related to attending religious services and religious importance. Respondents that attended religious services and considered religion important were less likely to be involved in a group fight. As religious service attendance and religious importance increased, taking part in a group fight decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

#### *Carry a Weapon to School*

Carrying a weapon to school was significantly related to attending religious services and religious importance. The more often respondents attended religious services and believed religion was important, the less likely the respondent was to carry a weapon to school. As religious service attendance and religious importance increased, carrying a weapon to school decreased after controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety, and extracurricular activities.

Table 33. Summary Chart of Individual Religious and Delinquency Variables

	Scriptures are the	Church Attendance	Religious Importance	Prayer	Attending Religious
--	-----------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	--------	------------------------

	Word of God				Youth Group Activities
Burglarized a Building	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Damaged Property	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chewed Tobacco	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Drink Alcohol	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ever Had Sex	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Graffiti	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
School Suspension	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Physical Fight	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Pulled a Knife/Gun on Someone	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Serious Physical Fight	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Seriously Injure Someone	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Shoplift	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Shot/Stabbed Someone	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Steal a Car	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Steal Worth < \$50.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Steal Worth > \$50.00	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Group Fight	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Carried a Weapon to School	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

Yes = Statistically Significant  
 No = Not Statistically Significant

### Contextual Variables

The next set of analyses assessed the relationship between each religious variable and the delinquency index. Results indicate that the religiosity index, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending religious youth group activities were significantly related to delinquency controlling for urbanicity, race, sex composition, marital status and poverty level, see Tables 124-129. Respondents that believed that religion has sacred scriptures, attended religious services and youth group activities, prayed and considered religion important were less likely to be delinquent than respondents that did not.

Table 124.  
 Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.177	.1457	.000***
Religiosity	-.057	.0029	.000***
[Completely Urban=1]	.053	.0180	.003**
[Not Completely Urban=2]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race-White=1]	.082	.0468	.082
[Race-Black=2]	.180	.0518	.001***
[Race-Other=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex Composition-Heavily Male=1]	.280	.0426	.000***
[Sex Composition-Balanced=2]	.159	.0330	.000***
[Sex Composition-Heavily Female=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Never Married=1]	-.226	.1227	.077
[Married=2]	-.195	.1257	.120
[Separated/Divorced=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Poverty-Low=1]	-.147	.0270	.000***
[Poverty-Medium=2]	.000	.0274	.996
[Poverty-High=3]	0	.	.
[Females in Labor Force-Low=1]	.074	.0340	.030
[Females in Labor Force-Medium=2]	.087	.0259	.001***
[Females in Labor Force-High=3]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity, Urbanicity, Race, Sex Composition, Marital status, Poverty level, Females in the Labor Force

Table 125.

Parameter Estimates – Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Sig.
(Intercept)	1.805	.1294	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.294	.0390	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.180	.0407	.000***
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Completely Urban=1]	.080	.0137	.000***
[Not Completely Urban=2]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race-White=1]	-.022	.0345	.519
[Race-Black=2]	-.064	.0389	.101
[Race-Other=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex Composition-Heavily Male=1]	.179	.0326	.000***
[Sex Composition-Balanced=2]	.078	.0250	.002**
[Sex Composition-Heavily Female=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Never Married=1]	-.036	.1163	.757
[Married=2]	-.065	.1151	.572
[Separated/Divorced=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Poverty-Low=1]	-.181	.0206	.000***
[Poverty-Medium=2]	-.032	.0211	.131
[Poverty-High=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Females in Labor Force-Low=1]	.007	.0265	.783

[Females in Labor Force-Medium=2]	.065	.0198	.001***
[Females in Labor Force-High=3]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the word of God, Urbanicity, Race, Sex Composition, Marital status, Poverty level, Females in the Labor Force

Table 126.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attended Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.795	.1250	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.402	.0208	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.168	.0224	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.101	.0227	.000***
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Completely Urban=1]	.062	.0137	.000***
[Not Completely Urban=2]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race-White=1]	-.037	.0345	.287
[Race-Black=2]	-.046	.0389	.239
[Race-Other=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex Composition-Heavily Male=1]	.164	.0326	.000***
[Sex Composition-Balanced=2]	.071	.0250	.005
[Sex Composition-Heavily Female=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Never Married=1]	-.042	.1164	.721
[Married=2]	-.061	.1152	.597
[Separated/Divorced=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Poverty-Low=1]	-.178	.0206	.000***
[Poverty-Medium=2]	-.025	.0212	.236
[Poverty-High=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.

[Females in Labor Force-Low=1]	.011	.0265	.691
[Females in Labor Force-Medium=2]	.069	.0198	.000***
[Females in Labor Force-High=3]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attended Religious Services, Urbanicity, Race, Sex Composition, Marital status, Poverty level, Females in the Labor Force

Table 127.

Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	2.037	.1263	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.647	.0313	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.336	.0310	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.129	.0365	.000***
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Completely Urban=1]	.064	.0137	.000***
[Not Completely Urban=2]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race-White=1]	-.014	.0345	.693
[Race-Black=2]	.023	.0390	.549
[Race-Other=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex Composition-Heavily Male=1]	.176	.0326	.000***
[Sex Composition-Balanced=2]	.089	.0250	.000***
[Sex Composition-Heavily Female=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Never Married=1]	-.103	.1164	.378
[Married=2]	-.112	.1152	.333
[Separated/Divorced=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Poverty-Low=1]	-.220	.0208	.000***
[Poverty-Medium=2]	-.036	.0212	.094
[Poverty-High=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Females in Labor Force-Low=1]	.031	.0265	.247

[Females in Labor Force-Medium=2]	.069	.0198	.000***
[Females in Labor Force-High=3]	0	.	
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Urbanicity, Race, Sex Composition, Marital status, Poverty level, Females in the Labor Force

Table 128.  
Parameter Estimates - Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.879	.1256	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.464	.0235	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.260	.0248	.000***
[At least once a month=3]	-.079	.0280	.005**
[Less than once a month=4]	-.101	.0292	.001***
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Completely Urban=1]	.081	.0137	.000***
[Not Completely Urban=2]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race-White=1]	-.042	.0345	.222
[Race-Black=2]	-.037	.0389	.341
[Race-Other=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex Composition-Heavily Male=1]	.162	.0326	.000***
[Sex Composition-Balanced=2]	.076	.0250	.002**
[Sex Composition-Heavily Female=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Never Married=1]	-.056	.1164	.633
[Married=2]	-.078	.1152	.498
[Separated/Divorced=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Poverty-Low=1]	-.194	.0207	.000***
[Poverty-Medium=2]	-.030	.0212	.164
[Poverty-High=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.

[Females in Labor Force-Low=1]	-.006	.0265	.812
[Females in Labor Force-Medium=2]	.057	.0198	.004**
[Females in Labor Force-High=3]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attended Religious Services, Urbanicity, Race, Sex Composition, Marital status, Poverty level, Females in the Labor Force

Table 129.

Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.625	.1240	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.313	.0176	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.106	.0190	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.079	.0192	.000***
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Completely Urban=1]	.070	.0137	.000***
[Not Completely Urban=2]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race-White=1]	-.008	.0345	.816
[Race-Black=2]	-.029	.0389	.450
[Race-Other=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex Composition-Heavily Male=1]	.181	.0326	.000***
[Sex Composition-Balanced=2]	.078	.0250	.002**
[Sex Composition-Heavily Female=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Never Married=1]	-.029	.1163	.806
[Married=2]	-.052	.1151	.654
[Separated/Divorced=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Poverty-Low=1]	-.184	.0206	.000***
[Poverty-Medium=2]	-.034	.0212	.111
[Poverty-High=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Females in Labor Force-Low=1]	.011	.0265	.678

[Females in Labor Force-Medium=2]	.065	.0198	.001***
[Females in Labor Force-High=3]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Youth Groups, Urbanicity, Race, Sex Composition, Marital status, Poverty level, Females in the Labor Force

## Relationship between Religion WII and Delinquency Wave II

The next set of analyses assessed the relationship between religion in Wave II and delinquency in Wave II, controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities, see Tables 130-135. The religiosity index in Wave II was significantly related to delinquency in Wave II. Scriptures are the word of God was not significantly related to delinquency. Attending religious services and religious group activities once a week or more was significantly related to delinquency. In addition, religion being very important and frequency of prayer were also significantly related to delinquency. As attending religious services and youth group activities increased, delinquency decreased. Similarly, the more an important that the respondent felt religion was and the more often that the respondent prayed, the less likely they were to be delinquent.

Table 130.

Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.838	.0457	.000***
Religiosity WII	-.055	.0034	.000***
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency WII

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 131.

Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.013	.0873	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.019	.0639	.763

[Disagree=2]	.110	.0663	.098
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.018	.0223	.422
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	.043	.0228	.059
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.095	.0369	.010**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.006	.0493	.896
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.023	.0204	.260
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 132.

Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attended Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.230	.0680	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.380	.0328	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.043	.0348	.215
[Less than once a month=3]	-.073	.0356	.040*
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.030	.0223	.172
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	.057	.0228	.013*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.090	.0369	.015*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.027	.0493	.581
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.034	.0204	.092
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attended Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 133.

Parameter – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.193	.0774	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.343	.0504	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.062	.0503	.221
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	.175	.0575	.002**
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.

[Race=.00]	-.024	.0223	.274
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	.056	.0228	.015*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.106	.0369	.004**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.024	.0494	.620
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.024	.0204	.234
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept) Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 134.

Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.338	.0693	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.504	.0351	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.298	.0371	.000***
[At least once a month=3]	-.108	.0428	.012*
[Less than once a month=4]	-.142	.0435	.001***
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.031	.0223	.170
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	.063	.0229	.006**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.115	.0370	.002**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.027	.0494	.584
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.035	.0204	.083
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 135.

Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.115	.0628	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.320	.0268	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.048	.0280	.086
[Less than once a month=3]	-.079	.0301	.009**

[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.018	.0223	.417
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	.048	.0228	.034*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.091	.0369	.014*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.009	.0493	.850
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.030	.0204	.140
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

### **Relationship between Religion WI and Delinquency Wave II**

In order to assess whether there was a change in delinquency, the next set of analyses assessed the relationship between religion in Wave I and delinquency in Wave II, controlling for sex, race, marital status, concern for safety and extracurricular activities, see Tables 126-130. Religiosity was significantly related to delinquency, as religion in wave I increased, delinquency in Wave II also increased. Consistent with the findings assessing the relationship between religion Wave II and delinquency Wave II, scriptures are the word of God was not significantly related to delinquency. Also consistent with the findings assessing the relationship between religion Wave II and delinquency Wave II attending religious services, religious group activities and frequency of prayer was significantly related to delinquency. Although religious importance was significant when we looked at the relationship between religion Wave II and delinquency Wave II, the relationship was no longer significant between religious importance in Wave I and delinquency in Wave II.

Table 136.

## Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.886	.0507	.000***
Religiosity (Scale)	.017 1	.0037	.000***

Dependent Variable: Delinquency WII

Model: (Intercept), Religiosity

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.001

Table 137.

## Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.153	.0909	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.085	.0689	.216
[Disagree=2]	-.084	.0716	.240
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.000	.0225	.990
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.014	.0233	.559
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.095	.0369	.003**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.057	.0498	.252
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.086	.0205	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.001

Table 138.

## Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attended Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.108	.0681	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.030	.0345	.383
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.025	.0376	.513
[Less than once a month=3]	-.122	.0392	.002**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.007	.0228	.762
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.015	.0234	.527
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.107	.0364	.003*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.056	.0498	.263
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.088	.0205	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attended Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status,

Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.001

Table 139.

## Parameter – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.146	.0829	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.090	.0573	.117
[Fairly Important=2]	-.053	.0574	.357
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.067	.0669	.316
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.010	.0230	.659
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.010	.0233	.654
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.108	.0364	.003**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.058	.0498	.242
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.089	.0205	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept) Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety,

extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 140.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.192	.0710	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.145	.0390	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.130	.0412	.002**
[At least once a month=3]	-.281	.0491	.000***
[Less than once a month=4]	.032	.0474	.501
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.014	.0228	.545
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.007	.0233	.748
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.109	.0364	.003**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.052	.0498	.292
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.095	.0206	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 141.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	1.041	.0637	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	.035	.0259	.179
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	.157	.0276	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.121	.0316	.000***
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.015	.0226	.497
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.018	.0233	.429
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.114	.0365	.002**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.059	.0498	.239
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	.083	.0205	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: Delinquency II

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

### **Controlling for Delinquency and Religiosity WI with Delinquency outcome in WII**

In order to further explore whether a causal relationship exists between religiosity and delinquency, the next analysis controlled for delinquency and religiosity at Wave I with delinquency at Wave II as the outcome. Results indicate that controlling for delinquency at Wave I had an inverse relationship with delinquency. An adolescent with delinquent intentions in Wave I did not continue to be delinquent in Wave II. In addition, controlling for religiosity in Wave I has a positive relationship with delinquency. Adolescents that were religious in Wave I were delinquent in Wave II.

Table 142.

#### Parameter Estimates - Religiosity

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.948	.0537	.000***
Delinquency WI	-.010	.0020	.000***
Religiosity WI	.015	.0038	.000***

Dependent Variable: Delinquency Wave II

Model: (Intercept), Delinquency WI, Religiosity WI

## Chapter V – Data Results and Conclusion

### A. Interpretation of results

The current research answered several important questions about the relationship between religiosity and juvenile delinquency. The following results are organized according to the hypotheses tested.

*Hypothesis 1: Juveniles that are involved, committed and believe in religion are less likely to be delinquent than juveniles that are not religious.*

The answer to the hypothesis 1 is yes. The original index of religiosity which included belief in scriptures, past year attended religious services, religious importance, past year attended religious youth groups and frequency of prayer was significantly associated with delinquency. In addition, when we tested each religious variable separately we found that the individual measures of religiosity were significantly related to delinquency. Specifically, the first set of analyses tested the influence of belief in scriptures, past year attended religious services, religious importance, past year attended religious youth groups and frequency of prayer on delinquency. Respondents that believed in religious scriptures were less likely to be involved in delinquency. Similarly, respondents that attended religious services and youth group services once a month or more were less likely to be delinquent. In addition, the more often that the respondent prayed, the less likely they were to be delinquent. Although these four measures were significantly related to delinquency in the direction that was hypothesized, religious importance was significant in the opposite direction. The results revealed that respondents that believed that religion was “fairly important” were likely to be delinquent.

The second set of analyses assessed the relationship between the individual measures of religiosity and delinquency while controlling for sex, race, parental marital status, involvement in extracurricular activities and neighborhood characteristics. The results provide support for hypothesis 1 that juveniles that are religious are less likely to be delinquent than juveniles that are not religious. Specifically, respondents that believed that religion has sacred scriptures were less likely to be delinquent than respondents that did not believe that scriptures are the word of God. Similarly, the more often that

respondents attended religious services and youth religious activities, the less that they were involved in delinquency. Finally, the more often that respondents prayed and the more important they considered religion, the less likely they were to be delinquent. The inclusion of the control variables provided similar results to the original analyses that did not include control variables. The only difference was in religious importance, which originally indicated that there was a positive relationship between religious importance and delinquency. When the control variables were added to the analysis, there was now an inverse relationship between religious importance and delinquency. As religious importance increased, delinquency decreased.

*Hypothesis 2: Religion reduces delinquency even after controlling for family and peer relationships.*

The second hypothesis addressed what impact family and peer variables have on the relationship between religiosity and delinquency. Results provide support for this hypothesis. When we controlled for family bonds in the model, the relationship between religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth group activities was significantly associated with delinquency. Specifically, respondents that believed that religion has sacred scriptures were less likely to be delinquent than respondents that did not believe that scriptures are the word of God. Similarly, the more often that respondents attended religious services and youth religious activities, the less that they were involved in delinquency. Finally, respondents that prayed at least once a day and considered religion important were less likely to be delinquent. In all measures of religiosity, family bonds

have an inverse relationship with delinquency. Results indicate that religiosity reduces delinquency with the inclusion of family bonds.

Controlling for prosocial friends in the model indicated that the relationship between religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth group activities was significantly associated with delinquency. Respondents that believed that religion has sacred scriptures were less likely to be delinquent than respondents that did not believe that scriptures are the word of God. Similarly, the more often that respondents attended religious services and youth religious activities, the less that they were involved in delinquency. Finally, respondents that prayed at least once a day and considered religion important were less likely to be delinquent. Although the religious variables were all inversely related to delinquency, prosocial friends increased delinquency in all of the models.

Controlling for antisocial in the model indicated that the relationship between religiosity, scriptures are the word of God, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending youth group activities was significantly associated with delinquency. Respondents that believed that religion has sacred scriptures were less likely to be delinquent than respondents that did not believe that scriptures are the word of God. Similarly, the more often that respondents attended religious services and youth religious activities, the less that they were involved in delinquency. Finally, respondents' that prayed at least once a day and considered religion important were the less likely they were to be delinquent. The religious variables were all inversely related to delinquency and antisocial friends increased delinquency in all of the models.

The inclusion of prosocial and antisocial friends did not diminish the relationship

between religiosity and delinquency.

*Hypothesis 3: Adolescents that report religiosity will have a lower level of involvement in property, violent and alcohol/drug offenses.*

The third hypothesis explored the research question of whether religiosity would reduce specific types of delinquent offenses. The current research provides mixed support for hypothesis 3. While the likelihood of some offenses such as damaging property, graffiti, out of school suspension, seriously injure someone, shoplift and stealing something for less than \$50.00 were significantly affected by belief in sacred scriptures, attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending religious youth group activities, for other offenses such burglary, tobacco use, drinking alcohol, ever had sex, physical fight, pulled knife, serious fight, shot/stabbed someone, steal something worth more than \$50.00, group fight and carry a weapon at least one measure of delinquency became insignificant. When the offenses were combined into a single measure of delinquency all of the measures of religiosity were significant but when each delinquent offense was evaluated separately only some of the measures of religiosity remained significant. It is important to note that each type of delinquency tested had at least one measure of religiosity that reduced delinquency. This indicates that religiosity does have a significant influence on a variety of delinquent behaviors.

*Hypothesis 4: Contextual level variables will not diminish the effects of religiosity on delinquency.*

The fourth hypothesis looked at the influence of contextual variables on the relationship between religion and individual level delinquency. The results provide support for this hypothesis. Religiosity, believing that scriptures are the word of God,

attending religious services, religious importance, frequency of prayer and attending religious youth groups reduced delinquency while controlling for urbanicity, race, sex composition marital status, poverty level and females in the labor force. The inclusion of contextual variables did not cancel or diminish the effects of individual religiosity on delinquency.

*Hypothesis 5: The relationship between religiosity and delinquency will remain significant over time.*

The final hypothesis addressed whether there would be a change in religiosity and delinquency from Wave I to Wave II. Hypothesis 5 was only partially supported. As previous indicated for Wave I religiosity and Wave I delinquency, the results showed that belief in scriptures, past year attended religious services, religious importance, past year attend religious service and frequency of prayer was significantly related to delinquency.

Assessing the impact of Wave II religiosity on Wave II delinquency, belief in sacred scriptures became insignificant between Wave I and Wave II. While any attendance of religious services was significantly related to delinquency in Wave I only attending religious services once a week or more was related to delinquency in Wave II. In addition, while religion being very important remained significant, religion being fairly important became insignificant in Wave II. The results from Wave II for frequency of pray and attending youth religious groups remain consistent of that of Wave I, as frequency of prayer and attending religious services increased, delinquency decreased. Since it was hypothesized that religiosity would have a similar effect on religiosity from Wave I to Wave II, the hypothesis was only partially supported because the significance

of belief in scriptures, attending religious services and religious importance was reduced in Wave II.

