THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND CRIME: A CASE

STUDY ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

TACETTİN GÜNEŞ

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

OCTOBER 2003

a

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata

Director

I certify that thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Y. Ziya Özcan

Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____

Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu

Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu	
Prof. Dr. Y. Ziya Özcan	
Doç. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu	
Doç. Dr. Aslıhan Öğün	
Doç. Dr. Esra Burcu	

b

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND CRIME: A CASE

STUDY ON UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN TURKEY

Güneş, Tacettin

Ph. D., Department of Sociology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu

October 2003, 207 pages

This is a study on social control functions of religion through analyzing the relationship between religiosity and crime. It aims to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime by examining the 'social control functions' of religion on formal and informal social control mechanisms that constitute main crime prevention factors of societies.

As a set of values, religion has a social control function that constitutes a pressure to make members of a religion behave in accordance with the rules of that religion. By examining the extent of the correspondence between these religious rules and other social and formal rules we can see how religiosity could be a part of the social control mechanism, since religiosity means behaving according to religious rules.

Religion, religiosity, formal and informal control mechanisms, the effects of religion on these mechanisms, crime, reasons of crime, crime prevention functions of religion for individuals, and effects of religiosity on crime commitments est. have been examined under the title of the relationship between religiosity and crime. Thus this study aims to find out social control functions of religion on crime through examining all these concepts and other related items by gathering data from 435 university students from Turkey.

Keywords: Religion, Religiosity, Functions of religion, Crime, Social control

ÖZ

DİNDARLIK SUÇ İLİŞKİSİ: TÜRKİYEDEKİ ÜNÜVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİ ÜZERİNE BİR ÖRNEK OLAY ÇALIŞMASI

Güneş, Tacettin

Doktora, Sosyoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu

Ekim 2003, 207 sayfa

Bu çalışma dindarlık suç ilişkisinin analizi yoluyla dinin sosyal kontrol fonksiyonlarının araştırıldığı bir çalışmadır. Çalışma ile dindarlık ve suç ilişkisi analiz edilerek toplumların temel suç önleme faktörlerini oluşturan formal ve informal sosyal kontrol mekanizmaları üzerindeki dinin sosyal kontrol fonksiyonunun ortaya çıkarılması hedeflemektedir.

Bir değerler bütünü olarak din, üyelerinin dinin kurallarına uymalarını sağlayarak toplumda bir sosyal kontrol mekanizması oluşturur. Dindarlık, dinin kurallarına uymayı ifade ettiğinden dini kurallar ile toplumda sosyal kontrol mekanizması oluşturan diğer sosyal ve formal kurallar arasındaki örtüşme, dindarlığın sosyal kontrol mekanizmaları arasında nasıl bir yeri olabileceğini gösterir.

Din, dindarlık, formal ve informal kontrol mekanizmaları, dinin bu mekanizmalarla ilişkisi, suç, suçun sebepleri, dinin bireyler için suçu önleme fonksiyonları ve dindarlığın suç işlemeye etkileri v.s. dindarlık ve suç ilişkisi başlığı altında incelenmiştir. Böylece bu çalışma Türkiye'deki 435 üniversite öğrencisinden toplanan verilerle birlikte yukarıda bahsi geçen kavramlar ve diğer ilgili konuların ele alınmasıyla, dinin suç üzerindeki sosyal kontrol fonksiyonlarını ortaya çıkarmayı hedeflemiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Din, Dindarlık, Suç, Sosyal Kontrol, Dinin Fonksiyonları

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my special thanks to Prof. Dr. Kayhan Mutlu for his excellent guidance and support throughout the writing of this thesis. I offer great thanks for their views and suggestions to, Prof. Dr. Yusuf Ziya Özcan, Doç. Dr. Sibel Kalaycıoğlu, Doç. Dr. Esra Burcu, Doç. Dr. Aslıhan Öğün. I also express my thanks to Hakan KARACA and Sıtkı YILDIZ for their motivations and helps in all stages of this thesis, and Michel Altınsu for her reading and correction of the English of the thesis. And finally, I wish to express my special thanks to Zeynep, Feyza and Enes for sharing with me all stress during this thesis.

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Date: Signature:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime. Religion is, in a general definition, a set of values. These values influence religious individuals to behave in accordance with those religious rules. There are important correspondences between these religious rules and other social and legal rules. On the other hand crime is a kind of social deviance or a variation from a social norm, which is proscribed by criminal law.

Every society has ideas about good and bad behaviors. All societies have various mechanisms to encourage good behavior and to control or punish bad behavior. Social control comprises the whole range of legal and informal pressures directed to make people behave in accordance with legal and social rules. In this sense religion has an important social control capacity because of its functions both for the individual and the society.

As it is known various factors and motives can cause crime. Various theories explain the causes of crime differently. But, in the end,

criminal or legal behavior is a matter of choice. Since legal or criminal behavior is a matter of choice, we should deal with people's ideas and motives that coincide with legal or criminal behavior. When the functions of religion is considered, it can be easily seen that religious values can prevent some individuals from some criminal behaviors, as well as from some kinds of deviant behaviors, as a result of the social control functions of religion that have various dimensions

On the other hand, like religion, crime is also an old subject which has been considered with law, which can be treated as an aspect of government and social control (Mair, 1980; 139). Criminologists have sought to prevent or control crime by studying crime. But there are different approaches both to the definition of crime and the causes of crime, and also the ways of preventing and controlling crime. I'll discuss all these approaches and definitions about crime within the next chapter of the study.

The extent of correspondence between criminal behavior and sinful behavior is important for the relationship between religiosity and crime. If there is a high level correspondence between them we can expect an inverse relationship between religiosity and crime. Because we can define religious behavior as avoiding sinful behavior, if this is so, it will affect avoid some of criminal behavior. But the relationship between religiosity and crime is not so simple. On the one hand, there are various factors and motives that cause criminal behaviors, on the other hand religious values may become a

crime preventing factor by affecting the individual and society from different dimensions.

I am interested in the relationship between religiosity and crime to see social control functions of religion and religiosity on crime from a sociological perspective. Although religion and religiosity, and their relations with different subjects are considered by a lot of social scientists from different dimensions, there are very few scientific studies on the social control functions of religion. There are a lot of studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime in the World, especially in the United States and European countries (Ellis, 1985; 501) but in Turkey, there aren't any sociological studies on this subject. By this study I'll try to find out the social control functions of religion on crime by gathering data in Turkey where there has been no data gathered before on this subject.

In order to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime, first of all we should deal with how religion and crime are defined within related social theories. As it is known, both religion and crime, as two old and important concepts, have been studied by social scientists from many different perspectives since the beginning of the social sciences.

All the great thinkers who have set the intellectual tenor of our times-Hegel, Marx, Tylor, Spencer, Durkheim, Weber and Freud- had an a biding concern on religion, and many of their works were on its origin and function (Obeyesekere and Morris, 1987; 2). Assertions concerning the origins and functions of religion have been developed and explored by social

scientists since the rise of sociology, anthropology and psychology as independent academic disciplines.

There are a lot of authors who had very critical ideas about their societies, social structures, traditions and religion. But they saw religion as an indispensable part of social order. For example, Auguste Comte argued that beyond language and division of labor, religion is needed for social order. For him 'religion furnishes the unifying principle, the common ground without which individual differences would tear society together in a common cult and common system of beliefs. Religion is at the root of social order (Coser 1977; 11).

Like Comte, Jean Jacques Rousseau had critical views about traditional society, state and religion. But he also argued that "as soon as men come to live in civil society, they must have a religion to keep them there. No nation has ever endured or ever will endure without religion" but he further argues that "It is not enough that a nation should have a religion. The religion must be identified in the minds of the people, with the values of national life; else it will create disunity and violate the General Will, Religion has a responsibility toward civic or political ends before any others" (Nisbet, 1990; 131).

Emile Durkheim, as an important figure in sociology of religion, turned to the study of religious phenomena as core elements of systems of common beliefs in the last period of his scholarly life. His earlier concern with social regulation was focused on external forces of control, more specifically

the legal regulations. But, later he was led to consider the forces of control that were internalized in the individual consciousness. His study of religion was one of forces that created within individuals a sense of moral obligation to adhere to society's demands. For him religion as a social institution served to give meaning to man's existential predicaments by tying the individual to that supra-individual sphere of transcendent values which is ultimately rooted in his society (Coser, 1977; 136, 139).

In the nineteenth century such words as individual, change, progress, reason and freedom were notable. Men were fascinated by their referents and properties. All social and cultural differences were resolved by rationalist way. The stability of individual was a function of his unalterable instincts and his sovereign reason; the stability of society was guaranteed by the laws of historical change. But then rationalist conception of man became as unstable, inadequate, and insecure. Man's belief in himself has become weakest when his control of environments is greatest. To Nisbet, 'this is irony of ironies' and accrued when men shattered ancient beliefs, customs and traditions, but not replaced by any new beliefs (Nisbet, 1990; 14, 15, 19).

Fear of crime is an important factor within the contemporary sense of anxiety and insecurity. Besides the high crime rate, crime tendencies of individuals in a society are also important for a sense of insecurity. For example, 59 percent of Americans admit to having used physical force against another person, 25 percent of Americans say they would abandon

their families for money and 7 percent admit freely that they kill someone if paid enough (Etzioni; 1995, 27).

When we look at the crime rates of the different countries, according to United Nation's crime records, we can see that there has been a general rise of crime rates within the most of the countries. High crime rates are not related ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd ŧd

On the one hand high crime rates and social deviations are important social problems that negatively affect individuals' lives. On the other hand religion is an important factor that may affect the behavior of individuals, according to the level of their religiosity. These two concepts have been considered by social scientists with their all dimensions within different disciplines. The origins of religion, the functions of religion, and the history of religion are only some of the titles that have been examined by different scientists from different perspectives. The definition of crime, the causes of crime, the types of crime are also only some titles that have been studied by social scientists from different disciplines.

Social scientists, besides concerning the origins and the functions of religion within a world historical outlook, are also concerned with the affects of religious values on the daily problems that both individuals and societies heve faced. Rising rate of crime is an important problem that leads serious results for both individuals and societies. That is why, researches recently have begun to examine the link between religiosity and crime, religiosity and social control, religiosity and drug using etc, to see the effects of religious values on these problems (Erasmick, 1997; 135). Empirical research findings demonstrate that there is an inverse relationship between religiosity, crime and some social deviations.

Although social control functions of religion have been considered as a crime preventing factor within the most of the social theories and mounting research evidence demonstrates that there is an inverse

7

relationship between religiosity and crime, the relationship has long been a topic of controversy (Ellis and Thompson, 1989; 132).

Besides general theoretical explanations about the functions of religion on crime involvement, there are three different kinds of assertions on the explanations of various empirical study findings.

Firstly, quite a number of social scientists have argued that there is a positive relationship between religiosity and crime. This assertion has centered around arguments that both strong religious convictions and criminality tend to be associated with low intelligence or low education level or social status (Ellis; 1985, 502).

Secondly, a group of social scientists have argued that according to findings, an inverse relationship exist between religiosity and crime. They have offered at least four identifiable explanations for the existence of an inverse relationship between religiosity and crime (Bahr, 1986; 54, Ellis and Thamson, 1989; 132, Ellis, 1985; 503). I'll examine these explanations within the next chapter.

The third approach accepts the prevention effects of religiosity on crime, but not through producing guilt or fear of hellfire in individuals, but religion gains its power to prevent crime by shaping the individual only as an aspect of groups. That is why we only measure the prevention effects of religion on crime by moving from a psychological level of analysis to a sociological conception of religion (Stark, 1987; 112).

8

In this study, in order to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime we will first review the related literature under the different titles before considering with methodology of the study.

Within the literature review chapter we will first consider with literature that is related to religion. As it is known religion and the functions of religion have been examined by a lot of authors who are from different disciplines of social sciences. That is why we only dealt with some more important authors' works, which are particularly related with the subject of my study. we have examined the writings of authors who have made theoretical efforts to understand or explain religious phenomena particularly from the perspective of functions of religion for both individuals and society as the formation and maintenance of social order within their general outlook.

Secondly, we examined the concept of crime under the titles of conception of crime, types of crime, cause of crime and trends of crime in order to clarify the concept of crime and social deviations

Thirdly, after examining religion and crime as two separate concepts we considered the relationship between religiosity and crime, paying special attention to how these two concepts could be related. According to our assumption there is a negative relationship between religiosity and crime. That is why we examined all important dimensions of religion and crime which might be important for the relationship between religiosity and crime as two inversely related concepts. Under different titles we tried to demonstrate how religious values could be an effective factor to

prevent individuals from criminal or deviant behaviors through shaping their attitudes toward to crime and other factors that are related with crime involvement.

Finally, within the literature review chapter, we examined the empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime, as well as the efforts to explain the relationship between them within these empirical studies.

Within the Research Methodology chapter, we tried to explain clearly the subject of the study, the aim of the study, the sampling of the study, the measurement, the data analysis and the reporting of the findings.

In chapter IV, we started to analyze the findings of study starting from demographic characteristics of respondents. Then we analyzed the views of respondents on some social, politic and cultural structure of society.

In chapter V, we examined some findings of study that are related with how the respondents perceive religiosity in Islam; which rules, beliefs and rituals are seen as a requirements of being a good Muslim. So we can see the extent of the correspondence between the measures that are used to measure the religiosity of respondents and the perceived religiosity.

Within the same chapter we also analyzed the findings that are related with the perceived religiosity of the respondents' environment and religiosity of the respondents from different dimensions of religiosity; the

belief dimension, ritualistic dimension, and also their definition of their religiosity.

In chapter VI, we examined the findings that are related with social control function of religion and religiosity from different dimensions. So we can see the functions of religion and religiosity on individuals, on formal and informal social control mechanisms of society that are related with crime commitments of people and attitudes of people about crime

We examined the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments of respondents within chapter VII. We tried to find out whether religiosity level of the respondents inversely related with their crime commitment behavior, or not, through comparing the religiosity level of the respondents with some crime commitments of them, from the different dimensions of religiosity. Religiosity is viewed from two dimensions, the belief dimension of religiosity and the ritualistic dimension of religiosity.

Within the last chapter, we examined and discussed the general approach of the study and the findings of the study through some items that were considered in the study, and the findings of the study that were analyzed in detail within the related parts of the study by paying special attention to the finding of related empirical studies. We gathered our data from 435 university students who are undergraduate students from different classes and different disciplines from four different universities of Turkey. In short, according to found results we can say that religion and religiosity have important social control functions on crime through shaping attitudes of

people against crime by means of the different ways and mechanisms that fulfill the social control functions in the society. And religiosity level of the respondents inversely related with their crime commitment behavior at least some measures of religiosity.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction

In order to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime, first of all we should deal with how these two concepts are examined within related literature, then, we can consider how and why there should be a relationship, especially a negative relationship between these two concepts in the light of these examinations, as well as in the light of empirical studies and their explanations of this relationship.

As an old concept, religion can be viewed as the systems of belief, as well as systems of relationship and action. In most fields of social behavior ideas are normative; they are viewed with what ought to be done and reasons why it ought to be done. Religious thinking, although in one sense it is the type of thinking about what ought to be done, it also includes concern what is and why it is, like the nature of the universe and man's place in it

(Mair, 1985:211). That is why religious involvement not only provides meaning to one's life but also offers a set of standards to one's actions.

On the other hand, crime is a concept which is related with law. Law can be treated within two contexts. It is certainly an aspect of government; because the basic responsibility of government is the maintenance of law and order. It is also an aspect of social control; since it is concerned with the rules of conduct and the forces which operate to secure respect for these rules (Mair, 1985: 139).

Although religious rules and legal rules are different sets of rules and they have different sources and importance in society, both are rules that tell people how to behave in particular situations. Whenever someone has broken a legal rule, he or she becomes a criminal, but if some one has broken a religious rule he or she becomes a sinful. So the correspondence of criminal and sinful behavior become important for the relationship between religiosity and crime.

A lot of studies and their findings show that an inverse relationship exists between religiosity and criminality at least some measures of religiosity and criminality. After examining the concept of religion and crime I'll consider with these findings and their explanations.

2.2. The definition of Religion, Crime and Social Deviations

As an aspect of social and individual reality, religion has been considered by most of the authors of sociology, anthropology and psychology from the

perspective of their disciplines. In this part of the study I'll try to summarize briefly these author's works that examine questions on origins of religion and functions of religion.

2.2.1. Anthropological Tradition

Towards the end of the 19th century, scholars were preoccupied with questions relating to the origins of religion. They discussed with interest such questions as how people could come to believe in gods and if there were any tribe so primitive that they had no religion at all (Morris 1991:91). In these times beliefs were thought to have existed first as naïve interpretations of experiences and the religion to have been built on them. Then came a phase in which all practices were treated as important, and beliefs were held to have arisen to justify practices (Mair, 1980:211).

Spencer, Tylor, Frazer and Durkheim were early scholars who posed questions about the origins and functions of religion within the evolutionary framework.

Spencer was an important intellectual of his own period, and even Darwin considered him his superior. Spencer's key ideas on evolution were published several years before the publication of Darwin's classic study. Spencer's theory attempted to explain the total configuration of nature as well as it's necessary process (Coser, 1977:89).

According to Spencer the people of prehistory came to conceptualize the nation of duality by observing the phenomena of nature,

especially those relating to death and dream experiences. This idea of duality was strengthened by other experiences. The belief in ghosts was the basis of the earliest supernatural ideas. The idea of ghosts developed into those gods, the ghosts of important ancestors becoming divinities. So he concluded that "ancestor worship is the root of easy religion". To him earlier rules were conceived as divine personages and served various social functions (Morris, 1991:97).

Like Spencer, Tylor was also an evolutionist. He defined anthropology as the science of culture that includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, moral laws, customs and other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of societies. To him religion is the belief in spiritual beings. The beginning of this belief lies in animism. Animism was groundwork of all religions that have two aspects: a belief in souls and a belief in spirits which are universal among human cultures, and they were logical and based on rational thinking and empirical knowledge (Robertson, 1970:120).

Frazer follows Tylor in seeing a clear conceptual deviation between magic, science and religion. Most of his central themes are simply an elaboration and popularization of Tylor's theories (Morris, 1991:104).

Although Spencer and Tylor postulated different origins of religion, they shared certain basic assumptions. They viewed human culture in an evolutionary perspective and approached religion as an aspect of rational inference based on human experiences. Durkheim also took on an evolutionary perspective having to do with the origins of religion but he was

not interested in the epistemological status of religion. Durkheim was the first writer who treats all beliefs on a level, to him " there are no religions which are false. All are true in their own fashion; all answer though in different ways, to the given conditions of human existence" (Morris, 1991: 114).

Durkheim used Australian totemism to illustrate his theory of religion arguing that since the Australians had the most elementary social organization, their religion must be the most elementary religion. In this point, the question is not finding out the simplest form of religion, but what religious ideas are found among the simplest people (Mair, 1980:212).

Durkheim's central problem in all his work has to do with the sources of social order and disorder, the forces that make for regulating or de-regulation in society Although he stressed that in modern societies, integration was achieved through the intermeshing and mutual dependence of differential roles, he came to the conclusion point that these societies could not do without some common integration by a system of common beliefs. That is why he turned, in the last period of his scholarly life, to the study of religious phenomena as core elements of systems of common beliefs (Coser, 1977: 136).

Durkheim defines religion as "a unified set of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say things set a part and forbidden – beliefs and practices which unite one single moral community – all those who adhere to them "thus for him religion is essentially a collective thing, and it is inseparable from the idea of evil or moral community (Morris, 1991:115-116).

17

He is concerned with the functions of religion more than simply describing origins and forms of religion. To him four major functions of religion are disciplinary, cohesive, vitalizing, and euphoric social forces. Religious rituals prepare individuals for social life by giving self-discipline. By ceremonies religion brings people together and reaffirms their common bonds, so reinforces social solidarity. Religions also revitalize the social heritage of group and help the transmission of values to future generations. Finally religion serves to counteract feelings of frustration and loss of faith through the re-establishment of the believer's sense of well being and their sense of the essential rightness of the moral world. On the most general plane, as a social institution religion gives meaning to man's predicaments through tying the individual to the sphere of transcendent values which are ultimately rooted in his society (Coser, 1977: 139).

2.2.2. Psychological Tradition

Psychological tradition is a naturalistic interpretation of religion quite different from anthropological tradition. Its focus is placed on emotional states, not on the rational interpretation of phenomena. Religion is especially functional for individual not for the social group.

Rudolf Otto published his famous study "The Idea of the Holy" in 1917. His basic argument was that religion could be understood only trough the nation of holiness, an a priori category, a non rational category. His ideas became important with the contributions of his followers (Robertson, 1996:28).

With the implicit influence of Otto, Robert Lowie and Paul Radia were approached religion explicitly from a Psychological viewpoint. To them, religion is a response to abnormal phenomena, fear and insecurity. The idea of the supernatural arose out of man's attempt to cope with this uncertain external world. Religion is a means of maintaining life values – the desire for success, happiness and a long life (Morris, 1991:142).

Another important scholar was Bronislaw Malinowski, according to whom, religion and magic arise from emotional needs; they are man's way of facing the situations that he can not control. He saw the origin of religion in need to overcome the threat of disruption that is presented to a society when any of its members dies. So, to him, the essential significance of religion was that it gives man courage to face the world and death (Mair, 1977:224).

Malinowski gave religion a positive psychological function and to him it was universal and necessary. Religious inspiration had two sources: the desire for immortality, and feeling of peace and well-being (Morris, 1991:149).

In the psychological tradition Sigmund Freud is another important figure. His attitude towards religion was essentially negative, hostile and critical. He explains taboos, sacrifice totemism, exogamy and incest prohibitions, religion and the beginning of social life by "Mythical tragedy". To him "beginnings of religion, ethics, society and art meet in Oedipus Complex" that presents an origin of myth for the origin of humanity and matrilineal systems (Morris 1991:159).

19

Freud's intellectual development and his own life were closely linked with Carl Jung, but their views on religion were so opposed. Religion for Jung was something positive. In his study 'Psychology and Religion', he suggests that religion is not only sociological or historical phenomena but also a psychological fact. To him religion is a numerous experience that seizes and controls the human subject. He deals with religion from a "purely empirical point of view" and he deals with facts not judgments.

To him religious beliefs such as virgin birth are "psychological true" since the idea exists in someone's mind. Mythology and religion have important functions for human personality not only by giving meaning to known existence but they also have therapeutic role. He also insists that science could never replace religion and that some kind of religion is necessary for the psychic health of human kind (Morris, 1991:167,174).

An other scholar is Mircea Elida who viewed religion as a phenomenon sui genesis, which means it can be understood only in it's own terms. He insists that religion must be understood within 'its own frame of reference' as religious phenomena. Elida argues that, although sacred and profane are two modes of being in the world, contemporary human culture has completely a profane attitude toward the world. To him religious thought unites these diverse aspects of existence into a cosmological unity through symbolism (Morris, 1991:178-179).

2.2.3. Sociological Tradition

As it is briefly explained above; the anthropological tradition is mostly concerned with the origins and functions of the religion systems of preliterate cultures, and psychological tradition largely focused on the functions of religion for the individual. The sociological tradition, on the other hand, is largely focused on religion as a social institution, religion within historical change and development, history of world religions and the social functions of religion as belief systems, as solid historical phenomena within a world-historical outlook.

Spencer's and Durkheim's works were in general, of course, within the sociological tradition but their effects on anthropological tradition for religious studies so important that I examined their works on religion within the anthropological tradition. In this part, I'll examine briefly some others sociologists' works; the works of Comte, Marx and Weber; which are mainly related with religion and functions of religion.

Comte saw "a deplorable state of anarchy" in his time and he believed that sociology would help bring order in society. To him social and moral disorders are the result of intellectual anarchy, because theological and metaphysical philosophy has declined but positive philosophy has not yet reached. No order is possible until to the metaphysical stages, which will be more organic than old stages (Cliffs, 1968:71, 73)

Although Comte believed in principle that the division of labor develops individual capacities and contributes to human solidarity by creating in each individual a sense of his dependence on others; society needs spiritual ties to be held together. Hence Comte assigned central importance to language and above all religion. To him a common language is indispensable to a human community, only as a medium, not a positive guide to behavior. What is needed in addition is a common religious belief. Religion permits men to overcome their egoistic propensities and it binds a society together in a common cult and common systems of beliefs. Religion is at the roof of social order (Coser, 1977:11, 12).

As a social scientist Comte started his work to overcome the anarchy of his time through positive social science, but he, especially in his later years, considered himself not only a social scientist but also a founder of a new religion or new positivist order that's principle is love, it's base is order and it's aim is progress.

Within his general theory Karl Marx saw religion as a part of socioeconomic life, which was not an autonomous cultural phenomena that could be understand in it's own terms. It could be only seen as a form of ideology.

Marx argues that the mode of production of material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual process of life. Men are born into societies in which property relations have already been determined. The property relations in turn, give rise to different social

classes that shape political, ethical, philosophical and religious views. That is why his analysis centers on how the relationships between men are shaped by their positions in regard to the means of production (Coser 1977:45, 46).

For Marx, although religion is a secondary phenomenon and it depends on socio-economic circumstances, he is greatly concerned with the functions of religion through the concepts like ideology and alienation.

