1

Microlin

**National Library
of Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Religious Involvement and Deviance:

A Social Learning Approach

by

Gordon F.K. Hope

A Thesis submitted to

the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Psychology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

May, 1989

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-51130-3

The undersigned hereby recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis,

"Religious Involvement and Deviance:
A Sound Learning Approach"

submitted by

Gordon F. K. Hope, B.A., M.A.

in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Chair, Department of Psychology

Thesis Supervisor

External Examiner

Carleton University

May 10, 1989

RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT AND DEVIANCE:
A SOCIAL LEARNING APPROACH

Abstract

The relationship between religious involvement and deviant behaviour was studied among a sample of 192 undergraduate students at Carleton University in Ottawa. The students completed a package of pencil and paper instruments, including a survey of bio-demographic data, a Religious Involvement Survey, a survey of types and frequency of deviant behaviour, a battery of predictors of crime, and measures of the trait Self Monitoring, Positive Malinger (faking Good), and pro-social behaviour. A second sample of 26 persons known to be involved in church-sanctioned, Christian communities and groups also completed the same package of instruments. Data were gathered from both samples in November of 1987, and again in March of 1988, allowing for a four-month longitudinal study. The 27 rationally derived subscales of the Religious Involvement Survey were validated on the basis of estimates of internal reliability, test-retest correlations, and their ability to discriminate between the undergraduate and religious samples. On the basis of those investigations and of examinations of the factor structure of the R.I.S., the survey was reduced from 27 to 13 subscales. The revised R.I.S., with emphases on the measures of Religious Morality and Social Support for Religion, were examined in relation to deviance, with emphasis on the measure of Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. The strength of the religious involvement measures as predictors of deviance was also examined relative to measures from the battery

of predictors of deviance -- primarily the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations, Social Support for Crime, and Psychopathy.

As was hypothesized, the strongest single negative correlate of deviance from among the subscales of the R.I.S. was Religious Morality. Social Support for Religion was found to be unrelated to deviance on its own. However, as was hypothesized, among those scoring high on Self Monitoring, it was found to be negatively linked to deviance, while no relationship was demonstrated among those scoring low on Self Monitoring. Also, as was hypothesized, Social Support for religion was found to be linked to deviance when considered in interaction with Religious Morality and with Social Involvement in Religion. However, no substantial evidence was demonstrated for an effect on deviance rates by an interaction between Social Support for Religion and Religious Upbringing. A fourth hypothesis also recieved substantial support: religious involvement measures were unable to account additionally for variance in the deviance measure once the effects of the battery of predictors of crime had been taken into account.

A cursory examination was also made of relationships between all predictor variables and Pro-social Behaviour. Little was demonstrated other than the finding that Religious Experiences was the strongest correlate of Pro-social Behaviour.

Relationships between religious involvement and deviance are discussed in terms of Social Learning theory. Comments are also made regarding the relevance of the findings of this investigation to the criminal justice system and to religious groups and institutions.

DEDICATION

Two years ago (May 9, 1987) Erin and I were married. Fifteen months ago (February 12, 1988) our daughter Michelle was born. It is over the past 24 months that the bulk of the work on this dissertation has been completed. Erin and Michelle, then, have known too much of Dad as a doctoral candidate, and perhaps too little of him as a family man. No one can over-estimate, though, the power of a loving and patient wife to provide supportive encouragement; no one could believe the power of a babe, struggling to breathe, eat, move, walk, and talk to inspire a parent. This work must, therefore, be dedicated to my loving family: "Breathe a prayer of thanks, my little my darling, Dad's coming home."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have been the beneficiary of a great deal of assistance throughout the course of this dissertation project. In fact, because I have no vision, I have probably received more help than most doctoral candidates. It is hoped that these acknowledgements will express my deepest appreciation to those who have been so gracious to me.

Dr. Donald A. Andrews - my thesis supervisor:

Thanks for enormous patience and wisdom, and for assistance with every aspect of this work, from correcting spelling errors to designing the research methodology.

Allan MacDonald - my close friend:

Thanks for unselfishly giving time, energy and capability, and for assisting in every facet and phase of this work imaginable .

Dave Robinson - laboratory colleague:

Thanks for patient and tolerant assistance in honing my computer skills, building the SPSS file, and giving valuable advice regarding SPSS operations.

Members and associates of the Servants of God Lay Christian Community:

Thanks for continuous prayer support and personal encouragement.

Fr. Paul Hamilton, Mary and Irene Hamilton, and Fr. Mike Reed - close friends:

Thanks for longstanding personal support.

Dr. Robert Hoge and Dr. Nicholas Spanos - members of my thesis committee:

Thanks for giving direction at the various stages of this work.

Dr. Bill Jones - Department Chairman and member of my thesis committee:

Thanks for giving direction at the various stages of this work.

Dr. John Dourley - Internal-external member of my thesis committee:

Thanks for bringing the perspective of a student of Religion to the thesis examination.

Dr. Vernon L. Quinsey, Queens University - External member of my thesis committee:

Thanks for travelling to Carleton University to make valued contributions to the thesis examination and discussion.

Richard Robicheau and Grace O'Keefe - good friends:

Thanks for valuable assistance in formatting tables and appendices.

Dr. Julian Robertson, Carolyn Gardner and Sarah Snow - Volunteers with C.N.I.B.:

Thanks for help with reading and manuscript corrections.

Kathy Van Zantin, Marlene Hewitt, Linda Saslove and Susan Gruber -
Department secretarial staff:

Thanks for assistance with typing and computer screen
reading.

Dr. Thomas Tombaugh - Faculty member:

Thanks for so considerately allowing use of research
facilities.

Dr. Roger Wells - Faculty member:

Thanks for showing continued interest in my research
progress.

Dave Sliz and Penny Faulkner - laboratory colleagues:

Thanks for being so available to read endless computer
printouts.

Jacqui Kellough and Lynn Giff - Department staff:

Thanks for ongoing support and general assistance.

Table of Contents

Abstract	III
Dedication	V
Acknowledgements	VI
Table of Contents	IX
List of Tables	XI
List of Appendices	XVIII
Chapter	
i) Review of the Literature	1
a) Introduction	
b) Psychology and Religion	
c) Religious Involvement and Criminality	
d) Theories of Criminality	
e) Measuring Religious Involvement	
f) Conclusion: The Present Study	
ii) Methodology	58
a) Subjects	
b) Procedure	
c) Research Instruments	
d) Analysis Plan	

Chapter

iii)	Results	88
	a) Bio-demographics of the Subjects	
	b) The Religious Involvement Survey	
	c) The Dependent Variables	
	d) The Measure of self Monitoring:	
	a Moderating Variable	
	e) The Associations Between Religious Involvement	
	and Deviant Behaviour	
	f) The Battery of Core Criminological Correlates	
	In Relation to Deviance	
	g) Comparative Contributions of the R.I.S. Subscales	
	And the Measures From the Battery of Correlates	
	In Accounting for Variance in Rates of Deviance	
	h) Deviance in Relation to Change Scores	
	On the Predictors	
	i) On Victimizing and Victimless Deviance	
	j) Correlates of Pro-social Behaviour	
iv)	Discussion	198
	Bibliography of Refereces	216
	Appendices	233

List of Tables

Table Title

2.1)	Summary Presentation of the Religious Involvements	67
	Survey	
3.1)	Significance of Differences (Undergraduate Vs.	89
	Religious Samples) for Dichotomous and Continuous	
	Variables	
3.2)	Descriptive Statistics for Revised R.I.S. Subscales	96
	for Undergraduate Sample at Times One (n=152) and Two	
	(n=115)	
3.3)	Intercorrelations Among the Revised Subscales of the . . .	98
	R.I.S., Undergraduate Sample Time One Data	
3.4)	Factor Loadings for the Revised Subscales of the	100
	R.I.S., Times One and Two, Undergraduate Sample	
3.5)	Zero-order Correlations Between Bio-demographic	101
	Variables and Revised R.I.S. Subscales, Time One,	
	Undergraduate Data	
3.6)	Significance of Differences (Undergraduate Vs.	103
	Religious Samples) on Revised R.I.S. Subscales With	
	Controls for Age, gender, Marital Frequency, Occupation,	
	Education, Mother Occupation, Faking	
3.7)	Descriptive Statistics for Deviance Measures	108

Table Title

3.8)	Significance of Differences (Undergraduate Vs. 111 Religious Samples) On Measures of Deviance with Controls for Age, Gender, Marital Frequency, Education, Occupation, Mother's Occupation, Faking	111
3.9)	Zero-order Correlation Coefficients Between Measures ... 113 of Deviance and Bio-demographic Variables, Time One Cross-sectional Data, Undergraduate Sample	113
3.10)	Descriptive Statistics for the Measure of Pro-social ... 116 Behaviour	116
3.11)	Significance of Differences (Undergraduate Vs. 117 Religious Samples) for Pro-social Behaviour, Time One Data, With Controls for Age, Gender, Marital Frequency, Education, Occupation, Mother's Occupation, Faking	117
3.12)	Zero-order Correlation Coefficients Between 119 Pro-social Behaviour and Bio-demographic Variables	119
3.13)	Descriptive Statistics for the Measure of Self 120 Monitoring	120
3.14)	Zero-order Correlations Between Self Monitoring and ... 122 Bio-demographic Variables, Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data	122
3.15)	Zero-order Correlations Between Self Monitoring and ... 124 the Measures of Deviance, Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data	124

Table	Title	
3.16)	Zero-order Correlations Between Self Monitoring and ... the R.I.S. Subscales, Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data	126
3.17)	Zero-order Correlation Coefficients Between Measures .. of Deviance and Revised Set of Subscales of the Religious Involvement Survey, Time One Cross- sectional Data, Undergraduate Sample	127
3.18)	Summary for Regression Analysis of R.I.S. Subscales ... on Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)	130
3.19)	The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-sectional (Time One) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Social Support for Religion, and Self Monitoring	133
3.20)	The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-sectional (Time One) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, self Monitoring, Religious Morality, Religious Upbringing, and Social Involvement in Religion	137
3.21)	The Simple Effects of Religious Morality (Time One) ... on Time two Total Deviance Scores (Predictive) With Controls for Gender, Faking (Times One and Two), Self Monitoring (Time One), and Social Support for Religion (Time One)	140

Table Title

3.22)	The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion 142 (Time One) on Time Two Total Deviance Scores (Predictive) With Controls for Gender, Faking (Times One and Two), Self Monitoring (Time One), Religious Morality (Time One), Social Involvement in Religion (Time One), and Religious Upbringing (Time One)
3.23)	Factor Loadings for the Items of the Religious 145 Morality Subscale, Undergraduate Sample, Time One and Two
3.24)	Intercorrelations Among Factors of the Religious 148 Morality Subscale
3.25)	Significance of Differences (Undergraduate Vs. 149 Religious Samples) on Religious Morality Factors With Controls for Age, Gender, Education, Occupation, Mother's Occupation, Faking
3.26)	Zero-order Correlations Between Religious Morality 151 factors and Deviance Measures (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)
3.27)	Zero-order Correlations Between Core Criminological 154 Battery and Deviance Measures, Time One Data, Undergraduate sample
3.28)	Summary for Regression Analysis of Core Crimino- 156 logical Battery on Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)

Table Title

3.29)	The Simple Effects of Tolerance for Law Violations	159
	on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-sectional (Time One) data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Social Support for Crime, and Self Monitoring	
3.30)	the Simple Effects of Social Support for Crime on	166
	mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-sectional (time One) Data with Controls for Gender, Faking, Self Monitoring, and Tolerance for Law Violations	
3.31)	The Simple Effects of Tolerance for Law Violations	169
	(Time One) on Time Two Total Deviance Scores (Predictive) With Controls for Gender, Faking (Times One and Two), Self Monitoring (Time One), and Social Support for Crime (Time One)	
3.32)	The Simple Effects of Social Support for Crime	171
	(time One) on Time Two Total Deviance Scores (Predictive) With Controls for gender, Faking (Times One and Two), Self Monitoring (Time One), and Tolerance for Law Violations (Time One)	
3.33)	Summary for Regression Analysis of R.I.S. Subscales ...	175
	Followed by Core Criminological Battery on Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)	

Table	Title	
3.34)	Summary for Regression Analysis of Core Crimino- logical Battery Followed by R.I.S. Subscales on Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed (Undergraduate Sample , Time One Data)	179
3.35)	Zero-order correlations Between the Core Crimino- logical Battery and the R.I.S. Subscales (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)	180
3.36)	Zero-order Correlations Between the Deviance measure and Reported Religious Change (Time Two Cross- sectional Data, Undergraduate Sample)	185
3.37)	Zero-order Correlation Coefficients Linking Selected R.I.S. Subscales with Amount of Victimizing and Amount of Victimless deviance Recently Committed and With the Canonical Variable Combining Them	187
3.38)	Zero-order Correlation Coefficients Linking Selected Measures From the Core Criminological Battery with Victimizing and Victimless Deviance and the Canonical Variable linking Them	188
3.39)	Zero-order Correlations Between R.I.S. Subscales and Pro-social Behaviour (time One Cross-sectional Data, Undergraduate Sample)	190
3.40)	Zero-order Correlations Between the Core Crimino- logical Battery and the Measure of Pro-social Behaviour (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)	192

Table Title

3.41)	Summary for Regression Analysis of the R.I.S.	194
	Subscales on the Measure of Pro-social Behaviour	
	(Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)	
3.42)	Summary for Regression analysis of the Core	195
	Criminological Battery on the Measure of Pro-social	
	Behaviour (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)	
3.43)	Summary for Regression Analysis of Unique	196
	Correlates (Convictions, Religious Experiences,	
	Eternal Consequences, Social Support for Crime,	
	Awareness of Limited Opportunity) on Pro-social	
	Behaviour (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)	

List of Appendices

Appendix Title

I)	Summary of the Relationship Between Religious Involvement and Mental Health	233
II)	Informal Consent Form	251
III)	Background Information Questionnaire	252
IV)	Religious Involvement Survey (Part I)	254
V)	Religious Involvement Survey (Part II)	263
VI)	Religious Involvement Survey (Part III)	269
VII)	Religious Involvement Survey (Part IV)	271
VIII)	Religious Involvement Survey (Part V)	276
IX)	Criminal Behaviour Scale	280
X)	Pro-social Behaviour Scale	284
XI)	Correctional Battery of Predictors of Crime	288
	A) Social Support for Crime Scale (Time-1)	
	B) Social Support for Crime Scale (Time-2)	
	C) Criminal Sentiments Scale	
	D) Criminal Personality Scale	
XII)	Self Monitoring Scale	306
XIII)	Positive Malinger (Faking Good) Scale	309

Appendix Title

XIV)	Summary of Bio-demographic data for the Time One ... 312 and Time Two Undergraduate and Religious Samples
XV)	Descriptive Statistics for Original, Rationally 314 Derived RIS (Religious Involvement Survey) Subscales
XVI)	Summary of Analyses of Original, Rationally 316 derived scales of the R.I.S.
XVII)	Summary for Analysis of Internal Reliability of 322 the Subscale "Access to Religious Resources" (Items 3, 4 and 5 From the Rationally Derived Measure of Social Support for Religion)
XVIII)	Intercorrelations Among the Revised Subscales of ... 323 the R.I.S., Religious Sample Time One Data
XIX)	Table of Frequency Distributions for the Measures .. 324 of Deviance for Overall, Male and Female Undergraduates Sample, Time One and Time Two
XX)	Frequency Distributions for the Measures of 326 Deviance for Overall, Male and Female Religious Samples Time One and Time Two
XXI)	Table of Zero-order Correlations Between Self 328 Monitoring and Bio-demographic Variables, Religious Sample Time One Data
XXII)	Table of Zero-order Correlations Between Self 329 Monitoring and the Measures of Deviance, Religious Sample Time One Data

Appendix Title

XXIII)	Table of Zero-order Correlations Between Self 330
	Monitoring and the R.I.S. Subscales,
	Religious Sample Time One Data
XXIV)	Zero-order Correlations Between Religious 331
	Morality Factors and Deviance Measures
	(Religious Sample, Time One Data)
XXV)	Discussion of the Psychometric Properties of the ... 332
	Core Battery of Criminological Correlates
XXVI)	Table of Zero-order Correlations Between Self 344
	Monitoring and the Core Criminological
	Battery of Predictors of Deviance, Undergraduate
	Sample Time One Data
XXVII)	Discussion of the Effects of Selected Core 345
	Criminological Battery on R.I.S. Subscale
	Links With Deviance
XXVIII)	Zero-order Correlations Between the Deviance 371
	Measures and Reported Religious Change
	Time Two Cross-sectional Data, Religious Sample
XXIX)	Discussion of the Relationship Between Reported 372
	Religious Change and Deviance

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"The church is irrelevant to delinquency because it fails to instill in its members love for their neighbours, and because belief in the possibility of pleasure and pain in another world cannot now, and perhaps never could compete with the pleasures and pains of everyday life." This statement concludes the well-known "Hellfire and Delinquency" study (Hirschi and Stark, 1969, p/212-213). Hirschi and Stark had explored the relationship among church attendance, belief, and delinquent behaviour. Their conclusion aroused the attention of many, including a number of researchers. Across the spectrum of Jewish and Christian denominations moral behaviours are taught which appear to be anti-criminal in nature, as are attitudes and values which are presented as supportive of moral behaviour. Predominant in both religions are precise statements of moral conduct, including the ten commandments. As well, in the worship places of many of their denominations, reference is commonly made to punishment in this life and in the life hereafter which awaits those who transgress those moral codes. Furthermore, down through the centuries those standards have provided a base for the legal codes of many nations and states. The natural expectation has always been, therefore, that the more strongly one holds to behaviour, attitudes, values and beliefs indicative of religiousness, the less likely one will be to indulge in or tolerate criminal activities, attitudes and values.

The fact is, however, that conclusive results have not been easily forthcoming. Although there is little support for the general claim that the churches and the beliefs they preach are irrelevant to delinquency, latter-day investigators have had to wrestle with the question of understanding situations and circumstances under which religion does exert a suppressing influence on criminal behaviour, and situations and circumstances under which it does not. Such is the nature of the investigations of this dissertation.

To that end, this dissertation is a wide-ranging and indepth study from a psychological perspective of the religiousness-criminality relationship: That is, our focus is the link between the question of the link between personal religious involvement and personal involvement in crime. A preparatory step is that of coming to understand the social scientific study of religion, particularly as it pertains to psychology. As others have pointed out (e.g. Batson and Ventis, 1982), some researchers on both sides of the issue dealing with the positive vs. negative effects of religion have waded into that fray clutching personal viewpoints disguised as scientific investigation. That fact has served to reinforce for this investigator the requirement to develop and present objective tests of hypotheses and to further analyze the findings of research.

To that end this paper will also include a comprehensive review of previous investigations into the relationship between religious and criminal involvements. Because general theory and research in the area of criminal conduct provides an essential ingredient for

empirical investigations such as this one, it is important to examine the social psychology of criminal conduct.

In the light of those three factors taken together -- the psychological study of religion, the study of criminal conduct, and an historic perspective on the study of the relationship between religious and criminal involvements -- a more complete understanding can be brought to a discussion of the appropriateness to this research of instruments currently used to assess religiousness in its multitude of facets. An integration of those three factors is also essential to an understanding of the situations and circumstances which serve to mediate and moderate the relationship under study here.

The first chapter of this dissertation, therefore, contains a four part review of the literature. Part I examines in brief the psychological study of religion. Part II presents a comprehensive study of research into the relationship between religious and criminal involvements, while the third part summarizes general research and theory regarding criminal conduct. An assessment of the psychometric standards of devices used to measure religiousness is presented in Part IV. A fifth part presents the objectives of the research of this dissertation. Chapter 2 focusses on the research methodology and chapter 3 on the research findings. Chapter 4 presents a discussion of those findings in light of the hypotheses of the present dissertation, culminating in comments about the implications of this research for religious organizations and groups, and for programmes of diversion and rehabilitation for criminal offenders.

I) Psychology and Religion

The relationship between psychology and religion has been longterm if not always comfortable. Noteworthy studies of religion from a psychological perspective pre-date the twentieth century (E.G. Starbuck, 1900). Most of the theoretical and empirical studies have been dedicated at least in part to dealing with the question of the positive or negative value of the effects of religion on peoples' lives. This section provides an overview of the general state of the literature on religion and mental health. The study of criminality as it relates to religious involvement, the major focus of this thesis, is best located within that broader literature.

Many of psychology's important theoreticians, as well as notable one's from sociology, have felt it essential to include comments on religion in their writings. Marx felt that religion, and in particular Christianity, presented to the down-trodden the "pie in the sky" -- a myth perpetrated upon the masses so that, placing their hopes in it, they would be less rebellious against their lot in life. Durkheim (1915) saw the concepts, values and beliefs of religion, handed down from generation to generation, serving to maintain throughout the history of western civilization a view of morality and authority as inextricably linked -- a view essential to the perpetuation of society as we know it.

These two stances were taken by prominent sociologists, but equally well-known is the negative view of religion espoused by Sigmund Freud (1961). To him religiousness was an obsession arising out of an Oedipal complex: that is, a defense mechanism

adopted by persons harbouring an unresolved, uncouscious sexual desire for the parent of the opposite sex, and a related envy of the same-sex parent. Because of religion's universal acceptance, Freud postulated, those holding to it would be able to avoid adopting defense strategies, thus avoiding the risk of particular neurotic illnesses. On the other hand, Freud's pupil, and later adversary, Carl Jung (1933) saw religion as providing individuals with a sense of meaningfulness for life and life events. This sense, he proposed, is an ingredient essential to mental health.

To Gordon Allport (1950), religion's role as provider of an affiliative opportunity was as important as its morality and god-head aspects. Through this provision it would allow for peoples' needs for love and relationship to be met. Abraham Maslow, on the other hand, focussed on the individualistic aspect of religion (1964). He contended that a deepening relationship with God through personal religious experiences would provide for an individual a vehicle to self actualization, and Maslow deplored large religious organizations and churches for failing to foster environments conducive to such experiences. William James (1902) directed his attention to understanding the roles of deep religious faith and experiences. Though approaching the question from a different angle than Maslow, James thought that religiousness created an opportunity to realize self potential. One of the earliest contributors to the psychological study of religion, James expected that religiousness would contribute to pathological melancholia in the lives of some -- sick-souled religious individuals -- and for others -- the healthy-minded

religious -- to a lifestyle of natural expression, unencumbered by self-concern.

This brings into focus the question that has been of central concern to almost all empirical investigations in the psychological study of religion: is religion associated with a pathological and otherwise socially unhealthy lifestyle, or with a mentally healthy and socially valuable one? In short, research has provided little in the way of conclusive answers (Batson and Ventis, 1982). This is due at least in part to the lack of objectivity by some investigators -- some conducting smear campaigns against religion, and others bent on extolling its virtues, have done so under the guise of scientific inquiry (Batson and Ventis, 1982). The issue, as a result, has been a highly contentious one. In exploring the study of the association between religion and mental health, this section of the literature review begins with a discussion of that conflict. It then moves to a review of studies investigating the association between mental health and extent of religious involvement. Following this, it turns to investigations of the relationship between mental health and orientation of religious involvement. Finally, some additional brief remarks are put forward before a summary conclusion is presented.

Psychology Vs. Religion

Historically, psychology and psychiatry on the one hand, and religion on the other, have viewed themselves as competing with one another for the key to defining reality (Kilbourne and

Richardson, 1983). The issue of "healthy" attitudes and behaviour has been at the center of this competition. Exemplary of the conflict is a study reported by Batson and Ventis (1982) which they conducted in 1978 at a camp for teenaged lutheran females. They found that the young women reported holding beliefs in the divinity and virgin birth of Jesus, in an after-life, and in the devil. The young women held those same beliefs more firmly after having been confronted with a report of scientific evidence contradicting Jesus Christ's resurrection from the dead. The report, of course, was contrived for the experiment, but the subjects were informed of this only after completing the questionnaires. Psychologists, invoking the methods of scientific inquiry to uncover truths, tend to view such faith as pathological. Religion on the other hand, holding that the truths which issue from its god are supercedent, espouses that teachings and findings are misleading if they cannot be understood in the light of those truths, and so, sees such faith as providing a healthy stability against changing apparent realities.

The very concept of faith in the veracity of the precepts of a religion, espoused as healthy by most sectors of the Judeo-Christian tradition, is at odds to a certain extent with a conceptualization of mental health as open mindedness and flexibility which, according to Batson and Ventis, is commonly espoused among psychologists. In addition, followers of the Jewish and Christian faiths may be less likely to perceive of themselves as possessing high levels of personal competence and control -- another conceptualization of mental health which,

according to Batson and Ventis, is prevalent among psychologists. Such a view of the self is not entirely congruent with the teaching that people, in and of themselves, are weak and unable to overcome the powers of temptation to sin. Persons holding to this teaching would argue that healthiness involves professing a reliance on God's graces and mercy for personal strength and competence.

Though exemplary, the study of Batson and Ventis mentioned above was not formulated to elucidate the conflict between psychology and religion. Neither was this the object of their 1982 text. In fact, the strongest evidence of a conflict is the extent to which researchers from the fields of psychology and psychiatry have ignored religion (Stark, Kent, and Doyle, 1982; Larson et al, 1986). Stark and his colleagues suggest that this is because of an irreligiousness among social scientists which has led them to believe that religion is a disappearing, unimportant factor. Polls taken at conferences of the American Psychiatric and American Psychological Associations show that 43 percent of psychologists and 14 percent of psychiatrists report holding a belief in God or in a higher power (Larson et al, 1986). On the other hand, twelve Gallop polls taken between 1946 and 1981 show consistently that over 90 percent of the general population report holding those beliefs (Larson et al, 1986), and a 1978 Gallop poll shows that 71 percent of American youth report that religion is either the most important or one of the most important influences in their lives (Batson and Ventis, 1982). Even though these percentages might be inflated in the case of the general

population, and slightly under-estimated in the case of psychologists and psychiatrists due to whatever demand characteristics may be associated with such questions, the differences are striking, and may be leading to problems regarding the delivery of psychological services (Bergin, 1980).

Psychiatrists compared to psychologists and sociologists, say Larson and his colleagues (1986), are particularly guilty for a resulting lack of empirical studies of religion. They examined all issues between 1978 and 1982 of four major psychiatric journals, and found that, of 2,348 articles, only 59 included a quantified religious variable. These low numbers occurred in spite of the inclusion in their review of the December, 1980 special edition of the American Journal of Psychiatry, which was dedicated to the topic of psychopathology and charismatic religious groups. This, they report, is much lower than relevant rates for psychology and sociology. In only 3 of those 59 studies was religion the major topic. They conclude that psychiatric research in the area lacks conceptual and methodological sophistication: of the 59 articles 49 contained only a single-item measure of religious involvement, and only one used a previously scaled, multi-dimensional religiosity questionnaire. Those studies also seemed to lack investigative effort, as only 8 included references to other social scientific quantitative investigations of religion. Larson and his colleagues comment that the research of psychology and sociology score higher on all of these factors. However, in 1971 Stark complained that research into psychology and mental health was out of date and of poor

quality to begin with. In part, of course, the psychological study of religion would have been out of step in the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's with the countless investigations of rats, pigeons, etc. carried out to examine the empirical principles of learning theory. However, in the 1970's and 1980's renewed emphasis has been placed on the study of attitudes, values and beliefs, and their behavioural antecedents and consequences (Batson and Ventis, 1982). Such investigations are particularly found in the domain of social psychology, and so, it is not surprising that some writers have proposed examining the role of religious involvement from a social psychological perspective (Batson and Ventis, 1982; Hunsberger, 1982). However, it continues to be the case that a relatively small number of empirical investigations of religious effects have been published in the 1980's in books and journals of psychology. Stubbornly, though, religious effects on prejudice, fertility, divorce, voting habits and delinquency keep surfacing (Stark, Kent, and Dloyle, 1982).

Mental Health and the Extent Of Religious Involvement

In his study of white persons living in the northern United States, Stark (1971) attempted to relate measures of psychic inadequacy, neurotic distrust and authoritarianism to church attendance, and to the measure of religious orthodoxy developed by Glock and Stark in 1968. The psychic inadequacy instrument inquires as to an individual's ability to cope. Stark found that

persons scoring high on psychic inadequacy were less likely than those scoring low to indicate high levels of belief in God, an after-life, and the devil. He also found that they were less likely to attend church on a weekly basis. Except for the case of church attendance by moderate protestants, this pattern held true across denominational categories of Roman Catholic, liberal, moderate and conservative protestants. A negative relationship between psychopathology and religiousness was even more evident when the measure of neurotic distrust was used to represent mental disturbance. When a measure of authoritarianism was used -- the fascism scale of Adorno (1950) -- no pattern emerged for the sample as a whole. However, for Roman Catholics, Stark's results indicate a positive relationship between authoritarianism and both measures of religiousness. Stark concludes that, overall, and contrary to a number of earlier investigations, religious involvement is not associated with pathology, and may even be associated with a healthy constitution.

Stark's investigation drew upon three measures of mental health and two measures of religiousness. However, researchers attempting to understand the relationship between religiousness and mental health have used over thirty measures tapping at least half a dozen indicators of religiousness, and some fifty measures tapping seven conceptualizations of mental health (Batson and Ventis, 1982). How, then, can Stark's findings be touted as conclusive? Indeed, the results of no single study can be seen as shedding a conclusive light on the relationship under discussion here? For the remainder of this section of the literature review

the 1982 work of Batson and Ventis will be drawn upon heavily, with particular attention paid to chapters 7 and 8 of their text.

Chapter 7 of the Batson and Ventis text is based on a categorization of descriptions of mental health according to seven conceptualizations advanced by psychologists ranging in scope from Freud to Maslow: a) absence of illness, b) appropriate social behaviour, c) freedom from worry and guilt, d) personal competence and personal control, e) levels of self acceptance and self actualization, f) personal unification and organization, and g) open mindedness and flexibility. They also work with eleven different types of measures of religious involvement. Examining some fifty studies of religious involvement, Battson and Ventis (1982) carefully tabulated up to seventy-seven findings on the religion/mental health link. A summary and re-analysis of their tabulation is appended (Appendix I). Appendix I also includes a summary of more recent investigations of religion-mental health conclusions.

Mental Health and Orientation Of Religious Involvement

Batson and Ventis also reviewed six studies that examined conservative versus liberal religiousness in relation to mental health. All of those were denominational affiliation studies, and four revealed that membership in a conservative or fundamentalist denomination was associated with lower levels of health. The other two yielded no relationship, though the results from one of them fell just short of significance in supporting a similar

direction. In particular, the three studies which examined the link between denominational affiliation and mental health conceptualized as personal competence and control showed that members of conservative churches were more dependent on others in forming opinions and making decisions.

Though denominational affiliation is easily measured and understood as a conceptualization of orientation of religious involvement, for psychologists the term religious orientation has become synonymous with the measures of extrinsic and intrinsic religiousness developed by Allport and Ross (1967). For Allport and Ross, extrinsically religious persons, while believing in God, would tend to view religion as a means to social, economic or other personal ends; intrinsically religious individuals, on the other hand, would tend to view religion as an end in itself. The review by Battson and Ventis of empirical study into the association between religious orientation and the seven conceptualizations of mental health indicates that this line of investigation is even more anemic than the collection of investigations into the relationship between mental health and extent of religious involvement. They uncovered only 23 studies which presented a total of 30 findings regarding the association. A summary of these findings is included in Appendix I. Briefly, an extrinsic orientation has been consistently associated with racial prejudice, but has not been studied in relation to other forms of anti-social behaviour. Perhaps more importantly, Battson and Ventis have developed the construct of "Quest" as an aspect of religious orientation which they felt cut across denominational

affiliation.

The quest orientation is characterized as an ongoing questioning, seeking approach to religion -- an approach which is distinct from both the means and ends orientations which characterize extrinsic and intrinsic religiousness (Batson and Ventis, 1982, Chapter 5). Batson and his colleagues found that the quest orientation was unrelated to a measure of social desirability, but was negatively related to both questionnaire and behavioural intention indicators of prejudice. Once again, however, Quest has not been examined in relation to other types of anti-social behaviour. A summary of other findings regarding Quest is included in Appendix I.

Summary

The 1982 work of Battson and Ventis has been relied upon heavily for this portion of the review of the literature. Of the 141 studies reviewed, 35 were published after 1970, and 12 after 1975. Of the latter 12, most were authored by Battson and his colleagues. Further, in the 1980's the rate of empirical research into the relationship between religiosity and mental health has not increased. Much of the research is old, then, and some feel it is of poor quality (Stark, 1971). At the same time, some researchers have employed the guise of scientific inquiry to either conduct smear campaigns against religion or to extoll its virtues (Batson and Ventis, 1982). These two factors particularly contaminate literature on mental health and the extent of religious involvement, and along with the anemic state of that

body of literature, they serve to undermine the credibility of generalizations regarding that relationship. Furthermore, any generalizations which can be extrapolated from the literature cannot be sustained across the various ways of measuring extent of religious involvement. The one exception lies in the overwhelming weight of findings which indicate that religiously involved persons are more likely to harbour prejudicial attitudes. It appears, therefore, that this broad statement, like all regarding the extent of religious involvement, gives way when extent of religious involvement is examined in interaction with religious orientation. Examinations of religiousness from a psychological viewpoint, then, must account for the various ways in which individuals relate to their religions -- religious orientation-- as well as the various ways in which they are involved in religion.

II) Religious Involvement and Criminality

The social sciences and the Judeo-Christian tradition both hold, in general, that criminal conduct is inappropriate behaviour that is harmful to others, and perhaps unhealthy for the self. Because of the Judeo-Christian religious/moral sanctions -- sanctions which are evident in other world religions as well -- investigations of the rates and types of criminal involvement of persons participating in religious activities and maintaining religious values and beliefs is to be expected and encouraged, and is of the utmost relevance to religious institutions as well as to a number of branches of the social sciences.

Two recent reviews of the research literature have concluded that religiosity and criminality are inversely related. Tittle and Welsh (1983) reviewed 65 studies that presented original evidence on the issue. They noted that 55 of the studies -- 85 percent -- reported a significant inverse association between at least one measure of religious involvement and an assessment of some form of deviant behaviour. Ellis (1985) reviewed 31 studies of church attendance and found that each one uncovered an inverse association with criminality, with the correlation being statistically significant ($p < .05$) in 26 of the studies. According to Tittle and Welsh, few variables in the study of criminology have produced such consistent results from study to study. They note that being young and being male are two other members of a small set of variables that link with criminality in consistent ways across a number of studies. However, there are a number of well established correlates of criminality. These include indicators of anti-social personality (Andrews and Wormith, 1987), an early history of generalized rule violations (Loeber and Dishion, 1984), below average verbal intelligence (Hirschi and Hindelang, 1977), lack of affection and poor supervision or discipline in the parental home (Loeber and Dishion, 1984), holding explicitly pro-deviant personal attitudes and having explicitly pro-deviant personal associates (Johnson, 1979; Matsueda, 1982).

In view of the 1983 finding of Tittle and Welsh that ranks the empirical status of the link between religiosity and deviance with those of age, gender, anti-social personality and anti-social

attitudes, one might expect to find that religiosity is a focus of major interest within the field of criminality. In fact, the opposite has been the case. A review of 25 criminological textbooks conducted for this thesis found that the subject of religion was cited in the topic indexes of only nine. The majority of those references were to discussion of the general relationship between religious codes and the criminal code. In only 2 of the texts was individual religiosity and criminal behaviour even discussed. One of those texts (Wilson and Hernstein, 1985) simply bemoaned the lack of relevant research on the issue. The other (Martin and Fitzgerald, 1967) referred only to a single confirmatory study, but tacitly reported the findings such that the emphasis was placed on the error term: Many religiously involved people are deviant while many less religious people are not deviant. When textbook authors report error terms rather than observed correlations, one begins to suspect that the field is resisting the evidence. As suggested in Part I of this chapter, the relationship between social science and religion is not without some degree of conflict. In sharp contrast to its lack of attention regarding religion, criminology is very favourably disposed to the study of social class. Every textbook of the 25 reviewed gave extensive coverage of the social class of origin as a predictor of deviance, when it is among the least important of the predictors of individual criminality (Tittle, Villemez, and Smith, 1977; Andrews and Wormith, 1989).

The major studies of the link between religiosity and criminality will be reviewed presently, but first it is important

to note that an inter-study hit rate of 84 percent does not suggest that the link is well understood. Among the many issues that will surface in this review, and which require attention are those listed below. First, as noted by Tittle and Welsh (1983), the vast majority of the studies (91 percent) were conducted on juvenile delinquents or highschool students, so that the base for generalizing to young adults and older persons is weak. At the same time, the six studies that did employ adult subjects reported moderate to strong linkages. Second, and perhaps more importantly, the majority of studies reported simple bivariate associations with few employing controls for antecedent conditions, for potentially relevant intermediate consequent conditions, or for competing causal variables. Generally, empirical studies of religious involvement need to be integrated with general theories of deviance and criminal conduct. Third, a variety of measures of religious involvement were employed, and not all measures of religiosity may be equally relevant to the prediction of criminal conduct. There is a need for a comprehensive analysis of the construct of religious involvement and a theoretical and empirical specification of which aspects of religious involvement are most relevant to deviance. A comprehensive analysis of its construct may also identify aspects of religious involvement that were inadequately explored. For example, the summary of Batson and Ventis revealed only a single study of mystical experiences in relation to deviance (see Appendix I). Generally, studies of the link between religiosity and deviance need to be integrated with the broader literature on

religion.

Fourth, various measures of deviance were employed, and it is not clear what forms of deviance are most strongly linked with religious involvement. Of interest here are what has been labelled as victimizing or predatory criminality: that is, physical violence and violations of property rights, and conversely, victimless crimes, particularly drug and alcohol abuse. Fifth, the role of potential moderators of the religion-crime link need to be explored. In particular, there may be personal, social and circumstantial variables that influence the size and direction of correlations between religion and crime. Finally, the majority of existing studies are cross-sectional rather than longitudinal in design. Thus, more is known about religious involvement as a correlate than as a predictor of criminal conduct. Similarly, the predictive implications of changes in religious involvement as they affect crime are relatively unexplored.

This brief overview of potential errors of generalization, conceptualization and measurement serves to introduce the review of some of the major studies in the literature. We begin with studies by Glueck and Glueck (1950), Nye (1958), and Rhodes and Reiss (1970). This set of studies provides an overview of the state of the cross-sectional literature of the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's supportive of the link between criminality and religiosity. The review next turns to that single study -- "Hellfire and Delinquency" (Hirschi and Stark, 1969) -- which has so dominated recent criminological thinking regarding the relevance of religion

to delinquency. Finally, Part II of this chapter concludes with a review of the following specific issues:

a) what aspects of deviance are correlated with religious involvement?;

b) what aspects of religious involvement are correlated with criminality?;

c) what are the potential moderators of a religiosity-deviance link?

Three Classic Studies

The Glueck's 1950 comparison of 500 male training school residents with 500 non-delinquent males from the same lower class neighbourhoods of Boston was one of the first studies to provide impressive evidence of a religiosity/delinquency link. Relying upon the reports of social investigators, they found that 39 percent of their frequent and serious young criminals had been regular church attenders in the community compared to 67 percent of their non-delinquent controls. The difference -- 28 percent -- is statistically significant and clearly exceeded the discriminant capacity of a variety of measures of socio-economic circumstances, of physical condition and health status, and of the majority of indicators of personality and psychopathology obtained from psychiatric interviews, psychometric tests, and the reports of teachers. The only measures to show greater discriminability reflected low familial affection and cohesiveness, poor parental supervision, early and generalized rule violations such as trouble in school, delinquent associates, anti-social attitudes, and specific indicators of anti-social personality such as risk taking, lack of conscientiousness and extroversion in action.

While not reflecting the richness of the multiple sources of information employed by the Glueck's, Nye (1958) overcame many of the potential problems associated with extreme groups research by conducting a paper and pencil questionnaire survey of more than 700 highschool students in the pacific northwest of the United states. The youths were categorized as more or less delinquent according to their responses on a self report measure of

delinquent activity. For both males and females, regular church attendance was inversely associated with delinquency to a moderate degree (the contingency co-efficients were approximately .18). The contingency co-efficients were statistically significant, and clearly exceeded the discriminative capacity of measures of socio-economic status, birth order, family size, and the urban/rural status of the community. Once again, indicators of family stability, cohesiveness and parental supervision were among the strongest of the correlates of delinquency. Extending the findings of Glueck and Glueck, Nye reported that the church attendance of parents was also a correlate of delinquency, and that young people who reported discussing religious matters with their parents were among the least likely to be delinquent. Frequency of consultations with parents on religious matters was at least as strong a correlate of delinquency as were consultations with parents regarding sex, dating, school and occupational matters. The contingency co-efficients for this measure of religious involvement was in the area of .30.

Rhodes and Reiss (1970) surveyed over 21 thousand Tennessee highschool students on matters of religious involvement. The self report measures of religiosity were examined in relation to official court records of delinquency and truancy. Methodologically ahead of their time, Rhodes and Reiss reported their findings by way of a multiple classification analysis, allowing them to examine not only zero-order covariation, but also the covariation found when statistical controls were introduced for other measures. Unfortunately, rather than reporting actual

correlation co-efficients, they chose to express their findings in terms of delinquency rates per 1000 even for cells in which the actual and unstated N might not be very small. Thus, precise comparisons among different correlates are difficult. However, certain findings were very clear. First, white males and females who reported a religious affiliation had lower rates of delinquency than did youths who were unaffiliated religiously. The same pattern was evident with black youths, although rendered less stable due to a small N for that sample. Second, both personal church attendance and parental church attendance were inversely associated with delinquency. Once again, the results appeared stronger and more consistent among the white subjects. Third, the effects of each measure of religious involvement were maintained, albeit at reduced levels, when statistical controls were introduced for the other measures of religious involvement. Finally, the effects of religious involvement were maintained when social class and family structure were statistically controlled

These three classic studies covering the 1940's, 1950's and 1960's provide reasonably convincing evidence of a link between religiosity and crime. However, they contribute little to the specification of a causal model. The "Hellfire and Delinquency" study (Hirschi and Stark, 1969) did hypothesize a causal model, but as summarized below, that model was found to be empirically indefensible.

"Hellfire and Delinquency"

Hirschi and Stark (1969) proposed in "Hellfire and Delinquency"

that religiosity (personal and parental church attendance) might be associated with relatively low levels of delinquency through some combination of the following mediators:

a) supernatural sanction beliefs -- the possibility of being held accountable in an after-life,

b) acceptance of worldly authority -- for example, respect for police,

c) morality -- for example, giving "suckers" an even break or not being willing to violate rules in order to get ahead.

However, their sophisticated survey of California highschool students found that church attendance and supernatural sanction beliefs, though positively associated with each other, were unrelated to both self reported and officially recorded delinquency. Acceptance of morality and worldly authority were each correlated negatively with delinquency, but were essentially uncorrelated with religious involvement. Thus, Hirschi and Stark concluded that "The church is irrelevant to delinquency" because it does not influence "love for neighbours" or the belief that the pleasure and pains of every-day life are secondary to those of another world.

There are several interesting aspects to this conclusion. First, and most notably, while their failure to establish a statistically significant religiosity-criminality link was at odds with the majority of studies in the literature, their enthusiastic acceptance of the null-hypothesis was consistent with the mainstream of criminological thought. Second, their alternative explanations for delinquency were stated in a strong way, and yet,

were not even explored in their report. That is, neither "love for neighbours" nor a "paramount belief in immediate pleasures and pain" were assessed. Overall, "Hellfire and delinquency" was a natural target for rational empirical inquiry, and it did promote a number of vigorous responses.

Contextual Variables or Moderators

Stark, Kent and Doyle (1982) provided reasonably convincing evidence that the relatively weak correlations between religiosity and criminality reported by Hirschi and Stark could be accounted for by a consideration of the secular nature of California society. They operationalized a construct of "moral" community in terms of the proportion of a population who were members of a church. They suggested that other studies conducted on the secular west coast also yielded relatively mild correlations -- relative, that is, to the correlations uncovered in surveys of youths living in less secular regions of the United States. Stark and his colleagues noted, too, that correlations found in west coast studies were small relative to those that they uncovered in their nation wide investigation. They reworked the data from a national survey of highschool students to provide a specific test of "moral" community as a contextual variable. Schools were classed as secular if a minimum of 60 percent of their surveyed students scored below the mean on a Religious values index, and no more than 20 percent of the students obtained the highest possible score. These cut-off scores allowed for individual variation in religious involvement to be examined in relation to self reported deviant behaviour. The results revealed that the correlation

between personal religious involvement and delinquency were stronger in moral communities ($\gamma = -.30$) than in secular communities ($\gamma = -.19$).

Tittle and Welsh (1983) have also explored the moral community hypothesis. However, they did so in a manner so novel that interpretation of their findings is problematic. Working with a sample of over 1900 adolescent and adult residents of Iowa, New Jersey and Oregon, Tittle and Welsh created a proxy for a contextual variable by considering variation in aggregate religiosity at different levels of seven approximated context variables. These variables were respondents' ages (four levels), city size (four population levels), marital status (four classes), race (two categories), socio-economic status (three levels), location of residence (three states), gender (two sexes), and denominational affiliation (five categories). Thus there were 27 socio-demographic contexts, each of which had a corresponding index of aggregate religiosity. This index was specifically the proportion of respondents in a given context who chose any religion when asked, "what is your religion".

According to Tittle and Welsh (1983) the greater the percentage choosing a religion, the more religious the social context. In this way, Tittle and Welsh rank ordered the social context according to religiosity. Correlations between frequency of personal church attendance and personally rated likelihoods of violating the law were then computed for each of the 27 contexts. The correlation between this religiosity-deviance correlation assessed at the individual level and the rank order of contextual

religiosity was then calculated, and used by Tittle and Welsh as their key statistic. In other words, they were interested in how the correlation between personal religiosity and deviance varied with the contextual variables.

The findings of Tittle and Welsh (1983) were dramatically different than those reported by Stark, Kent and Doyle (1982). The higher the contextual religiosity the lower the inhibiting effects of individual religiosity on deviance. This pattern was evident with an overall measure of deviance as well as with five different types of deviance. Those five were large theft, illegal gambling, pot smoking, tax evasion, and remaining seated during the national anthem. Contextual effects on the relationship between personal religiosity and deviance were not significant when deviance referred to small theft, assault, lying to an intimate, and role specific acts such as cheating on exams for students or an employee making use of an employer's equipment without permission. The question of differential effects according to type of deviance assessed will be reviewed presently.

Tittle and Welsh (1983) were well aware of the limitations of their approach to assessing social context. For example, a high proportion of persons expressing a denominational preference does not directly suggest high levels of religious affiliation. Even more problematic was the assumption that persons within a particular category of age or social class experience similar social contexts. They grant that a different assessment of social context is preferable.

Interestingly, only two studies have examined the interaction

of personal religious involvement and the religiosity of personal associates. Hebert (1986) conducted one such study, and reported a significant interaction in her survey of undergraduates. However, the simple effects of religious involvement at different levels of the religiosity of friends and acquaintances was not reported. Thus, it is not known whether her findings were consistent with those of Stark, Kent and Doyle (1982), or with those of Tittle and Welsh (1983).

The other study is an elegant longitudinal investigation carried out by Burkett and Warren (1987) which demonstrates support for the findings of Stark and his colleagues. Studying highschool students, they examined the effects which association with marijuana using peers would have on the relationship between religiosity and marijuana use. Measures of church attendance, marijuana use, belief in the sinfulness of using marijuana, and association with marijuana using peers were taken at three times at one-year intervals. The zero-order correlations between those measures were all significant. They concluded that religious involvement exerts an indirect influence on marijuana use through its influence on the selection of friends who hold similar behaviour specific beliefs regarding the sinfulness of marijuana use.

In summary, the limited data available support the existence of an interaction between personal religious involvement and the religiousness of the social context. However, better conceptualization of the interaction is required in order to sort out the conflicting empirical findings regarding the nature of

that interaction. Tittle and Welsh themselves agree that the findings of Stark, Kent and Doyle are more consistent with the general social psychological "contingent consistency" hypothesis of Andrews and Kendal (1979), as well as with Durkheimian thought regarding the role of the social context. According to the contingency consistency hypothesis, personal predispositions -- for example, attitudes -- are more likely to be expressed in behaviour when the social context is also supportive of that behaviour. According to Durkheim, the importance of religion is not simply to instill fear of sin, but to bind the religious into a religious or moral community. Being constrained by this community is the major source of control. Thus, according to the contingency consistency hypothesis, personal religiosity will have little effect in the absence of a somewhat immediate moral community.

The fact that Tittle and Welsh employed such an indirect indicator of immediate context takes on added significance when one considers another finding from their study. Specifically, Tittle and Welsh hypothesized that personal religiosity may be a particularly strong source of control when there are higher levels of normative dissensus within the broader surrounding community. That is, the guides to action and/or controls associated with personal religious involvement may be particularly important when other controls are absent, weak, or inconsistently applied. This hypothesis received high levels of support from their analysis. They found strong, inverse correlations between religiosity and deviance in those approximated contexts that revealed high levels

of aggregated dissensus regarding norms and social disorganization. Interestingly, their interpretation of these findings assumes that high levels of personal religious involvement is accompanied by association with religious others. Religious others provide the supportive social network which is otherwise lacking, and may provide direct differential sanctioning of conformity and deviance.

Discussions of the role of the moral community as a moderator of personal religious involvement seem not to have considered two other potentially important matters. One of the matters has to do with the fact that the effects of moderators may be particularly strong only when other factors associated with a higher likelihood of deviant involvement -- risk factors -- are relatively few in number. The other has to do with individual differences in susceptibility to influence by the social environment.

In the most general sense, the context hypothesis reflects the view that deviant behavioural expressions are a function of the number, variety and strength of risk factors operating (Andrews, 1983). In this general version, the predictive value of any particular risk factor will depend upon the overall density of risk. The density of risk is determined by the extent to which demographic factors and other attributes of individuals and their lifestyles were found to be associated with higher likelihoods of criminal involvement. Andrews suggested that the personal or contextual status of any risk factor will be irrelevant, and the contributions of any particular risk factor will be minimal when the overall density is either very low or very high; on the other

hand, the contributions of any particular risk factor approaches an asymptote when the density of risk is at an intermediate level.

Morisson (1984) provides a good illustration of this point with regard to the criminal analysis of university undergraduates. She first demonstrated that being male was a major risk factor for criminality in her undergraduate sample. She then examined Attitude by Social Support interactions separately for her female (lower risk) and male (higher risk) subjects. Among males, attitudes favourable to violations of the law contributed to the prediction of criminal behaviour to a relatively mild degree regardless of the criminality of peers. Among females the effects of personal attitudes were also relatively weak except Among those who reported high levels of association with criminal others. In brief, the attitude-behaviour correlation was minimal under low risk conditions -- females without social support -- and high risk conditions -- males -- but greater under intermediate risk conditions -- females with social support. Some background intermediate level of risk -- support for deviance -- must be present, then, for any particular risk factor to contribute at asymptotic levels.

Andrews and Kendal (1979) also found that personal attitudes favourable to drug use were much more strongly associated with drug using behaviour when peers were drug users than when peers were less involved with drugs. However, this was the case only for those who moved from a status of non-user to user. Among those who were already users the correlation between attitude and behaviour was unrelated to peer use. For users, it appeared,

there was already a large number and variety of supports for increased use, and the contributions of any particular variable were reduced to insignificant levels.

Finally, not all individuals are equally likely to turn to the interpersonal environment for personal guides to action. Snyder (1974) has shown that individual differences in the trait of "self monitoring" have important implications for the behavioural effects of environmental signals. High scores on a measure of self monitoring indicated a readiness to scan the external environment for guides to action in immediate situations. Morrisson (1984) found this general principle operating in her analysis of the criminal conduct of undergraduate students. The effects of social support for deviance were clearly greater among those with above average scores on self monitoring than among the remaining undergraduates.

In summary, there are strong theoretical and empirical grounds for expecting that personal religious involvement will interact with religious associates in relation to criminal behaviour, at least under certain circumstances. Unfortunately, those circumstances have yet to be well defined empirically. One of the major concerns of the present project will be to explore those circumstances, using a wider variety of risk factors than have previously been used in studies of religion.

Religiosity and Different Forms of Deviance

An hypothesis has arisen in the literature suggesting that religiosity has its greatest impact on those forms of deviance

that are explicitly condemned by religion, and yet not so severely or generally condemned in secular society. Thus, for example, Burkett and White (1974) argued that crimes of theft and violence are generally proscribed by various groups in society. On the other hand, esthetic norms such as the proscription of alcohol and marijuana are much more strongly linked to religion.

Working with a sample of highschool students in the pacific northwest of the United States, Burkett and White replicated the 1969 findings of Hirschi and Stark regarding a null relationship between religiosity and crimes of theft and violence, while confirming a negative association between religiosity and use of beer and marijuana. The latter findings were evident when religiosity was defined in terms of church attendance, but not when it was defined in terms of belief in supernatural sanctions. A similar pattern of relationships between measures of religiosity and marijuana use among adolescents also surfaced in later studies (Burkett, 1977; Burkett and Warren, 1987).