In order to determine whether there was a change in delinquency, the next set of analyses assessed the relationship between religion in Wave I and delinquency in Wave II. Consistent with the findings assessing the relationship between religion Wave II and delinquency Wave II, scriptures are the word of God was not significantly related to delinquency. Also consistent with the findings of religion Wave II and delinquency Wave II attending religious services, religious group activities and frequency of prayer were significantly related to delinquency. Although religious attendance and youth participation in religious activities were significant, religious attendance was only significant for the category less than once a month and youth group participation was only significant for less than once a month. Attending youth group activities once a month a more was actually found to increase delinquency. In addition, although religious importance was significant when we looked at the relationship between religion Wave II and delinquency Wave II, the relationship was no longer significant between religious importance in Wave I and delinquency in Wave II.

In order to determine whether adolescents who were both religious and non-delinquent at Wave I continue to be non-delinquent at Wave II, the next analysis controlled for religiosity and delinquency in Wave I. Controlling for religiosity and delinquency in Wave I indicated that delinquency at Wave I had an inverse relationship with delinquency. An adolescent with delinquent intentions in Wave I did not continue to be delinquent in Wave II. In addition, controlling for religiosity in Wave I has a positive relationship with delinquency. Adolescents that were religious in Wave I were delinquent

in Wave II.

In summary, contrary to the hypothesis, controlling for religiosity in Wave I did not provide causal evidence that adolescents that were religious in wave I were not delinquent in Wave II. Similarly, adolescents that were delinquent in Wave I were less likely to be delinquent in Wave II. In addition, although belief in scriptures and religious importance were insignificant when evaluated in Wave II, attending religious services, frequency of prayer and attending religious youth group activities remained significant in both Wave I and Wave II. Therefore, we can conclude that although there were some changes from Wave I to Wave II, the influence that religion has on delinquency remains over time.

The central purpose of this study was to address the theoretical and methodological limitations on the relationship between religiosity and adolescent delinquency. Given the lack of a clear theoretical context, the current research provided a plausible theoretical framework using social control. The current research shows that religiosity operates as an agent of control that reduces delinquency. Specifically, respondents that attend religious services and activities have opportunities for involvement in conventional activities and are attached to a prosocial institution and its members. In addition, respondents that believe in scriptures, pray and believe that religion is important commit to a lifestyle of conventional behavior that includes less delinquency. Overall, the research concluded that presence of religion as a form of social control reduces all types of delinquency. The research indicates that individual-level religiosity negatively relates to individual-level delinquency. This finding lends support to the conclusion that individual-level religiosity deters delinquency.

The study also addressed a number of methodological limitations in the literature. First, the majority of studies have used an omnibus concept of religiosity or included only one measure of religiosity. The current study has revealed that using an omnibus measure of religiosity may not provide accurate results regarding its impact on delinquency. In the current analysis, the omnibus concept of religiosity was not related to delinquency whereas the individual measures were. This research provides support for the idea that religion is a multifaceted concept with many dimensions that should be examined separately. Second, while studies have varied in their estimation of the types of delinquent offenses that are reduced by religion (Baier and Wright 2001; Desmond, Soper, Purpura, and Smith 2009; Cochran Wood and Arneklev 1994; Rodell and Benda 1999), the current research provides support for the idea that religiosity affects a wide variety of delinquency including truant, property and violent offenses. Third, since most studies of religiosity and delinquency include only basic statistic techniques such as bivariate or chi square analysis, the current analysis included the Poisson regression model. This model is suited for the current data because it takes into account the complexity of the relationship (Johnson, Jang, Larson, & De Li 2001; Longest and Vaisey 2008; Burkett and Warren 1987) and provides an improved assessment of the nature of the relationship. Fourth, previous studies have fail to control for the influences of two of the most important influences on delinquent behavior, family and peers. The current research indicates that family bonds are extremely important for increased religiosity while decreasing delinquency. Finally, although the significance of the religiosity was reduced from the analysis in Wave I to the analysis in Wave II, there was still a consistent relationship

from Wave I to Wave II. This analysis provides the first step in establishing a causal relationship between religion and delinquency.

### B. Generalizations

Because the current study used data from a large nationally representative sample of students and schools throughout the United States we are confident that other studies that incorporate similar models will find results that are consistent with the outcomes previously discussed. Despite the introduction of various control, contextual and delinquency variables, religiosity positively affects individual behavior.

### C. Limitations and Study Threats to Validity

Despite its theoretical and methodological strengths, this study had a number of limitations. First, although the study used longitudinal data, we are unable to conclude that religiosity causes or deters delinquency. Future research should focus on the causal mechanisms that influence the relationship between religion and delinquency. Although the current study looked at differences in religiosity between Wave I and Wave II and concluded that the influence of religiosity on delinquency decreased in Wave II, the research does not provide a causal explanation for this occurrence. Another limitation to the current study is the possibility that religious youth were not honest regarding their level of delinquency. Although the validity of self-report data is normally high (Johnston et al. 2004), religious youths may not be honest about their level of delinquent involvement because of fear of punishment and disapproval by authoritative figures such as parents and school officials. In addition, although Add Health is an invaluable resource for data on the relationship between religiosity and delinquency there were a number of delinquent offenses that were not included in the current analysis. Other delinquent

offenses were not included in the current analyses because of missing data. For example, drug offenses were not included because for many of the drugs measures over half of the sample did not respond. It is possible that there is a fundamental difference in the types of delinquent offenses that adolescents are willing to discuss and those that they are not. Although the current research indicates that religiosity influences a variety of delinquent offenses, data which contains a high response rate for delinquent offenses not included here would provide an improved assessment as to the delinquent behaviors that are influenced by religiosity. Finally, the current research did not adequately assess the existence of friendship group norms. Although the current research did not find a significant relationship between peer influence on religiosity and delinquency, this area of research needs further investigation. In order to fully investigate this relationship, additional information from friends is needed. Mead (1934) argued that how friends perceive each other may be more important than the way they act.

#### D. Implications

In conclusion, although the findings presented here do not resolve the debate as to whether religiosity causes a reduction in delinquency, we have rigorously investigated a number of hypotheses raised by previous research and demonstrated empirically that religiosity negatively correlates with delinquency. The results of the current study suggest that religiosity is an important factor against delinquency. Accordingly, practitioners and policymakers and others interested in understanding the etiology and prevention of delinquency should pursue the role of religiosity to address delinquency to reduce delinquency among adolescents. Using the components of religion can be a cost effective way to get children to behave. Including a variety of religious interventions such as youth

group activities can provide communities with a viable solution to reduce delinquent behavior. A conversation among policy makers as to how to incorporate religious components into delinquency reduction programs is important to promote positive outcomes and prevent delinquency. Research continues to indicate that the most effective delinquency prevention and reduction strategies are comprehensive. Using religiosity as a factor to reduce risk and develop protective factors will enhance the ability of researchers to be able to reduce and prevent delinquency among adolescents. A broader issue that should be addressed is that the current research may have long-term implications regarding the separation of church and state. In order for delinquency reduction strategies that include religion to be used, there are many unanswered questions as to types of interventions that would be allowed within schools and in the community.

## References

- Adamczyk, A. (2009). Socialization and Selection in the Link between Friends' Religiosity and the Transition to Sexual Intercourse. *Sociology of Religion* , 70 (1), 5-27.
- Adamczyk, A., & Felson, J. (2006). Friends' Religiosity and first sex. *Social Science Research* , 35, 924-947.
- Adamczyk, A., & Palmer, I. (2008). Religion and Initiation into Marijuana use: the deterring role of religious friends. *journal of drug issues* , 717-742.
- Aiken, L., & West, S. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and Interpreting Interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Albrecht, S., Chadwick, B., & Alcom, D. (1977). Religiosity and Deviance: Application of an attitude-behavior contingent consistency model. *Journal for the scientific study of religion* , 16, 263-274.
- Bahr, S., & Hoffmann, J. (2010). Parenting Style, Religiosity, Peers and Adolescent Heavy Drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs* , 71 (4), 539-543.
- Bahr, S., & Hoffmann, J. (2008). Religiosity, Peers, and adolescent drug use. *Journal of Drug Issues* , 38, 743-770.
- Bahr, S., Hawks, R., & Wang, G. (1993). Family and religious influences on adolescent substance abuse. *Youth and Society* , 24, 443-465.
- Bahr, S., Maughan, S., Marcos, A., & Li, B. (1998). Family, religiosity, and the risk of adolescent drug use. *journal of marriage and the family* , 60, 979-992.
- Baier, C., & Wright, B. (2001). If You Love Me, Keep My Commandments: A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Religion on Crime. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency* , 38 (1), 3-21.
- Bainbridge, & Stark. (1981). Friendship, Religion and the Occult: A Network Study. *Review of Religious Research* , 22 (4), 313-327.
- Barnow, S., Schuckit, M., Lucht, M., John, U., & Freyberger, H. (2002). The Importance of a Positive Family History of Alcoholism, Parental Rejection and Emotional

- Warmth, Behavioral Problems and Peer Substance Use for Alcohol Problems in Teenagers: A Path Analysis. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* , 63, 305-315.
- Benda, B. (1995). The Effect of Religion on Adolescent Delinquency Revisited . *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency* , 32 (4), 446-466.
- Benda, B., & Corwyn, R. (1997). A Test of a Model with Reciprocal Effects Between Religiosity and Various Forms of Delinquency using 2-stage Least Squares Regression. *Journal of Social Service Research* , 22, 27-52.
- Benda, B., & Corwyn, R. (2001). Are the Effects of Religion on Crime Mediated, Moderated, and Misrepresented by Inappropriate Measures? *Journal of Social Service Research* , 27 (3), 57-86.
- Benda, B., & Toombs, N. (n.d.). Religiosity and Violence: Are They Related After Considering the Strongest Predictors? *Journal of Criminal Justice* .
- Benda, B., Pope, S., & Kellerher, K. (2006). Church Attendance or Religiousness: Their Relationship to Adolescents' Use of Alcohol, Other Drugs, and Delinquency. *Alcohol Treatment Quarterly* , 24 (1/2), 75-87.
- Benson, R., Donahue, M., & Erickson, J. (1989). Adolescence and Religion: A Review of the Literature 1970-1986. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religions* , 1, 153-181.
- Brook, J., Brook, D., & Richter, L. (2001). Risk Factors for Adolescent Marijuana Use Across Cultures and Across Time. *Journal of Genetic Psychology* , 162, 357-374.
- Brown, T., Parks, G., Zimmerman, R., & Phillips, C. (2001). The Role of Religion in Predicting Adolescent Alcohol Use and Problem Drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* , 62, 696-705.
- Burkett, S. (1993). Perceived Parents Religiosity, Friends' Drinking and Hellfire: A Panel Study of Adolescent Drinking . *Review of Religious Research* , 35 (2), 134-154.
- Burkett, S., & Ward, D. (1993). A Note on Perceptual Deterrence, Religiosity Based Moral Condemnation, and Social Control. *Criminology* , 31, 119-134.
- Burkett, S., & Warren, D. (1987). Religiosity, Peer Associations, and Adolescent Marijuana Use: A Panel Study of Underlying Causal Structures. *Criminology* (25), 109-131.
- Burkett, S., & White, M. (1987). Hellfire and Delinquency: Another Look. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* , 13, 455-462.