To him religion was the most basic form of alienation and historically the first form of ideology. The functions of ideology in general, namely religion served as moral sanctions, as an illusion, a consolation for unjust conditions, clouding the "true" realty and as a justification for inequalities. Religion was also seen as a means that the dominant classes used it to mystify or control peasants in a feudal society, and the workers in a capitalist society (Morris 1991:42, 44).

Max Weber was seen as attempting to bridge the gap between two extreme view points representing rival intellectual traditions: the positivism of natural science on one hand and German idealism and historicisms on the other hand. He was critical of positivists like Comte who attempted to assimilate the social sciences to natural sciences. On the other hand he was also critical of Diltey who made a radical distinction between the natural sciences and social sciences (Morris,1991; 57, 58).

Weber saw sociology as a comprehensive science of social action. That is why his primary focus was on the subjective meanings that human

actors attach to their actions within specific social – historical contexts. We can observe external courses of events and record their uniformities. But we can also do more; we can attempt to impute motives by interpreting men's actions and words. Social facts are intelligible facts in the last resort. We can understand human actions through the generating to the subjective meanings that they attach to their own behavior and to other's behaviors. So he developed a definition of sociology as "the interpretative understanding of social behaviors" that let gain an explanation of its causes its course and it's effects (Coser, 1971: 219,220).

As it is stated above, Marx argued that an economic infrastructure was a determinant factor that determines the cultural super structure. Weber refused to see the cultural structure as a reflection of material interests. To him, although they all mutually influence one another, the developments in the intellectual, psychic, scientific, political and religious spheres have relative autonomy. Weber's emphasis on the influence of religious ideas in the emergence of modern capitalism should be seen in this framework (Freund, 1990: 18).

As a main theme, Weber's sociology focused on rationalization of life in the western society. That is why an underlying theme of Weber's sociology of religion is the notion of rationalization; the increasing systemization of religious ideas and concepts, the growth of ethical rationalism and the progressive decline of ritual elements in religion. To him

rationalization demystified life and implied a purely instrumental relationship toward the natural world and toward people (Morris, 1991:68, 69).

Weber implies that a belief in the supernatural is universal and found in all early forms of society. Like Durkheim he argues that religion acts as a cohesive force unifying members of a household, clan, or tribal confederation in tribal societies. Religious, magical behavior or thinking must not be set a part from the range of everyday purposive convent in these societies. The distinction between them is a modern one that is not applicable to preliterate thought.

With the development of religion the primacy of local deities' became crystallized but could not eliminate the ancient magical nations. This produced a duel relationship between humans and supernatural domain. Weber sees priestly function as the development of religious doctrine as a rational system of religious concepts. To him this development is intrinsically linked with bureaucratic states and the stability of their social orders. In modern societies religion has function for both classes. For the less favored social strata it has an effective source of salvation beliefs, and for privileged classes it has psychological reassurances of legitimizing of life (Morris: 1991, 76).

In short, Weber was centrally concerned with the notion of progressive rationalization of life in western culture. That is why his underlying theme of sociology of religion was this notion of rationalization.

Thus his basic themes were the rationalization of religious life, systemization of religious ideas and concepts, and the decline of ritual elements of religion.

As it is seen from the above summaries, although the authors explain it's origins differently and evaluate its functions differently, all of them accept the importance of religious functions for both the individual and the society. For all societies, from elementary to modern, religion had important rules which shape people's values, and serves as a guiding principle in peoples lives. As a value system, religion can shape differently the values of people, and so the norms of society, to the degree of religiosity of people in these societies.

Although the norms of society are more concrete rules than values, they are connected with the values of society and the values of society are connected with the religious values of society. So, we can say that religion does not constitute the basic rules of society but it affects all kinds of rules in society. After examining the concept of crime and deviance, I'll try to examine the relationship between religion and crime from different dimensions including the construction of social rules and the violations of these rules.

2.2.4.   The Conception of Crime, the Types of Crime and Deviance

The definition of crime and deviance mostly depend on the culture considered. They are socially constructed concepts. This means what is called "crime" or 'deviance' in one culture may not be a crime in another. At

26

first glance, crime might be defined as the sum of all those actions deemed as "violation of the criminal law". This definition equates crime with law-breaking. But since criminal laws are not fixed in any society, using this approach gives rise to problems (Heidensohn, 1989; 3).

We can define crime as a kind of deviance that is proscribed by criminal law. But not all deviance is crime and not all crime is deviant (if "everybody" is doing it). Deviance is one kind legal behavior that is a departure from the norm, as society defines it (Friedman, 1977; 150).

Non-criminal deviance can be classified into (1) "Social deviations" and (2) social diversions. Social deviations are sometimes treated as if they were criminal, but there are clearly some very important differences. The most frequent types of these deviations are; adolescent (juvenile delinquency), vocational (non-criminal violations of public and financial trust), and interpersonal (psychological disturbances). All these are not considered criminal but they are also not always considered disreputable. Social diversions are regarded as less serious forms of deviance. These diversions are varied expressions of preferences with regard to sex, clothing, language, and leisure. In short, the line that drawn between crime, deviance, and diversion in society is certain and subject to change (Hagan, 1985; 58-59).

It will be useful to begin considering cultural differences, since crime is a type of social deviance or variation from a social norm that is

singled out for public punishment. Many non-criminal deviances are not the subject of punishment. That is why the question; "Why do some cultures define particular kinds of deviance as criminal?" is important. The answer to this question is related with the central theme of the culture considered. For example, there are two types of deviances in Inuit communities, "private wrongs" and "public crimes", according to the perceived threat to the community's survival. This conception of crime is different from European and other conceptions of crime and deviance. For example, "The destruction of an old parent or a newborn baby" is not a crime by the Inuit (Hagan, 1985; 5-7).

These kinds of divergent conceptions can become particularly problematic when cultures come close and have continued contact. The results of such contact include compromise, conflict, and coercion, and inevitably change. These kinds of changes and other social changes in a society lead to changes in the conception of crime. If criminal laws constitute "conduct norms" in a society, they must reflect social changes (Heidensohn, 1989; 4).

The Ottoman Empire was a case of cultural federalism. Within the Empire, Muslim, Jews, and Christians had their own courts applying distinctive laws of marriage, divorce and related matters (Friedman, 1977; 71).

Sociologists have tried to overcome some of these problems that have occurred as a result of these changes. For example, Sutherland

proposed that an action that causes an injury and incurs a penalty should be added to the definition of crime. (Heidensohn, 1989; 5).

Social Scientist's attempts to define crime can be seen in seven approaches: (1) The legal-consensus definition: Crime is an "intentional action in violation of criminal law committed without defense or excuse". (2) The socio-legal definition: "legal description of acts as socially injurious and legal provision of a penalty for the act." (3) The cross-cultural definition: "violation of conduct norms that is invariant across all cultural groups'. (4) The statistical definition: "high-frequency behaviors considered normal, and some low-frequency behaviors deviant". (5) Labeling definition: "deviance is normal, it represents a normal and purposeful attempt to correct or protest social injustice". (6) The utopian-Anarchist definition: ''crime and deviance represents a normal and purposive attempt to correct social injustice'' (7) The human rights definition: "Crime is violation of human rights" (Hagan, 1985; 42-48).

There have been literally hundreds of attempts to define crime within these approaches. But none of them could satisfy everyone. Sociologists of law fix their eyes on norms or rules; how they are made, applied, obeyed, and how they influence behavior. They are interested in the functions that these processes serve in society (Friedman, 1977; 5).

In this study, we will consider some behaviors some of which may be defined as crime or deviance. In order to see social control functions of religion on these behaviors, these definition differences are not crucial. That

is why we will define them as crime, although some of them could be defined as deviance.

There are many types of crime and deviance, which can be divided into several categories. Modern crime which can be classified into (1) conventional street crime (2) crime without a victim; for example, narcotics or dangerous drugs, and alcohol, (3) professional crime, (4) white collar crime, and (5) organized crime (Cull and Hardy, 1973; 8).

2.2.5. The Reasons of Crime

After this brief consideration on definition and types of crime I'll try to examine the reason of crime briefly. Like his contributions to sociology of religion, Durkheim has had considerable influence on the sociology of crime, as Reiner (1984) summarizes, his contributions could be categorized in to: (a) the influence of his conception of crime on "labeling" theory; (b) his "anomie" framework as crime causation theory; (c) and his effects on legal and penal evolution are important (Heidensohn, 1989; 39).

As it is known, Durkheim's sociology was centered on the understanding of the process by which order is maintained in societies. His concern was the sources of social order and disorder, the forces that make regulation or de-regulation in social structure. He saw crime as normal in terms of its occurrence and even as having positive social functions in terms of its consequences. Thus crime became an integral part of society, since

30

"crime brings together upright consciences and concentrates them" through the functional analysis (Coser, 1977; 142).

There are there different groups of theories that explain the causes of crime in different ways they are "theories of culture, status, and opportunity", "theories of under control" and "theories of over control". Except some "theories of over control", most of the other theories can be seen within the tradition of Durkheimian sociology in one sense.

I'll try to summarize some of these theories, in order to explore the causes of crime within these theories.

"Theories of culture, status, and opportunity" deals with value differences, cultural differences, variations in status and opportunities. These differences are seen as dividing people, pushing them to challenge the standards of the society in which they live. According to these theories, these kinds of social structures cause crime. There are three groups of theories which explain crime in different ways within this category: The "class culture theories" see crime as natural out growth of under class life (2) The "status frustration theories" see crime as a group response to the problems of meeting middle – class status expectations (3) The "opportunity theories" see crime as a product of the gap between the goals and means of attaining them (Hagan, 1985; 176-199).

I'll consider Merton's typology of goals, means, and ways of adapting to their relationship, because it has become one of the most famous

typologies in all sociology. Robert Merton followed Durkheim in his concern for "sociological perspectives" to explain the reason of crime by asking "why the frequency of deviant behavior varies within different social structure." He tried to discover how "some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconforming rather than conforming conduct". To him, social and cultural structures have two elements: first, "culturally defined goals, purposes and interest"; second, "the acceptable modes of reaching out for these goals." These cultural goals and institutional norms operate jointly to shape prevailing practices (Heidensohn, 1989; 41).

Merton developed a typology of goals, means, and ways of adapting to their relationship. The first type of adaptation is conformity: confirming behavior occurs where the goals and means of society are accepted and successfully pursued. The second type of adaptation is innovation: it occurs when culturally approved goals are pursued by culturally disapproved means. The third type of adaptation is ritualism: this is a common fate of the lower middle class: a ritualist is a follower of rules but he/she does not deal with achieving larger societal goals. The forth type of adaptation is retreatism: the retreatists are in society, but they have rejected both the goals and the means of society; for example drug addicts. The last type of adaptation is rebellion; it occurs when there is an organized struggle for social economic, and political change in society (Hagan, 1985; 193,194).

32

Apart from conformity all other forms of adaptation have some deviant potential. According to Merton's theory of anomi, which is developed from Durkheimian tradition within a more liberal sentiment, anomi occurs as a result of the lack of fit between goals and means, and then deviant behavior (Heidensohn, 1989; 42).

Merton's formulation is only one of the explanations that put emphasis on socially structured patterns of opportunity. This approach can be defined as structured patterns of opportunity. This approach can also be defined as structural approach, according to which societies are organized to satisfy human needs and wants, and there are advantaged and disadvantaged groups in society. Walter Miller (Theory of lower – class culture), Solomon Kobrin (the conflict of values) and Albert Cohen (theory of status deprivation), are some authors of this structural approach (Hagan, 1985; 176-196).

Durkheim's emphasis on social bonds and cultural regulation and the consequences of their absence and failure constituted the basis of the theories of undercontrol. These theories try to explain: "why would anyone violate rules of social conduct that nearly all of us accept". There are at least three kinds of theories of undercontrol that explain the causes of crime in a different way: (1) the social disorganization theory asserts that the growth of urbanization caused crime by breaking normal regulating behaviors. (2) The neutralization theory argues that most of the people learn the norms and values of society, but some people learn to rationalize or neutralize their

violation. (3) Control theory argues that some of the people are bound less weakly than others to society's norms and values and that those whose ties are weakest commit crime most (Hagan, 1985; 176-200).

So far we have examined theories that explain the reasons of crime from a kind of structural or cultural perspectives. On the other hand, Overcontrol theories' focus on how behaviors become valued or disvalued by particular groups, and on how such evaluations may in turn influence future behaviors. For them the dividing line between what is and is not called "criminal" is changeable. The overcontrol theories are: (1) Labeling theories which are focused on society's response to crime as a topic in its own right. (2) The group conflict theories, which link the labeling of crime to socially and economically dominant groups. (3) The Marxist theories consider with the influence of economic forces in producing what is regarded as the crime problems of capitalist societies (Hagan, 1985; 201-227).

2.2.6. Crime Trends

World crime rates have risen as a general trend. The crime rate is the number of criminal code offences reported for every 1 000 or 100 000 people. It is often a better measure of trends in crime than the actual number of crimes because it allows for population growth.

According to the United Nations' crime records, the number of total recorded crime per 100 000 people in Turkey were 189 in 1990,341 in 1993,404 in 1995 and 520 in 1997.We see a rapid rise in the total recorded

crime rates in Turkey for period 1990-1997. But, when we consider the recorded crime rates of other countries we see that the recorded crime rates are very low in Turkey compared with most other countries in the world.

The levels of total recorded crime rates do not depend on the development levels of countries. High crime rates are mostly seen in affluent societies, not in societies that have poor social and economic conditions. Although total recorded crime rates are high in these affluent societies the rising speed of crime rate is not high. For example, the total recorded crime rates rose only 1% in the in the EU Member States for the period 1996-2000.Morever, in England and Wales, total recorded crime rates fell 8% for the same period(Barclay and Tavares,2002 ; 1).

Comparisons between the total recorded crime levels in different countries for the different periods may be useful for seeing the trends of the total recorded crime rates.

Table 2-1 : Total Recorded Crime per 100 000 inhabitants.

Country/ye	1980	1983	1986	1990	1992	1995	1997
Turkey	-	-	-	189	214	404	520
China	90	60	51	195	136	140	131
Egypt	-	-	-	33	41	37	-
India	535	582	-	577	595	182	179
Poland	950	1275	1356	2317	2267	2527	2568
Malaysia	584	603	677	376	381	499	694
France	4877	6512	5943	6156	6677	-	-
Germany	4873	5573	5618	-	-	8168	8025
Sweden	11171	11513	13087	14240	13788	12976	1351
Denmark	8282	9015	11091	11531	11907	10309	1005
USA	5901	5179	5501	5803	5662	9921	9622

According to Table 2-1, the numbers of total recorded crime per 100 000 inhabitants are very different in different countries. It is interesting that the countries, which are known as developed, compared to others, have higher crime rates. And there is a general rise in the crime rates within most of the countries, although the rate of increase is varied.

2.3. Relationship between Religiosity and Crime

In this part of the study I'll try to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime from several dimensions. According to the assumption of this study, there is a negative relationship between religiosity and crime. In other

words, "people who are more religious commit fewer crimes, than those who are less religious"

Why should be there a relationship, especially a negative relationship between religiosity and crime? Why should religious values become a crime preventing factor?

Within the preceding parts of the study we examined the concepts of religion and crime in the light of theories, without paying special attention to how these two concepts could be related. In this part of the study, I'll consider some dimensions of religion and crime that could help to understand to what extent and what the nature is of the relationship between these two concepts.

In order to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime, the social control theory can be used as a general theoretical framework. The social control theory starts with the axioms that human action is guided by weighing profits and costs. Everybody has a tendency to commit crime. But as a result of socialization, people develop a bond to society that makes criminal behavior less likely. People who are attached to conventional society will enjoy many rewards for conventional behavior and will not run the risk of losing these ties and rewards by committing crimes. Religions usually share many values with society as a whole. Therefore religious people may have a relatively strong bond with values that condemn criminal behavior (Junger and Polder, 1993; 415).

37

Under the various titles I'll consider how and why religion and religiosity constitutes a social control function against crime within the general framework of the social control theory and other crime theories that try to explain: 'why would anyone violate rules of social conduct that nearly all of us accept?'.

2.3.1. The Sources of Law and Religious Values

During the examining of the crime, I examined a lot of different definitions of crime. As a simple definition, crime could be defined as "a violation of criminal law". But what is criminal law? How is it made? As it is generally accepted, criminal law is a part of legal system which is also a part of the broader social system.

Legal systems have structure and substance. Structure is the body, the framework of the system. Substance is observable behavior patterns of actors within the system. Besides structure and substance there is a third and vital element of the legal system. It is the element of demand which is created by "legal culture". Legal culture means ideas attitudes, beliefs, expectations, and opinion about law (Friedman, 1977:6, 7).

All these constitute the informal side of the system. Social forces do not "make" law directly. They should pass through the screen of legal system; to be a part of law.

In order to understand the relationship between religiosity and law we should examine the origins of laws in more detail. We should answer the

question where laws come from. So we can see the extent of the relationship between sources of law and religious values.

There are two of answers to the question of where laws come from. The first kind of answer sees the law as a product of consensus, evolving as a means of maintaining this consensus. The second kind of answer sees law as an instrument of social conflict that is used to maintain the power. Here the law is seen as having evolved out of a conflict between interest groups.

According to first answer, law is a natural product of the informal rules of interaction of a society. For example William Seagle (1941, 33) argues that law is a product of custom. Similarly Fredrick von Savigny asserts "that all law is first developed by the presuppositions on which a particular civilization is based" From this viewpoint there no important division between morality and law: customary morality is the very source of law (Hagan, 1985: 35)

Since we can accept law as the natural product of the informal rules of interaction of a society, religion might be accepted as an important source of law, because, social values and social rules might be mostly affected by the religious values of societies. As it was indicated earlier religion is a value system itself. It is not only concerned with what ought to be done, but also reasons why it ought to be done. Religion besides providing meaning to one's life, it also offers a set of standards to one's actions. All

these characteristics of religion affect the informal rules of interaction in a society, which are important sources of law.

On the one hand, religion enforces rules of right conduct, as an important part of informal rules of society, on the other hand, crime is a violation of criminal law, which is influenced by the right conduct of a society. This means that although their pressure types are different, both religion and law have approximately the same range of pressure directed to make people behave in accordance with social expectations.

The extent of the correspondence between the sources of law and the religious rules are important. First of all, this correspondence constitutes pressure to make people behave towards to the same direction with law. Then it also rises the legitimacy of law that positively affects law obeying. Because people are more likely to obey laws if they believe that the laws are legitimate. As Ellis indicates several authors agree that "to the degree that criminal laws embody the moral principles of particular religion, strong adherence to that religion should result in fewer violations of those criminal laws than weak (or non-) religious adherence" (Ellis, 1985; 504).

2.3.2. Social Control and Religious Values

Every society has ideas about good and bad behavior. Every society defines some behaviors as deviant. All societies take steps to encourage good behavior and control or punish bad behavior. The various functions of law can be reduced to social control function. This means that the law enforces

rules of right conduct in a society. Another important function of law is "dispute settlement". This function of law is also a kind of social control. When a dispute is settled, norms and rules are imposed on the parties; in this way bad conduct is discouraged and good conduct fostered.

Social control is important for all societies. All societies have both formal and informal social control mechanism. Law is the legal social control mechanism. But it has no monopoly on social control. There are many patterns of authority within society. Authority will always try to control, in some way, the behavior in the group which is under it. For example parents, teachers, and social leaders exercise social control in societies (Friedman, 1977; 11, 12).

The rules defining the roles are called role expectations. Social control comprises the whole range of pressures directed to make people play their roles in accordance with these expectations from both the formal and informal side of society (Mair, 1980; 11).

Researches recently have begun to examine the link between religion and social control. It has been noted that religion does play a role in shaping public opinion, and as a result, public policy on crime and crime control. Researchers are encouraged by finding of studies that explore the role of religion in shaping public support for the development of drug policies and other more general social control policies (Grasmick, 1997; 135). I'll examine some empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime, and social control in the next part of the chapter.

In the preceding part, we considered religious values as a source of law, which is the most effective legal social control mechanism. Now, I'll examine how religious values exercise social control, as an informal social control mechanism.

Since social control is the whole range pressures directed to make people play their roles in accordance with society's expectations, religious values should have important roles for social control, as far as, the religious values are accepted by people in a society.

As examined earlier many sociologists, psychologists and anthropologists have concerned the function of religious values for both the individual and the society. They examined the functions of religion from different perspectives. For example, Max Weber mainly looked at the functions of religion on the economic ethic and the social psychology of world religions. But he accepts the unifying and legitimizing function of religion as a cohesive force for society (Morris, 1987; 70, 76)

Psychological approaches, on the other hand, see religion as a means of maintaining life for individuals. For example according to Bronislaw Malinowski; the significance of religion is that it gives man the courage to face the world and death (Mair, 1977; 224).

Durkheim is an important author whose study is mainly on the sources of order and disorder, the forces that make regulation or de-regulation in society. In other words, Durkheim's main concern is social

control in his work. Durkheim's earlier concern with social regulation was focused on the more external forces of control, particularly the legal regulations. But later he focused on the social control forces that were mainly on social control forces that were internalized by individual consciousness. For him religion is one of the important forces that created within the individual as a sense of moral obligation to adhere to society's demands. Although he considers the internalized side of religion, religion is, to him, eminently social; it occurs in a social context (Coser 1977; 133, 136).

According to Durkheim there were four major functions of religion: the disciplinary, cohesive, vitalizing and euphoric function. These functions of religion are very important for informal social control. Religious rituals prepare men for social life by imposing self-discipline to individuals. In addition, religious ceremonies bring people together and reaffirm their common bonds so they reinforce social solidarity. Moreover religion revitalizes the social heritage of the group by transferring values to future generations. Finally religion has a psychological function that it serves to conduct feelings of frustration by reestablishing the believer's sense of well being (Coser, 1977; 139).

These functions of religious values constitute a range of pressures that make people behave in accordance with social expectations, which means social control. Religious values, besides constituting a kind of informal social control range in society, are also effective for efficient formal control mechanism by making people behave in accordance with the law. Of course,

there are several informal social control mechanisms. All these mechanisms affect each other within a complex relationship. Religious values are more or less effective on all these different social control mechanism as far as religious values are held by the people who have roles within these mechanisms. All these complex relations might be a subject of another study.

2.3.3. Law Obeying and Religious Values

In order to examine the effects of religious values on formal social control, I'll examine the function of religious values on law obeying. As indicated earlier, as a part of the broader social system, the legal system's most obvious function is social control. The efficient fulfillment of this function depends on making people behave in accordance with legal system. When an illegality occurs, legal system uses formal sanctions: arrest, imprisonment, fines and civil penalties. But informal means of social control can't be neglected to achieve efficient social control. Since legal behavior is a matter of choice, it is necessarily related with people's ideas and motives. People may choose to obey or disobey laws. What factors, in the end, determine these choices? Friedman divides them into three general categories. These are sensitiveness to sanction, response to social influence, and conscience. (Friedman 1977: 115)

Sanctions are one of the three clusters of motives that might explain legal behavior. But since we are examining the effects of religious values on legal behavior we should deal with other two motives that are seen

44

within the informal social control mechanisms. The second keep motive is the factor of social influence. We can call this the group factor in legal behavior.

As it is known, Durkheim's major thesis was that modern life disrupts both social and moral integration. People became isolated social atoms and, religious descent leads to pluralism, society lacks the moral integration that is necessary to ensure conformity to norms. For him the moral community is based on two elements. The first is social integration; the density and intimacy of attachments among groups. The second is moral integration; the collective conception of norms, and especially of religious beliefs that legitimate the norms.

As Rodney Stark argues Durkheim's thesis about moral communities once dominated the research and writing in urban sociology, especially the form described as human ecology. According to the research results crime rates was much higher in urban neighborhoods which had low moral integration, and cities higher in "moral integration" had lower rates of crime and suicide (Stark, 1987; 114,115).

Beside moral communities, there are other face-to-face groups. The family is one. It has important power to control its members. Families can make its members play their roles in accordance with law as a social control mechanism.

According to control theory, when the social bond is weak or broken, deviant behavior is likely to follow. F. Ivan Nye suggests that the

family contributes to the creation of the social bond in four ways: (1) internalized controls, (2) indirect controls, (3) direct controls, and (4) need satisfaction. Thus families became an influential factor in ensuring conformity, and avoiding crime (Hagan, 1985: 167).

Both moral communities and other face-to-face groups, including families, constitute social influence factors that might explain legal behavior. The effects of religious values on these social influence factors might be different according to the power of religious values that are held by people who have roles in these groups. There might be groups that are particularly shaped by religious factors and other groups by non-religious factors. For example, family as a social institution has legal, social, cultural, economic and religious dimensions. According to the characteristics of the family members some dimensions might be particular characteristics of a family. Both relations within groups and relations between groups are complex relations. We assumed that as a value system religion might affect the constitution of these groups and their functions as far as the extent of religiosity of group members.