Working with samples of Mormons, Albrecht, Chadwick and Alcorn (1977) similarly found that correlations between religiosity and deviance tended to be greater when deviance involved victimless acts such as drinking and drug use, as opposed to victimizing acts such as theft and fighting, although associations with both types of offenses were significant. These findings parallel the results of an investigation conducted by Higgins and Albrecht (1977) in the region around Atlanta, Georgia. Finally, Tittle and Welsh (1983) found the effects of normative dissensus on the magnitude of the correlation between religiosity and deviance was stronger

for acts of marijuana use than it was for acts of theft or assault. Surprisingly, normative dissensus had no effect on correlations with illegal gambling. Rohrbaugh and Jessor (1975) similarly found that religiosity correlated more strongly with marijuana use than it did with a general measure of lying, stealing, cheating and aggression.

Apart from Hebert (1986), the study of Rohrbaugh and Jessor is the only one to include undergraduates. In direct contrast, Hebert found that religiosity correlated more strongly with traditional criminality than it did with victimless crimes. The problem here is that Hebert made use of a well validated, comprehensive survey of criminal acts, but only a cursory survey of victimless crimes. Rohrbaugh and Jessor, on the other hand, employed a systematic assessment of marijuana use but a weak measure of criminality. As well, included in her multi-dimensional survey of religiosity Hebert employed a measure of religious morality -- endorsement of the ten commandments -- and it was this measure which was found, not surprisingly, to relate differentially with regard to predatory and victimless deviance.

Interestingly, Jenson and Erickson (1979) found that the inverse relationship between church attendance and marijuana use was significantly stronger for a sample of Mormons than for samples of Roman Catholics and protestants. They accounted for this difference by alluding to the well-known specific sanctions against the use of "foreign substances" contained in the teachings of the Mormon faith. It can be argued that the religious/moral

sanctions measure used by Hebert is more indicative of the specific moral teachings of most Christian denominations, and that, at any rate, there has been to this point no empirical support for the view that sanctions of the proscription of drugs and alcohol are stronger in, and more specific to religion than to secular society.

In summary, the issue of the moderating role of the type of deviance has not received serious enough attention. Correlations with victimless and victimizing crimes were only roughly compared, with no consideration having been given to the question of statistical significance of differences between them. Nor has much concern been shown for the possibility that different measures of deviance might be differentially reliable or valid. Nor have investigators considered that differences in the distributions of the criterion measures -- base rates and/or variance -- may be contributing to apparent differences in the magnitude of correlations with religiosity. However, the consistency with which religiosity has been found to relate more strongly to drug and alcohol abuse than with victimizing crime across several studies (Burkett and White, 1974; Albrecht, Chadwick, and Alcorn, 1977; Higgins and Albrecht, 1974; Jenson and Erickson, 1979) suggests that, though needing further understanding, it is a factor in the relationship between religiosity and deviance.

Measures of Religiosity That
Correlate with Deviance

Church attendance is both the most often employed measure of religiosity, and, as has been noted above (Ellis, 1985), the one which has been found most consistently to correlate with measures of criminality. Measures of the frequency of church attendance were employed since the time of the earliest studies to investigate the relationship between religiosity and crime (Middleton and Fay, 1941; Kvaraceus, 1944). As a measure of religious involvement it has retained its popularity because it is easy to obtain, and because it represents a socially visible form of piety (Stark, Kent, and Doyle, 1982).

Belief and attitudinal measures may tap into an important aspect of religiosity, but frequency of church attendance has been shown to correlate more strongly with marijuana use than does belief in an after-life (Burkett, 1977). Although a measure of orthodox religious beliefs has been found inversely linked with beer drinking, use of soft drugs, smoking and sexual activeness among adolescents (Vener, Zaenglein, and Stuart, 1977), there have to this point in time been no comparison between religious orthodoxy and church attendance as correlates of criminality.

There is evidence that specific beliefs regarding the sinfulness of a given behaviour is more strongly negatively linked to rates of incidences of that behaviour than is church attendance frequency. This was found to be the case with regard to belief in the sinfulness of marijuana use (Burkett, 1977; Burkett and Warren, 1987). Burkett and Warren went on to demonstrate that this act specific belief mediates the relationship between church attendance and marijuana use through the choice of peers. Such a

result is congruent with the interpretation by Jenson and Erickson (1979) of the finding that the relationship between church attendance and marijuana use/beer drinking is stronger among Mormon youths than any Roman Catholic and protestant youths. In worship services of the Mormon faith, preachings are more likely to include sanctions against those specific behaviours than is the case for the worship services of the Roman Catholic and protestant faiths.

The study of Jenson and Erickson is one of only two to investigate the relationship between denominational affiliation and deviance. The other is the 1970 work of Rhodes and Reiss referred to earlier. Those authors uncovered a very general pattern, noting that Jewish youths recorded the lowest rates of deviance, fundamentalist protestant youths recorded the highest, while non-fundamentalist protestants, Roman Catholics and Baptist youths recorded rates which fell in the middle. However, their findings were confounded by pronounced gender and race anomalies. They also noted that the relationship between frequency of church attendance and deviance did not vary across denominational affiliations. Believing any link between denominational affiliation and deviance to be unreliable, Elifson, Peterson and Hadaway (1983) are among those who have chosen to control for its effects by using measures of religiosity which allow for contrasting ideologies.

Rhodes and Reiss also explored a measure of the frequency of parental church attendance. They found it to be inversely related to the rates of delinquency of their adolescent subjects, a

finding which was later brought into question by results presented by Burkett (1977) in his study of marijuana use and beer drinking. Burkett noted that parental church attendance was related moderately to the act specific belief of their children that marijuana use and beer drinking were sinful, although it was more strongly linked to their frequency of church attendance and belief in supernatural sanctions. He concluded that parents influence the religious beliefs and participation of their children, but that their religious involvement does not impact directly on their childrens' rates of beer and marijuana consumption.

On the other hand, as was mentioned earlier in this chapter, an indicator of parent-child relationship which implicates religiosity -- i.e. the ease with which religious matters are discussed in the home, is inversely linked with the youths' involvements in crime (Nye, 1958). Further, Hebert found that, besides her measure of morality, the only other religiosity variable significantly related to deviance was the interaction of religious history and present religious associates. However, the association between this interaction and criminal involvement was, at best, a weak one.

Summary

Studies ranging in publication date from 1950 to 1987 were reviewed in this section, and it does appear that a tapestry can be manufactured from these raw materials. The relationship between religious involvement and criminality can be contained in

the following statements:

1) personal religious involvement is linked with reduced levels of criminal behaviour;

2) this link will be particularly evident in circumstances in which sanctions against criminal behaviour which are characteristic of religious organizations and institutions outweigh those characteristic of secular organizations and institutions;

3) such circumstances will be more or less present with respect to a) the social environment, and b) the nature of criminal acts -- eg.: victimizing versus victimless offenses;

4) this link between personal religious involvement and criminal behaviour operates due to beliefs regarding the sinfulness of specific behaviours, and the influences which those act-specific beliefs exert on the selection of friends;

5) in as much as a given social environment or community may be characterized as religion-oriented, the constraining effects of personal religious involvement on criminal behaviour will be enhanced because of the greater likelihood that a) the sanctions against criminal behaviour characteristic of religious organizations and institutions will outweigh those of secular organizations and institutions over a wider range of activities, and that b) religiously involved individuals will be more likely to come in contact with potential friends who hold similar beliefs regarding the sinfulness of specific behaviours.

III) Theories of Criminality

The preceding review has shown that at least some measures of

religious involvement are correlates of delinquency. Thus, it is important now to locate religious involvement in the context of more general theories of delinquent and criminal conduct. These include class-based Anomie/strain theory, class-based Subcultural theory, Psychodynamic and Social Control theory, and Differential Association and Social Learning prospectives.

Summarizing Andrews, Bonta and Wormith (1988), Hirschi (1969), Johnson (1979) and Akers and Cochran (1986), it is now obvious that the class-based versions of Anomie/Strain theory (Eg. Merton, 1938) and Subcultural theory (EG. Cohen, 1960) are of limited relevance to the analysis of individual criminal conduct. In brief, the root variable of Social Class of Origin is at best only mildly associated with delinquency (Tittle, Villemez and Smith, 1978), and class of origin is not strongly linked with indicators of either strain or subcultural beliefs supportive of crime (Hirschi, 1969; Johnson, 1979). In addition, indicators of strain such as worry about school performance and occupational future tend to be mildly negative, not positive, correlates of delinquency (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Hirschi, 1969; Johnson, 1979). Akers and Cochran (1986) showed that anomie variables accounted for only 3 percent of the variance regarding marijuana use of their teenaged subjects.

Two stronger theories of delinquency are provided by Psychodynamic theory (EG. Glueck and Glueck, 1950) and Social Control/-Containment/Bonding theory (Hirschi, 1969; Reckless, 1967). These theories recognize individual differences in temperament (EG. restlessly energetic) and ability (EG. poor verbal skill), the

importance of family attachments and training or supervision, antisocial attitudes, and attachments and involvements with school and peers. As such, this theory would appear to allow for contributions by religious variables, with assessments of religious morality being negatively associated with antisocial attitudes, and general involvement in religious activities being positively associated with conventional social attachments.

Interestingly, early versions of both Psychodynamic theory and Social Control theory were openly hostile to Differential Association theory. Over half a century ago Sutherland (1934) asserted that it does matter what company we keep. He laid down at that time the principles of Differential Association Theory, positing that a person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favourable to violations of the law over definitions unfavourable to law violations. For Sutherland the term "definitions" generally referred to internalized motivators such as beliefs, attitudes and self reinforcers. Likely because of methodological difficulties in operationalizing the favourability/unfavourability dimension, researchers focussed upon the extent to which an individual associates with peers who participate in deviant or non-deviant activities (Short, 1957). In his study with teenagers, Short had noted a definite positive relationship between the delinquent behaviour of young offenders and the delinquency of their associates. Admitting that his empirical procedures were crude, and that caution must be exercised when generalizing his findings, he noted that the relationship was stronger for males, and that it may exist

reliably only when the associations are with groups which participate in serious delinquency. However, it is evident that caution regarding Short's findings can be relaxed in view of copious empirical support (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Burgess and Akers, 1966; Hirschi, 1969; Jenson, 1972; Krone, 1974; Landsicaduse et al, 1980; Andrews, 1980; Elliott, Agetown, and Canter, 1979; Elliott, Hozinga, and Agetown, 1985; Akers and Cochran, 1986; Burkett, 1987). It would seem reasonable to assume that association with religious others may be related to reduced association with delinquent others. Similarly, assessments of religious morality may contribute to understanding definitions unfavourable to law violations.

The strongest theories of criminal conduct currently appear to be those that employ Social Learning and Cognitive Behavioural principles. Some of these prospectives (Wilson and Harnstein, 1985; Andrews, 1982) retain ties with Psycho-dynamic theory. Some other Social Learning prospectives are basically behavioural reformulations of Differential Association theory (EG. Akers, 1981).

An elegant study which investigates the relative predictive power of three theories of criminology regarding marijuana smoking behaviour of adolescents (Akers and Cochran, 1986) found that Social Control Theory variables accounted for 30 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. However, almost all of its predictive power was subsumed under the theoretical principles of a social learning model, which alone accounted for 68 percent of the variance in the dependent variable. This is the same study

referred to earlier which demonstrated the poor performance of Murton's 1938 Anomie Theory.

The principles or elements of the model proposed by Akers and Cochran are imitation or modelling, differential reinforcement of deviant and non-deviant activities, differential association with deviant and non-deviant others, and the balance of definitions favourable and unfavourable to violations of the law. The reader will recognize the last two of these elements as the principles of Differential Association Theory. Support for those principles has already been submitted (Short, 1957; Andrews, 1980). In a treatment system such as the one investigated by Andrews, the probation officers are in a position to, and are expected to act as models for their clients. Their position is also one wherein they have at their disposal high-quality or esteemed reinforcers and punishers for their clients' behaviour. These two features provide for investigation of the elements of the social learning model drawn from behaviour reinforcement principles, and Andrews's study provides support for their causal significance in a treatment setting. Support for the power of the combination of imitation, differential reinforcement, differential association and definitions has been documented with regard to a number of situations. These include alcohol and marijuana use (Krone et al, 1982; Landsicaduse et al, 1980), parental influences upon aggressive behaviour (Neopolitan, 1981), and in a group home setting (Brockman, Kirajen, and Wolfe, 1980). Furthermore, the effectiveness of imitation in determining the direction of adolescents' behaviours has been documented in a number of

studies, including Sarazin's 1973 study of the rehabilitation of institutionalized juvenile delinquents.

For some theorists social learning models can be boiled down to the summed contributions made by such elements as imitation, differential reinforcement, differential association, and definitions in forming the intention to perform a given behaviour -- a behaviour intention (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975). Fishbein and Ajzen proposed that an individual takes into account the possible consequences of a given behaviour, and, based on beliefs regarding the probabilities of each of those consequences, formulates her intention to carry it out. However, empirical evidence indicates that this formula may not always provide a complete account of behaviour. Bentler and Speckart (1979), in a study of drug use, found that, only when brought to consciousness (i.e. when the behaviour is pre-meditated) does intention play a role in determining behaviour. Only then, too, do subjective norms as to the probabilities of the various consequences of that behaviour come into play, operating through those intentions. This research also showed that, for marijuana and alcohol consumption, previous behaviour is a powerful determinant of behaviour intention, and that a non-trivial proportion of behaviour variability remains predictable from attitudes and previous behaviour after controlling for the effects of intentions. The particular relevance of that finding to criminology is made apparent by demonstrations that a history of criminal involvement is among the variables which make a significant and independent contribution to the prediction of recidivism among young offenders (Andrews,

Wormith, and Kiessling, 1985). Further research has provided evidence of the power of the influence of previous behaviour on intentions toward such behaviours as studying, dating and exercise (Bentler and Speckart, 1981) as well as teeth brushing and alcohol consumption (Kristianson, 1987). The Kristianson study indicates that previous behaviour accounts over 75 percent of the variability of the intentions for teeth brushing, alcohol consumption and exercise. Although previous behaviour seems to act as a powerful predictor across a wide variety of behaviour domains, the relative effects of attitude and intention seems to depend on the domain under examination (Bentler and Speckart, 1981).

Furthermore, Gorsuch and Ortberg (1983) found that, in morally laden situations, the effects usually attributed to attitudes were taken over by moral values. The subjects of the investigation were members of a Baptist congregation. The morally laden situations were hypothetical decisions about whether to keep an erroneous tax refund of 500 dollars, and whether to accept a job promotion which would preclude being able to attend Sunday worship services; the morally irrelevant decisions dealt with whether to attend a party, and whether to attend the second rather than the first Sunday service after sleeping poorly Saturday night. Even when entered last in the step-wise regression analysis, the moral obligation component provided significant predictive power with respect to behavioural intentions in morally laden situations. What contribution the moral obligation component would make in accounting for variability in the behavioural intentions of a more

secular sample is, as yet, uninvestigated. However, it would appear to be safe to conclude that, in situations to which an individual attributes moral relevance, the corresponding moral obligation will form a significant part of the attitudinal component in determining a behavioural response.

The concept of morality and adherence to a moral code call into play theories of personality and personality constructs. Still the best known effort to account for moral development in personality formation is the Freudian concept of the superego (1961). From the earliest days of the study of criminology attempts were made to draw links between criminal behaviour and personality. The Glueck's (1950), following the psycho-analytical train of thought, posited that delinquency occurs in the absence personal as well as external controls on basic sexual and aggressive energy. Years later, Hirschi showed that variables such as being easily bored, a contemptuous attitude toward the law, lack of respect for authority, and lack of self control were linked with increased delinquency. In fact, it has been argued that the basic tenets of Hirschi's social control theory -- attachment to, or caring about the opinions of family, teachers, etc., belief in the propriety of conforming to convention, involvement in conventional activities, and commitment through a personal investment in a conventional lifestyle -- are social psychological equivalents for the superego and ego operations (Andrews et al, inp.).

Andrews, Wormith and Kiessling (1985) formulated a survey of criminal personality measuring psychopathy, neuroticism,

inadequacy/immaturity, family dissension, and scholastic mal-adjustment, adapted from the measures of Peterson, Quay, and Cameron (1959), and the socialization scale of Gough (1969). Andrews and his colleagues found that none of their subscales added to the proportion of variability in recidivism rates accounted for by psychopathy. They also found that psychopathy and criminal history were joined by the variables age and criminal sentiments in making considerable and independent contributions to the prediction of recidivism. The criminal sentiments measure (Andrews and Kiessling, 1979) includes the measures referred to previously of attitudes regarding law, courts and police, tolerance of law violations, and identification with criminal others -- measures adapted from earlier works (Mylonas and Reckless, 1963; Reckless, 1973). Personality Variables, then, can be seen as making a contribution to the prediction of criminal behaviour which is independent of that made by attitude and previous behaviour -- variables proposed by supporters of derivatives of Social Learning Theory.

It appears, then, that four elements make unique and significant contributions as direct predictors regarding the likelihood of criminal conduct:

- 1) Pro-criminal attitudes -- the balance of definitions favourable and unfavourable to violations of the law, measurable in terms of criminal sentiments -- i.e.) attitudes regarding the law, courts and police, tolerance of law violations, identification with law offenders, and socialization;

- 2) Delinquent Associations -- differential associations with

delinquent and non-delinquent others, measurable in terms of the balance of those associations, both regular and occasional;

3) Criminal History -- the presence of previous criminal involvement, measurable in terms of such variables as the overall and recent amounts and frequencies of delinquent acts and trouble with the police;

4) Anti-social Personality -- the presence of criminal personality traits, measurable in terms of indicators of psychopathy.

Personal religious morality can be construed as contributing to attitudes unfavourable to law violations. As well, to whatever extent religious involvement may be associated with reduced levels of criminal conduct, association with religious others might be construed as contributing to associations with non-delinquent others.

IV) Measuring Religious Involvement

We have seen that factors predictive of criminal behaviour are measured through a sampling of specific domains, and that the focus upon those domains, and the types of scales used to sample them, are a subject of agreement across a wide spectrum of criminologists. To some extent the same can be said of factors of religious involvement. Over the years, social scientists of religion have come to agreement on the language and issues of debate, and techniques used to examine religious involvement (Gorsuch, 1984). To date there have, in general, been two forms of study of religious involvement -- those which inquire as to extent, and those which inquire as to the nature of religious

involvement. We have seen that most studies of the relationship between religious involvement and criminality represented the former in terms of the regularity of church attendance, and those would be categorized under the first form. A number, however, also used previously scaled, multi-dimensional questionnaires, examining the nature as well as the extent of religious involvement (Hirschi and Stark, 1969; Burkett, 1977; Burkett and Warren, 1987; Rohrbaugh and Jessor, 1975; Hebert, Unp.). This approach is preferred by social scientists for use in such studies (Himmelfarb, 1975; Gorsuch, 1984) who are unimpressed by correlations with single-item behavioural measures of religious involvement, and espouse multi-act, broad-based measures of attitude and behaviour. The works by Hirschi and Stark, Burkett, Burkett and Warren, and by Rohrbaugh and Jessor all adopted forms of the multi-dimensional model proposed by Glock and Stark (1965).

Glock and Stark proposed five dimensions in 1965 for the study of religiosity: Beliefs, Practice, Knowledge, Experiences, and Consequences. The Belief dimension provides a measure of an individual's endorsement of tenets of his or her faith, and acknowledgement of their truth. The Practice dimension refers to the worship and devotional behaviours (public and personal respectively) through which persons express their religiousness. The experiences factor allows for an accounting of sensations, perceptions and emotional feelings through which a person subjectively achieves a sense of contact with some aspect of the ultimate reality, and is usually represented in some form of communication with her god. The Knowledge dimension allows for

investigation of the extent to which an individual possesses information about the root traditions and scriptural bases for the tenets of his or her faith. The final dimension -- Consequences -- examines subjective beliefs as to the effects in every-day life of religious beliefs, practices, knowledge and experiences. The Beliefs dimension was subsequently divided by Glock and Stark (1968) into a primary measure -- Orthodoxy -- and two secondary measures -- particularism and ethicalism. Those secondary measures were intended to sample from beliefs which might be particular to and characteristic of a religion, and endorsement of general ethics such as love of neighbour and doing good for others. They also subdivided the Practice dimension at that time, with the public aspect represented in a subscale measuring Ritual practices, while the Devotional subscale was included to measure specifically private practices. In 1968 they also added a sixth factor -- a Relational index -- which was subdivided into the primary measure of communal involvement, and the secondary measure of Close Relations as might exist within a religion-oriented community. Glock and Stark found in their 1968 "American Piety" research that orthodoxy was the best single indicator of religious commitment, with Devotionalism being an equally good predictor for Roman Catholics. Ethicalism was found to be the poorest indicator, suggesting that beliefs in the propriety of loving one's neighbour and doing good for others are not restricted to religious persons. Finally, noting that the Knowledge dimension correlated poorly with all other dimensions and sub-dimensions, they concluded that because people who are generally well informed

are also likely to be knowledgeable about religion, that dimension could be excluded from future investigations. This thinking has received recent rational support (Gorsuch, 1984).

A number of subsequent studies have attempted to establish multi-dimensional models for understanding religious involvement (King and Hunt, 1969; 1971; 1972; Himmelfarb, 1975; Batson and Ventis, 1982; Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1982). While most multi-scale examinations of the relationship between criminality and religious involvement have drawn heavily from the work of Glock and Stark, Hebert's unpublished work stands alone in its inclusion of factors distilled by other researchers, drawing heavily from the works of King and Hunt (1972) and of Hilty, Morgan and Burns (1982). She also included a measure of religious morality which sampled from the ten commandments of the judeo-Christian tradition, and the reader will recall that it was that factor of her study which stood out among religious variables as most strongly negatively correlated with criminal behaviour.

Besides drawing from the work of Glock and Stark, King and Hunt borrowed from the concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness, as authored by Feigan (1964) and by Allport and Ross (1967). Through a series of factor analyses (King, 1967; King and Hunt, 1969; 1971; 1972) they distilled ten scales contained in six factors for measuring religiousness. Those factors are Credal Ascent, Devotionalism, Congregational Involvement (including the Church Attendance, Organizational Activities, and Financial Support scales), Religious Knowledge, Life Purpose (containing the Growth and Striving and the Extrinsic

Religiousness scales), and Religious Salience (containing the Behavioural and the Cognitioncy scales). Each of the ten scales show a high level of internal reliability, with alpha co-efficients ranging from .734 to .852. However, the work of King and Hunt suffers from the fact that some items appear in more than one scale. Ideally, the factors of multi-dimensional instruments should measure independent concepts. This is seldom achieved, but the second best approach is to preclude items appearing in more than one scale (Gorsuch, 1984). In an effort to overcome this problem, and in an attempt to examine the viability of the work of King and Hunt, Hilty, Morgan and Burns (1982) sought to replicate their findings. Hilty, Morgan and Burns started with the 1969 instrument because it included the greatest number of questions and scales. From it they resolved seven factors. Among them only one of the factors from the 1972 work of King and Hunt can be found still intact. That factor is Congregational Involvement, which Hilty, Morgan and Burns reconstructed into a single scale, added an item of their own, and renamed the Church Involvement dimension. Four other factors were revised from the 1969 analysis of King and Hunt -- Intolerance of Ambiguity, Credal Ascent (to which several items were added, and a new name, Orthodoxy, was given), Religious Knowledge (which was renamed Knowledge of Religious History), and Life Purpose. Two other factors -- Personal Faith, and Social Conscience -- are original contributions of Hilty, Morgan and Burns, though the Personal Faith scale consists of items from the former Devotionalism, Growth and Striving, and Behavioural Salience

scales.

Hebert's unpublished investigation drew heavily upon the direction provided by Hilty, Morgan and Burns and by King and Hunt for scales measuring religious involvement. However, she also fashioned scales which examined religiousness from the point of view suggested by Social Learning Theory. Based on evidence regarding the power of peer influences, and using the Criminal Associates Scale (Andrews et al, 1985) as a model, she included a Religious Associates Scale. As well, noting the influence of family beliefs in determining an individual's religious involvement (Nye, 1958; Burkett, 1977), a Religious Background Scale was also included. The Religious Associates Scale on its own, and also in combination with the Religious Background Scale, was found to correlate significantly with a measure of criminal offenses committed in the last year. The two in combination were also found to carry a moderately strong correlation with a measure of the number of victimizing offenses ever committed.

Lacking from the contribution of Hilty, Morgan and Burns, and from Hebert's work as well, are items which tap the concept of religious orientation as conceived of by Allport and his colleagues (Allport, 1950; Feigan, 1964; Allport and Ross, 1967). Though questioning whether intrinsic religiousness measures might lack conceptual validity, Batson and Ventis (1982) agree that further research is necessary before that concept can be dismissed (see Part I of this chapter for a more complete discussion). Furthermore, a recent meta-analytic review (Donahew, 1986) indicates that the I scale is correlated with religious commitment

and beliefs (R 's = .39 and .76 respectively), while the E. scale is correlated with fear of death (R =.27), prejudice (R =.34), and dogmatism (R =.36). However, there is also recent support for the power of the Quest Scale of Batson and Ventis (1982) as a more reliable and valid reformulation of mature, successfully internalized religious orientation compared to the I. scale (Hilty, Morgan, and Hartman, 1984). The reader will also recall the review of the work of Batson and his colleagues included in Part I of this chapter, and particular references to the Internal Orientation and External Orientation scales which they also developed. The instrument proposed by Batson and Ventis, then -- the Religious Life Inventory -- includes six scales: the 1967 Extrinsic and Intrinsic scales of Allport and Ross, their own External, Internal and Quest Scales, and a Doctrinal Orthodoxy scale. Their inventory also includes a collection of unscored buffer items.

It is noteworthy that most of the religious involvement inventories include some form of a religious beliefs or orthodoxy scale. In fact, some researchers have dedicated efforts specifically to developing orthodoxy scales (Puttman, 1962; Fullerton and Hunsberger, 1981). This fact both stems from, and supports the finding of Glock and Stark (1968) that orthodoxy is the strongest indicator of religious commitment. On the other hand, few authors of multi-dimensional religious involvement inventories have followed the direction of Glock and Stark in including items which tap into experiences of perceptions, sensations, etc. regarding the presence of God -- religious

experiences. The research of Glock and Stark (1968) indicates that about 45 percent of protestants and 43 percent of Roman Catholics report having experienced being in the presence of God. Further, the turn of the century work of James (1902) still stands out as a notable study of how powerful religious experiences are linked with changes in people's lives. Yet, recent, high-quality analysis of the nature of such experiences is rare. Moehle's 1983 factor analysis is an exception. She analyzed written descriptions of religious experiences from among adults and adolescents, and distilled five dimensions:

- 1) spiritual/temporal, examining whether one's religious experiences is of God or of the realization of human potential;
- 2) esthetic response, studying whether an experience of God occurs in a time of need or in a time of wonderment;
- 3) social/individual, measuring experiences induced by either autonomously or by social situations;
- 4) discrete/continual, examining whether an experience is of a loving, caring God, or not;
- 5) control, examining whether experiences of God are of a personal nature, or of the sort which would occur during a traditional religious celebration.

In summary, then, multiple factor instruments which sample from a broad base of behaviours, attitudes and beliefs are preferable measures of religious involvement for use when studying relationships between religious involvement and other aspects of people's lifestyles (Himmelfarb, 1975; Gorsuch, 1984).

Uni-dimensional instruments are useful, but only for establishing

the depth of an individual's religious commitment. For Christians this dimension appears to be adherence to a traditional, gospel-oriented interpretation of their faith -- orthodoxy, or credal ascent (Gorsuch, 1984; Glock and Stark, 1968). For Jews it may be the strength of identification with the particular tenets of one's denomination (Himmelfarb, 1975). It should be noted that such self identification is not synonymous with denominational affiliation. Denominational affiliation can be a useful measure of religious involvement, but as has been alluded to earlier in this review, is not a good predictor of other aspects of an individual's lifestyle (Elifson, Peterson, and Hadaway, 1983), and that it is at best indirectly negatively linked through moral teachings to criminality (Jenson and Erickson, 1979). As well, though church attendance provides a good measure of visible religious involvement, it is not, for adolescents particularly, a good measure of religiousness, since it may be more a function of parental wishes (Stark, Doyle, and Kent, 1980). Finally, a measure of endorsement of the ten commandments, on its own, as used by Hebert in her unpublished study, may also fail to separate religious and non-religious persons, because of the extent to which that moral code is reflected in secular legal codes.

Adherence to the ten commandments and church attendance, though, should be included as measures in a multi-dimensional instrument sampling from a broad base of attitudes, beliefs and behaviours indicative of religiousness. Endorsement of the ten commandments should be included as a subscale of a measure of religious orthodoxy as was done in Hebert's unpublished study, and

church attendance may have increased meaning when included as a measure of church involvement, as was done by King and Hunt (1969; 1971; 1972) and by Hilty, Morgan and Burns (1982). However, a measure of church involvement itself may be best utilized as a subscale of a broader measure of religious behaviours and involvements, both communal and personal, as was done by Glock and Stark (1968). Other factors which have shown up from time to time are religious experiences (Glock and Stark, 1965; 1968), consequences (ibid), intolerance of ambiguity (King and Hunt, 1969; Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1982). There are, too, the Intrinsic/Extrinsic Religious orientation (Allport and Ross, 1967), and the External, Internal and Quest dimensions (Batson and Ventis, 1982). Besides these there are the measures advanced by Hebert (unp) in light of strong findings supportive of social learning models as accounting for variability in attitudes, beliefs and behaviours. Those measures include Religious Associates and Religious History.

V) Conclusion: The Present Study

This thesis provides a comprehensive exploration of religious involvement and orientation in relation to self reports of delinquent behaviour of undergraduates. Some facets of the assessment of religious involvement are examined. In particular, the study focusses upon the contribution of religious morality and social support for religion to the prediction of deviance. The contribution of religiousness measures are also assessed with reference to the contribution of more standard attitudinal, social and personality correlates of delinquency.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Subjects for the present study were drawn from two populations -- the population of undergraduate students at Carleton University in Ottawa, and the population of persons with established involvements in churches and religious groups in and around the same city. The sample for the first population was made up of respondents to a notice of the research experiment, which was directed specifically to the attention of students in the experimental subject pool of the Introductory Psychology course. Any other persons who answered to that notice were also included in that sample. As well, students in a second year psychology course were also approached to participate in the experiment, and were included in in that sample. In all, this sample included 192 subjects.

Participants in the second sample were gathered from known religious groups in the Ottawa area. First, persons attending an open prayer meeting sponsored by the Servants of God Community -- an interdenominational lay Christian Community -- was approached. Second, participants in the Anglican Cursillo movement, a movement sanctioned by the Anglican church, but in which members of other denominations also participate, were contacted. Third, contact was also made with members of the Roman Catholic Cursillo movement -- a similar movement within, and sanctioned by the Roman Catholic Church. This sample was composed of 26 participants.

Because of the usual demographic distribution of university undergraduate student bodies, the ages for subjects in the first sample ranged from 16 to 47 years, with a mean of 21.38, and a standard deviation of 5.17 years. In the second sample, on the other hand, ages of subjects ranged from 29 to 62 years, with a mean of 42.08, and a standard deviation of 8.11 years (see Appendix IX). The demographic characteristics of the first population were deemed to be desirable because the greater likelihood of lifestyle and relational changes which are associated with young adult and university life make viable the relatively brief duration of this longitudinal study. The demographic characteristics of the second population were deemed to be desirable because this sample was intended to provide baseline scores on measures of both religious involvement and criminality of individuals with known religious involvement against which to compare responses from a more general population.

Procedure

In accordance with the the shortterm repeated measures design of the present experiment, data were gathered from all subjects in October, 1987, and again in March, 1988. The subjects from Carleton University who had responded to the research notice were contacted by telephone, and arrangements were made with each of them to come to whatever scheduled group session was most convenient for them. The posted notice had informed them that the experiment would take place in two parts -- a fall and a spring sitting -- and that each part would require about an hour of their time. This information was repeated during the telephone

conversation, and any questions of the potential participants were answered. At all group sessions, which were attended by up to fifteen subjects, a fuller explanation was given.

At the beginning of all group sessions in the fall sitting all participants present were given a copy of the package of questionnaires. Each package was contained in an envelope with a three-digit code number on the outside, and the ten survey instruments on the inside. Each one consisted of a background information questionnaire (to which was attached the formal consent form), The Religious Involvements Survey, delinquency (or Criminal behaviour) Scale, and the measures of criminal sentiments, criminal personality, history of trouble at home and school, and socialization. Each package also contained a Helping and a Faking questionnaire, and a sheet stating appreciation for the subjects' participation, and asking for any comments on the research. In all packages the first instrument was the Background Information Questionnaire with the Informal consent Form attached, and the last was the Appreciation Sheet. The other eight instruments were placed into packages in random order. After all subjects had received their envelopes they were told,

"These packages consist of nine questionnaires, the longest of which is the Religious involvements Survey. That particular questionnaire inquires about the ways and extent to which you to which you are involved in religious activities and hold religious beliefs. The extent to which any of you is personally involved in religion is not important to our research team, as our intent is to study a wide range of religious involvements, so do not feel

that a lack of religious involvement disqualifies you from this experiment. Other questionnaires in the package deals with the ways and extent to which you may were involved in criminal activities. Because of their nature, then, these questionnaires ask what, for some of you, will be very sensitive questions. We recognize this, and I assure you now that the greatest effort possible will be taken to ensure that the highest level of confidentiality will be maintained."

The participants were then instructed to open their survey packages, and their attention was drawn to the Informal Consent Form, which was the first sheet of the package (see Appendix II).

"There are two things we need you to do with this sheet: we need you to sign your name to it, and to copy on to it the three-digit number which appears on your package envelope. Your signature on this form means that you understand the nature of the research and are willing to take part. We also need the three-digit number on this sheet as a code number. When you turn in your completed questionnaire package that number will be transferred onto the other questionnaires, and the Informal Consent Form removed from your package. In this way we will be able to put the answers you give us now alongside those you give us in March, because you will receive a package with the same number when you complete the second part of the experiment. In this way, too, no one will be in a position to connect your name with your numbers."

The subjects were then given the opportunity to ask any questions, after which they were told that, if they did understand

the nature of the research, and did wish to participate, they should sign their names and code numbers to the Informal Consent Form, and then move on to fill out the Background Information Questionnaire and the rest of the questionnaires. The experimenter then remained in the room until all of the participants in that group had completed and turned in their survey packages.

To obtain a sample of religious subjects for the time-1 data gathering portion of the research the experimenter attended meetings of the Servants of God prayer meeting, and of the Anglican Cursillo movement, at which he was given an opportunity to briefly explain the nature of the research, and to ask for volunteer participants. When the meetings were over he met with any interested persons, and explained more fully the nature of the research and the Informal Consent Form, using the same explanations as given to the Carleton University Subjects. Any from those groups wishing to participate then took the survey packages to their homes to complete them, and later return them by hand or by mail to the experimenter. Religious subjects were also asked to include their telephone numbers on the Informal consent Form, so that they could be contacted about arrangements for the time-2 data gathering portion of the experiment. To add to the number of religious subjects the experimenter also approached individuals whom he knew to be involved in the Roman catholic Cursillo Movement, explained the nature of the research and the Informal Consent Form to them, and asked them to take a survey package home to complete, and return to him within two weeks.

Before the March sitting of the experiment a new survey package was compiled for each subject who had participated in the October sitting. Code numbers were written onto the new envelopes which matched exactly the code numbers of the packages which had been completed in October. A list was compiled which matched subjects names and code numbers. As well, some of the questionnaires were adapted: those which had used the time reference of one year to measure the frequency of specific behaviours were changed so as to employ a reference to the time which had passed since the end of October, 1987 -- the duration of time between the fall and spring sittings. At the beginning of March the Carleton University subjects were again telephoned, and arrangements were made for each of them to again come to a group session whose timing was most convenient for their time tables. In each of the march (time-2) group sittings subjects were given their envelopes in accordance with the list of names and code numbers. They were then briefly reminded about the nature of the research, that they had already signed formal consent forms, and that the greatest efforts were continuing to be made to ensure that the utmost confidentiality was being maintained. They were then given an opportunity to ask questions, after which instructions were given to proceed in filling out the battery of questionnaires.

Of the 192 subjects in the undergraduate sample 120 returned to complete the package at the time-2 phase. They ranged in age from 17 to 45 years, with a mean of 21.16, and a standard deviation of 5.26 years (see Appendix IX).

The religious subjects were also contacted by telephone

starting at the beginning of March. Arrangements were made to deliver their time-2 survey packages to them at the Servants of God prayer meeting, or at the next meeting of the Anglican Cursillo Movement. In cases where this arrangement was not suitable offers were made to have the packages delivered by hand to the subjects' homes or places of work. Either at the meetings, or in person where appropriate, they were given the same reminders and instructions as the Carleton University subjects, and asked to return the packages by March 26. As that date drew near any subjects who had not returned their completed packages were contacted by telephone again, and reminded of that request. All data-gathering was completed, and all survey packages returned to the research team by March 31.

Of the 26 subjects in the religious sample 21 completed the package at the time-2 phase. They ranged in age from 29 to 47 years, with a mean of 38.63, and a standard deviation of 5.62 years (see Appendix IX).

Research Instruments:

Demographic Data

The demographic data for the present investigation were gathered during the fall sitting. The instrument compiled for this purpose is the Background Information Questionnaire (see Appendix III), which is composed of common demographic items -- age, gender, marital status, education and occupation, and the education levels and careers of parents. It also inquires as to whether subjects' families were ever supported primarily by welfare or unemployment insurance benefits -- a variable which was

found to be correlated with criminality (Hirschi, 1969). Two other items inquire as to the respondents' criminal records and past criminal behaviour. Finally, it also seeks data regarding religious identification and denominational affiliation.

The Religious Involvement Survey

The Religious involvements Survey consists of five sections -- a religious beliefs questionnaire, religious involvement, religious associates, and religious orientation questionnaires, and a religious experiences scale. It was developed to reflect those dimensions of religiosity which the literature has shown to be salient with regards to other important attitudes, beliefs and behaviours in peoples' lives. At the same time, an effort was made to introduce into the survey items which increase the emphasis on variables touted as holding predictive power by Social Learning Theory -- the major Theoretical perspective of this thesis. To accomplish these aims, each section of the survey was loaded with items gathered from research instruments developed and validated by prominent researchers in the study of the Psychology of Religion (Allport and Ross, 1967; King and Hunt, 1972; Fullerton and Hunsberger, 1982; Moehle, 1981; Batson and Ventis, 1982; Hilty, Morgan and Burns, 1982; Tobalyk and Milford, 1981; King and Hunt, 1972). These were supplemented by a number of items introduced to the field in the present research, and in Hebert's unpublished study. This is in accord with the view expressed by Gorsuch (1984) that the high levels of reliability and validity attached to already developed religiosity research instruments makes it appropriate to use what is already available

for the most part when investigating religiosity. While complying with this view, however, the present author found it appropriate to alter slightly the wording of several items for two primary reasons. First, most of the instruments adopted for use in this study were developed for research among persons who, because of the settings of the research efforts, were known to exhibit religious beliefs and involvements to some extent at least; a few items were adapted, therefore, to reflect the setting of this experiment -- a "secular" university. Second, some instruments contain wording which would concern many people as being "sexist" -- e.g) "God made man ..." (Fullerton and Hunsberger, 1982); alterations were made to remove this bias. The resulting instrument -- The Religious Involvement Survey -- is discussed here in terms of the origins of its sections and the items in them, its overall fabric, and the scoring method which it employs. Table 2.1 summarizes the construction of the Religious Involvements Survey, demonstrating its scales, subscales, sources of contributions, and item by subscale scoring key.

The first section -- the Religious Beliefs Questionnaire -- consists of four subscales (see Appendix IV): Judeo-Christian orthodoxy, Christian orthodoxy, beliefs regarding religious/moral sanctions, and beliefs regarding "eternal consequences" of one's lifestyle and behaviour. Most previous studies concerned with religious beliefs have used single-scale orthodoxy instruments which included items that could be construed as tapping some or all of these factors (King and Hunt, 1972; Hilty, Morgan and Burns, 1982; Tobacyk and Milford, 1981; Fullerton and Hunsberger,

Table 2.1:
Summary Presentation of
The Religious Involvements Survey

scales	subscales	contributing sources	scoring key
Religious Beliefs	Judeo-Christian Orthodoxy	Batson and Ventis, 1982 King and Hunt, 1972 Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1984 Fullerton and Hunsberger, 1982 Glock and Stark, 1968 original	1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 13*, 15*, 18*, 32*, 34*, 36*, 40, 41*, 42, 44, 45, 48, 53.
	Christian Orthodoxy	Batson and Ventis, 1982 King and Hunt, 1972 Fullerton and Hunsberger, 1982 Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1982 original	5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16*, 17, 33, 35, 37*, 38, 39, 43*, 46*, 47*, 54.
	Religious morality	Hebert, 1986 original	22, 23, 24, 25*, 26, 27, 28*, 29, 30, 31.
	Eternal Consequences	Glock and Stark, 1968 Hebert, Unp. Tobacyk and Milford, 1981	7*, 19, 20, 21, 49, 50, 51, 52.

Table 2.1 (continued):
Summary Presentation of
The Religious Involvements Survey

scales	subscales	contributing sources	scoring key
Religious Involvement	congregation Denomination Sect	King and Hunt, 1972 Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1982 original	1*, 6*, 7*, 8*, 10*, 11*, 12*.
	Small Groups	Pattisson and Pattisson, 1980 Hine, 1980	2, 3, 4, 9*.
	Personal Relationship	Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1984 King and Hunt, 1972	13, 17*, 23*, 30, 31*, 32*, 33*, 34*, 35*, 36, 37*.
	Close Friends	Hine, 1980 original	14*, 24*, 27*.
	Acquaintances	King and Hunt, 1972 original	15*, 25*, 28*.
	Family	Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1982 original	16*, 26*, 29*.
	Communion	King and Hunt, 1972	5*.
Religious Associates	Acquaintances	Hebert, 1986	1a*, 1b*, 1c*.
	Best friends	Hebert, 1986	2a*, 2b*, 2c*.
	Knowledge of Activities	Hebert, 1986	3*, 4*, 5*, 6*, 7*.
	Negative Influences	Hebert, 1986 original	8, 9a*, 9b*, 9c*, 9d*.

Table 2.1 (continued):
Summary Presentation of
The Religious Involvements Survey

scales	subscales	contributing sources	scoring key
Religious Orientation	Intrinsic Religiousness	Allport and Ross, 1967	5, 7*, 11, 12*, 16, 18, 22.
	Extrinsic Religiousness	Allport and Ross, 1967	1, 3, 0, 14, 20, 25.
	external	Batson and Ventis, 1982	4, 8, 10, 13*, 15*, 19, 21*, 24*.
	Internal	Batson and Ventis, 1982	2, 6, 17, 23*.
	Quest	Batson and Ventis, 1982	26, 27*, 28, 29, 30, 31.
Religious Experiences	Experiences	Moehle, 1981 James, 1902 Hine, 1980 Pattisson and Pattisson and Pattisson, 1980 Hebert, 1986	1a-a2.
	Influences	Hebert, 1986 original	3*, 4*, 5*.
	desirability	original	6*.

Note: The symbol "*" indicates that those items to whose number it is attached are to have their Likert scales reversed for scoring purposes.

1982; Glock and Stark, 1969; 1971; 1972). However, claims abound as to which aspects of religious belief are more salient than which others. It was speculated that beliefs regarding religious/moral sanctions and eternal consequences are the aspects of religiosity most strongly predictive of the extent of delinquency (Hirschi and Stark, 1969; Hebert, 1986), and, in fact, this link was shown to exist in "non-secular" environments (Stark, Kent and Doyle, 1982). As well, Gorsuch (1984) expresses the view that an orthodoxy which reflects a traditional interpretation of the gospel is what, among Christians, separates those who are religiously involved from those who are not. The latter point notwithstanding, the distinction between Judeo-Christian and Christian orthodoxies may appear somewhat arbitrary. It is, however, based in a null-hypothetical approach to the study of religion in a secular setting: although these subscales did turn out in the end to be highly correlated, there was little reason to assume on an a priori basis that beliefs regarding the existence of one true god who created and has plans for the universe, and who listens to people's prayers and is concerned with their actions measure or are predictive of the same things as are beliefs regarding the existence, divinity and role of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit.

In summary, then, the Religious Beliefs Questionnaire consists of fifty-four items. The 24-item Christian Orthodoxy Scale of Fullerton and Hunsberger (1982) is included in its entirety, as is the 12-item Doctrinal Orthodoxy sub-scale of Batson and Ventis (1982), one item of which also appears in the Fullerton and

Hunsberger scale. Together these comprise all but one of the items of the present Religious Beliefs Questionnaire subsumed in the Judeo-Christian Orthodoxy and Christian Orthodoxy subscales. A final item: "There is one true god" appears, to the best of this author's knowledge, for the first time in this study, and is included because, as a statement, it comprises the theological foundation for the Jewish and Christian faiths.

Of the eight items included in the "Eternal Consequences" subscale seven were developed for use in this survey. The eighth: "The devil actually exists" is taken from the 1968 inventory of Glock and Stark. Finally, the entire 10-item Religious/moral Sanctions subscale was formulated for use in this survey. Eight of these are adopted from the ten commandments handed by God to the Jewish nation through Moses, and were employed by Hebert in her unpublished investigation, while the other two are statements of activities which are generally considered to be sanctioned by churches and denominations which are viewed as tending to a traditional interpretation of Christian orthodoxy.

This questionnaire, then, will provide examination of the role in people's lives played by a variety of religious beliefs, including specifically Judeo-Christian and Christian orthodoxies, and beliefs regarding religious/moral sanctions and eternal consequences of one's lifestyle and behaviour. It will also allow for tests of the Christian Orthodoxy Scale of Fullerton and Hunsberger, and the Doctrinal Orthodoxy Scale of Batson and Ventis. As well, items 10 and 21 of this scale taken together with item 6 of the Religious Involvements Questionnaire will allow

for replication of the "Hell-Fire and Delinquency" study (Hirschi and Stark, 1969).

One of the aspects of religiosity of interest to Hirschi and Stark was frequency of church attendance. It is this aspect which is the subject of item 10 of the Religious Involvements Questionnaire -- the second section of the Religious Involvement Survey (see Appendix V). This item, however, is worded in terms of attendance at worship services, so as to not limit eligibility to respond to it to those of the Christian religion, or, in fact, to those of the Christian religion who attend worship services at a church. This item is one of seven in the Congregation/denomination/sect subscale which is intended to allow examination of religious involvement at the large group level. This subscale goes beyond examination of attendance at worship services to include different types of involvement and financial support.

The thirty-seven items of the Religious Involvements Questionnaire encompass six other subscales. It inquires as to involvements on a small group basis, on a level of "personal relationship" with God, in religious activities with close friends, acquaintances and family members, as well as childhood religious involvements. One item is also dedicated to examining specifically a Christian facet of attendance at worship services -- the frequency with which a respondent receives the Eucharist, or Holy Communion. In all cases these items inquire as to religious practices, and as such they form an expansion of the "Practices" dimension proposed by Glock and Stark (1969). Sixteen

of the items were taken from the inventory developed by Hilty, Morgan and Burns (1982), which was itself a reformulation of the 1969 survey of King and Hunt. Three more were items found in the King and Hunt 1972 survey which had not been included by Hilty, Morgan and Burns in their reformulation. The largest number, though, eighteen items, were introduced in the present study. A number of those, however, are based on findings in the literature (Hine, 1969; Hine, 1980; Pattisson and Pattisson, 1980; Albrecht, Alcorn and Chadwick, 1986). Others are vastly altered versions of items common to questionnaires in the psychology of religion.

An example of this latter case is found in the first item of the Religious Involvements Questionnaire. It inquires as to the strength of identification by subjects with a specific church, sect or denomination. As such, it broadens the eligibility of response compared to the denominational identification question usually found in the literature, and it rotates that dimension from an examination of different denominations to one of strength of identification, thus following the direction stemming from Himmelfarb's 1975 findings. This item is one of those included in the Congregation/- Denomination/Sect subscale. A second item of this subscale which was introduced in this study examines the frequency with which respondents participate in worship services in a leadership role as opposed to simply as a member of the congregation. Both of these items, it is felt, tap into issues shown by social psychology to be important factors in group participation. A third item, one of those which examines the type of financial support contributed by respondents, is adapted from

the survey developed by King and Hunt (1972). The remaining four items of this subscale were chosen from the eleven items of the "church" subscale in the inventory of Hilty, Morgan and Byren (1982).

All of the items in the Personal Relationship subscale also came from that inventory. Three of those are found in the Orthodoxy subscale formulated by those authors. However, because they include such statements as "I know I need God's continual love and care," it is felt that, for the purposes of this study, they belong in a survey of religious involvement on the level of a personal relationship with one's god. Seven of the remaining eight items of the Personal Involvement subscale are taken from the Personal Faith subscale of the Hilty, Morgan and Burns inventory. Of those, six had been chosen in turn from the Devotionalism subscale of the King and Hunt 1972 survey. The eighth is an item in the King and Hunt devotionalism subscale not used by Hilty, Morgan and Burns. The eighth is an item of the King and Hunt Devotionalism subscale not used by Hilty, Morgan and Burns.

Two other items from the Personal Faith subscale of the Hilty, Morgan and Burns 1982 inventory also appear in the Religious Involvements Questionnaire of the present survey. One is in the Acquaintances subscale, while the other appears in the Family subscale. The remainder of those subscales -- two items from each of the Acquaintances and Family measures -- have been introduced in this study. This is also true of all three items of the Close Friends, and all four items of the Small Groups subscales. It was

felt that, in keeping the perspective of the modelling, differential association, and differential reinforcement dimensions of Social Learning Theory, those subscales were an important factor in the present investigation. As well, though introduced in this study as multi-item measures, these factors have received attention in the literature of the psychology of religion (Hine, 1969; Hine, 1980; Pattisson and Pattisson, 1980; Albrecht, Chadwick, and Alcorn, 1977).

Finally, the Background subscale of the Religious Involvements Questionnaire examines the extent of involvement in religious activities the respondent may have experienced as a child. The five items of this subscale are among those which were first employed in Hebert's unpublished study.

The third section of the Religious Involvement's survey -- The Social Support for Religion Questionnaire -- was adapted for this study, and is based on the Social Support for crime Scale of Andrews, Wormith and Kiessling (1985) (see Appendix VI). Those authors developed that scale to extend earlier research on the Differential Association Theory of delinquency (Short, 1957; Linden and Hackler, 1973). Their extension of earlier works is based on the inclusion of "access to resources" items in investigations of delinquency -- knowledge of persons who could help the respondent become involved in criminal activities. If social psychological theories of criminal involvement are readily applicable to religious involvement, then instruments which test those theories must also be adaptable for use in a social psychology of religion. The Andrews, Wormith and Kiessling scale

2

MicroD

is an example of one which is available for such a cross-over. The five "access to resources" items make up one of the four subscales of the Social Support for Religion questionnaire. Two others are the Friends subscale (items 1A, 1B and 1C) and the Best Friends subscale (items 2A, 2B and 2C). These differ from the Acquaintances and Close Friends subscales of the Religious involvement questionnaire in that they provide examination of simply the involvement of those associates as opposed to shared involvement with them. The fourth factor of religious associates is examined through item 8 and items 9A through 9D, which compose the Negative Influences subscale. The items in question 9 are an addendum to the adapted version of the Social Support for crime Scale. They seek to investigate the effects of various approaches experienced by respondents of persons wishing to draw attention to their religious group or sect.

Unlike the Social Support for Religion questionnaire, all of the items in the Religious Orientation Questionnaire -- Part IV of the present survey -- are taken, with little adaptation, from research in the psychology of religion (see Appendix VII). In fact, all of them can be found in the Religious Life Inventory (Batson and Ventis, 1982). Batson and Ventis sought to expand the range of investigation allowed by the often used Religious orientation Scale (Allport and Ross, 1967). This questionnaire, then, consists of five subscales: the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiousness measures, and the External, Internal and Quest measures. Of those, only the Quest factor is included in its entirety, contributing a six-item subscale. Seven of the nine

items from the intrinsic factor have also been included, as have six of the eleven from the Extrinsic factor, eight of the nine from the External factor, and four of the six from the Internal factor. The remaining items were excluded because adaptation of their wording for application to research in a secular environment was found, at the least, to be cumbersome.

To test in a secular setting the approaches developed by Allport and Ross (1967), and by Batson and Ventis (1982) will be interesting and worthwhile work. The religious Orientation Questionnaire allows as much as possible for such an opportunity when taken together with the twelve items of the Religious Beliefs Questionnaire contributed by the Orthodoxy Scale of Batson and Ventis. As well, its 31 items will allow a multi-faceted examination of people's views regarding the role played by religion in their lives.

Part V -- the final section of the Religious Involvements Survey -- is the Significant Religious Experiences Questionnaire (see Appendix VIII). It seeks to examine the types, number, and frequency of meaningful religious experiences which occur in people's lives, and the role they play in influencing lifestyle and behaviours. Only two multi-item subscales are included in this questionnaire, which are supplemented by two single-item factors. The first single-item factor is not a scored item. It asks each respondent to briefly describe his most significant religious experience, and, as well as providing information about such events and the contexts in which they occur, Of those 22 general items 17 refer to experiences directly implicating "God",

while 5 refer to experiences strongly characterized by other facets of religiousness, including the beauty of nature, the awesomeness of the universe, and human potential. The other single-item factor asks respondents to indicate the degree to which they deem religious experiences to be desirable.