- Catalano, R., Kosterman, R., Hawkins, J., Newcomb, M., & Abbott, R. (1996). Modeling the Etiology of Adolescent Substance Use: A Test of the Social Development Model. *Journal of Drug Issues* , 26, 429-455.
- Chadwick, B., & Top, B. (1993). Religiosity and Delinquency among LDS Adolescents . *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* , 33, 51-67.
- Chu, D. (2007). Religioisty and Desistance from Drug Use. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* , 34, 661-679.
- Cochran, J. (1988). The Effect of Religiosity on Secular and Ascetic Deviance. *Sociological Focus* , 21, 293-306.
- Cochran, J., & Akers, R. (1989). Beyond Hellfire: An Exploration of the Variable Effcets of Religiosity on Adolescent Marijuana and Alcohol Use. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* , 26, 198-225.
- Cochran, J., & Wood, P. (1994). Is The Religioisty-Delinquency Relationship Spurious? *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* , 31, 92-123.
- Cornwall, M. (1987). The Social Basis of Religion: A Study of the Factors Influencing Religious Belief and Commitment . *Review of Religious Research* , 29, 44-56.
- Cox, M., & Matthews, B. (2007). Faith-Based Approaches for Controlling the Delinquency of Juvenile Offenders. *Ferdal Probation* , 71 (1), 31-37.
- Cretacci, M. (2002). Religion and Social Control Theory: An Expansion of Hirschi's Social Bond. Doctoral Dissertation . Universty of Albany, State University of New York at Albany.
- Cretacci, M. (2003). Religion and Social Control: An Application of a Modified Social Bond on Violence. *Criminal Justice Review* , 28, 254-277.
- Desmond, S., Soper, S., Purpura, D., & Smith, E. (2009). Religioisty, Moral Beliefs, and Delinquency: Does the Effect of Religiosity on Delinquency Depend on Moral Beliefs? *Sociological Spectrum* , 29 (1), 51-71.
- Donahue, M. (1995). Religion and the Well-Being of Adolescents. *Journal of Social Issues* , 51, 145-160.
- Durkheim, E. (1951[1897]). *Suicide: A Study in Sociology*, translated by J.A. Spalding & G. Simpson. New York, New York: Free Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1984[1893]). *The Division of Labor in Society*, translated by Lewis Coser. New York, New York: Free Press.

- Elifson, K., Peterson, D., & Hadaway. (1983). Religiosity and Delinquency. *Criminology* , 21, 505-527.
- Elliott, D., Huizinga, D., & Ageton, S. *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ellison, C., & Levin, J. (1998). The religion-health connection: evidence, theory, and future directions. *Health Education and Behavior* , 25, 700-720.
- Evans, D., Cullen, F., Dunaway, R., & Burton, V. Religion and crime reexamined: the impact of religion, secular controls, and social ecology on adult criminality. *Criminology* , 33, 195-217.
- Fernquist, R. (1995). A research note on the association between religion and delinquency. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal* , 16, 169-175.
- Francis, L. (1996). The Impact of Personality and Religion on Attitude Towards Substance Use Among 13-15 Year Olds . *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* , 44, 97-103.
- Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A General Theory of Crime* . Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hadaway, C., Elifson, K., & Petersen, D. (1984). Religious Involvement and Drug Use among Urban Adolescents . *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* , 23, 109-128.
- Harris, K. (n.d.). *The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health)*.
- Harris, K., Halpern, C., Whitsel, E., Hussey, J., Tabor, P., Entzel, P., et al. (2009). *The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research Design*. Retrieved from <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design>
- Hawkins, J., Catalano, R., & Miller, J. (1992). Risk and Protective Factors for Alcohol and Other Drug Problems in Adolescence and Early Adulthood: Implications for Substance Abuse Prevention. *Psychological Bulletin* , 112, 64-105.
- Haynie, D. (2002). Friendship Networks and Adolescent Delinquency: The Relative Nature of Peer Delinquency . *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* , 18, 99-134.
- Haynie, D., & Osgood, D. (2005). Reconsidering Peers and Delinquency: How do Peers Matter? *Social Forces* , 84, 1109-1130.
- Higgins, P., & Albrecht, G. (1977). Hell Fire and Delinquency Revisited. *Social Forces* , 55, 952-958.

- Hill, P., & Hood, R. (1999). *Measures of Delinquency*. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Iannotti, R., & Bush, R. (1992). Elementary School Children's Use of Alcohol, Cigarettes and Marijuana and Classmates' Attribution of Socialization. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* , 30, 275-287.
- Jang, S. J., & Johnson, B. (2001). Neighborhood Disorder, Individual Religiosity, and Adolescent Use of Illicit Drugs: A Test of Multilevel Hypotheses. *Criminology* , 39 (1), 109-143.
- Jang, S., & Johnson, B. (2001). Neighborhood Disorder, Religiosity, and Adolescent Use of Illicit Drugs: A Test of Multilevel Hypotheses. *Criminology* , 39, 109-143.
- Jeynes, W. (2003). The Effects of Religious Commitment on Academic Achievement of Urban and Other Children. *Education and Urban Society* , 36 (1), 44-62.
- Ji, C.-H., Perry, T., & Clarke-Pine, D. (2011). Considering Personal Religiosity in Adolescent Delinquency: The Role of Depression, Suicidal Ideation, and Church Guidelines. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity* , 30 (1), 3-15.
- Johnson, B. (2001). Reviewing and Clarifying the Role of Religion in Reducing Crime and Delinquency. *Federal Probation* , 65 (3), 49-53.
- Johnson, B., De Li, S., Larson, D., & McCullough, M. (2000). A Systematic Review of the Religiosity and Delinquency Literature: A Research Note. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* , 16, 32.
- Johnson, B., Jang, S., Larson, D., & De Li, S. (2001). Does Adolescent Religious Commitment Matter? A Reexamination of the effects of religiosity on delinquency. *Journal of research in crime and delinquency* , 38 (1), 22-44.
- Johnson, B., Larson, D., DeLi, S., & Jang, J. (2000). Escaping from the Crime of Inner Cities: Church Attendance and Religious Salience among Disadvantaged Youth. *Justice Quarterly* , 17, 377-391.
- Johnson, B., Tompkins, R., & Webb, D. *Objective Hope: Assessing the Effectiveness of Faith-Based Organizations: A Review of the Literature*. Center for Research on Religion and Urban Civil Society. University of Pennsylvania.
- Johnson, M. C. (2008). The Moderating Effects of Religiosity on the Relationship between Stressful Life Events and Delinquent Behavior. *Journal of Criminal Justice* , 36 (6), 486-493.

- Jussim, L., & Osgood, D. (1989). Influence and Similarity among Friends: An Integrative Model Applied to Incarcerated Adolescents. *Social Psychology Quarterly* , 52, 98-112.
- Kafka, R., & London, R. (1991). Communication in Relationships and adolescent Substance Use: The Influence of Parents and Friends. *Adolescence* , 26, 587-598.
- Kandel, D. (1996). The Parental and Peer Contexts of Adolescent Deviance: An Algebra of Interpersonal Influences. *Journal of Drug Issues* , 289-315.
- Larson, D., & Johnson, B. (2004, September 15). Religion: The Forgotten Factor in Cutting Youth Crime and Saving At-Risk Youth. Retrieved from <http://manhattaninstitute.org/html/jpr98-2.htm>
- Lichfield, A., Thomas, D., & Li, B. (1997). Dimensions of Religiosity as Mediators of the Relations between Parenting and Adolescent Deviant Behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research* , 12, 199-226.
- Mason, A., & Windle, M. (2002). A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Religiosity on Adolescent Alcohol Use and Alcohol-Related Problems. *Journal of Adolescent Research* , 17, 346-364.
- Maxwell, K. (2002). Friends: The Role of Peer Influence Across Adolescent Risk Behaviors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* , 31, 267-277.
- McKune, B., & Hoffmann, J. (2009). Religion and Academic Achievement Among Adolescents . *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* , 5 (10), 1-22.
- Mckune, B., & Hoffmann, J. (2009). Religion and Academic Achievement among Adolescents. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* , 5, 1-22.
- Meier, A. (2003). Adolescents' Transition to First Intercourse, Religiosity and Attitudes about Sex. *Social Forces* , 81, 1031-1052.
- Merrill, R., Salazar, R., & Gardner, N. (2005). Relationship Between Family Religiosity and Drug Use Behavior Among Youth. *Social Behavior and Personality* , 33, 821-836.
- Muller, C., & Ellison. (2001). Religious Involvement, Social Capital, and Adolescents' Academic Progress: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of 1988. *Sociological Focus* , 34, 155-183.
- Pearce, L., & Haynie, D. (2004). Intergenerational Religious Dynamics and Adolescent Delinquency. *Social Forces* , 52 (4), 1553-1572.