Another major factor that might explain legal behavior is inner voice. This voice has been called different names like conscience, the sense of right and legitimacy. It covers all those motives that can not trace the signals about sanctions, neither from the state nor from society. Friedman distinguishes a number of these inner motives: (1) civil mindedness; this is the idea that we ought to obey some rule, because it is good for other people,

even though it is not in our personal interest. (2) Morality: this refers to a somewhat different motive. People often follow norms for religious or ethical reasons rather than for reasons of personal or social utility. Morality can be a powerful motivation; it keeps people from stealing and killing. It is the reason why religious Moslems and Mormons do not drink. (3) Sense of fairness: When a rule is fair, it deserve support not because of its content but because of some formal quality, for example, the fact that it applies to everyone alike. These motives do not depend on general faith in institutions. They (civic mindedness, fairness and morality) relate to the form or content of rules. (4) Trust: this is rather different motive. Trust is faith in authority, faith that they know what they are doing because they have inside information. (5) Legitimacy: this is a kind of trust in procedures, structures, or authorities. According to Max Weber a rule, custom, order or system is legitimate when it is endowed with the prestige of exemplariness and obligator ness. The feeling of legitimacy is an actually feeling about the source of the rule, or the form of rule, or a procedure of adapting the rule (Friedman, 1977; 138,139).

All of these motives might explain legal behavior. But each one has its negative side as well. On the other hand, all these motives are attitudes, not behavior. The relationship between legitimacy and legal behavior is based on hypothesis that people are more likely to comply with the rules when they feel they are legitimate, than those rules that they feel are not. A similar hypothesis could be framed about other motives. (Friedman, 1977; 142)

47

There is close relationship between religious values and these inner motives. Although these inner motives are usually called various names, religions, especially Islam, approves of all these inner motives with their positive side. There are verses in Qur'an about fairness: (4/58, 5/8, 5/42), and on morality: (103/1, 17/23, 2, 4/36). Civic mindedness is also an important characteristic of religious man within most religions.

The positive effects of inner motives and religious values on legal behavior is based on the assumption that people who have these motives and values are more likely to obey the legal rules than those that do not have them. In this study I will try to find out how religious values affect an individual's motives and values with which they become more likely to obey legal rules than those they do not. The effects of religious values on behavior have also been tested empirically in different studies. In the following part I'll consider with some empirical studies that explore the effects of religious values on crime involvement.

2.3.4. Empirical Studies on the Relationship between Religiosity and Crime

There are many empirical studies about the relationship between religiosity and crime. Lee Ellis examined the assertions about the relationship between religiosity and crime in the light of 56-research studies, paying special attention to how criminality and religiosity were operationalzed in each study. These studies constitute three different groups according to the establishing of the relationship between religiosity and criminality. The first group of

studies established the relationship between church attendance and crime rates. According to these studies, at least among church members frequent church attendees have lower crime rates than infrequent church attainders especially in victimless crimes. But these studies did not show a significant relationship between church attendance and criminality. A significant negative relationship exists between frequent church attendance and criminality

On the other hand, a group of studies about church membership indicate that it is positively related to criminality. There are eight relevant studies which shared a common methodology. They compared church membership for groups of prisoners with church membership of populations from which the prisoners came. But this approach has been criticized and these studies are regarded as inconclusive because of their methodology (Ellis, 1985; 507).

The second group of studies examined the relationship between religiosity and crime, according to being the religious membership among the main western religions.

Among the main western religions, membership in Juducizm is associated with lower crime rates as compared to the Christian religious membership as a whole. Among Christians, Protestants have lower crime rates than Catholics. The explanations of these differences are mainly related with the factor that; some religions require a set of Orthodox beliefs from their members than other religions. To the degree that religion's group solidarity,

belief in divine sanctions, obedience to authority help to prevent crime involvement, as a result, crime rates are lower among the more orthodox religions than among the members of more liberal religions. Rhodes and Reiss (1970) analyzed data separately by race and found that 'non-religious` whites had higher crime rates than any of the Judeo-Christian groups, and nonreligious black had next to the highest rates. Whites in other religions had the second highest crime rate, and blacks in other religions (probably mainly Moslems) had lowest crime rates (Ellis, 1985; 510)

The third groups of studies using 'belief in afterlife with divine punishment', at least among persons who consider themselves members of an organized religion were found to have lower crime rates. But using 'belief in a personal god' as a measure of religiosity has produced inconsistent results. Consistent results were found when the belief in an afterlife and divine sanctions are used as a measure of religiosity (Ellis, 1985; 508).

There are other empirical studies that examine the relationship between religiosity and social control. I'll explore two of them.

Stephen J. Bahr by using a national sample over 17.000 high school seniors, he examined the effect of the education level of parents, the employment status of the mother, the number of parents in household, religiosity, religious affilianation, gender and race on alcohol and marijuana use. The results showed that neither parental education nor the employment status of mother was related to the use of alcohol or marijuana. Although the differences were small, adolescents who lived with both parents were less

likely to use marijuana than adolescents who lived in single- parent homes. But the level of religiosity had a significant association with alcohol and marijuana use among all religious denominations. Religious denomination, gender, and race were also related to drug use. This study shows that religiosity is a very important variable on alcohol and marijuana use. So, adolescents who were active religiously tented to use less alcohol and marijuana than those adolescents not involved in religious activities (Bahr, 1986; 53, 71).

Brenda Sims Blackwell and Harold G. Grasmick examine the issue of public support for random drug testing by focusing on the role of religion, specifically religious affiliation, in shaping public opinion as a social control mechanism. Evidences from the data shows that conservative protestants, compared to liberal moderate protestants, Catholics and those with no affiliation, indicate higher levels of support for random drug testing. This study and other similar studies (Grasmick, Bursik and Blackwell; 1993, Grasmick Cochran, Bursik and Kimpel; 1993, Farrington and Langan; 1992, Nagel;1990) suggest that there is a need for further research exploring the role of religion in the development of drug policies and social control policies in general. At the same time the role of religion in shaping public sentiment and policy concerning crime can not be overlooked (Blackwell and Grasmick, 1997; 135,147).

After examining findings of several empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime I'll consider the conventional

explanations on the relationship between religiosity and crime, which are used within different empirical studies to explain the relationship.

As Rodney Stark indicates, even though several empirical studies found a strong negative relationship between religiosity and crime, some other studies found no relationship or weak relationship between them. These findings made many authors reconsider the explanations that they made about their studies. According to Stark, if we move from a psychological conception of religion, clarity leaps from chaos. He argues that religion affects conformity, not through producing guilt or fear of hellfire in the individual, but that religion gains its power to shape the individual only as an aspect of groups (Stark, 1987; 112).

Although most of the social scientists found an inverse relationship between religiosity and crime, quite a number of social scientists argued that there is a positive relationship between them. They based their arguments what seemed to be conflicting evidence. Their explanations centered around arguments that both religious convictions and criminality tend to be generally associated with low intelligence or with low social status (Ellis 1985; 502)

Contrary to this explanation, another explanation argues that both religious convictions and crime preventing variables are coincidental, for example education levels and social status (Sutherland and Cressey, 1974; 234). This explanation may be called "social class explanation". Its evidence comes from multiple regression studies that have been able to reduce negative religiosity-criminality relationship by statistically controlling for such

variables as number of drug-using friends and unstable family situations (Ellis, 1985; 505). But several multiple regression studies show that negative religiosity-criminality relations couldn't be reduced by controlling nonreligious variables (Bahr, 1986; 63).

There are also arguments that religiosity and crime are inversely related, not for coincidental reasons but because religious conviction really does prevent crime. One of these explanations is the "group solidarity explanation". As indicated earlier, going back at least to Durkheim; several social scientists have argued that religion is a focus point of group solidarity and a commitment to a common set of principles. Some other scientists contended that "to the degree that criminal laws embody the moral principles of a particular religion, strong adherence to that religion should result in fewer violations of those criminal laws than weak religious adherence "(Ellis, 1985, 504). As is seen above, during examining the relationship between religious values and social control, law obeying and sources of law, we considered all these functions of religion in detail.

Most religions hold that violations of moral principles or values may result in sanctions in an afterlife. As a result, these values affect behavior and "the behavior is considered immoral according to the religious teachings, strong adherent to religious rules should commit fewer offenses than weak adherents". This explanation may be called the "hell fire explanation" it accepts a negative relationship between religiosity and crime as a result of religious values (Ellis, 1985; 504). This explanation reduces

will gather our data from Muslims, we don't need a special examination of Islam as a different religion. Since we will examine the relationship between religiosity and crime, we should carefully examine how the strength of religious involvement could be determined in Islam as a religion, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. The Subject of the Study

In this part of the study, first of all, I'll define briefly some basic terms that are used throughout the study in order to make clear what we mean by these terms. Of course these terms have various meanings and they are used within different studies within different meanings as it is seen in related literature. Since we will use some terms which carry a wide content and have various meanings we will specify them by defining what we mean by these terms. These terms are:

Religion: a set of values and rules which are believed to have come from sacred sources by members of a religion

Religious behavior: the behaviors of a person who is a member of a religion and follows the rules of the religion

Religiosity: believing the religious teachings and following the religious rules

Belief dimension of religiosity: believing the teachings of religion; like God, Hell and Heaven, the Day of Judgment, the holy book est.

Ritualistic dimension of religiosity: performing the rituals of religion as are obligated by religion like praying, fasting, giving alms est.

Perceived religiosity: the perception of ones religiosity by other people

Objective definition of religiosity: definition of religiosity in Islam according to respondents' perception, notwithstanding their own religiosity

Religiosity of environment: the perceived religiosity of father, mother, friends and class mates

Sin: break of religious rules

Crime: a kind of social deviance or variation from a social norm, which is proscribed by criminal law.

Social control: the whole range of legal or informal pressures directed to make people behave in accordance with legal and social rules.

Social control functions of religion: the whole range of religious pressure that is directed to make religious people behave in accordance with religious rules;

The subject of this study is the relationship between religiosity and crime. As considered before we have considered some behaviors as crime that could be defined as deviance also. But we have defined them as crime to see the functions of religion by not taking into account the definition differences, since it is not crucial for the relationship. According to the assumption of the study,

there should be a negative relationship between religiosity and crime. In the preceding chapter we tried to demonstrate why and how there should be a negative relationship between these two concepts. Firstly, we considered the concept of religion, the functions of religion, the concepts of crime and causes of crime from different dimensions. Then we examined the relationship between religiosity and crime by paying special attention how religiosity and crime are related and why there should be a negative relationship between them. In addition to these considerations we examined the empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime, and conventional attempts to explain this relationship within these empirical studies. This is also an empirical study that will examine the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments, and the social control functions of religion and religiosity on crime and related items by data that will be gathered from university students in Turkey.

As considered earlier, the relationship between religiosity and crime can be examined in different ways. The relationship can be examined by gathering data from known criminals or known as non-criminals. When we gather data from known criminals who are mostly within prisons, we can measure the relationship between religiosity and known criminal behaviors, but we can also gather data from non-criminals and we can measure both the relationship between religiosity and attitudes towards crime and the relationship between religiosity and some less serious crime commitments which are usually not punished, although they are defined as crime; like drug addiction or some insults. Measuring attitudes towards crimes is also

important to find the relationship between religiosity and crime. Attitudes are different from behaviors but attitudes affect behaviors. Several empirical studies explain behavior differences by attitude differences.

Before examining the relationship between religiosity and the crimes committed by respondents, we will first examine the effects of religious values on crime, as a social control function of religion. We assuming a negative relationship between religiosity and crime, and we will measure it by measuring the relationship between religiosity and its effects on attitudes towards criminal acts. In other words, we assume that religious values make individuals have attitudes that make them avoid crime commitment. This is why we will measure whether religiosity makes individuals have attitudes that lead differences on crime commitment, or not, through some social control mechanisms. As demonstrated in the preceding chapter, besides constructing attitude differences about crime, religiosity negatively affects individual's crime commitment from different dimensions.

Since we assuming that religious values inversely affect an individual's relations with crime through constructing social control mechanism, law obeying attitudes, group solidarity, legitimizing laws by defining several crimes as sin. All these relationships between religiosity and crime will be the subject of this study.

The originality of the study will be the type of examining the relationship between religiosity and crime. As examined earlier a wide range of behaviors are defined as crime; from killing to violating a small traffic rule.

We are examining this relationship by gathering data from university students in Turkey. We will try to find out the effects of religiosity both on attitudes about some serious crimes and some relatively small crime commitments; whether religiosity differences lead to attitude differences on crime and also some kinds of crime commitments. So we would empirically test the explanations of several empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime, and also the relationship between religiosity and some crime commitments. As considered earlier, the mentioned studies tried to test whether there is an inverse relationship between them. For example, they found Protestants as a whole have lower crime rates then Catholics among Christians. But they didn't test why there are such crime rate differences among Christians. They only explain these crime rate differences by belief differences without any empirical findings about these differences.

In this study, we will examine the effects of these religious beliefs, and values on crime, as a social control factor that prevents individuals from crime commitments trough fulfilling crime preventing functions as stated by social control theory.

3.2. *The Aim of the Study*

The aim of the study is to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime. Since we assume that there is a negative relationship between religiosity and crime, we will try to measure the functions of religious values on crime from different angles.

violations of those criminal laws, than weak (or non) religious adherence"
(Ellis, 1985; 504).

5. To see the social control function of religion we will try to find out what
would be the first factor that determines the respondent's choice, when they
face a situation in which they have to choose obeying or not obeying a
criminal rule? As considered earlier there are three main factors that might
explain legal behavior. Besides legal sanctions and social pressures, morality
is an effective factor that might explain legal behavior. Morality may not be a
powerful motive for everybody for legal behavior. But for religious individuals,
morality, which is mostly shaped by religious values, may be a powerful
motive to avoid these individuals from committing criminal acts, especially
when these criminal acts are also sinful at the same time.

We will try to measure whether religiosity is effective factors that
might determine the behavior of respondents when they face a situation in
which they have to choose legal or illegal behaviors. This will be a measure
of attitudes, not behaviors. But measuring attitudes is important for the
relationship between religiosity and crime. As Friedman argues the legal
system relies heavily on voluntary compliance. Attitudes about legitimacy,
about obedience to law may be the very glue that binds a society together
(Friedman, 1978; 144). That is why measuring the effects of religiosity on
attitudes about legal or illegal behaviors is important for the relationship
between religiosity and crime.

Since we will gather data from students, their explanation of legal behavior is important for the effects of religiosity. That is why we will try to measure respondent's attitudes about three main factors that might explain legal behavior; which factor is firstly important for them to explain legal behavior or to avoid from criminal acts.

As it could be seen from explanations that considered so far, we will not try to determine whether respondents committed any serious crime or offence. Respondents may not answer such questions. That is why we will firstly try to measure respondent's attitudes towards different crimes from different angles.

Attitudes are different from behaviors. But they affect each other. Several empirical studies show that belief differences and attitude differences lead behavior differences. As considered earlier, the denominational studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime, explain the crime rate differences between denominations by orthodox belief differences within these different denominations (Ellis, 1985; 508) In other words, several empirical findings show that attitude differences towards crime may lead crime commitment differences. That is why, measuring the respondent's attitude about some serious crimes is important to understand the relationship between religiosity and crime.

6. Besides measuring respondents' attitudes towards crime, we will also measure the relationship between religiosity and some crime commitments of respondents as another objective of the study. But these crimes are not

63

serious crimes such as killing some one or burglary. They are some kinds of wordily offenses; insults against someone, use of physical forces against individuals, drug addiction and cheating within the examinations.

All these items will be the objectives of the study to measure the relationship between religiosity and crime as two inversely related concepts from different angles of these concepts.

3.3. The Sampling of the Study

Since we try to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime we should choose a sample by which we could gather data to find out the relationship between religiosity and crime. If we only want to find out the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments, crime as occurred behavior, we can choose a sample that all of the respondents are criminals whom are probably from prison. But the relationship between religiosity and crime could be examined in different ways.

As considered in the preceding chapter, especially by the "under control theories, crime commitments are explained by deviations from social norms and values (Hagan, 1985; 148). In addition to these theories, most of the findings of the empirical studies on crime commitment differences are explained by value differences of individuals (Ellis, 1985; 503). That is why studies that aimed to find out individuals norms and values that affect individuals' crime commitment are important for both understanding of crime and understanding of effects of values and norms on crime. Which kinds of values or norms make individuals obey laws or avoid them from criminal

behaviors? Does religion, as a set of values, make religious individuals have attitudes that prevent them from crime commitments?

In this study we will try to discover the effects of religions values on crime. We assume that religiosity as an effective factor can constitute attitudes on religious individual that make him or her behave in accordance with laws, so avoid those individuals from criminal behaviors. Since we try to find out the effects of religiosity on attitude construction about crime, we do not have to look only criminal individuals to find out the effects of religiosity on crime within the mentioned sense. We will gather data to test the effects of religiosity on crime from a sample that is chosen from university students in Turkey.

This is a "purposive sample" construction, according to which the "researcher uses his or her own judgment about which respondents to choose, and picks only those who best meet the purposes of the study"(Bailey, 1982; 99) We want to see the effects of religions values on crime, that is why we should choose a sample by which we can test the effects of religiosity by controlling other factors that may be coincidental with religiosity-for example education levels and social status-on construction of law obeying attitudes. In other words, by choosing our sample from university students, we can reduce the effects of education level differences and social status differences, as much as possible. So we can test the effects of religiosity on the attitude construction about crime and crime commitments

by gathering data from respondents who are more or less homogeneous according to education and status levels.

We will choose 450 university students, as the sampling of the study from four different universities (Middle East Technical University and Gazi University from Ankara, Bolu Izzet Baysal University from Bolu and Van Yüzüncü Yıl University from Van) in Turkey. We will try to reach "average university students" to collect our data to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime from the mentioned angles.

3.4. Measurement

The data of the study will be collected by questionnaire by which all of the objectives of the study could be achieved. As it is known, in order to obtain the validity of a questionnaire; it must actually measure the concepts in question, not some other concepts, and if a questionnaire is valid it will be accurate every time, and thus it must be reliable also (Bailey, 1982; 68, 69) During examination of the objectives of the study we studied what we will measure as the objective of the study. In this part of the study we will consider how the objectives will be measured by which questions accurately.

Since we try to measure the effects of religiosity on crime, first of all we should accurately measure religiosity. In the preceding chapter we considered with how religiosity were measured differently within the different studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime. We can see at least six categories of operational measures for religiosity within the db db db db db db db db db c

through some propositions that are related with some basic principles of Islam. Questions 14, 15, 17, 18, 27, 28, 30, 31 and 33 are related with the definition of good Muslim both for practice and belief categories, and also the forbidden behavior dimension.

As a second objective we will try to measure the religiosity of respondents in order to see the effects of religiosity on crime, from different dimensions of religiosity. We will measure the belief dimension of religiosity by questions 34, 40, 42, 44 and 46, the daily rituals dimension by questions 9 and 10, and respondents' definition of their religiosity by questions 13 and 47. Besides other factors, as a main variable, measurement of religiosity is very important to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime. That is why we specially tried to measure accurately religiosity of respondents.

Religiosity of respondent's environment; religiosity of family, religiosity of friends and religiosity of class mates will be measured by questions 4, 5, 6, 11 and 12. By the measurement of environment we will see whether respondents have a religious environment or not.

Another objective of the study is measurement of whether respondents see some crimes as sin or not. We will try to see the extent of the correspondence between sin and crime. As considered earlier this correspondence is important for the effect of religiosity on law obeying behaviors of religions individuals. While they are trying to avoid sin they became avoiding themselves from crime also. Questions 28, 37, 45, 50, 52

will measure the correspondence between some crimes and sins within a general approach.

How do respondents explain their legal behavior and how do they perceive other people's explanations of law obeying? According to them, which factor is first explanatory factor for legal behavior among explanatory factors? Due to which factor do respondents choose legal behavior, and due to which factor other people obey laws, if they face a situation in which they have to choose legal or illegal behavior. These will be measured by questions 56, 57 and 58.

In order to measure the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments, crime as behavior we will use question 41, 48, 54 and 58. These are not serious crimes but they are important to see the effects of religiosity on crime commitment

There are other questions to destroy the concentration of the respondents about similar questions. By these questions we also can see respondents' considerations about some political dimensions of the society. These questions are 16, 21, 22, 25, 29, 35, 36 and 38.

3.5. Data analysis and reporting

Since we try to see the relationship between religiosity and crime within the mentioned sense, we should see the results of all mentioned items within the designed structure of study; from demographic characteristics of respondents to the relationship between the religiosity of respondents and crime commitments of respondents. We will indicate all results within the tables and

cross tabulations as percentages and absolute numbers to see the results of considered items and considered relationships. We will also use logistic regression analysis to see the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments of respondents, crime as behavior. In other words, we will use both percentage distributions and explanatory statistical techniques to see the results of the study.

Of course, the relationship between religiosity and crime can be studied within a different study design and by different statistical techniques. But we organized our study as mentioned way and used mentioned statistical techniques in order to see adequately the relationship between religiosity and crime as considered sense.

Findings of the study will be interpreted within their own ground, and will be reported within their own context under the different titles that are designed according to requirements of the study.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSES

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will analyze the finding of the study starting from demographic characteristics of the respondents. As stated in the preceding chapter, the respondents of our questionnaire were university students who live in Ankara, Van and Bolu. By choosing respondents from different universities in different parts of Turkey we tried to reach average university students in order to see the effects of religiosity on crime in different dimensions.

The questionnaires were given to respondents during classes and were asked not to write their names on the questionnaire to prevent respondents from any group effects or any other factors that may affect the answers of respondents. With a few exceptions, approximately all of the questions were answered by the respondents. This is why the analysis of the data will reflect all of the pictures of respondents about asked questions.

After analyzing the demographic characteristics of the respondents I will considered the respondents answers on some social and politic structure of Turkish society. The main function of these questions was to destroy the attention of respondents about similar questions that were asked to see the relationship between religiosity and crime.

4.2 *Demographic Characteristics of Respondents*

Although I did not consider the demographic characteristics of the respondents as intermediary variables for the relationship between religiosity and crime, they were important to see which kinds of respondents answered our questions. As stated earlier I tried to reach average university students to construct the sample of the study. Table 4-1 shows some of the demographic characteristics of respondents.

Table 4-1 : Demographic Characteristics of Respondents.

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents			
Variables		N	%
SEX	Male	242	55,6
	Female	193	44,4
AGE	Less than 20	37	8,5
	Between 20-26	317	72,9
	More than 25	37	8,5
CLASS	First Year	102	23,4
	Third Year	68	15,6
	Forth Year	100	23,0
	Missing	146	33,6

As it is seen from the Table 4-1, 55.6 % of the respondents are male and 44.4 % of the respondents are female, 8.5 % of the respondents are younger than age 20, 72 % of the respondents are between age 20 and 25, and 8.5 % of respondents are between age 20 and 25, and 8.5 % of respondents are between age 20 and 25, respondents are between age 20 and 25, etween age 20 and 25, 27

Turkey, Islamic laws in the Muslim countries, the importance of mosques in a society, religious education in some high schools and the applicability of the Islamic principles to the political decisions'.

4.3.1 Relations with Muslim Countries

Respondents were asked: 'Turkey should have close relations with Muslim countries. SA, A, D and SD'. (SA: Strongly agree, A: Agree, D: Disagree, SD: Strongly disagree). Table 4-2 shows the answers of the respondents to this question.

Table 4-2 :Ideas about Relationship with Muslim Countries.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	169	38,9
A	159	36,6
D	73	16,8
S	30	7,0
Missing	4	0,9
Total	435	100

According to Table 4-2, 38.9 % of the respondents strongly agree that Turkey should have close relations with the other Muslim countries. And 36.6 % of the respondents agree to the same question.

On the contrary, 16.8 % of the respondents disagree that Turkey should have close relations with Muslim countries. And 7.0 % of the respondents strongly disagree with having close relations.

If we add SD categories to D categories and SA categories to A categories we can see that 23.8 % of the respondents disagree with Turkey having close relations but 75.5 % of the respondents agree to having close relations with Muslim countries.

These results show that most of the respondents agreed with having close relations with other Muslim countries. I did not consider the probable reasons of the answers. There may be many reasons that made the respondents agree to having close relations with other Muslim countries, from religious reasons to economic reasons. But as I stated above the reasons for the answer are not among the objectives of this study.

4.3.2 Relations with Christian Countries.

In order to see the views of the respondents on this subject we asked the question 'Turkey should have limited relations with Christian countries. SA, A, D and SD' the results of the respondents are in Table 4-3.

Table 4-3 :Ideas about Relations with Christian Countries.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	56	12,9
A	101	23,2
D	141	32,4
S	133	30,6
Missing	4	0,4
Total	435	100

As it is shown in the Table, 12.9 % of the respondents strongly agree with that Turkey should have limited relations with Christian countries, and 23.2 % of the respondents agree.

On the contrary, 32.4 % of the respondents strongly disagree with Turkey's having limited relations with Christian countries, and 30.6 % of the respondents disagree

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then 63.0 % of the respondents disagree with Turkey's limited relations with Christian countries, and 36.1 % of the respondents agree to limited relations with Christian countries.

According to these results, it can be seen that most of the respondents do not want limited relations with Christian countries.

4.3.3 Being both Muslim and Secular.

The respondents were asked the following question 'It should be accepted by the other Muslim countries that both being Muslim and secular like in the case of Turkey. SA, A, D and SD', Table 4-4 shows the answers of the respondents about that question.