The two multi-item subscales of this section are the Experiences and the Influences subscales. The first of these is composed of items 1A through 1W. It lists 22 general but brief descriptions of religious experiences, as well as providing an "other" option, requiring responses to each item which indicate whether the respondent has undergone such an experience, and if so, whether or not that experience continues to have meaning for him or her. Fourteen of the items in this subscale were derived from a factor analytical study (Moehle, 1981) which was carried out in an effort to define dimensions of religious experiences for adults and adolescents. Of the remainder, three were derived from descriptions given in studies of Christians involved in various pentecostal movements (Hine, 1969; Hine, 1980; Pattisson and Pattisson, 1980), and five are based on descriptions found in the classical lecture series of William James (1902). The Influences Subscale consists of three items, and simply asks respondents to indicate the degree to which significant religious experiences, every-day religious experiences, and their religious beliefs have influenced their behaviour.

In conclusion, the Religious Involvements Survey presents a comprehensive collection of questionnaires, each of which contains a broad sample of items relevant to the aspect of involvement with

which it is concerned. The survey is expected to possess power because it includes some previously developed scales in their entirety, and large portions of others, all of which have been found to possess validity in the social scientific study of religion. Further, those scales and items which are introduced in this survey for the first time examine issues which many think are at the heart of Judeo-Christian religious tradition -- Issues of attitudes, values, beliefs, practices, personal history, orientation and experiences to which most people have given sufficient thought to be clear about their own stances (Gorsuch, 1984). From among those contributing sources two recent orthodoxy scales are included in their entirety (Fullerton and Hunsberger, 1982; Batson and Ventis, 1982). As well, the remainder of the Religious Life Inventory of Batson and Ventis, inasmuch as it can be adapted to a secular population, will also be tested through the survey, including in large measure, the older Religious Orientation Scale (Allport and Ross, 1967). An investigation is also allowed which is, in large part, faithful to the "Hellfire and delinquency" study (Hirschi and Stark, 1969), and which, in fact, extends that study by sampling from a broader range of beliefs regarding eternal consequences, as well as involvements in church or congregational activities. The study of religious participation is itself expanded beyond that of church and congregational involvement (King and Hunt, 1972; Hilty, Morgan, and Burns, 1984) to encompass factors of equal or greater importance to a social psychological approach to the study of religious participation, including involvements with family, small

groups, close friends, and acquaintances, as well as personal involvements and an historical perspective on participation. This feature, along with the inclusion of the Religious Associates Questionnaire, will allow a deeper examination than has been hitherto carried out regarding the roles played by differing communal environments in the lives of people from varying degrees and types of religiousness. Finally, the study of types and roles of religious experiences is inclusive and relevant, basing its examination almost entirely on the works of earlier authors (Hames, 1902; Hine, 1969; Hine, 1980; Moehle, 1981).

On its own, the Religious Involvements Survey should provide the basis for a powerful analysis of religiosity. This research will enter it into a correlational and regression study alongside other scales which examine and are linked to different aspects of criminal behaviour. The anticipated result is a comprehensive presentation of the role played by religion and religious involvement, with its various factors, in influencing and predicting criminal behaviour.

Other Instruments

The instruments used to measure the criterion variables for the present investigation are known to possess valid and reliable power, having been developed and used in previous research. This is also the case for the Social Support for Crime, Criminal Personality, Criminal Sentiments, and Trouble at Home and School questionnaires. They are discussed in detail in Morrison (1984), Andrews (1985), and Andrews, Kiesling et al (1979). A briefer set of descriptions will be presented here.

The present investigation has used two criterion measures -- the Criminal Behaviour or Delinquency Scale (see Appendix IX) and a Pro-social Helping Scale (see Appendix X). The Criminal Behaviour Scale consists of 33 items which inquire as to the respondent's criminal activity. It is, then, a self-report measure. Each of the items presents a criminal offense, and includes a five category response-alternative scale, with the choices being never, not in the last year, once, twice, or three times in the last year. Five variables were derived from this scale -- number of offenses ever committed, the number recently committed, the total amount of deviance recently committed, as well as the total amount of victimizing and victimless deviance engaged in recently. The last two variables were created by subdividing the "total amount of recent deviance" variable. This scale was developed by Andrews, Kiessling, Russell and Grant (1979).

The Pro-social helping behaviour measure was adopted from McFarlane, Neale, Ray and Steiner (1981). The modified scale measures the number of times in the past month a person has taken part in specific helping behaviours, with the response alternatives ranging from not at all, to about once a day. Hebert (1986) reported an internal consistency estimate of .90 for the pro-social Scale.

Like the Criminal Behaviour Scale, the Criminal Associates Questionnaire was developed by Andrews and his colleagues (Andrews, Kiessling, Russell, and Grant, 1979). It is one of three questionnaires which compose the Correctional Battery of

Predictors of Crime (see Appendix XI). They based their work on earlier investigations (Piliavin, Hardyck, and Vadum, 1968; Linden and Hackler, 1973). This instrument asks respondents to indicate their awareness of criminal activities in their community. It is concerned both with the activities of close associates and of others less familiar to the respondent, and, essentially, provides a measure as to the respondent's awareness of, and closeness to opportunities to become involved in criminal activities. For each item there are four response alternatives, ranging from "most" to "none" with regard to associates, and from "definitely yes" to "no" for awareness of opportunities. A more indepth discussion is again provided by Andrews, Wormith and Kiessling (1985).

The Criminal Sentiment measures -- the second scale of the Correctional Battery (Core Criminological Battery) -- examine respondents' attitudes towards the Law, Court and Police, as well as Identification with Criminal Others, and Tolerance for Law Violations, and Awareness of Limited Opportunities. These scales were adapted from the work of Mylonas and Reccckless (1963) and Reckless (1973), and a more detailed discussion is again provided by Andrews, Wormith and Keisling (1985). Also included are two items from a scale developed by Hagan, Gillis and Simpson (1985) to measure excitement seeking and risk taking attitudes -- "I like to take risks," and, "The things I like to do best are dangerous," -- and two items used in the "Hell-fire and delinquency" study (Hirschi and Stark, 1969) to measure attitudes regarding deviant morality -- "To get ahead you have to do some things that are not right," and, "Suckers deserve to be taken advantage of." Each of

the items allows five response alternatives, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree".

The criminal Personality Questionnaire used in this investigation -- the third scale from the Core Criminological Battery -- allows true/false responses to its items. It was formulated by Andrews, Wormith and Keisling for their 1985 study, and is comprised of the Socialization scale (Gough, 1969), and measures of Psychopathy, Cognitive Neuroticism, Emotional Inadequacy/Immaturity, Family Dissension, and Scholastic Maladjustment (Peterson, Quay, and Cameron, 1959).

A Self Monitoring Scale was also included in the questionnaire package (see Appendix XII). It was developed by Snyder (1974), and measures the probability that respondents attend to their environments for guidance to their behaviour in immediate situations.

Finally, a Faking Scale was included to allow a measure of the extent to which any subjects were participating in positive malingering (see Appendix XIII). It consists of 33 true/false items, and was composed for use with the M.M.P.I. (Cofer, Chance, and Judson, 1949).

Analysis Plan

Analyses for the present dissertation will proceed in several stages. These stages reflect the various methodological and theoretical concerns of the dissertation. As such, the analysis plan was developed to allow tests of the following hypotheses:

a) within the R.I.S. set Morality will be the strongest (inverse) correlate of criminal behaviour;

b) Religious Associates will interact with a number of the R.I.S. subscales in the prediction of criminal behaviour: it is specifically expected to interact with Morality, Religious Background and Religious Involvement;

c) the contributions of Religious Associates will be greatest among respondents who score above average on Snyder's Self Monitoring Scale;

d) The contribution of R.I.S. subscales, or of any interaction between them, to the prediction of criminal behaviour will be reduced to non-significant levels with the introduction into the equation of the measures of Psychopathy, Pro-criminal Attitudes, Social Support for Crime, and Trouble at School/Home. In particular, any contribution of Religious Associates will be reduced through controls for Social Support for Crime, while any contribution of Morality will be reduced through controls for Psychopathy and Pro-criminal Attitudes.

The first set of analyses involve examination of the psychometric properties of the subscales of the Religious Involvements Survey and the core battery of criminological scales. Second, the R.I.S. subscales are examined in relation to the core predictors of criminal behaviour, as well as in relation to criminal behaviour scores. Third, the religious variables will be integrated with the set of attitudinal, social support and personality measures in an examination of the correlates of criminal conduct.

Psychometrics of the

Religious Involvements Survey

The reliability of R.I.S. subscales will be examined in terms of internal consistency and temporal stability. The internal consistency of the rationally derived and previously developed subscales of the survey will be explored for both time-1 and time-2 applications for both the undergraduate and religious samples. SPSS Reliability will be employed in these analyses to specify any grounds there may be for minor modifications to the subscales if the addition and/or deletion of specified items improves the alpha estimate of internal consistency. The temporal stability (test retest) estimates will be derived for each R.I.S. subscale within both the undergraduate and religious samples. The factor structure of the R.I.S. will be explored through a principal components analysis with varimax rotation. This procedure will provide an indication as to whether the efficiency of the study might be improved by collapsing certain subscales together. However, certain subscales will be maintained as rationally derived for purposes of hypothesis testing. These key measures include Religious Beliefs, Religious Involvement, Religious Associates, Religious Background, Morality, and Significant Religious Experiences. The concurrent validity of R.I.S. subscales will be explored through comparisons of the scores of the undergraduate sample with those of the religious sample. In particular, it is anticipated that the religious group will score higher than the undergraduate sample on orthodoxy, involvement, associates, and significant religious experiences. The psychometrics of the core battery of predictors of criminality

will also be explored in terms of their internal consistency, temporal stability and factor structure. This will mark the first time that temporal stability estimates have been produced within an undergraduate sample on these scales.

The R.I.S., Core Battery,
And Criminal Behaviour Scores

R.I.S. subscale scores will be examined in relation to scores on pro[^]criminal attitudes, social support for crime, psychopathy, and trouble at home/school by way of zero-order correlations within the undergraduate and religious samples. In addition, the zero-order and multiple correlations of R.I.S. subscales will be examined in relation to criminal behaviour scores.

These analyses will be applied both cross-sectionally for time-1 data, and shortterm longitudinally with time-1 scores as the predictors, and time-2 Criminal Behaviour scores as the criterion variable. Finally time-2 criminal behaviour scores will be examined with changes on the R.I.S. and core battery subscales introduced as additional potential predictors. It is anticipated that changes in pro-criminal attitudes and social support for crime will have incremental predictive validity over their respective time-1 scores. Additionally, it is expected that changes in scores on the R.I.S. subscales may be viewed as sources of change in pro-criminal attitudes and social support for crime.

Supplementary analyses will explore the implications of religious involvement for various subsets of the undergraduates.

These subsets include those with above average scores on Psychopathy, Pro-criminal Attitudes and Social Support for crime. Because of the tentative link between psychic inadequacy and religious involvement (Stark, 1971), supplementary analyses will also be conducted with the undergraduate sample divided according to their scores on Inadequacy/immaturity.

Throughout all of these analyses gender will be introduced as an additional variable. The literature review of this dissertation has indicated that this is an important variable, with males having been established as a higher risk factor for involvement in criminal behaviour. As well, the dimension victimless versus victimizing offenses will be investigated with regard to the way in which it is related to and predicted by religious involvement. Of particular interest is the question of whether victimless and victimizing crimes are differentially related to various measures of religiousness, including specifically religious orthodoxy (including the commandments), worship service attendance, and denominational affiliation.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Demographic Information on the Subjects

A total of 218 subjects completed the battery of questionnaires in the autumn of 1987, of which, 192 were members of the undergraduate sample, while the remaining 26 composed the "religious" sample. The results of a series of comparisons of the two samples is summarized in Table 3.1. Inspection of Table 3.1 reveals that the undergraduate sample was, on average, younger, included a greater proportion of women, a greater proportion of singles, and, not surprisingly, a greater proportion of fulltime students. The undergraduate and religious samples were indistinguishable statistically on number of years of schooling. However, the religious sample is clearly different from the undergraduate sample on aspects of religious belief and affiliation, as is demonstrated in Appendix XIV. At the time-2 phase -- the spring of 1988 -- 140 of the subjects were re-assessed. The undergraduate and religious samples were similar on some demographic measures. The table in Appendix ix details the distributions of the two samples on all of the bio-demographic items for both the time-1 and time-2 phases. Most notably, the undergraduate participants ranged in age from 16 to 47 years with a mean age of 21.38 (s.d.=5.17), while ages in the religious sample ranged from 29 to 62 years with a mean of 42.08 (s.d.=8.11). Over 90 percent of the undergraduate sample had never been married, over 70 percent were fulltime students, with

Table 3.1
Significance of Differences
(Undergraduate vs. Religious Samples)
for Dichotomous and Continuous Bio-demographic Variables

Variable	Mean Scores		F	Sig. F
	undergraduate n = 192	religious n = 26		
age	21.38	42.08	313.25	.000
gender	1.73	1.54	4.32	.039
marital frequency	0.11	0.96	89.99	.000
occupation	1.86	5.85	122.34	.000
education	14.04	15.50	19.26	.000
father's occupation	6.03	6.08	0.01	.904
mother's occupation	4.70	3.73	4.08	.045
father's education	13.30	12.20	1.54	.216
mother's education	12.86	12.83	.002	.966
father on welfare	1.92	1.85	1.04	.308
mother on welfare	1.90	1.96	0.56	.453
family welfare	1.99	1.96	0.30	.584
ever arrested	1.96	1.92	0.65	.422
ever convicted	1.96	1.96	.003	.960
number of convictions	0.14	0.04	0.21	.646
faking	10.03	13.81	30.45	.000

the education mean for the sample being 14.04 years. On the other hand, about 69 percent of the religious sample were married and living with their spouses, and another 11 percent were separated or divorced; about 69 percent were engaged in skilled labour, clerical and professional careers, and another 23 percent were home-makers; none were fulltime students, though the sample mean for education was 15.50 years. The distinction between the samples on age might also be related to differences between them with regard to the distributions of occupations among their mothers. This is particularly true with respect to career involvements as homemakers and unskilled labourer or low-level clerical positions: The percentages for mothers involved in those careers were 30.65 and 21.51 respectively for the undergraduate sample, and 57.69 and 0.00 respectively for the religious sample. The samples also differed with regard to the proportion of males and females in each, with the undergraduate sample containing 23.54 percent males and 76.45 percent females, and the religious sample composed of 46.15 and 53.85 percent males and females respectively.

The credibility of some of the differences discussed here is demonstrated in Table 3.1 which presents the results of analyses of variance for the dichotomous and continuous variable measures employed in gathering bio-demographic information. It also shows that differences between the samples are insignificant on measures of fathers' occupations, education levels of both parents, the extent to which welfare benefits were a major source of income in their parental homes, and convictions and arrests.

Finally, and not surprisingly, Appendix XIV demonstrates a major difference between the samples with regard to religious affiliation and denominational affiliation. The reader will recall that the Religious sample was expressly made up of persons with specifically Christian involvements, and so, 100 percent of that sample listed Christianity as their religious affiliation, with 57.69 percent being Roman Catholic and 42.31 percent being members of the Anglican Church. On the other hand, about 73 percent of the members of the undergraduate sample reported being Christian, and were spread out across several denominations; 5.73 percent belonged to Jewish, Moslem and other religions, and 21.35 percent professed no religious affiliation.

The figures and statistics reported in this section, including in Table 3.1, are taken from the time-1 data. However, Appendix XIV indicates that almost all of the differences and similarities between the samples are preserved in the time-2 data. Besides providing a description of the two samples, and of the distinctions between them, the analysis of the bio-demographic data completed here allows the composition of a list of measures which, because of how they distinguish between the two samples, and yet which are rationally independent of religiousness, must be considered for use as covariates in any analysis which compares the religious and undergraduate samples. Those variables are age, gender, education, occupation, and mother's occupation. A final variable -- Faking -- which is not a bio-demographic measure, must be added to this list. The reader will recall that this is the measure of positive malingering employed in the present research.

Table 3.1 demonstrates that it also credibly distinguishes the samples from one another, with the religious sample presenting a higher mean score.

The Religious Involvement Survey

Preliminary Analyses

Data were gathered for the 27 subscales contained in the 5 sections of the Religious Involvement Survey (including the Reported Religious Change subscale administered only at the time-2 phase). Appendix XV contains the descriptive statistics for each of the subscales, as originally conceived, in a table format. For the undergraduate and religious samples combined, and for the two samples separately, it presents subscale means, standard deviations and alpha estimates of reliability for both time-1 and time-2 data, and a test-retest reliability estimate. An examination of the table indicates that most of the subscales exhibit high levels of internal consistency and test-retest reliability with respect to the undergraduate sample. Perhaps because of the high proportion of extreme scores and homogeneous nature of the religious sample, the reliability estimates pertaining to that sample are not as strong.

This preliminary analysis included examination of the question of how well the R.I.S. subscales as originally derived distinguish between the undergraduate and religious samples. In addition, the Alpha statistics and factor analytical results were conducted in order to eliminate any obviously weak items, and to combine subscales where possible. A summary of these preliminary analyses

are presented in Appendix XVI.

Refining of the Religious Involvement Survey

Data were gathered for the 27 variables in the 5 sections of the R.I.S. Appendix XV includes descriptive statistics for each of the subscales as originally constructed or the undergraduate and religious samples. The appended explorations of internal consistency (see Appendix XVII) and factor structures (see the second and third tables attached to Appendix XVI) were employed to modify the make-up of R.I.S. subscales in several ways. Taking into account these analyses and the hypotheses of the present dissertation, several changes were made. Some original R.I.S. subscales have been collapsed together, reduced in size, or laid aside. These refinements reduced the number of subscales from 27 to 13. The notable refinements are as follows.

- a) The factor analyses suggest that the Religious Orientation section could be collapsed into two subscales, with the measure of Orientation to Religion as a Means maintained separately, and the others combined (see Appendix XIV). However, in deference to Allport and Ross (1967) and Battson and Ventis (1982), the five orientation subscales were kept distinct for analytical purposes.
- b) Because of their relevance to the hypotheses of the present thesis, Religious Moral Beliefs, Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, and Religious Upbringing subscales were maintained without alteration.
- c) Six subscales of the Religious Involvements section were collapsed together: Participation in Holy Communion, Participation

in Church/Denomination, Participation in Small Groups, Involvement with Close Friends, Involvement with Acquaintances, and Involvement with Family. All of these measure various types of Social Involvement in Religion.

- d) Because Personal Relationship with God measures a concept closely aligned with personally held beliefs (see the third table attached to Appendix XVI), it was joined with the Christian Orthodoxy and Judao-Christian Orthodoxy subscales to or a Personal Religious Commitment subscale.
- e) A Social Support for Religion subscale was formed containing the Affective Ties to Best Friends, Affective Ties to Friends, and the Access to Religious Models subscales, along with a modified form of the Access to Religious Resources subscale.

The Negative Religious Influences subscale was eliminated because it presents negative factor loadings, with the loading for time-1 data being quite small at $-.34$. Access to Religious Resources subscale was modified because a reliability analysis of that measure had shown that one of its items -- item 5 of the Social Support for Religion section -- served to decrease drastically the Cronbach Alpha estimate of internal reliability (see Appendix XVII).

- f) Owing to the results of the factor analysis of the Religious Experiences section, a subscale of that name was formed containing the measures of Experiences of God, Experiences of Other Than God, Desirability of Religious Experiences, and Religious Influences. The Unlisted Experiences item, which asks subjects to register experiences they have had which are not mentioned in the provided list, and the Description of

Religious Experiences item, which asks subjects to describe the most important of their religious experiences, were eliminated. They present small factor loadings with respect

g) Having been measured only at time-2, and because of its relevance to the present dissertation, the Reported Religious Change subscale has been maintained separately from other subscales.

The list of the thirteen revised subscales of the Religious Involvement Survey which are in use for this research, then, consists of

- 1) Personal Religious Commitment,
- 2) Religious Moral Beliefs,
- 3) Beliefs in Eternal Consequences,
- 4) Social Involvement in Religion,
- 5) Religious Upbringing,
- 6) Social Support for Religion,
- 7) Religious Experiences,
- 8) Reported Religious Change,
- 9) the Religious Orientation measures -- Means, Ends, External Orientation, Internal Orientation, and Quest-Seeking Orientation.

Inspection of Table 3.2 reveals that the internal consistency of the revised R.I.S. subscales were uniformly high. With the exception of Means Orientation, the alpha co-efficients were greater than .70. Similarly, the test-retest reliability estimates were

Table 3.2
Descriptive Statistics for Revised RIS
Subscales for Undergraduate Sample
at Times One (n=182) and Two (n=115)

Scale	No. of Items	Time One			Time Two			Test Retest
		mean	s.d.	alpha	mean	s.d.	alpha	
Religious Commitment	47	198.45	70.19	.98	189.42	63.05	.99	.93
External Consequences	8	30.59	12.11	.92	32.83	11.93	.94	.84
Religious Morality	10	49.39	8.79	.71	51.39	9.66	.74	.81
Social Involvement in Religion	21	54.89	23.84	.94	56.92	23.46	.94	.90
Religious Upbringing	5	20.81	7.45	.87	20.51	7.89	.88	.87
Social Support for Religion	10	22.54	4.85	.81	21.72	4.93	.82	.54
Religious Experiences	25	31.43	26.53	.96	31.13	26.99	.96	.90
Extrinsic/Means Orientation	6	26.64	4.52	.14	26.4	4.99	.28	.53
Intrinsic/Ends Orientation	7	22.35	9.87	.87	23.6	9.98	.86	.91
External Orientation	4	14.22	6.45	.81	15.52	6.55	.74	.86
Internal Orientation	8	30.96	13.42	.91	32.56	13.96	.92	.91
Quest/Seeking Orientation	6	21.42	10.38	.81	21.24	6.82	.83	.73

high, falling below .70 only in the cases of Social Support or Religion and Means Orientation.

A correlation matrix for these measures drawn from the time-1 data for the undergraduate sample is presented in Table 3.3. A corresponding matrix for the religious sample is presented in Appendix XVIII.

Table 3.3 contains 66 correlation co-efficients. Half of those estimates are greater than .5 in magnitude, indicating that a number of the subscales are strongly related to one another. 17 of the co-efficients are of a magnitude greater than .7 all of which are in a positive direction, and 15 of which are shared among five of the subscales: Personal Religious Commitment, Social Involvement in Religion, Orientation to Religion As an Ends, External Orientation to Religion, and Internal Orientation to Religion. On the other hand, all of the correlations involving the measure of Orientation to Religion as a Means are relatively small and in the negative direction, ranging in size from $-.13$ to $-.187$. The relationship among the subscales as completed by the undergraduates is further explored in a factor analysis, the details of which are presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 reinforces the point that Personal Religious Commitment, Religious Experiences, Orientation to Religion As an Ends, External Orientation to Religion, and Internal Orientation to Religion are highly correlated. The analysis for time-1 data places them in Factor-1 with loadings ranging from .789 to .926, as does the analysis for time-2 data, with loadings ranging from .749 to .927. Beliefs in eternal consequences, Religious Moral

Table 3.3
Inter Correlations among the
Revised Subscales of the RIS, Undergraduate Sample
Time 1 Data

Undergraduate Sample	Religious Commitment	Religious External Consequences	Religious Morality	Religious Involvement in Religion	Social Involvement in Religion	Religious Support for Religion	Religious Experiences	Extrinsic/Means Orientation	Intrinsic/Ends Orientation	Quest/Seeking Orientation
Religious Commitment	***									
External Consequences	.827	***								
Religious Morality	.663	.538	***							
Social Involvement in Religion	.713	.552	.626	***						
Religious Upbringing	.391	.219	.325	.581	***					
Social Support for Religion	.256	.244	.218	.426	.169	***				
Religious Experiences	.771	.600	.623	.726	.377	.313	***			
Extrinsic/Means Orientation	-.143	-.039	-.046	-.125	-.187	-.074	-.019	***		
Intrinsic/Ends	.853	.666	.722	.834	.495	.353	.831	-.080	***	
External Orientation	.736	.556	.540	.723	.512	.364	.689	-.078	.79	***
Internal Orientation	.866	.691	.690	.773	.441	.306	.821	-.099	.92	***
Quest/Seeking Orientation	.447	.328	.334	.354	.286	.197	.466	-.013	.54	***

Beliefs, and Social Involvement in Religion also load on Factor-1. As well, both analyses define another dimension (Factor-2 for the time-1 data, and Factor-3 for the time-2 data) most strongly characterized by Orientation to Religion As a Means.

A measure of central concern to this thesis is Social Support for Religion. The correlation matrix in Table 3.2 shows it to be, at best, moderately correlated with the subscales in Factor-1, with co-efficients ranging from .218 to .426. The factor matrices in Table 3.4 for time-1 and time-2 data taken together indicate that it is best seen as operating independently of that factor. How to locate the remaining subscales -- Religious Upbringing, and a Quest-Seeking Orientation to Religion -- within a factor structure of the R.I.S. is unclear. However, a definitive factor structure is not the aim of this analysis. For the purposes of this dissertation it is most interesting to note that the two measures of religious involvement which are of most importance to its research -- Religious Moral Beliefs and Social Support for Religion -- measure concepts which are quite independent of one another: Their estimated correlation is only .218, and the factor analysis further supports their independence.

The final set of preliminary analyses with the R.I.S. subscales involved their correlations with bio-demographic variables as well as their abilities to distinguish between the undergraduate and religious samples of respondents. Table 3.5 presents the correlations between the R.I.S. subscales and the bio-demographics of the undergraduates. Inspection reveals that R.I.S. scores were generally independent of age and gender. However, religious

Table 3.4

Factor Loadings For The Revised Subscales
Of The RIS, Time One and Time Two Data, Undergraduate Sample

Subscale	Time One Factor Loading		Time Two Factor Loading		
	F1	F2	F1	F2	F3
Religious Commitment	0.894		0.927		
Eternal Consequences	0.785		0.796		
Religious Morality	0.756		0.767		
Social Involvement in Religion	0.779	0.412	0.678	0.535	
Religious Upbringing	0.379	0.625		0.730	
Social Support For Religion	0.326	0.329		0.757	
Religious Experiences	0.866		0.828		
Extrinsic/Mean Orientation		-0.823			0.835
Intrinsic/Ends Orientation	0.926		0.864	0.363	
External Orientation	0.789	0.314	0.749	0.408	
Internal Orientation	0.919		0.889	0.306	
Quest/Seeking Orientation	0.571			0.417	0.660
Eigenvalue	6.780	1.110	6.630	1.190	1.010
Per Cent of Variance	56.500	9.200	55.200	10.000	8.400

Table 3.5
Zero-Order Correlations Between Bio-Demographic Variables and Revised RIS subscales, Time 1 undergraduate data

Demographic Variables	Religious Commitment	External Consequences	Morality	Religious Involvement	Social Involvement	Religious Support	Extrinsic Means	Intrinsic Ends	External Orientation	Internal Orientation	Quest/Seeking Orientation
Age	-.062	-.061	.047	.026	.013	.090	.155 ^C	.056	.053	-.015	.034
Gender	.111 ^A	.045	.043	.034	.045	.025	.009	.026	.042	.066	.056
Marital Frequency	.014	-.004	.068	.083	.038	.086	.144 ^B	.106 ^A	.115 ^A	.032	.072
Education	-.081	-.022	-.086	-.047	.040	-.003	.027	-.061	.025	-.063	-.039
Occupation	-.032	-.022	-.009	-.046	.015	-.034	-.032	-.052	-.100 ^A	-.048	.003
Father's Education	-.212 ^D	-.214 ^D	-.169 ^C	-.143 ^B	.007	.007	-.153 ^B	.041	-.170 ^C	-.161 ^C	-.081
Mother's Education	-.155 ^C	-.205 ^D	-.119 ^A	-.044	.006	.048	-.082	-.072	-.140 ^B	-.135 ^B	-.155 ^C
Father's Occupation	-.094	-.099 ^A	-.081	-.042	-.008	.023	-.060	.072	-.110 ^A	-.049	-.097 ^A
Mother's Occupation	-.089	-.088	.031	-.066	.068	-.031	-.077	-.060	-.049	-.062	-.099 ^A
Father Welfare	.028	.041	.054	.039	-.008	.081	.001	.060	.040	-.007	.054
Mother Welfare	-.013	.038	-.022	-.039	-.044	-.088	-.036 ^D	.043	-.044	.005	-.050
Benefit	-.015	.079	-.028	-.027	-.088	-.024	.001	-.029	.010	-.008	.059
Arrests	.046	.044	-.048	.003	-.037	.021	.049	.064	-.013	.049	.096
Convictions	.029	.028	.048	.111 ^A	.110 ^A	.129	.042	.058	.089	.036	.019
No. of Convictions	.005	-.013	-.127	-.018	-.063	-.099	.032	.023	.018	-.059	.050
Faking	.096 ^A	.098 ^A	.169 ^D	.115 ^A	-.044	.058	.086	.141 ^B	.058	.122 ^B	-.031

Coding for "p" values
A: $\leq .10$
B: $\leq .05$
C: $\leq .02$
D: $\leq .01$
E: $\leq .005$
F: $\leq .002$
G: $\leq .001$

involvement tended to be negatively related to Father's (and Mother's) Education. In addition, Positive Malinger (faking good) was a mild positive correlate of religious involvement. The undergraduate and religious samples were compared on the R.I.S. subscales with and without statistical controls introduced for Age, Gender, Marital Frequency, parental occupation and education, and Faking (see Table 3.6). The religious and undergraduate samples were found to differ on the latter control variables, as Table 3.5 demonstrates. Inspection of Table 3.6 reveals that the religious sample presented higher mean religious involvement scores than did the undergraduates on every R.I.S. subscale except for Quest Orientation and Means Orientation. The religious sample scored lower on Means Orientation. The eta co-efficients reflect the unadjusted differences between means, while the beta co-efficients reflect the differences between means adjusted for the control variables.

Table 3.6 was derived from analyses of variance that examine the capacities of the R.I.S. subscales to discriminate between the undergraduate and religious samples when controls were introduced for the five demographic measures of age, gender, marital frequency, education, occupation, and mother's occupation, and for the measure of faking -- measures also shown by Table 3.6 to discriminate between the samples. Table 3.6 presents the adjusted mean scale scores for both samples, an eta co-efficient -- a correlation co-efficient indicating the strength with which a subscale discriminates between the samples before the controls are introduced, a beta coefficient -- a correlation co-efficient

Table 3.6

Significance of Differences (Undergraduate vs. Religious Samples) on Revised RIS Subscales With Controls For Age, Gender, Marital Frequency, Occupation, Education, Mother's Occupation, Faking

Variable	Adjusted mean scores		eta	beta	p	R	ps
	Under-graduate	Religious					
Religious Commitment	197.80	317.23	0.44	0.52	0.000	0.52	0.00
Social Involvement in Religion	55.83	109.75	0.64	0.59	0.000	0.66	0.00
Religious Upbringing	22.56	28.27	0.40	0.37	0.001	0.43	0.00
Social Support For Religion	31.87	78.31	0.52	0.51	0.000	0.55	0.00
Religious Morality	50.94	65.45	0.51	0.51	0.000	0.53	0.00
Eternal Consequences	31.83	49.53	0.51	0.46	0.000	0.53	0.00
Religious Experiences	20.45	27.11	0.24	0.35	n/s	0.28	n/s
Extrinsic/Means Orientation	26.93	14.30	0.59	0.72	0.000	0.61	0.00
Intrinsic/Ends Orientation	22.91	41.80	0.60	0.54	0.000	0.62	0.00
Internal Orientation	14.73	22.32	0.40	0.36	0.001	0.44	0.00
Quest/Seeking Orientation	31.20	52.46	0.48	0.49	0.000	0.51	0.00
Reported Change in Religiousness	21.54	21.56	0.01	0.00	n/s	0.16	n/s
	10.93	14.40	0.57	0.48	0.000	0.61	0.00

indicating the strength with which a subscale discriminates between the samples after the controls are introduced, and a p-value showing the probability with which the beta co-efficient could occur purely by chance. Of the 13 subscales only the Quest-Seeking orientation is shown as incapable of discriminating between the samples. All other subscales demonstrate convincing discriminating capacity, with probabilities of less than .02 associated with their beta co-efficients.

All but the Quest-Seeking Orientation to Religion measure, then, are evidently associated with involvement in religion -- Table 3.5 indicates that some of them are also correlated with a couple of other bio-demographic measures. Table 3.5 presents a matrix of correlation co-efficients estimating the relationships between the bio-demographic measures, including Faking, with the R.I.S. subscales. For the most part the table demonstrates null relationships sprinkled with a few moderately strong ones which carry p-values of less than .05. It is interesting, though, to note the correlations associated with father's education and mother's education. Nine moderately strong, negative relationships are associated with father's education, ranging in size from $-.135$ to $-.214$. Eight of these -- the strongest ones -- refer to relationships with the eight subscales assigned to Factor-1, -- Personal Religious Commitment, Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, Religious Moral Beliefs, Social Involvement in Religion, Religious Experiences, Orientation to Religion As an ends, External Orientation to Religion, and Internal Orientation to Religion. The measure of mother's education demonstrates

weaker relationships with all of these, though five of them are of moderate strength -- Personal Religious Commitment, Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, Orientation to Religion As an ends, External Orientation to Religion, and Internal Orientation to Religion. The Faking measure, finally, is positively associated with three R.I.S. subscales, all from that same list -- Religious Moral Beliefs, Orientation to Religion As an Ends, and Internal Orientation to Religion.

In summary, factor analyses and reliability analyses of the original, rationally derived structure of R.I.S. have been used. Taking those analyses into account, and keeping in mind the hypotheses of the present dissertation, thirteen subscales were developed. Four of these are composite subscales: Personal Religious Commitment, Social Involvement in Religion, Social Support for Religion, and Religious Experiences. Four others are maintained in their original form because of their central concern to the thesis: Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, Religious Moral Beliefs, Religious Upbringing, and Reported Religious Change. Finally, the five religious orientation measures are maintained as adapted for this dissertation because of their place of concern to the literature on the social scientific study of religion. Generally, the R.I.S. subscales demonstrated satisfactory levels of internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and ability to distinguish between the general undergraduate and more religiously involved samples of respondents. Before examining how these thirteen measures of religious involvement are related to measures of self reports regarding deviant and pro-social behaviour, we

turn to analyses of the dependent variables of the present dissertation.

The Dependent Variables

The Measures of Deviance

As was detailed in the previous chapter on the research methodology, scores were computed for

- a: the number of types of deviance ever committed,
- b: the number of types of deviance recently committed,
- c: the total amount of deviance recently committed.

By taking subsets of each of these measures, corresponding scores were also computed for victimizing and victimless deviance.

Appendix XVIX contains a table of frequency distributions on all measures for the overall, male and female undergraduate samples.

It demonstrates the expected gender differences: more males reported committing deviant acts, both recently and over the longterm, and males reported involvement in a wider range and greater number of deviant acts. These differences hold across the overall measures of deviance, and the measures of victimizing and victimless offenses. The most important contribution of this chart, though, is its depiction that a higher percentage of the undergraduate sample who returned to complete the questionnaires at time-2 reported having never committed any of the deviant acts listed than was the case for that sample at time-1 (17.9 versus 10.8). This is true for males (6.5 versus 2.0), and females (22.1 versus 14.0), and, with one exception, these differences occur with respect to victimizing and victimless acts ever committed.

The exception refers to the percentages of males who reported committing no victimless acts, in which case the difference is negligible (32.3 versus 32.0). Evidently, then, this one exception notwithstanding, of the undergraduates who did not return to complete the questionnaires at time-2, a disproportionate number had, at least to some extent, previously been involved in deviant behaviour.

Appendix XX presents the corresponding frequency distributions for the religious sample. This chart does not depict as clear a distinction between the genders with respect to reports of no deviant involvement, especially regarding time-2 data. It is clear, though, that more members of the undergraduate sample on the whole report having been involved in a wider range and greater number of deviant acts than members of the religious sample. This difference, not surprisingly, also stands up with respect to recent deviant behaviour. In fact, all members of the religious sample -- both male and female -- report having been involved in no victimless deviance recently, both at time-1 and time-2.

These differences are more clearly illustrated in Table 3.7, which presents the descriptive statistics for all measures of deviance. It shows that the only measure for which the religious sample did not register a lower rate of reported deviant behaviour is the time-2 measure of victimizing deviant acts ever committed. However, when adjustments are made to the sample mean scores based on controls for age, gender, marital frequency, education, occupation, mother's occupation, and faking, none of the differences at time-1 are significant.

Table 3.7
Descriptive Statistics for Deviance Measures

Scale	No. of Items	Poss. Range	Sample	Time One				Time Two				Test	
				mean	s.d.	alpha	n	mean	s.d.	alpha	n	Retest	n
No. of Types of Victimization Deviance ever Committed	12	0 to 12	combined undergrad. religious	1.43 1.50 0.92	1.66 1.69 1.26	.691 .697 .627	210 185 25	1.18 1.18 1.24	1.59 1.63 1.30	.704 .725 .559	138 117 21	.709 .723 .542	139 118 21
No. of Types of Victimless Deviance ever Committed	6	0 to 6	combined undergrad. religious	0.93 1.01 0.40	1.16 1.19 0.82	.582 .578 .593	210 185 25	0.75 0.82 0.33	1.17 1.22 0.73	.665 .669 .548	138 117 21	.202 .196 .662	139 118 21
No. of Types of Deviance Ever Committed	33	0 to 33	combined undergrad. religious	5.66 6.04 2.84	5.33 5.45 3.21	.889 .889 .816	210 185 25	4.78 4.97 3.71	5.28 5.50 3.77	.899 .906 .833	138 117 21	.836 .840 .759	139 118 21
No. of Types of Victimizing Dev- iance Recently Committed	12	0 to 12	combined undergrad. religious	0.43 0.48 0.08	0.94 0.98 0.40	.641 .638 1.00	210 185 25	0.29 0.32 0.0	0.76 0.81 0.0	.607 .618 n/a	138 117 21	.616	139 118 21
No. of Types of Victimless Dev- iance Recently Committed	6	0 to 6	combined undergrad. religious	0.45 0.51 0.0	0.84 0.87 0.0	.529 .516 n/a	210 185 25	0.27 0.32 0.0	0.69 0.75 0.0	.595 .589 n/a	138 117 21	.758	139 118 21
No. of Types of Deviance Recently Committed	33	0 to 33	combined undergrad. religious	2.39 2.69 0.20	3.29 3.39 0.50	.842 .836 .250	210 185 25	1.33 1.54 0.19	2.49 2.65 0.51	.836 .835 .618	138 117 21		139 118 21
Amount of Victimizing Dev- iance recently Committed	12	0 to 33	combined undergrad. religious	0.75 0.83 0.16	1.86 1.94 0.80	.654 .656 .750	210 185 25	0.56 0.62 0.0	1.61 1.72 0.0	.621 .641 n/a	138 117 21	.718	139 118 21

Table 3.7
Descriptive Statistics for Deviance Measures
(continued)

Scale	No. of Items	Poss. Range	Sample	Time One			Time Two			Test Retest	n
				mean	s.d.	alpha	mean	s.d.	alpha		
Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed			combined	1.00	2.03	.543	0.54	1.50	.556	.797	139
			undergrad.	1.14	2.13	.534	0.64	1.61	.550		118
			religious	0.0	0.0	n/a	0.0	0.0	n/a		21
Total Amount of Deviance			combined	4.34	6.79	.846	2.42	5.02	.834	.851	139
		0 to 99	undergrad.	4.87	7.07	.843	7.78	5.34	.835		118
			religious	0.44	1.12	.096	0.43	1.36	.867		21

Table 3.8 illustrates this point. It contains the adjusted sample mean scores for all measures of deviance, relevant Eta and Beta correlation co-efficients, and P-values associated with the Beta co-efficients. Although in all cases the mean score for the religious sample is lower than that of the undergraduate sample, none of the differences can be associated with a probability level of less than .10.

Besides presenting unadjusted sample means and standard deviations, Table 3.7 allows examination of the reliabilities of the deviance measures through Cronbach Alpha estimates of internal reliability and test-retest reliability co-efficients. It demonstrates that, for the combined and undergraduate samples, the overall measures of deviance -- Total Number of Types of Deviance ever Committed, Total Number of Types of Deviance Recently Committed, and Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed -- estimates of internal reliability are higher than they are for corresponding measures of victimizing and victimless deviance. It also shows that alpha co-efficients for the religious sample are lower, indeterminant, or unstable from time-1 to time-2. For the most part, these points are also applicable to the estimates of test-retest reliability. In the cases of each of the overall measures of deviance these co-efficients exceed .8, while this is the case for none of the measures of victimizing or victimless deviance. The test-retest co-efficients associated with measures of deviance recently committed might be considered to be inapplicable because the time-1 and time-2 data are drawn from periods which are independent from one another. However, as

Table 3.8

Significance of Differences (Undergraduate vs Religious Samples)
 On Measures of Deviance With Controls For Age, Gender, Marital Frequency,
 Education, Occupation, Mother's Occupation, Faking

Measure of Deviance	Cell Means		Eta	Beta	p
	Undergraduate n=179	Religious n=25			
Number of Types of Victiminizing Deviance Ever Committed	1.51	0.87	0.11	0.13	ns
Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed	0.99	0.63	0.17	0.10	ns
Number of Types of Deviance Ever Committed	5.97	0.37	0.20	0.13	ns
Number of Types of Victiminizing Deviance Recently Committed	0.44	0.27	0.14	0.06	ns
Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed	0.51	0.10	0.20	0.16	0.16
Number of Types of Deviance Recently Committed	2.54	1.30	0.25	0.12	ns
Amount of Victiminizing Deviance Recently Committed	0.72	0.55	0.10	0.03	ns
Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed	1.08	0.33	0.17	0.12	ns
Total Amount of Deviance	4.51	2.92	0.21	0.07	ns

estimates of the correlation between time-1 and time-2 data they are of interest because they illustrate the extent to which subjects who were involved in deviant behaviour up to a year preceding their completion of the time-1 questionnaires continued to commit deviant acts after that time. For the religious sample these co-efficients are very small or indeterminant, primarily because of the low rates of recently committed deviance among its subjects. For the undergraduate sample, on the other hand, the co-efficients are very high, ranging in magnitude from .617 for the Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed to .817 for the Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. These findings suggest that, depending on the type of act, between 40 and 73 percent of the variance in recent deviant behaviour among undergraduates can be accounted for by knowledge of deviance rates in an immediately preceding period. The rate of recent deviant behaviour, then, is likely the best predictor and strongest single correlate of the rate of deviant behaviour for the immediate subsequent period of several months.

Some bio-demographic characteristics are also strong indicators of deviance. Table 3.9 displays a matrix of zero-order correlation co-efficients for the bio-demographic variables and the positive malingering measure of Faking with the deviance measures for the time-1 data of the undergraduate sample. The characteristic most strongly and consistently related to deviance is clearly gender. It is correlated significantly with all but the measure of the Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed. All of the significant correlations are negative, and

yield probability levels less than .001, demonstrating that males carryout more deviant behaviour than do females.

Age is correlated negatively, and moderately strongly with several of the self report deviance measures. In particular, it is related most strongly with the Total Number of Types of Deviance Recently Committed ($r = -.192$) and the Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed ($r = .170$), $P < .01$ in both cases). The Arrests item, which simply asked subjects to respond "yes" or "no" to the question "Have you ever been arrested?" is shown in Table 3.9 to be moderately correlated with The number of Types of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed, the Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed, the Number of Types of Deviance Recently Committed, and the Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed, with R-values ranging from .173 to .215 in magnitude, all yielding probability levels less than .01. It is also moderately related to the Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Ever Committed ($r = .118$, $P < .01$), and more strongly related to the Number of Types of Deviance Ever Committed ($r = .223$, $P < .002$). Perhaps surprisingly, the variables Convictions and Number of Convictions bare very few associations with the deviance measures. The strongest of the few significant ones correlates Number of Convictions with the Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Ever Committed ($r = .159$, $P < .02$). Finally, only one of the correlation co-efficients relating the deviance measures with variables touted as indicative of socio-economic status -- occupation, education, father's and Mother's education, and father's and mother's occupation -- is significant at a level of probability less than

.05. The correlation between mother's occupation and the number of types of victimless deviance ever committed is registered at $-.133$ ($P < .05$).

The most interesting correlates of the deviance measures, then, are gender and age, both of which are known to be strong indicators of deviant behaviour relative to other bio-demographic variables.

Pro-social Behaviour

Table 3.10 contains the descriptive statistics for the measure of Pro-social Behaviour used in the present research. It shows that this scale displays a high level of internal consistency: the Cronbach Alpha estimates of internal reliability are above .9 for both the religious and undergraduate samples, and for the two samples combined, with respect to both time-1 and time-2 data. The test-retest estimates are also shown to be high -- .683 for the undergraduate sample and .769 for the religious sample. As was the case for the measures of recent deviant activity, the periods sampled at the time-1 and time-2 sessions are temporally independent, as the questionnaire asks subjects to indicate activities up to one month previous to completing it. As is the case for deviance, then, a very strong indicator of present pro-social behaviour is the rate of such behaviour from the recent past.

Unlike the deviance measures, however, the sample means for Pro-social Behaviour are remarkably similar, as is indicated in Table 3.10. This finding is confirmed in Table 3.11 which examines the significance of the difference between those sample

Table 3.10
Descriptive Statistics for the
Measure of Pro-Social Behaviour

Range	Sample	Time One				Time Two				Test Retest
		n	mean	s.d.	alpha	n	mean	s.d.	alpha	
0 to 130	combined	210	43.77	16.70	.905	139	42.35	16.77	.918	.691
	undergrad.	185	43.81	16.53	.906	118	42.36	17.12	.922	.683
	religious	25	43.53	18.26	.917	21	42.29	14.86	.901	.769

Table 3.11
 Significance of Differences
 (undergraduate vs. religious samples)
 for Pro-social Behaviour (Time 1 data)
 with Controls for Age, Gender, Marital Frequency,
 Education, Occupation, Mother Occupation and Faking

Mean Scores	Undergraduate (n = 185)	Religious (n = 25)	eta	beta	p
	43.88	38.85	.08	.09	ns

means. The analysis of variance to which it refers attaches a Beta Co-efficient of .09 to the relationship between the Pro-social Behaviour measure and the distinction between the samples, a value which yields a non-significant level of probability.

The Pro-social Behaviour scale is, for the most part, also unrelated to the bio-demographic characteristics employed in the present dissertation. Table 3.12 reveals that there are only two zero-order correlations between it and the bio-demographic variables, both of which are only moderate in consistency. The co-efficient for the relationship between pro-social behaviour and mother's education is .127, yielding a probability level less than .05. Surprising perhaps, the other bio-demographic measure which demonstrates a moderately strong, positive relationship with pro-social behaviour is the Convictions variable. The correlation between them is .173 ($P < .02$). It is speculated here that this correlation either defied the 2-percent odds and occurred by chance, or that it is due to the prevalence of community service order sentences handed down by the courts to persons of undergraduate university age who are convicted of criminal offences.

The Measure of Self-monitoring:

A Moderating Variable

The Self Monitoring scale measures the extent to which respondents report conforming their behaviour to social cues in their immediate environments. Table 3.13 presents the descriptive statistics for the Self Monitoring measure. It shows that this

Table 3.12
Zero-order Correlation Coefficients Between
Pro-social Behaviour and
Bio-demographic Variables

	Pro-Social Behav- iour
Age	-0.029
Gender	0.010
Marital Frequency	0.092
Education	0.009
Occupation	-0.013
Father's Education	0.118 ^A
Mother's Education	0.127 ^B
Father's Occupation	0.019
Mother's Occupation	-0.009
Father on Welfare	0.035
Mother on Welfare	0.003
Benefits	0.168
Have Been Arrested	0.040
Have Been Convicted	0.171 ^C
Number of Convictions	0.003
Faking	0.091

Coding for "p" values:

E: < .005	A: < .10
F: < .002	B: < .05
G: < .001	C: < .02
	D: < .01

Table 3.13
Descriptive Statistics for the
Measure of Self Monitoring

Range	Sample	Time One				Time Two				Test Retest
		n	mean	s.d.	alpha	n	mean	s.d.	alpha	
0	combined	204	13.69	3.99	.674	138	13.53	3.59	.598	.709
to	undergrad.	182	13.36	3.96	.666	118	13.23	3.50	.574	.695
25	religious	22	16.41	3.26	.562	20	15.09	3.75	.649	.701

scale exhibits a moderately strong degree of internal reliability, with the Cronbach alpha estimates for the undergraduate sample being .666 for time-1 data and .574 for time-2. The estimates for the religious sample are similar (alpha=.562 for time-1 data; alpha=.649 for time-2 data). The test-retest correlations estimates are slightly stronger ($r=.695$ for the undergraduate sample; $r=.701$ for the religious sample). Table 3.13 also reveals slightly higher mean scores on the Self Monitoring scale for the religious sample for both time-1 and time-2 data.

Table 3.14 presents a row of zero-order Pearson Correlation co-efficients relating the Self Monitoring measure to the 16 continuous and dichotomous bio-demographic variables. Self Monitoring was related to only four of these variables ($P<.05$) -- age ($r=.168$, $p<.02$), convictions ($r=-.128$, $p<.05$), number of convictions ($r=-.182$, $p<.02$), and marital frequency ($r=.196$, $p<.01$). The correlation between marital frequency and self monitoring is unexpected. A discussion of that relationship is outside of the scope of this thesis. However, the moderately strong, negative relationships between self monitoring and the convictions variables are noteworthy. These correlations suggest that persons involved in deviance tend not to look to their immediate environments for social cues to which to conform their behaviour. Appendix XXI presents the corresponding row of correlation co-efficients for the religious sample. A number of the co-efficients in that appendix are of greater magnitude than those in Table 3.14, but the small number of subjects in the religious sample serves to determine that none of them are of

Table 3.14
Table of Zero Order Correlations between Self-Monitoring and
Bio-Demographic Variables, Undergraduate Sample
Time 1 Data

	Age	Gender	Frequency	Marital	Educa- tion	Occupa- tion	Father's Education	Mother's Education	Father's Occupa- tion	Mother's Occupa- tion	Father's Welfare	Mother on	Benefit	Arrests	Convic- tions	Mo. of Convic- tions	Falsing
Self Monitoring	.168	.119	.196	.977	.068		-.066	.059	-.023	.071	.050	.075	-.037	-.005	.128	-.182	.062
C	A	D													B	D	

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

significance.

Table 3.15 emphasizes the relationship within the undergraduate sample between self monitoring and deviance. It presents a row of correlation co-efficients relating the Self Monitoring variable to the deviance measures. and the dependent variables of the present research. All of the co-efficients in Table 3.15 are negative, including the one referring to the relationship between self monitoring and the Pro-social Behaviour measure ($r=.125$, $p<.05$). Those referring to relationships with measures of victimless deviance are also only moderate at best, but those which refer to relationships with measures of victimizing deviance and overall measures of deviance all yield probability levels less than .002. The strong relationship is with the measure of Total Number of Types of Deviance Ever Committed ($r=-.321$, $p<.001$), and the self Monitoring variable is shown to correlate with the measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed at $-.239$ ($p<.002$). Within the religious sample, however, the Self Monitoring scale is shown in Appendix XXII to be related to none of the deviance variables. Again, in some cases, this is because the small size of that sample does not allow apparently moderate correlations to register significant probability levels.

Table 3.16 outlines the correlations between Self Monitoring and R.I.S. subscales in yet another row off zero-order Pearson correlation co-efficients. All of the co-efficients in that table, except for the one referring to the relationship with religious morality, are in the negative direction. However, only

Table 3.15
Table of Zero Order Correlations between Self-Monitoring and
the Measures of Deviance, Undergraduate Sample
Time 1 Data

	No. of Types of Victim- ing Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Victim- ing Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Victim- ing Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Victim- ing Deviance less Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victim- ing Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victim- ing Deviance less Deviance recently Committed	Total amount of Deviance
Self Monitoring/ G	-.319	-.164 A	-.321 G	-.234 F	-.124 B	-.268 G	-.231 F	-.135 B	-.239 F

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

the correlation between self monitoring and religious upbringing is significant ($r = -.151$, $p < .02$). This relationship is insignificant among members of the religious sample, as shown in Appendix XXIII. Analysis of data from that sample reveals that the Self Monitoring variable is significantly related to religious morality ($r = .459$, $p < .01$). The table in Appendix XXIII also shows it to be related positively to the measure of Religious Experiences ($r = .341$, $p < .05$), and to the measure of Internal Orientation to Religion ($r = .399$, $p < .05$). Once again, a number of the correlation co-efficients in Appendix XXIII are high relative to their counterparts in Table 3.16, but the small size of the religious sample does not allow them to register significantly low levels of probability.

Because, within the undergraduate sample, it is consistently significantly related to deviance, but bears little in relationship with the religious involvement measures, the Self Monitoring measure seems a likely candidate as a moderating variable in the present research. For this reason, its role in interaction with religious morality and with social support for religion as indicators of deviance is among the examinations discussed in the next section.