- Potvin, R., & Sloane, D. (1985). Parental Control, Age, and Religious Practice. *Review of Religious Research* , 27 (1), 3-14.
- Reed, M., & Roundtree, R. (1997). Peer Pressure and Adolescent Substance Use. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* , 13, 143-180.
- Regenerus, M. (2007). *Forbidden Fruit: Sex and Religion in the Lives of American Teenagers*. New York: Oxford.
- Regenerus, M. (2002). Friends' Influence on Adolescent Theft and Minor Delinquency: A Developmental Test of Peer-Reported Effects. *Social Science Research* , 31, 681-705.
- Regenerus, M. (2003). Linked Lives, Faith, and Behavior: Intergenerational Religious Influence on Adolescent Delinquency. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* , 42, 189-203.
- Regenerus, M. (2004). Moral Communities and Adolescent Delinquency: Religious Contexts and Community Social Control. *Sociological Quarterly* , 44, 523-554.
- Regenerus, M. (2000). Shaping School Success: Religious Socialization and Educational Outcomes in Urban Public Schools. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* , 39 (3), 363-370.
- Regenerus, M., & Burdette. (2006). Religious Change and Adolescent Family Dynamics. *The Sociological Quarterly* , 47, 175-194.
- Regenerus, M., & Elder, G. (2003). Religion and Vulnerability among Low-Risk Adolescents. *Social Science Research* , 32, 633-658.
- Regenerus, M., Smith, C., & Fritsch, M. (2003). *Religion in the Lives of American Adolescents: A Review of the Literature*. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Reiss, A. (1951). Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Controls. *American Sociological Review* , 16 (2), 196-207.
- Reiss, A. (1952). Social Correlates of Psychological Types of Delinquency. *American Psychological Review* , 17 (6), 710-718.
- Rhodes, A., & Reiss, A. (1970). The Religious Factor and Delinquent Behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* , 7, 83-98.
- Rodell, D., & Benda, B. (1999). Alcohol and Crime Among Religious Youth. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly* , 17 (4), 53-66.

- Rohrbaugh, J., & Jessor, R. (1975). Religiosity in Youth: A Personal Control Against Deviant Behavior. *Journal of Personality* , 43 (1), 136-155.
- Rostosky, S., Wilcox, B., Comer-Wright, M., & Randall, B. (2004). The Impact of Religiosity on Adolescent Sexual Behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research* , 19, 677-697.
- Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scheepers, P., Grotenhuis, M., & Van Der Slik, F. (2002). Education, Religiosity and Moral Attitudes: Explaining Cross-National Effect Differences. *Sociology of Religion* , 63, 157-176.
- Shilling, C., & Mellor, P. (2011). Retheorizing Emile Durkheim on Society and Religion: Embodiment, Intoxication and Collective Life . *The Sociological Review* , 59 (1).
- Simons, Gordon, L., Simons, R. L., & Conger, R. D. (2004). Identifying the mechanisms whereby family religiosity influences the probability of adolescent antisocial behavior. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* , 35, 547-563.
- Simons, L., Simons, R., & Conger, R. (2004). Identifying the Mechanisms Whereby Family Religiosity Influences the Probability of Adolescent Antisocial Behavior. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* , 35, 547-563.
- Simpson, M., & Coklin, G. (1989). Socioeconomic Development, Suicide, and Religion: A Test of Durkheim's Theory of Religion and Suicide. *Social Forces* , 67, 945-964.
- Sloane, D., & Potvin, R. (1986). Religion and Delinquency: Cutting Through the Maze. *Social Forces* , 65, 87-105.
- Smith, C. (2005). *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, C. (2003). Theorizing Religious Effects among American Adolescents. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* , 42, 17-30.
- Smith, C., Denton, M., Faris, R., & Regnerns, M. (2002). Mapping American Adolescent Religious Participation. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion* , 41, 397-412.
- Smith, P. (2008). Durkheim and Criminology: Reconstructing the Legacy. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* , 3, 333-344.

- Stark, R. (1996). Hellfire and Delinquency One More Time. *Sociology of Religion* , 57, 163-173.
- Stark, R., & Bainbridge, W. (1997). *Religion, Deviance, and Social Control*. New York: Routledge.
- Stark, R., & Bainbridge, W. (1980). Toward a Theory of Religion: Religious Commitment . *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* , 19 (2), 114-128.
- Stark, R., Doyle, D., & Rushing, J. (1983). Beyond Durkheim: Religion and Suicide. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* , 22, 120-131.
- Stark, R., Kent, L., & Doyle, D. (1982). Religion and Delinquency: The Ecology of the Lost Relationship. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* , 19, 4-24.
- Sutherland, E. (1947). *Principles of Criminology* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippencott
- Treboux, D., and Busch-Rossnagel, N.A.
- Thompson, M., Ho, C., & Kingree, J. (2007). Prospective Associations Between Delinquency and Suicidal Behaviors in Nationally Representative Sample. *Journal of Adolescent Health* , 40, 232-237.
- Tittle, C., & Welch, M. (1983). Religiosity and Deviance: Towards a Contingency Theory of Constraining Effects. *Social Forces* , 61, 653-682.
- Van Der Meer Sanchez, Z., Garcia De Oliveira, L., & Nappo, S. (2008). Religiosity as a Protective Factor Against the Use of Drugs . *Substance Use and Misuse* , 43, 1476-1486.
- Wade, T., & Pevalin, D. (2005). Adolescent Delinquency and Health. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* , 47, 619-654.
- Walker, C., Ainette, M., Wills, T., & Mendoza, D. (2007). Religiosity and Substance Use: Test of an Indirect-Effect Model in Early and Middle Adolescence. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* , 21, 84-96.
- Wallace, J., Brown, T., Bachman, J., & Laveist, T. (2003). The Influence of Race and Religion Abstinence from Alcohol, Cigarettes, and Marijuana among Adolescents. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* , 64, 843-848.
- Wallace, J., Yamaguchi, R., Bachman, J., O'Malley, P., Schulenberg, J., & Johnston, L. (2007). Religiosity and Adolescent Substance Use: The Role of Individual and Contextual Influences. *Social Problems* , 54, 308-327.

- Wilcox, W. (1998). Conservative Protestant Child Rearing: Authoritarian or Authoritative? *American Sociological Review* , 63, 796-809.
- Willits, F., & Crider, D. (1989). Church Attendance and Traditional Religious Beliefs in Adolescence and Young Adulthood: A Panel Study. *Review of Religious Research* , 31, 68-81.
- Yu, M., & Stiffman, A. (2010). Positive Family Relationships and Religious Affiliation as Mediators between Negative Environment and Illicit Drug Symptoms in American Indian Adolescents . *Addictive Behaviors* , 35, 694-699.

## Appendix I. Individual Measures of Religiosity and Delinquency

Table 34.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the word of God

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.010	.4558	.027*
[Agree=1]	-1.303	.2411	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.792	.2558	.002**
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.906	.1285	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.112	.1320	.396
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.683	.1234	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.482	.3606	.182
[Concern for Safety =1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.398	.1925	.039*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		.027*

Dependent Variable: BURGLARIZE A BUILDING

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 35.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attended Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.909	.4255	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.308	.1775	.082
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.342	.1974	.083
[Less than once a month=3]	-.143	.1968	.466
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.880	.1285	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.129	.1337	.336
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.685	.1242	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.460	.3606	.202
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.382	.1923	.047*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: BURGLARIZE A BUILDING

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attended Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 36.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.262	.4602	.006***
[Very Important=1]	-1.110	.2400	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.634	.2316	.006**
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.326	.2753	.236
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.836	.1286	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.007	.1352	.960
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.664	.1231	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.440	.3603	.222
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.417	.1925	.030*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
(Scale)	1 <sup>b</sup>	.	.

Dependent Variable: BURGLARIZE A BUILDING

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 37.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.770	.4367	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.593	.1978	.003**
[At least once a week=2]	-.338	.2058	.100
[At least once a month=3]	-.411	.2479	.097
[Less than once a month=4]	.157	.2251	.486
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.829	.1294	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.067	.1338	.619
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.676	.1235	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.464	.3604	.198
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.390	.1925	.043*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: BURGLARIZE A BUILDING

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 38.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.910	.4115	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.435	.1576	.006**
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.382	.1785	.032*
[Less than once a month=3]	-.345	.1797	.055
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.867	.1285	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.123	.1319	.350
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.686	.1234	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.449	.3603	.212
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.409	.1926	.034*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: BURGLARIZE A BUILDING

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 39.  
Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.490	.2567	.056
[Agree=1]	-.496	.1809	.006**
[Disagree=2]	-.054	.1867	.772
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.814	.0670	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.160	.0719	.026*
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.168	.0701	.017*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.025	.1604	.877
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.284	.1049	.007**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-DAMAGE PROPERTY

Model: (Intercept), Scripture is the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 40.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.705	.2056	.001***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.328	.0960	.001***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.224	.1046	.032*
[Less than once a month=3]	-.045	.1045	.665
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.793	.0670	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.158	.0726	.029***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.154	.0704	.028***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.004	.1605	.979
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.279	.1049	.008**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-DAMAGE PROPERTY

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 41.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.049	.2229	.826
[Very Important=1]	-1.032	.1241	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.689	.1211	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.568	.1509	.000***
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.760	.0671	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.088	.0732	.231
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.152	.0699	.030*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.021	.1604	.896
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.292	.1049	.005**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-DAMAGE PROPERTY

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 42.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.701	.2139	.001***
[At least once a day=1]	-.363	.1112	.001***
[At least once a week=2]	-.064	.1141	.577
[At least once a month=3]	-.082	.1320	.534
[Less than once a month=4]	.062	.1334	.643
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.763	.0674	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.148	.0726	.042*
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.169	.0701	.016*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.021	.1604	.896
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.289	.1050	.006**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-DAMAGE PROPERTY

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 43.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.818	.1967	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.171	.0810	.035*
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.134	.0915	.144
[Less than once a month=3]	-.077	.0917	.401
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.793	.0670	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.195	.0718	.007**
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.175	.0701	.012*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.025	.1603	.874
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.284	.1049	.007**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-DAMAGE PROPERTY