Table 4-4 : Ideas about Being both Muslim and Secular.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	151	37.7
A	152	34.9
D	67	15.4
S	48	11.0
Missing	17	3.9
Total	435	100

According to the Table, 37.7 % of the respondents strongly agree with that other Muslim countries should accept the fact that a country can be both Muslim and secular as the case of Turkey, and to 37.9 % of the respondents agree

On the contrary, 15.4 % of the respondents strongly disagree with acceptance of Turkey's case by other Muslim countries; both being Muslim and secular and 11.0 % of the respondents disagree with the question.

If 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' and 'SD categories' is added to the 'D categories' then 75.6 % of the respondents agree with the acceptance of Turkey's model; being both Muslim and secular, but only 26.4 % of the respondents disagree with acceptance of the model of Turkey by other Muslim countries.

4.3.4 Secularism in Turkey.

As it is known, there is a lot of discussion on the implementation of secularism in Turkey. Respondents were asked 'Secularism should continue

in Turkey SA, A, D, and SD', without taking into account any of the discussion on how the implementations of secularism in Turkey. The answers of the respondents are seen in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5 : Ideas about Continuation of Secularism in Turkey.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	180	41.4
A	153	35.2
D	47	10.8
SD	35	8.0
Missing	20	4.6
Total	435	100

According to Table 4-5, 41.4 % of the respondents strongly agree that secularism should continue in Turkey, and 35.2 % of respondents agree.

On the contrary, 8.0 % of the respondents strongly disagree with continuation of secularism in Turkey, and 10.8 % of the respondents disagree.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then 76.6 % of the respondents agree with continuation of secularism in Turkey. And 18.8 % of the respondents disagree with continuation of secularism in Turkey.

As mentioned earlier, I asked this question without taking into account any of the different discussions on how the implementation should be done; perhaps the percentages would be different if I took into account how the implementation should be carried.

4.3.5   *Islamic Laws in MuslimCountries.*

The concept of 'Islamic Laws' is also a concept in which the definition is made differently by different authors. Without considering the definition differences, respondents were asked 'Muslim countries should be governed by Islamic laws. SA, A, D and SD'. The answers of the respondents are see (9Tj 3.36645 0 Td (

If 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' and 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' then 27.8 % of the respondents agree with the idea that Muslim countries should be governed by Islamic laws, 68.6 % of the respondents disagree with the implementation of Islamic laws in Muslim countries. These results also indicate that the concept of 'Islamic Law' is not clear for the respondent, when we remember their answers on secularism in Turkey.

4.3.6   The Importance of Mosques in a Society.

The importance of mosques in a society is another question that was asked in this category. I asked the respondents 'The mosque is the most important construction in a society. SA, A, D and SD'. The Table 4-7 shows the answers of the respondents on this question.

Table 4-7 : The Importance of Mosques in a Society.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	123	28.3
A	145	33.3
D	107	24.6
SD	51	11.7
Missing	9	2.1
Total	435	100

According to Table 4-7, 28.3 % of the respondents strongly agree that a mosque is most important construction in a society, and 33.3   % of respondents agree with the same question.

On the contrary, 11.7 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the idea that the mosque is the most important construction in a society, and 24.6 % of the respondents disagree with the same idea.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then 35.2 % of the respondents disagree with the idea that mosques is most important construction in a society, and 61.6 % of the respondents agree

4.3.7 Religious Education in Some High Schools.

As is known in Turkish society, there are some high schools in which religious education is given and after graduating from these schools, students may be a religious officer in a mosque or they may attend to different universities in Turkey. Of course, this subject has many dimensions, but the respondents were only asked 'Religious education in some high schools (imam-hatip schools) is useful for Turkey. SA, A, D, and SD'. The answers of the respondents are seen in Table 4-8.

Table 4-8 : Ideas about Religious Education in Some High Schools.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	101	23.2
A	158	35.9
D	87	20.0
SD	82	18.9
Missing	9	2.1
Total	435	100

According to Table 4-8, 23.2 % of the respondents strongly agree that a religious education in some high schools is useful in Turkey, and 35.9 % of respondents agree.

On the contrary, 20.0 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the usefulness of these schools for Turkey, and 18.9 % of the respondents also disagree

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then 38.9 % of the respondents disagree with the usefulness of religious education in some high schools, and 59.1 % of the respondents agree.

4.3.8 *Political Rules and Islamic Principles.*

The last question that was asked to the respondents about the social and cultural structure of society was 'Political decisions should be made according to the Islamic principles. SA, A, SD and D'. This subject also has been a popular discussion item related with the secular structure of state since the beginning of the Turkish Republic. But I only analyzed the answers of respondents to the question without dealing with the different dimensions of the subject. Table 4-9 shows the answers of respondents about the question.

Table 4-9 : Ideas about 'Giving Political Rules according to Islamic Principles'.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	76	17.5
A	114	26.2
D	124	28.5
SD	113	26.0
Missing	8	1.8
Total	435	100

According to Table 4-9, 17.5 % of the respondents strongly agree that the political decisions should be made according to the principles of Islamic rules. And 26.2 % of respondents

On the contrary, 28.5 % of the respondents strongly disagree with making political decisions according to Islamic Principles, and 26.0 % of the respondents disagree

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then 52.5 % of the respondents disagree with giving political decisions according to Islamic principles, and 43.7 % of the respondents agree.

CHAPTER 5

OBJECTIVE DEFINITION OF RELIGIOSITY.

Besides the definitions of religiosity that are made by authors within related literature, definitions of religiosity and understandings of religiosity by ordinary people are also important in order to examine the effects of religiosity on different subjects. That is why we tried to find out how respondent understanding of religiosity in Islam before examining the relationship between religiosity and crime. As Martin points out the respondents views are important to understand the properties of the religions beliefs more than the formal properties of belief systems (Martin, 2002; 861-863) Some of the items, that were asked in order to understand the religiosity of the respondent, were also asked to better understand whether the respondents see these items as a religiosity requirement, for example, whether praying 5 times a day is seen as a requirement of religiosity or not.

I asked questions about the belief dimensions of religiosity, the ritualistic dimensions of religiosity and prohibitions in order to examine

respondents understanding of religiosity in Islam, notwithstanding the religiosity of respondents. From the answer of the respondents, it could be said that there is an important correspondence between respondents understandings of religiosity within Islam and religiosity items that are used to measure respondents religiosity.

In the following parts of the study I will try to analyze the respondents' answers on how they perceive 'the religiosity of someone' in Islam from different dimensions. After these analyses I will examine the religiosity of respondents' environment.

5.1 Belief Dimension of Religiosity.

As it was discussed before, the belief dimension of religiosity is an important part of religiosity, along with other dimensions of religiosity. In order to understand the belief dimension of religiosity in Islam I asked respondents whether they see the Qur'an, as a Holy Book of Islam, as a source of the foundations of beliefs and principles that determine the permitted and forbidden activities in Islam. Viewing the Qur'an as a source of beliefs and principles is important in order to understand the belief dimension of religiosity in Islam, because all of the other items related with belief dimension of Islam depend on that source. So, the questions that were asked to test the religiosity of respondents should be seen within this context, because all the questions related with belief dimension of religiosity are depends on that source.

I asked two questions to measure the belief dimension of religiosity in Islam according to the respondents, notwithstanding religiosity of respondents. These questions were 'the Qur'an holds the fundamentals of beliefs in Islam' and 'the Qur'an holds all the rules of the permitted and forbidden activities in Islam'. SA, A, SD and D.

Table 5-1 shows the answers of respondents as to whether they see the Qur'an as a source of permitted and forbidden activities in Islam or not. As it is known belief in the Holy Book of Islam is a fundamental dimension of religion, with its all contexture.

Table 5-1 : Ideas about 'The Qur'an holds Permitted and Forbidden Activities'

Answer categories	N	%
SA	241	55.4
A	146	33.6
D	25	4.7
SD	17	3.9
Missing	6	1.4
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-1, 55.4 % of the respondents strongly agree that the Qur'an holds the rules about what is permitted and forbidden in Islam, and 33.6 % agree.

On the contrary, 3.9 % of the respondents strongly disagree that the Qur'an contains the rules about what is permitted and forbidden in Islam, and 4.7 % of the respondents disagree.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA category is added to 'A category then 8.6% of the respondents disagree with that the Qur'an contains the rules about what is permitted and forbidden in Islam, and 89.0 % of the respondents agree.

Second question the respondents were asked was whether they see the Qur'an as a source for the fundamentals of beliefs in Islam or not. Table 5-2 shows the answers of the respondents for this question.

Table 5-2 : Ideas about 'Qur'an holds Fundamentals of Beliefs in Islam'

Answer categories	N	%
SA	267	61.4
A	148	34.0
D	7	1.6
SD	9	2.1
Missing	4	0.9
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-2, 61.4 % of the respondents strongly agree that the Qur'an holds all of the belief fundamentals of Islam, and 34.0 % of respondents agree.

On the contrary, only 1.6 % of the respondents strongly disagree that the Qur'an holds all belief fundamentals of Islam, and 2.1 % of the respondents disagreed with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories', then 3.7 % of the respondents disagree with that

Qur'an holds all of the belief fundamentals of Islam, and 95.4 % of the respondents agree.

5.2 *Ritualistic Dimension of Religiosity.*

The ritualistic dimension of religion is important for the measurement of religiosity and also to measure the effects of religiosity on the different subjects, as well as crime

In this part, I will examine the answers of the respondents that gave answers to the questions which were asked to find out their perception about fundamental rituals of Islam. We tried to find out whether they see these rituals as the fundamental of rituals of Islam by which members of the religion become religious by performing them.

The rituals that were asked to respondents are agreed to be the fundamental rituals of Islam within the all related literature. With these questions we can determine the extent of the correspondence between respondents understanding of religiosity, and religiosity within the related literature on the ritualistic dimension of religiosity in Islam.

I asked four questions to the respondents on the ritualistic dimension of religiosity. These questions were: 'A good Muslim must pray five times in a day; A good Muslim must fast during Ramadan; A good Muslim must give alms to the poor people; and A good Muslim must go to Mecca for pilgrimage, if it is economically possible. SA, A, SD and D.

As it is agreed, praying is an important religious activity in Islam. Since I' am trying to find out the religiosity definition of respondents from their own understanding of religiosity, praying is an important religious activity to measure the ritualistic dimension of religiosity according to the respondents.

Table 5-3 shows the answers of respondent to the questions that were asked to measure the importance of praying for religiosity.

Table 5-3 : Perception of praying to be a good Muslim

Answer categories	N	%
SA	287	66.1
A	92	21.1
D	30	6.9
SD	25	5.7
Missing	1	0.2
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-3, 66.1 % of the respondents strongly agree with that a good Muslim should pray five times a day, and 21.1 % of respondents agree.

On the contrary, 6.9 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the requirement of five times praying a day to be a good Muslim, and 5.7 % of the respondents disagree.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then 87.2 % of the respondents agree with that a good Muslim should pray five times a day, and only 12.6 % of the respondents disagree. These results show that praying is an important

89

religious activity that is seen a requirement of being a good Muslim by the respondents.

Another religious activity that was asked about was fasting during the whole Ramadan as the requirement of being a good Muslim. In the Table 5-4, the answers of respondents are seen to the question of fasting.

Table 5-4 : Perception of Fasting in Ramadan to be a good Muslim.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	296	68.0
A	93	21.4
D	24	5.5
SD	20	4.6
Missing	2	0.5
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-4, 68.0 % of the respondents strongly agree that a good Muslim should fast during the whole of the Ramadan, and 21.4 % of respondents also agree with the requirement of fasting during the Ramadan to be a good Muslim.

On the contrary, 4.6 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the requirement of fasting during the Ramadan to be a good Muslim, and 5.5 % of the respondents disagree with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then only 10.1 % of the respondents disagree with that a good Muslim should fast during the whole of the Ramadan, and 89.4 % of the respondents agree with that a good Muslim should fast during the

whole of the Ramadan in order to be a good Muslim as the requirement of religion. These results show that fasting is also an important religious activity that is seen as a requirement of being a good Muslim according to the respondents.

Our third religious activity is giving alms to the poor in order to be a good Muslim. Respondents were asked the question to see whether they view giving alms to the poor as a requirement of being a good Muslim or not. Table 5-5 shows the answers of the respondents that were asked for giving alms to the pours.

Table 5-5 : Perception of Giving Alms to be a good Muslim.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	267	61.4
A	142	32.6
D	14	3.2
SD	9	2.1
Missing	3	0.7
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-5, 61.4 % of the respondents strongly agree with that a good Muslim should give alms to the poor as a requirement of the religion, and 32.6 % of respondents agree

On the contrary, 2.1 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the requirement of giving alms to be a good Muslim, and 3.2 % of the respondents also disagreed with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' added to the 'A categories' then only 5.3 % of the respondents disagree with the requirement of being giving alms to the poor, but 94.0 % of the respondents agree with that a good Muslim should give alms in order to be a good Muslim as a requirement of religion.

These results show that giving alms is another important religious activity one that is seen as a requirement of being a good Muslim according to the respondents.

The fourth religious activity is going to Mecca for the pilgrimage in order to be a good Muslim, if it can be afforded. In the Table 5-6, the answers of the respondents are seen for the question.

Table 5-6 : Perception of Going to the Mecca for pilgrimage to be a good Muslim

Answer categories	N	%
SA	253	58.2
A	126	29.0
D	23	5.3
SD	31	7.1
Missing	2	0.5
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-6, 58.2 % of the respondents strongly agree with that a good Muslim should go to Mecca for the pilgrimage as the requirement of the religion, and 29.0 % of respondents also agree with that going to the Mecca for pilgrimage was a requirement for being a good Muslim.

On the contrary, 5.3 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the requirement of going on pilgrimage, and 7.1 % of the respondents also disagreed with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' then 87.2 % of the respondents agree with that a good Muslim should go to the Mecca for pilgrimage as a part of the requirement of religion, but 12.4 % of the respondents disagree that a good Muslim should go for pilgrimage, if it can be afforded, as a requirement of the religion.

These results show that along with praying, fasting and giving alms, going on pilgrimage is also an important religious activity that is viewed as a requirement of being a good Muslim according to the respondents.

5.3   Forbidden Behaviors and Religiosity.

Forbidden behaviors are also important parts of religions for the religiosity of their members. Like most of the other world-wide religions, Islam also forbids some certain behaviors for its members, which are also criminal behaviors at the same time. I will examine the correspondence between some sins and crimes within the sixth chapter in more detail. In this part I will examine some behaviors that can be viewed as criteria for religiosity. That is why I asked some questions that were related with the religiosity of Muslims within the Islamic contexture. I asked respondents whether a good Muslim uses alcohol or drugs, or has sexual relations without marriage, or not.

Within Islamic teaching, these are defined as forbidden behaviors. The first question I asked about these behaviors was: 'A Muslim does not use alcohol. SA, A, SD and D. Table 5-7 indicates the answers of the respondents to the question.

Table 5-7 : Perceived relationship between Alcohol Addiction and Religiosity.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	195	44.8
A	122	28.0
D	69	15.9
SD	48	11.1
Missing	1	0.2
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-7, 44.8 % of the respondents strongly agree that as a requirement of religion a good Muslim should not use alcohol and 28.0 % of respondents agreed

On the contrary, 11.1 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the requirement of not using alcohol in order to be a good Muslim, and 15.9 % of the respondents also disagreed with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' we can see that 27.0 % of the respondents disagree that a Muslim should not use alcohol as a requirement of religion, but 72.8 % of the respondents agree with that a Muslim should not use alcohol in order to be a good Muslim as a requirement of religion.

Another forbidden behavior that was asked to the respondents was about drug usage which is considered a forbidden behavior within all Islamic literature. In the Table 5-8, the answers of respondents can be seen on drug usage.

Table 5-8 : Perceived relationship between Drug Usage and Religiosity.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	225	51.7
A	122	28.0
D	50	11.5
SD	36	8.3
Missing	2	0.5
Total	435	100

As it is seen from Table 5-8, 51.7 % of the respondents strongly agree that as a requirement of being a good is to abstain from drug use, and 28.0 % of respondents also agreed with the question.

On the contrary, 11.5 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the requirement of abstains from drug use in order to be a good Muslim. Moreover 8.3 % of the respondents also disagreed with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' we can see that 79.7 % of the respondents agree with that a good Muslim should not use drug as a requirement of religion, but 19.8 % of the respondents disagree with that a good Muslim should not use drug to be a good Muslim as a requirement of religion.

The last question, to measure the respondents understanding of religiosity through the forbidden behaviors, was about having sexual relation outside of marriage. This is also strongly forbidden by the Holy Book of the religion. The answers of the respondents to this question are seen in Table 5-9.

Table 5-9 : Perceived relationship between Sexual Relations without Marriage and Religiosity.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	235	54.0
A	104	23.9
D	54	12.4
SD	42	9.7
Missing	0	
Total	435	100

As it can be seen from Table 5-9, 54.0 % of the respondents strongly agree that a good Muslim should not have sexual relations outside of marriage as a requirement of the religion, and 23.9 % of respondents also agreed with the question.

On the contrary, 9.7 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the requirement of marriage for sexual relations in order to be a good Muslim, and 12.4 % of the respondents also disagreed with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and SA categories' is added to 'A categories' we can see that 77.9 % of the respondents agree with that a good Muslim should not commit sexual relations without marriage

as a requirement of religion, but 22.1 % of the respondents disagree with that as a requirement of religion.

These results show that there is an important correspondence between forbidden behaviors within the Islamic literature and the respondents understanding of these behaviors as they are defined within the literature. In other words, the respondents see religiosity as it is defined within the religious books, at least on these selected items.

5.4 *Religiosity of Respondent's Environment.*

Before examining the religiosity of the respondents we should analyze the answers of the respondents which were asked in order to see the religiosity of the respondents' environment; the religiosity of the parents, the religiosity of friends and the religiosity of class mates. As discussed before the religiosity of the environment is important for the effects of religiosity on crime. It has been argued that religion can be considered an effective factor for crime prevention only within a religious climate (Junger and Polder, 1993; 416). That is why I tried to examine the religiosity of parents, friends and class mates as a part of the religiosity of the respondents' environment.

The religiosity of the environment is important for both the religiosity of the respondents and its effects on crime or other subjects which are related to religious values or related with social control functions of religion.

I not only considered the respondents present religiosity of environment but also the respondents' religiosity and the religious climate

during their adolescence. So I can examine the living atmosphere that respondents have had.

My first item used to examine the respondents' religiosity of environment was the religiosity of the parents. Then I examined the religiosity of friends both during adolescence and the present. I examined the religiosity of class mates as part of the respondents' environment religiosity.

5.4.1 Religiosity of Parents

The questions that were asked to the respondents to measure the religiosity of their parents were 'How would you evaluate the religiosity of your father and how would you evaluate the religiosity of your mother?'

The answers that were given by respondents about their fathers' religiosity are seen within the Table 5-10.

Table 5-10 : Perceived Religiosity of Father.

Religiosity of father	N	%
Very Religious	31	7.1
Religious	224	51.5
Not Religious	114	26.2
Not at all	62	14.3
Missing	4	0.9
Total	435	100

As it is seen from Table 5-10, according to 7.1 % of the respondents, their fathers are very religious as the perceived religiosity. In addition, 51.5 % of respondents viewed their fathers as religious.

98

On the other hand, 26.2 % of the respondents viewed their fathers as not religious, and 14.3 % of the respondents viewed their fathers as not religious at all.

If 'religious father categories' is added to 'very religious' categories and 'not religious' is added to 'not at all' categories we can see that 58.6 % of the respondents see their fathers as religious, but 40.7 % of the respondents see their fathers as non religious as perceived religiosity.

The answers that were given by respondents concerning their mother's religiosity are seen in the Table 5-11.

Table 5-11 : Perceived Religiosity of Mothers.

Religiosity of mothers	N	%
Very Religious	54	12.6
Religious	256	58.9
Not Religious	76	17.5
Not at all	43	9.9
Missing	6	1.4
Total	435	100

As it is seen from Table 5-11, a 12.6   % of the respondents view their mothers as very religious as a perceived religiosity, in addition, 58.9 % of respondents view their mothers as religious.

On the other hand, 17.5 % of the respondents view their mothers as not religious, and 9.9 % of the respondents view their mothers as not religious at all.

99

If 'religious mother' categories is added to 'very religious' categories and 'not religious' categories is added to 'not at all' categories we can see that 71.5 % of the respondents see their mothers as religious, but 27.7 % of the respondents see their mothers as non religious.

If we compare the religiosity of mothers with religiosity of fathers we can see that the most of the respondents perceive their mothers as more religious than their fathers.

5.4.2 Religiosity of Friends

Along with the religiosity of parents, the religiosity of friends is also important for the effects of religiosity in constructing a religious climate as stated before. I asked questions to find out the respondent's perceived religiosity of their friends for both their adolescent period and the present period.

Table 5-12 shows the respondent's perceived religiosity of their friends in their adolescent period.

Table 5-12 : Perceived Religiosity of Friends during Adolescent Period.

Religiosity of friends	N	%
Very Religious	10	2.3
Religious	167	38.4
Not Religious	197	45.3
Not at all	59	13.6
Missing	2	0.5
Total	435	100

As it is seen from Table 5-12, according to 2.3 % of the respondents, their friends were very religious during their adolescent period as a perceived religiosity. In addition, 38.4 % of respondents view their friends as religious during the same period.

On the other hand, 45.3 % of the respondents view their friends as not religious. Moreover, 13.6 % of the respondents view their friends as not religious at all.

If 'religious friend categories' is added to 'very religious categories' and not 'religious categories' is added to 'not at all' categories, we can see that 40.7 % of the respondents see their friends as religious, but 58.9 % of the respondents see their friends as non religious during their adolescent period.

Perceived religiosity of present friends of respondents is seen in the Table 5-13.

Table 5-13 : Perceived Religiosity of present Friends.

Religiosity of friends	N	%
Very Religious	9	2.1
Religious	165	37.1
Not Religious	182	42.1
Not at all	76	17.5
Missing	3	0.7
Total	435	100

As it is seen from Table 5-13, 2.1 % of the respondents view their friends as very religious   as a perceived religiosity. In addition, 37.1 % of respondents view their friends as religious at the present.

On the other hand, 42.1 % of the respondents view their friends as not religious, and 17.5 % of the respondents view their friends as not religious at all.

If we add the religious friend categories to the 'very religious categories' and 'not religious categories' to 'not at all categories' we can see that 39.2 % of the respondents see their friends as religious, but 59.6 % of the respondents see their friends as non religious at the present time.

If we compare the perceived religiosity of friends during their adolescent period with the religiosity of their friends at the present time, we can see that respondents perceive the religiosity of their fiends as approximately the same for both the present time and for their adolescent period.

5.4.3 Religiosity of Class Mates

Besides the religiosity of parents and the religiosity of friends, I examined the perceived religiosity of the respondents' class mates under the title of the religiosity of respondents' environment which constitutes the religious climate in which religious values become an effective prevention factor on crime commitment (Junger and Polder, 1993; 416).

I asked the respondents how they perceived the religiosity of their class mates. Table 5-14 shows the perceived religiosity of class mates of the respondents.

Table 5-14 : Perceived Religiosity of Class Mates.

Religiosity of Class mates	N	%
Very Religious	4	0.9
Religious	109	25.1
Not Religious	241	55.5
Not at all	71	16.3
Missing	10	2.3
Total	435	100

As is seen from Table 5-14, a only 0.9 % of the respondents view their class mates as very religious   as the perceived religiosity. In addition, 25.1 % of the respondents view their class mates as religious.

On the other hand, 55.5 % of the respondents view their class mates as not religious. Moreover, 16.3 % of the respondents view their class mates as not religious at all.

If 'religious class mates categories' is added to 'very religious categories' and 'not religious categories' is added to 'not at all categories' we can see that 26 % of the respondents see their class mates as religious, but 71.8 % of the respondents see their class mates as non religious.

If we compare the perceived religiosity of parents, the religiosity of friends, and the religiosity of class mates we can see that there are not any important differences between them as they were seen in the related tables.

5.5 Religiosity of Respondents

Since I' am trying to find the effects of religiosity on crime, first I should analyze the religiosity of the respondents. As was discussed in the preceding chapters, I examined how religiosity was measured differently from within different studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime. I examined at least six categories of operational measures for religiosity from the different empirical studies. There are; church membership, church attendance, belief in God, belief in an afterlife, denominational membership, and other measures of religiosity that comprise different dimensions of religions (Ellis, 1985; 507).

I asked questions that comprise of both the belief dimension and the ritualistic dimension of religiosity. In addition, I asked questions to see how respondents define their own religiosity.

At the beginning of this chapter I tried to find how the respondents understand religiosity within Islam before examining the religiosity of the respondents. As Martin points out the respondents views are important to understand the properties of the religions beliefs more than the formal properties of belief systems (Martin, 2002; 861-863) Some of the questions, that are asked to understand the religiosity of the respondent, are also asked to understand whether the respondents see them as a religious requirement,

104

for example, whether fasting during Ramadan is a requirement of religiosity or not.

As it is seen from the answers of the respondents there is a big correspondence between the respondents' understanding of religiosity and my questions that were asked to measure the religiosity of the respondents. For example, we asked about praying frequency of the respondents to measure their ritualistic dimension of religiosity, notwithstanding their religiosity. I also asked 'Should a good Muslim pray 5 times a day', and 87 % respondents strongly agreed or agreed with the question. Respondents were asked questions for all other items to see the correspondence between respondents' understanding of religiosity and asked religiosity. So we can say that we asked questions to measure the religiosities of respondents are questions that are agreed by respondents as questions measuring the religiosity of Muslims.