The Associations Between Religious Involvement And Deviant Behaviour

Table 3.17 presents the zero-order Pearson correlation co-efficients between the R.I.S. subscales and all of the deviance measures. This table deals with the cross-sectional relationship

Table 3.16
Table of Zero Order Correlations between Self-Monitoring and
the RIS Subscales, Undergraduate Sample
Time 1 Data

	Religious Commit- ment	External Con- sequences	Religious Morality	Religious Involvement in Religion	Social Support for Religion	Religious Experiences	Extrinsic/ Means Orienta- tion	Intrinsic/ Ends Orienta- tion	External Orienta- tion	Internal Orienta- tion	Quest/ Seeking Orienta- tion
Self Monitoring	-.106 A	-.097 A	.049	-.074	-.151 C	-.049	-.028	-.078	-.104 A	-.104 A	-.086

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$
B: $\leq .05$
C: $\leq .02$
D: $\leq .01$
E: $\leq .005$
F: $\leq .002$
G: $\leq .001$

or time-1 data, and for that reason the Reported Religious Change subscale is excluded from the analysis. The twelve R.I.S. subscales and the nine deviance measures provide for 108 co-efficients. Table 3.17 shows that of those only 16 are strong enough to yield probability levels of less than .05. One of those is a moderately strong, positive correlation of .132 between External Orientation to Religion and the Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed. The remaining 15 are negative in direction, and 9 of them yield probability levels less than .01. One of those refers to the relationship between Social Involvement in Religion and the Total Number of Types of Deviance Ever Committed -- a correlation of $-.178$. The other 8 refer to relationships between Religious Morality and all but one of the deviance measures. The Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed is the only deviance measure not significantly related to Religious Morality. The co-efficients associating Religious Morality with the other deviance measures range in magnitude from $-.169$ to $-.309$. The relationship between Religious Morality and the Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed -- the major dependent variable of this research -- is $-.241$ ($p < .001$) Religious Morality, in fact, is the only R.I.S. subscale to be significantly related to the Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. For that matter, it is the only R.I.S. subscale to be significantly related to the corresponding measures for victimizing deviance ($r = -.183$) and victimless deviance ($r = -.183$) ($p < .01$ in both cases).

Table 3.17 thus provides confirmation for the first hypothesis

of the present dissertation, demonstrating that Religious Morality is the single religious involvement subscale of this research most strongly, and negatively, linked to deviant behaviour.

Table 3.18 presents the results of a regression analysis which examined the extent to which the R.I.S. subscales are able to add to the proportion of variance accounted for in the Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed once that deviance measure's relationship with the covariates has been taken into account. The table presents an additive model, based on increases in the proportion of variance -- the multiple-R-squared -- accounted for in the deviance measure when new variables are added to the equation. Predictor variables are selected for the equation in a step-wise fashion from successive, rationally pre-determined sets. The criterion for the selection of a variable is a partial correlation with Deviance that is significant with a probability level less than .05. In Table 3.18 variables are listed in the order in which they were entered into the equation. The table reports for each predictor a zero-order correlations, multiple-R and multiple-R-squared figures, increase in the multiple-R-square achieved achieved by adding that variable, the F-value for that change in the multiple-R-squared, and a co-efficient demonstrating the significance of the increase in the R-squared. and the p-value sighting the probability level yielded by that beta co-efficient. Each row in the table then presents data relevant to the variable's relationship with the deviance measure at the conclusion of the regression analysis -- a beta coefficient demonstrating the variable's relative importance to the equation,

Table 3.18
Summary for Regression Analysis of RIS subscales on Total Amount
of Deviance Recently Committed
(undergraduate sample, Time 1 data)

Entry	Variable	Correlation	Multi R	R ²	R ² Change	R ² Change	SIG F	Beta	Partial Corr.	F	P.C.	Sig F
1	Gender	-.42	.42	.177	.177	.177	.001	-.49	-.49	4.12	.00	.00
2	Faking	-.10	.47	.223	.046	.046	.004	-.18	-.18	5.87	.021	.021
3	Religious Morality	-.19	.49	.244	.021	.021	.048	-.36	-.36	14.66	.001	.001
4	Personal Religious Commitment	.02	.55	.302	.058	.058	.001	.32	.32	12.05	.001	.001

its partial correlation with the deviance measure based on statistical controls for the other variables in the equation, and another p-value, referring to the probability of that partial correlation.

The regression analyses collect representatives from various variable sets to enter in a stepwise fashion according to predetermined blocking strategies. Notably, with Religious Morality entered, Personal Religious Commitment entered as a significant, positive correlate of deviance, despite its negligible zero-order correlation. This intriguing and unexpected finding will be discussed later. The second, third and fourth blocks included Religious Morality, Social Support for Religion, and a set of variables representing Social support for Religion in interaction with Religious Morality, Social Involvement in Religion, Religious Upbringing, and Self Monitoring. The fifth block included the remaining R.I.S. subscales.

Inspection of Table 3.18 reveals that the significant contributions of the demographic set were exhausted after the entry of Gender and Faking. The strongest single correlate from within the religious involvement Survey sets was Religious Morality, and it contributed significantly with Gender and Faking controlled. At this point closer examination is made of the Religious Morality/Deviance link and the role of moderator variables.

Religious Morality and Deviance:

The Role of Moderators

Table 3.19 first displays the unadjusted mean deviance scores for the undergraduate sample at low and high levels of Religious Morality. Eta co-efficients estimating the relationship between deviance and Religious Morality based on those unadjusted means are presented along with corresponding p-values. Inspection reveals that the mean deviance score of the high Religious Morality subgroup was approximately half that of the low Religious Morality subgroup. In addition, note that the effect of religious Morality was evident among both male and female undergraduates, although slightly stronger, and statistically significant in the subsample of females.

The remainder of the rows in Table 3.19 introduce statistical controls for Faking, and where appropriate, for Gender. The beta co-efficient reflects the magnitude of the simple effects off Religious Morality with those controls introduced, and the p-values indicate the levels off significance of the beta co-efficients. The Multiple-R column reflects the overall correlation with Deviance of Religious Morality, Gender and Faking. Inspection of the fourth row reveals that controls for Gender and Faking reduce the effect of Religious Morality from .17 to .11, although it remains statistically significant. Once again, the effect appeared slightly stronger among women than among men.

The analyses of the roles of moderator variables, as those roles were hypothesized, begins in the seventh row of Table 3.19. The first moderator variable of theoretical interest was Social

Table 3.19
The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean
Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data
With Controls for Gender, Faking,
Social Support for Religion, and Self-Monitoring

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted							
(comb.)	6.06 (93)	3.70 (91)	.17		.02	.17	.05
Men	10.33 (27)	7.82 (22)	.13		ns	.13	ns
Women	4.32 (66)	2.39 (69)	.20		.02	.20	.05
Adjusted for Gender and/or Faking							
(comb.)	5.62 (93)	4.09 (91)	.17	.11	.05	.42	.000
Men	10.15 (27)	8.03 (22)	.13	.11	ns	.14	ns
Women	4.08 (66)	2.61 (69)	.20	.15	.05	.31	.001
Social Support for Religion							
Strong	5.88 (45)	2.67 (52)	.28	.23		.47	.000
Weak	5.52 (48)	5.94 (39)	.03	(-).03	ns	.40	.000
Men: Social Support for Religion							
Strong	12.45 (13)	5.03 (10)	.29	.35	.05	.34	ns
Weak	8.05 (14)	10.52 (12)	.04	(-).13	ns	.26	ns
Women: Social Support for Religion							
Strong	3.80 (32)	1.67 (42)	.28	.24	.02	.34	.05
Weak	4.40 (34)	4.02 (27)	.09	.04	ns	.28	.05
Self Monitoring							
High	2.37 (39)	2.56 (44)	.03	(-).02	ns	.24	ns
Low	8.38 (53)	5.37 (45)	.21	.18	.05	.49	.000
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	2.48 (8)	3.36 (6)	.06	(-).15	ns	.44	ns
Low	13.41 (19)	10.15 (15)	.15	.15	ns	.15	ns
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	2.36 (31)	2.42 (38)	.02	(-).01	ns	.21	ns
Low	5.73 (34)	2.81 (30)	.33	.28	.01	.40	.005

Table 3.19
 The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean
 Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data
 With Controls for Social Support for Religion,
 Gender, Self-Monitoring and Faking
 (continued)

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	<u>R</u>	<u>p$\leq$</u>
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Low Self-Monitoring/ High Social Support for Religion	8.31 (28)	3.82 (25)	.31	.26	.05	.50	.005
Others	4.49 (65)	4.25 (66)	.09	.02	ns	.41	.000
Men: Low Self Monitor- ing/High Social Support for Religion	14.58 (10)	7.19 (6)	.27	.31	ns	.37	ns
Others	7.12 (17)	8.81 (16)	.01	.09	ns	.25	ns
Women: Low Self Monitoring/High Social Support for Religion	5.46 (18)	2.15 (19)	.34	.29	.05	.42	.05
Others	3.56 (48)	2.79 (50)	.14	.09	ns	.28	.02

Support for Religion. As hypothesized, the effect of Religious Morality was substantial and significant under conditions of strong Social Support for Religion. The effect of Religious Morality was weak and insignificant under weak Social Support for Religion conditions. Inspection of the next four rows of Table 3.19 reveals that this pattern was found among both the undergraduate men and the undergraduate women.

Rows thirteen and fourteen present the simple effects of Religious Morality at lower and higher levels of Self Monitoring. The effect of Religious Morality was strongest among the low Self Monitoring undergraduates -- that is, among those less likely to scan the immediate social environment for cues to action. Once again, the pattern is evident among both men and women, although the effect is statistically significant only in the larger sample of women. Incidentally, the strong main effect of Self Monitoring is notable: regardless of Religious Morality, low self monitorers reported more deviance than did high self monitorers.

The final rows of Table 3.19 explore the simple effects of Religious Morality on deviance when respondents are classified simultaneously on Social Support for Religion and Self Monitoring. Clearly, the effect of morality was strongest among those scoring low on Self Monitoring and reporting strong social support for religion. Once again, the pattern is evident among both men and women.

Deviance and Social Support for Religion:

The Role of Moderators

Social Support for Religion itself was not strongly associated with Deviance, as shown in Table 3.20. Inspection of that table shows that overall unadjusted effect was minor in magnitude ($\eta^2=.11$), and statistically significant only among the women ($\eta^2=.17$). In fact, among men there was a slight tendency for those with strong social support for religion to report more deviance than those with less social support. However, the picture is clarified when Religious Morality is introduced as a moderator.

Inspection reveals that strong social support for religion is associated with relatively low levels of deviance among those scoring above the median on Religious Morality. Similarly, Self Monitoring appears to be an important moderator variable. Strong social support for religion was associated with low levels of deviance among the high self monitoring individuals. However, and unexpectedly, this is clearly the case only for the women.

Also in accordance with the hypotheses of this dissertation, the effects of Social Support for Religion were examined with Social Involvement in Religion and Religious Upbringing as potential moderator variables. Inspection of Table 3.20 reveals that Social Involvement in Religion was a moderator of the effect of Social Support for Religion. Low levels of deviance were found among those who had friends who were religious -- that is, strong social support -- and who were involved in religious activities with others (strong involvement). Notable as well was the high

Table 3.20
The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean
Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data With
Controls for Gender, Faking, Self Monitoring, Religious
Morality, Religious Upbringing and Social Involvement in Religion

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted							
(comb.)	5.71 (87)	4.16 (97)	.11		ns	.11	ns
Men: Unadjusted	9.19 (26)	9.22 (23)	.00		ns	.00	ns
Women: Unadjusted	4.23 (61)	2.59 (74)	.17		.02	.17	.05
Adjusted for Gender and/or Faking							
(comb.)	5.43 (87)	4.43 (97)	.11	.07	ns	.41	.000
Men							
Women	4.05 (61)	2.73 (74)	.17	.14	.05	.31	.001
Religious Morality							
High	5.14 (39)	2.62 (52)	.25	.20	.05	.444	.000
Low	5.75 (48)	6.39 (45)	.03	(-).04	ns	.390	.002
Men: Religious Morality							
High	9.63 (12)	6.65 (10)	.22	.22	ns	.26	ns
Low	8.85 (14)	11.92 (13)	.14	(-).14	ns	.14	ns
Women: Religious Morality							
High	3.64 (27)	1.59 (42)	.24	.23	.05	.29	.10
Low	4.44 (34)	4.19 (32)	.07	.02	ns	.32	.05
Self Monitoring (comb.)							
High	3.30 (41)	1.66 (42)	.19	.20	.05	.32	.05
Low	7.35 (45)	6.71 (53)	.11	.04	ns	.46	.000
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	2.84 (8)	2.89 (6)	.09	.01	ns	.42	ns
Low	12.08 (18)	11.85 (16)	.01	.01	ns	.05	ns
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	3.42 (33)	1.44 (36)	.23	.23	.05	.31	.05
Low	4.79 (27)	4.05 (37)	.14	.07	ns	.298	.10

Table 3.20
The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean
Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data With
Controls for Gender, Faking, Self Monitoring, Religious
Morality, Religious Upbringing and Social Involvement in Religion
(continued)

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p $\leq$	<u>R</u>	<u>p$\leq$</u>
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Religious Upbringing							
High	6.03 (39)	4.01 (54)	.23	.15	.10	.48	.00
Low	4.92 (48)	4.94 (43)	.00	(-).00	ns	.36	.005
Men: Religious Upbringing							
High	12.74 (12)	6.51 (10)	.31	.32	.10	.33	ns
Low	6.10 (14)	11.55 (13)	.24	(-).26	ns	.28	ns
Women: Religious Upbringing							
High	3.57 (27)	3.13 (44)	.13	.05	ns	.31	.05
Low	4.40 (34)	2.23 (30)	.21	.21	.05	.33	.05
Social Involvement in Religion							
High	6.80 (33)	3.26 (59)	.27	.25	.005	.42	.001
Low	4.56 (54)	6.26 (38)	.05	(-).12	ns	.49	.000
Men: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	11.17 (11)	5.08 (15)	.28	.35	.05	.37	ns
Low	7.80 (15)	16.89 (8)	.34	.40	.05	.37	ns
Women: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	5.07 (22)	2.42 (44)	.25	.23	.05	.31	.05
Low	3.54 (39)	3.12 (30)	.08	.05	ns	.37	.01

level of deviance within a small subsample of men who had strong social support for religion but a low level of social involvement.

The moderator role of Religious upbringing was weak and, if present at all, quite complex. Briefly, only among men with a stronger religious upbringing was Social Support for Religion approaching the effect predicted. Among women, the effect of Social Support for Religion appeared to be limited to those with less rather than more religious upbringing.

In summary, strong social support for Religion is associated with low levels of deviance when Religious Morality and Self Monitoring are high, and, perhaps, among those most involved in social religious activities.

Religious Involvement Measures

As Predictors of Deviance

Table 3.21 presents data on the relationship between Religious Morality as assessed at time-1 and self reported deviance as assessed at time-2. The pattern of results is similar to that reported for the cross-sectional analyses. However, almost without exception, the magnitude of the differences between adjusted mean deviance scores was reduced. As well, almost all of the interaction effects were reduced to insignificant levels. In the predictive model, Religious Morality continues to effect deviance scores only among females who reported strong Social Support for Religion, and among low self monitoring women.

Table 3.22 presents data for the analyses of Social Support for Religion as a potential predictor of deviance. Again, the pattern

Table 3.21
The Simple Effects of Religious Morality (Time 1) on Time 2
Total Deviance Scores (predictive) With Controls for Gender,
Faking (Time 1), Faking (Time 2), Self Monitoring (Time 1),
and Social Support for Religion (Time 1)

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted (comb.)	4.02 (52)	1.85 (62)	.20		.02	.20	.05
Men: Unadjusted	7.35 (17)	5.21 (14)	.13		ns	.13	ns
Women: Unadjusted	2.40 (35)	0.88 (48)	.28		.01	.28	.02
Adjusted for Gender Faking 1, Faking 2 (tot.)	3.63 (52)	2.16 (62)	.20	.13	.05	.46	.00
Men	7.35 (17)	5.21 (14)	.13	.13	ns	.19	ns
Women	2.25 (35)	0.99 (48)	.28	.23	.02	.35	.02
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	1.94 (23)	1.31 (30)	.15	.12	ns	.29	ns
Low	5.30 (20)	2.78 (31)	.23	.19	.10	.55	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	2.19 (6)	1.78 (5)	.08	.09	ns	.17	ns
Low	10.47 (11)	6.76 (9)	.16	.20	ns	.21	ns
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	1.96 (17)	1.16 (25)	.16	.14	ns	.36	ns
Low	2.71 (18)	0.69 (22)	.39	.37	.01	.49	.02
Social Support for Religion (tot.)							
High	3.17 (31)	1.30 (35)	.23	.19	.10	.46	.01
Low	4.40 (21)	2.24 (27)	.18	.10	ns	.49	.02
Men: Social Support for Religion							
High	6.00 (9)	5.80 (5)	.09	.01	ns	.61	ns
Low	7.38 (8)	6.21 (9)	.19	.08	ns	.42	ns
Women: Social Support for Religion							
High	2.08 (22)	0.50 (30)	.41	.39	.005	.45	.01
Low	1.88 (13)	2.26 (18)	.18	.05	ns	.41	ns

Table 3.21
 The Simple Effects of Religious Morality (Time 1) on Time 2
 Total Deviance Scores (predictive) With Controls for Gender,
 Faking (Time 1), Faking (Time 2), Self Monitoring (Time 1),
 and Social Support for Religion (Time 1)
 (continued)

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	<u>R</u>	<u>p$\leq$</u>
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Low Self-Monitoring/ High Social Support for Religion	4.30 (18)	1.98 (18)	.23	.18	ns	.55	.02
Others	3.37 (34)	2.20 (44)	.18	.12	ns	.47	.002
Men: Low Self Monitoring High Social Support for Religion	8.14 (6)	8.37 (3)	.06	.01	ns	.72	ns
Others	6.06 (11)	5.22 (11)	.14	.06	ns	.36	ns
Women: Low Self Monitoring High Social Support for Religion	2.41 (12)	0.66 (15)	.44	.38	.05	.49	.10
Others	2.17 (23)	1.12 (33)	.21	.18	.10	.30	ns

Table 3.22
The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion (Time 1)
on Time 2 Total Deviance Scores (predictive) with Controls
for Gender, Faking (Time 1), Faking (Time 2), Self Monitoring,
Religious Morality, Social Involvement in Religion,
and Religious Upbringing

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p _s	R	p _s
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	3.75 (48)	2.18 (66)	.14		ns	.14	ns
Men: Unadjusted	6.76 (17)	5.93 (14)	.05		ns	.05	ns
Women: Unadjusted	2.10 (31)	1.17 (52)	.16		ns	.16	ns
Adjusted for Gender							
Faking 1, Faking 2 (tot.)	3.21 (48)	2.57 (66)	.14	.06	ns	.44	.000
Men	6.35 (17)	6.44 (14)	.05	.00	ns	.16	ns
Women	2.06 (31)	1.20 (52)	.16	.15	.10	.31	.05
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	2.13 (24)	1.12 (29)	.21	.19	.10	.32	ns
Low	4.23 (24)	3.84 (36)	.16	.03	ns	.52	.002
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	2.08 (6)	1.91 (5)	.08	.04	ns	.15	ns
Low	9.02 (11)	8.54 (9)	.06	.03	ns	.09	ns
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	2.17 (18)	0.96 (24)	.23	.22	.10	.39	.10
Low	1.93 (13)	1.44 (27)	.08	.08	ns	.35	ns
Religious Morality							
High	2.41 (27)	1.42 (35)	.19	.11	ns	.42	.02
Low	4.16 (21)	3.93 (21)	.12	.02	ns	.215	.05
Men: Religious Morality							
High	5.44 (9)	4.80 (5)	.04	.04	ns	.05	ns
Low	7.45 (8)	7.26 (9)	.10	.01	ns	.31	ns
Women: Religious Morality							
High	1.70 (18)	0.39 (30)	.22	.27	.05	.30	ns
Low	2.52 (13)	2.33 (12)	.12	.03	ns	.30	ns

Table 3.22
The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion (Time 1)
on Time 2 Total Deviance Scores (predictive) With Controls
for Gender, Faking (Time 1), Faking (Time 2), Self Monitoring,
Religious Morality, Social Involvement in Religion,
and Religious Upbringing
(continued)

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p $\leq$	<u>R</u>	<u>p$\leq$</u>
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Social Involvement in Religion							
High	4.26 (19)	1.05 (42)	.39	.36	.002	.47	.01
Low	2.63 (29)	5.10 (24)	.08	.19	.10	.58	.001
Men: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	8.56 (6)	-0.30 (8)	.55	.73	.02	.63	ns
Others	6.16 (11)	13.53 (6)	.34	.39	.10	.39	ns
Women: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	3.52 (13)	0.89 (34)	.29	.36	.01	.45	.02
Low	2.63 (29)	5.10 (24)	.08	.19	.10	.58	.001
Religious Upbringing							
High	3.78 (21)	2.10 (36)	.26	.15	ns	.48	.01
Low	2.98 (27)	2.94 (30)	.03	.00	ns	.43	.05
Men: Religious Upbringing							
High	9.24 (8)	3.52 (6)	.24	.35	ns	.29	ns
Others	4.69 (9)	7.60 (8)	.11	.17	ns	.36	ns
Women: Religious Upbringing							
High	1.94 (13)	1.17 (30)	.17	.13	ns	.29	ns
Low	2.17 (18)	1.23 (22)	.15	.17	ns	.36	ns

of results found in the cross-sectional analysis is reproduced in the predictive model. However, most of the differences between mean deviance scores were reduced in magnitude to insignificant levels. However, inspection of Table 3.22 suggests that the interaction effect between Social Support for Religion and Social Involvement in Religion survived in the predictive analyses for both males and females.

The Factor Structure of Religious Morality

Religious Morality, as the single measure of religiousness most strongly related to deviance, begs study in greater detail. As was suggested in Chapter II of the present thesis, in reviewing the unpublished paper of Hebert (1986), the religious morality measures may test adherence to legal codes as much as to religious moral leanings, and so, may not measure a specific aspect of religiousness per se. Although not all of the ten items of the Religious Morality Subscale used in this study refer specifically to deviance (see Appendix IV, items 22-31), it can be expected that those items which do will be most strongly correlated with the deviance measures.

A factor analysis was conducted on the time-1 and time-2 data gathered from the undergraduate sample for the ten items of the Religious Morality Subscale. The resulting factor loadings are presented in Table 3.23. The analysis applied to the time-1 data divides the items into three easily distinguishable factors. The primary factor includes five items. In accordance with their presentation in Appendix IV, they are

Table 3.23

Factor Loadings For The Items of The
Religious Morality Subscales
Undergraduate Sample, Time One and Time Two Data

Items	Time One Factor Loading			Time Two Factor Loading	
	F1	F2	F3	F1	F2
22			-0.706		-0.659
23		0.759	0.385		0.796
24		0.838			0.622
25	0.653			0.583	
26		0.731			0.672
27	0.678			0.673	
28	0.635			0.735	
29	0.732			0.699	
30	0.774			0.775	
31	0.353		0.706	0.563	
Eigenvalue	2.84	1.83	1.06	3.13	1.76
Per Cent Variance	28.4	18.3	10.6	31.3	17.6

- 25: There is nothing wrong with sexual intercourse outside of marriage between two consenting adults,
- 27: It is wrong to desire or imagine having sexual relations with the spouse of another person,
- 28: Homosexual relations between consenting adults is all right,
- 29: To deliberately abort a pregnancy is wrong unless the woman's life is at serious risk,
- 30: At least one day a week should be reserved for religious worship.

This factor includes the items which measure attitudes towards sexual religious morals and the item referring to regular weekly worship. As such, this factor might be said to measure fundamentalist religious morality. A second factor includes three items:

- 23: Theft is wrong,
- 24: It is wrong to kill another person,
- 26: It is wrong to tell lies.

These are the three items which refer specifically to aspects of deviant behaviour and attitudes. The third factor includes two items:

- 22: One should treat others in the same positive ways that one likes to be treated by others,
- 31: One should honour and respect one's father and mother.

Those factors can be said to measure conventional, pro-social attitudes.

The factor analysis of the time-2 data distills two factors. The primary factor includes the same five items measuring

fundamentalist religious morality; the second includes the three items referring to deviant behaviour and attitudes. The third factor distilled from the time-1 data is divided among these two time-2 factors: item-31 is loaded onto the primary factor, and item-22 onto the second factor. However, for both these items the time-1 loadings onto a third factor are of greater magnitude than are the time-2 loadings (for item-22 $f=.796$ for time-1, $f=.659$ for time-2; for item-31 $f=.706$ for time-1, $f=.563$ for time-2). For this reason, and because of the rational appeal, the Religious Morality Subscale will be examined here as a three-factor measure. Table 3.24 displays the matrix of intercorrelations between the Religious Morality factors for the undergraduate and religious samples. It shows that, for the undergraduate sample, the strongest correlation is between Factor-1 and Factor-3 ($r=.256$, $p<.001$). Factor-2 is more moderately correlated with Factor-1 ($r=.161$, $p<.02$) and with Factor-3 ($r=.179$, $p<.01$). The data for the religious sample shows no significant relationships between the three factors. This is most likely again owing to the high scores registered by members of the religious sample in all three cases.

Table 3.25 shows the extent to which scores obtained by the religious sample are significantly higher than those registered by the undergraduate sample. It is another simple effects table, displaying the results of analyses of covariance, with controls for age, gender, marital frequency, education, occupation, mother's occupation, and the Faking measure -- the covariate measures found to distinguish between the two samples (see Table 3.1). Table

Table 3.24
Intercorrelations Among Factors
of the Religious Morality Subscale

Factor	1	2	3
F1	*	.161 ^B	.256 ^G
F2		*	.179 ^C
F3			*

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$	E: $\leq .005$
B: $\leq .05$	F: $\leq .002$
C: $\leq .02$	G: $\leq .001$
D: $\leq .01$	

Table 3.25
Significance of Differences
(undergraduate vs. religious samples)
on Religious Morality Factors

Factor	Undergraduate n=185	Religious n=26	eta	beta	P _s	R	P _s
F1	18.34	30.52	.53	.49	.000	.55	.00
F2	18.67	18.53	.15	.02	ns	.23	ns
F3	12.89	14.18	.15	.33	.006	.22	ns

3.25 shows that the samples differ significantly from one another, with the religious sample scoring higher on Factor-1 -- the fundamentalist factor, and Factor-3 -- the conventional, pro-social attitudes factor. However, the samples are shown to not differ significantly with respect to Factor-2 -- the deviant behaviour and attitudes factor -- with the undergraduate sample recording a slightly higher (more moral) mean score.

Finally, examination is made of the relationships within the undergraduate sample between the three Religious Morality factors and the measures of deviance. Table 3.26 displays the relevant zero-order correlation matrix. Appendix XXIV presents the corresponding matrix for the religious sample. Table 3.26 shows that the third factor is least related to the list of nine deviance measures. It bears only moderately strong, negative relationships with the measure of Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Ever Committed ($r = -.148$, $p < .05$), and with the measure of Total Number of Types of Deviance Ever Committed ($r = -.159$, $p < .02$). As expected, Factor-2 is, on the whole, most strongly related to the list of deviance measures. It is correlated with all measures of victimizing deviance and total deviance negatively, and strongly enough to yield probability levels of less than .001, the relationships of greatest magnitude being with the measures of victimizing deviance. On the other hand, it is correlated significantly with none of the measures of victimless deviance. Factor-1, however, is shown to be significantly and negatively correlated with the measures of Number of types of victimless deviance Recently Committed ($r = -.196$, $p < .01$), and with the measure

Table 3.26

Zero-order Correlations Between
Religious Morality Factors and Deviance Measures
(Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)

Factor	Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Ever Committed	Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed	Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed	Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	Amount of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed
F1	-0.192 ^D	-0.024	-0.101 ^A	-0.196 ^D	-0.176 ^D	-0.108 ^A	-0.176 ^D
F2	-0.296 ^G	-0.057	-0.280 ^G	-0.095 ^A	-0.261 ^G	-0.310 ^G	-0.265 ^G
F3	-0.148 ^B	-0.077	-0.051	-0.072	-0.050	-0.580	-0.048

Coding for "p" values: A: $\leq .10$ B: $\leq .05$ C: $\leq .02$ D: $\leq .01$ E: $\leq .005$ F: $\leq .002$ G: $\leq .001$

of Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed ($r = -.167$, $p < .01$). It is not significantly correlated, though, with either of the equivalent measures of victimizing deviance. Factor-1 is, though, significantly and negatively related with the measure of Number of Types of Victimized Deviance Ever Committed, and with all measures of total deviance strongly enough to yield probability levels less than .01.

With respect to measures of recent deviance, on the basis of relationships with the first two factors derived from the Religious Morality Subscale, one might wonder if measures of religiousness are differentially related to victimizing and victimless deviance.

The Battery of Core Criminological Correlates In Relation to Deviance

The psychometric properties of the Core Battery of Criminological Correlates are discussed in detail in Appendix XXV. That appendix includes a presentation of the battery's descriptive statistics -- that is, means, standard deviations, estimates of internal consistency and test-retest reliability, etc. -- inter-correlations among members of the battery, and its factor structure. Appendix XXV also examines the correlations between the Core Battery of Criminological Correlates and the bio-demographic variables. As was mentioned earlier, this dissertation marks the first time the psychometrics of the battery have been examined among a sample of undergraduate respondents in a longitudinal design.

The Core Battery Of Criminological Correlates in Relation to Deviance

The General Picture

It is expected, of course, that on the whole the established correlates of deviance included in this battery will demonstrate strong relationships with the deviance measures. Table 3.27 presents the matrix of zero-order correlations relating these two sets of variables. Of the 117 co-efficients displayed in that table, 92 are strong enough to yield probability levels less than .01. All of the 9 correlations implicating the measure of Awareness of Limited Opportunity are included in the 25 co-efficients which fail to reach that magnitude. In fact, none of those 9 correlations yield probability levels less than .05. Eight other relatively weak correlations involve the measure of Inadequacy/Immaturity, although it is correlated with 2 of the deviance measures strongly enough to result in probability levels less than .02.

The measures of Tolerance for Law Violations, Social Support for Crime, and Psychopathy are all correlated at an insignificant level with the measure of Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed. However, they are linked with the other deviance measures in the expected negative direction, and strongly enough to deliver probability levels less than .001 in all cases. The measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed -- the deviance measure most frequently employed in the present research -- is similarly related to all of the battery measures except for

Table 3.27

Zero-order Correlations Between Core Criminological Battery
and Deviance Measures, Time One Data, Undergraduate Sample

	Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Ever Committed	Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed	Number of Types of Deviance Recently Committed	Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed	Amount of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed
Tolerance of Law Violations	0.304 ^G	0.356 ^G	0.268 ^G	0.286 ^G	0.333 ^G	0.242 ^G	0.291 ^G
Social Support For Crime	0.496 ^G	0.602 ^G	0.441 ^G	0.374 ^G	0.571 ^G	0.436 ^G	0.381 ^G
Criminal Sentiments	-0.164 ^C	-0.191 ^D	-0.188 ^E	0.179 ^D	-0.227 ^G	-0.199 ^E	-0.186 ^E
Awareness of Limited Opportunities	0.107 ^A	0.097 ^A	0.013	0.043	0.082	0.037	0.039
Identification With Criminal Others	0.342 ^G	0.362 ^G	0.337 ^G	0.269 ^G	0.413 ^G	0.348 ^G	0.296 ^G
Risk Taking	0.434 ^G	0.482 ^G	0.362 ^G	0.279 ^G	0.482 ^G	0.369 ^G	0.275 ^G
Morality	0.283 ^G	0.317 ^G	0.306 ^G	0.201 ^E	0.349 ^G	0.266 ^G	0.195 ^E
Socialization	-0.507 ^G	-0.577 ^G	-0.348 ^G	-0.394 ^G	-0.479 ^G	-0.299 ^G	-0.368 ^G
Psychopathy	0.499 ^G	0.564 ^G	0.368 ^G	0.294 ^G	0.487 ^G	0.318 ^G	0.278 ^G
Neuroticism	0.432	0.502 ^G	0.227 ^G	0.354 ^G	0.394 ^G	0.185 ^D	0.336 ^G
Inadequacy/Immaturity	0.172 ^D	0.158 ^C	0.036	0.011	0.073	-0.018	0.007
Family Dissension	0.290 ^G	0.344 ^G	0.124 ^B	0.233 ^G	0.223 ^G	0.087	0.247
Scholastic Maladjustment	0.622 ^G	0.681 ^G	0.388 ^G	0.417 ^G	0.530 ^G	0.374 ^G	0.430

Coding for "p" values: A: $s \leq .10$ E: $s \leq .005$
 B: $s \leq .05$ F: $s \leq .002$
 C: $s \leq .02$ G: $s \leq .001$
 D: $s \leq .01$

Awareness of limited Opportunity and Inadequacy/immaturity. It is most strongly correlated with Social Support for Crime ($r=.583$), and with Scholastic Mal-adjustment ($r=.542$).

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to test which correlates of deviance from the battery make independent and significant contributions in accounting for variance in the measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed, and to examine the extent to which those contributors are related as a set to that measure. Three sets of variables were presented for selection into the equation by the analysis, the results of which is summarized in Table 3.28. The first set present consisted of the demographic measures, excluding the variables Arrests, Convictions, and Number of Convictions. Of course, as in the regression analysis summarized in Table 3.18, the two demographics found to make significant, independent contributions were the Gender and Faking variables. The second set of measures presented for stepwise selection by the analysis procedure consisted of Social Support for Crime and Tolerance for Law Violations. These were presented as a set as they have been deemed to be the battery counterparts to the R.I.S. measures of Social Support for Religion and Religious Morality. Table 3.28 indicates that both of those variables make independent and significant contributions, with Social Support for Crime accounting for the greater increase in the proportion of variance accounted for in the deviance measure ($R\text{-squared-change}=.205$, $p<.001$). Finally, a set composed of the remainder of the core criminological battery was presented for selection into the equation. Of those, only the measures of

Table 3.28
 Summary for Regression Analysis of Core Criminological Battery on Total Amount
 of Deviance Recently Committed
 (undergraduate sample, Time 1 data)

Entry	Variable	Correlation	Multi R	R ²	R ² Change	F	SIG F	Beta	Partial Corr.	Partial F	Sig F
1	Gender	-.42	.42	.177	.177	31.65	.001	-.25	-.31	14.89	.001
2	Faking	-.10	.47	.223	.046	8.62	.005	-.15	-.19	5.81	.02
3	Social Support for Crime	.57	.65	.428	.205	52.03	.001	.30	.35	19.52	.001
4	Tolerance for Law Violations	.37	.67	.444	.016	4.19	.05	.05	.06	.47	ns
5	Psychopathy	.54	.71	.507	.062	18.03	.001	.25	.28	12.41	.001
6	Risks	.49	.73	.526	.019	5.75	.02	.16	.19	5.75	.02

Psychopathy ($R\text{-squared-change}=.062$, $p<.001$) and Risk-taking ($R\text{-squared-change}=.019$, $p<.02$) were found to make independent, significant new contributions in accounting for variance in the deviance measure. Interestingly, the Scholastic Mal-adjustment measure, despite its high zero-order correlation with Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed, could not be selected by the analysis procedure. A second finding emerges, too, as a result of presenting this final set to the stepwise procedure: as shown in Table 3.28, the partial correlation co-efficient -- i.e.: the indicator of independent contribution -- involving the measure of Tolerance for Law Violations drops to less than significant levels ($\text{partial-}r=.06$). The table also shows that the two demographic measures and the four battery variables selected to the equation account for 52.6 percent of the variance in the measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. This compares favourably with the 30.2 percent of the variance in the deviance measure accounted for by the two demographics plus the R.I.S. measures of Religious Morality and Personal Religious Commitment selected by the stepwise procedure of the multiple regression analysis summarized in Table 3.18.

It is of interest that both the social support for crime and the tolerance of law violations measures were found to make significant and independent contributions to the equation at their point of entry into the stepwise analysis procedure. The reader will recall the apriori determination that those measures would be examined in relation to the self report measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. As was the case for their R.I.S.

counterparts, these examinations took the form of analyses of co-variance, with controls implemented for the measures of gender and faking. Included was analyses for the total sample, and for males and females at above-median and below-median levels of selected variables thought to have value as moderators.

As mentioned, the bi-level Tolerance for Law Violations variable is shown to correlate significantly with the deviance measure ($\eta^2=.33$, $p<.001$). Table 3.29 shows that the magnitude of the relationship increases when the Tolerance for Law Violations variable is combined into a composite correlate with Gender and the Faking measure (multiple- $R=.57$, $p<.001$). This trend is evident in all cases in which the relationship between the bi-level Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the deviance measure are significant for the overall sample -- I.Ei: among those reporting strong levels of social support for crime ($\eta^2=.43$, $p<.001$, multiple- $R=.56$), among those scoring low on the Self Monitoring measure ($\eta^2=.34$, $p<.001$, multiple- $R=.49$), and among those reporting strong levels of social support for crime and recording low levels of self monitoring ($\eta^2=.47$, $p<.001$, multiple- $R=.61$). On the other hand, in cases where differences between the unadjusted mean deviance scores fail to reach significant levels, neither does a composite variable combining Gender, the Faking measure, and the bi-level Tolerance for Law Violations variable correlate significantly with deviance rates.

As was the case for the analyses involving Religious Morality and Social Support for Religion, the list of potential moderators included the measure of Self Monitoring. The reader will recall

Table 3.29
The Simple Effects of Tolerance for Law Violations on
Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data
With Controls for Gender, Faking, Social Support for Crime,
Self Monitoring

	Tolerance of Law Violations		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	2.63 (95)	7.31 (89)	.33		.000	.33	.00
Men: Unadjusted	3.06 (16)	12.18 (33)	.43		.001	.43	.002
Women: Unadjusted	2.54 (79)	4.45 (56)	.20		.02	.20	.05
Adjusted for Gender Faking							
(tot.)	3.28 (95)	6.63 (89)	.33	.24	.000	.465	.000
Men	3.13 (16)	12.14 (33)	.43	.43	.002	.43	.01
Women	2.74 (79)	4.16 (56)	.20	.15	.05	.31	.001
Social Support for Crime							
(tot.)							
Strong	4.22 (50)	9.73 (56)	.43	.33	.000	.583	.000
Weak	2.02 (45)	1.64 (33)	.00	.07	ns	.245	ns
Men: Social Support for Crime							
Strong	4.04 (10)	16.75 (22)	.57	.56	.000	.57	.005
Weak	1.63 (6)	2.92 (11)	.26	.27	ns	.336	ns
Women: Social Support for Crime							
Strong	3.36 (40)	6.25 (34)	.29	.26	.01	.39	.005
Weak	2.02 (39)	1.10 (22)	.10	.16	ns	.25	ns
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	1.98 (53)	3.34 (30)	.21	.16	.10	.29	.10
Low	4.88 (41)	8.52 (57)	.34	.21	.02	.49	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	3.47 (8)	2.02 (6)	.15	.24	ns	.48	ns
Low	2.73 (7)	14.37 (27)	.44	.44	.005	.44	.05
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	1.69 (45)	3.69 (24)	.26	.22	.05	.30	.05
Low	4.03 (34)	4.73 (30)	.11	.07	ns	.29	.10

Table 3.29
The Simple Effects of Tolerance for Law Violations on
Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data
With Controls for Gender, Faking, Social Support for Crime,
Self Monitoring

(continued)

	Tolerance of Law Violations		eta	beta	p≤	R	p≤
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Low Self-Monitoring/ High Social Support for Crime	5.53 (23)	12.00 (39)	.47	.34	.002	.610	.000
Others	2.36 (72)	2.74 (50)	.09	.05	ns	.224	ns
Men: Low Self Monitoring High Social Support for Crime	2.53 (5)	18.17 (20)	.58	.58	.002	.586	.10
Others	3.44 (11)	2.86 (13)	.08	.11	ns	.293	ns
Women: Low Self Monitoring High Social Support for Crime	4.62 (18)	7.15 (19)	.27	.23	.10	.409	.05
Others	2.13 (61)	2.74 (32)	.11	.07	ns	.213	.111

that Self Monitoring bears relatively strong, negative relationships with measures of Victimizing Deviance and with total deviance measures, as displayed in Table 3.16. that table shows it to be related negatively to Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed ($r = -.239$, $p < .002$). Appendix XXVI presents an examination of the Self Monitoring measure in relation to the measures from the core criminological battery. This row of correlation co-efficients shows it to be positively related with Socialization, and negatively related with Psychopathy, Neuroticism, and Scholastic Mal-adjustment strongly enough to yield probability levels less than .001. Of particular interest is its relation with Social Support for Crime ($r = -.197$, $p < .01$), and its insignificant relationship with Tolerance for Law Violations ($r = -.078$). These findings suggest that the Self Monitoring measure will be a more appropriate moderator for the Tolerance for Law Violations variable than for the measure of Social Support for Crime.

Deviance and Tolerance For Law Violations

Table 3.29 presents the summary of simple effects analyses describing the relationship between a Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the self report measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. This table follows the format employed in simple effects tables encountered previously in this chapter. It presents results of the analyses of variance for the general relationship, and when selecting for above median and below median

splits on Social Support for Crime and on Self Monitoring, and finally, on a variable designed to separate those who score high on Social Support for Crime and low on Self Monitoring from the rest of the sample.

In as much as Social Support for Religion is the R.I.S. counterpart to Social Support for Crime, the reader will note a congruence between the set of analyses conducted for the relationship between tolerance for law violations and deviance and those conducted for the relationship between religious morality and deviance, and summarized in Table 3.19. The notable general difference between the two sets of results is, of course, that those who score below the median on the Religious Morality measure obtain the higher mean deviance score, while this is the case for those who score above the median on the Tolerance for Law Violations measure. Table 3.29 reveals this to be the case for the Tolerance for Law Violations measure with respect to the overall sample both when the mean deviance scores are unadjusted ($\eta^2 = .33$, $p < .001$), and when they are adjusted through controls for gender and faking ($\beta^2 = .24$, $p < .01$). This difference between the mean deviance scores exists for the male and female subsamples as well.

This positive relationship is also in evidence among those who report strong levels of social support for crime ($\eta^2 = .43$, $\beta^2 = .33$, $p < .01$ for the overall sample), but disappears among those reporting weak levels of social support for crime. examination of the relevant mean deviance scores indicates that an interaction exists between tolerance for law violations and social

support for crime in relation to the deviance measure. This interaction will be examined further when the relationship between deviance and social support for crime is explored.

It is not clear as to whether there might be an interaction between tolerance for law violations and self monitoring in effect. For the overall sample the relationship between the Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the deviance measure is significant among those scoring low on the Self Monitoring measure ($\eta^2=.34$, $\beta=.23$, $p<.02$). Although the corresponding relationship does not yield as small a probability level among those scoring high on Self Monitoring ($\eta^2=.30$, $\beta=.21$, $p<.10$), the mean deviance scores on both sides of the median split for the Self Monitoring variable indicate positive relationships. This appears to be the case among females also, although for that subsample it is those scoring high on Self Monitoring for whom the relationship between tolerance for law violations and recent deviance produces the lower probability level ($\eta^2=.26$, $\beta=.22$, $p<.05$). Among males, on the other hand, the interaction effect appears dramatic. The four relevant mean deviance scores are quite similar except for the highly augmented mean obtained by males who scored high on Tolerance for Law Violations and low on Self Monitoring. Accordingly, the relationship between the Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the deviance measure is insignificant among males scoring high on Self Monitoring, but strong and positive among those scoring low on that measure ($\eta^2=.44$, $\beta=.44$, $p<.01$).

With these findings in mind, it is not surprising that a

similar pattern of mean deviance scores emerges when males scoring low on Self Monitoring and high on Social Support for Crime are compared with the rest of the male subsample. Among males scoring low on Self Monitoring and high on Social Support for Crime the positive relationship between tolerance for law violations and deviance is strong ($\eta^2=.58$, $\beta=.58$, $p<.001$), while it is insignificant among the remainder of the male subsample. This interaction effect also appears to be present in the overall sample ($\eta^2=.47$, $\beta=.34$, $p<.01$ among those scoring low on Self Monitoring and reporting strong levels of social support for crime). An examination of the mean deviance scores, though, suggests that those scoring low on Self Monitoring and high on Social Support for Crime report higher rates of deviance than does the rest of the sample, no matter whether they display low or high levels of tolerance for law violations. Though this pattern is not reflected among the mean deviance scores for males, it is in evidence with respect to the mean deviance scores for the female subsample. However, an interaction effect cannot be concluded for females because the relationship between the Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the deviance measure is positive, but insignificant for both groups of that subsample.

In summary, the Tolerance for Law Violations variable on its own is a strong indicator of reports of deviance recently committed. It is shown to be a particularly strong positive correlate of that measure among those reporting strong levels of social support for crime. It also bears a strong, positive relationship with deviance among males who score low on Self Monitoring, and therefore, among males who score low on Self Monitoring and high on Social Support for Crime.

Deviance and Social Support for Crime

Unlike the Social Support for Religion subscale, the Social Support for Crime measure is a strong correlate of deviance (see Table 3.36). Like the Tolerance for Law Violations variable, the bi-level Social Support for Crime variable is positively and strongly related to the self report measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed both when the means for that measure are unadjusted ($\eta = .67$, $p < .001$ for the overall sample), and when they are adjusted for the effects of Gender and Faking ($\beta = .32$, $p < .01$ for the overall sample). Table 3.30, which summarizes the simple effects analyses for the relationship between deviance and social Support for Crime, shows the significant relationships to hold for both the male and female subsamples. It also reveals that this positive relationship holds for subsamples characterized by above median as well as by below median scores on the measure of Self Monitoring.

Not surprisingly, the positive relationship between the Social Support for Crime variable and the deviance measure appears to be strongest among those scoring above the median on the measure of Tolerance for Law Violations ($\eta = .47$, $\beta = .44$, $p < .001$ for the overall sample). However, it does persist, though at a relatively moderate strength, among those scoring below the median on the Tolerance for Law Violations variable ($\eta = .21$, $\beta = .18$, $p < .05$ for the overall sample), and it disappears among females of that

Table 3.30
The Simple Effects of Social Support for Crime on
Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data
With Controls for Gender, Faking, Self Monitoring and
Tolerance for Law Violations

	Social Support for Crime		eta	beta	p $\leq$	<u>R</u>	<u>p$\leq$</u>
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	1.86 (78)	7.13 (106)	.37		.00	.37	.00
Men: Unadjusted	2.47 (17)	12.78 (32)	.49		.00	.49	.00
Women: Unadjusted	1.69 (61)	4.69 (74)	.31		.00	.31	.00
Adjusted for Gender Faking							
(tot.)	2.23 (78)	6.87 (106)	.37	.32	.00	.52	.00
Men	2.38 (17)	12.82 (32)	.49	.50	.00	.51	.001
Women	1.87 (61)	4.54 (74)	.31	.28	.00	.39	.00
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	1.36 (42)	3.61 (41)	.29	.28	.005	.37	.01
Low	3.26 (36)	9.17 (62)	.41	.34	.00	.57	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	1.35 (8)	4.90 (6)	.57	.59	.01	.72	.02
Low	3.35 (9)	15.07 (25)	.48	.49	.002	.49	.02
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	1.37 (34)	3.38 (35)	.26	.23	.05	.32	.05
Low	2.43 (27)	5.77 (37)	.35	.32	.005	.43	.002
Tolerance of Law Violations (tot.)							
High	2.15 (33)	10.35 (56)	.47	.44	.00	.62	.00
Low	1.99 (49)	3.20 (50)	.21	.18	.05	.36	.005
Men: Tolerance of Law Violations							
High	2.89 (11)	16.82 (22)	.62	.62	.00	.62	.001
Low	1.21 (6)	4.17 (10)	.31	.40	.05	.59	.10
Women: Tolerance of Law Violations							
High	1.39 (22)	6.43 (34)	.41	.40	.001	.47	.002
Low	2.06 (39)	3.01 (40)	.19	.14	ns	.31	.05

subsample. Examination of the mean deviance scores confirms an interaction between social support for crime and tolerance for law violations for the overall sample, and for males and females separately. In all cases, the mean scores of those reporting high levels of tolerance for law violations and strong social support for crime are markedly augmented above the other relevant means.

As is again the case for the Tolerance for Law Violations variable, when the bi-level Social Support for Crime variable is combined into a composite correlate with Gender and the Faking measure, the multiple-R magnitude is augmented compared to the simple eta co-efficient. In the case of the general relationship the increase is 15 points ($\eta = .37$; multiple-R = .52 for the overall sample). Interestingly, all of the multiple-R's at both above and below median levels of the moderating variables are significant. In instances involving the overall sample they range from .36 among those scoring low on Tolerance for Law Violations ($p < .01$) to .62 among those scoring high on that same measure ($p < .001$).

In summary, with regard to cross-sectional, time-1 data, both social support for crime and tolerance for law violations are strong indicators of recently committed deviance. This is particularly true when they operate in interaction with one another. This interaction effect is played out in the form of augmented deviance rates among those scoring high on both measures, and reduced deviance rates among those scoring low on both measures.

The Core Criminological Battery As Predictors of Deviance

The power demonstrated by the Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the measure of Social support for crime as cross-sectional indicators of rates of deviance is carried forward, establishing them as strong short-term predictors of deviance rates. The patterns of situational cross-sectional association with the self report measure of deviance recently committed as defined by the intervening variables are, for the most part, found to recur in the predictive model.

The differences between the unadjusted means displayed in Table 3.31, and the magnitudes of the associated eta co-efficients, reveal a strong, positive relationship between the time-1 Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the time-2 deviance measure ($\eta = .34$, $p < .001$ for the overall sample). This case holds as well for the male and female subsamples. The patterns are again evident when the mean deviance scores are adjusted for the gender demographic and for the time-1 and time-2 Faking measures ($\beta = .28$, $p < .002$).

Table 3.32 displays the similar predictive powers of the Social Support for Crime variable with respect to the unadjusted mean deviance scores ($\eta = .30$, $p < .001$ for the overall sample), and for the adjusted mean deviance scores ($\beta = .24$, $p < .005$). Tables 3.31 and 3.32 both also display a powerful effect upon time-2 deviance scores determined by the interaction between the two time-1 predictors. Each predictor is shown to be unrelated to the future deviance measure among subjects who score below the median on the other predictor. However, as Table 3.31 reveals, among those

Table 3.31
The Simple Effects of Tolerance for Law Violations (Time 1)
on Time 2 Total Deviance Scores (Predictive) With Controls
for Gender, Faking (Time 1), Faking (Time 2), Self Monitoring
and Social Support for Crime

	Tolerance of Law Violations		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	1.08 (59)	4.73 (55)	.34		.00	.34	.00
Men: Unadjusted	1.36 (11)	9.15 (20)	.45		.005	.45	.01
Women: Unadjusted	1.02 (48)	2.20 (35)	.21		.05	.21	.10
Adjusted for Gender							
Faking 1, Faking 2 (tot.)	1.41 (59)	4.37 (55)	.34	.28	.001	.51	.00
Men	1.45 (11)	9.09 (20)	.45	.44	.01	.46	.10
Women	0.98 (48)	2.26 (35)	.21	.23	.02	.35	.02
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	0.75 (32)	2.85 (21)	.42	.39	.005	.45	.05
Low	2.09 (27)	5.56 (33)	.33	.25	.02	.57	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	1.71 (5)	2.24 (6)	.00	.12	ns	.18	ns
Low	0.83 (6)	12.22 (14)	.56	.56	.01	.56	ns
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	0.57 (27)	3.14 (15)	.50	.44	.002	.54	.005
Low	1.41 (21)	1.78 (19)	.06	.06	ns	.35	ns
Social Support for Crime (tot.)							
Strong	1.51 (29)	6.66 (34)	.45	.39	.00	.64	.00
Weak	1.20 (30)	0.86 (21)	.02	.07	ns	.21	ns
Men: Social Support for Crime							
Strong	1.40 (8)	12.9 (13)	.63	.61	.002	.69	.01
Weak	2.36 (3)	1.70 (7)	.02	.11	ns	.27	ns
Women: Social Support for Crime							
Strong	1.04 (21)	3.30 (21)	.37	.37	.005	.48	.02
Weak	0.85 (27)	0.85 (14)	.09	.00	ns	.25	ns

Table 3.31
 The Simple Effects of Tolerance for Law Violations (Time 1)
 on Time 2 Total Deviance Scores (Predictive) With Controls
 for Gender, Faking (Time 1), Faking (Time 2), Self Monitoring
 and Social Support for Crime
 (continued)

	Tolerance of Law Violations		eta	beta	p≤	R	p≤
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Low Self-Monitoring/ High Social Support for Crime	2.19 (16)	8.60 (20)	.50	.40	.002	.71	.00
Others	1.05 (43)	2.05 (35)	.21	.18	.10	.29	ns
Men: Low Self Monitoring High Social Support for Crime	1.43 (5)	15.49 (10)	.72	.67	.005	.74	.05
Others	1.88 (6)	2.47 (10)	.12	.11	ns	.24	ns
Women: Low Self Monitoring High Social Support for Crime	1.50 (11)	2.85 (10)	.22	.25	ns	.44	ns
Others	0.85 (37)	1.99 (25)	.20	.20	.10	.33	.10

Table 3.32
The Simple Effects of Social Support for
Crime (Time 1) on Time 2 Total Deviance Scores (Predictive)
With Controls for Gender, Faking (Time 1), Faking (Time 2),
Self Monitoring and Tolerance for Law Violations

	Social Support for Crime		eta	beta	p _s	<u>R</u>	<u>p_s</u>
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	1.06 (51)	4.29 (63)	.30		.00	.30	.001
Men: Unadjusted	1.90 (10)	8.52 (21)	.37		.02	.37	.05
Women: Unadjusted	0.85 (41)	2.17 (42)	.24		.02	.24	.05
Adjusted for Gender							
Faking 1, Faking 2							
(tot.)	1.43 (51)	3.98 (63)	.30	.21	.005	.49	.000
Men	1.35 (10)	8.79 (21)	.37	.42	.02	.44	ns
Women	0.94 (41)	2.08 (42)	.24	.21	.05	.34	.02
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	0.86 (27)	2.32 (26)	.31	.27	.05	.38	ns
Low	2.12 (24)	5.25 (36)	.32	.23	.05	.56	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	0.59 (5)	3.18 (6)	.42	.59	.10	.54	ns
Low	2.51 (5)	16.90 (15)	.37	.39	.10	.39	ns
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	0.94 (22)	2.08 (20)	.28	.21	.10	.39	.10
Low	0.96 (19)	2.18 (21)	.21	.22	.10	.41	.10
Tolerance of Law Violations (tot.)							
High	1.28 (21)	6.86 (34)	.42	.39	.00	.63	.00
Low	1.11 (30)	1.05 (29)	.01	.01	ns	.28	ns
Men: Tolerance of Law Violations							
High	1.81 (7)	13.10 (13)	.58	.59	.005	.59	.10
Low	0.56 (3)	1.67 (8)	.29	.37	ns	.64	ns
Women: Tolerance of Law Violations							
High	0.69 (14)	3.20 (21)	.41	.38	.02	.50	.05
Low	1.02 (27)	1.02 (21)	.01	.00	ns	.24	ns

Tolerance for Law Violations variable is powerfully predictive with respect to the deviance measure ($\eta^2=.45$, $\beta^2=.39$, $p<.001$ for the overall sample). Table 3.32 similarly shows that, among those scoring high on the Tolerance for Law Violations measure, the relationship between the Social Support for Crime predictor and the time-2 deviance measure is a strong one ($\eta^2=.42$, $\beta^2=.39$, $p<.001$ for the overall sample).