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 44.  
Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-2.293	.2205	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.129	.1223	.292
[Disagree=2]	-.535	.1294	.000***
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-3.133	.0934	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	1.859	.0762	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	.027	.0471	.563
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.567	.1428	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.602	.1029	.000***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: 30 DAYS-CHEWED TOBACCO

Model: (Intercept), Scripture is the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 45.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-2.596	.1939	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	.092	.0627	.144
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	.320	.0651	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	.193	.0679	.005**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-3.135	.0934	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	1.814	.0765	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	.048	.0473	.306
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.553	.1429	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.579	.1030	.000***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: 30 DAYS-CHEWED TOBACCO

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 46.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-2.419	.2055	.000***
[Very Important=1]	-.001	.0905	.994
[Fairly Important=2]	-.086	.0904	.341
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	.135	.1025	.189
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-3.140	.0934	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	1.821	.0767	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	.040	.0472	.395
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.546	.1429	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.594	.1029	.000***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: 30 DAYS-CHEWED TOBACCO

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 47.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-2.059	.1919	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.530	.0567	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.517	.0606	.000***
[At least once a month=3]	-.246	.0670	.000***
[Less than once a month=4]	-.424	.0740	.000***
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-3.098	.0935	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	1.760	.0765	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	.062	.0471	.185
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.583	.1428	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.612	.1030	.000***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: 30 DAYS-CHEWED TOBACCO

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 48.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-2.557	.1889	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.292	.0573	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	.620	.0468	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	.124	.0555	.026*
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-3.137	.0934	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	1.808	.0763	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	.029	.0472	.535
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.545	.1428	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.634	.1030	.000***
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: 30 DAYS-CHEWED TOBACCO

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 49.  
Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.511	.1817	.005**
[Agree=1]	-.100	.1358	.463
[Disagree=2]	.156	.1397	.265
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.076	.0406	.063
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.185	.0463	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.135	.0455	.003**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.002	.1049	.988
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.075	.0689	.275
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: DRINK ALCOHOL > 2-3 TIMES

Model: (Intercept), Scripture is the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 50.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.474	.1378	.001***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.264	.0656	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.028	.0698	.686
[Less than once a month=3]	.096	.0700	.169
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.061	.0407	.133
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.159	.0467	.001***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.109	.0457	.017*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.018	.1048	.864
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.075	.0689	.275
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: DRINK ALCOHOL > 2-3 TIMES

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 51.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.339	.1625	.037*
[Very Important=1]	-.365	.1058	.001***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.045	.1046	.667
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	.070	.1200	.558
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.043	.0407	.296
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.128	.0471	.007**
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.122	.0454	.007**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.006	.1048	.957
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.084	.0689	.223
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: DRINK ALCOHOL > 2-3 TIMES

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 52.

Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.498	.1441	.001**
[At least once a day=1]	-.185	.0773	.017*
[At least once a week=2]	.030	.0799	.703
[At least once a month=3]	.120	.0897	.180
[Less than once a month=4]	.050	.0947	.595
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.044	.0410	.288
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.173	.0468	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.135	.0455	.003**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.007	.1048	.948
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.084	.0689	.222
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: DRINK ALCOHOL > 2-3 TIMES

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 53.

Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.441	.1301	.001***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.410	.0554	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.172	.0585	.003**
[Less than once a month=3]	.008	.0559	.887
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.056	.0407	.166
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.173	.0462	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.126	.0454	.006**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.008	.1048	.941
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.082	.0689	.233
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: DRINK ALCOHOL > 2-3 TIMES

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 54.

Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.458	.2103	.030*
[Agree=1]	-.051	.1626	.754
[Disagree=2]	.089	.1684	.598
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.102	.0487	.037
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.253	.0518	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.322	.0521	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.090	.1129	.427
[Concern=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.013	.0854	.881
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: EVER HAVE SEX

Model: (Intercept), Scripture is the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 55.

Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.264	.1539	.086
[Once a week or more=1]	-.479	.0772	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.133	.0811	.100
[Less than once a month=3]	.024	.0818	.767
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.086	.0488	.079
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.323	.0523	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.276	.0523	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.063	.1128	.578
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.006	.0855	.940
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: EVER HAVE SEX

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 56.

## Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.384	.1967	.051
[Very Important=1]	-.225	.1412	.111
[Fairly Important=2]	.075	.1402	.593
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	.314	.1561	.044
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.071	.0489	.149
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.324	.0529	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.311	.0520	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.098	.1128	.387
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.002	.0855	.984
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: EVER HAVE SEX

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 57.

## Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.350	.1635	.032*
[At least once a day=1]	-.266	.0930	.004**
[At least once a week=2]	-.083	.0967	.392
[At least once a month=3]	.040	.1086	.714
[Less than once a month=4]	.115	.1116	.301
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.066	.0492	.180
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.291	.0524	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.315	.0521	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.078	.1129	.491
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.002	.0855	.986
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: EVER HAVE SEX

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 58.

## Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.310	.1454	.033*
[Once a week or more=1]	-.515	.0672	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.260	.0708	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	.002	.0664	.972
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.083	.0488	.089
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.291	.0516	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.308	.0520	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.082	.1128	.467
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.005	.0855	.949
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: EVER HAVE SEX

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 59.

## Parameter Estimates - Scripture is the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.303	.3063	.322
[Agree=1]	-.632	.2299	.006**
[Disagree=2]	-.152	.2385	.525
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.640	.0895	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.099	.0942	.295
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.288	.0934	.002**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.559	.1682	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.284	.1425	.046*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-PAINT GRAFFITI

Model: (Intercept), Scripture is the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 60.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.613	.2404	.011*
[Once a week or more=1]	-.394	.1326	.003**
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.215	.1429	.132
[Less than once a month=3]	-.036	.1435	.803
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.613	.0897	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.107	.0952	.261
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.270	.0938	.004**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.540	.1682	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.283	.1426	.047*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
(Scale)	1 <sup>b</sup>	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-PAINT GRAFFITI

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 61.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.001	.2729	.998
[Very Important=1]	-.994	.1771	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.689	.1740	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.412	.2102	.050*
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.580	.0898	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.167	.0963	.082
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.278	.0931	.003**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.566	.1681	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.298	.1425	.037*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.998

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-PAINT GRAFFITI

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 62.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.576	.2540	.023*
[At least once a day=1]	-.388	.1517	.010**
[At least once a week=2]	-.189	.1581	.232
[At least once a month=3]	-.107	.1807	.554
[Less than once a month=4]	-.087	.1884	.642
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.587	.0902	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.098	.0953	.306
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.292	.0934	.002**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.557	.1681	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.291	.1426	.041*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-PAINT GRAFFITI

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 63.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.667	.2260	.003**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.308	.1122	.006**
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.473	.1381	.001***
[Less than once a month=3]	.004	.1188	.972
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.608	.0896	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.083	.0939	.376
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.290	.0932	.002**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.563	.1681	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.300	.1426	.035*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-PAINT GRAFFITI

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 64.

Parameter Estimates – Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.069	.2285	.762
[Agree=1]	-.384	.1679	.022*
[Disagree=2]	-.313	.1776	.078
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.712	.0621	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.475	.0619	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.531	.0617	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.200	.1253	.110
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.047	.1119	.674
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: RECEIVED OUT-OF-SCHL SUSPENSION

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.001

Table 65.

Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.008	.1780	.962
[Once a week or more=1]	-.506	.0904	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.258	.0964	.007**
[Less than once a month=3]	-.103	.0986	.297
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.697	.0622	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.548	.0626	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.494	.0619	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.179	.1253	.153
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.038	.1119	.732
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: RECEIVED OUT-OF-SCHL SUSPENSION

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p&lt;.05, \*\*p&lt;.01, \*\*\*p&lt;.001

Table 66.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.016	.1885	.931
[At least once a day=1]	-.379	.1054	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.241	.1109	.029*
[At least once a month=3]	-.149	.1266	.240
[Less than once a month=4]	-.109	.1318	.406
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.676	.0625	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.521	.0627	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.522	.0617	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.196	.1252	.118
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.034	.1120	.759
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: RECEIVED OUT-OF-SCHL SUSPENSION  
Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 67.  
Parameter Estimates –Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.021	.2217	.923
[Very Important=1]	-.392	.1542	.011*
[Fairly Important=2]	-.192	.1534	.210
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.059	.1790	.740
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.688	.0622	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.532	.0633	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.522	.0616	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.209	.1252	.095
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.033	.1119	.770
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: RECEIVED OUT-OF-SCHL SUSPENSION  
Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 68.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.193	.1698	.257
[Once a week or more=1]	-.201	.0759	.008**
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.162	.0862	.060
[Less than once a month=3]	-.038	.0856	.654
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.701	.0621	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.491	.0618	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.527	.0617	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.204	.1252	.102
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.035	.1119	.752
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: RECEIVED OUT-OF-SCHL SUSPENSION

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 69.  
Parameter Estimates – Scriptures are the word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.238	.1834	.194
[Agree=1]	-.199	.1385	.150
[Disagree=2]	-.168	.1452	.248
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.723	.0471	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.214	.0478	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Marital Status=.00]	-.341	.0479	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.274	.0961	.004**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.073	.0858	.397
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: GOT INTO A PHYSICAL FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 70.

## Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.262	.1379	.057
[Once a week or more=1]	-.341	.0689	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.221	.0747	.003**
[Less than once a month=3]	-.081	.0760	.289
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.712	.0472	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.264	.0483	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.316	.0481	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.254	.0962	.008**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.070	.0858	.417
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: GOT INTO A PHYSICAL FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 71.

## Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.303	.1690	.073
[Very Important=1]	-.348	.1161	.003**
[Fairly Important=2]	-.117	.1152	.308
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.099	.1356	.465
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.702	.0473	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.271	.0487	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.330	.0479	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.274	.0960	.004**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.061	.0858	.474
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: GOT INTO A PHYSICAL FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 72 .  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.065	.1485	.662
[At least once a day=1]	-.086	.0863	.317
[At least once a week=2]	.093	.0894	.299
[At least once a month=3]	.133	.1006	.188
[Less than once a month=4]	.030	.1073	.780
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.707	.0475	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.235	.0483	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.339	.0480	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.275	.0961	.004**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.062	.0859	.472
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: GOT INTO A PHYSICAL FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 73.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.084	.1311	.524
[Once a week or more=1]	-.064	.0566	.261
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.031	.0641	.623
[Less than once a month=3]	-.060	.0668	.365
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.718	.0472	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.216	.0477	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.341	.0479	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.276	.0960	.004**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.071	.0858	.411
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: GOT INTO A PHYSICAL FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 74.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.134	.4893	.020*
[Agree=1]	-.192	.3845	.618
[Disagree=2]	-.050	.4024	.901
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.093	.1380	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.691	.1284	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.484	.1281	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.310	.2463	.209
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.122	.2246	.588
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PULLED A KNIFE/GUN ON SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 75.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.081	.3520	.002**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.278	.1868	.137
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.304	.2070	.142
[Less than once a month=3]	-.248	.2182	.257
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.078	.1381	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.700	.1299	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.478	.1287	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.285	.2467	.248
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.117	.2246	.602
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PULLED A KNIFE/GUN ON SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 76.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.553	.4117	.179
[Very Important=1]	-.845	.2710	.002**
[Fairly Important=2]	-.706	.2707	.009**
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.195	.3135	.534
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.052	.1384	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.785	.1318	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.471	.1277	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.303	.2462	.218
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.142	.2248	.528
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PULLED A KNIFE/GUN ON SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), – Religious Importance, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 77.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.075	.3765	.004**
[At least once a day=1]	-.293	.2209	.184
[At least once a week=2]	-.112	.2306	.627
[At least once a month=3]	-.125	.2667	.638
[Less than once a month=4]	-.397	.3022	.189
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.068	.1389	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.704	.1299	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.485	.1282	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.308	.2463	.212
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.133	.2249	.553
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PULLED A KNIFE/GUN ON SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 78.

Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.147	.3336	.001***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.219	.1536	.155
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.526	.2009	.009**
[Less than once a month=3]	-.019	.1735	.911
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.072	.1381	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.711	.1279	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.481	.1278	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.300	.2462	.223
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.146	.2248	.517
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PULLED A KNIFE/GUN ON SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 79.

Parameter Estimates – Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Std. Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.355	.1780	.046*
[Agree=1]	-.255	.1338	.057
[Disagree=2]	-.257	.1409	.069
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.687	.0468	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.191	.0478	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.342	.0479	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.383	.0916	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.098	.0865	.255
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUS PHYS FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the word of God, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 80.

Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.397	.1344	.003**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.422	.0669	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.303	.0729	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.212	.0750	.005**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.673	.0469	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.246	.0484	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.315	.0481	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.360	.0916	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.094	.0866	.276
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUS PHYS FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 81.

Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.451	.1634	.006**
[Very Important=1]	-.399	.1106	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.266	.1102	.016
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.206	.1313	.117
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.671	.0469	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.237	.0488	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.333	.0479	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.387	.0915	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.091	.0866	.295
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUS PHYS FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 82.

Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.234	.1440	.104
[At least once a day=1]	-.219	.0828	.008**
[At least once a week=2]	-.094	.0867	.276
[At least once a month=3]	.089	.0961	.354
[Less than once a month=4]	.038	.1014	.708
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.660	.0472	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.234	.0484	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.334	.0479	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.380	.0916	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.086	.0866	.322
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUS PHYS FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 83.

Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.170	.1284	.187
[Once a week or more=1]	-.091	.0564	.108
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.097	.0648	.133
[Less than once a month=3]	-.096	.0668	.151
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.681	.0469	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.201	.0478	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.340	.0479	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.385	.0915	.000***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.093	.0866	.282
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUS PHYS FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 84.

Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
-----------	---	----------------	--------------

(Intercept)	-.218	.2458	.375
[Agree=1]	-.355	.1777	.045*
[Disagree=2]	-.365	.1880	.052
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.040	.0689	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.154	.0663	.020*
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.309	.0665	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.246	.1351	.069
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.064	.1214	.596
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUSLY INJURE SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 85.

Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.189	.1899	.320
[Once a week or more=1]	-.479	.0881	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.467	.0984	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.431	.1032	.000***
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.022	.0690	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.200	.0671	.003**
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.289	.0668	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.214	.1352	.113
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.065	.1214	.593
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUSLY INJURE SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 86.

Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.120	.2259	.597

[Very Important=1]	-.541	.1457	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.318	.1444	.027*
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.241	.1725	.163
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.016	.0691	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.226	.0677	.001***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.296	.0664	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.247	.1350	.067
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.052	.1214	.669
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: SERIOUSLY INJURE SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 87.

Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.405	.2030	.046*
[At least once a day=1]	-.239	.1109	.031*
[At least once a week=2]	-.071	.1155	.541
[At least once a month=3]	-.014	.1312	.913
[Less than once a month=4]	-.113	.1409	.423
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.016	.0693	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.191	.0671	.004**
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.304	.0666	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.249	.1351	.066
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.053	.1215	.660
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: SERIOUSLY INJURE SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 88.

Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.479	.1840	.009**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.105	.0774	.173

[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.106	.0889	.232
[Less than once a month=3]	-.229	.0961	.017*
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.031	.0690	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.163	.0663	.014*
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.308	.0666	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.248	.1350	.066
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.058	.1215	.636
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SERIOUSLY INJURE SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 89.

Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.151	.1918	.431
[Agree=1]	-.561	.1383	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.215	.1440	.134
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.381	.0515	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.057	.0567	.314
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.236	.0557	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.282	.1132	.013*
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.205	.0845	.015*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOPLIFT

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 90.  
Parameter Estimates – Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.118	.1540	.442
[Once a week or more=1]	-.381	.0784	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.184	.0843	.029*
[Less than once a month=3]	-.064	.0851	.449
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.358	.0516	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.037	.0572	.517
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.215	.0560	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.269	.1132	.018*
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.206	.0845	.015*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOPLIFT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 91.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.172	.1811	.343
[Very Important=1]	-.701	.1199	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.273	.1176	.020*
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.049	.1361	.719
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.328	.0516	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.032	.0578	.575
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.220	.0556	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.297	.1132	.009**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.221	.0845	.009**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOPLIFT

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 92.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.180	.1634	.272
[At least once a day=1]	-.330	.0942	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.040	.0969	.678
[At least once a month=3]	.055	.1091	.613
[Less than once a month=4]	.169	.1108	.128
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.329	.0519	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.028	.0573	.622
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.234	.0557	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.282	.1132	.013*
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.217	.0845	.010**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOPLIFT

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Pray, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular  
\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 93.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.230	.1458	.115
[Once a week or more=1]	-.234	.0662	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.179	.0744	.016*
[Less than once a month=3]	-.035	.0725	.629
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.361	.0515	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.071	.0566	.209
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.239	.0557	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.289	.1131	.011*
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.211	.0845	.013*
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOPLIFT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 94.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-2.400	1.0939	.028*
[Agree=1]	.784	1.0067	.436
[Disagree=2]	.924	1.0244	.367
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.237	.2316	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.407	.2124	.055
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.533	.2111	.012*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.446	.3962	.260
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.838	.2840	.003**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: S31Q8 SHOT/STABBED SOMEONE-W1

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 95.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.134	.4972	.023*
[Once a week or more=1]	-.610	.2700	.024*
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.628	.3072	.041*
[Less than once a month=3]	-.959	.3630	.008**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.194	.2314	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.417	.2150	.052
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.512	.2125	.016*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.372	.3975	.349
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.821	.2837	.004**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOT/STABBED SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 96.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.126	.6534	.085
[Very Important=1]	-.556	.4782	.245
[Fairly Important=2]	-.478	.4783	.317
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	.049	.5394	.927
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.207	.2320	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.475	.2180	.029*
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.519	.2107	.014*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.437	.3965	.271
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.851	.2844	.003**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOT/STABBED SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 97.  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.543	.5719	.007**
[At least once a day=1]	-.131	.3729	.725
[At least once a week=2]	.045	.3879	.907
[At least once a month=3]	-.243	.4727	.607
[Less than once a month=4]	.061	.4601	.895
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.226	.2328	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.414	.2151	.054
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.532	.2111	.012*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.428	.3964	.280
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.845	.2848	.003**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOT/STABBED SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 98.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.276	.4815	.008**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.476	.2535	.060
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-1.070	.3786	.005**
[Less than once a month=3]	-.455	.3077	.139
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.200	.2317	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.457	.2113	.030*
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.518	.2104	.014*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.409	.3965	.302
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.886	.2847	.002**
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: SHOT/STABBED SOMEONE

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

Table 99.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.169	.3312	.000***
[Agree=1]	-.482	.2289	.035*
[Disagree=2]	-.288	.2401	.230
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.431	.0840	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.147	.0891	.100
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.268	.0895	.003**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.007	.2021	.972
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.038	.1518	.801
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL A CAR

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 100.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.269	.2680	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.408	.1209	.001***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.425	.1355	.002**
[Less than once a month=3]	-.374	.1401	.008**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.411	.0841	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.162	.0901	.072
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.258	.0900	.004**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	.009	.2021	.966
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.039	.1518	.795
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL A CAR

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 101.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.882	.3016	.003**
[Very Important=1]	-.813	.1766	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.637	.1754	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.455	.2143	.034*
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.397	.0843	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.210	.0911	.021*
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.255	.0894	.004**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.017	.2020	.931
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.027	.1518	.859
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL A CAR

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 102 .  
Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.335	.2808	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.295	.1436	.040*
[At least once a week=2]	-.230	.1518	.129
[At least once a month=3]	-.450	.1875	.016*
[Less than once a month=4]	-.327	.1914	.088
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.412	.0847	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.142	.0901	.114
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.271	.0896	.003**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.013	.2020	.950
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.043	.1518	.777
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: STEAL A CAR

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 103.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.453	.2581	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.340	.1086	.002**
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.154	.1172	.187
[Less than once a month=3]	-.217	.1237	.079
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.410	.0841	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.156	.0889	.080
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.264	.0895	.003**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.010	.2019	.961
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.028	.1519	.854
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: STEAL A CAR

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 104.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.165	.2141	.440
[Agree=1]	-.595	.1497	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.158	.1552	.309
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.501	.0564	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.063	.0617	.310
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.201	.0608	.001***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.136	.1311	.298
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.154	.0945	.103
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL WORTH < \$50

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 105.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.548	.1764	.002**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.259	.0877	.003**
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.077	.0939	.410
[Less than once a month=3]	.056	.0946	.557
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.480	.0564	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.064	.0622	.302
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.188	.0610	.002**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.128	.1311	.327
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.153	.0945	.104
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL WORTH < \$50

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 106.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.171	.2028	.398
[Very Important=1]	-.710	.1301	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.244	.1273	.055
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.035	.1471	.814
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.444	.0565	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.021	.0628	.741
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.187	.0606	.002**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.148	.1310	.259
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.170	.0945	.072
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL WORTH < \$50

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 107.

Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.517	.1842	.005**
[At least once a day=1]	-.336	.1017	.001***
[At least once a week=2]	-.005	.1040	.965
[At least once a month=3]	.088	.1170	.450
[Less than once a month=4]	.104	.1212	.392
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.445	.0568	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.046	.0623	.458
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.203	.0608	.001***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.134	.1311	.307
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.167	.0946	.077
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL WORTH < \$50

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 108.

Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.571	.1663	.001***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.206	.0714	.004**
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.239	.0830	.004**
[Less than once a month=3]	.026	.0771	.734
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.478	.0564	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.088	.0615	.153
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.205	.0607	.001***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.141	.1310	.280
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.160	.0945	.090
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: STEAL WORTH < \$50

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 109.

Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.451	.3734	.228
[Agree=1]	-.965	.2601	.000***
[Disagree=2]	-.495	.2733	.070
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.868	.1226	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.096	.1270	.448
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.536	.1202	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.623	.2153	.004**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.201	.2000	.315
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-STEAL WORTH >\$50

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 110.

Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.796	.3070	.009**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.664	.1556	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.677	.1771	.000***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.538	.1797	.003**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.822	.1227	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.084	.1285	.515
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.522	.1209	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.592	.2154	.006**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.185	.1998	.354
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-STEAL WORTH >\$50

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 111.

Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.232	.3489	.507
[Very Important=1]	-1.308	.2169	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.846	.2086	.000***
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.420	.2491	.092
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.785	.1229	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.039	.1300	.764
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.513	.1198	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.646	.2151	.003**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.222	.2000	.267
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-STEAL WORTH >\$50

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 112.

Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
-----------	---	----------------	--------------

(Intercept)	-.907	.3313	.006**
[At least once a day=1]	-.693	.1944	.000***
[At least once a week=2]	-.229	.1964	.243
[At least once a month=3]	-.213	.2286	.351
[Less than once a month=4]	.132	.2196	.547
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.779	.1235	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.033	.1285	.796
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.528	.1203	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.620	.2153	.004**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.218	.2002	.276
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-STEAL WORTH >\$50

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 113.

Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.112	.2983	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.285	.1461	.051
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.303	.1696	.074
[Less than once a month=3]	-.377	.1789	.035
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.831	.1227	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.127	.1270	.317
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.547	.1203	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.636	.2149	.003**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.209	.2001	.297
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: PAST 12 MOS-STEAL WORTH >\$50

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 114.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.214	.2403	.374
[Agree=1]	-.184	.1858	.323
[Disagree=2]	-.124	.1946	.523
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.566	.0616	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.337	.0633	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.293	.0642	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.386	.1215	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.011	.1102	.917
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: TAKE PART IN A GROUP FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 115.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.107	.1761	.542
[Once a week or more=1]	-.397	.0904	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.331	.0994	.001***
[Less than once a month=3]	-.174	.1011	.085
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.553	.0617	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.385	.0640	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.270	.0645	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.363	.1215	.003**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.011	.1103	.924
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: TAKE PART IN A GROUP FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 116.

## Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	.101	.2130	.636
[Very Important=1]	-.621	.1455	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.320	.1440	.026*
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.047	.1664	.780
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.530	.0618	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.436	.0647	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.276	.0641	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.391	.1214	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.008	.1103	.945
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: TAKE PART IN A GROUP FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 117.

## Parameter Estimates- Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.338	.1920	.078
[At least once a day=1]	-.123	.1161	.291
[At least once a week=2]	.002	.1212	.986
[At least once a month=3]	.250	.1319	.059
[Less than once a month=4]	-.022	.1457	.882
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.544	.0621	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.362	.0640	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.290	.0643	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.386	.1214	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.002	.1103	.988
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: TAKE PART IN A GROUP FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 118.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.321	.1674	.055
[Once a week or more=1]	-.107	.0755	.156
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.080	.0858	.350
[Less than once a month=3]	-.116	.0900	.197
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-.558	.0617	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	-.340	.0632	.000***
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.293	.0642	.000***
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.386	.1214	.001***
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	.007	.1103	.952
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: TAKE PART IN A GROUP FIGHT

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 119.  
Parameter Estimates - Scriptures are the Word of God

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.793	.3328	.017*
[Agree=1]	-.384	.2478	.121
[Disagree=2]	-.094	.2572	.716
[Religion Doesn't Have Sacred Scriptures=3]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.124	.0959	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.099	.0947	.296
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.228	.0927	.014*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.473	.1737	.007**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.015	.1615	.925
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: CARRY WEAPON TO SCHOOL

Model: (Intercept), Scriptures are the Word of God, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 120.  
Parameter Estimates - Past Year Attend Religious Services

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.779	.2510	.002**
[Once a week or more=1]	-.579	.1228	.000***
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	-.191	.1277	.135
[Less than once a month=3]	-.420	.1403	.003**
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.087	.0959	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.074	.0956	.440
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.197	.0932	.035
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.435	.1739	.012*
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.025	.1615	.876
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: CARRY WEAPON TO SCHOOL

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Religious Services, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 121.  
Parameter Estimates – Religious Importance

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-.582	.2929	.047*
[Very Important=1]	-.724	.1869	.000***
[Fairly Important=2]	-.341	.1827	.062
[Fairly Unimportant=3]	-.332	.2223	.135
[Not Important at all=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.080	.0961	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.028	.0963	.768
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.215	.0926	.020*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.463	.1737	.008**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.027	.1615	.866
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1		

Dependent Variable: CARRY WEAPON TO SCHOOL

Model: (Intercept), Religious Importance, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular

\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 122.  
Parameter Estimates – Frequency of Prayer

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.160	.2748	.000***
[At least once a day=1]	-.106	.1620	.512
[At least once a week=2]	.271	.1640	.098
[At least once a month=3]	.226	.1852	.223
[Less than once a month=4]	.175	.1945	.368
[Never=5]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.091	.0964	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.091	.0955	.338
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.235	.0929	.011*
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.473	.1738	.006**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.033	.1616	.839
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: CARRY WEAPON TO SCHOOL

Model: (Intercept), Frequency of Prayer, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular  
\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Table 123.  
Parameter Estimates- Past Year Attend Youth Groups

Parameter	B	Standard Error	Significance
(Intercept)	-1.095	.2427	.000***
[Once a week or more=1]	-.139	.1098	.204
[Once a month or more/less than once a week=2]	.112	.1152	.329
[Less than once a month=3]	-.120	.1282	.350
[Never=4]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Sex=.00]	-1.112	.0959	.000***
[Sex=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Race=.00]	.127	.0947	.178
[Race=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
Marital Status=.00]	-.238	.0928	.010**
[Marital Status=1.00]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[Concern for Safety=0]	-.472	.1736	.007**
[Concern for Safety=1]	0 <sup>a</sup>	.	.
[extracurricular=.00]	-.008	.1615	.962
[extracurricular=1.00]	0	.	.
(Scale)	1	.	.

Dependent Variable: CARRY WEAPON TO SCHOOL

Model: (Intercept), Past Year Attend Youth Groups, Sex, Race, Marital Status, Concern for Safety, extracurricular  
\*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001

Jennifer L. Biddle

12 Saratoga Court Easton, PA 18040  
[jl323@msn.com](mailto:jl323@msn.com) \* (610) 559-5987

Education:

May 2013 Rutgers the State University of New Jersey, Newark, NJ  
 Ph.D. in Criminal Justice

May 2006 Rutgers the State University of New Jersey, Newark, NJ  
 Master of Arts in Criminal Justice

August 1999 The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA  
 Bachelor of Arts in Administration of Justice / Minor in Sociology

Work Experience:

Research Assistant, Rutgers Institute on Corruption Studies, Newark, N.J. 08/09 – 03/10

- Compiled corruption resources and information for the website
- Conducted literature reviews on current issues in corruption
- Assisted in the design and content of the corruption website

Research Assistant to the Dean, Rutgers University, Newark, NJ, 10/07 – 08/09

- Assisted in the revamping of the doctorate and masters criminal justice programs.
- Redesigned and modified the school of criminal justice website and catalog.
- Summarized research reports, speeches and data into concise briefs

Grants Development Assistant, Federal Employment and Guidance Service, New York, NY 06/04 – 02/06

- Researched potential Federal, State, City and Private funding sources
- Assisted with the writing and submission of grant applications
- Authored grants submitted to Federal, State, City and Private funding sources

Teaching Experience:

Seminar on American Corrections  
 Seminar on Delinquency and Juvenile Justice  
 Seminar on Comparative Criminal Justice Systems  
 Seminar on Different Cultures and Crime  
 Seminar on Introduction to Criminal Justice  
 Seminar on Criminology  
 Seminar on The Theories of Crime and Delinquency  
 Seminar on Methods and Techniques of Social Research

Honors and Awards:

Dissertation Fellowship, *Reassessing the Relationship between Religion and Juvenile Delinquency*. Awarded \$20,000 from the Graduate School-Newark, Rutgers University, 2012-2013.