5.5.1 Belief Dimension of Religiosity

There were five questions which were asked to measure the belief dimension of religiosity. The respondents were asked yes or no questions: 'there is a Day of Judgment, the Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, everyone is going to be judged by Allah, there is Hell and Heaven'. The respondents were told that 'If you accept or believe the content of the question choose 'yes' if not choose 'no'. In addition, I asked to the respondents: 'If I commit any sin I am going to be punished' SA, A, D and SD. Table 5-15 shows the answers of the respondents about four questions.

105

Table 5-15 : Belief Dimension of Religiosity.

Belief dimension of Religiosity	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
There is a Day of Judgment	384	88.3	46	10.6
Qur'an; the Messages of Allah	402	92.4	29	6.7
Being judged by Allah	385	88.5	47	10.9
Hell and heaven	388	89.2	42	7.7
Missing				
Total	435		100	

As it is seen from Table 5-15, 88.3 % of the respondents believe that there is a Day of Judgment, and 10.6 % of the respondents do not believe that there is a Day of Judgment.

Like believing a Day of Judgment, 92.4 % of the respondents accept that the Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, and 6.7 % of the respondents do not accept the Qur'an as the messages of Allah.

88.5 % of the respondents believe that everyone is going to be judged by Allah on the Day of Judgment, and 10.9 % of the respondents do not believe in being judged by Allah in the Day of Judgment.

Finally, 89.2 % of the respondents believe that there is Hell and Heaven, and 7.7 % of the respondents do not believe in the existence of hell and heaven.

These items are related with very the fundamentals of the belief dimensions of Islam. Which is why, according to these results most of the respondents can be accepted as religious within the belief dimension of religiosity.

106

In addition, I asked the respondents to agree or disagree with the statement 'If I commit any sin, I am going to be punished' SA, A, D and SD. Table 5-16 shows the answers of the respondents to this question.

Table 5-16 : Believing Punishment for Sin.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	213	49.0
A	134	31.8
D	55	12.7
SD	30	6.9
Missing	3	0.7
Total	435	100

According to Table 5-16, 49.0 % of the respondents strongly agrees with the statement that if he/ she commit a sin he/she will be punished, and 31.8 % of respondents also agree with the statement.

On the contrary, 6.9 % of the respondents strongly disagree with the idea that he or she will be punished if he or she commits a sin, and 12.7 % of the respondents also disagree.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' we can see that 80.8 % of the respondents agree with that he/she will be punished if he/she commits a sin, and 19.6 % of the respondents disagree with that he/she will be punished if he/she commits a sin.

According to the results of the questions that were asked for all items to view the belief dimension of the religiosity, most of the respondents

are seen very religious to the belief dimension of religiosity. Within the following part of the chapter ritualistic dimension of religiosity will be examined.

5.5.2 Ritualistic Dimension of Religiosity

The ritualistic dimension of religiosity is an important aspect to examine the effects of religiosity on crime. As discussed before, some empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime, church membership was used as the measure of religiosity to see the effects of religiosity on crime commitment but any inverse relationship couldn't be found between them. On the other hand, when church attendance frequency was used as the measure of religiosity, the inverse relationship was found between religiosity and crime commitment (Ellis, 1985; 507).

As it is known, most important ritualistic dimension of Christian religiosity is church attendance. There are four important religious activities that show the religiosity of Muslims according to the ritualistic dimension of religion. These are, as the respondents were asked and they confirmed; praying, fasting, giving alms and going on pilgrimage, these are all important aspects of being a good Muslim. Since our respondents are students and they normally can perform only two of them, I asked some questions about the praying and fasting frequency as a measure of the ritualistic dimension of religiosity for the respondents.

The answers of the respondents are seen in the Table 5-17 about the frequency of praying.

Table 5-17 : Praying Frequency of Respondents.

Frequency of praying	N	%
Five times a day	85	19.5
At least once a day	66	!5.2
At least once a week	75	17.2
At least once a month	51	11.7
At least once a year	60	13.8
Never	97	22.3
Missing	1	0.2
Total	435	100

As it is seen from Table 5-17, 19.5 % of the respondents are praying five times a day and 15.2 % of the respondents are praying at least once a day. The respondents who answered the question of the frequency of praying as 'five times a day' and 'at least once a day' can be considered religious according to ritualistic dimension of religiosity.

On the other hand, 17.2 % of the respondents are praying at least once a week and 11.7 % of the respondents are praying at least once a month. These respondents can be considered as moderately religious.

13.8 % of the respondents are praying at least once a year and 22.3 % of the respondents are not praying at all. These respondents can be considered as not religious according to the ritualistic dimension of religiosity.

As it is known, praying is one of the most important religious activities in Islam. There is daily praying (five times a day), weekly praying (Friday prayer once a week) and holiday praying (twice a year) in Islam. The

respondents' answers could be understood according to these praying rules in Islam.

Another important religious activity is fasting in the month of Ramadan. That is why I also asked the fasting frequency of the respondents within the Ramadan in order to measure the ritualistic dimension of respondents' religiosity. Table 5-18 show the respondents' fasting frequency in the month of Ramadan

Table 5-18 : Fasting Frequency of Respondents.

Frequency of fasting	N	%
30 days	238	54.7
More than 20 days	75	17.3
More than 10 days	28	6.4
At least once	32	7.4
Never	60	13.8
Missing	2	0.5
Total	435	100

As it is seen in Table 5-18, 54.7 % of the respondents are fasting 30 days in Ramadan and 17.3 % of the respondents are fasting more than 20 days, 6.4 % respondents are fasting more than 10 days, 7.4 % of the respondents are fasting at least once in Ramadan and 13.8   % of the respondents are not fasting at all.

At the beginning of this chapter, the answers of the respondents were analyzed to see how they define a good Muslim, and they mostly

defined a good Muslim as praying 'five times a day' and 'fasting 30 days in the Ramadan'. As it is seen from the answers, although the numbers of respondents were low on 'five times praying a day', 'fasting 30 days' is very high.

According to the a frequency of fasting day of the respondents, we can consider the respondents as religious who are fasting 30 days in Ramadan as a measure of the ritualistic dimension of religiosity.

The respondents who are fasting more than 10 or 20 days in Ramadan can be considered as moderate and the others as not religious for the ritualistic dimension of the religiosity of respondents.

5.5.3 Respondents' Definition of Their Religiosity.

In order to measure the religiosity of the respondents, I have examined the belief dimension of the religiosity and the ritualistic dimension of religiosity through analyzing the answers of the respondents. In this part of the study I will deal with the respondents' definition of their own religiosity.

I asked 'How do you define your religiosity at present'; very religious, religious, not religious, not at all. The answers of the respondents are seen in the Table 5-19.

Table 5-19 : Respondents' Definition of Their Religiosity.

Answer Categories	N	%
Very Religious	25	5.7
Religious	211	48.7
Not Religious	133	30.6
Not at all	64	14.7
Missing	2	0.5
Total	435	100

As it is seen from Table 5-19, 5.7 % of the respondents define themselves as very religious, and 48.7 % of respondents define themselves as religious.

On the other hand, 30.6 % of the respondents define themselves not religious, and 14.7 % of the respondents define themselves as not religious at all.

If 'religious categories' is added to 'very religious categories' and 'not religious' categories is added to 'not at all' categories we can see that 54.4   % of the respondents see themselves as religious, and 45.3 % of the respondents see   themselves as not religious.

The percent of respondents who define themselves as religious is very high when compared it with other categories. If added to the respondents who define themselves as very religious, the percent becames higher.

So far I have examined the religiosity levels of the respondents in three different Tables, from three different dimensions; the belief dimension,

the ritualistic dimension and the respondents' definition of their own religiosity. I Chapter VII, I'll study the relationship between religiosity and crime through the belief dimension of religiosity and the ritualistic dimension religiosity.

CHAPTER 6

SOCIAL CONTROL FUNCTIONS OF RELIGIOSITY.

Social control comprises the whole range of pressures directed to people to make them play their roles in accordance with the expectations from both the formal and informal side of society (Mair, 1980; 11).

Of course, social control and social control mechanisms of society is a wide subject, and it has different dimensions. I will only study the impact of religious values on crime as an informal social control mechanism of society.

In order to learn about the social control function of religion, I will deal with the relationship between some of the religious rules and expectations that come from both the formal and informal side of society, by examining the extent of the correspondence between sin and crime.

After examining the extent of the correspondence between sin and crime I will examine the perceived relationship between religiosity and crime to see the perceived relationship between them

Then, I will examine the effects of religious values on law obeying as a social control function of religion. As indicated earlier, as a part of

114

broader social system, the legal system's most obvious function is social control. The efficient fulfillment of this function depends on making people behave in accordance with the legal system. In the end, legal behavior is a matter of choice, and is necessarily related with people's ideas and motives. People may choose to obey or disobey laws. What factors, in the end, determine these choices. I tried to find out the impact of religious values on law obeying through some related items

I also examined the social control function of religion on alcohol usage. Although alcohol usage is not crime in most societies, it may lead to some problems for society. That is why, I asked questions to see the effects of religiosity on alcohol usage as a part of social control function of religion.

Lastly, I asked questions to explore how the respondents view the relationship between religiosity and being in a good manner. The effect of religion on being in a good manner is also important in order to see the social control functions of religion or religiosity from the perspectives of the respondents.

Before examining the relationship between religiosity and crime commitment in the next chapter, I will examine the social control function of religion on the relationship between them through the mentioned items. In other words I will see how and to what extent religion and religiosity have effects on people to make them avoid crime through fulfilling some functions on individual attitudes, and on formal and informal social control mechanism

115

of society. So I determine whether religion and religiosity have an effect on crime and attitudes about crime by examining them with some related items.

6.1   The Extend of the Correspondence between Sin and Crime

As I examined earlier, religion enforces rules of right conduct to its members, and is an important part of the informal rules of society. On the other hand, crime is a violation of criminal law, which is made, mostly, according to the rules of right conduct of a society. This means that although their pressure types are different, both religion and law have approximately the same range of pressure directed to make people behave in accordance with social expectations. When a member of a religion does not behave in accordance with religious rules he or she become sinful, but if someone does not behave in accordance with laws he or she become criminal. Some crimes might also be sin at the same time.

That is why, the extent of the correspondence between sin and crime is important. First of all, this correspondence constitutes pressure to make people behave in the same way to force them to avoid approximately the same behaviors.

The high level of correspondence between some legal rules and religious rules also raises the legitimacy of law which positively affects law obeying. Because people are more likely to obey laws if they believe that the laws are legitimate (Friedman, 1977; 142).

The impacts of these correspondences on law obeying have been viewed differently. As Ellis indicates several authors agree on "to the degree that criminal laws embody the moral principles of particular religion, strong adherence to that religion should result in fewer violations of those criminal laws than weak (or non-) religious adherence" (Ellis, 1985; 504).

In the Table 6-1 the answers of the respondents are seen on the drug usage of a Muslim. I asked 'a Muslim does not use drug' SA, A, D and SD.

Table 6-1 : Perceived relationship between being Muslim and Drug Usage.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	225	51.7
A	122	28.0
D	50	11.5
SD	36	8.3
Missing	2	0.5
Total	435	100
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-1, 51.7 % of the respondents strongly agreed that a Muslim does not use drugs, and 28.0 % of respondents also agreed

On the contrary, 8.3 % of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement that a Muslim does not use drugs, and 11.5 % of the respondents also disagreed.

117

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' we can see that approximately 80 % of the respondents agreed with that a Muslim does not use drug, but only approximately 20 % of the respondents disagreed with the statement.

According to these results, most of the respondents view a Muslim as a person who does not use drugs. So, it could be argued that, for the respondents there is a correspondence between the religious rules and the Turkish criminal law on drug usage. This is why religiosity might be seen as an important social control function on drug usage through factors considered above. I will also examine the relationship between the respondents' religiosity and their relationship with drug usage in the next chapter.

I asked to the respondents if they see drug usage and alcohol usage as sin. Table 6-2 shows the answers of the respondents to this question.

Table 6-2 : Perception of Drug and Alcohol addiction as Sin.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	223	51.3
A	151	35.0
D	39	9.0
SD	18	4.2
Missing	4	0.9
Total	431	99.1
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-2, 51.3 % of the respondents strongly agreed that alcohol and drug addition is a sin, and 35.0 % of respondents also agreed with the question.

On the contrary, 9.0 % of the respondents strongly disagree that alcohol and drug addition is a sin, and 4.2 % of the respondents also disagree with the question.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' we can see that approximately 86 % of the respondents agree with that alcohol and drug addition is sin, only nearly 14 % of the respondents disagree with that alcohol and drug addition is sin.

According to these results, alcohol and drug addition is seen as a sin by most of the respondents. These results also confirm the previous results about the perception of the respondents on a Muslim's drug addition. In other words, religious rules on alcohol and drug addition constitute a social control mechanism by defining them as sin. So there is a correspondence between sin and crime regarding drug addition

I also asked other questions to find the correspondence between some sins and some crimes. Most crimes are related to the injuring of persons or the injury against their property. That is why I asked the respondents whether they view injuring a person and injuring their property as a sin or not. The answers of the respondents are seen in Table 6-3

Table 6-3 : The Perception of Respondents about 'Injuring Persons' personality and Injuring their Property as Sin or not.

Answer categories	N	%
Yes	412	94.7
No	18	4.2
Missing	5	1.1
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-3, 94.7 % of the respondents perceive injuring a person and injury against their property as a sin. Only 4.2 % of the respondents do not perceive them as sin. These results are very important in measuring the extent of the correspondence between sin and crime.

According to these results there is an important correspondence between sin and crime on the items considered earlier. Of course, there are different crimes and sins that could be examined; and whether there is a correspondence between them or not. But since most of the crimes are related to the injuring of persons and injuring against their private property, examining the correspondence of these items should be enough to see the extent of correspondence between sin and crime. I also examined the correspondence between sin and crime through the use of alcohol and drugs

In short, from the results we found we can see an important correspondence between sin and crime on the items I considered. That is why, I can say that religion and religiosity has an important social control

function on crime due to the reasons mentioned at the beginning of this section.

6.2   The Perceived Relationship between religiosity and crime

After examining the correspondence between sin and crime, I examined the perceived relationship between religiosity and these crimes; that are related with the injuring of persons and injury against their property.

In order to examine the social control function of religion, besides asking questions for respondents' perception about these behaviors; whether they see these behaviors as sin or not, I also asked questions about the relationship between these behaviors and religiosity.

In order to examine the perceived relationship between religiosity and crime I asked the respondents 'Does a religious person give injury to other persons' property, and does a religious person injure another peoples' (injuring or killing). Within the Table 6-4 the answers of respondents are seen regarding the relationship between religiosity and injuring people.

Table 6-4 : Perceived relationship between religiosity and giving injury to others' properties.

Answer categories	N	%
No	311	72.5
Yes	118	27.5
Missing	6	1.4
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-4, 72.5 % of the respondents perceive that a religious person does not give injury to another's property, 27.5 % of the respondents do not perceive a religious person as who one does not give injury to others' property. These results are very important for the perceived relationship between religiosity and crime. These results also confirm the results of the previous question to the extent that there is a correspondence between sin and crime

My second question on the perceived relationship between religiosity and crime was 'does a religious person injure another persons (injuring or killing). The answers of the respondents are seen in the Table 6-5.

Table 6-5 : Perceived Relationship Between Religiosity and Injuring another Persons'.

Answer categories	N	%
No	266	62.0
Yes	163	38.0
Missing	6	1.4
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-5, 62.0 % of the respondents perceive that a religious person does not injure another persons'. 38.0 % of the respondents do not perceive a religious person as one who does not injure other persons' These results are very important for the perceived relationship between religiosity and crime. Although the percentages are different, these results

also confirm the results of the question to the extent of the correspondence between sin and crime regarding giving injury to others' and their personal property.

In short, 62.2 % of the respondents perceive that a religious person does not injure other persons' and 72.5 of the respondents perceive that a religious person does not give injury to other persons' property. Although the percentages are lower than their perception as sin, these results are important to see the relationship between religiosity and crime, as a social control function of religion.

I will examine the function of religiosity on alcohol and drug usage within the next parts of the study, but in this part I will deal with the perceived effects of religiosity on both alcohol and drug addiction in order to see the perceived function of religiosity on them. For that we asked to the respondents 'does being religious help being no usage of alcohol and drug?' The answers of the respondents are seen in Table 6-6.

Table 6-6 : The Perceived effects of religiosity on being no usage of alcohol and drug.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	206	47.4
A	148	34.0
D	39	9.0
SD	39	9.0
Missing	3	0.7
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-6, 47.4 % of the respondents strongly agree that being religious can help people prevent the usage of alcohol and drugs, 34.0 % of respondents also agree that there is a prevention function of religiosity on alcohol and drug usage.

On the contrary, 9.0 % of the respondents strongly disagree that alcohol and drug usage could be prevented by the help of religiosity. Moreover 4.2 % of the respondents also disagree with the preventing effects of religiosity on alcohol and drug usage.

If 'SD categories' is added to 'D categories' and 'SA categories' is added to 'A categories' we can see that approximately 81 % of the respondents agree with that religiosity of one can help prevent the usage of alcohol and drug, only nearly 18 % of the respondents disagree with that alcohol and drug addition could be prevented by the help of ones religiosity.

According to these results, no usage of alcohol and drug could be achieved by the help of ones being religious. These results also show that respondents perceive religiosity as a factor that could help people to prevent them from committing crime, since drug usage is a crime according to the current laws of Turkey.

In general, according to these results there is a negative relationship between religiosity and crime, according to the perception of respondents. In other words, according to most of respondents, religiosity can make someone avoid from some crime and alcohol usage.

6.3 Explanation of Legal Behavior.

Examining the explanation of legal behavior is another important factor to see the social control function of religion. People may choose to obey or disobey laws. What factors, in the end, determine these choices? Friedman divides them into three general categories. These are: sensitiveness to sanction, response to social influence, and conscience (Friedman 1977: 115).

Of course, all of these factors may affect peoples' choice differently at different items. I only tried to find how respondents perceive the explanation of peoples' law obeying and what would be the first factor that determines the respondent's choice, when they face a situation in which they have to choose obeying or disobeying a criminal rule?

To see how they perceive other persons' choices of legal behavior I asked the respondents 'why do people obey laws' (a) because of legal sanctions, (b) because of social pressure or (c) because of religious or moral reasons. The answers of the respondents are seen in Table 6-7.

Table 6-7 : The perceived explanation of legal behavior of other persons.

Answer categories	N	%
Because of legal sanctions	249	57.2
Because of social pressure	72	16.6
Religious or moral reasons	98	22.5
Missing	16	3.7
Total	435	100

As is seen in the table, to the respondents, most of the people obey laws because of the legal sanctions. 57.2 of the respondents perceive the law obeying of people as a result of their sensitiveness to legal sanctions, and16.6% of the respondent perceive law obeying of people as due to their sensitiveness to social pressure. To 22.5 % of the respondent's perception, people obey laws due to their sensitiveness to religious and moral reasons.

Although these results do not reflect the respondents' explanation of legal behavior, they indicate how religious and moral values might explain the legal behavior of people as a perceived explanation of legal behavior, in addition to legal sanctions and social pressures.

According to these results, religious and moral values have an important social control function on law obeying besides legal sanctions and social pressures. The impact of the religious values on law obeying is seen more clearly when the respondents answer the question that was asked to see their own explanation of legal behavior. Respondents were asked what would be first factor that determines the respondent's choice, when they face a situation in which they have to choose between obeying or disobeying a law or giving injury to another's property or injuring their personality. Table 6-8 shows the answers of the respondents to the question.

Table 6-8 : Respondents' explanation of law obeying on giving injury to others' property or injuring their personality.

Answer categories	N	%
Because of legal sanctions	69	15.9
Because of social pressure	31	7.3
Because it is sin	283	65.1
Because of an other factor	44	10.1
Missing	8	1.8
Total	435	100

According to the Table, most of the respondents see their religious values as the most important factor that prevents them from committing crime, in a situation in which they faced to choose or not to choose giving injury to others' property or injuring their personality.

By asking this question I wanted to see the social control function of religion on the mentioned crime commitment situation besides other factors that might prevent from committing a crime. As it could be seen from the Table, 15.9% of the respondents view legal sanctions as the most important factor that prevents them from crime commitment behavior within such a mentioned situation. 7.3% of the respondents see the social pressure as most important factor for the same situation. The percent of the respondents rises 65.1% when religious values are considered as the most important factor for preventing them from crime commitment within

127

mentioned situation. 10.1% of the respondents do not see any of these 3 factors as most important factor to explain legal behavior for the given situation.

As was seen in the previous table, according to the respondents, most of the people obey laws because of sensitiveness to legal sanctions. 57.2 %of the respondents perceive the law obeying of people as a result of their sensitiveness to legal sanctions. But when they were asked to explain their law obeying behaviors in a situation in which they personally had to choose or not to choose giving injury to others' property or injuring their personality, they explained their law obeying behavior as due to being sensitive to religious values by seeing the behavior as sin. The percentage of respondents rose 65.1 when they considered sin as the first factor for law obeying for the mentioned situation.

According to these results it is obvious that religion and religious values have an important social control function on law obeying behavior through providing sensitiveness against criminal acts by defining most of them as sin.

6.4   Alcohol Addiction of Respondents

In order to see the social control function of religion I also considered the alcohol addiction of respondents. Within the preceding chapter we dealt with alcohol usage to see whether respondents see it as a forbidden action or not, as a requirement of religion. 72.8 % of the respondents agreed that alcohol usage is a forbidden action in Islam.

I wanted to see whether alcohol usage as a forbidden action in Islam leads to the respondents' relation with alcohol usage or not, by asking 'what do you think about alcohol usage' (a) I use some, it does not matter, (b) I do not use, because it is sin, (c) I do not use, because it is unhealthy and (d) only over usage of alcohol is unhealthy. The answers of the respondents are seen in the Table 6-9.

Table 6-9 : Respondents' Considerations about Alcohol Addiction.

Answer categories	N	%
I use some, it does not matter	117	26.9
I do not use, because it is sin	181	41.6
I do not use, because, it is unhealthy	108	24.8
Only over usage is unhealthy	23	5.3
Missing	6	1.4
Total	435	100

According to the Table, 26.9 % of the respondents use alcohol and they do not see using it as a problem. But 41.6 % of the respondents do not use alcohol due to religious values by seeing it as sin. 24.8 % of the respondents also do not use alcohol, but because they see it as unhealthy. And 5.3 % of the respondents see it as unhealthy when it is over used.

The question on alcohol usage I wanted to see the social control function of religion on alcohol usage and the results show that religious values have an important effect on preventing people from alcohol usage,

129

especially when we remember that only 54 % of the respondents defined themselves as religious. This means that religiosity has an important function for preventing people from using alcohol as a requirement of religious rules.

After seeing the function of religiosity on alcohol usage and on some crimes I also should look at the perceived effects of religiosity on being in a good manner to see the social control function of religion and religiosity within a wider perspective.

6.5   Religiosity and Being in a Good Manner.

The functions of religion on being a good manner is not directly related with crime commitment but it is an important factor that is indirectly related with crime by constructing a climate for the individual in which the individual may be more likely to prevent himself or herself from committing crime. For example, if ones religiosity is seen as making him or her as having more commonsense or tolerance, religiosity might be considered an effective factor for being in a good manner in which one may be less likely to commit any crimes. Of course, the relationship between religiosity and being a good manner is a wide subject and their relation could be examined in detail by other studies. Here, I only considered some items to see some perceived functions of religion under the title of being in a good manner which are indirectly related with crime. These are religiosity and happiness, religiosity and morality, religiosity and self-seeking, religiosity and having commonsense and tolerance, religiosity and being property-centralized, and religiosity and being a criminal.

Our first question on being a good manner was 'As a general consideration, religious people are happier than those who are non-religious. SA, A, D and SD'. Within the Table 6-10, the answers of respondents are seen

Table 6-10 : The Perceived Happiness of Religious People.

Answer categories	N	%
SA	178	40.9
A	127	29.4
D	73	16.8
SD	54	12.4
Missing	3	0
Total	435	100

According to answers of the respondents that are in the Table, 40.9 % of the respondents strongly agree that religious people are happier than people who are not religious. In addition, 29.4 % of the respondents also agree that religious people are happier than those who are not religious.

On the other hand, 16.8 % of the respondents strongly disagree to that religious people are happier than people who are not religious. And 12.4 % of the respondents also strongly disagree to that religious people are happier than those who are not religious.

If we add SA answers to the A answers and SD answers to the D answers we can see that 70.3 % of the respondents perceive that religious

people are happier than people who are not religious, and 29.2 % of the respondents perceive that religious people are not happier than those who are not religious.

According to these results we can say that most of the respondents (70 %) accept that religiosity makes people happy. So, as a perceived consideration, religiosity has a positive impact on being ones in a good manner within the considered sense.

Our second question under the title of being in a good manner was about perceived effects of religiosity on the morality of people. We asked to the respondents 'To be a moral person, being a religious person is not a condition. SA, A, D, and SD.' the answers of respondents are seen in the Table 6-11.