Table 3.32 also indicates that social support for crime is also predictive of deviance rates, though only moderately at best, among those scoring above the median as well as those scoring below the median on the Self Monitoring measure. Although the data for the male and female subsamples fail to lead to probability levels less than .05 at either level of Self Monitoring, the differences between mean scores for the overall sample do ($\eta^2=.31$, $\beta^2=.27$, $p<.05$ at high Self Monitoring; $\eta^2=.32$, $\beta^2=.23$, $p<.05$ at low levels). This is also apparently the case for the predictive relationship between tolerance for law violations and deviance rates, as shown in Table 3.31. However, the significant relationships associated with the overall sample ($\eta^2=.42$, $\beta^2=.39$, $p<.005$ at high levels of Self Monitoring; $\eta^2=.33$, $\beta^2=.25$, $p<.02$ at low levels) seem to be in effect for females, but not males, who score high on the Self Monitoring measure, and in effect for males, but not females, among those who score below the median on that scale. To conclude a three-way interaction between tolerance for law violations, self monitoring, and gender on the basis of a simple effects analysis such as this one, though, would be inappropriate, and the data does not support

3

MicroD

any conclusion of a two-way interaction effect.

On the other hand, the data for the overall sample suggest an effect on the time-2 deviance measure exists for an interaction between the Tolerance for Law Violations variable and the variable constructed to compare those who scored low on Self Monitoring while reporting strong levels of social support for crime with all other subjects. While the relationship among the "others" group does not reach significant levels, among those who score low on Self Monitoring while reporting strong levels of social support for crime the positive relationship is very evident ($\eta^2 = .50$, $\beta = .40$, $p < .002$). This significant outcome seems to be due entirely to its presents among male subjects, as it is absent from the female subsample.

When it comes to a question of accounting for the variance in future deviance, the unclear results regarding the interaction effects of tolerance for law violations and self monitoring allow little in the way of conclusions. Results regarding the effect of the interaction between tolerance for law violations and social support for crime are somewhat more clear: those subjects who scored high on both measures were more likely to participate in future deviance than were any other subjects. Use of the combination variable allows the Self Monitoring measure to be added to the interaction between tolerance for law violations and social support for crime. The interaction effect of tolerance for law violations with that combination variable on future deviance is also significant. However, examination of the relevant beta co-efficients suggests that inclusion of the Self Monitoring

variable adds nothing to the interaction effect of tolerance for law violations with social support for crime ($\beta=.39$ for the interaction effect of tolerance for law violations with social support for crime; $\beta=.40$ for the interaction effect of tolerance for law violations with the combination variable).

Comparative Contributions of the R.I.S. Subscales
And the Measures From the Battery of Correlates
In Accounting for Variance in Rates of Deviance

The power of the Tolerance for Law Violations variable and of the measure of Social Support for Crime with respect to the extent to which they account for variance in the self report measures of recently committed and soon to be committed deviance has been shown to be impressive. The Religious Morality Subscale has also been shown to account for a significant, though lesser, proportion of the variance in those deviance rates, as has the measure of Social Support for Religion, particularly in interaction with Social Involvement in Religion. Of interest is the extent to which each set of measures -- the R.I.S. subscales and the core battery -- continues to account for variance in deviance rates once the effects of the other set and of the relevant covariates have been determined. Cross-sectional multiple regression analyses on time-1 data have been employed to provide a starting point for this examination.

The first analysis is summarized in Table 3.33. It reveals

Table 3.33
 Summary for Regression Analysis of RIS subscales followed by Core Criminological
 Battery on Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed
 (undergraduate sample, Time 1 data)

Entry	Variable	Correlation	Multi R	R ²	R ² Change	F	SIG F	Beta	Partial Corr.	Partial F	Sig F P.C.
1	Gender	-.42	.42	.177	.177	31.65	.001	-.28	-.36	20.67	.001
2	Faking	-.10	.47	.23	.046	8.62	.005	-.12	-.16	3.86	.05
3	Religious Morality	-.19	.49	.244	.021	3.98	.048	-.19	-.20	5.98	.02
4	Religious Commitment	.02	.56	.316	.073	15.19	.001	.25	.24	8.37	.005
5	Social Support for Crime	.57	.68	.468	.152	40.59	.001	.27	.32	15.64	.001
6	Psychopathy	.54	.73	.534	.065	19.79	.001	.21	.25	9.24	.005
7	Risks	.49	.74	.552	.018	5.67	.019	.16	.19	5.53	.020
8	Moral	.32	.75	.568	.016	5.11	.025	.14	.19	5.11	.025

that the core criminological battery retains the capacity to account for significant proportions of variance in the deviance measure after the covariates and R.I.S. subscales have been entered into the equation. The analysis procedure dealt with four sets of measures. The first set is made up of the same list of covariates employed in the previous multiple regression analyses, and of course, gender and the Faking measure were selected to the equation by the analysis procedure. The second set of variables is composed of the Religious Morality subscale and the variable constructed to represent the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion. Both variables in this set were forced into the equation. It is notable that Religious Morality contributed significantly to the variance accounted for in the deviance measure ($R\text{-squared-change}=.021$, $p<.05$), while the constructed interaction variable did not ($R\text{-squared-change}=.000$). The third set presented the remaining R.I.S. subscales to the analysis, and procedure, as was the case for the multiple regression analysis applied to the R.I.S. and covariate measures alone (see Table 3.18), selected only the Personal Religious Commitment Subscale. Table 3.33 shows that, to this point, more than 30 percent of the variance in the deviance measure had been accounted for ($R\text{-squared}=.316$ after entry of the Personal Religious Commitment measure).

The final set of variables presented to the analysis is composed of all of the measures from the core criminological battery. Four of those variables were selected to the equation by the analysis procedure: Social Support for Crime, Psychopathy,

Risk-taking, and deviant Morals. The measure of Tolerance for Law Violations is notably absent from this list. Nonetheless, Table 3.33 shows that after the consecutive significant contributions made by these four measures, the proportion of variance accounted for in the deviance measure was raised to over 55 percent ($R\text{-squared}=.568$ after the entry of the core battery).

Table 3.33 also shows that, at the completion of the analysis, the three strongest contributors in terms of accounting for variance in the deviance measure were Gender ($\beta=-.28$, $\text{partial-}r=-.36$, $p<.001$), Social Support for Crime ($\beta=.27$, $\text{partial-}r=.32$, $p<.001$), and Personal Religious Commitment ($\beta=.24$, $\text{partial-}r=.24$, $p<.005$). Not surprisingly, the variable constructed to represent the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion continued to make no contribution to the equation. However, the contribution provided by the Religious Morality measure continued to be significant ($\text{partial-}r=.20$, $p<.02$).

Although the core criminological battery attained a strong capacity to account for significant proportions in the variance of the self report measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed, it can be seen that their inclusion does not reduce the contributions of religious morality and of personal religious commitment to insignificant levels.

On the other hand, a regression analysis in which the measures from the core criminological battery were presented for entry into the equation before the R.I.S. subscales fails to provide direct evidence for the retention of power by the Religious Morality and

Personal Religious Commitment variables in accounting for variance in the deviance measure. That analysis, summarized in Table 3.34, presented the correlates of deviance in two steps following the entry of the covariates Gender and Faking into the equation. As was the case for the regression analysis for the correlates of deviance alone, the first group from the battery in this case consisted of the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations and Social Support for Crime, and the second contained the remainder of the battery measures. Of course, the results to this point are the same as for the earlier regression analysis (see Table 3.28): battery measures accepted by the analysis procedure include Social Support for Crime, Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, and Risk-taking, with the contribution to the equation of Tolerance for Law Violations being reduced to insignificance by the entry of Psychopathy and Risk-taking. The next step then presented all of the R.I.S. subscales to the analysis procedure, and none of them were accepted into the equation.

Table 3.35 presents a matrix of zero-order correlations between the R.I.S. subscales and the measures from the core criminological battery. It shows that Tolerance for Law Violations is strongly and negatively correlated to a number of the R.I.S. subscales, but that its strongest relationship is with religious morality ($r = -.327$, $p < .001$). Religious morality is also shown to be one of the strongest correlates of psychopathy ($r = -.205$, $p < .002$). On the other hand, Table 3.35 shows that social support for crime is strongly correlated with none of the R.I.S. subscales, including

Table 3.34
 Summary for Regression Analysis of Core Criminological Battery followed by
 RIS Subscales on Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed
 (undergraduate sample, Time 1 data)

Entry	Variable	Correlation	Multi R	R ²	R ² Change	F	SIG F	Beta	Partial Corr.	F	P.C.	Sig F	P.C.
1	Gender	-.42	.42	.177	.177	31.65	.001	-.25	-.31	14.89	.001		
2	Faking	-.10	.47	.223	.046	8.62	.005	-.15	-.19	5.81	.02		
3	Social Support for Crime	.57	.65	.428	.205	52.03	.001	.30	.35	19.52	.001		
4	Tolerance for Law Violations	.37	.67	.444	.016	4.19	.05	.05	.06	.47	ns		
5	Psychopathy	.54	.71	.507	.062	18.03	.001	.25	.28	12.41	.001		
6	Risks	.49	.73	.526	.019	5.75	.02	.16	.19	5.75	.02		

Table 3.35
Zero-Order Correlation Between the Core Criminological Battery and the RIS subscales
undergraduate sample, Time 1 data

	Tolerance for Law Violations	Social Support for Crime	Identification of Criminals	Aware- ness of Limited Opportunity	Risk Taking	Moral ity	Social- ization	Psycho- pathy	Neuro- icism	Inade- quacy/ Immaturity	Family Dissen- sion	Scho- lastic Maladjust- ment
Religious Commitment	-.244 ^G	.079	.101 ^A	-.019	-.159	-.179 ^D	.229 ^G	-.107 ^A	-.111 ^A	-.039	-.087 ^G	-.251
External Consequences	-.174 ^B	.055	.119 ^A	.022	-.163 ^C	-.187 ^C	.252 ^G	-.084	-.117 ^A	-.064	-.118 ^A	-.271 ^G
Religious Morality	-.327 ^G	-.084	.166 ^C	-.048	-.244 ^G	1.78	.348 ^G	-.205 ^F	-.201 ^E	.012	-.262 ^G	-.347 ^G
Social Involvement in Religion	-.262 ^G	.006	.085	-.018	-.108 ^A	-.237 ^G	.169 ^D	-.152 ^C	-.036	.054	-.128 ^B	-.206 ^E
Religious Uprighting	-.105 ^A	.043	-.033	.021	.021	-.026	.010	-.093 ^A	.056	.088	.029	0.063
Social Support for Religion	-.182 ^D	.114 ^A	.133 ^B	-.056	-.053	-.181 ^D	.133 ^B	-.221 ^G	-.105 ^A	.053	-.169 ^D	-.106 ^A
Religious Experiences	-.223 ^G	.035	.089	-.044	-.126 ^B	-.152 ^C	.106 ^A	-.091	-.049	.113 ^A	-.024	-.209 ^E
Extrinsic/Mean Orientation	-.025	.027	.114 ^A	-.018	.009	.047	.061	-.064	.076	.099 ^A	-.085	.027
Intrinsic/Ends Orientation	-.234 ^G	.057	.087	.002	-.127 ^B	-.172 ^D	.195 ^D	-.106 ^A	-.089	.068	-.087	-.048 ^G
External Orientation	-.117 ^A	.071	.031	.039	-.076	-.037	.111 ^A	-.119 ^A	-.015	.098 ^A	-.035	-.117 ^A

Table 3.35
Zero-Order Correlation Between the Core Criminological Battery and the RIS subscales
undergraduate sample, Time 1 data
(continued)

	Social Tolerance for Law Violations	Support for Crime	Identifi- cation of Criminal	Aware- ness of Limited Others Opportunity	Risk Taking	Morality	Social- ization	Psycho- Neurot- icism	Inade- quacy/ Immune- security	Family Dissen- sion	Scho- lastic Maladjust- ment
Internal Orientation	-.244 ^G	.019	.093 ^A	-.092	-.117 ^A	-.137 ^B	.189 ^D	-.066	-.002	-.098 ^A	-.216 ^G
Quest/Seeking Orientation	.059	.101 ^A	-.133 ^B	.058	-.069	.064	-.049	.151 ^C	.016	.045	-.142 ^B

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

Social Support for Religion ($r=.114$, $p<.10$). Interestingly, these two social support measures are positively correlated. In fact, the only R.I.S. variable negatively correlated with social support for crime is Religious Morality ($r=-.084$). Based on these correlations, and correlations with the measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed (see Tables 3.17 and 3.32), it would be surprising if Tolerance for Law Violations and Psychopathy did not serve to reduce the relationship between religious morality and the deviance measure to an insignificant level. The small and positive correlation between social support for crime and social support for religion, though, suggests that the relationship between the deviance measure and social support for religion, particularly in interaction with social involvement in religion, might not be reduced to insignificance through controls for the effects of social support for crime.

As reflected in the hypotheses of the present dissertation, an intention of this work was to examine the effects of certain core correlates of deviance on certain R.I.S. subscale correlations with deviance. Specifically, we expected that the R.I.S. correlations with deviance would be reduced to non-significant levels by such controls. A number of explorations of the effects of controls for core battery scores on R.I.S.-deviance correlations are appended (see Appendix XXVII). Similarly, various core battery correlations with deviance were examined with controls introduced for R.I.S. scores (see Appendix XXVII). Because of fluctuating n 's across various combinations of variables, and because of occasional small sample sizes, these

analyses are, at best, suggestive of trends. However, the following conclusions appear warranted.

- 1) reflecting their moderate to strong negative correlations with R.I.S. subscales, controls for Psychopathy and Tolerance for Law violations did reduce the Religious Morality/deviance link to generally non-significant levels.
- 2) Controls for Social Support for Crime failed to eliminate the Religious morality by Social Support for Religion interaction. Similarly, the Social Support for Religion by Social Involvement in Religion interaction was not eliminated.
- 3) Many intriguing potential interactions exist for further analyses in subsequent studies.

Deviance in relation to Change Scores on the Predictors

The one criterion measure which has not yet been examined in relation to the deviance measures is that of Reported Religious Change. The Reported Religious Change subscale was administered only at the time-2 phase of the experiment. This subscale inquires as to changes on four aspects of religious involvement -- beliefs and convictions, participation, personal relationship with God, and social associations (see Appendix VIII, item 7F). It also asked subjects to indicate whether they had undergone any significant experiences of God, and to note the extent to which significant religious experiences had influenced their lifestyles or behaviour.

Table 3.36 presents a row of correlation co-efficients showing the strengths of links between the Reported Religious Change subscale to the self report deviance measures. These co-efficients are based on the undergraduate sample time-2 data. All of them are in the negative direction, but only four are large enough to yield probability levels less than .05 (see Table 3.36). Appendix XXVIII presents the equivalent data for the religious sample, and reveals no significant correlations. Although there is evidence of weak relationships between deviance and beliefs regarding the extend of changes in one's religiousness, then, reported religious change is not a good indicator of deviant involvement.

Actual change scores were derived by calculating simple difference scores (time-1 subtracted from time-2). As reviewed in Appendix XXIX, the use of change scores did not improve the predictability of deviance.

On Victimizing and Victimless Deviance

A canonical correlation was performed to examine whether selected criterion variables from among the R.I.S. subscales and the battery of correlates of deviance relate differentially to victimizing and victimless deviance. A single canonical solution was extracted by the analysis. It portrays the measures of Amount of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed and Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed as related strongly and in the same direction ($r=.743$ for the measure of victimless deviance;

Table 3.36
Zero-Order Correlation Between the Deviance Measure and Reported Religious Change
Time 2 Cross-sectional Data, Undergraduate Sample

	No. of Types of Victimization Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Victimeless Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Victimization Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Victimeless Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victimization Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victimeless Deviance recently Committed	Total Amount of Deviance
Reported Religious Change	-.028	-.101	-.112	-.153 ^B	-.102	-.158 ^B	-.121 ^A	-.159 ^B

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .05$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

$r = .909$ for the measure of victimizing deviance) to a canonical variable composed of Religious Morality, Social Support for Religion, Personal Religious Commitment, Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, and Religious experiences from among the R.I.S. subscales, and Criminal Sentiments, Identification with Criminal Others, Tolerance of Law Violations, Social Support for Crime, Deviant Morality, Risk-taking, Psychopathy, Family Dissension, and Scholastic Mal-adjustment from among the battery of correlates of deviance. This finding suggests that no distinction need be made between measures of recent victimizing and victimless deviance on the bases of either religious involvement or other proven indicators of deviance.

This point is illustrated with respect to the R.I.S. subscales in Table 3.37. That table displays the zero-order correlations between the five R.I.S. subscales used in the canonical analysis and the separate measures of victimizing and victimless deviance. It also presents the correlations between those five R.I.S. measures and the canonical deviance variable. It shows that significant relationships with the separate deviance measures are attributable only to Religious Morality, and that it is related equally to both variables ($r = -.183$ in both cases). Table 3.37 also shows that all of the R.I.S. subscales are correlated more strongly with the canonical deviance variable, and that this is particularly true of Religious Morality ($r = -.463$), Social Support for Religion ($r = -.308$), and Beliefs in Eternal Consequences ($r = -.167$).

Table 3.37
Zero Order Correlation Coefficients Linking Selected RIS
Subscales with Amount of Victimizing and Amount of
Victimless Deviance Recently Committed and with the
Canonical Variable Combining Them

RIS Variables	Amount of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed	Canonical
Religious Morality	-.183	-.183	-.463
Social Support for Religion	-.036	-.117	-.308
Religious Commitment	.006	-.065	-.099
External Consequences	-.058	-.060	-.167
Religious Experiences	-.038	-.056	-.084

Table 3.38
Zero Order Correlation Coefficients Linking Selected Measures
from the Core Criminological Battery with
Victimizing and Victimless Deviance and with the
Canonical Variable Combining Them

RIS Variables	Amount of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed	Canonical
Tolerance for Law Violations	.242	.291	.512
Social Support for Crime	.438	.381	.649
Psychopathy	.338	.278	.606
Morality	.266	.195	.406
Risk Taking	.369	.275	.593

Table 3.38 displays the equivalent data for five of the measures from the core criminological battery -- Social Support for Crime, Tolerance of Law Violations, Psychopathy, Deviant Morality, and Risk Taking. All are shown to be related positively and strongly to both single deviance measures, but not with correlation estimates which appear different enough in magnitude to justify separating the two deviance measures. Each measure is also shown to be much more strongly to the canonical deviance variable.

Correlates of Pro-social Behaviour

Having examined in depth the relationships among religious involvement variables, measures from a battery touted as correlates of deviance, and deviant behaviour itself -- anti-social behaviour -- This chapter concludes with a brief exploration of relationships between the predictor variables and a measure of pro-social behaviour. As was demonstrated in Table 3.12, the only bio-demographic variables bearing significant correlations with the measure of Pro-social Behaviour employed in this study are Mother's Education ($r=.127$, $p<.05$) and Convictions ($r=.171$, $p<.01$).

Table 3.39 displays a similar column of correlation co-efficients detailing the relationships between pro-social behaviour and the R.I.S. subscales. It shows that two of the subscales are moderately and positively associated with the measure of Pro-social Behaviour -- Intrinsic/Ends Orientation to Religion ($r=.130$, $p<.05$) and Social Involvement in Religion ($r=.165$, $p<.02$). A third -- Religious Experiences -- is more

Table 3.39

Zero-order Correlations
Between Measures of RIS Subscales
And Pro-social Behavior
(Time One Cross-sectional Data,
Undergraduate Sample)

	Pro- Social Behavior
Religious Commitment	0.107 ^A
Eternal Consequences	-0.047
Religious Morality	0.075
Social Involvement in Religion	0.165 ^C
Religious Upbringing	0.093
Social Support for Religion	0.078
Religious Experiences	0.229 ^F
Extrinsic/Means Orientation	0.048
Intrinsic/Ends Orientation	0.130 ^B
External Orientation	0.120 ^A
Internal Orientation	0.066
Quest/Seeking Orientation	0.048

Coding for "p" values: A: ≤ .10 E: ≤ .005
 B: ≤ .05 F: ≤ .002
 C: ≤ .02 G: ≤ .001
 D: ≤ .01

strongly associated with the dependent measure ($r=.229$, $p<.02$).

A regression analysis was performed to examine the extent to which R.I.S. subscales combine to account for variance in the Pro-social Behaviour measure. The religious involvement variables were presented to the analysis procedure after a step had been taken to allow the effects of the bio-demographic measures, excepting measures of convictions and religious affiliation, to be removed. The results of that analysis is summarized in Table 3.40. It shows that none of the bio-demographic variables were selected by the analysis procedure to the equation. Not surprisingly, then, the measure of Religious Experiences was the first R.I.S. subscale selected to the equation. Neither of the other two subscales shown in Table 3.39 to correlate significantly with pro-social behaviour were found to account additionally for variance in the dependent variable. Rather, the measure of Beliefs in Eternal Consequences is shown to add a significant contribution in this regard, due to a significant negative partial correlation (partial- $r=-.20$, $p<.02$). Table 3.40 displays a small zero-order correlation between Beliefs in Eternal Consequences and Pro-social Behaviour of .04. This suggests that that relationship is suppressed by the measure of Religious Experiences. This is interpreted to suggest that, among persons having undergone little in the way of religious experiences, beliefs in eternal consequences are negatively associated with pro-social, helping behaviour. However, this may mean very little when one considers that, taken together, the two religious involvement variables account for only 7.4 percent of the variance in the Pro-social Behaviour measure.

Table 3.40
Zero-Order Correlations Between the Core Criminological Battery and the Measures
of Pro-social Behaviour (Undergraduate and Religious Samples)
Time . Cross-sectional Data

	Tolerance for Law Violations	Criminal Sentiments	Social Support for Crime	Identification with Criminal Others	Aware- ness of Limited Opportunity	Morality	Risk Taking	Social- ization	Neurot- icism	Psycho- pathy	Inade- quacy/ Imma- turity	Family Dissen- sion	Scho- lastic Maladjust- ment
Pro-social (undergrad.)	-.129 ^B	.072	.211 ^F	-.005	-.151 ^B	-.052	-.124 ^B	-.078	.029	.049	.161 ^C	.078	.084
Pro-social (religious)	.164	-.119	.164	.095	-.287 ^A	-.073	-.065	.208	-.035	-.018	-.343 ^A	-.064	-.010

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

The relationship between pro-social behaviour and the measures from the battery of correlates of deviance was also examined, and is summarized in the row of correlation co-efficients presented in Table 3.41. The strongest relationship is shown to be a positive one involving the measure of Social Support for Crime ($r=.211$, $p<.002$). Several other moderate relationships are also indicated, involving Inadequacy/Immaturity ($r=.161$, $p<.02$), Awareness of Limited Opportunity ($r=-.151$, $p<.05$), Tolerance for Law Violations ($r=-.129$, $p<.05$), and Risk-taking ($r=.124$, $p<.05$). The measures from the battery of correlates were then submitted to a regression analysis similar to that performed on the R.I.S. subscales. The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 3.42, which shows that two of the battery measures make independent and insignificant contributions to variance in the Pro-social Behaviour measure -- Social Support for Crime and Awareness of Limited Opportunities. Together they account for about 9 percent of the variance ($R\text{-squared}=.088$).

Finally, a regression analysis was carried out involving five predictor variables -- Religious Experiences, Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, Social Support for Crime, Awareness of Limited Opportunities, and Convictions. Table 3.43 shows that all five were entered into the equation as making independent, significant contributions to the variance in Pro-social Behaviour. Together they account for close to 18 percent of the variance ($R\text{-squared}=.177$). Table 3.43 also indicates that the two most important variables in the equation are the R.I.S. subscales --

Table 3.41

Summary For Regression Analysis
Of The RIS Subscales on The Measure of Pro-social Behavior
(Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)

Entry	Variable	correlation	multi. R	R ²	R ² Change	F	Sig F	Beta	Partial Cor	F P.C.	Sig F P.C.
1	Religious Experiences	0.18	0.18	0.034	0.034	5.04	<.05	0.35	0.27	11.22	<.001
2	External Consequences	-0.04	0.27	0.074	0.040	6.25	<.02	-0.26	-0.20	6.25	<.02

Table 3.42

Summary For Regression Analysis
Of The Core Criminological Battery on The Measure of Pro-social Behavior
(Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)

Entry	Variable	correlation	multi. R	R ²	R ² Change	F	Sig F	Beta	Partial Cor	F P.C.	Sig F P.C.
1	Social Support For Crime	0.22	0.22	0.047	0.047	7.41	≤.01	0.22	0.25	7.62	<.01
2	Awareness of Limited Opportunity	-0.15	0.29	0.088	0.041	7.14	.001	-0.20	-0.21	7.14	<.02

Table 3.43

Summary For Regression Analysis of Unique Correlates
 Convictions, Religious Experiences, External Consequences,
 Social Support For Religion, Awareness of Limited Opportunity on Pro-social Behavior
 (Undergraduate Sample, Time One Data)

Entry	Variable	correlation	multi. R	R ²	R ² Change	F	Sig F	Beta	Partial Cor	F P.C.	Sig F P.C.
1	Religious Experiences	0.23	0.23	0.052	0.050	9.78	≤.005	0.36	0.31	17.06	<.001
2	External Consequences	-0.04	0.31	0.098	0.046	9.60	<.001	-0.26	-0.22	9.12	<.005
3	Social Support For Crime	0.22	0.37	0.136	0.078	9.21	<.001	0.18	0.21	7.08	<.01
4	Convictions	0.17	0.39	0.157	0.021	8.08	<.001	0.15	0.15	4.80	<.05
5	Awareness of Limited Opportunity	-0.15	0.42	0.177	0.020	7.42	<.001	-0.14	-0.15	4.16	<.05

Religious Experiences ($\beta = .36$), and Beliefs in Eternal Consequences ($\beta = -.26$). This finding should not be unexpected, as the battery measures have been designed by their authors specifically as indicators of anti-social behaviour.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Of the four hypotheses advanced in the present dissertation two have received unqualified support. Partial support was presented for the other two.

- A) Religious Morality is uncontested as the religious involvement measure most strongly and negatively associated with deviance.
- B) The measure of Social Support for Religion interacts with each of Religious Morality and Social Involvement in Religion in association with deviance rates. An interaction between Social Support for Religion and Religious Upbringing was not found.
- C) Social Support for Religion is more strongly and negatively linked to deviance among those who score high on the measure of Self Monitoring than it is among those who score low on that measure.
- D) The association between Religious Morality and deviance is, for the most part, reduced to nonsignificant levels when the effects of specific measures from the battery of correlates of deviance are removed, those measures being Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, and Social Support for Crime; in particular, the reduction of that relationship is effected through statistical controls for Tolerance for Law Violations and Psychopathy. Only among those reporting strong levels of social support for religion did the relationship retain significant probability levels. Statistical removal of the effects of Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, and

Social Support for Crime also reduces to nonsignificant levels the relationships between deviance rates and the interactions combining Social Support for Religion with Religious Morality and Social Involvement in Religion; it was found, though, that such reductions could not be attributed to controls for the measure of Social Support for Crime alone.

These hypotheses were tested through the use of a wide range of measures of religious involvement, a tried and true approach to gathering self report data on deviant behaviour, a comprehensive battery of well-known correlates of deviance, a number of bio-demographic variables a measure of positive molingering -- Faking -- and a measure of Self Monitoring. Data were gathered from a sample of 192 undergraduate university students and a smaller sample of 26 "religious" adults.

Data from the sample of religious adults were gathered to help test the validity of the subscales of the Religious Involvement Survey through comparison of its scores with those of the undergraduate sample. Validation of the R.I.S. subscales through this and other procedures was required because many of those measures were developed and used for the first time in the present thesis. The 27 subscales were developed, adopted and adapted based on explorations into the literature from the social scientific study of religion including research into the relationship between deviance and religious involvement, theological appropriateness of items and scales, appropriateness for use among members of a non-religious population -- the undergraduates, directions implied by Social learning theory, and

the hypotheses of the present dissertation. The rationale for the developmental procedure for the Religious Involvement Survey is detailed in the methodology chapter, and the empirical and rational bases for reducing the number of subscales from 27 to 13 is detailed in the Results chapter.

In support of an a priori expectation, the religious sample obtained higher mean scores than the undergraduate sample, even when controls were introduced for those covariates that distinguished between the samples, on measures of Social Involvement in Religion, Social Support for Religion, Religious Experiences, and measures implicating religious orthodoxy including Personal Religious Commitment, Religious Morality, and Beliefs in Eternal Consequences. The religious sample was also distinguished from the undergraduate sample on the basis of higher mean scores on measures of Religious Upbringing, Reported Religious Change (between the time-1 and time-2 phases of the experiment), Intrinsic/Ends Orientation to Religion, Internal Orientation to Religion, and External Orientation to Religion. The two samples also differed with respect to the measure of Extrinsic/Means to Religion, with the religious sample obtaining the lower mean score. Finally, the two samples could not be distinguished on the basis of the measure of Quest/Seeking Orientation to Religion to Religion. This last finding is not particularly surprising, as the Quest/Seeking Orientation, proposed by Battson and Ventis (1982) is touted as a measure which cuts across religious affiliations as well as other religious orientations. Furthermore, in terms of its application among

populations of people with predominantly Christian affiliations as pointed out in the literature review of the present thesis, that orientation appears to be strongly associated with affiliation to liberal Christian philosophies, which tend to reflect contemporary rather than fundamentalist Christian mores. In terms of internal and test-retest reliability, however, the Quest/Seeking Orientation measure produced among the lowest estimates for the undergraduate sample and for the two samples combined. This is also true of the Extrinsic/Ends Orientation measure. All other measures from the revised list of subscales of the R.I.S. found these tests to be sources of support for their validity.

Future studies employing these religious involvement measures might find it appropriate to realign them. For example, as shown through factor analysis, the measures of Beliefs in Eternal Consequences and Religious Morality might be combined with the measure of Personal Religious Commitment, since that larger subscale contains many items tapping religious beliefs as well. However, for studies of religious involvement and deviance, the literature indicates that integrity be maintained for a measure of Beliefs in Eternal Consequences (Hirschi and Stark, 1969; Burkett and Warren, 19987), and of Religious Morality (Hebert, unp).

The approach to measuring deviant involvement employed in this research has been used in a number of previous works, including Hebert's unpublished paper. For details on this approach see the methodology chapter. It allows three distinct classes of self report data to be gathered: number of types of deviance ever committed, number of types of deviance recently committed, and

amount of deviance recently committed. The present research relied on the last of those classes of data. However, as Hebert found, the instrument from which this approach is derived is not designed to distinguish between victimless and victimizing deviance. Future research efforts might endeavour to supplement this instrument particularly with items tapping victimless deviance when exploring the issue of whether predictor measures -- religious or others -- are associated differentially with those two types of deviance. Consideration might also be given to the addition of population specific items, as was done by Lorri in her unpublished 1986 study of university campus deviance.

Besides the R.I.S. subscales the present dissertation employed thirteen other predictor variables. Details regarding those measures are outlined in the methodology chapter. Most of them were found to correlate highly with the deviance measures, including the measure of Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. Two of the variables not significantly related to that self report measure are Awareness of Limited Opportunity and Inadequacy/Immaturity.

The measure of Awareness of Limited Opportunity stems from class-based theories of criminality, and is shown in the present study to be unrelated to all of the measures of deviance. This finding serves to reiterate the irrelevance of such theories to an understanding of deviant behaviour. Inadequacy/Immaturity is a personality measure, and relates only to measures of number of types of deviance ever committed. Those relationships are positive, and only moderate in strength. The personality measures

of Socialization, Psychopathy, and Neuroticism, however, are shown to be strongly related to all three classes of deviance data. It is important to note here, though, that a number of the items contained in the Socialization measure also appear in either the Psychopathy or Neuroticism measures. Caution should be undertaken, then, in studies which employ these three measures together. As Gorsuch points out (1984), if the ideal of uncorrelated predictor measures cannot be realized, then at the least items should not be shared among them so that they might conceptually measure different domains.

Depending on the focus of a given study, any of these predictor variables, or any combination of them, might be desirable. Given the findings of the present thesis, and of Hebert's unpublished study, research efforts examining the efficacy of religious involvement measures as indicators of deviance would do well to employ the Tolerance of Law Violations measure as it is a strong correlate of deviance which is also an appropriate counterpart to any Religious Morality scale. Any study of deviance, however, would do well to utilize the measures of Social Support for Crime, Psychopathy, and Risk-taking. The present research found them to be among the four highest correlates of the deviance measures. They were also found to make significant and independent contributions in accounting for variance in the measure of Amount of Deviance Recently Committed after the effects of the covariates Gender and Faking were controlled. In fact, in combination with those covariates, these three predictor variables taken together appear to account for over 50 percent of the variance in the

deviance measure.

The co-variate measures of Gender and Faking are the only ones found to make significant and independent contributions to variance in the measure of Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. The list of covariates also included Age, and a number of other bio-demographic variables, as is detailed in the methodology chapter. That Age failed to make a significant independent contribution to variance in the deviance measure may be an artifact of the present investigation. It is known to be a strong correlate of deviance, and a number of moderate to strong negative correlations with various deviance measures were revealed here as well. Significant correlations between the deviance measures and such class- and status-based bio-demographic variables as Education, Occupation, and those implicating parental education and occupation are noticeably lacking. This is also true of measures implying parental welfare support and family benefits. On the other hand, measures tapping parental education, and particularly that of Father's Education, are negatively correlated with some measures of religious involvement, including specifically measures implicating religious beliefs. As well, the measure of Faking was found to correlate significantly and positively with that of Religious Morality.

Studies of deviant behaviour, then, should include as covariates measures of gender, age, and some measure of positive molingering. Consideration of inclusion of measures tapping parental education should also be given for studies of religious involvement and deviance.

On Other Issues Relevant to
The Relationship Between
Religious Involvement and Deviance

Two other issues relevant to the relationship between religious involvement and deviance were examined, and, for all intents and purposes, those examinations produced null results.

- a) No R.I.S. measure, and no measure from the battery of core correlates of deviance related differentially with victimless and victimizing deviance. This was shown in the canonical analysis.
- b) Little was indicated in the way of relationships between Change scores on predictor variables (time-2 minus time-1) and scores on amount of deviance committed between the two phases of the experiment.

Religious Morality, Personal
Religious Commitment and Deviance

An unanticipated finding arose out of the regression analysis relating the R.I.S. subscales to the proportion of variance accounted for in Amount of Deviance Recently Committed (see Table 3.18). This analysis shows that, after the effects of the covariates Gender and Faking have been taken into account, Religious Morality retains the strongest partial correlation with the deviance measure. After its effects are accounted for, the only other variable displaying a significant partial correlation with the deviance measure is Personal Religious Commitment. That partial correlation is a positive, and rather strong one of .28,

even though the corresponding zero-order correlation of .02 is negligible. As well, that partial correlation had been nonsignificant in magnitude before the Religious Morality measure was entered into the equation. This finding is interpreted to indicate that religious morality exerts a suppressing effect on a relatively strong association between deviance and personal religious commitment (orthodoxy and personal relationship with God). This suppressing effect is such that, among persons having a low level of ascription to religious moral sanctions, personal religious commitment is associated with higher rates of deviant involvement.

There is evidence that the interaction between religious morality and personal religious commitment uncovered here is a powerful one. Table 3.44 shows that the partial correlations between the deviance measure and each of those subscales are not reduced to nonsignificant levels even through the subsequent entry into the equation of the measures from the battery of prospective correlates of deviance. However, when the measures from the battery were entered into the equation before the R.I.S. variables, neither Religious Morality nor Personal Religious Commitment displayed significant partial correlations with the deviance measure.

The temptation at this point is to speculate about the relevance of this interaction effect to notable scandals involving members of the clergy and famous television evangelists. The temptation will be resisted here, however, except to suggest that this topic will provide important discussion material if this

finding can be replicated and further elucidated in future research efforts.

Relationships with Pro-social Behaviour

Only nine of the 26 potential correlates were found to correlate significantly with the measure of Pro-social Behaviour. Seven of those are correlated positively -- the covariate item tapping whether or not a respondent has ever been convicted of a criminal offense, Religious Experiences, Social Involvement in Religion, Intrinsic/Ends Orientation to Religion, Social Support for Crime, Inadequacy/Immaturity, and Risk-taking. Two others are correlated negatively -- Tolerance for Law Violations, and Awareness of Limited Opportunity. The set of analyses performed with respect to examination of these relationships is not an indepth one. Nevertheless, some comments are deemed to be appropriate.

That social involvement in religion should be associated with pro-social behaviour is not surprising, since participation in religious services and activities places one in a milieu wherein such behaviour is preached and encouraged. Nor is the moderate positive relationship between Intrinsic/Ends Orientation to Religion and Pro-social Behaviour unexpected, as such findings have been revealed in the literature of the social scientific study of Religion (Battson and Ventis, 1982). Battson and Ventis found that, if controls are introduced for a variable measuring social desirability, the relationship between intrinsic religiousness and helping behaviour will be reduced to nonsignificant levels. Considering the correlation of .130

linking these two measures in the present study, and the correlation of .141 linking Intrinsic/Ends Orientation to Religion with Faking, one would expect an analysis of covariance controlling for the effects of Faking to reveal a null relationship between intrinsic religiousness and pro-social behaviour in this instance as well.

What is somewhat surprising is the correlation of .229 relating religious experiences to pro-social behaviour. From a rational standpoint, it would seem that the items of the Religious Experiences subscale refer to material less proximally associated with pro-social behaviour than do the items of the Social Involvement in Religion subscale. Why the link between religious experiences and pro-social behaviour would be stronger than that involving social involvement in religion, or for that matter, those implicating other subscales with which Religious Experiences is strongly related such as Personal Religious Commitment, is difficult to understand. It may be that religious experiences provide for an individual a heightened sense of the reality of God, and so, an increased urgency to carry out the command to love one's neighbour. However, the present examination is not of the sort which could provide empirical evidence for the role of such a mediating variable.

A further surprise was encountered when all R.I.S. subscales were entered into a regression analysis as a single and only block, with the measure of Pro-Social Behaviour as the dependent variable. The analysis procedure selected Religious Experiences to the equation firstly, of course. However, the only other

measure chosen is that of Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, and it was chosen on the basis of a significant negative partial correlation with Pro-social Behaviour. The zero-order correlation of .04 relating Beliefs in Eternal Consequences with Pro-social Behaviour is negligible. It appears, then, that a suppressing interaction between Religious Experiences and Beliefs in Eternal Consequences has been exposed. If such an interaction is veridical, it can be interpreted to suggest that, among persons who have undergone little in the way of religious experiences, strong ascription to beliefs in eternal consequences for behaviour in this life is associated with avoidance of pro-social (helping) behaviour.

That such measures as having ever been convicted, Social Support for Crime, Risk-taking, and Inadequacy/Immaturity should be positively and significantly linked with Pro-social Behaviour, or that Tolerance for Law Violations and Awareness of Limited Opportunities should be negatively linked with that measure, also defies easy rational explanation. The sturdiness of the measure of awareness of Limited Opportunity, in particular, is demonstrated by the regression analysis wherein only it and Social Support for Crime were selected by the analysis procedure from among the battery of prospective correlates of deviance as making significant and independent contributions in accounting for variance in the measure of pro-social behaviour.

A final regression analysis shows that each of the measures of Religious Experience, Beliefs in Eternal Consequences, Social Support for Crime, Awareness of Limited Opportunities, and

Convictions make significant and independent contributions in accounting for variance in the pro-social Behaviour measure. It demonstrates, too, that the two measures first selected to the regression equation, and the ones which also retain the highest partial correlations with the dependent variable, are Religious Experiences and Beliefs in Eternal Consequences.

Directions for Future Research

The following statement is offered with respect to the present dissertation:

Many intriguing findings have emerged from the present research, most of which were expected and a few of which are surprising, and these findings stem from analyses of data which were gathered using a somewhat inefficient data gathering process, which was rendered so in part due to the comprehensive but cumbersome Religious Involvement Survey.

Having offered this statement, a number of directions for future research are proposed as follow-up to the procedures and findings of the present study.

- 1: Development of an instrument for the purposes of gathering information on religious involvement which reflects the principles should be view as an advancement in marrying the disciplines of social psychology and the social scientific study of religion. The instrument presented and utilized in the present dissertation, however, is not now in a most desirable form.
- 1: Through tests of internal reliability and inter-item relationships efforts should be made to eliminate irrelevant

and redundant items so as to increase the efficiency of the Beliefs in Eternal Consequences and Religious Experiences subscales.

- b: Similar efforts might be taken with respect to the Personal Religious Commitment subscales but only in the case that it is can be determined that this subscale adds anything to an understanding of religious involvement not already available through measures of religious orthodoxy such as have been developed and validated by Fullerton and Hunsberger (1982).
- c: The Religious Morality subscale should be increased in size to include items which reflect the three commandments of the Judao-Christian faith not presently represented; they are "I am the lord your God, you shall place no other gods before me",
"You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain",
"You shall not covet your neighbour's goods".

Factor analyses on the revised subscale would be appropriate to determine whether similar factor structures are then extracted

- d: The Social Involvement in Religion subscale should be altered to form a measure of religious participation. This should be done through elimination of the nine items refering to co-participation in religious services and activities with family, friends and acquaintances. Tests of internal reliability and inter-item relationships should then be conducted to determine whether the further elimination of items is warranted.

2: Taking into account the results of factor analyses of the

revised Religious Morality subscale, explorations should be conducted to determine which individual factors, and which combinations of factors are associated significantly with deviance. Study should also be made of which individual factors and which combinations of factors interact with measures of religious associates in relation to deviance.

- 3: A study including analyses of covariance should be conducted to determine whether a measure of social support for religion interacts in relation to deviance rates with a measure of religious participation as derived from the Social Involvement in Religion subscale employed in the present dissertation.
- 4: Research should be conducted to determine whether the results of the regression analysis can be replicated which demonstrates the suppression effect had by religious morality on a positive association between personal religious commitment and recent deviant behaviour. If these results are replicated, exploratory covariance and correlational analyses should be performed to determine at what low level of ascription to religious moral sanctions is a positive relationship between personal religious commitment and deviance found to exist.
- 5: Multiple analyses of variance, including canonical correlational analyses, should be conducted, using appropriately supplemented deviance measuring instruments, to determine whether measures of religious involvement, and/or measures for which a strong relation with deviance has been proven, relate differentially to victimless and victimizing deviance. Such analyses could also be employed to demonstrate whether or not

whether measures relate differentially to marijuana use and other forms of deviance.

- 6: Correlational analyses should be performed to determine whether replication is forthcoming with respect to relationships between pro-social behaviour and measures of religious involvement, such as religious experiences, religious participation, and an intrinsic/ends orientation to religion. If the results revealed in this thesis are replicated,
- a: they should be further explored through analyses of variance;
 - b: correlational and/or covariance analyses should be performed to seek support for the premise that any relationship between intrinsic religiousness and pro-social behaviour will be reduced to nonsignificant levels through the introduction of controls for measures of social desirability or positive malingering;
 - c: research should be conducted to demonstrate whether or not replication is forthcoming with respect to the suppression effect of religious experiences on a negative relationship between beliefs in eternal consequences and pro-social behaviour, and if these results are replicated, exploratory correlational and variance analyses should be performed to determine at what low level of religious experiences to pro-social behaviour and beliefs in eternal consequences for behaviours in this life are inversely associated.

Conclusions

The present thesis, with its results, joins a long, decades-old list of studies which define an association between religious involvement and reduced rates of deviance and crime. Long past are the times when it could be said in good faith that research on the relationship between religiousness and criminality is inconclusive. This study has been unable to provide support for those which have distinguished types of deviance which are more strongly and negatively linked to religious involvement. However, it has provided clear evidence as to which conceptualizations of religious involvement are associated with lower incidences of self reports of overall amount of deviance recently committed.

The conceptualizations of religious involvement defined here, and found to be associated with reduced deviance, all involve a context characterized by social support for religious involvement. Where such support is available, ascription to religious moral sanctions, participation in religious activities, and religious upbringing are negatively linked to deviant involvement; in its absence, ascriptions to religious moral sanctions and religious upbringing are unrelated to deviant involvement, and participation in religious activities appears to be positively associated with deviance. As such, the findings of Stark, Kent and Doyle (1982) are supported and expanded upon. Furthermore, the method used here to measure the presence of such a context is more efficient than those employed by either Stark and his colleagues, or by Tittle and Welsh (1983). Use of this measurement instrument also appears to surmount the problem of conceptualizing in an

experimental setting interactions between a context of social support for religious involvement and personal religious involvement. The power of the social support for religion context was also demonstrated: within it, ascription to religious moral sanctions was associated with lower rates of deviance even when the effects of a very high density of risk factors was taken into account -- criminal associates, attitudes supportive of law violations, and psycho-sociopathic personality orientation. As well, among persons reporting higher than average levels of criminal associates or attitudes tolerant of law violations, within the context of social support for religion, religious participation was found to be associated with reduced deviance rates, while outside that context it was found to be highly associated with augmented deviance rates.

Important inferences can be drawn here for religious institutions and organizations wishing to encourage in their members a morality counteractive to anti-social behaviour. It is evident that to preach religious moral sanctions and religious participation is not enough. Successful direction into such a morality must include the provision of a milieu supportive of religiousness, and encouragement of members to adopt such a milieu into their own lives.

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswick, E., Livinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harpers.
- Ajzen, W., & Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-Behaviour Relations: A Theoretical Analysis and Review of Empirical Research. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 888-918.
- approach (third edition). Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth.
- Akers, R. L., & Cochran, J. K. (1986). Adolescent marijuana use: A test of three theories of Deviant behaviour. Deviant Behaviour, 6, 323-346.
- Albrech, S. L., Chadwick, B. A., & Alcorn, D. S. (1977). Religiosity and Deviance: Application of an attitude-behaviour consistency contingency. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 16, 263-274.
- Alexander, J. F., & Parsons, B. E. (1973). Short term Behavioural intervention with delinquent families: Impact on family process and recidivism. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 81, 219-225.
- Allen, R. O. & Spilka, B. (1967). Committed and Consensual Religion: a Specification of Religion-prejudice Relationships. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 6, 191-206.

- Allport, G. W. (1950). The Individual and His Religion.
New York: MacMillan.
- Allport, G. W. & Cramer, B. M. (1946). Some Roots of prejudice.
Journal of Psychology, 22, 9-39.
- Allport, J. W., & Ross, J. M. (1967). Personal Religious
Orientation and prejudice. Journal of Personality and Social
Psychology, 5, 432-443.
- Alter, M. G. (1986). Religious Experience Inventory: An
empirical investigation of Christian religious maturity and
of its Relationship to Mental Health. Dissertation Abstracts
International, 46, 1973.
- Andrews, D. A. (1980). Some Experimental Investigations of
differential Association Through Deliberate Manipulations of
the structure of Service Systems. American Sociological
Review, 45, 442-462.
- Andrews, D. A. (1983). Assessment of outcome in correctional
Samples. In: M. J. Lambert, E. R. Christianson and S.S. de
Julio (Eds), The Assessment of Psychotherapy Outcome
(PP160-201). New York: John Wiley.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., and Wormith, J. S. (1988). Criminal
Behaviour: Notes for 49:342. Ottawa: Carleton University
Bookstore.

- Andrews, D. A., Kiessling, J. J., Russel, R. J., & Grant, B. A., (1979). Volunteers and the One to One Supervision of Adult Probationers. Toronto, Ont.: Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D. A., & Wormith, J. S. (1989). Personality and Crime: Knowledge Destruction and Construction in Criminology. Justice Quarterly, 13, in press.
- Andrews, D. A., Wormith, J. S., & Kiessling, J. J. (1985). Self-reported Criminal Propensity and Criminal Behaviour: Threats to the Validity of Assessments of Attitudes and Personality. Canada Department of the Solicitor General. Programmes Branch.
- Andrews, K. H., & Kandal, D. B. (1979). Attitude and Behaviour: Specification of the Contingent-Consistency hypothesis. American Sociological Review, 44, 298-310.
- Battson, C. d., & Ventis, W. L. (1982). The Religious Experience: A Social Psychological Perspective. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bentler, P. M., & Speckart, G. (19779). Models and Attitude-Behaviour Relations. Psychological Review, 86, 452-464.
- Bentler, P. M., & Speckart, G. (1981). Attitudes "cause" Behaviours: Structural Equation analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 226-238.

- Bergin, A. E. (1980). Psycho-therapy and Religious Values. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48, 95-105.
- Bergin, A. E., Masters, K. S., & Richards, P. S. (1987). Religiousness and mental health reconsidered: A Study of an Intrinsically religious Sample. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 34, 197-204.
- Brockman, C. J., Kirajen, K., & Wolf, M. M. (1980). Group home treatment research: Social learning and social control perspectives. In: T. Hirschi and M. Gottfredson (Eds) Understanding Crime. Sage, Beverly Hills, 117-130.
- Burgess, R. L., & Akers, R. L. (1966). The Differential Association Reinforcement theory of Criminal behaviour. Social Problems, 14, 128-147.
- Burkett, S. R., (1977). Religion, parental influence and Adolescent Alcohol and Marijuana use. Journal of Drug Issues, 7, 263-273.
- Burkett, S. R., & Warren, B. O. (1987). Religiosity, Peer Associations and adolescent marijuana use: A panel study of Underlying Causal Structures. Criminology, 45, 109-131.
- Burkett, S. R., & White, M. (1974). Hellfire and Delinquency: Another look. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 13, 455-462.

- Byrnes, J. G. (1984). The Psychology of Religion. New York: Free Press.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rogers, W. L. (1976). The Quality of American Life. New York: Russell Sage.
- Cloward, R., & Ohlin, L. (1959). Illegitimate means, anomie and deviant behaviour. American Sociological Review, 24, 164-177.
- Cofer, C. N., Chance, J., & Judson, A. J. (1949). A study of malingering from the M.M.P.I. Journal of Psychology, 27, 491-499.
- Cole, G. (1982). Relationships among measures of mental health, stress and religiosity. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 1433.
- Conger, R. D. (1976). Social control and social learning models of delinquent behaviour: A synthesis Criminology, 14, 17-40.
- Donahew, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 400-419.
- Durkheim, E. (1915). The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. New York: Free Press.
- Elifson, K. W., Peterson, D. M., & Hadaway, C. K. (1983). Religiosity and delinquency: A Contextual Analysis. Criminology, 21, 505-527.

- Elliott, D. S., Agetown, S. S., & Canter, R. J. (1979). An integrative theoretical perspective on Delinquent behaviour. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 16, 1-27.
- Elliott, D. S., Hozinga, S., & Agetown, S. S. (1985). Explaining Delinquency and drug use. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Ellis, L. (1985). Religiosity and Criminality: Evidence and Explanations of Complex Relationships. Sociological Perspectives, 28, 501-520.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. (1978). Psychopathy, Personality and Genetics. In: R. D. Hare and D. Shawling (Eds), Psychopathic Behaviour: Approaches to Research (pp197-233). Chichester, Eng: Wiley.
- Feagin, J. (1964). Prejudice and religious types: A Focussed Study of Southern fundamentalists. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 4, 3-13.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1974). Attitudes Towards Objects as Predictors of single and Mmultiple Behaviour criteria. Psychological Review, 81, 59-74.
- Freud, S. (1961). Beyond the Pleasure Principle (Revised Edition). Hogarth: London.
- Fullerton, T. J., & Hunsberger, B. (1982). A Uni-dimensional Measure of Christian Orthodoxy. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 21, 317-326.

REFERENCES

- Gallanter, M., & Westermeyer, J. (1980). Charismatic religious experience and large group psychology. American Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 1543-1546.
- Glock, C. Y., & Stark, R. (1965). Religion and society in tension. Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1950). Unravelling juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge, Mass.: University Press.
- Gorsuch, L. (1984). Measurement: The boon and bane of investigating religion. American Psychologist, 39, 228-236.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & McFarlane, S. G. (1972). Single Vs. multiple-item scales for measuring religious commitment. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 65-75.
- Gorsuch, R. L., & Ortberg, J. (1983). Moral Obligation and Attitude: Their Relation to Behavioural Intention. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1025-1028.
- Gough, H. G. (1969). Manual for the C.P.I., California Psychological Inventory (Revised Edition). Palo Alto, Ca.: Consulting Psychologists.
- Hadaway, C. K. (1978). Life satisfaction and religion: A re-analysis. Social Forces, 57, 636-643.
- Hadaway, C. K., & Roof, W. C. (1978). Religious commitment and the quality of life in American society. Review of Religious Research, 12, 155-176.

- Hagan, J., Gilles, A. R., & Simson, J. (1985). The Class Structure of gender and Delinquency: Toward a Power Control Theory of common delinquent behaviour. American Journal of Sociology, 90, 1151-1178.
- Hebert, K. (1986). The Nature of the Association Between Religious Involvement and Criminal Behaviour (unpublished paper). Department of Psychology, Carleton University.
- Higgins, P. C., & Albrecht, G. L. (1974). Hellfire and Delinquency Revisited. Social Forces, 55, 952-958.
- Hilty, D. M., Morgan, R., & Burns, J. E. (1983). King and Hunt Revisited: Dimensions of Religious Involvement. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22, 252-266.
- Hilty, D. M., Morgan, R., & Hartman, W. (1985). A Structural equation modelling analysis of the means, Ends, & Quest Dimensions. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 24, 424-436.
- Himmelfard, H. (1975). Measuring religious involvement. Social Forces, 53, 606-618.
- Hine, V. H. (1969). Pentecostal glossalalia: Toward a functional interpretation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 8, 211-226.
- Hine, V. H. (1980). Bridge-burners: Commitment and participation in a religious movement. American Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 1573-1586.

- Hirschi, T. (1969). Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of Calif. Press.
- Hirschi, T. (1980). Introduction. In: T. Hirschi and M. Gottfredson (Eds) Understanding Crime: Current Theory and Research. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Hirschi, T., & Gottfredson, M. (1980). Understanding Crime: Current Theory and Research. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Hirschi, T., & Hindelang, M. J. (1977). Intelligence and Delinquency: A Revisionist Review. American Sociological Review, 42, 571-587.
- Hirschi, T., & Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and Delinquency. Social Problems, 17, 202-213.
- Hunsberger, B. (1980). Questions and Problems in psychology and Religion: An emerging Social Psychology of Religion? Behavioural Sciences, 12, 64-77.
- Hunt, R. A., & King, M. B. (1971). The intrinsic-extrinsic concept: A review and evaluation. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 10, 339-356.
- James, W. (1902). Varieties of Religious Experience. New York: Randomhouse.
- Jenson, G. F. (1972). Parents, peers and association: A test of the differential association perspective. American Journal of Sociology, 78, 63-72.

- Jenson, G. F., & Erickson, M. L. (1979). The Religious factor and Delinquency: Another look at the "Hellfire" Hypothesis. In: (Eds), The Religious Dimension: New Directions in Quantative Research. New York: Academic Press.
- Johnson, J. G. (1979). Juvenile Delinquency and Its Origins: An Integrative Theoretical Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, W., & Dixon, P. (1985). Response alternatives in Lickart Scaling. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44, 563-567.
- Jung, C. G. (1933). Modern Man in Search of a Soul. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kilbourne, B., and Richardson, J. J. (1983). Psychotherapy and new religions in a pluralistic society. Sociological Analysis, 47,
- King, M. B. (1967). Measuring the Religious variable: Nine Proposed Dimensions. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 6, 173-185.

REFERENCES

- King, M. B., & Hunt, R. A., (1969) Measuring the religious variable: Amended findings. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 8, 321-323.
- King, M. B., & Hunt, R. A. (1972). Measuring the Religious variable: Replication Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 11, 240-251.
- Knudten, R. D., & Knudten, M. S. (1971). Juvenile Delinquency, Crime and religion. Review of Religious Research, 12, 130-152.
- Kristianson, C. (1987). Social Learning Theory and Preventative Health behaviour: Some Neglected Variables. Social Behaviour, 2, 73-86.
- Krone, M. D. (1974). An investigation of the effect of parental and peer associations on marijuana use: An empirical test of Differential association Theory. In: M. Ridell and T.P. Thornberry (Eds), Crime and Delinquency: Dimensions of Deviance. New York: Praeger.
- Krone, M. D., Akers, R. L., Radosavich, M. J., & Landsicaduse, L. (1982). Norm Qualities and adolescent drinking and drug behaviour: The effects of norm quality and reference group on using and abusing alcohol and marijuana. Journal of Drug Issues, 11, 343-359.

REFERENCES

- Krone, M. D., & Massey, J. P. (1980). Social Control and Delinquent Behaviour: An examination of the elements of the social bond. Sociological Quarterly, 21, 521-543.
- Kvaraceus, W. C. (1944). Delinquent Behaviour and Church Attendance. Sociology and Social Research, 28, 284-289.
- Landsicaduse, L., Akers, R. L., Krone, M. D., & Ridosavich, M. J. (1980). Cessation of alcohol and drug use among adolescents: A social learning model. Deviant Behaviour, 5, 79-96.
- Larson, D. B., Pattisson, E. M., Blazer, D. B., Omran, A. R., & Kaplan, B. H. (1986). A systematic analysis of research on religious variables in four major psychiatric journals, 1978-1982. American Journal of Psychiatry, 143, 329-334.
- Lindon, E., & Hackler, J. C. (1973). Effective ties and Delinquency. Pacific Sociological Review, 16, 27-47.
- Lipsmeyer, M. E. (1984). The Measurement of Religiosity and its Relationship to mental Health/impairment. Dissertation Abstracts International, 45, 1918-1919.
- Loeber, R., & Dishion, T. (1983). Early Predictors of male Delinquency: A Review. Psychological Bulletin, 94, 424-457.
- Lovekin, A., & Malony, H. N. (1977). Religious Glossalalia: A longitudinal Study of Personality Changes. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 16, 383-393.

- MacDonald, C. B., & Lockett, J. B. (1983). Religious Affiliation and psychiatric diagnoses. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 22, 15-37.
- Martin, J. M., & Fitzpatrick, J. P. (1967). Delinquent Behaviour: A Redefinition of the Problem. New York: Random.
- Maslow, A. (1964). Religions, Values, & Peak Experiences. Columbus, Ohio State University Press.
- Mattsueda, R. L. (1982). Testing Control Theory and Differential Association: A Causal Modelling Approach. American Sociological Review, 47, 489-504.
- McKelvie, S. T. (1978). Graphic Rating Scales -- How Many categories. British Journal of Psychology, 69, 185-202.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. American Sociological Review, 3, 672-682.
- Middleton, W. C., & Fay, P. J. (1941). Attitudes of Delinquent Girls toward Sunday Observance, the Bible and War. Journal of Educational Psychology, 32, 555-558.
- Middleton, R., & Putney, S. (1962). Religion, normative Standards and behaviour. Sociometry, 85, 141-152.
- Moehle, D. (1983). Cognitive Dimensions of Religious Experiences. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 19, 122-145.

REFERENCES

- Morrisson, B. (1984). Moderator Variables and the Relationship Between Criminal Sentiments and Criminal Behaviour.
Unpublished Masters Thesis, Department of Psychology,
Carleton University.
- Mylonas, A. D., & Reckless, W. C. (1963). Prisoners'
Attitudes Towards Law and legal Institutions. Journal of
Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 54, 479-484.
- Nemiah, I. C. (Ed.) (1980). Special Section: Modern Religious
Experience and psychiatry. American Journal of Psychiatry,
137(12).
- Neopolitan, J. (1981). Parental influences on aggressive
behaviour: A social learning approach. Adolescence, 16,
831-840.
- Nye, F. I. (1958). Family Relationships and Delinquency. New
York: Wiley.
- Odel, B. N. (1974). Accelerating Entry into the Opportunity
Structure: A Sociologically Based treatment for Delinquent
Youths. Sociological and Social Research, 58, 312-317.
- Pattisson, E. M., & Pattisson, M. L. (1980). "Ex-gays:
Religiously mediated change in homosexuals. American Journal
of Psychiatry, 137, 1553-1562.
- Peterson, D. R., Quay, H. C., & Cameron, G. R. (1959).
Personality and background factors in Juvenile Delinquency

REFERENCES

- As Inferred from Questionnaire Responses.
Journal of Consulting Psychology, 23, 395-399.
- Pilliovin, I. M., Hardyke, J. E., & Vadem, A. C. (1968).
Constraining Effects of Personal Cost on the Transgressions
of Juveniles. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
10, 227-231.
- Reckless, W. C. (1973). American Criminology: New Directions.
New York: Appleton-Century, Cross.
- Rhodes, A. L., & Reiss, A. J. (1970). The "Religious Factor"
and Delinquent Behaviour. Journal of Research on Crime and
Delinquency, 7, 83-98.
- Rohrbaugh, J., & Jessor, R. (1975). Religiosity in Youth: A
Personal Control Against Deviant Behaviour? Journal of
Personality, 43, 136-155.
- Sarazin, I. G., & Ganzer, V. J. (1973). Modelling and group
discussion in the rehabilitation of juvenile Delinquents.
Journal of Counseling Psychology, 20, 442-449.
- Shore, M. F., & Massimmo, J. E. (1979). Fifteen Years After
Treatment: A study of comprehensive Vocationally Oriented
Psychotherapy. American Journal of Ortho-Psychiatry, 49,
240-245.
- Short, J. F. (1957). Differential association and Delinquency.
Social Problems, 4, 233-239.

REFERENCES

- Snyder, M. (1974). Self monitoring of expressive behaviour.
Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30, 526-537.
- Spanos, N. P., Cross, W. P., Lapage, M., & Corestine, M.,
(1986). Glossalalia As a learned Behaviour: An experimental
demonstration Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95, 21-23.
- Spilka, B., Hood, R. W., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1985). The
Psychology of Religion: An Empirical Approach. Englewood
Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Starbuck, J. P. (1900). The Psychology of Religion: An Empirical
Study of the Growth of Religious Consciousness. London:
Scott.
- Stark, R. (1971). The economics of piety: Religious commitment
and social class. In: G. W. Thielbar and S. D. Feldman
(Eds), Issues in social equality. Boston: Littlebrown.
- Stark, R., Doyle, D. P., & Kent, L. (1980). Rediscovering
Moral Communities: Church Membership and Crime (pp43-52).
In: T. Hirschi and M Gottfredson (Eds) Understanding Crime:
Current Theory and Research. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Stark, R., Kent, L., & Doyle, D. P. (1982). Religion and
Delinquency: The ecology of a "lost" Relationship. Journal
of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 19, 4-24.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1924). Criminology. Philadelphia:
Lippincott Press.

REFERENCES

- Taylor, W. R., (1981). Psychological Health and its Relation to certain categories of background experience. Dissertation Abstracts International, 41, 3904.
- Tittle, C. R., Villemez, W. J., & Smith, D. A. (1978). The Myth of Social Class and Criminality: An Empirical Assessment of the Empirical Evidence. American Sociological Review, 43, 643-656.
- Tittle, C. R., & Welsh, M. R. (1983). Religiosity and Deviance: Toward a Contingency theory of Constraining Effects. Social Forces, 61, 653-682.
- Tobacyk, J., & Milford, G. (1983). Belief in paranormal Phenomena: Assessment Instrument Development and implications for personality Functioning. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 1029-1037.
- Ullmann, L. P., & Krasner, L. (1964). A Psychological approach to abnormal behaviour. Inglewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Vener, A. M., Zaenglein, M. M., & Stuart, P. (1977). Traditional Religious Orthodoxy, respect for Authority, & Non-conformity in Adolescents. Adolescence, 45, 43-56.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Hernstein, R. J. (1985). Crime and Human Nature. New York: Simon and Shuster.
- Zaenglein, M. M., Vener, A. N., & Stuart, S. S. (1976). The Adolescent and his religion: Beliefs in Transition, 1970-1973. Adolescence, 44.

Summary of the Relationship Between Religious Involvement and Mental Health

It is noteworthy that every one of these conceptualizations of mental health has had to bear the brunt of strong criticism -- some with regard to their very validity as ways of understanding health, and all, at one time or another, with respect to the ways in which they are applied. A case in point is the conceptualization of mental health as the absence of mental illness, the definitive word for which -- the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of the American Psychological Association -- has been revised three times to reflect changing views of what are and what are not mental illnesses. Another example can be made of the conceptualization of mental health as open mindedness and flexibility, which is generally thought of as opposite to the notion of authoritarianism. For some time now some psychologists have seen this indicator as reflecting a cognitive/belief structure rather than the presence or absence of pathology (Stark, 1971).

Batson and Ventis reviewed 57 studies from which they distilled 67 findings for their discussion of the relationship between these seven conceptualizations of mental health and extent of religious involvement. Table 1.1 of this thesis is based on Table 7.2 of their text, and gives a line score for 62 of those findings based on 53 of the studies. The five findings from the four studies eliminated here depicted the relationship between mental health and involvement in conservative versus liberal Christian

denominations -- clearly not a measure of the extent of religious involvement. The bottom line of the table demonstrates clearly that the majority of the findings -- 33 of the 62 presented here -- reveal a negative association between mental health and extent of religious involvement, while only 15 present a positive association. Studies of three of the conceptualizations of mental health -- personal competence and control, self acceptance/self actualization, and open mindedness and flexibility -- contributed disproportionately to these totals. Between them they account for 23 of the negative associations and only 2 of the positive relationships. As was noted earlier, two of the conceptualizations -- Personal Competence and Personal Control, and open mindedness and flexibility -- are less acceptable to religious persons than to psychologists as indicators of health. On the other hand, the distribution of findings with regard to the conceptualization of mental health as absence of illness favours a positive association, with 7 of the 11 presenting positive findings and 2 presenting negative relationships. Interestingly, this distribution is congruent with the remark of Freud (1961), that religious persons would not demonstrate certain neurotic disorders due to the universal acceptance granted to religion. The distributions of findings for each of the three remaining conceptualizations of mental health -- appropriate social behaviour, freedom from worry and guilt, and personality unification and organization -- are inconclusive regarding the association.

Based on the various balances in the distributions of findings according to conceptualizations of mental health, a tentative profile seems to emerge. Individuals who are involved in religion tend to be freer from physical and psychological illnesses than those who are uninvolved; relative to their uninvolved counterparts they believe themselves to be less competent and in control of occurrences in their lives, they are less fulfilled and accepting of themselves, and exhibit greater inflexibility and closed mindedness; Relative to their uninvolved counterparts they are also equally likely to suffer from worry and guilt feelings, and to participate in socially inappropriate behaviours. However, this pattern does not appear to be consistent across the various measures of the extent of religious involvement.

Table 1.2 re-organizes the data into a measure of religious involvement by conceptualization of mental health format. It is extrapolated from table 7.1 of the book by Batson and Ventis which summarizes the 67 findings examined in Chapter 7 of that text. For this analysis each of the 53 studies was attributed a separate finding for each measure of the extent of religious involvement it employed. As well, studies which reported varying outcomes for different groupings of subjects -- eg) males and females -- were attributed a finding for each outcome. The reader will note, then, that there are 77 rather than 62 findings presented in Table 1.2. However, with 11 measures of religious involvement and 7 conceptualizations of mental health, the format for table 1.2 yields 77 cells. Little can be concluded about a number of the

measures of religious involvement to which a small number of findings are relevant. In fact, extrapolations will be risked here for only five of the measures.

It does appear that the distribution of findings for measures of religious orthodoxy and belief most closely resembles the distribution for extent of religious involvement as a whole. On the other hand, distributions of findings for measures of worship service attendance and participation in religious activities present pictures of the relationship between mental health and extent of religious involvement which are the most complimentary to religion. It is perhaps surprising, then, that the four studies measuring declaration of denominational affiliation all report findings of negative associations between those measures and mental health. The same is also true of findings regarding seminary and pre-clergy students and ordained ministers, although the mental health status of ministers was examined in only one study.

The review by Batson and Ventis of the relationship between extent of religious involvement and mental health is not exhaustive. It particularly lacks recent research, representing findings from only three studies published later than 1975. A brief examination of some studies published in the last decade and not reviewed by Batson and Ventis, and which investigate the relationship between religious involvement and mental health suggests that a pattern demonstrating a positive but weak directionality for that relationship is emerging. Exemplary of

such studies are three which examined the relationship between religiousness and life satisfaction (Campbell, Converse, and Rogers, 1976; Hadaway, 1978; Hadaway and Roof, 1978). The measures of life satisfaction which this series of studies employed fits well into the list of seven conceptualizations of mental health used by Batson and Ventis. Campbell and his colleagues (1976) conducted a study of quality of life in America, which attempted to note lifestyles which correlated with life satisfaction. They performed a nation-wide survey in which life satisfaction was measured as personal competence -- degree of control a person feels he has over his life -- and mental well being. This work reported a small but negative correlation between these measures and self-reported religious mindedness. However, in a re-analysis of the same data Hadaway (1978) showed that the earlier study had erred in attaching negative values to those relationships. Hadaway, in fact, showed that religious mindedness was related significantly, though weakly, in a positive direction to personal competence ($R=.07$), and to mental well-being ($R=.17$). In a further nation-wide investigation Hadaway and Roof (1978) found that a subjective rating of life worthwhileness was similarly related to religious commitment as measured by subjective ratings of the personal importance of religion, attendance at worship services, and membership in a church or synagogue.

The findings regarding the relationship between extent of religious involvement and mental health can be summarized all too

briefly. This is because too few studies were carried out to adequately cover this broad relationship, as is illustrated by the number of empty cells in the tables in Appendix I. Taken as a whole, though, it appears that extent of religious involvement is positively associated with absence of mental and physical illness, and linked negatively with personal competence and control, self acceptance and self actualization, and with open mindedness and flexibility, while the manner in which it is related to participation in socially appropriate behaviour, freedom from worry and guilt feelings, and personality unification and organization is not well understood. The issue of religious orthodoxy and religious orientation requires additional research (Hunsberger, 1982).

Table 1.3 reveals a definite interaction effect between religious orientation and mental health in general, With the intrinsic/ends orientation much more positively associated with healthiness. This directional difference is also evident when mental health is conceptualized as freedom from worry and guilt, personal competence and control, and open mindedness and flexibility.

The extrinsic/means-intrinsic/ends religiousness distinction grew out of a study in the mid 1940's which showed that church attending Roman catholics and protestants in the northern United States were more likely to hold anti-Negro prejudices than non-attenders, and that a strong religious upbringing was correlated with racial prejudice (Allport and Cramer, 1946). This

finding has been paralleled in numerous studies, including those which link church attendance, religious attitudes and religious orthodoxy with racism, anti-semitism, ethno-centrism, and more. In Chapter 8 of their text, Batson and Ventis reviewed 42 findings stemming from 34 studies which examined these associations. Table 1.4 is a replication of table 8.2 from their text, and gives a line-score for that review. Table 1.4 shows that, of those 42 findings, only 2 linked greater religious involvement with reduced prejudice; On the other hand, 34 of those findings link greater religious involved with increased prejudice. Almost without exception, this association is reflected across measures of extent of religious involvement and types of prejudice.

In their 1946 study Allport and Cramer also found that those subjects who believed that religious involvement would serve to reduce racial prejudice were themselves no more prejudiced than were the subjects who did not attend church. Hypothesizing, then, that an individual's relationship with religion would be the factor which would determine whether or not his religious involvement would be positively associated with prejudice, Allport began developing an instrument to examine the extrinsic versus intrinsic distinction (Allport, 1950). Since that time, almost all studies have reported intrinsically religious people to be less prejudiced than those who are extrinsically religious, and none have reported findings in the opposite direction. In their review of findings on this association Battson and Ventis included studies which contained measures that parallell the

extrinsic-intrinsic distinction, such as the a nutrally vs. seriously religious distinction (Adorno et al, 1956), a consensual vs. committed classification (Allen and Spilka, 1967), and a less-than-weekly vs. at-least-weekly church attendance dichotomy (Gorsuch and McFarlane, 1972). The extrinsic religiousness measure and its equivalents were hypothesized by their authors to correlate negatively with prejudice, while the intrinsically religiousness measure and its equivalents were hypothesized to be unrelated to prejudice.

In their review of 40 findings from 31 studies Batson and Ventis found that the difference between extrinsic and intrinsic religiousness with regard to prejudice was maintained, no matter how those orientations were conceptualized. The evidence appears to be overwhelming, with 38 of the findings presenting significant differences and 2 presenting inconclusive results. However, a single study by Batson and his colleagues which was recounted in this review may bring into question what seems to be the obvious conclusion. Noting that differences with regard to prejudice between extrinsically and intrinsically religious people were inferred from responses to written questionnaires, they included a behavioural intention component in their study which required all subjects to indicate whether they wished to complete the interview portion of the experiment with a black or white interviewer. As expected, responses to the questionnaires suggested that the intrinsically oriented subjects were less prejudiced than their extrinsically oriented counterparts. However, the groups could

not be differentiated from one another on the basis of the behavioural intention component of the study, and the analysis showed that it was the intrinsically religious group whose responses had shifted. Batson and his colleagues also found that intrinsic religiousness was positively associated with scores on a social desirability scale. They concluded, therefore, that intrinsically religious individuals may not actually be any less prejudiced than their extrinsically religious counterparts. Rather, differences between them with regard to responses to written questionnaires may be a result of a heightened desire on the part of intrinsically religious individuals to appear socially righteous. Batson and Ventis recognize that this conclusion is somewhat tenuous. It does, though, raise doubt enough to reopen what has been thought to be a closed case regarding the relationship between religious orientation and prejudice.

Four studies have also been conducted yielding six findings regarding the relationship between the quest orientation and various conceptualizations of mental health. They indicate that the questioning, seeking approach to religion is positively associated with personal competence and control, and with open mindedness and flexibility, while the ways in which it is related to freedom from worry and guilt and to self acceptance and self actualization are unclear.

It is interesting to note an emerging similarity between the quest orientation and liberal versus conservative christian religious affiliation with regard to the ways in which they are

related to conceptualizations of mental health. Table 1.5 presents a line score for these associations stemming from the six findings relevant to the quest orientation and the seven findings reviewed by Batson and Ventis relevant to the liberal versus conservative Christian religious affiliation variable. It shows that these orientations were studied with respect to the same four conceptualizations of mental health, and that their profiles bear striking resemblance to one another. It would be inappropriate to conclude that these ways of being religious are equivalent at this time. However, it would seem that, whereas the extrinsic/means and intrinsic/ends orientations are generally thought to cut across denominational affiliations, the questioning/seeking approach of the quest orientation would be less ascribed to by members of the majority of Christian denominations, because they espouse adherence to specific tenants of faith rather than a completely open minded approach to religion.

Some Additional Remarks

Some brief comments are appropriate here regarding a further orientation or style of religious involvement. Although the orientations reviewed above are those many commonly studied by psychologists, for most people the topic of mental health and religious involvement congers up thoughts and questions about participation in small, so-called charasmatic Christian groups. Studies of the relationship between psychopathology and involvements in such groups were carried out. Confusion reigns supreme in this area of investigation, however, because little

attention has been paid to distinguishing between those which operate outside the mainstream churches, drawing their focus and direction from a central person or small core group, and those aligned with and sanctioned by mainstream denominations. Mention of the first sort of Christian Charismatic group usually brings to mind images such as the mass suicides of Jonestown, Gianna. However, the vast majority of persons who call themselves charismatic Christians belong to the second sort (Hine, 1969). The previously mentioned special edition of the American Journal of Psychiatry (Dec., 1980) which was dedicated to studies of the relationship between psychopathology and involvement in charismatic groups is blatantly guilty of failing to emphasize this distinction. Membership in this more common sort of charismatic group -- often called pentecostal groups -- comes about through an initiation process known as the baptism of the Holy Spirit. This event is often evident through glossalalia. Glossalalia, or tongue speaking, is vocalization which has no semantic meaning for the speaker (Hine, 1969). For many Christians it is recognized as a form of prayer in praise of God, and one of the gifts bestowed by his holy Spirit. Although the concepts of the baptism of the Holy Spirit and non-meaningful vocalizations are foreign to most people, as event and behaviour they are easily subject to measurement. As well, the acquisition of glossalalia has been shown to be a behaviour learning process (Spanos et al, 1986), and so is subject to experimental manipulation. As such, it lends itself well to the study of

involvement in pentecostal or charismatic groups. Using such measures (Hine 1969; Lovekin and Maloney, 1978), and employing subjective ratings of extent of involvement (Hine, 1980), no relationship has been found between participation in pentecostal groups and either impaired or augmented mental health.

Table 1.1:
A Line Score for 62 Findings From 53 Studies
For the Association between
Religious Involvement and Mental Health
and Mental Health

Conceptualizations of Mental Health	+	?	-	total
absence of illness -----	7	2	2	11
participation in appropriate social behaviour -	3	3	5	11
freedom from worry and guilt -----	3	1	3	7
personal competence and personal control -----	1	2	7	10
self acceptance / self actualization -----	1	3	9	13
personality unification and organization -----	0	1	0	1
Open Mindedness and Flexibility -----	0	2	7	9
totals -----	15	14	33	62

(adapted from Batson and Ventis, 1982, Chapter 7, Table 7.2)

note: "+" indicates a positive relationship,

"-" indicates a negative relationship,

"?" indicates a null finding.

Table 1.2:
line Score of 77 Findings From 53 Studies
In a Measures of Extent of Religious Involvement
By Conceptualizations of Mental Health Format

Measures of Extent of Religious Involvement	Conceptualizations of mental Health				
	a.i.	a.s.b.	f.f.- w.fg.	p.c.fc.	s.a./- s.a.
	+ ? -	+ ? -	+ ? -	+ ? -	+ ? -
worship service ----- attendance -	3 1 0	2 0 0	1 2 1	1 1 2	0 0 1
participation in ----- religious activities -	*****	0 1 0	3 1 0	0 0 2	a a a
strength of religious ----- orthodoxy and belief -	1 1 0	0 3 0	0 1 1	0 0 1	0 1 1
denominational ----- affiliation -	*****	0 0 2	0 0 1	0 0 1	*****
pre-clergy student and ----- and clergy status -	0 0 2	0 0 1	*****	0 0 1	0 0 1
religious background -----	1 0 0	0 1 1	*****	*****	*****
importance of religion -----	1 0 0	*****	*****	0 0 1	1 0 2
being religious -----	1 1 0	1 0 0	*****	*****	0 1 3
positive vs. negative ----- attitudes toward religion -	*****	0 1 1	*****	*****	*****
intense religious ----- experiences -	1 0 0	*****	*****	0 0 1	0 1 0
interest in religion -----	*****	*****	*****	*****	0 1 1
----- totals -----	8 3 2	3 6 5	4 4 3	1 1 9	2 5 10

(based on Batson and Ventis, 1982, Chapter 7, Table 7.1)

note: The following symbols refer to the seven conceptualizations
of mental health

A.I. absence of illness

A.S.B. appropriate social behaviour

F.W.fG. freedom from worry and guilt

P.C.fC. personal competence and personal control

S.A. self acceptance and self actualization

P.U.fO. personality unification and organization

O.M.fF. open mindedness and flexibility.

APPENDIX I

Table 1.3:
A Line Score for 30 findings from 23 Studies
For the Association between
Extrinsic and Intrinsic Religious Orientations
And Mental Health

	RELIGIOUS ORIENTATIONS					
	Extrinsic/ Means			Intrinsic/ Ends		
	+	?	-	+	?	-
Conceptualizations of Mental Health	+	?	-	+	?	-
absence of illness	*****			*****		
participation in appropriate social behaviour	0	0	1	1	0	1
freedom from worry and guilt	0	1	2	3	0	0
personal competence and personal control	0	1	3	3	1	1
self acceptance / self actualization	0	1	0	1	2	1
personality unification and organization	*****			*****		
open mindedness and flexibility	0	0	4	0	3	0
totals	0	3	10	8	6	3

(adapted from Batson and Ventis, 1982, Chapter 7, Table 7.7)

States were more likely to hold anti-Negro prejudices

Table 1.4.:

A Line Score for 42 Findings From 34 Studies

For the Association Between

Extent of Religious Involvement

And Types of prejudice

Extent of Religious Involvement												
Types of Prejudice	Church membership and Attendance			Religious Attitudes			Religious Orthodoxy and Con- servatism			Totals		
	+	?	-	+	?	-	+	?	-	+	?	-
ethno- -----	3	0	0	-	3	0	1	-	2	0	0	-
centrism -				-				-				-
racism -----	6	2	0	-	3	0	0	-	4	2	0	-
-				-				-				-
anti- -----	4	1	0	-	0	1	0	-	4	1	0	-
Semitism -				-				-				-
-				-				-				-
other -----	2	0	0	-	1	0	0	-	2	1	1	-

totals -----	15	3	0	-	7	1	1	-	12	4	1	-

(replicated from Batson and Ventis, 1982, Chapter 8, Table 8.2)

Table 1.5

A Line Score for Findings Regarding
The Quest Orientation to Religion and
Liberal vs. Conservative
Christian Religious Affiliation
in relation to Mental Health

	Religious Orientations					
	liberal vs. Con- servative Affiliation			Quest Orientation		
Conceptualizations of Mental Health	+	?	-	+	?	-
absence of illness -----	*****			*****		
participation in appropriate ----- social behaviour -	*****			*****		
freedom from worry and guilt -----	0	1	0	0	1	0
personal competence and personal ----- control -	3	0	0	1	0	0
self acceptance / self ----- actualization -	1	1	0	1	1	0
personality unification and ----- organization -	*****			*****		
open mindedness and flexibility -----	1	0	0	2	0	0
----- totals -----	5	2	0	4	2	0

(based on the review of Batson and Ventis, 1982, Chapter 7)

Informal Consent Form

251

I, _____ agree to participate in a two-phase study of attitudes, values and beliefs regarding religion, lifestyle, and behaviour. Both phases of the study involve completing a package of paper-and-pencil questionnaires. Each phase will last approximately 1 hour.

The study is being conducted by Gordon Hope under the supervision of Don Andrews.

The procedure of this experiment has been fully explained to me.

I also understand that I may withdraw from the experiment at any time. In any case, the results and my identity will be kept in strictest confidence.

Name: (Print) _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Witness: _____ Date: _____

I.D. CODE # _____

This portion of the form will be destroyed once the Phase 2 questionnaires have been completed (or by April 10, 1988 at the latest).

- 1) What is your age? ---
- 2: Are you male or female (circle number)? 1 Male 2 Female
- 3: Please circle the number beside the description of marital status which best applies to you presently.
- 1 Single and never married
- 2 married but divorced
- 3 single due to the death of my spouse
- 4 married and living with my spouse
- 5 married but separated
- 6 cohabiting without formal married status
- 4: How many times have you been married (circle number)?
- 0 none, 1 once, 2 twice, 3 more than twice
- 5: How many years have you completed in: primary school ---
- highschool ---
- community college ---
- undergraduate university ---
- graduate university ---
- 6: What is your present occupation? -----
- 7: What has been the predominant occupation of your father throughout his working career? -----
- 8: What has been the predominant occupation of your mother throughout her working career? -----
- 9: What is the last year of schooling completed by your father? -----
- 10: What is the last year of schooling completed by your mother? -----

11) To the best of your knowledge, did your father ever collect welfare benefits or unemployment insurance while you were living at home (circle number)?

1 yes, 2 no, 3 unsure

12: To the best of your knowledge, did your mother ever collect welfare benefits or unemployment insurance while you were living at home (circle number)?

1 yes, 2 no, 3 unsure

13: To the best of your knowledge, was there ever a time while you were living at home when the primary source of income for your family was welfare benefits or unemployment insurance (circle number)?

1 yes, 2 no, 3 unsure

14: Were you ever arrested when you were under sixteen years of age? (circle number)?

1 yes 2 no

15: have you ever been convicted of a criminal offense (circle number)

1 yes 2 no

If yes, how many times have you been convicted? ---

16: Please circle the number beside the religion with which you presently identify yourself.

0 none, 1 Jewish, 2 Christian, 3 Moslem, 4 other
(please specify)

17: If you identify yourself with a specific religion, with which particular denomination do you identify yourself? -----

RELIGIOUS INVOLVEMENT SURVEY

Our research team wishes to gather information about the nature and importance of religious faith and involvement in peoples' lives. You would assist us greatly by filling out the following survey. This questionnaire consists of several parts, and each part is composed of a number of items. We ask that you answer all items in each part, and that you do so carefully and honestly. We assure you that only members of the research team will be privy to your answers, and that the utmost care will be taken in holding them in confidence. In answering this survey please follow all instructions closely. Thank you very much for your help.

Part I:

Below are a number of statements. Please indicate the strength and direction of your sentiments regarding the truth of each one by circling the number below the response which best reflects your belief about that statement.

1: There is one true god.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

2: I believe in the existence of a just and merciful personal god.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

3: I believe God created the universe.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

4: I believe God has a plan for the universe.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

5: I believe Jesus Christ is the Messiah promised in the old testament.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

6: I believe one must accept Jesus christ as Lord and Saviour to be saved from sin.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

7: I do not believe I will in any way be held accountable by a god for the way I have lived.

8: I believe in the "second coming" -- that Jesus Christ will one day return to judge and rule the world.

9: I believe in "original sin" -- that people are born as sinners.

10: There is a life after death.

11: I believe in salvation as release from sin and freedom for a new life with God.

12: God exists as Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

13: Humans are not special creatures made in the image of God, they are simply a recent development in the process of animal evolution.

14: Jesus Christ is the divine Son of God.

15: Those who feel that God answers prayers are just deceiving themselves.

16: It is ridiculous to believe that Jesus Christ could be both human and divine.

17: Jesus was born of a virgin.

18: The bible may be an important book of moral teachings, but it was no more inspired by God than were many other such books in the history of the world.

19: There is a hell to which I will be eternally vanquished if I do not repent of my sins.

20: There is a heaven to which I will be welcomed for eternity if I believe in God and follow in his ways.

21: The devil actually exists.

22: One should treat others in the same positive ways that one likes to be treated by others.

23: Theft is wrong.

24: It is wrong to kill another person.

25: There is nothing wrong with sexual intercourse outside of marriage between two consenting adults.

26: It is wrong to tell lies.

27: It is wrong to desire or imagine having sexual relations with the spouse of another person.

42: God hears all of our prayers.

43: Jesus christ may have been a great ethical teacher, as other men have been, but he was not the divine son of God.

44: God made Adam of dust in his own image, and breathed life into him.

45: There is a god who is concerned with every ones actions.

46: Jesus' death on the cross, if it actually occurred, did nothing in and of itself to save the human race.

47: There is really no reason to hold to the idea that Jesus was born of a virgin; Jesus' life showed better than anything else that he was exceptional, so why rely on old myths that don't make sense?

48: I believe there is a transcendent realm (another world, not just this world in which we live).

28: Homosexual relations between consenting adults is all right.

29: To deliberately abort a pregnancy is wrong unless the woman's life is at serious risk.

30: At least one day a week should be reserved for religious worship.

31: One should honour and respect ones father and mother.

32: The concept of God is an old superstition that is no longer needed to explain things in the modern era.

33: Through the life, death and resurrection of Jesus, God provided a way for the forgiveness of peoples' sins.

34: Despite what many people believe, there is no such thing as a god who is aware of peoples' actions.

35: Jesus was crucified, died, and was buried, but on the third day he rose from the dead.

36: In all likelihood there is no such thing as a god-given immortal soul in people which lives on after death.

37: If there ever was such a person as Jesus of Nazareth, he is dead now and will never walk the earth again.

38: Jesus miraculously changed real water into real wine.

39: The resurrection proves beyond a doubt that Jesus was the Christ or Messiah of God.

40: The Bible is the word of God, given to guide people to grace and salvation.

41: Most of the religions in the world have miracle stories in their traditions, but there is no reason to believe any of them are true, including those found in the Bible.

49: Generally, bad deeds in this world are subject to punishment in the after-life.

50: Generally, good deeds in this world are subject to reward in the after-life.

51: I believe that my bad deeds in this world are subject to punishment in the after-life.

52: I believe that my good deeds in this world are subject to reward in the after-life.

53: I believe the Bible is the unique authority for God's will.

54: Christ will return to the earth some day.

Part II:

In this section of the questionnaire we are asking you to help us assess the extent of your religious involvement. These questions deal with different types of religious activities. Please answer each one by circling the number below the response which best reflects your degree of involvement.

- 1: Do you identify yourself with a specific church, sect or denomination?

identify strongly				identify somewhat			no
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

- 2: Are you involved regularly with any groups which focus on religious writings, teachings or discussions regarding specifically a mature spiritual lifestyle?

no				focus somewhat			focus strongly
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

- 3: Are you involved regularly with any groups which expect you to adopt behaviours and attitudes which they specifically associate with a mature spiritual lifestyle?

no				expect somewhat			expect strongly
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

- 4: Are you involved regularly with any groups whose members include one or more persons on whom you attempt to model a mature spiritual lifestyle for yourself?

no				I attempt somewhat			I attempt strongly
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

- 5: How often do you take Holy Communion, the Lord's Supper of the Eucharist, the Eucharist?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6: How often do you attend worship services?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7: How often do you spend time in meetings or doing work for your church, synagogue, temple, etc.?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8: How often do you participate in worship services in a capacity other than as simply a member of the congregation, such as a choir member, reader, or in some other leadership capacity?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9: How often do you participate in worship activities other than worship services, such as prayer meetings or study groups?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10: I make financial contributions to a church, synagogue, temple, etc.:

regular planned amounts	whenever possible		sometimes		seldom	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11: During the last year how often have you made contributions to a church, synagogue or temple, other than at regular collections?

regularly			several times			never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12: I keep pretty well informed about my congregation, synagogue, temple, and I have some influence on its decisions.

very much the case for me				somewhat the case for me			not at all the case for me
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

13: I know that I need God's continual love and care.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

14: How often do you talk about matters of religion with your close friends?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15: How often do you talk about religion with your friends, neighbours, or fellow students and workers?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16: In talking with members of your family, how often do you yourself mention religion or religious activities?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17: I feel a strong need to continue growing in understanding of my faith.

feel strongly				feel somewhat			feel not at all
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

18: When you were growing up, did your parents identify themselves with a specific church or denomination?

identify strongly				identify somewhat			no
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

19: When you were growing up, how often did your parents attend worship services, prayer meetings, religious study groups, etc.?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20: When you were growing up, how often did your parents participate in social and/or volunteer service activities organized by religious groups or organizations?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21: When you were growing up, how often did your parents wish you to attend worship services or other worship activities, such as Sunday school or other such learning situations?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

22: When you were growing up, was there ever a period of time of at least one year during which you regularly attended religious services?

never	monthly	2 or 3 times a month	weekly	2 or 3 times a week	4 or 5 times a week	daily
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

23: I know how it feels to repent and experience forgiveness of my sins.

I know very well			unsure			not true for me
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24: Of your closest friends, how many are members of a church, synagogue or other religious group?

all				some			none
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

25: Of your acquaintances, How many are members of a church, synagogue or other religious group?

all				some			none
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

26: Of your parents and siblings, How many are members of a church, synagogue or other religious group?

all				some			none
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

27: With how many of your closest friends do you participate in worship services or other activities organized by a religious group or organization?

all				some			none
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

28: With how many of your acquaintances do you participate in worship services or other activities organized by a religious group or organization?

all				some			none
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

29: With how many of your parents and siblings do you participate in worship services and other activities organized by a religious group or organization?

all				some			none
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

30: I frequently feel very close to God in prayer, during public worship or at important moments in my daily life.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

31: How often do you pray privately in places other than at a place of worship?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

32: How often do you ask God to forgive your sins?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

33: Private prayer is one of the most important and satisfying aspects of my religious experience.

very true			somewhat true			not true for me
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

34: When you have decisions to make in your everyday life, how often do you try to find out what God wants you to do?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

35: How often have you personally tried to convert someone to your faith?

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

36: I must admit that I don't do very much to increase my knowledge of God.

very true			somewhat true			not at all true
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

37: To what extent has God influenced your life?

influenced strongly			influenced somewhat			influenced not at all
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Part III:

We are interested in learning about the religious involvement of those with whom you associate, and the frequency with which you cross paths with people who are involved in religious activities. For each question in this section please circle the number of the response which is most true of your particular situation.

- 1: Think of the people you know and have been associated with since the end of October, 1967. Are any of them involved in regular religious activities?:

a: attendance at worship services;

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

b: attendance at prayer meetings, study groups, etc.;

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

c: participation in social or volunteer service activities organized by a religious organization.

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

- 2: Think of your best friends: that is, those close friends who you have seen most frequently since the end of October, 1967. Are any of them involved in regular religious activities?:

a: attendance at worship services;

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

b: attendance at prayer meetings, study groups, etc.;

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

c: participation in social or volunteer service activities organized by a religious organization.

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

- 3: If I wanted to become involved in a religious activity in my community I would know who to approach and where to find that person.

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

- 4: If I was planning to organize a religious activity such as a prayer meeting or study group, I know some people who could and would help me organize it.

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

- 5: While I might not call them friends, and I might not see them very often, I do know some people who are involved in religious activities regularly.

1 yes 2 no

4

Micro-D

6: I know of at least one person in my neighbourhood or area of town who appears to have benefited from involvement in religious activities.

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

7: In my neighbourhood or area of town there are people who are involved in regular religious activity, and who are liked and respected by others in the community.

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

8: In my neighbourhood or area of town there are people who are involved in regular religious activity, and who are disliked and not respected by others in the community.

1 yes 2 not sure 3 no

9: Have you recently been approached in the following ways by someone wishing to draw your attention to their religious beliefs:

a: giving or delivering pamphlets to you about their religious movement;

1 no 2 once 3 several times 4 often

b: stopping you on the street to talk about their religious movement;

1 no 2 once 3 several times 4 often

c: coming to your place of residence to talk about their religious movement;

1 no 2 once 3 several times 4 often

d: following you for a period of time in order to draw your attention to their religious movement.

1 no 2 once 3 several times 4 often

part IV:

We wish to learn further about the extent to which religion influences your life, and the type of role it may play. Again, for each question in this section, please circle the number below the response which corresponds most closely with your personal situation.

1: There are many more important things in my life than religion.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

2: The church has played an important part in my life.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

3: It doesn't matter so much what I believe so long as I lead a moral life.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

4: God's will should shape my life.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

5: It is important for me to spend periods of time in private religious thought and meditation.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

6: At least one community religious leader -- rabbi, minister, priest has had an important influence in my life.

strongly disagree				unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

7: If not prevented by unavoidable circumstances, I attend worship services:

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8: It is necessary for me to have a religious belief.

strongly disagree			unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9: The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.

strongly disagree			unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10: When it comes to religious questions, I feel driven to know the truth.

strongly disagree			unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11: Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the divine being.

strongly disagree			unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12: I read literature about my denomination or religion:

daily	weekly	monthly	several times a year	seldom	about once a year	never
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13: Religion is something I have never felt personally compelled to consider.

strongly disagree			unsure			strongly agree
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21: I find it impossible to conceive of myself as being religious.

22: Religion is especially important because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.

23: Outside forces (other persons, church, etc.) have been relatively unimportant in my religious development.

24: For me religion has not been a must.

25: The purpose of prayer is to secure a happy and peaceful life.

26: It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainties.

27: I do not expect my religious convictions to change in the next few years.

14: The church is most important as a place to form good social relationships.

15: Whether I turn out to be religious or not doesn't make much difference to me.

16: If I were to join a church group I would prefer to join a bible study group rather than a social fellowship.

17: Certain people have served as "models" for religious development in my life.

18: My religious beliefs are what really lie behind my whole approach to life.

19: I have found it essential to have faith.

20: What religion offers most is comfort when sorrows and misfortune strike.

28: I have been driven to ask religious questions out of a growing awareness of the tensions in my world and in my relation to my world.

29: my religious development has emerged out of my growing sense of personal identity.

30: God wasn't very important to me until I began to ask questions about the meaning of my own life.

31: Questions are far more central to my religious experience than are answers.

Part V:

Whatever your current beliefs regarding religion might be, you may at some time in the past have had one or two significant religious experiences, a series of such experiences, or indeed, you may be continuing to experience significant religious events. We are interested in learning about the occurrence and role of such events in your life.

- 1: Some types of religious experiences are listed below. You are asked to indicate your personal experience by circling one of the numbers for each item on the list. The numbers refer to the following answers:

- 0 -- I never had an experience like that;
- 1 -- I had at least one such experience, but it means little to me now;
- 2 -- That experience was not uncommon for me, but it means little to me now;
- 3 -- I had at least one such experience, and it continues to be meaningful to me;
- 4 -- That experience is not uncommon for me, and it continues to be meaningful to me.

- a: seeing and feeling with a new clarity --- 0 1 2 3 4
- b: being born again of the Holy Spirit ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- c: feeling very close to God ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- d: the baptism of the Holy Spirit ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- e: speaking in tongues ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- f: feeling as one with the universe ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- g: being freed from the sins of my past ---- 0 1 2 3 4
- h: being given the opportunity for a
new life with God ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- i: an undeniable awareness of the presence
of God at a religious service ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- j: a revelation regarding the far-reaching
capacities and potential of myself,
and of human beings in general ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- k: a realization that, throughout my life, I
have been too lucky for it all to be
co-incidental ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- l: an undeniable awareness of the presence
of God amid beautiful surroundings ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- m: the realization that an important
personal prayer of mine had truly been
answered ----- 0 1 2 3 4
- n: a deep involvement with a close-knit
group based on a relationship with God -- 0 1 2 3 4
- o: a revelation regarding God while in a
self-induced mental or physical state --- 0 1 2 3 4

p: an undeniable awareness of the presence of God which confused me because of how little I know about religion	0	1	2	3	4
q: a powerful awareness of my own relationship with a loving and providential God	0	1	2	3	4
r: an undeniable awareness of the presence of God in the celebration of a traditional religious feast or holiday ..	0	1	2	3	4
s: an undeniable awareness of the presence of God while in a time of desperation ..	0	1	2	3	4
t: the joy and peace of a forgiven sinner ..	0	1	2	3	4
u: being deeply moved during the occurrence of an event of great significance for the world	0	1	2	3	4
v: of having been saved by God	0	1	2	3	4
w: other (please describe briefly)	0	1	2	3	4

- 2: If applicable, please detail briefly the most important of these experiences, and the context in which it occurred.

Please answer the following questions by circling the number below the response which best reflects your personal circumstances.

3: Has your lifestyle and/or behaviour changed as a result of a significant experience of God?

changed radically				changed somewhat			no
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

4: Has your lifestyle and/or behaviour changed as a result of every-day experiences of God?

changed radically				changed somewhat			no
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

5: Is your lifestyle and/or behaviour shaped by your religious beliefs?

shaped radically				shaped somewhat			no
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

6: Are experiences of God desirable to you?

very desirable				somewhat desirable			not at all desirable
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

7: Since the end of October, 1987:

a: my beliefs and convictions have become

less religious	remained the same	more religious
1	2	3

b: my involvements in religious activities have

decreased	remained the same	increased
1	2	3

c: my personal relationship with God has

weakened	remained the same	strengthened
1	2	3

7: Since the end of October, 1987:

d: my associations with, and attachments to religious people have

weakened	remained the same	strengthened
1	2	3

e: Have you had one or more significant experiences of God?

no	one	more than one
1	2	3

f: Has your lifestyle/behaviour changed as a result of one or more significant religious experiences?

no	somewhat	radically
1	2	3

DEL

This questionnaire deals with some material which you might consider highly sensitive and personal. We agree. However, if this research is to have maximum social benefit, then it is important that we get a picture of the extent to which participants are involved in illegal activities.

Your answers to this questionnaire, like your answers to the other questionnaires, will not be made available to anyone other than the researchers involved in this study. YOUR ANSWERS ARE COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL AND NO NAMES APPEAR ANYWHERE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRES.

Following are some activities which you may have participated in. Please circle the letter which represents your level of participation in the activities. PLEASE ANSWER EVERY QUESTION.

If you have NEVER engaged in the activity	circle "A"
If you have engaged in the activity at least once in your life
but NOT IN THE LAST YEAR	circle "B"
If you have engaged in the activity only ONCE IN THE LAST YEAR	circle "C"
If you have engaged in the activity TWICE IN THE LAST YEAR	circle "D"
If you have engaged in the activity THREE OR MORE TIMES IN THE
LAST YEAR	circle "E"

A = NEVER

B = NOT IN THE LAST YEAR

C = ONCE IN THE LAST YEAR

D = TWICE IN THE LAST YEAR

E = THREE OR MORE TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR

1. Bribed or attempted to bribe a police officer or any other type of official.
 A B C D E
2. Used force to get money or valuables from another person.
 A B C D E
3. Sold beer, wine, or liquor without a licence.
 A B C D E
4. Visited prostitutes or solicited.
 A B C D E
5. Carried a razor, switchblade, or gun (besides ordinary pocketknife).
 A B C D E
6. Attacked someone with the idea of taking his/her life.
 A B C D E
7. Taken part in a gang fight.
 A B C D E
8. Taken things of large value (worth more than \$200.00) that did not belong to me (excluding an automobile).
 A B C D E
9. Broken in and entered a home, store, or building.
 A B C D E
10. Had marijuana or hashish in my possession.
 A B C D E
11. Taken a car for a ride without the owner's knowledge.
 A B C D E
12. Attempted to force or forced someone to have sexual intercourse with me.
 A B C D E
13. Started a fist fight during an argument or struck or 'beat up' someone who had not hit me first or had not threatened to hit me.
 A B C D E

A = NEVER

D = TWICE IN THE LAST YEAR

B = NOT IN THE LAST YEAR

E = THREE OR MORE TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR

C = ONCE IN THE LAST YEAR

14. Purposefully damaged property not belonging to me.

A B C D E

15. Driven a care without a driver's license or permit.

A B C D E

16. Falsified information while filling out an application or report, or falsified an official document (e.g., student loan application).

A B C D E

17. Sold marijuana or hashish.

A B C D E

18. Started a fire or helped set fire to a building.

A B C D E

19. Participated in illegal gambling.

A B C D E

20. Taken things of medium value (worth between \$5 and \$200) that did not belong to me (e.g., library books).

A B C D E

21. Made false cab or ambulance calls, fire alarms, food orders, etc.

A B C D E

22. Driven a car in a very fast reckless manner.

A B C D E

23. Went on to someone's property when I knew I was not supposed to.

A B C D E

24. Threatened to hurt or injure someone.

A B C D E

25. Taken little things (worth less than \$5) that didn't belong to me (e.g., shoplifting)

A B C D E

A = NEVER

B = NOT IN THE LAST YEAR

C = ONCE IN THE LAST YEAR

D = TWICE IN THE LAST YEAR

E = THREE OR MORE TIMES IN THE LAST YEAR

26. Had in my possession things I knew were stolen.

A B C D E

27. Have cheated on exams and/or assignments.

A B C D E

28. Driven a car while impaired by alcohol or drugs or when I knew I had consumed more alcohol than allowed by law to drive.

A B C D E

29. Caused a disturbance in a public place by shouting, screaming, fighting, swearing, or using obscene or insulting language.

A B C D E

30. Had illegal drugs other than marijuana or hashish in my possession.

A B C D E

31. Sold illegal drugs other than marijuana or hashish.

A B C D E

32. Have stolen a car for purposes other than joyriding.

A B C D E

33. Got some money or something from others by deception or false pretense.

A B C D E

HELP

On the following pages is a list of things that people do to be helpful to one another. Read each item in the list and decide if you have helped someone in that way in the last month. Show your answer to each item by circling one of the numbers from 1 to 5 under the category which best describes how often you have done these helpful things. Be sure to circle one of the numbers for each of the items in the list.