Table 6-11 : The Perceived Effects of Religiosity on being a Moral Person

Answer categories	N	%
SA	178	40.9
A	127	29.2
D	73	16.8
SD	54	12.4
Missing	3	0.7
Total	435	100

According to the answers of the respondents that are in the Table, 40.9 % of the respondents strongly agree with the statement that 'to be a

moral person, being a religious person is not a condition'. In addition, 29.2 %
of the respondents also agree with the statement

In the other hand, 16.8 % of the respondents disagree with the statement that
'to be a moral person, being a religious person is not condition'. And 12.4 %
of the respondents also strongly disagree with the same statement.

If 'SA answers' is added to the 'A answers' and 'SD answers' is
added to the 'D answers' we can see that 70.1 % of the respondents agreed
with the statement that 'to be a moral person, being a religious people is not
condition, and 29.2 % of the respondents disagreed with the statement.

According to these results we can say that most of the respondents
(70 %) do not accept that being religious is conditional to be a moral person.
So, as a perceived consideration, being religious has a limited impact on
being ones 'in a good manner' within the considered sense.

Our third question under the title of 'being in a good manner' was
about the perceived relationship between religiosity and self-seeking. We
asked to the respondents 'Being non religious makes person self-seeking.
Yes or No.' the answers of respondents are seen in the Table 6-12.

Table 6-12 : The Perceived Relationship between Being non Religious and Self-seeking

Answer categories	N	%
Yes	147	34.4
No	280	64.4
Missing	8	1.8
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-12, 34.4 % of the respondents perceive that a non religious person becomes a self-seeking person. 64.4 % of the respondents do not perceive a non religious person as one who becomes a self-seeking person. These results are very important for the perceived relationship between religiosity and being self-seeking.

According to these results we can say that most of the respondents (64.4 %) do not accept that being religious is conditional to being a non self-seeking person. But 34.4 % of the respondents' answers are very important for the perception of being a non self-seeking person as an effect of being religious. So, as a perceived consideration, being religious has an important impact on being ones 'in a good manner' within the considered sense

Our fourth question under the title of 'being in a good manner' was about the perceived relationship between religiosity and having commonsense and tolerance. We asked to the respondents 'Being religious makes person have commonsense and tolerance. Yes or No.' the answers of respondents are seen in the Table 6-13.

Table 6-13 : The Perceived Relationship between Being Religious and having Commonsense and Tolerance.

Answer categories	N	%
Yes	314	72.2
No	115	26.4
Missing	6	1.4
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-13, 72.2 % of the respondents perceive that a religious person is someone who has commonsense and tolerance. But 26.4 % of the respondents do not perceive a religious person as someone who has commonsense and tolerance. These results are very important for the perceived relationship between religiosity and having commonsense and tolerance.

According to these results we can say that most of the respondents (72.2 %) accept that being religious makes a person have both commonsense and tolerance. 40.0 % of the respondents do not agree to the question. So, as a perceived consideration, being religious has an important impact on being ones 'in a good manner' within the considered sense

Our fifth question under the title of being 'in a good manner' was about the perceived relationship between religiosity and being 'property-centralized'. I asked the respondents 'not being religious makes people be property-centralized. Yes or No.' the answers of respondents are seen in the Table 6-14.

Table 6-14 : The Perceived Relationship between not being Religious and Being Property-centralized.

Answer categories	N	%
Yes	174	40.0
No	249	57.2
Missing	12	2.8
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-14, 40.0 % of the respondents perceive that a non religious person become a 'property-centralized'. 57.2 % of the respondents do not perceive a non religious person as ones who becomes a 'property-centralized' person. These results are very important for the perceived relationship between religiosity and being 'property-centralized' person.

According to these results we can say that most of the respondents (57.2 %) do not accept that 'being not religious make someone a person who is property-centralized'. But 40.0 % of the respondents' answers are very important for the perception of being 'property-centralized' as a result of not being religious. So, as a perceived consideration, being religious has an important impact on being ones 'in a good manner' within the considered sense

Our sixth question under the title of being in a good manner was about the relationship between religiosity and being a criminal through the perceived religiosity of known criminals. We asked the respondents 'Are there criminals who have committed serious crimes and are also religious in your environment. Yes or No.' the answers of respondents are seen in the Table 6-15.

Table 6-15 : The Perceived Religiosity of Known Criminals.

Answer categories	N	%
Yes	156	35.9
No	270	62.1
Missing	9	2.1
Total	435	100

According to Table 6-15, to the 35.9 % of the respondents, there are criminals who committed a serious crime in their environment, and are also religious, as a perceived religiosity of criminal. But 62.1 % of the respondents do not know a criminal who is religious. These results are important for the relationship between criminals and their perceived religiosity.

According to these results we can say that most of the respondents (62.1%) do not perceive criminals as being religious. But 35.9 % of the respondents perceive some criminals as religious. These results are not directly related with criminals' religiosity but the respondents' perception of criminals' religiosity.

So far we examined the relationship between religiosity and being in a good manner through different items to see the function of religiosity. According to the gathered results it could be said that religiosity has an important effect on being in a good manner as a perceived consideration.

Under the title of 'Social Control Functions of Religion and Religiosity' we examined; the Extent of Correspondence between Sin and Crime, the Perceived Relationship between Religiosity and Crime, Explanation of Legal Behavior, Alcohol Usage, and the Relationship between Religiosity and Being in a Good Manner.

All these items could be examined in the framework of 'social control theory' according to which people develop a bond to society that makes criminal behavior less likely. Since religions usually share many values with society as a whole, religious people may have a relatively strong bond with values that condemn criminal behavior (Junger and Polder, 1993; 417).

By examining these items I wanted to see the functions of religion and religiosity on crime. As considered before religion and religiosity become effective on crime and crime commitment through different ways and mechanisms. I examined social control functions of religion and religiosity on crime through the previously mentioned items which related to the ways and the mechanisms by which religion and religiosity fulfill functions on crime and attitudes about crime. In other words I examined how and to what extent religion and religiosity would be an effective factor on people to make them avoid crime through fulfilling some functions on individual attitudes, and on formal and informal social control mechanism of society.

According to these results, it is clearly seen that religion and religiosity has function on crime and attitudes about crime; (1) I found an

important correspondence between sin and crime on the considered items that means religion and religiosity has an important social control function on crime due to the reasons that were mentioned at the beginning of this part. (2) According to the results there is a negative relationship between religiosity and crime from the perception of the respondents. In other words, according to most of the respondents, religious values make people avoid some crime and alcohol usage. (3) According to the results that were given to explain legal behavior, it is obvious that religion and religious values have an important social control function on law obeying through providing sensitiveness against criminal acts by defining most of them as sin. (4) By examining the alcohol usage of the respondents I wanted to see the social control function of religion on alcohol usage, and found that religious values have an important effect for preventing people from using alcohol as a requirement of religion (5) I also examined the relationship between religiosity and being in a good manner through different items. According to the results it could be said that religiosity has an important effect on being in a good manner as a perceived consideration.

CHAPTER 7

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RELIGIOSITY AND CRIME

In this study I have been examining the effects of religious values on crime, as a social control function of religion, from different dimensions. I assumed a negative relationship between religiosity and crime, and so far I tried to confirm it by measuring the relationship between religiosity and its effects on attitudes towards criminal acts and on factors that are related with crime. In other words, I assumed that religious values may make individuals more likely to have attitudes that make them avoid committing crime through both shared values with whole society and constructing values for individual.

That is why so far, I tried to find out, whether religion and religiosity have social control functions on individuals, and on formal and informal social control mechanisms of society, by examining them under the related items. As it was examined in the preceding chapter, religion and religiosity have important effects on both formal and informal social control mechanisms that make people behave according to expectations of society.

Since religion and religious values have important effects on both formal and informal social control mechanisms of society, religious people

who have relatively strong bonds with these values, may condemn criminal behavior. In other words, because of the social control function of religion, religious people should commit fewer crimes than people who are not religious.

As mentioned before, it might be thought that since I want to examine the relationship between religiosity and crime I should choose a sampling from criminals, probably from a prison, to find out the relationship between them. If I want to find the relationship between religiosity and crime, crime only as occurred behavior or only serious crime, I have to choose a sampling in which all of the respondents or at least some of the respondents are prisoners. But the relationship between religiosity and crime can be examined in different ways.

I did not try to measure whether our respondents committed any serious crime or not. As an important part of the relationship between religiosity and crime, I tried to examine the effects of religion and religious values on the respondent's attitudes towards different serious crimes, and their perceptions about some related items from different dimensions within previous chapter.

In this chapter I will deal with the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments through the respondents' religiosity and their commitments of some behaviors. But these behaviors are not serious crimes; they may be also defined as deviant behaviors. We do not consider various definitions of these behaviors. We only consider their relations with religiosity

141

by defining them as crime. These are: the use of physical force against someone, insulting someone, drug addiction and cheating on examinations.

As discussed before, measuring the religiosity is very important for examining the relationship between religiosity and crime. This is why I first tried to find out how religiosity was perceived in Islam by the respondents notwithstanding their religiosity through related items. So I found the extent of the correspondence between the respondents' perception of religiosity and the religiosity items that were used to measure the respondents' religiosity. For example, I asked the respondents whether they saw 'praying five times a day' as a measure of being a religious Muslim or not, and 87.2 of them saw it as requirement of being a religious Muslim. Since I found a high level of correspondence between them I can assume the religiosity measures are accurate measures and then try to find the relationship between religiosity and crime by using them.

An important point on measuring the religiosity of the respondent is that there are important differences on the respondents' religiosity when it is measured by different dimensions of religiosity. For example, when the respondents were asked 'there is a Day of Judgment, Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, everyone is going to be judged by Allah, there are hell and heaven' by asking them 'If you accept or believe the content of the statement, chose 'yes' if not, chose 'no', approximately 90 % of respondent chose 'yes'. On the other hand, when a question asked to the respondents to see their praying frequency for the ritualistic dimension of religiosity, only

19.5 of the respondents chose 'five times praying a day', although 87 % of them saw it as a requirement of religion.

That is why I tried to find the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments of the respondents by comparing their crime commitments to different items that were used to measure the religiosity of respondents. So we can see the effects of religiosity on crime commitments from different dimension of religiosity, as well as from different religiosity measure items.

Since I measured the religiosity of the respondents from two dimensions of religiosity I will compare them with crime commitments of the respondents according to these dimensions. So we can see the effects of different dimensions of religiosity on different crime commitments in detail. Since religiosity of the respondents has different dimensions and they might affect their crime commitment behavior differently, we should analyze them differently. That is why we firstly considered frequency distributions of related variables together within cross-tabulations in such a way that their interrelations can be examined. As it is known, in cross-tabulations all combinations of categories of all variables are presented. So by percentages the independent variable we can see whether changes in religiosity percentages of respondents (independent variable) results in a different distribution on crime commitment of respondents (dependent variable) (Bailey, 1982; 393). Then I will analyze whether there is a statistically

significant relationship between some measures of religiosity and crime commitment through regression analysis.

7.1 The Relationship between Religiosity and Crime from belief Dimension of Religiosity.

In order to measure the belief dimension of religiosity we asked five questions to the respondents in Chapter 5. The questions were; 'there is a Day of Judgment, Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, everyone is going to be judged by Allah, there are hell and heaven' yes or no. The respondents were told that 'If you accept or believe the content of the question chose 'yes' if not chose 'no'. In addition, 'If I commit any sin I am going to be punished' SA, A, D and SD.

As it is seen from the examined answers (Table 5-15, 5-16) within the related part of the study, a high percent (approximately 90 %) of the respondents were seen as religious and there is not any important percentage differences between items that were asked to measure belief dimension of religiosity. In other words, one of the items that was used to measure the belief dimension of religiosity can represent all the items that were asked for this dimension of religiosity. That is why I will compare only one of the items of religiosity from the belief dimension to see its' effects on crime commitments.

I have chosen the question 'everyone is going to be judged by Allah in the Day of Judgment' to see the effects of religiosity on chosen crime commitments from the belief dimension of religiosity. As mentioned above

144

these crimes are 'use of physical force against someone, insulting someone, drug addiction and cheating on examinations'. The relationship between religiosity and use of physical force against someone is seen within the Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 : Percentages of Each Categories (believe or not believe being judged by Allah) who Used or not Used Physical Force Against Someone.

	Did you use physical force			
Did you believe being Judged	Used		Not used	
Yes	117	30.7 %	264	69.3 %
No	11	23.4 %	36	76.6 %
Total	128	29.9 %	300	70.1 %

According to the Table, 29.9 % of the respondents declared that they used physical force against someone who was thought to have injured them. As it is known, this is a crime according to current laws. Since I am trying to find the effects of religiosity on crime commitments I will compare these crime commitments with religiosity of the respondents. There is not any negative effect of religiosity of respondents on their use of physical force against someone; on crime commitments of respondents. Contrary, I found that the percent of non-religious respondents were less likely to commit crime as considered sense.

According to results, 29.9 % of the respondents committed crime. The percent of religious respondents who committed a crime is 30.7, and the

145

percent of non-religious respondents who committed crime is 23.4 as considered sense. So we can say that religiosity; to the belief dimension, as considered sense, does not negatively affect crime commitment of respondents on using physical force against someone who was thought to have injured them. Our second crime is related with 'insulting someone' who was thought to have injured the respondents. The answers of the respondents are seen in the Table 7-2

Table 7-2 : Percentages of Each Categories (believe or not believe being judged by Allah) who Insult or not Insult Against Someone.

Did you believe being Judged	Did you insult someone			
	Insulted		Not insulted	
Yes	259	67.4 %	125	32.7 %
No	41	89.4 %	5	10.9 %
Total	300	69.9 %	130	30.2 %

According to the Table 7-2, 69.9 % of the respondents declared that they used 'insult' against someone who was thought by the respondents to have injured them. As it is known, this is also a crime commitment according to current laws. Comparing this with the preceding crime commitment percentage, this crime commitment percentage is very high among the respondents.

According to results, 69.9 % of the respondents committed crime. The percent of religious respondents who committed a crime is 67.4, and the

146

percent of non-religious respondents who committed crime is 89.4. So we can say that religiosity; according to the belief dimension, has a negative effect on crime commitment of the respondents. There is a 22 % difference between religious respondents and non-religious respondents on the considered crime item. The general high percentage of crime commitment of respondents may be as a result of the perception of insult by the respondents. As it is known, most of the people saw some insults as a normal reaction to persons who they think injured them, although it is a crime.

Our third crime is 'cheating on examinations' to see the effects of religiosity on crime. The relationship between religiosity; believing in being judged and crime; cheating on examination is seen in the Table 7-3.

Table 7-3 : Percentages of Each Categories (believe or not believe being judged by Allah) who Cheat or not Cheated within the examinations.

	Did you cheat within the examinations			
Did you believe being Judged	Yes		No	
Yes	282	76.0 %	89	24.0 %
No	38	82.6 %	8	17.4 %
Total	320	76.7 %	97	23.3 %

According to the Table 7-3, 76.7 % of the respondents declared that they committed a crime by cheating on examinations. Comparing this to the preceding crime commitments percentages, this crime commitment percentage is the highest crime commitment percentage.

147

The percentage of the religious respondents who committed this crime is 76.0, and the percent of non-religious respondents who committed crime is 82.6. We can see a difference between the religious respondents and non-religious respondents on cheating on examinations. But there is only a 6.6 % of difference between the religious respondents and non-religious respondents on this item. Due to the big difference between the numbers that are considered religious and non-religious respondents, and high level crime commitments among the respondents, the differences shouldn't be seen as an important indicator for the relationship between religiosity and crime.

The fourth crime item that was asked to the respondents to see the effects of religiosity on crime commitment is drug addiction. I tried to find out whether the religiosities of respondents make them avoid from drug addiction, or not, from the belief dimension of religiosity. The relationship between the religiosities of respondents and their drug addiction is seen within the Table 7-4.

Table 7-4 : Percentages of Each Categories (believe or not believe being judged by Allah) related with Drug addiction behavior of respondents.

Did you believe being Judged	Sometimes I have thought on using it	I have never thought, because it is a sin	I have never thought, because it is unhealthy	I used some, no matter
	Drug Addiction behaviors of respondents			
Yes	40 10.5 %	176 46.2 %	159 41.7 %	6 1.6 %
No	10 21.3 %	0	31 66.0 %	6 12.8
Total	50 11.7 %	176 41.1	190 44.4 %	12 2.8 %

According to Table 7-4, 2.8 % of the respondents declared that they committed crime by using drugs at least once. In addition, 11.7 % of the respondents declared that sometimes they have thought about it, and have intended to use drugs. Comparing this to the preceding crime commitments percentages, this crime commitment percentage is the lowest crime commitment percentage. But drug use is an important crime, and the actual percentage is not low, in addition, declaration of such crimes mostly may be lower than the actual case, due to many factors.

The percentage of religious respondents who committed this considered crime is only 1.6, and the percentage rose to 12.8 among the non-religious respondents. Moreover, the percentage of religious respondents who declared that they sometimes intended to use drugs is 10.5% but the percentage rose to 21.3 among the non- religious respondents. We can see an important difference between the religious respondents and the non-religious respondents both on drug use and on intention to use drugs.

Besides, its effect on drug addiction, religion constitutes an important control mechanism against drug use by defining it as sin. 46.2 % of the respondents declared that they have never intended to use drugs, due to the fact that it is a sin. There are also 44.4 % of respondents who declared that they have never intended to use drugs, because it is unhealthy from both the religious respondents and the non-religious respondents.

Since I found a big percentage difference on drug use between the religious and the non-religious respondents, and control function of religion against drugs addiction among the respondents, we can say that religiosity and drug addiction are interrelated variables at least from the belief dimension of religiosity.

So far I have tried to see the effects of religiosity on four different crimes by taking in to account the belief dimension of religiosity. Within the next part of the study I'll consider the effects of religiosity on crime commitments from the ritualistic dimension of religiosity. As we discussed at

the beginning of the chapter, measuring the religiosity from its' different dimension is important to see its' effects on crime and other related items. That is why, after analyzing its' effects on crime commitments from the belief dimension, I will try to out the effects of religiosity from ritualistic dimension.

7.2 The Relationship between Religiosity and Crime from Ritualistic Dimension of Religiosity.

The ritualistic dimension of religiosity is important to see the relationship between religiosity on crime. As discussed earlier, in some empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime; when church membership was used as the measure of religiosity, any inverse relationship couldn't be found between them. On the other hand, when church attendance frequency was used as the measure of religiosity, the inverse relationship may found between religiosity and crime commitment (Ellis, 1985; 507).

As it is known, there are four important religious activities that indicate the religiosity of Muslims according to activity dimension of religion. These were asked to the respondents and the respondents agreed that they are required activities to be a good Muslim; they are; praying, fasting, giving alms and going for pilgrimage. Since our respondents are students and they can normally perform only two of them, we can ask questions about praying and fasting frequency as the measure of the ritualistic dimension of religiosity to see their effects on crime commitments of the respondents. But we saw that the respondent who pray five times or at least once a day also fast 30 days or more than 20 days in Ramadan. For example, 94 % of the

respondents who pray five times a day also fast 30 days in Ramadan. In other words, we can mostly see the ritualistic religiosity level of the respondents by one of these two rituals. That is why I only compared the praying frequency of the respondents with their crime commitments as the ritualistic dimension of religiosity.

As mentioned above I will try to find the effects of the ritualistic dimension of religiosity on the crime namely 'the use of physical force against someone, insulting someone, drug addiction, and cheating on examinations'. The relationship between religiosity; praying frequency and use of physical force against someone is seen within the Table 7-5.

Table 7-5 : Percentages of Each Categories (Praying frequency) who used or not Used Physical Force Against Someone.

Did you use physical force				
Praying frequency	Used		Not used	
Five times a day	14	16.5 %	71	83.5 %
At least once a day	10	15.6 %	54	84.4 %
At least once a week	38	50.7 %	37	49.3 %
At least once a month	18	36.0 %	32	64.0 %
At least once a year	24	40.7 %	35	59.3 %
Never	23	24.0 %	73	76.2 %
Total	127	29.6 %	302	70.4 %

According to the Table, 29.9 % of the respondents declared that they used physical force against someone who was thought as to have injured them as it was shown before when I examined the effects of the belief dimension of religiosity. Since I' am trying to find out the effects of religiosity on crime commitments I will compare these crime commitments with the religiosity of respondents which is measured by praying frequency.

As mentioned before, the religiosity of respondents are very high according to the belief dimension of religiosity but according to praying frequency of the respondents the religiosity of respondents becomes low. If we accept the respondents as religious when they pray five times a day we see that only 19.5 % of them are religious. But, the respondents who pray at least once a day should also be accepted within 'the religious' category, since we categorized religiosities as; very religious, religious, not religious and not at all. Five times praying a day should be accepted within the 'very religious' category of religiosity. Praying at least once a week, a month or a year should be accepted within the 'not religious' category and never praying respondents within 'not religious at all' category

At first sight we can see the negative effects of religiosity of the respondents on their use of physical force against someone. For example, the percentage of respondents, who are in 'very religious' or 'religious' categories, and admitted to use of physical force against someone is 16.5 and 15.6, but the percentage rose to 50.7 among the respondents who pray at least once a week, to 36.0 among the respondents who pray at least once

a month, to 40.7 among respondents who pray at least once a year and to 24.0 among the respondents who never pray.

According to these results, we can say that religiosity; the ritualistic dimension of religiosity has an important negative effect on the crime commitments of respondents on the considered crime item. As it was seen in the preceding section, religiosity of respondents, according to the belief dimension of religiosity, didn't indicate any negative effects on crime commitments of respondents on the same item. Contrary to that, we saw that the percent of non-religious respondents was lower than religious respondents on crime commitments. That is why the measurement of religiosity is very important to see its' effects on crime commitments or other related items.

According to results, there is an irregular effect of religiosity on crime commitments. Since religiosity affects crime commitments, the crime commitment percent of 'not religious' respondents, who pray at least once a week, a month or a year, should be lower than 'not religious at all' who never pray. As it is seen in the Table, the results are different than expectations. But these results do not change the fact that religiosity negatively affects crime commitments of the respondents on the considered crime item, at least to the religious and very religious respondents.

So, although effects of religiosity is irregular to the level of religiosity, according to the ritualistic dimension of religiosity, we can say yhat religiosity of respondents negatively affects crime commitment of on using

154

physical force against someone who was thought as to injure them. Our second crime is related with 'insulting someone'. The answers of respondents are seen within the Table 7-6.

Table 7-6 : Percentages of Each Categories (Praying frequency) who Insulted or not Insulted Against Someone.

Praying frequency	Did you insult against someone			
	Insulted		Not insulted	
Five times a day	52	61.9 %	32	38.1 %
At least once a day	30	45.5 %	36	54.5 %
At least once a week	56	74.7 %	19	25.3 %
At least once a month	38	74.5 %	13	25.5 %
At least once a year	48	80.0 %	12	20.0 %
Never	76	80.9 %	18	19.1 %
Total	300	69.8 %	130	30.2 %

According to the Table, 69.8 % of the respondents declared that they insulted someone who had injured them as it was mentioned before during examining the effects of belief dimension of religiosity. We tried to find out the effects of religiosity on mentioned crime commitment item by comparing it with religiosity of respondents which is measured by praying frequency.

At first sight we can see the negative effects of religiosity of the respondents on their use of insult as a punishment against someone; on their crime commitments. The percentage of respondents, who are in 'very religious' or 'religious' categories, and declared that they have insulted someone is 61.9 and 45.5, but the percentage rises to 74.7 among

155

respondents who pray at least once a week, to 74.5 among the respondents who pray at least once a month, to 80.0 among the respondents who pray at least once a year and to 80.9 among the respondents who never pray.

According to these results, we can say that religiosity; ritualistic dimension of religiosity has important negative effects on crime commitments of the respondents on considered crime item. As it was seen within the preceding part, religiosity of respondents, according to belief dimension of religiosity, also indicated negative effects on crime commitments of the respondents on the same item.

Contrary to preceding crime item, there is a regular effect of religiosity on crime commitments on this item, according to religiosity level of respondents. As it is seen in the Table, results are not different than expectations. As a result, according to the results, religiosity negatively affects crime commitments of respondents on the considered crime item.

In short, religiosity, according to the ritualistic dimension of religiosity, has negative effects on crime commitment of respondents in regards to insulting someone who had injured them. Our third crime issue is related to cheating on examinations. The answers of respondents are seen in the Table 7-7.

Table 7-7 : Percentages of Each Categories (Praying frequency) who Cheated or not Cheated within examinations.

	Did you cheat within the examinations			
Praying frequency	Cheated		Not cheated	
Five times a day	52	75.6 %	20	24.4 %
At least once a day	34	53.1 %	30	46.9 %
At least once a week	64	85.3 %	11	14.7 %
At least once a month	40	87.0 %	6	13.0 %
At least once a year	46	79.3 %	12	20.7 %
Never	75	80.6 %	18	19.4 %
Total	321	76.8 %	97	23.2 %

According to the Table 7-7, 76.8 % of the respondents declared that they have committed crime by cheating during the examinations. Comparing to this previous crime commitment percentages, this crime commitment percentage is the highest one.