Not at all in the last month	once or twice in the last month	about once a week in the last month	several times a week in the last month	about every day in the last month	
1	2	3	4	5	
1. Looked after a member of someone's family while they were away.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Was present with someone in a stressful situation.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Took care of someone's possessions while they were away (pets, plants, home, apartment, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
4. Told someone how I acted in a situation similar to theirs.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Did something to help someone get their mind off things.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Talked with someone about their interests.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Let someone know they did something well.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Went with someone to speak with someone who would take action.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Told someone that I would keep the things that we talked about private, just between the two of us.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Assisted someone in setting a goal for themselves.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Expressed respect or esteem for a skill or personal quality possessed by someone.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Gave someone information on how to do something.	1	2	3	4	5

Not at all in the last months	once or twice in the last month	about one a week in the last month	several times a week in the last week	about every day in the last month
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	---	---

1

2

3

4

5

13. Loaned someone over \$25.

1

2

3

4

5

14. Comforted someone by showing them some physical affection.

1

2

3

4

5

15. Provided someone with transportation.

1

2

3

4

5

16. Loaned someone under \$25.

1

2

3

4

5

17. Helped someone understand why they didn't do something well.

1

2

3

4

5

18. Listened to someone talk about their private feelings.

1

2

3

4

5

19. Loaned or gave someone something (other than money) that they needed.

1

2

3

4

5

20. Told them how I felt in a situation that was similar to theirs.

1

2

3

4

5

21. Let someone know that I will always be around if they need me.

1

2

3

4

5

22. Expressed interest and concern in someone's well being.

1

2

3

4

5

23. Told someone that I feel very close to them.

1

2

3

4

5

24. Told someone who they should see for assistance.

1

2

3

4

5

25. Told someone what to expect in a situation that was about to happen.

1

2

3

4

5

Not at all in the last months	once or twice in the last month	about one a week in the last month	several times a week in the last week	about every day in the last month
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--	---	---

1

2

3

4

5

26. Gave someone over \$25.

1

2

3

4

5

27. Taught someone how to do something.

1

2

3

4

5

28. Joked or kidded to try to cheer someone up.

1

2

3

4

5

29. Provided someone with a place to stay.

1

2

3

4

5

30. Pitched in to help someone do something that needed to get done.

1

2

3

4

5

31. Gave someone under \$25.

1

2

3

4

5

32. Volunteered my time to help others either in the Community or at School.

1

2

3

4

5

33. Please list any voluntary service organizations to which you belong.

34. Please list any voluntary service activities in which you have engaged in the last three months:

Confidential Research Questionnaire

O.T.P. 5

This questionnaire asks several questions about how much crime you see going on around you.

Please answer as honestly and as carefully as possible. Remember your answers are confidential and will not be seen by anyone other than the research staff. The answers will be stored on a computer without your name attached to the answers. This front sheet with your name on it will then be destroyed once your answers are counted and stored on the computer.

Please circle the answer which best describes your situation in the last six months.

1. Think of the people you know and have been associating with over the last six months:

a) Are any of them involved in activities such as stealing (cars, money or other property or fraud)?

Most are Several are Very few are None are

b) Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or just gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?

Most are Several are Very few are None are

2. Think of your best friends, that is, those close friends who you have seen most frequently over the last six months.

a) Are any of them involved in activities such as stealing (cars, money or property) or fraud?

Most Several Very few None

b) Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or just gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?

Most Several Very few None

Social Support for Crime Scale
[Time-1]

3. If I want to purchase some stolen goods at a reduced price, I'd know where to go or who to see.

Definitely
Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

4. If I want to get some money for some stolen goods, I'd know where to go or who to see.

Definitely
Yes

Yes

Not sure

NO

5. If I was planning to commit a crime, I know some people who could and would help me plan it.

Definitely
Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

6. While I might not call them friends and I might not see them very often, I know some people who are involved in criminal activity.

Definitely
Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

7. I know of at least one person in my neighbourhood or area of town who appears to be doing "just fine" as a result of his/her criminal activity.

Definitely
Yes

yes

Not sure

30

Social Support for Crime Scale

[Time-1]

8. In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who are involved in criminal activity and are liked and respected by others in the neighbourhood.

Definitely

Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

9. In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who are involved in criminal activity and they are disliked and not respected by others in the neighbourhood.

Definitely

Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

Confidential Research Questionnaire

Q.T.P. 5

This questionnaire asks several questions about how much crime you see going on around you.

Please answer as honestly and as carefully as possible. Remember, your answers are confidential and will not be seen by anyone other than the research staff. The answers will be stored on a computer without your name attached to the answers. This front sheet with your name on it will then be destroyed once your answers are counted and stored on the computer.

Please circle the answer which best describes your situation since the end of October, 1987.

1. Think of the people you know and have been associating with since the end of October 1987.

a) Are any of them involved in activities such as stealing (cars, money or other property) or fraud?

Most are Several are Very few are None are

b) Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or just gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?

Most are Several are Very few are None are

2. Think of your best friends, that is, those close friends who you have seen most frequently since the end of October 1987.

a) Are any of them involved in activities such as stealing (cars, money or property) or fraud?

Most	Several	Very few	None
-------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------

b) Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or just gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?

Most	Several	Very few	None
-------------	----------------	-----------------	-------------

3. If I want to purchase some stolen goods at a reduced price, I'd know where to go or who to see.

Definitely Yes	Yes	Not sure	No
----------------	-----	----------	----

4. If I want to get some money for some stolen goods, I'd know where to go or who to see.

Definitely Yes	Yes	Not sure	No
----------------	-----	----------	----

5. If I was planning to commit a crime, I know some people who could and would help me plan it.

Definitely Yes	Yes	Not sure	No
----------------	-----	----------	----

6. While I might not call them friends and I might not see them very often, I know some people who are involved in criminal activity.

Definitely Yes	Yes	Not sure	No
----------------	-----	----------	----

7. I know of at least one person in my neighbourhood or area of town who appears to be doing "just fine" as a result of his/her criminal activity.

Definitely Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

8. In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who are involved in criminal activity and are liked and respected by others in the neighbourhood.

Definitely Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

9. In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who are involved in criminal activity and they are disliked and not respected by others in the neighbourhood.

Definitely Yes

Yes

Not sure

No

CS

This is not a test and there are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers.

Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. Circle the answer which best represents your feeling about the statement. Circle the answer which best represents your general feeling or the way you usually feel.

If you STRONGLY AGREE	circle SA
If you AGREE	circle A
If you are not sure or UNDECIDED	circle U
If you DISAGREE	circle D
If you STRONGLY DISAGREE	circle SD

Please indicate your feelings about every statement by circling one of the five (5) answers; that is, please answer every question by circling one of the five phrases.

Criminal Sentiments Scale

Strongly AgreeAgreeUndecidedDisagreeStrongly Disagree

1.	Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a person cannot respect the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2.	Nearly all laws deserve our respect	SA	A	U	D	SD
3.	It is our duty to obey all laws.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4.	Laws are usually bad.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5.	The law is rotten to the core.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6.	Almost any jury can be fixed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7.	You can't get justice in court.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8.	On the whole, lawyers are honest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9.	Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecution.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10.	On the whole, the police are honest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11.	A cop is a friend to people in need.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12.	Life would be better with fewer police.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13.	The police should be paid more for their work.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Strongly AgreeAgreeUndecidedDisagreeStrongly Disagree

14. The police are just as crooked as the people they arrest.

SA

A

U

D

SD

15. All laws should be strictly obeyed because they are laws.

SA

A

U

D

SD

16. The law does not benefit the common person.

SA

A

U

D

SD

17. The law as a whole is sound.

SA

A

U

D

SD

18. In the long run, law and justice are the same.

SA

A

U

D

SD

19. The law enslaves the majority of people for the benefit of a few.

SA

A

U

D

SD

20. On the whole, judges are honest and kindhearted.

SA

A

U

D

SD

21. Court decisions are almost always just.

SA

A

U

D

SD

22. Almost anything can be fixed in the courts if you have enough money.

SA

A

U

D

SD

23. A judge is a good person.

SA

A

U

D

SD

24. Our society could be better off if there were more police.

SA

A

U

D

SD

25. Police rarely try to help people.

SA

A

U

D

SD

Criminal Sentiments Scale

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Undecided</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
1. I probably won't be able to do the kind of work I want to do, because I won't have enough education	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. No matter where people come from they can still get ahead if they work hard.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Most people are better off than I am.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. I am as well off as most people.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. The world is usually good to people like me.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. There is a good chance that some of my friends will have a lot of money.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. People like myself can't become successful unless they get a lucky break.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. Sometimes a person like myself has to break the law in order to get ahead.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Most successful people used illegal means to become successful.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life that I have.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. People should always obey the law no matter how much it interferes with their personal ambition.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. I would rather associate with people that obey the law than those that don't.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. It's all right for people to break the law if they don't get caught.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Criminal Sentiments Scale

Strongly AgreeAgreeUndecidedDisagreeStrongly Disagree

14. I'm more like the people who can make a living outside the law than I am like those who only break the law occasionally.
- SA A U D SD
15. Most people would commit crimes if they knew they wouldn't get caught.
- SA A U D SD
16. People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.
- SA A U D SD
17. There never is a good cause for breaking the law.
- SA A U D SD
18. I don't have much in common with people who never break the law.
- SA A U D SD
19. A hungry person has the right to steal.
- SA A U D SD
20. It's allright to evade the law if you don't actually violate it.
- SA A U D SD
21. No one can vioiate the law and be my friend.
- SA A U D SD
22. A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable.
- SA A U D SD
23. People are fools to work for a living if they can get by some easier way; even if it means violating the law.
- SA A U D SD
24. If people work hard, they will get ahead in the world.
- SA A U D SD
25. I like to take risks.
- SA A U D SD
26. The things I like to do best are dangerous.
- SA A U D SD

Criminal Sentiments Scale

Strongly AgreeAgreeUndecidedDisagreeStrongly Disagree

27. To get ahead, you have to do some things that are not right.

SA

A

U

D

SD

28. Suckers deserve to be taken advantage of.

SA

A

U

D

SD

This is not a test and there are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

Circle each of the following statements as "true" (T) or "false" (F) according to the way you feel about it. If you agree with the statement, circle "T". If you disagree, circle "F". Please answer every statement, if you are not sure, circle the choice which comes closest to your general feeling or to the way you usually feel.

For each statement, circle the appropriate answer according to how you feel about it.

	True	False
1. While I was in school I played hookey quite a bit.	T	F
2. If someone dares me to do something, I usually do it.	T	F
3. The way things look, it's pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something.	T	F
4. I feel more strongly about right and wrong than most people.	T	F
5. Most things don't excite or thrill me.	T	F
6. My parents often didn't like my friends.	T	F
7. I was always happy about my home life.	T	F
8. I often do things on the spur of the moment without thinking first.	T	F
9. Most of the time my parents let me make my own decisions.	T	F
10. I wouldn't ask for a favour even if it meant going without something.	T	F
11. I have had more things to worry about than most people.	T	F
12. Before I do something I try to think of how my friends will react to it.	T	F
13. When I was in school I was sometimes sent to the principal for fooling around.	T	F
14. I try to stay out of trouble at all costs.	T	F
15. I usually feel pretty happy.	T	F
16. Many times I feel as though I have done something wrong or wicked.	T	F
17. I have often done things against my parent's wishes.	T	F
18. How I look, and what impression I am making upon others, is important to me.	T	F
19. I have never drank heavily.	T	F
20. It is hard for me to drop, or break with a friend.	T	F
21. When I was younger I often felt like leaving home.	T	F
22. The way I look has never worried me.	T	F

	True	False
23. My sex behaviour has gotten me into trouble before.	T	F
24. If I see trouble I go out of my way to meet it rather than to try to escape it.	T	F
25. My home life was never enjoyable.	T	F
26. I seem to have more regrets than other people about the things I do.	T	F
27. My table manners are better when I am out in company than they are at home.	T	F
28. It doesn't take much for someone to win an argument with me.	T	F
29. Seeing a smart lawyer get a criminal free makes me pretty discouraged with the law.	T	F
30. At times in the past I drank far too much alcohol.	T	F
31. Even when I have gotten into trouble I was usually trying to do the right thing.	T	F
32. Having enough friends and social life is very important to me.	T	F
33. I often had the urge to run away from home.	T	F
34. I have gotten a pretty raw deal out of life.	T	F
35. I often find people talking about me behind my back.	T	F
36. When I was in school, I used to give the teachers a lot of trouble.	T	F
37. I think most other people are happier than I am.	T	F
38. When I was a youngster I stole something occasionally.	T	F
39. When I was a child my home was less peaceful and quiet than those of most other people.	T	F
40. If I could make enough money I would like to travel with a circus or carnival.	T	F
41. Going to school never interested me much.	T	F
42. My family was always very close to one another.	T	F
43. I don't think my parents ever really understood me.	T	F
44. The only way to get along nowadays is not to trust anyone.	T	F
45. The only way to make big money is to steal it.	T	F

Criminal Personality Scale

	True	False
46. I have very strong likes and dislikes	T	F
47. I got (or used to get) into a lot of fights in school.	T	F
48. When something goes wrong I usually blame myself rather than the other fellow.	T	F
49. It isn't their fault that most people get into trouble.	T	F
50. I do what I want to, whether anybody likes it or not.	T	F
51. I sometimes feel that I made the wrong choice in my occupations.	T	F
52. I don't mind lying if I am in bad trouble.	T	F
53. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job.	T	F
54. It is hard for me to act natural when I am with new people.	T	F
55. I have never been in trouble with the law.	T	F
56. I enjoy work as much as play.	T	F
57. I often feel that I am not getting anywhere in life.	T	F
58. When in school, I sometimes felt like quitting.	T	F
59. When I was a little kid, I was always doing things my folks told me not to.	T	F
60. I have failed at least one year in school.	T	F
61. The only way to settle anything is by winning a fight.	T	F
62. A lot of times it's fun to be in jail.	T	F
63. My folks move (or used to move) from place to place a lot.	T	F
64. My folks have sometimes been in trouble with the law.	T	F
65. I would rather be at home when things go wrong.	T	F
66. I'm really too tough a person to get along with most friends.	T	F
67. I would have been more successful if people had given me a fair chance.	T	F
68. I have run away from home.	T	F
69. Cops and judges will tell you one thing and do another.	T	F
70. Winning a fight is more fun than anything.	T	F

Criminal Personality Scale

	True	False
71. If you don't have enough to live on it's okay to steal.	T	F
72. Sometimes I feel (or used to feel) that if I could just get away from home, everything would be all right.	T	F
73. If somebody does something to me, I always get them back.	T	F
74. A person like me hits first and asks questions later.	T	F
75. The people that run things are usually against me.	T	F
76. My folks usually blame bad company for the trouble I get into.	T	F
77. Cops usually treat you dirty.	T	F
78. If the cops don't like you, they will get you for anything.	T	F
79. Most brothers and sisters are more trouble than they are worth.	T	F
80. It's dumb to trust older people.	T	F
81. My mother and father argued a lot.	T	F
82. My father (or mother) treated me badly.	T	F
83. I was often punished unfairly as a child.	T	F
84. My folks yelled at us kids a lot.	T	F
85. My mother and father have never really been friends of mine.	T	F
86. I have lived in an orphan's home or a foster home at some time.	T	F

SMO

The statements on the following pages concern your personal reactions to a number of different situations. No two statements are exactly alike, so consider each statement carefully before answering. If a statement is "True" (or mostly true), circle the "T". If a statement is "False" (or mostly false), circle the "F".

It is important that you answer as frankly and as honestly as you can. Your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence.

TRUE FALSE

T	F	1. I find it hard to imitate the behaviour of other people.
T	F	2. My behaviour is usually an expression of my true inner feelings, attitudes, and beliefs.
T	F	3. At parties and social gatherings, I do not attempt to do or say things that others will like.
T	F	4. I can only argue for ideas which I already believe.
T	F	5. I can make impromptu speeches even on topics about which I have almost no information.
T	F	6. I guess I put on a show to impress or entertain people.
T	F	7. When I am uncertain how to act in a social situation, I look to the behaviour of others for cues.
T	F	8. I would probably make a good actor.
T	F	9. I rarely need the advice of my friends to choose movies, books, or music.
T	F	10. I sometimes appear to others to be experiencing deeper emotions than I actually am.
T	F	11. I laugh more when I watch a comedy with others than when alone.
T	F	12. In a group of people, I am rarely the centre of attention.
T	F	13. In different situations and with different people, I often act like a very different person.
T	F	14. I am not particularly good at making other people like me.
T	F	15. Even if I am not enjoying myself, I often pretend to be having a good time.
T	F	16. I'm not always the person I appear to be.
T	F	17. I would not change my opinions (or the way I do things) in order to please someone else or win their favour.
T	F	18. I have considered being an entertainer.
T	F	19. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.
T	F	20. I have never been good at games like charades or improvisational acting.
T	F	21. I have trouble changing my behaviour to suit different people and different situations.

TRUE FALSE

T	F	22.	At a party, I let others keep the jokes and stories going.
T	F	23.	I feel a bit awkward in company and do not show up quite so well as I should.
T	F	24.	I can look anyone in the eye and tell a lie with a straight face (if for a right end).
T	F	25.	I may deceive people by being friendly when I really dislike them.

(Faking Good) Scale

F

Circle each of the following statements as "true" (T) or "false" (F) according to the way you feel about it. If you agree with the statement, circle "T". If you disagree, circle "F". There are no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. PLEASE TRY TO ANSWER EVERY STATEMENT. If you are not sure, circle the choice which comes closest to your general feeling or to the way you usually feel.

TRUE FALSE

T	F	1.	I gossip a little at times.
T	F	2.	At times I have very much wanted to leave home.
T	F	3.	I would like to be a soldier.
T	F	4.	Sometimes when I am not feeling well I am cross.
T	F	5.	I am very careful about my manner of dress.
T	F	6.	I go to church almost every week.
T	F	7.	My hardest battles are with myself.
T	F	8.	I must admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter.
T	F	9.	If given the chance I could do some things that would be of great benefit to the world.
T	F	10.	I have been inspired to a program of life based on duty which I have since carefully followed.
T	F	11.	I do not always tell the truth.
T	F	12.	Religion gives me no worry.
T	F	13.	I like to talk about sex.
T	F	14.	When I was a child, I belonged to a crowd or gang that tried to stick together through thick and thin.
T	F	15.	I hate to have to rush when working.
T	F	16.	I frequently find myself worrying about something.
T	F	17.	If given the chance, I would make a good leader of people.
T	F	18.	I find it hard to set aside a task that I have undertaken, even for a short time.
T	F	19.	I worry over money and business.
T	F	20.	Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.
T	F	21.	I very much like hunting.
T	F	22.	At times I feel like swearing.
T	F	23.	I feel sure that there is only one true religion.

T	F	24.	I have several times had a change of heart about my life work.
T	F	25.	I would like to hunt lions in Africa.
T	F	26.	I like to flirt.
T	F	27.	I am entirely self-confident.
T	F	28.	At periods my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
T	F	29.	I do not like everyone I know.
T	F	30.	It is a good thing to be frank.
T	F	31.	I would like to be an auto racer.
T	F	32.	I would like to be a journalist.
T	F	33.	I have very few fears compared to my friends.

Appendix XIV

Summary of Bio-demographic Data For The
Time One and Time Two Undergraduate and Religious Samples

Variable	Descriptor	Time One		Time Two	
		Undergraduate n=192	Religious n=26	Undergraduate n=119	Religious n=21
Age	Range	16-47	29-62	17-45	29-47
	Mean	21.38	42.08	21.16	38.63
	S. D.	5.17	8.11	5.26	5.62
Gender	Male (%)	26.55	46.15	17.65	47.62
	Female (%)	73.45	53.85	82.35	52.38
Marital Status	Never Married (%)	86.42	19.23	89.91	15.79
	Married to Spouse (%)	7.28	69.23	5.27	79.95
	Separated/Divorced (%)	2.98	11.54	1.15	5.26
	Cohabiting (%)	5.21	0.00	3.66	0.00
Marital Frequency	0 (%)	90.14	19.23	92.44	10.53
	1 (%)	6.77	80.77	5.88	84.21
	2 or more (%)	3.08	0.00	1.68	5.26
Occupation	Full-time Student (%)	70.84	0.00	67.23	0.00
	Homemaker (%)	6.77	23.08	6.72	26.32
	Unskilled Labour (%)	10.41	3.85	10.92	5.26
	Skilled/Clerical (%)	9.83	23.08	11.76	26.32
	Professional (%)	2.08	46.15	3.37	42.11
Education	Range	Gr.11-B.A.Hons.	Gr. 9-Ph.D.	Gr.11-B.A.Hons.	Gr.10-Ph.D.
	Mean (years)	14.04	15.50	13.85	15.89
	S. D.	1.22	3.24	1.26	2.94
Father's Occupation	Missing	5	0	2	0
	Unskilled (%)	34.51	26.92	35.89	12.05
	Skilled (%)	19.36	23.08	19.66	26.32
	Professional (%)	47.13	50.00	44.44	52.63
Mother's Occupation	Missing	6	0	2	0
	Homemaker (%)	30.65	57.69	32.48	57.89
	Unskilled (%)	8.36	0.00	8.55	0.00
	Skilled (%)	34.52	26.92	31.62	31.58
	Professional (%)	26.47	15.38	27.35	10.53
Father's Education	Range	Gr. 2-Ph.D.	Gr. 2-Ph.D.	Gr. 2-Ph.D.	Gr. 2-Ph.D.
	Mean (years)	13.30	12.20	12.89	12.79
	S. D.	4.04	4.86	4.12	5.06
Mother's Education	Range	0-Ph.D.	Gr.8-B.A.Hons	0-Ph.D.	Gr.8-B.A.Hons
	Mean (years)	12.86	12.83	12.71	13.28
	S. D.	3.07	2.37	3.33	2.27
Father on Welfare	Unsure	6	0	3	0
	Yes (%)	21.51	15.38	9.48	15.79
	No (%)	78.49	84.62	90.52	84.21
Mother on Welfare	Unsure	8	0	4	0
	Yes (%)	14.13	3.85	10.43	0.00
	No (%)	85.87	96.15	89.56	100.00
Benefits	Unsure	5	1	2	1
	Yes (%)	3.21	11.58	3.41	5.56
	No (%)	96.79	88.42	96.59	94.44

Appendix XIV

Summary of Bio-demographic Data For The
Time One and Time Two Undergraduate and Religious Samples
(continued)

Variable	Descriptor	Time One		Time Two	
		Undergraduate n=192	Religious n=26	Undergraduate n=119	Religious n=21
Have Been Arrested	Yes (%)	4.17	7.69	5.04	5.26
	No (%)	95.83	92.31	94.96	94.74
Have Been Convicted	Yes (%)	3.64	3.85	3.36	5.26
	No (%)	96.36	96.15	96.64	94.74
Number of Convictions	0 (%)	96.36	96.15	96.64	94.74
	1 (%)	2.60	3.85	1.68	5.26
	2 or more (%)	1.04	0.00	1.68	0.00
Religious Affiliation	None (%)	21.35	0.00	21.01	0.00
	Jewish (%)	2.08	0.00	2.52	0.00
	Christian (%)	72.92	100.00	73.11	100.00
	Moslem (%)	2.08	0.00	1.68	0.00
	Others (%)	1.56	0.00	1.68	0.00
Denomina- tional Affiliation	None (%)	28.13	0.00	26.05	0.00
	Roman Catholic (%)	31.25	57.69	32.77	68.42
	Presbyterian (%)	4.69	0.00	4.20	0.00
	Anglican (%)	17.71	42.31	17.65	31.58
	United (%)	9.38	0.00	10.08	0.00
	Other Christian (%)	3.13	0.00	3.36	0.00
	Non-Christian	5.72	0.00	5.88	0.00

Appendix XV

Descriptive Statistics for Original, Rationally Derived RIS (Religious Involvement Survey) Subscales

Scale	No. of Items	Poss. Range	Sample	Time One			Time Two			Test	
				mean	s.d.	alpha	mean	s.d.	alpha	n	Retest
Christian Orthodoxy	19	19 to 133	combined	88.06	32.39	.981	91.58	31.54	.982	135	.939
			undergrad.	82.74	30.69	.978	84.99	29.45	.978	115	.921
			religious	127.35	9.67	.914	129.45	6.47	.799	20	.925
Judeo Christian Orthodoxy	17	17 to 119	combined	82.69	26.59	.965	86.14	25.78	.969	135	.917
			undergrad.	78.4	25.29	.959	81.09	24.54	.963	115	.894
			religious	114.31	6.21	.752	115.20	5.49	.773	20	.908
External Consequences	8	8 to 56	combined	32.70	13.07	.932	35.24	12.69	.937	135	.860
			undergrad.	30.59	12.11	.925	32.83	11.93	.935	115	.838
			religious	48.38	8.50	.796	49.15	6.49	.623	20	.506
Religious Morality	10	10 to 70	combined	51.22	9.79	.753	53.74	10.39	.801	135	.852
			undergrad.	49.39	8.79	.709	51.39	9.26	.744	115	.808
			religious	64.73	4.96	.297	67.25	4.63	.689	20	.606
Holy Communion	1	1 to 7	combined	3.08	2.04	n/a	3.18	2.01	n/a	135	.854
			undergrad.	2.68	1.84	n/a	2.66	1.71	n/a	115	.792
			religious	6.00	.28	n/a	6.15	.37	n/a	20	.445
Church/Congregation Involvement	7	7 to 49	combined	20.01	11.71	.929	20.86	11.81	.933	135	.931
			undergrad.	17.29	9.47	.895	17.57	9.35	.895	115	.904
			religious	40.12	5.25	.615	39.75	4.24	.392	20	.309
Small Group Involvement	4	4 to 28	combined	9.22	7.49	.936	10.57	8.16	.939	135	.886
			undergrad.	7.23	5.34	.886	8.09	5.82	.866	115	.757
			religious	23.92	3.78	.621	24.85	3.71	.877	20	.877
Involvement with Close Friends	3	3 to 21	combined	10.08	4.31	.765	10.67	4.32	.762	135	.809
			undergrad.	9.11	3.37	.614	9.40	3.22	.547	115	.661
			religious	17.23	3.71	.830	17.95	2.04	.683	20	.774
Involvement with Acquaintances	3	3 to 21	combined	9.09	3.24	.654	9.75	3.22	.593	135	.734
			undergrad.	8.47	2.91	.585	9.03	2.78	.429	115	.661
			religious	13.73	2.44	.437	13.90	2.38	.624	20	.359

Appendix XV

Descriptive Statistics for Original, Rationally Derived RIS (Religious Involvement Survey) Subscales
(continued)

Scale	No. of Items	Poss. Range	Sample	Time One				Time Two				Test	
				mean	s.d.	alpha	n	mean	s.d.	alpha	n	Retest	n
Involvement with Family	3	3 to 21	combined	10.46	4.91	.741	218	10.97	5.21	.778	135	.756	138
			undergrad.	10.12	4.99	.765	192	10.39	5.26	.805	115	.773	119
			religious	12.96	3.43	.479	26	14.30	3.45	.484	20	.297	19
Religious Upbringing	5	5 to 35	combined	21.35	7.45	.976	218	21.21	7.84	.885	135	.880	138
			undergrad.	20.81	7.45	.869	192	20.51	7.89	.878	115	.867	119
			religious	25.38	6.27	.901	26	25.25	6.36	.883	20	.938	19
Personal Relationship with God	11	11 to 77	combined	40.97	19.42	.947	218	44.13	20.34	.957	135	.942	138
			undergrad.	37.30	17.58	.932	192	39.63	18.58	.943	115	.919	119
			religious	68.08	6.78	.769	26	69.95	4.65	.628	20	.727	19
Social Support from Friends	3	3 to 9	combined	7.06	2.12	.859	218	6.71	2.18	.832	135	.296	138
			undergrad.	6.86	2.16	.857	192	6.36	2.14	.809	115	.219	119
			religious	8.58	.81	.551	26	8.75	.91	.939	20	-.125	19
Social Support from Best Friends	3	3 to 9	combined	6.04	2.41	.863	218	5.75	2.50	.887	135	.447	138
			undergrad.	5.70	2.34	.846	192	5.24	2.34	.855	115	.319	119
			religious	5.50	1.14	.901	26	8.65	.93	.943	20	.633	19
Access to Religious Resources	3	3 to 8	combined	6.93	1.43	.563	218	7.19	1.28	.569	135	.472	138
			undergrad.	6.79	1.47	.560	192	7.05	1.34	.555	115	.439	119
			religious	7.88	.43	-.066	26	7.95	.22	-	20	-.056	19
Access to Religious Models	2	2 to 6	combined	5.16	1.06	.645	218	5.09	1.19	.738	135	.577	138
			undergrad.	5.07	1.08	.631	192	4.94	1.23	.724	115	.558	119
			religious	5.78	.71	.842	26	6.00	.000	-	20	-	19
Negative Religious Influences	5	5 to 19	combined	14.17	2.75	.689	218	15.05	2.72	.706	135	.553	138
			undergrad.	14.07	2.76	.686	192	14.97	2.82	.726	115	.563	119
			religious	14.88	2.57	.708	26	15.50	2.06	.471	20	.471	19
Extrinsic/Mean Orientation	6	6 to 42	combined	25.41	5.78	.445	218	25.28	6.05	.496	135	.692	138
			undergrad.	26.64	4.52	.139	192	26.46	4.99	.282	115	.532	119
			religious	16.35	6.06	.553	26	18.50	7.24	.709	20	.706	19

APPENDIIX XVI

Summary of Analyses of
Original, Rationally Derived
Scales of the R.I.S.

Notable exceptions to this trend include the Quest-Seeking orientation to religion measure developed by Battson and Ventis (1982), on which the two samples display similar means, and the orientation to religion as an extrinsic means to an end developed by Allport and Ross (1967), on which the mean of the religious sample is markedly lower than that of the undergraduate sample.

A further examination of the portions of the R.I.S. drawn from the work of other authors shows that apparently large differences between the samples also occur with respect to the measure by Allport and Ross of an orientation to religion as its own ends, and the External and Internal orientations to religion advanced by Battson and Ventis. On each of these the Religious sample exhibited the higher mean. This is also true of the Religious Beliefs scale of Battson and Ventis (1982) and the Christian Orthodoxy scale of ullerton and Hunsberger (1982) (see the first attached table), which compose much of the Religious beliefs section of the present survey.

The 4 subscales of the Religious Beliefs section demonstrate the same properties, suggesting that strength of beliefs regarding any aspect of Christian Religion is indicative of the strength of beliefs regarding others. This indication is confirmed by a factor analysis of that section which yielded a single factor solution for both time-1 and time-2 data (see the second attached table). That table reveals that single factor solutions are also

APPENDIIX XVI

derived from the Religious Involvement section for both time-1 and time-2 data, and from the Social Support for Religion, Religious Experiences, and the Religious Orientation sections for time-1 data. Those latter three sections do require a two-factor solution with respect to time-2 data when the number of subjects from the undergraduate sample for whom there was data were reduced to 119 from the 192 for whom there was data at time-1. These results provide some support for the rationale on which was founded the original formulation of the R.I.S. However, an overall analysis distills the entire survey into five factors, of which the principal one and three others cut across the five sections (see the third attached table).

A much more indepth analysis can be made of the reliability and factor structure of the Religious Involvement Survey, and of the effectiveness with which it distinguished between samples of specifically religious persons and samples drawn from the population at large. The aim of the present research, however, is to methodically investigate the relationship between religiousness and deviance, and so, further analysis of the R.I.S. has been done only to the extent that it furthers that purpose.

All but the Quest-Seeking Orientation to Religion measure, then, are associated with religious involvement, as is evidenced by their capacities to discriminate between the undergraduate and religious samples.

Scale	No. of Items	Poss. Range	Sample	Time One			Time Two			Test			
				mean	s. d.	alpha	n	mean	s. d.	alpha	n	Retest	n
Orthodoxy Scale of Batson and Ventis	11	11 to 77	combined	51.22	17.81	.947	218	57.97	19.07	.959	131	.920	138
			undergrad.	48.34	16.92	.939	192	54.44	18.06	.953	113	.898	119
			religious	72.54	5.39	.621		66.14	5.05	.225	18	.864	19
Christian Orthodoxy Scale of Fullerton and Hunsberger	24	24 to 168	combined	114.69	39.35	.982	218	118.89	37.63	.983	131	.933	138
			undergrad.	108.23	37.33	.979	192	111.67	35.41	.979	113	.913	119
			religious	162.38	10.28	.940	26	136.38	6.42	.800	18	.910	19

Appendix XVI

Table 2

Factor Table for Rationally Derived RIS Subscales by Sections,
Time 1 and Time 2 Data, Undergraduate Sample

Section	Subscales	Time 1 Factor Loadings		Time 2 Factor Loadings	
		<u>F1</u>	n=192	<u>F1</u>	n=119
Religious Beliefs	Christian Orthodoxy	.94		.95	
	Judeo-Christian Orthodoxy	.95		.94	
	Eternal-Consequences	.89		.88	
	Religious Morality	.75		.76	
	Eigenvalue	3.15		3.13	
	Percentage of Variance	78.8		78.2	
Religious Involvement		<u>F1</u>		<u>F1</u>	
	Holy Communion	.71		.66	
	Church/Denomination	.91		.92	
	Small Groups	.78		.78	
	Close Friends	.79		.76	
	Acquaintances	.79		.71	
	Family	.87		.87	
	Upbringing (Religious)	.65		.68	
	Personal Relationship with God	.80		.76	
	Eigenvalue	5.03		4.78	
	Percentage of Variance	62.9		59.7	
Social Support for Religion				<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>
	Support from Friends	.68		.88	
	Support from Best Friends	.69		.76	
	Access to Religious Resources	.67		-	.74
	Access to Religious Models	.60		.37	.61
	Negative Social Influences	-.34		-	-.76
	Eigenvalue	1.87		2.06	1.04
	Percentage of Variance	37.4		41.2	20.9

Appendix XVI

Table 2

Factor Table for Rationally Derived RIS Subscales by Sections,
Time 1 + Time 2 Data, Undergraduate Sample
(continued)

Section	Subscales	Time 1 Factor Loadings	Time 2 Factor Loadings	
			<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>
Religious Experiences	Description of Desirability	.51	.34	.71
	Desirability	.82	.85	
	Other than God	.81	.82	
	Experiences of God	.93	.91	
	Unlisted Experiences	.43		.87
	Religious Influences	.89	.91	
	Eigenvalue	3.45	3.29	1.19
	Percentage of Variance	57.4	54.8	19.9
			<u>F1</u>	<u>F2</u>
Religious Orientation	Means			.93
	Ends		.95	
	External		.89	
	Internal		.95	
	Seeking/Quest		.60	.51
	Eigenvalue		2.96	1.11
	Percentage of Variance		59.3	22.3

Table 3
Overall Factor Loadings For Rationally Derived
RIS Subscales Time One and Time Two Data, Undergraduate Sample

Subscales	Time One Factor Loading, n = 185					Time Two Factor Loading, n = 115						
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
Christian-Orthodoxy	0.871					0.888						
Judeo-Christian Orthodoxy	0.904					0.882						
Eternal Consequences	0.832					0.848						
Religious Morality	0.699					0.681	0.373					
Holy Communion	0.556	0.443				0.508	0.621					
Church/Congregation	0.654	0.602				0.508	0.689					
Small Groups Involvement	0.572	0.459				0.411	0.503					
Close Friends Involvement	0.379	0.611	0.414			0.500		0.375	0.303	0.476		
Acquaintances	0.360	0.631	0.336									
Family Involvement	0.517	0.699				0.418	0.756					
Religious Upbringing		0.717				0.776	0.797	0.467				
Personal Relationship with God	0.894		0.812							0.809		
Social Support from Friends			0.764							0.765		
Social Support from Best Friends			0.316						0.699			
Access to Religious Resources		0.583	0.330						0.731			
Negative Religious Influences		0.348		-0.572					-0.654			
Extrinsic/Means Orientation				0.518								0.862
Intrinsic/Ends Orientation	0.859	0.397				0.723	0.327	0.444				
External Orientation	0.656	0.459				0.638	0.399					
Internal Orientation	0.882	0.316				0.783	0.307	0.391				
Quest/Seeking Orientation	0.518			0.363				0.416	0.395			0.523
Experiences of God	0.837					0.639		0.604				
Experiences Other Than God	0.554			0.529				0.828				
Desirability of Religious Experiences	0.801											
Religious Influences	0.795	0.336				0.576		0.540				
Eigen Value	12.58	2.13	1.46	1.26		12.21	2.20	1.81	1.42	1.22	1.05	1.02
Percentage of Variance	48.4	8.2	5.6	4.9		43.6	7.9	6.5	5.1	4.4	3.7	3.7

Appendix XVII

Summary for Analysis of Internal
 Reliability of the Subscale
 Access to Religious Resources
 (Items 3, 4 and 5 From The Rationally
 Derived Measure of Social Support for Religion)
 mean = 6.92
 s.d. = 1.43
 alpha = .563

	Items		
	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5
Item/Scale Correlation	.611	.568	.041
Alpha if item deleted	.022	.093	.768

Appendix XIX

Table of Frequency Distributions For The Measures
Of Deviance For Overall, Male and Female Undergraduates
Sample, Time One and Time Two

Scale	V A L U E	Per Cent						Cumulative Per Cent					
		Overall		Male		Female		Overall		Male		Female	
		T1 n=188	T2 n=118	T1 n=50	T2 n=31	T1 n=138	T2 n=87	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2
Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Ever Committed	0	39.6	49.2	20.0	29.0	46.7	56.3	39.6	49.2	20.0	29.0	46.7	56.3
	1	18.7	21.2	18.0	16.1	19.0	23.0	58.3	70.3	38.0	45.2	65.7	79.3
	2	18.7	12.7	20.0	16.1	18.2	11.5	77.0	83.1	58.0	61.3	83.9	90.8
	3	8.0	5.1	8.0	6.5	8.0	4.6	85.0	88.1	66.0	67.7	92.0	95.4
	4	8.0	4.2	16.0	12.9	5.1	1.1	93.0	92.4	82.0	80.6	97.1	96.6
	5	3.7	6.8	8.0	16.1	2.2	3.4	96.8	99.2	90.0	96.8	99.3	100.0
	6	2.7	0.0	8.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	99.5	0.0	98.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
	7+	0.5	0.8	2.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
Number of Types of Victimless Deviance Ever Committed	0	44.7	55.1	32.0	23.3	49.3	63.2	44.7	55.1	32.0	32.3	49.3	63.2
	1	27.7	25.4	26.0	32.3	28.3	23.0	72.4	80.5	58.0	64.5	77.6	86.2
	2	13.8	9.3	10.0	9.7	15.2	9.2	86.2	89.8	68.0	74.2	92.8	95.4
	3	8.5	5.1	22.0	16.1	3.6	1.1	94.7	94.9	90.0	90.3	96.4	96.6
	4	4.3	2.5	8.0	0.0	2.9	3.4	99.0	97.5	98.0	0.0	99.3	100.0
	5	1.1	2.5	2.0	9.7	0.7	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
Number of Types of Deviance Ever Committed Range = 0 to 21	0	10.8	17.9	2.0	6.5	14.0	22.1	10.8	17.9	2.0	6.5	14.0	22.1
	1	11.9	15.4	4.1	12.9	14.7	16.3	22.7	33.3	6.1	19.4	28.7	38.4
	2	9.7	11.1	4.1	0.0	11.8	15.1	32.4	44.4	10.2	0.0	40.4	53.5
	3	8.6	9.4	8.2	9.7	8.8	9.3	41.1	53.8	18.4	29.0	49.3	62.8
	4	7.0	7.7	2.0	9.7	8.8	7.0	48.1	61.5	20.4	38.7	58.1	69.8
	5	9.2	6.0	12.2	0.0	8.1	8.1	57.3	67.5	32.7	0.0	66.2	77.9
	6	5.9	3.4	12.2	3.2	3.7	3.5	63.2	70.9	44.9	41.9	69.9	81.4
	7	7.0	5.1	10.2	6.5	5.9	4.7	70.3	76.1	55.1	48.4	75.7	86.0
	8	8.1	3.4	2.0	6.5	10.3	2.3	78.4	79.5	57.1	54.3	86.0	88.4
	9	0.5	3.4	0.0	9.7	0.7	1.2	78.9	82.9	0.0	64.5	86.8	89.5
	10	1.6	4.3	0.0	6.5	2.2	3.5	80.5	87.2	0.0	71.0	89.0	93.0
	11+	19.5	12.8	42.9	29.0	11.0	7.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number of Types of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	0	73.8	81.4	60.0	67.7	76.8	86.2	73.8	81.4	60.0	67.7	78.8	86.2
	1	12.8	8.5	12.0	6.5	13.1	9.2	86.6	89.8	72.0	74.2	92.0	95.4
	2	8.0	5.9	14.0	12.9	5.8	3.4	94.7	95.8	86.0	87.1	97.8	98.9
	3	2.1	2.5	4.0	6.5	1.5	1.1	96.8	98.3	90.0	93.5	99.3	100.0
	4	2.7	1.7	8.0	6.5	0.7	0.0	99.5	100.0	98.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
	5	0.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Number of Types of Vic- timless Devi- ance Recently Committed	0	66.0	80.5	52.0	64.5	71.0	86.2	66.0	80.5	52.0	69.5	71.0	86.2
	1	21.8	11.9	24.0	16.1	21.0	10.3	87.8	92.4	76.0	80.6	92.0	96.6
	2	7.4	4.2	12.0	9.7	5.8	2.3	95.2	96.6	88.0	90.3	97.8	98.9
	3	3.2	2.5	8.0	6.5	1.4	1.1	98.4	99.2	96.0	96.8	99.3	100.0
	4	1.6	0.8	4.0	3.2	0.7	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0
Number of Types of Deviance Recently Committed Range = 1 to 17	0	31.4	49.6	20.4	29.0	35.3	57.0	31.4	49.6	20.4	29.0	35.3	57.0
	1	18.4	23.1	10.2	19.4	21.3	24.4	49.7	72.6	30.6	48.4	56.6	81.4
	2	14.1	6.8	12.2	9.7	14.7	5.8	63.8	79.5	42.9	58.1	71.3	87.2
	3	8.1	7.7	10.2	12.9	7.4	5.8	71.9	87.2	53.1	71.0	78.7	93.0
	4	7.6	2.6	12.2	3.2	3.9	2.3	79.5	89.7	65.3	74.2	84.6	95.3
	5	5.4	3.4	4.1	3.2	5.2	3.5	84.9	93.2	69.4	77.4	90.4	98.8
	6	4.9	0.9	6.1	0.0	4.4	0.0	89.7	94.0	75.5	0.0	94.9	0.0
	7	0.5	2.6	4.1	0.0	0.7	1.2	90.3	96.6	79.6	0.0	95.6	100.0
	8	1.6	1.7	4.1	9.7	2.2	0.0	91.9	98.3	83.7	87.1	97.8	0.0
	9+	8.1	1.7	16.3	12.9	2.2	0.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0

Appendix XIX

Table of Frequency Distributions For The Measures
Of Deviance For Overall, Male and Female Undergraduates
Sample, Time One and Time Two
(continued)

Scale	V A L U E	Per Cent						Cumulative Per Cent					
		Overall		Male		Female		Overall		Male		Female	
		T1 n=188	T2 n=118	T1 n=50	T2 n=31	T1 n=138	T2 n=87	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2
Amount of Victimizing Deviance Recently Committed	0	73.8	81.4	60.0	67.7	78.8	86.2	73.8	81.4	60.0	67.7	78.8	86.2
	1	10.2	6.8	10.0	6.5	10.2	6.9	84.0	88.1	70.0	74.2	89.1	93.1
	2	4.8	2.5	10.0	0.0	2.9	3.4	88.8	90.7	80.0	0.0	92.0	96.6
	3	2.1	1.7	2.0	3.2	2.2	1.1	90.9	92.4	82.0	77.4	94.2	97.7
	4	2.1	0.8	2.0	3.2	2.2	0.0	93.0	93.2	84.0	80.6	96.4	0.0
Range= 1 to 9	5+	7.0	6.8	16.0	19.4	3.6	2.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Amount of Victimless Deviance Recently Committed	0	66.0	80.5	52.0	64.5	71.0	86.2	66.0	80.5	52.0	64.5	71.0	86.2
	1	9.0	5.1	6.0	9.7	10.1	3.4	75.0	85.6	58.0	74.2	81.2	89.7
	2	3.2	3.4	4.0	0.0	2.9	4.6	78.2	89.0	62.0	0.0	84.1	94.3
	3	11.2	4.2	14.0	9.7	10.1	2.3	89.4	93.2	76.0	83.9	94.2	96.6
	4	2.1	2.5	4.0	3.2	1.4	2.3	91.5	95.8	80.0	87.1	95.7	98.9
	5	1.6	0.0	2.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	93.1	5.0	82.0	0.0	97.1	0.0
	6+	6.9	4.2	18.0	12.9	2.9	1.1	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Total Amount of Deviance	0	31.4	49.6	20.4	29.0	35.3	57.0	31.4	49.6	20.4	29.0	35.3	57.0
	1	11.4	16.2	6.1	16.1	13.2	16.3	12.7	65.8	26.5	45.2	48.5	73.3
	2	8.6	3.4	4.1	6.5	10.3	2.3	51.4	69.2	30.6	51.6	58.8	75.6
	3	9.7	11.1	6.1	9.7	11.0	11.6	61.1	80.3	36.7	61.3	69.9	87.2
	4	5.9	3.4	12.2	6.5	3.7	2.3	67.0	883.8	49.0	67.7	73.5	89.5
	5	4.9	1.7	2.0	0.0	5.9	2.3	71.9	85.5	51.0	0.0	79.4	91.9
	6	3.2	3.4	4.1	0.0	2.9	4.7	75.1	88.9	55.1	0.0	82.4	96.8
	7	4.3	0.9	6.1	3.2	3.7	0.0	99.5	89.7	61.2	71.0	86.0	0.0
	8	2.7	0.0	4.1	0.0	2.2	0.0	82.2	0.0	65.3	0.0	88.2	0.0
	9	1.6	1.7	4.1	3.2	2.2	1.2	83.0	91.5	69.4	74.2	90.4	97.7
Range - 0 to 34	10+	16.2	8.5	30.6	25.8	9.6	2.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Appendix XX

Frequency Distributions for the Measures
of Deviance for Overall, Male and Female Religious Samples
Time 1 and Time 2

Scale	Value	Percent						Cumulative Percent					
		Overall		Male		Female		Overall		Male		Female	
		T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2
No. of Types of Victimizing Deviance ever Committed	0	53.8	36.8	41.7	44.4	64.3	30.0	53.8	36.8	41.7	44.4	64.3	30.0
	1	19.2	36.8	16.7	22.2	21.4	50.0	73.1	73.7	58.3	66.7	85.7	80.0
	2	19.2	11.1	25.0	22.2	14.3	20.0	92.3	94.7	83.3	88.9	100	100
	3	3.8	0	8.3	0	0	0	96.2	0	91.7	0	0	0
	4+	3.8	5.3	8.3	11.1	0	0	100	100	100	100	0	0
No. of Types of Victimless Deviance ever Committed	0	73.1	78.9	50.0	77.8	92.9	80.0	73.1	78.9	50.0	77.8	92.9	80.0
	1	15.4	15.8	25.0	11.1	7.1	20.0	88.5	94.7	75.0	88.9	100	100
	2	7.7	0	16.7	0	0	0	96.2	0	91.7	0	0	0
	3	3.8	5.3	8.3	11.1	0	0	100	100	100	100	0	0
No. of Types of Deviance ever Committed	0	28.0	26.3	18.2	22.2	35.7	30.0	28.0	26.3	18.2	22.2	35.7	30.0
	1	16.0	10.5	18.2	0	14.3	20.0	44.0	36.8	36.4	0	50.0	50.0
	2	20.0	21.2	0	44.4	35.7	0		57.9	0	66.7	85.7	0
	3	8.0	10.5	9.1	0	7.1	20.0	72	68.4	45.5	0	92.9	70.0
	4	4.0	5.3	9.1	11.1	0	0	76.0	73.7	54.5	77.8	0	0
	5	4.0	0	0	0	0	0	80.0	0	0	0	0	0
	6+	20	26.3	45.5	22.2	7.1	30.0	100	100	100	100	100	100
No. of Types of Victimizing Deviance ever Committed	0	96.2	89.5	91.7	88.9	100	90.0	96.2	89.5	91.7	88.9	100	90.0
	1	0	10.5	0	11.1	0	10.0	0	100	0	100	0	100
	2	3.8	0	8.3	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	0
No. of Types of Victimless Deviance recently Committed	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No. of Types of Deviance recently Committed	0	84.0	89.5	72.7	88.9	92.9	90.0	84.0	89.5	72.7	88.9	92.9	90.0
	1	12.0	5.3	18.2	0	7.1	10.0	96.0	94.7	90.0	0	100	100
	2	4.0	5.3	9.1	11.1	0	0	100	100	100	100	0	0
Amount of Victimizing Deviance recently Committed	0	96.2	89.5	97.7	88.9	100	90.0	96.2	89.5	91.7	88.9	100	90.0
	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0	5.3	0	0	0	10.0	0	94.7	0	0	0	10.0
	3	0	5.3	0	11.1	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0
	4	3.8	0	8.3	0	0	0	100	0	100	0	0	0

Appendix XX

Frequency Distributions for the Measures
of Deviance for Overall, Male and Female Religious Samples
Time 1 and Time 2
(continued)

Scale	Value	Percent						Cumulative Percent					
		Overall		Male		Female		Overall		Male		Female	
		T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2	T1	T2
Amount of Victimless Deviance recently Committed	0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total Amount of Deviance	0	84.0	89.5	72.7	88.9	92.9	90.0	84.0	89.5	72.7	88.9	92.9	90.0
	1	4.0	0	9.1	0	0	0	88.0	0	81.8	0	0	0
	2	8.0	5.3	0	0	0	10	0	94.7	0	0	0	100
	3	8.0	0	9.1	0	7.1	0	96.0	0	90.0	0	100	0
	4+	4.0	5.3	9.1	11.1	0	0	96.0	100	100	100	0	0

Appendix XXII

Table of Zero Order Correlations between Self-Monitoring and
the Measures of Deviance, Religious Sample
Time 1 Data

	No. of Types of Victim- ing Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Victim- ing Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Victim- ing Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victim- ing Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victim- ing Deviance less Deviance recently Committed	Total amount of Deviance
Self Monitoring	-.176	-.084	-.186	-.095	n/a	-.179	-.095	n/a
								-.059

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

Appendix XXIII

Table of Zero Order Correlations between Self-Monitoring and
the RIS Subscales, Religious Sample
Time 1 Data

	Religious Commit- ment	External Con- sequences	Religious Morality	Religious Involvement in Religion	Social Support for Religion	Religious Experiences	Extrinsic/ Means Orienta- tion	Intrinsic/ Ends Orienta- tion	External Orienta- tion	Internal Orienta- tion	Quest/ Seeking Orienta- tion
Self Monitoring	.255	.284	.459	-.060	-.264	.305	.341	-.221	.102	.148	.399
	A	A		A	A	A	B			B	

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

APPENDIX XXV

Discussion of the Psychometric
Properties of the Core Battery
O Criminological Correlates

The hypothesized relationships between measures of religiousness and deviance have already been demonstrated. It is also of interest to this dissertation to examine the extent to which those variables continue to account for variance in rates of deviant behaviour once the effects of relationships between deviance and a battery of correlates of deviance have been statistically removed. This battery has been discussed in the methodology chapter of the thesis, and includes thirteen measures. The first table attached to this appendix is the descriptive statistics table for those measures, and employs the same format as descriptive statistics tables encountered earlier. For both the undergraduate and religious samples, and for the two samples combined, it displays means, standard deviations and Crombach alpha estimates of internal reliability derived for both time-1 and time-2 data, and a correlational estimate of test-retest reliability.

The first table attached here shows that five members of the battery register estimates of internal reliability of .8 or higher for either the time-1 or time-2 data of the undergraduate sample -- Criminal Sentiments (law, courts and police), Risk-taking, Social Support for Crime, Socialization, and Family Dissention. Of these, Socialization and Family Dissention exhibit test-retest estimates higher than .8 as well. The other three register

APPENDIX XXV

moderately high test-retest estimates for the undergraduate data, ranging from a correlation of .456 to a correlation of .769. The measure of Inadequacy/Immaturity exhibits particularly low estimates of reliability based on the data from the undergraduate sample ($\alpha=.091$ for time-1; $\alpha=.291$ for time-2). However, the test-retest estimate for that variable is somewhat higher ($r=.572$). Though not always the case, the alpha estimates of internal reliability and the test-retest correlations for the religious sample tend to be lower than those of the undergraduate sample. Again,, the small size of the religious sample tends to render these estimates difficult to interpret.

Besides the measure of Social Support for Crime, the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations and of Psychopathy are of particular interest to the present research. In both cases the estimates of internal reliability are respectable regarding the undergraduate sample data. This is particularly true of Tolerance for Law Violations ($\alpha=.730$ for time-1; $\alpha=.736$ for time-2; $r=.771$), though the co-efficients for the Psychopathy variable are quite high as well ($\alpha=.665$ for time-1; $\alpha=.767$ for time-2; $r=.754$).

All of the measures from the battery of correlates of deviance are examined here in relation to the covariate measures -- the bio-demographic variables and the measure of Faking. The matrix of zero-order correlations for the undergraduate sample used for this examination is displayed in the second table attached to this appendix. It shows that eight of the thirteen members of the battery are correlated with Gender strongly enough to yield

APPENDIX XXV

probability levels less than .01. The correlations implicating six of those variables -- Tolerance for Low Violations, Social Support for Crime, Psychopathy, Identification with Criminal Others, Risk-taking, and Scholastic Mal-adjustment -- yield probability levels less than .001. The directions of the correlations in all eight cases reveal that male subjects tended more to obtain scores indicative of deviant behaviour and attitudes. No other covariate measure is so strongly correlated with so many of the battery measures. Gender is the only covariate measure with which Tolerance for Law Violations, Identification with Criminal Others, Socialization, and Scholastic Mal-adjustment each demonstrate a strong relationship. Besides its relationship with gender, Social Support for Crime is moderately and positively correlated with the measure of Father Having Received Welfare Benefits ($r=.181$, $p<.01$). The measure of Risk-taking, besides its relationship with gender, is moderately and negatively correlated with age ($r=-.183$, $p<.01$). the positive correlation between Neuroticism and Gender is equaled by its correlation with Number of Convictions ($r=.174$, $p<.01$), both of which are eclipsed by the magnitude of the negative correlation between Neuroticism and Faking ($r=-.241$, $p<.001$). Other significant correlations are scattered throughout the second table attached to this appendix, but the only consistency demonstrated in the correlation matrix is the relationships between gender and the measures from the battery of correlates of deviance.