At first sight we can see the negative effects of religiosity of respondents on their cheating level in the examinations. But comparing this to previous crimes, the negative effect of religiosity is seen smaller. The percentage of the respondents, who are in 'very religious' or 'religious' categories, and declared that they have cheated during the examinations, is 75.6 and 53.1, but the percentage rise to 85.3 among respondents who pray at least once a week, to 87.0 among respondents who pray at least once a

157

month, to 79.3 among respondents who pray at least once a year and to 80.6 among the respondents who never pray.

According to these results, we can say that religiosity; ritualistic dimension of religiosity has a negative effect on crime commitments of respondents on this crime item. As it was seen within the preceding part, religiosity of respondents, according to belief dimension of religiosity, also indicates negative effects on crime commitments of respondents on the same item.

Like to the previous crime item, there is a relatively regular effect of religiosity on crime commitments on this matter, according to religiosity level of respondents.

In short, religiosity, according to the ritualistic dimension of religiosity, has negative effects on respondent's tendency to commit a crime i.e; cheating during examinations.

Our fourth crime is related with drug addiction of respondents. The answers of respondents to the related question are seen within the Table 7-8.

Table 7-8 : Percentages of Each Categories (Praying frequency) related with Drug addiction behavior of respondents.

Praying frequency	Drug Addiction behaviors of Respondents			
	Sometimes I have thought on using it	I have never thought, because it is a sin	I have never thought, because it is unhealthy	I used some, no matter
Five times a day	3 3.5 %	71 83.8 %	11 12.9 %	-
At least once a day	2 3.2 %	44 69.8 %	17 27.8 %	-
At least once a week	9 12.0 %	37 49.3 %	29 38.7 %	-
At least once a month	12 23.5 %	12 23.5 %	25 49.0 %	2 3.9 %
At least once a year	8 13.6 %	8 13.6 %	43 72.9 %	-
Never	16 16.5 %	4 4.1 %	69 69.1 %	10 10.3 %
Total	50 11.6 %	176 40.9 %	192 44.7 %	12 2.8 %

According to the Table 7-8, 2.8 % of the respondents declared that they committed crime by using drugs at least once. In addition, 11.7 % of the respondents declared that sometimes they have thought about it, and have intended to use drugs. As we considered before, comparing to the previous crime commitments, this crime commitment percentage is the lowest one. But drug addiction is an important crime, and the percentage is not low in its own case, in addition, declaration of such crimes mostly may be lower than the real situation, due to a lot of factors

Like other crime items, we can see the negative effects of religiosity of respondents on their drug addiction and thoughts about drug addiction. And comparing to the previous crimes, the negative effect of religiosity is seen as an important element on drug addiction and thoughts about drug addiction. The percentage of the respondents, who are in 'very religious' or 'religious' categories, declared that they have never had any drug so far. The same results are also seen among the respondents who pray at least once a week, and among the respondents who pray at least once a year. But, the percentage is 3.9 among respondents who pray at least once a month, and it rise to 10.3 among the respondents who never pray.

Nearly, the same negative effects of religiosity also exist for thoughts about drug addiction. In other words, the level of religiosity of respondents' affects their intention about drug addiction; and being more religious has negative effect on the respondents' crime commitment thoughts.

Religion and religiosity constitutes an important social control mechanism against drug addiction by defining it as sin. 40.9 % of the respondents declared that they have never intended to use drug, due to the fact that it is considered as sin. And the percentage rise to 83.8, among the respondents who pray five times a day and to 69.8 among the respondents who pray at least once a day. These percentages are 49.3 among the respondents who pray at least ones a week, 23.5 among the respondents

who pray at least ones a month, 13.6 among respondents who pray ones at least a year, and 4.1 among respondents who never pray.

There are also 44.4 % of respondents who declared that they have never intended to use drug, due to the fact that it's considered as unhealthy from both religious respondents and non-religious respondents.

Like to the previous crime items, there is a relatively regular effect of religiosity on crime commitments on drug addiction and drug addiction thoughts, according to religiosity level of respondents.

In short, we found that religiosity level of respondents and crime commitment of respondents on drug addiction and drug addiction thoughts are interrelated

So far, I have dealt with the effects of religiosity; praying frequency of respondents as a ritualistic dimension of religiosity on four different crime items. According to findings, there are important changes in percentages of crime commitment or attitudes about crime according to ritualistic dimension of religiosity on all studied crime items. We can also say that religiosity which is measured according to ritualistic dimension of religiosity has a more clear effect on crime commitments of respondents than religiosity that is measured according to belief dimension.

After examining our variables within cross-tabulations to see whether changes in religiosity of respondents results in a different distribution of crime commitments or attitudes about crime commitments, we should also

analyze whether there is a statistically significant relationship between our variables or not, through a logistic regression analysis. For that I'll use some variables that are used to measure belief dimensions of religiosity, sex, age, fasting frequency, praying frequency and perceived religiosity of mothers as independent variables, and crime commitment of respondents as dependent variable.

By 'the strength of the relationship' we simply mean how much one variable affects the other. If we either suspect or have shown that a relatively strong relationship exists between our variables we can use a statistical technique that let us to predict the score of one variables from the knowledge of the other variable. Regression analysis is an appropriate statistical method for prediction (Bailey, 1982; 390).

We used logistic regression analysis for this kind of prediction. Our first dependent variable is insulting someone as a kind of crime. Of course this is not a serious crime but it is not allowed, and it is proscribed as crime by law, and it is punished by different ways. Throughout the study we have considered a lot of serious crimes as a related variable with religion. In other words, within the previous parts of the study we considered the relationship between religiosity and crime by including all kinds of crimes like killing someone and giving injury against someone's property. But in this part of the study we only examine the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments of respondents, which does not cover all dimensions of the relationship. That is why, due to characteristics of our sampling, I used

relatively small crimes in this part of the study, but this does not mean that we examine the relationship between religiosity and crime through only these small crimes. As mentioned before, the relationship between religiosity and crime commitment is only a part of the relationship.

Insult is first dependent variable within our logistic regression analysis. 88.5 % of the respondents are included in analysis. We examined how the answer categories of our variables were structured in the previous parts. As it could be seen in previous examinations, insulting someone has two answer categories; yes and no. And other independent variables have various answer categories as indicating someone's religiosity or non-religiosity. As a reference point, in sex variable; female, in religiosity variables; less religious answers categories are created. Constructed regression model is statistically efficient. According to Naelkerke R Sequare independent variables can explain 16.8 % of dependent variable. To Hosmer and Lemeshow tests, there is not any statistical difference between observed and predicted values (p: 0.520). 74.3 % of the observed values are predicted properly within analysis.

Table 7-9 : Logistic Regression of Insult by 9 independent Variables

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
SEX(female/male(1)	**1,126**	**,284**	**15,687**	**1**	**,000**	**3,085**
AGE	-,031	,045	,485	1	,486	,969
RELIGIOSITY OF MOTHER Very religious			6,342	3	,096	
Religious	,286	,645	,197	1	,657	1,332
Not religious	,439	,576	,581	1	,446	1,551
Not religious at all	**1,334**	**,630**	**4,486**	**1**	**,034**	**3,797**
PRAYİNG FREQ Five times a day			10,117	5	,072	
At least ones a day	**-1,176**	**,547**	**4,626**	**1**	**,031**	**,309**
At least ones a week	**-1,148**	**,562**	**4,170**	**1**	**,041**	**,317**
At least ones a month	-,744	,581	1,640	1	,200	,475
At least ones a year	-,348	,577	,365	1	,546	,706
Never	,102	,506	,040	1	,841	1,107
FASTINGFREQUENCY 30 daysY			6,063	4	,194	
More than 20 days	**,995**	**,621**	**2,563**	**1**	**,109**	**2,704**
More than 10 days	,204	,599	,116	1	,733	1,227
At lest ones	,873	,757	1,330	1	,249	2,395
Newer	,670	,667	1,009	1	,315	1,954
DAY OF JUDGMENT	-,583	1,180	,245	1	,621	,558
QUR'AN HOLDS MESSAGES OF ALLAH	,055	,882	,004	1	,951	1,056
BEİNG JUDGED BY ALLAH	-,813	1,158	,494	1	,482	,443
HELL AND HEAVEN	-,298	1,116	,071	1	,790	,742
Constant	**1,921**	**1,158**	**2,754**	**1**	**,097**	**6,827**

$$\text{Log }(Y_{insult}) = 1{,}921 + 1{,}126 X_{MALE} + 1{,}334 X_{MOTHER\ NOT\ RELIGIOUS} - 1{,}176 X_{5\ TIMES\ PRAYING\ A\ DAY} - 1{,}148 X_{AT\ LEAST\ ONES\ A\ DAY} +$$

$$\quad\quad (0{,}097)\quad (0{,}0001)\quad\ (0{,}034)\quad\quad\quad\quad (0{,}031)\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad (0{,}041)$$

$$\quad\quad [6{,}827]\quad [3{,}085]\quad\ [3{,}797]\quad\quad\quad\quad\ [0{,}309]\quad\quad\quad\quad\quad [0{,}317]$$

$$0{,}995 X_{30\ DAYS\ FASTING}$$
$$(0{,}109)$$
$$[2{,}704]$$

As it could be seen in the equation, the probability of insulting someone is higher (6.827) than not insulting someone among respondents, when we considered it out of all related variables. But there are some variables that affect the probability of insulting someone. For example,

164

compared to being male, being female reduces the probability of insulting; being female reduces 3.058 times the probability of insulting according to being male.

Mothers' perceived religiosity level difference of respondent is also an effective factor that affects respondents' commitment on insulting someone. The probability of insult is 3.797 times higher among the respondents whose mothers are perceived by them within 'not religious at all' category than respondents whose mothers are more religious

On the other hand, as a religiosity measure; fasting 30 days in Ramadan is seen a positive factor that increases the probability of insulting someone. Respondents, who are religious according to fasting frequency, are more likely to insult someone than respondents who are not religious according to religiosity that is measured by fasting ritual of religion.

But, according to the other independent variable that is used to measure ritualistic dimension of religiosity; to praying frequency of respondents, there is a negative relationship between religiosity and insulting someone. Insulting someone probability of religious respondents, who are religious according to this measure of religiosity, is seen less likely (0.309 times) than respondents who are not religious according to this ritualistic dimension of religiosity that is measured by praying frequency.

Belief in Day of Judgment, belief in Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, belief in being judged by Allah and belief in Hell and Heaven are other

independent variables that are used to measure belief dimension of religiosity. But non of these variables are seen effective on insulting probability of respondents. In other words, there isn't any statistically significant relationship between these variables and insulting someone.

Using physical force against someone is another dependent variable that is used to measure crime commitment of respondents. We used the same independent variables to analyze the relationship between using physical force against someone and these variables, some of which are used to measure religiosity of respondents.

Again, in sex variable; female, in religiosity variables; less religious answers are considered as a reference point. Constructed regression model is statistically efficient. According to Nagelkerke R Square independent variables can explain 24.4 % of dependent variable. To Hosmer and Lemeshow tests, there isn't any statistical difference between observed and predicted values (p: 0.522). 72.7 % of the observed values are predicted properly within analysis.

Table 7-10 : Logistic Regression of use of physical force by 9 independent Variables

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
SEX(female/male(1)	**1,550**	**,312**	**24,745**	**1**	**,000**	**4,712**
AGE	,003	,044	,004	1	,948	1,003
RELIGIOSITY OF MOTHER Very religious			2,628	3	,453	
Religious	-,342	,602	,324	1	,569	,710
Not religious	-,654	,532	1,510	1	,219	,520
Not religious at all	-,746	,552	1,827	1	,177	,474
PRAYİNG FREQ Five times a day			23,149	5	,000	
At least ones a day	**-,895**	**,559**	**2,560**	**1**	**,110**	**,409**
At least ones a week	-,185	,602	,094	1	,759	,831
At least ones a month	,658	,531	1,537	1	,215	1,931
At least ones a year	,658	,563	1,363	1	,243	1,930
Never	**,876**	**,468**	**3,498**	**1**	**,061**	**2,401**
FASTINGFREQUENCY 30 DAYS			4,587	4	,332	
More than 20 days	,480	,548	,766	1	,381	1,616
More than 10 days	-,206	,585	,124	1	,725	,814
At lest ones	,460	,637	,521	1	,471	1,584
Newer	,643	,574	1,257	1	,262	1,902
DAY OF JUDGMENT	-,960	,999	,923	1	,337	,383
QUR'AN HOLDS MESSAGES OF ALLAH	,081	,642	,016	1	,899	1,085
BEİNG JUDGED BY ALLAH	,716	,948	,571	1	,450	2,046
HELL AND HEAVEN	,200	,969	,043	1	,836	1,222
Constant	**-1,853**	**1,102**	**2,827**	**1**	**,093**	**,157**

Log (Yphysical force)= -1,853 + 1,550XMALE - 0,895X5 TIMES PRAY + 0,876XONES A DAY

(0,093)   (0,0001)   (0,11)   (0,061)

[0,157]   [4,712]   [0,409]   [2,401]

As it could be seen in the equation, the probability of use of physical force against someone is higher (0.157 times) than not using physical force against someone among the respondents, when we considered it out of all related variables. But there are some variables that affect the probability of using physical force against someone. For example, in comparison with being male, being female reduces the probability of using physical force; being female reduces 4.712 times the probability of using physical force against someone, according to being male. The probability of using physical force among males is higher than insult probability among males; insult probability was 3.058 times higher among males than among females.

Mothers' perceived religiosity level difference of respondent is not an effective factor that affects respondents' commitment on using physical force against someone. In other words, contrary to insult, the probability of using physical force is not higher among the respondents whose mothers are perceived by them within 'not religious at all' category.

On the other hand, as a religiosity measure; fasting 30 days in Ramadan is seen an ineffective factor on using physical force. According to other independent variable that is used to measure ritualistic dimension of religiosity; praying frequency of respondents has a negative relationship between religiosity and using physical force against someone. Probability of

religious respondents, who are religious according to this measure of religiosity, is seen less likely (0.409 times) on committing use of physical force than respondents who are not religious according to ritualistic dimension of religiosity that is measured by praying frequency.

Belief in Day of Judgment, belief in Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, belief in being judged by Allah and belief in Hell and Heaven are other independent variables that are used to measure belief dimension of religiosity. And all these are used as independent variables on use of physical force, but non of these variables are seen effective on using physical force. In other words, there isn't any statistically significant relationship between these independent variables and dependent variable.

Cheating on examinations is our last dependent variable that is used to measure crime commitment of respondents. We used the same independent variables to analyze the relationship between cheating on examinations and these independent variables, some of which are used to measure religiosity of respondents.

Again, in sex variable; female, in religiosity variables; less religious answers are considered as a reference point. Constructed regression model is statistically efficient. According to Nagelkerke R Square independent variables can explain 11.9 % of dependent variable. To Hosmer and Lemeshow tests, there isn't any statistical difference between observed and predicted values (p: 0.183). 81.1 % of the observed values are predicted properly within analysis.

Table 7-11 : Logistic Regression of Cheating during Examinations by 9 independent Variables

Variables in the Equation

	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
SEX(female/male(1)	**,785**	**,311**	**6,375**	**1**	**,012**	**2,193**
AGE	**-,105**	**,048**	**4,712**	**1**	**,030**	**,900**
RELIGIOSITY OF MOTHER Very religious			1,155	3	,764	
Religious	-,071	,684	,011	1	,917	,931
Not religious	,323	,617	,273	1	,601	1,381
Not religious at all	,250	,611	,167	1	,683	1,284
PRAYİNG FREQ Five times a day			5,498	5	,358	
At least ones a day	-,643	,581	1,227	1	,268	,526
At least ones a week	-,803	,583	1,894	1	,169	,448
At least ones a month	-,078	,638	,015	1	,903	,925
At least ones a year	,297	,675	,194	1	,660	1,346
Never	-,118	,521	,052	1	,820	,888
FASTINGFREQUENCY 30 DAYS			3,732	4	,444	
More than 20 days	,786	,637	1,524	1	,217	2,195
More than 10 days	,193	,613	,099	1	,753	1,213
At lest ones	,337	,715	,222	1	,638	1,400
Newer	,867	,713	1,477	1	,224	2,380
DAY OF JUDGMENT	-1,388	1,284	1,168	1	,280	,250
QUR'AN HOLDS MESSAGES OF ALLAH	**1,914**	**,834**	**5,264**	**1**	**,022**	**6,780**
BEİNG JUDGED BY ALLAH	1,022	1,250	,668	1	,414	2,778
HELL AND HEAVEN	**-1,723**	**1,144**	**2,270**	**1**	**,132**	**,179**
Constant	**2,949**	**1,172**	**6,331**	**1**	**,012**	**19,084**

$$\text{Log}(Y_{\text{CHEATING}}) = 2{,}949 + 0{,}785 X_{\text{MALE}} - 0{,}105 X_{\text{AGE}} + 1{,}914 X_{\text{QURAN}} - 1{,}723 X_{\text{HELL AND HEAVEN}}$$
$$(0{,}012) \quad (0{,}012) \qquad (0{,}030) \qquad\qquad (0{,}022) \qquad\qquad\qquad (0{,}132)$$
$$[19{,}084] \ [2{,}193] \qquad [0{,}900] \qquad\qquad [6{,}780] \qquad\qquad\qquad [0{,}179]$$

As it could be seen in equation, the probability of cheating during examinations is 19.084 times higher than not cheating in examinations among respondents, when we considered it out of all related variables. But there are some variables that affect the probability of cheating in examinations. For example, in comparison with being male, being female reduces the probability of cheating during examinations. Like sex variable, age variable is also effective on cheating in examinations. In comparison with being young, being old reduces the probability of cheating during examinations; being older reduces 0.900 times the probability of cheating in examinations according to being young.

Mothers' perceived difference of respondent and other dependent variables are not effective factors that affect respondents' cheating during examinations. In other words, like use of physical force, the probability of cheating in examinations is not higher among the respondents whose mothers are perceived by them within 'not religious at all' category or other categories that is defined as 'non religious' category (within answer categories of considered independent variable).

Besides praying and fasting, belief in Day of Judgment, belief in Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, belief in being judged by Allah and belief in Hell and Heaven are other independent variables that are used to measure ritualistic and belief dimensions of religiosity, but non of these variables are

171

seen effective on cheating during examinations. In other words, there isn't any statistically significant relationship between these independent variables and the dependent variable.

As it could be seen from above statistical analysis there is no regular relationship between considered dependent variables and considered independent variables. Only sex variable has statistically significant relationship with all dependent variables. There are also some statistically significant relationships between religiosity and dependent variables, at least on some measures of religiosity, but not on all measures of religiosity

In this Chapter we have examined the relationship between religiosity and crime commitment through cross-tabulations and explanatory analysis. Within the cross-tabulations we have examined the relationships between religiosity and crime commitment as percentage distributions. According to findings there are important changes in percentages of crime commitment, according to religiosity level of ritualistic dimension of religiosity, on all considered crime items. There are also some inverse relationship between belief dimension of religiosity and crime commitment. But we can say that religiosity which measured according to ritualistic dimension of religiosity has a more clear effect on crime commitments of respondents than religiosity that is measured according to belief dimension. Logistic regression analysis also indicated that, not all religiosity measures but ritualistic dimension of religiosity (praying frequency) is inversely related with crime

172

commitment (on insult and use of physical force) within the considered
sense.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

I have started to study this thesis with the consideration: why and how there should be a relationship between religiosity and crime. I assumed a negative relationship between them. Our assumption is based on explanations which are widely considered by social scientists within the related literature both on religion and crime, and empirical studies which are specifically considered with the relationship between religiosity and crime.

That is why we started studying on how the social functions of religion are explained by authors who considered religion and functions of religion in sociology, anthropology and psychology. Then we studied the concept of crime and explanations of the crime theories. After considering with religion and crime within the related literature, we studied on how and why there should be a relationship, especially negative relationship between religiosity and crime. We also considered the empirical studies and their findings on the relationship between religiosity and crime

Before examining the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments of respondents, we specifically considered how and why religious values should be accepted as a crime preventing factor through examining the social control functions of religion on crime and related items. We mostly used the general framework of social control theory and other crime theories that try to explain: 'why would anyone violate rules of social conduct that nearly all of us accept?' (Hagan, 1985; 148).

As we mentioned before, empirical studies on the relationship between religiosity and crime mostly examined only whether there is a negative relationship between them, or not, they haven't contained measurements that try to measure how religious values become crime preventing factor on the attitudes of people. In this study, I have not only tried to find out whether there is a negative relationship between religiosity and crime commitments, but also I tried to find out how religious values constitute crime preventing attitudes and mechanisms through studying social control functions of religion and religiosity.

We started to analyze the gathered data from demographic characteristics of respondents. According to findings, the characteristics of respondents are appropriate to test the objectives of our study.

'Objective measurement of religiosity' was one of our important objectives to see the correspondence between respondents' perception of religiosity and our religiosity measurements that were used to measure the religiosity of respondents. We saw a high level of correspondence

175

between perceived religiosity and used measurements of religiosity. For example, we used 'praying five times a day' as a measurement of ritualistic dimension of religiosity and 87.2 % of the respondents also indicated that it is a requirement of being a religious Muslim. According to findings, the percent of the respondents are also approximately at the same level on seeing as a requirement of being a religious Muslim about other 0used religiosity measurements for all dimensions of religiosity. This high level of correspondence was very important both for accurate measurement of religiosity of respondents and the relationship between religiosity and crime.

We also tried to find out how the respondents perceive the religiosity of their parents, friends and class mates. According to findings, 71.5 % of the respondents perceive their mothers as religious or very religious, 58 % of the respondents perceive their fathers as religious or very religious, 39.2 % of the respondents perceive their friends as religious or very religious and only 26 % of the respondents perceive their class mates as religious or very religious. As I mentioned before 'religious climate' is important for the relationship between religiosity and crime (Junger and Polder, 1993; 416). But measurement of this 'religious climate' and its effects on crime commitment is a wide subject, we only tried to see how respondents perceive the mentioned actors who are mostly in their environments.

Since we tried to find out the relationship between religiosity and crime, accurate measurement of respondents' religiosity was very important. That is why we tried to measure the religiosity of respondents from different dimensions; both from belief dimension and from ritualistic dimension. Results indicated that these kinds of distinctions are required to see the real dimensions of religiosity and so its effects on crime commitments. When we measured the religiosity of the respondents by items that are related with belief dimension of religiosity, 90 % of respondents were seen religious, but when we measured the religiosity of respondents by items that related with ritualistic dimension of religiosity, the percent decrease 19.5 on some items (praying five times a day) or 54.7 on the other items (fasting 30 days in Ramadan). That is why accurate measurement of religiosity is required to measure it from its all dimensions.

As I mentioned before, measuring of social control function of religion and religiosity was one of the fundamental objectives of our study to see the relationship between religiosity and crime. We considered the social control function of religion and religiosity under the titles of ' The extent of the correspondence between sin and crime, The perceived relationship between religiosity and crime, Explanations of legal behavior, Alcohol usage of respondents and Perceived relationship between religiosity and having a good manners.

177

We should remember how we considered the social control; Social control comprises the whole range of pressures directed to make people play their roles in accordance with the expectations from both formal and informal side of society (Mair, 1980; 11).

As we discussed in detail before, social control function of religion on different issues is studied by scientists who are from various disciplines (Bocock, 1995; 119, Grasmick, 1997; 135).

According to findings, approximately 90 % of respondents saw the crimes like 'injuring someone's property, injuring someone's personality and drug addiction as sin. These perceptions indicate that there is a high level of correspondence between sin and crime, and that means religion and religiosity constitutes an important social control function. We should remember the arguments that deals with close relationship between crime and sin in Islam (Al-Khalifah, 1994; 1-12).

And we also saw another social control function of religion from respondents' perception of the relationship between religiosity and crime. To them a negative relationship exists between religiosity and some crimes as perceived relationship. In other words, religious people do not commit some crimes due to their religiosity, to the view points of respondents. For example, 81 % of the respondents agreed on 'being a religious people helps to avoid from both alcohol and drug addiction'.

Explanation of legal behavior is another important item that indicates the social control function of religiosity on crime. According to

findings, most of the respondents see their religious values as most important factor that prevents them from crime commitment, on a situation in which they faced to choose or not to choose giving injury to others' property or injuring their personality. By examining this item we wanted to see social control function of religion on the above mentioned crime commitment situation besides other factors that might prevent from crime commitment. We found that 15.9 % of the respondents saw legal sanctions as most important factor that prevents them from crime commitment behaviors in these types of situations. 7.3 % of the respondents see the social pressure as the most of the important factor to them for the same situation. The percentage of the respondents rose 65.1 when religious values are considered as the most important factor for preventing them from crime commitment within mentioned situations.

We also examined the relationship between religiosity and having a good manner or being a nice person. There is a growing interest on this relationship (Ellison, 1992; 411). The relationship between them is not directly related with crime but it affects crime commitments indirectly. Since we try to see the social control function of religion, we should deal with this type of relationship. We discussed with some items to see some perceived functions of religion. These are; religiosity and happiness, religiosity and morality, religiosity and self-seeking, religiosity and having commonsense and tolerance, religiosity and being property-centralized, and religiosity and being criminal. We found important perceived effects of religiosity on having good manners. For example, according to the 72.2 %

179

of respondents; 'being religious, make people have more commonsense and tolerance'. This result and other results that are found on the other related items indicated that there is an important relationship between religiosity and being in a good manner that means religiosity has an important social control function on the considered subject

All these issues have been studied under the framework of social control theory, according to which people develop a bound to society that makes criminal behavior less likely. Since religions usually share many values with society as a whole, religious people may have relatively strong bonds with values that condemn criminal behavior (Junger and Polder, 1993; 417).