A set of factor analyses was conducted on the battery of measures in an effort to examine possible clusters. The factor

APPENDIX XXV

loadings derived from those analyses on both time-1 and time-2 data are contained in the fourth table attached to this appendix. It reveals that three factors have been distilled from time-1 data and four from the time-2 data, and that the primary factors derived from the two data sets are completely independent of one another. Five measures -- Tolerance for Law Violations, Criminal Sentiments (law, courts, police), Awareness of Limited Opportunities, Identification with Criminal Others, and Deviant Morality -- make their strongest contribution to the primary factor derived from time-1 data, and the first four from that set are most strongly represented in factor-2 derived from time-2 data. On the other hand, the five variables making their strongest contributions to the primary factor based on time-2 data are Social Support for Crime, Socialization, Neuroticism, Family Dissent, and Scholastic Mal-adjustment. However, the magnitude of loadings distilled from time-1 data suggests that that grouping of variables should be divided between factor-2 and factor-3. The remainder of the factor picture is no less confusing, leaving only two conclusions to be drawn from this analysis. Firstly: one small cluster of four correlates of deviance can be distilled, consisting of variables measuring attitudes towards crime and the criminal justice system -- Tolerance for Law Violations and Criminal Sentiments -- and a view of oneself relative to the availability of social and economic opportunities -- Awareness of Limited Opportunity -- and to criminal others -- Identification with Criminal Others. Secondly: the measure of Psychopathy loads relatively weakly, and almost equally onto all factors, indicating

APPENDIX XXV

that it may be the single measure most representative of the battery of correlates of deviance.

Examination of the inter-correlations among the battery of measures shows that the Psychopathy variable is correlated with every other measure strongly enough to yield probability levels less than .001. The inter-correlation matrix is presented in the fifth table attached here, which shows this to be true of the measures of Neuroticism and Socialization as well. In fact, of the 78 co-efficients displayed in that table, 60 demonstrate this level of strength, all of them being in the expected direction. Only 9 of the correlation co-efficients fail to yield probability levels less than .05, and 5 of those implicate the measure of Inadequacy/Immaturity. It is evident, then, the Inadequacy/Immaturity measure notwithstanding, that the measures which make up the battery of predictors of deviance are strongly inter-related. Not surprisingly, this is true of the small cluster of variables derived in the factor analysis. The six correlations involving those four measures range in magnitude from .283 between Tolerance of Law Violations and Awareness of Limited Opportunities, to -.603 between Tolerance for Law Violations and Criminal Sentiments ($p < .001$ in all cases).

The inter-correlational picture is a much different one with respect to the data gathered from the religious sample. The third table attached to this appendix displays the relevant matrix, and displays, on the whole, correlation co-efficients which are smaller in magnitude than those derived from the undergraduate sample data. More than 60 of the co-efficients displayed in that

APPENDIX XXV

table fail to yield probability levels less than .-5.

It is the data from the undergraduate sample, though, which is of concern and of greater use in examining relationships with deviance in this study. The scales of this battery have been studied in relation to deviance within student populations in previous works, and this thesis turns now to add its contribution to those efforts.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics For The Core Criminological Battery

Scale	No. of Items	Poss. Range	Sample	Time One			Time Two			Test			
				mean	s.d.	alpha	n	mean	s.d.	alpha	n	Retest	n
Criminal Sentiment (Law, Courts, Police)	25	25 to 125	combined	95.25	11.49	.899	204	95.88	11.99	.914	138	.763	136
			undergrad.	94.62	11.68	.905	182	95.08	11.95	.914	119	.769	118
			religious	99.21	7.98	.820	22	100.84	11.33	.914	19	.679	18
Awareness of Limited Opportunity	8	8 to 40	combined	16.25	3.42	.645	204	16.26	3.59	.724	138	.633	136
			undergrad.	15.96	3.36	.673	182	16.09	3.62	.749	119	.644	118
			religious	18.64	2.94	.304	22	17.14	3.35	.610	19	.523	18
Identification of Christian Others	6	6 to 30	combined	13.83	2.93	.512	204	13.32	3.01	.579	138	.666	136
			undergrad.	13.96	3.01	.539	182	13.65	3.00	.569	119	.682	118
			religious	12.88	2.03	.285	22	11.57	2.46	.480	19	.208	18
Tolerance for Law Violations	8	8 to 40	combined	19.29	4.15	.741	204	19.42	4.34	.769	138	.692	136
			undergrad.	19.69	4.12	.730	182	20.23	4.09	.736	119	.681	118
			religious	16.09	2.86	.629	22	15.09	2.81	.545	19	.418	18
Risk Taking	2	2 to 10	combined	8.50	1.96	.805	204	5.31	2.42	.869	138	.459	136
			undergrad.	5.64	1.98	.815	182	5.63	2.46	.868	119	.427	118
			religious	4.36	1.39	.482	22	3.62	1.16	.594	19	.235	18
Morality	2	2 to 10	combined	4.01	1.72	.579	204	4.18	2.27	.702	138	.288	136
			undergrad.	4.13	1.76	.557	182	4.38	2.38	.694	119	.264	118
			religious	3.00	.98	.709	22	3.09	1.04	.550	19	.157	18
Socialization	44	0 to 44	combined	32.97	5.64	.778	204	33.26	6.05	.817	138	.833	136
			undergrad.	32.69	5.71	.781	182	32.98	6.15	.821	119	.827	118
			religious	28.18	4.59	.738	22	28.76	5.38	.807	19	.684	18
Psychopathy	25	0 to 25	combined	3.39	2.68	.679	204	3.22	3.07	.778	138	.769	136
			undergrad.	3.66	2.68	.664	182	3.59	3.12	.767	119	.754	118
			religious	1.14	1.13	.198	22	1.19	1.78	.733	19	.670	18
Neuroticism	27	0 to 27	combined	7.97	4.53	.794	204	7.73	4.48	.801	138	.759	136
			undergrad.	8.38	4.52	.789	182	8.18	4.49	.796	119	.743	118
			religious	4.55	2.81	.581	22	5.33	3.65	.761	19	.779	18

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for the Core Criminological Battery
(continued)

Scale	No. of Items	Poss. Range	Sample	Time One			Time Two			Test Retest	
				mean	s.d.	alpha	n	mean	s.d.	alpha	n
Inadequacy/ Immaturity	7	0 to 7	combined	2.27	1.18	.109	204	2.32	1.26	.224	138
			undergrad.	2.32	1.17	.091	182	2.29	1.29	.291	119
			religious	1.86	1.21	.243	22	2.48	1.12	-.045	19
Scholastic Maladjustment	9	0 to 9	combined	2.77	2.20	.709	204	2.76	2.12	.680	139
			undergrad.	2.93	2.26	.719	182	2.96	2.18	.691	119
			religious	1.50	1.06	-.085	22	1.71	1.38	.381	19
Family Dissension	11	0 to 11	combined	2.09	2.27	.779	204	2.16	2.44	.819	139
			undergrad.	2.11	2.28	.776	182	2.16	2.49	.826	119
			religious	1.91	2.22	.823	22	2.14	2.19	.824	19
Social Support for Crime	11	0 to 22	combined	6.17	5.42	.849	204	5.39	4.72	.835	139
			undergrad.	6.69	5.49	.844	182	6.14	4.75	.821	119
			religious	1.91	1.71	.566	22	1.43	1.47	.482	19
Self Monitoring	25	0 to 25	combined	13.69	3.99	.674	204	13.53	3.59	.598	139
			undergrad.	13.36	3.96	.666	182	13.23	3.50	.574	119
			religious	16.41	3.26	.562	22	15.09	3.75	.649	19
Faking	33	0 to 33	combined	10.23	3.49	.513	204	11.12	3.79	.588	139
			undergrad.	9.87	3.40	.505	182	10.59	3.33	.485	119
			religious	12.14	2.77	.229	22	12.90	4.86	.770	19

Table 2
Zero-order Correlations Between Core Criminological Battery and
Bio-Demographic Variables, Time One Data
Undergraduate Sample

	Age	Gender	Marital Frequency	Educa- tion	Occupation	Father's Educa- tion	Mother's Educa- tion	Father's Occupa- tion	Mother's Occupa- tion	Father's Welfare	Mother's Welfare	Benefits	Arrests	Convic- tions	Number Of Con- victions	Faking
Tolerance For Law Violations	-0.040	-0.236 ^G	-0.048	-0.012	-0.051	-0.048	-0.124 ^B	-0.021	0.005	-0.012	0.082	-0.001	0.112 ^A	0.075	0.016	-0.078
Social Support For Crime	-0.099 ^A	-0.256 ^G	-0.116 ^A	-0.041	0.013	-0.108 ^A	-0.134 ^B	-0.080	-0.059	0.181 ^D	0.135 ^B	0.023	0.127	0.037	0.037	-0.016
Criminal Sentiments (Law, Courts, Police)	-0.044	0.061	-0.010	-0.084	0.042	0.095	0.173 ^D	0.130 ^B	0.057	-0.048	-0.061	-0.017	-0.061	-0.043	0.049	0.126 ^B
Awareness of Limited Opportunity	0.204 ^E	-0.099 ^A	0.021	0.177 ^D	0.035	-0.079	-0.056	-0.135 ^B	-0.078	0.023	0.109 ^A	-0.034	-0.007	0.066	-0.001	-0.131 ^B
Identification of Christian Others	-0.044	-0.316 ^C	-0.022	0.012	-0.018	-0.073	-0.092	-0.059	-0.106 ^A	0.016	0.078	-0.095 ^A	0.051	0.042	0.004	0.012
Risk Taking	-0.183 ^D	-0.301 ^G	-0.095 ^A	-0.031	-0.076	-0.04	0.025	-0.078	0.052	-0.009	0.015	-0.038	0.108 ^A	0.124 ^B	0.063	0.078
Morality	0.047	-0.133 ^B	0.029	-0.058	-0.025	-0.104 ^A	-0.057	-0.108 ^A	-0.014	-0.007	0.027	-0.003	0.001	0.049	-0.061	-0.092
Socialization	-0.040	0.209 ^F	-0.021	-0.006	-0.092	-0.018	-0.071	0.032	-0.006	-0.095 ^A	-0.033	0.051	-0.093	-0.042	-0.053	0.101 ^A
Psychopathy	-0.142 ^B	-0.316 ^G	-0.175 ^D	0.021	-0.008	-0.056	-0.071	-0.101 ^A	0.069	0.069	0.121 ^B	0.032	0.087	0.026	0.039	-0.019
Neuroticism	0.007	-0.174 ^D	-0.045	0.027	0.023	-0.021	-0.026	-0.059	-0.002	0.066	0.024	-0.07	0.092	0.038	0.124 ^B	-0.241 ^G
Inadequacy/Immaturity	0.083	-0.077	0.034	0.130 ^B	0.095 ^A	-0.091	0.007	-0.086	0.049	0.119 ^B	-0.019	0.066	-0.009	0.021	-0.028	-0.021
Family Dissension	0.056	-0.066	0.069	-0.061	0.119 ^B	-0.047	-0.039	-0.022	-0.081	0.146 ^B	0.011	0.067	0.168 ^D	-0.002	0.107 ^A	0.002
Schoolastic Maladjustment	-0.019	-0.329 ^G	-0.037	0.019	0.067	0.036	0.054	0.075	0.059	0.117 ^A	-0.011	-0.069	0.086	0.079	0.036	-0.112 ^A

Coding for "p" values: A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

Appendix XXV

Table 3

Factor Loadings For Core Criminological Battery
Undergraduate Sample
Time One and Time Two

Scales	Time One Factor Loading			Time Two Factor Loading			
	F1	F2	F3	F1	F2	F3	F4
Tolerance of Law Violations	0.746						0.78
Social Support For Religion			0.655	0.655		0.365	
Criminal Sentiments (Law, Courts, Police)	-0.837				-0.769		
Awareness of Limited Opportunity	0.569	0.443	-0.394		0.723		
Identification of Christian Others	0.603	0.319			0.707		
Risk Taking	0.364		0.686	0.429		0.589	
Morality	0.639					0.772	
Socialization		-0.763	-0.468	-0.827			-0.307
Psychopathy	0.466	0.481	0.418	0.416	0.432	0.388	0.313
Neuroticism		0.763	0.332	0.682	0.325		
Inadequacy/Immaturity		0.604					0.897
Family Dissension		0.595	0.315	0.798			
Scholastic Maladjustment		0.362	0.74	0.744			
Eigenvalue	5.09	1.52	1.25	5.27	1.38	1.25	1.05
Percentage of Variance	39.2	11.7	9.7	40.5	10.7	9.6	8.1

Table 4
Intercorrelations Among Measures From The Core Criminological Battery
(Undergraduate Sample Time One Data)

	Tolerance For Law Violations	Social Support For Crime	Criminal Sentiments (Law, Courts, Police)	Awareness of Limited Opportunity	Identifica- tion of Christian Others	Risk Taking	Morality	Social- ization	Psycho- pathy	Neuroti- cism	Inade- quacy/ Immat- urity	Family Dissension	Scholastic Maladjust- ment
Tolerance For Law Violations	***												
Social Support For Crime		0.259 ***	-0.504 -0.146	0.283 0.006	0.417 0.273	0.354 0.354	0.453 0.076	-0.420 -0.334	0.454 0.402	0.305 0.302	0.033 0.086	0.339 0.173	0.340 0.454
Criminal Sentiments (Law, Courts, Police)			***	-0.420 ***	-0.482 0.383 ***	-0.267 -0.015 0.352 ***	-0.402 0.191 0.265	0.345 -0.291 -0.445 -0.402 -0.328 ***	-0.460 0.292 0.467 0.438 0.341 -0.647 ***	-0.272 0.325 0.349 0.325 0.254 -0.800 0.558 ***	-0.106 0.145 0.182 0.134 0.111 -0.312 0.239 0.292 ***	-0.232 0.350 0.249 0.044 0.193 -0.653 0.379 0.469 0.169 ***	-0.185 0.030 0.327 0.449 0.246 -0.685 0.469 0.509 0.058 0.387 ***
Awareness of Limited Opportunity				***									
Identification of Christian Others					***								
Risk Taking						***							
Morality							***						
Socialization								***					
Psychopathy									***				
Neuroticism										***			
Inadequacy/Immaturity											***		
Family Dissension												***	
Scholastic Maladjustment													***

Table 5
Intercorrelations Among Measures From The Core Criminological Battery
(Religious Sample Time One Data)

	Tolerance For Law Violations	Social Support For Crime	Criminal Sentiments (Law, Courts, Police)	Awareness of Limited Opportunity	Identifica- tion of Christian Others	Risk Taking	Morality	Social- ization	Psycho- pathy	Neuroti- cism	Inade- quacy/ Immatur- ity	Family Dissension	Scholastic Maladjust- ment
Tolerance For Law Violations	***												
Social Support For Crime		0.026 ***											
Criminal Sentiments (Law, Courts, Police)			-0.400 0.014 ***	-0.036 0.015	0.480 -0.118	0.306 -0.164	0.291 -0.220	0.117 0.173	0.104 0.069	-0.216 -0.200	-0.017 -0.066	-0.230 0.015	-0.088 0.079
Awareness of Limited Opportunity				-0.362 ***	-0.343 -0.128 ***	-0.268 -0.069 0.357 ***	-0.526 -0.291 0.499 0.222 ***	0.153 -0.179 0.301 -0.071 -0.139 ***	-0.228 0.048 0.283 0.180 0.327 -0.447 ***	-0.261 0.243 0.011 -0.155 0.237 -0.669 0.457 ***	-0.039 -0.037 -0.131 0.141 0.045 -0.131 0.358 0.059 ***	0.072 0.027 0.105 -0.068 0.054 -0.771 0.307 0.657 0.137 ***	-0.098 -0.048 0.027 -0.103 0.193 -0.695 0.483 0.617 0.091 0.656 ***
Identification of Christian Others													
Risk Taking													
Morality													
Socialization													
Psychopathy													
Neuroticism													
Inadequacy/Immaturity													
Family Dissension													
Scholastic Maladjustment													

APPENDIX XXVII

Discussion of the of the Effects of
Selected Core Criminological Battery
on R.I.S. Subscale Links with Deviance

Specific examination of these relationships was carried out through analyses of covariance. The first set of analyses explores the effects of the Tolerance for Law Violations and the Psychopathy measures as covariates on the relationship between the bi-level Religious Morality variable and the self report measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently committed. the simple effects of those analyses are summarized in the first table attached to this appendix. As has already been shown, the relationship between religious morality and the deviance measure is significant when the mean deviance scores are unadjusted. However, when the covariates Gender, Faking, Tolerance for Law Violations, and Psychopathy are introduced, The probability levels associated with the differences between the adjusted means climbs above the .05 mark. This is true with respect to the general relationship for the overall sample and for the male and female subsamples, and it is also true when the relationship is examined at both above-median and below-median levels of the Self Monitoring measure, and at the below-median level of the Social Support for Religion variable. It is found to be true again when the relationship is examined among those reporting strong levels of social support for religion while scoring low on Self Monitoring, and among those outside of that defined group.

The reader will recall that when the relationship between religious morality and the deviance measure was examined with

APPENDIX XXVII

controls for Gender and Faking alone, significant findings were revealed for the general relationship, among those scoring low on the Self Monitoring measure, among those scoring high on Social Support for Religion, and among those reporting strong levels of social support for religion while scoring low on Self Monitoring (see Table 3.19). Using again a one-tail test of significance, as was done in the earlier analyses of the relationships between the deviance measure and the religious involvement measures, it was found that the addition of Tolerance for Law Violations and Psychopathy to the list of covariates fails to remove the significant relationship among those from the overall sample who scored above the median on the Social Support for Religion measure ($\eta^2 = .28$, $\beta = .16$, $p < .05$). The effect of this persistent significant difference is to suggest that an interaction between religious morality and social support for religion continues to effect deviance rates. Examination of the relevant means lends support to that suggestion, with those from the general who scored high on both measures of religious involvement tending to report the lowest deviance rates. This pattern is also present within the female subsample, and the pattern of mean deviance scores for the male subsample also indicates an interaction effect.

A further set of analyses was done which included the measure of Social Support for Crime among the covariates. The resulting simple effects are summarized in the second table attached to this appendix. It shows that the only difference between mean deviance scores which persisted in being significant are those associated with the overall sample members reporting strong levels of social

APPENDIX XXVII

support for religion. Again, examination of the relevant cell means suggests an effect on deviance rates had by an interaction between the bi-level Religious Morality and Social Support for Religion variables. The pattern of mean scores continues to be similar to that which emerged when this interaction effect was studied with only the Gender and Faking measures as covariates (see Tables 3.19, 3.20, and the first table attached here).

Of interest here, too, are the high multiple correlation co-efficients relating the self report deviance measure to the composite variable composed of the bi-level Religious Morality variable and the five covariates Gender, Faking, Psychopathy, Tolerance for Law Violations, and Social Support for Crime. For the overall sample the co-efficients range in magnitude from a value of .54 to a value of .73, and yield probability levels of less than .001 in all cases. In fact, the only insignificant multiple correlation stems from the subsample of males who scored high on the Self Monitoring measure (multiple- $r=.70$), and that rather high value is rendered insignificant by the small number of subjects on which it is based. It can be concluded, then, that this combination of six variables provides an excellent indicator of deviance rates across a wide range of situations.

The measures from among the battery of correlates of deviance impact upon the Social Support for Religion variable somewhat differently than they do upon religious morality. The third table attached to this appendix summarizes the simple effects of the set of analyses of covariance employed to examine the impact of the Social Support for Crime variable on the relationship between

APPENDIX XA.VII

deviance and social support for religion. As has already been demonstrated, the differences between the unadjusted mean deviance scores based on the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable are insignificant for the overall sample and for the male subsample, though they are significant for the female subsample ($\eta^2 = .17$, $p < .02$). The reader will recall that when the mean deviance scores were adjusted based on the effect of the covariates Gender and Faking, the differences were again insignificant for the overall sample and male subsamples (see Table 3.20). However, the second table attached to this appendix shows that when the Social Support for Crime variable is added to the covariates, the one-tailed test indicates that the difference between the newly adjusted means for the overall sample are significant ($\beta = .10$, $p < .05$), and that they remain so for the female subsample ($\beta = .17$, $p < .02$). A similar situation is revealed when the analysis is applied to those scoring above the median on the Self Monitoring measure ($\eta^2 = .19$, $\beta = .21$, $p < .02$ for the overall sample; $\eta^2 = .21$, $\beta = .22$, $p < .05$ for the female subsample). No significant differences are found, though, among those scoring below the median on the Self Monitoring measure. With respect to the relationship between the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable and the deviance measure at above median and below median levels of Self Monitoring, then, inclusion of Social Support for crime among the covariates makes little difference. Nor does it make much difference to that relationship when it is examined across the two levels of Religious Morality. The difference between the mean deviance scores remains

APPENDIX XXVII

significant at high levels of Religious Morality for the overall sample ($\eta^2=.25$, $\beta^2=.22$, $p<.01$). On the other hand, no significant differences between means appear among those scoring low on Religious Morality. As well, examination of the relevant means provides confirming evidence for the persistence of an interaction effect on deviance rates between social support for religion and religious morality, with those scoring high on both religious variables tending to record lower deviance rates than other subjects.

Even stronger than that effect is that of the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion when the mean deviance scores are adjusted for Gender, Faking and Social Support for Crime. Examination of the relevant means in the third table attached to this appendix indicates that the interaction effect comes into play for the overall sample, and for both the male and female subsamples. As was the case for the earlier examination (see Table 3.20), the third table attached to this appendix shows that no significant differences exist between the mean deviance scores among those scoring below the median on Social Involvement in Religion, while the differences are visually apparent and statistically varified among those reporting high levels of social involvement in religion ($\eta^2=.27$, $\beta^2=.25$, $p<.005$ for the overall sample; $\eta^2=.28$, $\beta^2=.25$, $p<.05$ for the male subsample; $\eta^2=.25$, $\beta^2=.25$, $p<.02$ for the female subsamp.e). Among males, in fact, the negative relationship found among those reporting higher levels of social involvement in religion is inverted to a positive relationship among those

APPENDIX XXVII

scoring low on that variable ($\eta=.34$, $\beta=.21$, $p<.10$). Such an inversion had been apparent for both the male subsample and for the overall sample when this interaction effect was examined with only Gender and Faking employed as covariates. It can be argued, then, that inclusion of Social Support for Crime among the covariates may serve to reduce the effect of the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion upon deviance rates, but certainly not to insignificant levels.

The third table attached to this appendix indicates that inclusion of Social Support for Crime among the covariates does serve to remove whatever effect their may have been upon deviance rates by an interaction between social support for religion and religious upbringing. However, left intact is the relationship between the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable and the deviance measure among those who scored above the median on the Religious Upbringing measure ($\eta=.23$, $\beta=.16$, $p<.02$ for the overall sample).

The inclusion of the Social Support for Crime measure among the covariates, then, provides little impact in the way of reducing the relationship between deviance and social support for religion. Left intact are the effects on deviance scores had by the interaction between social support for religion and religious morality, and the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion. As well, the contributions Social Support for Crime measure to the adjustments of mean deviance scores among those scoring above the median on Self

APPENDIX XXVII

Monitoring, and among those scoring above the median on Religious Upbringing do not reduce differences between those means to insignificance. Finally, the difference between the adjusted means of the overall sample for the general relationship between Social Support for Religion and the deviance measure were significant when Social Support for Crime was included among the covariates, whereas that difference had not been significant when the means were adjusted for Gender and Faking alone.

Quite a different picture emerges, however, when the list of covariates is increased to five members through the addition of the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations and Psychopathy. The simple effects resulting from this set of analyses is summarized in the fourth table attached to this appendix. It shows that when the mean deviance scores are adjusted based on the expanded set of covariates, the general relationship between the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable and the deviance measure is reduced to insignificance ($\beta = .05$). A similar impact is had among those scoring above the median on Self Monitoring ($\beta = .11$, $p < .10$), on Religious Morality ($\beta = .10$), and on Religious Upbringing ($\beta = .11$, $p < .10$). Included in these reductions is the elimination of the effects on deviance scores had by the interaction between social support for religion and religious morality.

The fourth table attached to this appendix also reveals evidence, though, that the effect on deviance rates had by the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion survives the impacts of these covariates.

APPENDIX XXVII

Among those reporting higher levels of social involvement in religion the relation between the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable and the deviance measure remains negative and significant ($\eta^2=.27$, $\beta^2=.16$, $p<.02$ for the overall sample; $\eta^2=.28$, $\beta^2=.21$, $p<.10$ for the male subsample; $\eta^2=.25$, $\beta^2=.13$, $p<.10$ for the female subsample), while the differences between the adjusted means among those scoring below the median on the Social Involvement in Religion variable are all insignificant. Examination of all of the relevant means shows that, the insignificant differences notwithstanding, the relationship between social support for religion and the deviance measure is inverted to a positive one among subjects reporting low levels of social involvement in religion. This inversion is even more apparent with respect to the male subsample.

In fact, the interaction effect of social support for religion and social involvement in religion is reduced through statistical controls on the effects of Tolerance for Law Violations and Psychopathy in particular, and the argument that it continues to operate is clouded by the associated insignificant probability levels. Nonetheless, in the face of the demonstrated power of those correlates of deviance, the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion has proven to be the most sturdy indicator of deviance from among the religious involvement measures.

The power of those correlates of deviance is shown in the fourth table attached to this appendix in the column of multiple correlation co-efficients. For the overall sample, the

APPENDIX XXVII

correlation between the measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed and the composite variable made up of Gender, Faking, the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, and Social Support for crime, and the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable is .67. Among the various conditions defined by the intervening variables Self Monitoring, Religious Morality, Social Involvement in Religion, and Religious Upbringing, the co-efficients relevant to the overall sample range in magnitude from .56 among those scoring above the median on Self Monitoring to .76 among those reporting high levels of social involvement in religion.

One intent of the present research is to study in what way the impact had by the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, and Social Support for Crime might be played out in terms of the relation between R.I.S. subscales and Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed among those scoring above the median on those correlates of deviance. The fifth table attached to this appendix summarizes the simple effects stemming from analyses of covariance relating religious morality to the deviance measure at high levels of Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, and Social Support for Crime, using Gender and Faking as covariates. Perhaps most strikingly, it shows the mean deviance scores to be rather inflated among the subjects examined in these analyses. Table 3.50 also shows that, among those scoring high on the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations and Psychopathy, the relationships between the bi-level Religious Morality variable and the deviance measure are in the negative direction, but that they

APPENDIX XXVII

fall well short of significance. Among those reporting strong levels of social support for crime, though, negative and significant relationships are indicated for the overall sample ($\eta^2=.16$, $\beta^2=.16$, $p<.05$) and for the male subsample ($\eta^2=.33$, $\beta^2=.31$, $p<.05$).

The sixth table attached to this appendix summarizes the simple effects for the equivocal analyses as they apply to the relationship between social support for religion and the deviance measure, and for the interaction effect involving social support for religion and social involvement in religion. It reveals that virtually no significant differences between adjusted mean deviance scores exist under the conditions of high scores on these measures from the battery of correlates of deviance when the relationship between the deviance measure and the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable is examined on its own. The one exception applies to the female subsample scoring above the median on Social Support for Crime ($\eta^2=.25$, $\beta^2=.20$, $p<.05$).

When the analyses are adapted to examine the effect of the interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion an interesting picture emerges. With respect to the subjects who scored above the median on the Psychopathy measure, a significant and positive relationship is revealed between the bi-level Social Support for Religion Variable and the deviance measure among those scoring low on the Social Involvement in Religion variable ($\eta^2=.19$, $\beta^2=.25$, $p<.02$). This contrasts with a negative relationship which falls just short of significance among subjects who scored high on both the

APPENDIX XXVII

Psychopathy and Social Involvement in Religion variables ($\eta^2=.22$, $\beta^2=.20$, $p<.10$). An interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion is apparently in effect, then, with respect to scores on the deviance measure among those scoring above the median on Psychopathy. Examination of the relevant means defines this interaction as one wherein those scoring low on one of the religious involvement measures and high on the other tend to register the higher rates of deviance, whereas those who score high on both measures or who score low on both measures tend to register lower deviance rates. It is reiterated here that all of these mean deviance scores are high for the overall sample, though differences between them are evident and attributable in part to this interaction effect. This same pattern of adjusted mean deviance scores and test of significance results is apparent within the male subsample as well ($\eta^2=.50$, $\beta^2=.62$, $p<.01$ among males scoring high on Psychopathy and low on Social Involvement in Religion). Amazingly, the six males who scored high on Psychopathy, high on Social Involvement in Religion, and below the median on Social Involvement in Religion registered an adjusted mean score of 22.78 incidences of deviance over the previous year. Among females who scored above the median on the Psychopathy measure the pattern of mean deviance scores is somewhat different, and none of the differences between the means yield significant probability levels.

Among subjects scoring above the median on Tolerance for Law Violations another set of patterns of interaction effects between social support for religion and social involvement in religion is

APPENDIX XXVII

presented in Table 3.51. For the overall sample the significant difference between means stems from the negative relationship between social support for religion and the deviance measure among those reporting high levels of social involvement in religion ($\eta^2=.39$, $\beta^2=.35$, $p<.02$). This relationship is inverted to a positive, but insignificant one among subjects scoring low on Social Involvement in Religion. Within the male subsample no significant differences between mean deviance scores are revealed, but the pattern of those means bears great similarity to that of the overall sample. Among the females, too, a significant difference indicating a negative relationship between social support for religion and the deviance measure is revealed for those reporting high levels of social involvement in religion ($\eta^2=.45$, $\beta^2=.45$, $p<.05$). This difference all but disappears among the females scoring below the median on the Social Involvement in Religion variable, but again, an interaction effect is apparent.

Finally, with regard to subjects reporting strong levels of social support for crime, an argument can be made for the existence of an effect upon deviance rates attributable to an interaction between these two measures of religious involvement. The figures in Table 3.51 suggest that, based on the results for the overall sample, the presence of such an effect is debatable, although a significant negative relationship is evident between the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable and the deviance measure among those reporting high levels of social involvement in religion ($\eta^2=.38$, $\beta^2=.32$, $p<.02$). Among males scoring high on

APPENDIX XXVII

the Social Support for Crime measure a flip-flop interaction effect is again apparent, with the negative relationship between the bi-level Social Support for Religion variable and the deviance measure being significant among those scoring above the median on the Social Involvement in Religion variable ($\eta^2=.35$, $\beta^2=.40$, $p<.05$). Among females reporting strong levels of social support for crime the pattern of adjusted mean deviance scores is similar to that presented regarding females scoring above the median on the Tolerance for Law Violations measure. In this instance, too, the difference between means among those reporting high levels of social involvement in religion defines a negative and significant relationship between social support for religion and the deviance measure ($\eta^2=.37$, $\beta^2=.34$, $p<.05$).

Because the analyses relevant to these interaction effects deal with median splits on three variables simultaneously -- Social Support for Religion, Social Involvement in Religion, and the measure from the battery of correlates of deviance being examined -- and with the gender split as well, rather small numbers of subjects are represented in many of the cells. These small n 's make it inappropriate to insist on specific conclusions when describing the effects upon deviance scores had by the interaction between the two R.I.S. subscales among those scoring high on the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, or Social Support for Crime. However, there is evidence for such interaction effects in all cases. That evidence is particularly strong with respect to subjects scoring high on Tolerance for Law Violations and/or Psychopathy. Taken together, the evidence

APPENDIX XXVII

supports claims regarding the sturdiness of the measure of religious involvement conceptualized by an interaction between social support for religion and social involvement in religion in terms of its unique contribution in accounting for variance in the self report measure of Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed.

Appendix XXVII

Table 1

The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, Social Support for Religion, and Self-Monitoring

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted							
(comb.)	6.06 (93)	3.70 (91)	.17		.02	.17	.05
Men	10.33 (27)	7.82 (22)	.13		ns	.13	ns
Women	4.32 (66)	2.39 (69)	.20		.01	.20	.02
Adjusted for Gender and/or Faking							
(comb.)	5.11 (93)	4.68 (91)	.17	.03	.05	ns	.00
Men	8.81 (27)	9.68 (22)	.13	.04	ns	.47	.02
Women	3.70 (66)	2.97 (69)	.20	.08	ns	.49	.00
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	2.12 (39)	2.78 (44)	.03	.08	ns	.42	.01
Low	7.67 (53)	6.21 (45)	.21	.09	ns	.62	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	2.27 (8)	3.64 (6)	.06	.23	ns	.51	ns
Low	11.30 (19)	12.82 (15)	.15	.07	ns	.64	.005
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	1.94 (31)	2.76 (38)	.02	.10	ns	.51	.001
Low	5.45 (34)	3.13 (30)	.33	.22	.05	.49	.002
Social Support for Religion (tot.)							
Strong	5.33 (35)	3.15 (52)	.28	.16	.05	.54	.00
Weak	5.08 (48)	6.49 (39)	.03	.10	ns	.58	.00
Men: Social Support for Religion							
High	9.42 (13)	8.96 (10)	.30	.02	ns	.58	.10
Weak	7.82 (14)	10.67 (12)	.04	.15	ns	.53	ns
Women: Social Support for Religion							
Strong	3.38 (32)	1.99 (42)	.28	.16	.10	.43	.005
Weak	3.91 (34)	4.63 (27)	.09	.07	ns	.56	.00

Appendix XXVII

Table 1

The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, Social Support for Religion, and Self-Monitoring (continued)

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Low Self-Monitoring/ High Social Support for Religion	7.41 (28)	4.74 (25)	.31	.16	.10	.62	.00
Others	3.99 (65)	4.74 (66)	.09	.06	ns	.54	.00
Men: Low Self Monitor- ing/High Social Support for Religion	11.30 (10)	12.65 (6)	.27	.06	ns	.79	.02
Others	6.48 (17)	9.49 (16)	.01	.17	ns	.42	ns
Women: Low Self Monitoring/High Social Support for Religion	5.19 (18)	2.40 (19)	.34	.25	.10	.51	.05
Others	3.10 (48)	3.24 (50)	.14	.02	ns	.54	.00

Appendix XXVII

Table 2

The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion
on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1)
Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Social Support for Crime,
Self Monitoring and Religious Morality

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p≤	R	p≤
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	5.71 (87)	4.16 (97)	.11		ns	.11	ns
Men: Unadjusted	9.19 (26)	9.22 (23)	.00		ns	.00	ns
Women: Unadjusted	4.23 (61)	2.59 (74)	.17		.02	.17	.05
Adjusted for Gender/ Faking							
(tot.)	5.63 (87)	4.24 (97)	.11	.10	.05	.67	.00
Men	9.46 (26)	8.90 (23)	.00	.03	ns	.66	.00
Women	4.21 (61)	2.60 (74)	.17	.17	.02	.55	.00
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	3.34 (41)	1.62 (42)	.19	.21	.02	.52	.00
Low	7.63 (45)	6.47 (53)	.11	.07	ns	.68	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	3.16 (8)	2.46 (6)	.09	.11	ns	.69	.10
Low	11.93 (18)	12.02 (16)	.01	.00	ns	.68	.00
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	3.36 (33)	1.50 (36)	.23	.22	.05	.50	.00
Low	5.13 (57)	3.80 (37)	.14	.13	ns	.56	.00
Religious Morality							
High	5.25 (39)	2.54 (52)	.25	.22	.005	.64	.00
Low	6.21 (48)	5.90 (45)	.03	.02	ns	.68	.00
Men: Religious Morality							
High	9.61 (12)	5.68 (10)	.22	.22	.10	.70	.01
Low	9.41 (14)	11.21 (13)	.14	.08	ns	.72	.001
Women: Religious Morality							
High	3.74 (27)	1.52 (42)	.24	.25	.02	.49	.00
Low	4.75 (34)	3.87 (32)	.07	.09	ns	.58	.00

Appendix XXVII

Table 3

The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, Social Support for Crime, Social Support for Religion, and Self Monitoring

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted							
(comb.)	6.06 (93)	3.70 (91)	.17		.02	.17	.05
Men	10.33 (27)	7.82 (22)	.13		ns	.13	ns
Women	4.32 (66)	2.39 (69)	.20		.01	.20	.02
Adjusted for Gender and/or Faking							
(comb.)	5.21 (93)	4.58 (91)	.17	.04	ns	.68	.00
Men	10.67 (27)	7.40 (22)	.13	.16	.10	.71	.00
Women	3.54 (66)	3.13 (69)	.20	.04	ns	.59	.00
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	2.26 (39)	2.66 (44)	.03	.05	ns	.54	.00
Low	7.65 (53)	6.24 (43)	.21	.08	ns	.72	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	3.06 (8)	2.59 (6)	.06	.08	ns	.70	ns
Low	13.16 (19)	10.46 (15)	.15	.13	ns	.75	.00
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	1.96 (31)	2.74 (38)	.02	.09	ns	.58	.00
Low	5.09 (34)	3.53 (30)	.33	.15	.10	.61	.00
Social Support for Religion (tot.)							
High	5.26 (45)	3.21 (56)	.28	.15	.05	.64	.00
Low	5.39 (48)	6.11 (39)	.03	.05	ns	.73	.00
Men: Social Support for Religion							
High	10.52 (13)	7.53 (10)	.29	.14	ns	.78	.005
Low	10.20 (14)	8.02 (12)	.04	.12	ns	.76	.002
Women: Social Support for Religion							
High	3.21 (32)	2.12 (42)	.28	.12	ns	.55	.00
Weak	3.72 (34)	4.87 (27)	.09	.11	ns	.68	.00

Appendix XXVII

Table 3

The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross Sectional (Time 1) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, Social Support for Crime, Social Support for Religion, and Self Monitoring
(continued)

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Low Self-Monitoring/ High Social Support for Religion	7.41 (28)	4.83 (25)	.31	.15	.10	.69	.00
Others	4.22 (65)	4.52 (66)	.09	.02	ns	.69	.00
Men: Low Self Monitor- ing/High Social Support for Religion	12.53 (10)	10.51 (6)	.27	.08	ns	.83	.02
Others	8.61 (17)	7.23 (16)	.01	.08	ns	.72	.001
Women: Low Self Monitoring/High Social Support for Religion	4.86 (18)	2.72 (19)	.34	.19	ns	.62	.01
Others	3.01 (48)	3.33 (50)	.14	.04	ns	.62	.00

Appendix XXVII

Table 4

The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Social Support for Crime, Tolerance for Law Violations, Psychopathy, Religious Morality and Self Monitoring

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	5.71 (87)	4.16 (97)	.11		ns	.11	ns
Men: Unadjusted	9.19 (26)	9.22 (23)	.00		ns	.00	ns
Women: Unadjusted	4.23 (61)	2.59 (74)	.17		.02	.17	.05
Adjusted for Gender/ Faking							
(tot.)	5.30 (87)	4.54 (97)	.11	.05	ns	.67	.00
Men	9.15 (26)	9.26 (23)	.00	.01	ns	.71	.00
Women	3.91 (66)	2.85 (74)	.17	.11	.10	.60	.00
Self Monitoring (tot.)							
High	3.13 (41)	1.83 (42)	.19	.16	.10	.56	.00
Low	7.17 (45)	6.86 (53)	.11	.02	ns	.71	.00
Men: Self Monitoring							
High	3.26 (8)	2.32 (6)	.09	.16	ns	.72	ns
Low	11.29 (18)	12.73 (16)	.01	.07	ns	.94	.00
Women: Self Monitoring							
High	2.94 (33)	1.88 (36)	.23	.12	ns	.59	.00
Low	4.78 (27)	4.05 (37)	.14	.07	ns	.59	.00
Religious Morality							
High	4.41 (39)	3.17 (52)	.25	.10	ns	.73	.00
Low	6.13 (48)	5.98 (45)	.03	.01	ns	.68	.00
Men: Religious Morality							
High	8.43 (12)	7.09 (10)	.22	.08	ns	.73	.02
Low	9.61 (14)	11.11 (13)	.14	.07	ns	.73	.005
Women: Religious Morality							
High	3.02 (27)	1.99 (42)	.24	.11	ns	.68	.00
Low	4.81 (34)	3.80 (32)	.07	.10	ns	.58	.00

Appendix XXVII

Table 4

The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data With Controls for Gender, Faking, Tolerance for Law Violations, Social Support for Crime, Psychopathy
(continued)

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p $\leq$	<u>R</u>	<u>p$\leq$</u>
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Social Involvement in Religion							
High	5.95 (33)	3.84 (59)	.27	.16	.05	.76	.001
Low	4.81 (54)	5.89 (38)	.05	.07	ns	.65	.001
Men: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	9.77 (11)	6.09 (15)	.28	.21	ns	.84	.001
Low	8.47 (15)	15.63 (8)	.34	.31	ns	.67	.10
Women: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	4.33 (22)	2.78 (44)	.25	.13	ns	.70	.001
Low	3.66 (39)	2.97 (30)	.08	.08	ns	.56	.001
Religious Upbringing							
High	5.74 (39)	4.22 (54)	.23	.11	ns	.73	.001
Low	4.98 (48)	4.88 (43)	.00	.01	ns	.63	.001
Men: Religious Upbringing							
High	11.37 (12)	8.16 (10)	.31	.17	ns	.64	.01
Low	7.62 (14)	9.71 (13)	.24	.10	ns	.76	.002
Women: Religious Upbringing							
High	3.67 (27)	3.07 (44)	.13	.06	ns	.74	.001
Low	4.37 (34)	2.25 (30)	.21	.21	.10	.51	.005

Appendix XXVII

Table 5

The Simple Effects of Religious Morality on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Time One Cross Sectional Data at High Levels of Selected Predictors of Crime, Controlling for Gender and Faking

	Religious Morality		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted							
(comb.)	6.06 (93)	3.70 (91)	.17		.02	.17	.02
Men	10.33 (27)	7.82 (22)	.13		ns	.13	ns
Women	4.32 (66)	2.39 (69)	.20		.01	.20	.02
Psychopathy							
(comb.)	7.76 (65)	6.05 (46)	.12	.10	ns	.38	.001
Men	12.05 (22)	9.23 (18)	.15	.14	ns	.15	ns
Women	5.33 (43)	4.34 (28)	.15	.08	ns	.25	ns
Tolerance for Law Violations							
(comb.)	7.85 (53)	6.62 (36)	.12	.07	ns	.44	.000
Men	12.76 (21)	11.17 (12)	.05	.07	ns	.07	ns
Women	5.11 (32)	3.57 (24)	.15	.12	ns	.27	ns
Social Support for Crime							
(comb.)	8.36 (56)	5.75 (50)	.16	.16	.05	.51	.000
Men	16.31 (15)	9.67 (17)	.33	.31	.05	.34	ns
Women	5.10 (41)	4.18 (33)	.15	.08	ns	.30	.05

5 of/de 5

MICRO

Appendix XXVII

Table 6

The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data at High Levels of Selected Predictors of Crime, Controlling for Gender, Faking

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
Unadjusted	5.71 (87)	4.16 (97)	.11				
Men: Unadjusted	9.19 (26)	9.22 (23)	.00				
Women: Unadjusted	4.23 (61)	2.59 (74)	.17				
Psychopathy (tot.)	6.87 (64)	7.30 (47)	.00	.03	ns	.37	.001
Men	9.42 (25)	13.04 (15)	.17	.17	ns	.19	ns
Women	5.48 (39)	4.28 (32)	.12	.10	ns	.26	.10
Tolerance of Law Violations (tot.)	7.84 (46)	6.75 (43)	.09	.06	ns	.43	.00
Men	11.66 (18)	12.80 (15)	.05	.05	ns	.06	ns
Women	5.57 (28)	3.33 (28)	.21	.18	.10	.29	.10
Social Support for Crime (tot.)	8.33 (47)	6.17 (59)	.18	.13	.10	.50	.00
Men	13.81 (15)	11.87 (17)	.12	.09	ns	.19	ns
Women	5.97 (32)	3.72 (42)	.25	.20	.05	.35	.01

Appendix XXVII

Table 7

The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data at High Levels of Selected Predictors of Crime, Controlling for Gender, Faking, and Social Involvement in Religion

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p≤	R	p≤
	Low (n)	High (n)					
A. <u>PSYCHOPATHY</u>							
Psychopathy (tot.)	6.87 (64)	7.30 (47)	.00	.03	ns	.37	.001
Men: Psychopathy	9.42 (25)	13.04 (15)	.17	.17	ns	.19	ns
Women: Psychopathy	5.48 (39)	4.28 (32)	.12	.10	ns	.26	.09
Social Involvement in Religion							
High	8.62 (25)	5.30 (22)	.22	.20	ns	.33	ns
Low	5.64 (39)	10.15 (20)	.19	.25	.05	.53	.001
Men: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	11.13 (11)	7.18 (9)	.13	.22	ns	.25	ns
Low	7.67 (14)	22.78 (6)	.50	.62	.02	.55	.05
Women: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	7.36 (14)	3.84 (18)	.25	.25	ns	.25	ns
Low	4.51 (25)	4.73 (14)	.01	.02	ns	.45	.02

Appendix XXVII

Table 7

The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data at High Levels of Selected Predictors of Crime, Controlling for Gender, Faking, and Social Involvement in Religion
(continued)

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p $\leq$	R	p $\leq$
	Low (n)	High (n)					
B. <u>TOLERANCE OF LAW VIOLATIONS</u>							
Tolerance of Law Violations (tot.)	7.84 (46)	6.75 (43)	.09	.06	ns	.43	.00
Men	11.66 (18)	12.80 (15)	.05	.05	ns	.06	ns
Women	5.57 (28)	3.33 (28)	.21	.18	.17	.29	.09
Social Involvement in Religion							
High	12.06 (13)	5.32 (23)	.39	.35	.05	.46	.10
Low	6.28 (33)	8.23 (20)	.11	.11	ns	.53	.01
Men: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	4.07 (7)	8.35 (7)	.22	.30	ns	.27	ns
Low	10.02 (11)	16.59 (8)	.25	.29	ns	.26	ns
Women: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	11.35 (6)	3.24 (16)	.45	.45	.05	.45	ns
Low	4.07 (22)	3.28 (12)	.14	.09	ns	.45	.05

Appendix XXVII

Table 7

The Simple Effects of Social Support for Religion on Mean Total Deviance Scores: Cross-Sectional (Time 1) Data at High Levels of Selected Predictors of Crime, Controlling for Gender, Faking, and Social Involvement in Religion
(continued)

	Social Support for Religion		eta	beta	p≤	R	p≤
	Low (n)	High (n)					
C. <u>SOCIAL SUPPORT FOR CRIME</u>							
Social Support for Crime (tot.)	8.33 (47)	6.17 (59)	.18	.13	.14	.50	.00
Men	13.81 (15)	11.87 (17)	.12	.09	ns	.19	ns
Women	5.97 (32)	3.72 (42)	.25	.20	.08	.35	.009
Social Involvement in Religion							
High	10.26 (19)	4.92 (35)	.38	.32	.02	.49	.005
Low	7.25 (28)	7.75 (24)	.01	.03	ns	.63	.001
Men: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	14.25 (8)	6.94 (10)	.35	.40	.10	.49	ns
Low	13.06 (7)	19.36 (7)	.15	.28	ns	.18	ns
Women: Social Involvement in Religion							
High	8.52 (11)	3.65 (25)	.37	.34	.10	.48	.10
Low	4.77 (21)	3.63 (17)	.19	.13	ns	.36	.02

Zero-Order Correlations Between the Deviance Measure and Reported Religious Change
Time 2 Cross-sectional Data, Religious Sample

	No. of Types of Victimization Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Victimeless Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Deviance ever Committed	No. of Types of Victimization Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Victimeless Deviance recently Committed	No. of Types of Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victimization Deviance recently Committed	Amount of Victimeless Deviance recently Committed	Total Amount of Deviance
Reported Religious Change	-.276	-.191	-.257	.347 ^A	n/a	.259	.352 ^A	n/a	.310 ^A

Coding for "p" values

A: $\leq .10$ E: $\leq .005$
 B: $\leq .05$ F: $\leq .002$
 C: $\leq .02$ G: $\leq .001$
 D: $\leq .01$

APPENDIX XXIX

Discussion of the Relationship Between
Reported Religious Change and Deviance

Of interest is the question as to whether changes in scores on the Religious involvement measures and on measures from the battery of correlates of deviance are indicative of self reported deviant involvement. The first table attached to this appendix summarizes the results of the analyses carried out to test the link between changes in religious involvement and time-2 scores on Total Amount of Deviance Recently Committed. Regression analyses were employed in which the bio-demographic variables and the time-1 Faking measure were presented in the first block, followed by the forced entry into the equation of five single-variable blocks: the time-1 R.I.S. measure under examination, the time-2 Faking measure, the time-2 R.I.S. measure, a variable created to represent an interaction between time-1 and time-2 faking, and a variable created to represent the interaction between the time-1 and time-2 data on the R.I.S. measure under examination. Gender was selected by the analyses procedure from among the bio-demographic variables and the Faking measure, accounting for almost 17 percent of the variance in the time-2 deviance measure, and no other covariate was found to contribute additionally to that amount. The design of the analyses is such that, after the selection of Gender and the forced entry of the specific time-1 R.I.S. variable into the equation, the residual relationships between the deviance measure and the remaining variables -- I.E.: the partial correlations -- would specify the extent to which changes in scores on those variables are linked to the deviance

APPENDIX XXIX

measure. Regression analyses were performed with respect to the R.I.S. measures of Religious Morality and Social Support for Religion, and with respect to the Social Support for Religion measure's interactions with Social Involvement in Religion, /religious Upbringing, Religious Morality, and Self Monitoring, and also with respect to a variable constructed to represent the interaction between Religious Morality and Self Monitoring. Finally, a regression analysis of this sort was also performed with respect to the measure of Personal Religious Commitment because of the wide range of change scores on that variable (see Appendix XXVIII). In the first table attached to this appendix a line is dedicated to each regression analysis. It shows that none of the variables representing faking were selected to the equation. It also reveals that none of the partial correlations for the time-2 R.I.S. measures or the interaction variables were significant. It is concluded, then, that in no case did changes in scores on the R.I.S. measures account for additional variance in the time-2 deviance measure once the effects of time-1 R.I.S. measures had been taken into account.

A similar set of regression analyses was conducted with respect to the measures of Tolerance for Law Violations, Social Support for Crime, and Psychopathy. Those analyses are summarized in the second table attached to this appendix. Again, variables representing Faking were not selected to the equation by any of the analysis procedures. As well, the only variable for which significant or near significant partial correlations are revealed is Social Support for Crime. It would not be surprising that

APPENDIX XXIX

changes in scores on this variable might account for additional variance in rates of deviance. However, considering that over the short four month period between the 58m3-1 and time-2 phases of the research, changes in scores on none of the other examined variables accounted for additional variance, it might be hasty to conclude success on the part of the measure of Social Support for Crime in doing so.

Appendix XXIX

Table 1
Effects of Changes in Scores on RIS Subscales
(Ability in Accounting for Variance in Time 2
Total Deviance Scores After Time 1 Predictors
and Co-variables Age and Gender Have Been
Statistically Controlled)

Variable	Time 1			Time 2			Time 1 x Time 2		
	Correla- tion	Partial Correlation	Sig F Partial	Correla- tion	Partial Correlation	Sig F Partial	Correla- tion	Partial Correlation	Sig F Partial
Religious Morality	-.33	-.29	<.002	-.30	-.02	>.8	-.32	.03	>.7
Social Support for Religion	-.19	-.09	>.3	-.18	-.07	>.4	-.23	-.11	>.2
Social Support for Religion x Social Involvement in Religion	-.19	-.16	<.10	-.15	-.00	>.9	-.18	-.02	>.8
Social Support for Religion x Religious Upbringing	-.08	-.04	>.6	-.08	-.00	>.9	-.11	-.07	>.4
Social Support for Religion x Religious Morality	-.27	-.25	<.1	-.23	-.06	>.5	-.28	-.07	>.4
Social Support for Religion x Religious Morality	-.16	-.12	<.20	-.18	-.11	>.20	-.19	-.12	>.20
Religious Morality x Self Monitoring	-.23	-.21	<.05	-.27	-.13	<.20	-.25	-.04	>.6
Religious Commitment	-.17	-.14	<.20	-.16	-.04	>.6	-.17	.00	>.9

Table 2
Effects of Changes in Scores on Measures from the Battery
of Correlates of Deviance (Ability in Accounting for Variance
in Time 2 Total Deviance Scores After Effects of Time 1
Predictors and Co-variables Age and Gender Have Been
Statistically Controlled)

Variable	Time 1			Time 2			Time 1 x Time 2		
	Correlation	Partial Correlation	Sig F Partial	Correlation	Partial Correlation	Sig F Partial	Correlation	Partial Correlation	Sig F Partial
Tolerance for Law Violations	.39	.32	<.001	.38	.07	>.40	.43	.10	>.20
Social Support for Crime	.51	.45	<.001	.47	.16	<.10	.56	.25	<.005
Psychopathy	.46	.37	<.001	.38	.04	>.60	.33	-.09	>.30

END

1|6·0|2·90

FIN