By examining these items we wanted to see the functions of religion and religiosity on crime. We argued the social control functions of religion and religiosity on crime through the mentioned items which are related with the ways and the mechanisms by which religion and religiosity fulfill functions on crime and attitudes about crime. In other words we examined how and which extent religion and religiosity would be an effective factor on people to make them avoid from crime through fulfilling some functions on individual attitudes, and on formal and informal social control mechanism of society.

The other fundamental objective of the study was the examining the effects of religiosity on crime commitments. In this chapter, so far, we have talked about the effects of religion and religiosity on people's attitudes,

perceptions, and on formal and informal social control mechanisms of society. After these examinations we can deal with the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments through respondents' religiosity and their crime commitments. But these crimes were not serious crimes, although they are defined as crimes. These crimes were: use of physical force against someone, insulting someone, drug addiction and cheating during the examinations.

As discussed before measuring of the religiosity is very important for the relationship between religiosity and crime. That is why I tried to find out the relationship between religiosity and crime commitments of respondents by comparing their crime commitments to different items that were used to measure the religiosity of respondents. So we saw the effects of religiosity on crime commitments from different dimension of religiosity, as well as from different religiosity measure items.

In order to measure the belief dimension of religiosity we asked five questions to the respondents as we examined in the chapter 7. The questions were; 'there is a Day of Judgment, Qur'an holds the messages of Allah, everyone is going to be judged by Allah, there are hell and heaven' yes or no. Respondents were told that 'If you accept or believe the content of the question chose 'yes' if not chose 'no'. In addition, we asked 'If I commit any sin I am going to be punished' SA, A, D and SD.

We found that approximately 90 % of the respondents claimed to be religious and there were not important percentage differences

between items that had been asked to measure belief dimension of religiosity. In other words, one of the items that were used to measure the belief dimension of religiosity can represent all items that were used for this dimension of religiosity. That is why in descriptive analysis we compared only one of the items of religiosity from belief dimension to see its' effects on crime commitments as percentages within cross-tabulations.

As I stated before, there are four important religious activities that indicate the religiosity of Muslims according to the ritualistic dimension of religion. They were asked to the respondents and they agreed on them as required activities to be a good Muslim; they were; praying, fasting, giving alms and going for pilgrimage. Since our respondents are students and they can normally perform only two of them, we asked questions about praying and fasting frequency as the measurement of the ritualistic dimension of religiosity to see its effects on crime commitments of the respondents. But we saw that respondent who pray five times or at least once a day also fasting 30 days or more than 20 days within the Ramadan. For example, 94 % of the respondents who pray five times in a day also fasting 30 days in the Ramadan. That is why we only compared the praying frequency of respondents with their crime commitments as a measurement of ritualistic dimension of religiosity.

According to the results, religiosity level of respondents has negative effects on their crime commitments from both belief and ritualistic dimension of religiosity, except on 'use of physical force' according to

182

belief dimension of religiosity, as measures of percentage distributions. On this item we found a positive effect of religiosity from belief dimension of religiosity on crime commitment of respondents. But on all other crime items we found negative effects of religiosity, although ritualistic dimension has a more clear effect as percentage distribution. For example on drug addiction, according to belief dimension, 1.6 % of religious respondents declared that they had used drugs but according to ritualistic dimension of religiosity, non of religious respondents declared that they had used any drugs. The percentage of drug addiction rose 12.8 among the non religious respondents.

In addition these findings we also found some statistically meaningful negative relationships between religiosity and crime commitments at least on some measures of religiosity; some ritualistic measures of religiosity through logistic regression analysis; there are statistically significant negative relationship between praying frequency of respondent and both use of physical force and insult. All of the findings were discussed within the previous chapter in detail.

In short, according to the results, we can say that religion and religiosity have important social control functions on crime through shaping attitudes of people against crime by means of different ways and mechanisms that fulfill social control functions in society. And religiosity, at least some measures of religiosity level of respondents, is inversely related with their crime commitment behaviors.

183

REFERENCES

Adler, F. Gerhard, O. W. and Laufer, W. S. Criminology. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Al-Khalifah, A. M. 1994.'Religiosity in Islam as a Protective Mechanism Against Criminal Temptation'. Vol: 11, Spring. The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences

Bahr, Stephen J. 1986.'Religion, Family, and Adolescent Drug Use'. Vol: 28, January . Sociological Perspectives.

Bailey, K. D.1982. Methods of Social Research. New York, London: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Barcly, G and Taveres, C. 2002. International Comparisons of Criminal Justice Statistics 2000. London.

Blackwell, B. S. 1997. 'Random Drug Testing and Religion' Sociological Inquiry. Vol: 67 No: 2.

Bloch, H. 1970. Man, Crime and Society. New York: Random House, Inc.

Bocock, R. 1995. Consumption. London, New York: Routledge

Coser, L. A. 1977. Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context. London, Sidney, Toronto, Washington, New York, Chicago: HBJ.

184

Cressey, Donald. R. 1964. Delinquency, Crime and Differential Association. Netherlands: The Hague.

Ellis, L. 1985. 'Religiosity and Criminality: Evidence and Explanations of Complex Relationships'. Sociological Perspectives. Vol. 28 No: 4.

Ellis, L. and Thomson, R. 1989. 'Relating Religion, Crime, Arousal and Boredom' SSR. Vol: 73 No: 3.

Ellison, C. G. 1992. 'Are Religious People Nice People? Evidence from National Survey of Black Americans'. Social Forces. Vol: 71. No: 2.

Etzioni, A 1995. The Spirit of Community. San Francisco, California. ICS Press

Kur'an-ı Kerim ve Türkçe Anlamı. 1983 Ankara: Diyanet İşleri Başkanlıgı Yayınları.

Fitzgeralt, M. McLennan, G. and Pawson, J. 1990 Crime and Society: Reading in History and Theory. London: Routledge.

Friedman, L. M. 1977. Law and Society: An Introduction USA: Prentice- Hall, Inc.

Gibbons, Don C. 1968. Crime and Criminal Carriers: An Introduction to Criminology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Gottfredson, M. C. and Hirchi, T. 1990. A General Theory of Crime. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Grasmick, H. G. 1997. 'Random Drug Testing and Religion' Sociological Inquiry. Vol: 67. No: 2.

Hagan, J. 1985. Modern Criminology: Crime, Criminal Behavior, and Its Control. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Junger, M. and Polder, W. 1993. 'Religiosity, Religious Climate, and Delinquency among Ethnic Groups in the Netherllands' Brith. J. Criminol. Vol: 33 No: 3

Mair, L. 1980. An Introduction to social Anthropology. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Martin, J. L. 2002. 'Power, Authority, and the Constraint of Belief Systems' AJS Vol: 107. No: 4.

Merton, R.K. 1968. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.

Morris, B. 1987. Anthropological Studies of Religion: An Introductery Text Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nisbet, R.1990.The Quest for Community: A Study in the Ethics of Order and Freedom. San Francisco, California. ICS Press.

Ross, L.E. 1994 'Religion and Deviance: Exploring the impact of Social Control Element' Sociological Spectrum. Vol: 14

Seventh United Nations Survey of Crime Trends and Operations of Criminal Justice Systems, covering the period 1998-2000. By Office on Drugs and Crime Centre for International Crime Prevention.

Skoog, R. J. 1987. 'A Perspective on Crime, Values, and Religion' Crime, Values, and Religion. Editors: James M. Day and William S. Laufer. Oklahoma: Ablex Pub.

Stark, R. 1987. 'Religion and Deviance: A New Look'. Crime, Values, and Religion. Editors: James M. Day and William S. Laufer. Oklahoma: Ablex Pub.

Sutherland, E. H. 1973. On Analyzing Crime. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press.

Taylor, I. Watson, P. and Young, J. 1988. The New Criminolgy: For a Social Theory of Deviance. London, New York: Routledge.

Thomas, G. M. 1996. 'Cultural Analysis of Religious Change and Movements' Sociological Inquiry. Vol. 66 No: 3.

Vito, G. F. and Hommes, R. M. 1994. Criminolgy: Theory, Research, and Policy. Belmont: Watsworth Pub. Co.

Wolfgang, M. E. Savitz, L. and Johnston, N. 1970. The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency. New York, London, Sidney, Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Zeitlin, I. M. 1968. Ideology and The Development of Sociological Theory. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Inc.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONARY

AŞAĞIDAKİ SORULAR SİZ ÖĞRENCİLERİN BAZI KONULARDAKİ İNANÇLARINI DEĞERLENDİRMEK AMACI İLE HAZIRLANMIŞTIR. CEVAPLARINIZ DOKTORA TEZ KONUSU OLARAK DEĞERLENDİRİLECEKTİR. CEVAPLARINIZ ŞAHSINIZDA DEĞERLENDİRİLMEYECEKTİR. BU NEDENLE LÜTFEN ADINIZI HİÇBİR KISMA YAZMAYINIZ VE SİZİN İÇİN EN UYGUN CEVAPLARI YUVARLAK İÇİNE ALINIZ.

1- Cinsiyetiniz?

a   Erkek   b   Kadın

2-Yaşınız? (olduğu gibi yazınız)

…………………........................

3-Kaçıncı sınıftasınız? (olduğu gibi yazınız)

………………………………..

4- Babanızın dindarlık derecesini nasıl sınıflandırırsınız?

a) Çok dindar

b) Dindar

c) Dindar değil

d) Hiç dindar değil

5-Annenizin dindarlık derecesini nasıl sınıflandırırsınız?

a) Çok dindar

b) Dindar

c) Dindar değil

d) Hiç dindar değil

6- 18 yaşınıza gelinceye kadar ki arkadaşlarınızın dindarlık derecesini nasıl sınıflandırırsınız?

a) Çok dindardı

b) Dindardı

c) Dindar değildi

d) Hiç dindar değildi

7- Büyüme çağınıza kadar (18 yaşınıza kadar) ne kadar sıklıkla namaz kılardınız?

a) Günde 5 kere

b) Günde en az bir kere

c) Haftada en az bir kere

d) Ayda en az bir kere

e) Genel olarak yılda en az bir kere

f) Hiç kılmadım

8- Büyüme çağınıza kadar (18 yaşınıza kadar) Ramazanda ne kadar süre ile oruç tutardınız?

a) 30 gün

b) 20 günden fazla

c) 10 günden fazla

d) En az bir gün

e) Hiç tutmadım

9-Halihazırda ne kadar sıklıkla namaz kılıyorsunuz?

a) Günde 5 kere

b) Günde en az bir kere

c) Haftada en az bir kere   d) Ayda en az bir kere

e) Genel olarak yılda en az bir kere   f) Hiç kılmadım

10- Halihazırda Ramazanda ne kadar süre ile oruç tutuyorsunuz?

a) 30 gün   b) 20 günden fazla

c) 10 günden fazla   d) En az bir gün

e) Hiç tutmadım

11- Halihazırda arkadaşlarınızın çoğunu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?

a) Çok dindar   b) Dindar

c) Dindar değil   d) Hiç dindar değil

12- Sınıf arkadaşlarınızın çoğunu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz?

a) Çok dindar   b) Dindar

c) Dindar değil   d) Hiç dindar değil

13- Halihazırda kendinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?

a) Çok dindar   b) Dindar

c) Dindar değil   d) Hiç dindar değil

AŞAĞIDAKİ SORULARIN SİZE GÖRE EN UYGUN OLAN SEÇENEĞİNİ YUVARLAK İÇİNE ALINIZ.(DOĞRUDAN ŞAHSINIZA YÖNELİK OLMAYAN SORULARDA OBJEKTİF TESPİTİNİZİ YANSITACAK ŞEKİLDE) EĞER TAMAMEN AYNI FİKİRDE İSENİZ "TA", AYNI FİKİRDE İSENİZ "A", KARŞI İSENİZ "K", TAMAMEN KARŞI İSENİZ "TK" HARFLERİNİN BULUNDUĞU KISMI İŞARETLEYİNİZ.

14- İyi bir Müslüman günde 5 kere namaz kılmalıdır.

TA   A   K   TK

15- İyi bir Müslüman bütün ramazan ayı boyunca oruç tutmalıdır.

TA   A   K   TK

16- Türkiye Müslüman ülkelerle yakın ilişkiler kurmalıdır

TA   A   K   TK

17- İyi bir Müslüman düzenli olarak fakirlere zekat-sadaka vermelidir.

TA   A   K   TK

18- İyi bir Müslüman Mekke'ye Hac için gitmelidir eğer ekonomik durumu müsait ise.

TA   A   K   TK

19- Hadisler ve Ayetler modern yaşama uygulanabilir.

TA   A   K   TK

20- Genel olarak dindar kişiler dindar olmayanlardan daha huzurludur.

TA   A   K   TK

21- Türkiye'nin Hıristiyan ülkelerle sınırlı ilişkileri olmalıdır.

TA   A   K   TK

22- Türkiye örneğinde olduğu gibi hem Müslüman hem de laik olmak, diğer Müslüman ülkeler tarafından kabul edilmelidir.

TA   A   K   TK

23- Din insana hayatın her döneminde yardımcı olur.

TA   A   K   TK

24- Allah güçlükle karşılaştığımda bana yardım eder.

TA   A   K   TK

25-Türkiye'de laiklik devam etmelidir.

TA   A   K   TK

26- Dindar olma kişinin alkol, uyuşturucu kullanmamasına yardım eder.

TA   A   K   TK

27- Bir Müslüman alkol almaz.

TA   A   K   TK

28- Bir Müslüman uyuşturucu kullanmaz.

TA   A   K   TK

29- Müslüman ülkeler kesinlikle şeriat kanunları ile yönetilmelidir.

TA   A   K   TK

30- Kur'an yapılması ve yapılmaması gereken emirleri içerir.

TA   A   K   TK

31- Kur'an İslam'ın inanç esaslarını bildirir.

TA   A   K   TK

32- Ahlaklı bir insan olmak için dindar bir insan olmak şart değildir.

TA   A   K   TK

33- Evlilik dışı ilişki günahtır.

TA   A   K   TK

34- Günah olan bir eylemi yaparsam cezalandırılacağım.

TA   A   K   TK

35- Cami bir toplulukta en önemli yapıdır.

TA   A   K   TK

36- İmam Hatip okulları Türkiye için faydalıdır.

TA   A   K   TK

37- Uyuşturucu ve alkol alışkanlığı günahtır.

TA   A   K   TK

38- Politik kararlar İslami prensiplere uygun olarak verilmelidir.

TA   A   K   TK

39- Çevrenizde tanıdığınız önemli bir suç işlemiş dindar insanlar var mı.

Evet   Hayır

AŞAĞIDAKİ SORULARI KABUL EDİYORSANIZ / İNANIYORSANIZ EVET YADA HAYIR DİYE İŞARETLEYİNİZ.

40- Kıyamet günü vardır.

Evet   Hayır

41- Size haksızlık ettiğini düşündüğünüz kişileri sözlü olarak(hakaret ederek) hiç cezalandırdınızmı ?.

Evet   Hayır

42- Kur'an Allah'ın emirlerini iletir.

Evet   Hayır

43- Günlük hayatta her türlü kararımı Kur'an'da belirtilen esaslara göre veririm.

Evet   Hayır

44- Mahşer günü herkes Allah'a hesap verecektir.

Evet   Hayır

45- Başkalarının malına canına zara vermek günahtır.

Evet   Hayır

46- Cennet ve cehennem vardır.

Evet   Hayır

47- Kendinizi iyi bir Müslüman olarak görüyor musunuz?

Evet   Hayır

48- Son beş yıl içinde hiç kopya çektiniz mi.

Evet   Hayır

49- Bir alkolik / uyuşturucu müptelasının kötülük yapmasının sebebi inançlarının zayıf olmasıdır.

Evet   Hayır

50- Dindar bir insan başkasının malına zarar vermez.

Evet   Hayır

51- Dini inancı olmayan insanlar yalnız kendi çıkarlarını gözetir.

Evet   Hayır

52- Dindar bir insan başkasının canına zarar vermez. (Yaralama veya Öldürme)

Evet   Hayır

53- Dindar bir insan sağduyu ve hoşgörü sahibidir.

Evet   Hayır

54- Size haksızlık ettiğini düşündüğünüz kişileri hiç döverek cezalandırdınız mı?

Evet   Hayır

55- Dini inancı olmayan insanlar maddiyata çok önem verir.

Evet   Hayır

56- Sizce insanlar yasalara neden uyarlar?

a) Kanuni cezalar yüzünden

b) Toplumun baskısı yüzünden

c) Ahlaki veya dini nedenler yüzünden

d) Diğer

57- Şayet başkasının malına veya canına zarar vermek gibi durumla karşılaşırsanız sizi bu eyleminizden alıkoyacak en önemli neden ne olabilir?

a) Kanuni cezalar

b) İnsanların yargılaması/ayıplaması

c) Günah olması

c) Başka bir neden

58-Uyuşturucu kullanmak hakkıında ne düşünüyorsunuz?

a) Zaman zaman düşündüğüm oldu

b) Kullanmam çünkü günahtır

c) Kullanmam çünkü sağlığa zararlıdır

c) Denedim,bir mahsuru yoktur

59-Alkol almak hakkında ne düşünüyorsunuz?

a) Bir miktar almanın bir mahzuru yoktur

b) Kullanmam çünkü günahtır

c) Kullanmam çünkü sağlığa zararlıdır

d) Alkolün sadece çoğu zararlıdır.

APPENDIX B

TURKISH SUMMARY

Dindarlık suç ilişkisinin ele alındığı bu çalışmada dinin sosyal kontrol fonksiyonları üniversite öğrencilerinden toplanan verilerle belirtilen konu çerçevesinde geniş bir şekilde irdelenmektedir. Bilindiği gibi din bir değerler bütünüdür ve her dinin mensuplarından istediği davranış biçimleri ve bu davranışları belirleyen kuralları vardır. Her toplumda toplumun yaşanabilir bir birliktelik olarak devam etmesini sağlayan formal ve informal kurallar vardır. Toplumdaki değerleri ve kuralları oluşturan çok sayıda kaynak ve bu kaynakları etkileyen değişik faktörler vardır. Her toplum 'normal' olarak kabul ettiği yaşama biçimini ve bunları düzenleyen formal ve informal kuralları korumaya çalışır. Suç olarak tanımlanan davranışlar toplumda yaşayan bireylerin 'normal' olarak kabul edip üzerinde anlaştıkları 'normal'ler den suç olarak tanımlanan 'sapmaları' ifade eder. Bu anlamda suç kavramı en genel anlamıyla kültürel bir belirlemedir. Ancak her 'normal'den sapma suç değildir, 'normal'den 'sapma'nın suç olarak kabul edilmesi bu 'sapma'nın toplumun formal yapısı; hukuk sistemi tarafından suç olarak tanımlanmasıyla mümkündür.

Suç kavramının kültürel boyutu göz önünde bulundurulduğunda toplumların kültürel yapıları ve insanların davranışları üzerinde önemli etkileri olan dinin ve dini değerlerin ne ölçüde suç kavramıyla ilişkili olduğu görülebilir. Elbette ki bu ilişkinin boyutu ele alınan toplumdaki dini değerlerin yaygınlığına ve etkinliğine göre olacaktır. Bu anlamda dindarlık suç ilişkileri teorik yaklaşımlardan çok saha çalışmalarıyla açıklığa kavuşturulabilecek bir özelliğe sahiptir. Aynı dini öğretiye sahip farklı toplumlarda din suç ilişkisinin toplumun diğer özellikleri nedeniyle farklılık göstermesi mümkündür. Bu çalışma dindarlık suç ilişkilerini önemli boyutları ile ele almayı amaçlayan bir saha çalışmasıdır. ABD'de ve AB ülkelerinde konuyla ilgili çok sayıda araştırma yapılmış olmasına rağmen Türkiye'de henüz bu konuda yapılmış bilimsel araştırma bulunmamaktadır. Bu çalışma bu alanda bir ilk olma özelliğine sahiptir.

Her saha çalışmasında olduğu gibi bu çalışmada da ele alınan konuyla ilgili literatürün taranması çalışmanın ilk bölümünü oluşturmuştur. Ele aldığımız konu dindarlık suç ilişkisi olduğu için bu kavramların sosyal bilimler içinde, özellikle sosyolojik çalışmalarda nasıl ele alındığı öncelikle kısa olarak incelenmiştir. Bu incelemelerde özellikle dinin fonksiyonları üzerinde yoğunlaşan çalışmalar üzerinde durulmuştur. Yapılan incelemelerde konuya ilgili bütün önemli otoritelerin dinin ve dini değerlerin toplum ve birey için çok önemli fonksiyonları olduğu hususunu vurguladıkları görülmüştür.

Din ve dinin fonksiyonlarının her disiplin içinde disiplinlerin genel yaklaşımları ve ilgi alanlarına göre ele alındığı ve kendi bakış açılarıyla

198

konuyu değerlendirdikleri görülmektedir. Sosyologların toplum için dinin ne tür fonksiyonları olduğu üzerinde durdukları görülürken psikologların daha çok dinin birey için ne tür fonksiyonları olduğu üzerinde durdukları görülür. Antropologların ise dinin kökeni ve pirimitiv toplumlardaki fonksiyonlarını ele aldıkları görülmektedir.

Diğer taraftan suç'un ele alındığı literatürde suç kavramının suçun ele alındığı toplumun kültürel yapısıyla ilişkisi bağlamında değerlendirildiği, bu boyutun üzerinde özellikle durulduğu görülmektedir. 'Sosyal sapmaların' hangi türlerinin ve hangi derecelerinin suç olarak tanımlanacağı ve tanımlandığı konunun ele alındığı kültüre göre farklılık göstermektedir.

Suç ve dindarlık ilişkisinin araştırıldığı saha çalışmalarında dindarlıkla suç arasında ne tür bir ilişki olduğu saha çalışmalarında elde edilen verilere, elde edilen farklı sonuçlara göre değişik şekillerde açıklanmaktadır. Bu çalışmalarda dindarlıkla suç arasında negatif bir ilişki olduğunu gösteren çalışmalar ağırlıktadır. Ancak bu negatif ilişkinin çok değişik şekillerde açıklandığı görülmektedir (Ellis, 1985; 504).

Bu çalışmada temel olarak dindarlık ve suç arasında neden ve nasıl bir ilişki olduğu, özellikle neden negatif bir ilişki olabileceği üzerinde durulmuştur. Çalışmada kullanılan temel kavramların ilgili literatürde nasıl ele alındığı belirtildikten sonra bu açıklamalardan yola çıkılarak neden bu kavramlar arasında negatif bir ilişki olabileceği açıklanmaya çalışılmıştır.

Bu bağlamda öncelikle sosyal kontrol kavramı üzerinde durulmuş ve toplumun en büyük ve etkin sosyal kontrol aracı olan kanunların sosyal

kontrol fonksiyonları, kültürel kaynakları ve bu kaynaklarla dini değerlerin ve kuralların ilişkisi irdelenmiştir.

Kanunların temelinde kanunların yapıldığı toplumun kültürel yapısının en belirleyici faktör olduğunu ileri süren teorilerden yola çıkarak dini değerlerin ve kuralların kanunların oluşturulmasında ne tür etkileri olabileceği "kanunların kaynakları ve dini değerler" başlığı altında incelenmiştir. Bu noktada konumuz açısından üzerinde durulması gereken en önemli konu dini kuralların yapılmasını yasakladığı davranışlar ile kanunların yapılmasını yasakladığı davranışlar arasındaki örtüşmedir. Bu örtüşmenin büyük boyutlarda olması dindarlıkla suç arasında neden negatif bir ilişki olabileceğini açıklamaya imkan sağlar. Çünkü dindarlık dinin kurallarına uymayı ifade eden bir kavramdır. Eğer bir kişi dinin kurallarına uyuyorsa ve bu kurallarda kanunların öngördüğü kurallarla örtüşüyorsa dindarlıkla suç arasında negatif bir ilişki olması beklenebilir. Elbetteki dindarlık ve suç ilişkisi birçok boyutu olan bir ilişkidir. Kanunun öngördüğü davranışlar ile dinin öngördüğü davranışların örtüşmesi sadece ilişkinin bir boyutunu ifade eder. Ayrıca bu ilişkinin gerçekten beklendiği gibi olup olmadığı bilimsel verilerle ortaya çıkarılmalıdır. Bu çalışmada üniversite öğrencilerinden elde edilen verilerle ilişkinin bu boyutuyla ilgili verilerin de toplanması öngörülmüştür. Ayrıca çalışmada dindarlığın kanunlara uyma; dolayısıyla suç işlememe davranışı üzerinde ne tür bir etkisi olduğu üzerinde durulmuş ve bu konuda veriler toplanmıştır. Çalışma ile bu konu ve benzer birçok konu değişik başlıklar altında incelenerek dinin sucu önleme hususunda ne tür sosyal kontrol fonksiyonları olabileceği ortaya çıkarılmaya çalışılmıştır.

Dinin ve dindarlığın suç işlemeyi azaltacağı düşünülen sosyal kontrol fonksiyonlarının irdelenmesinin yanında dindarlıkla suç işleme arasındaki ilişki verilerin toplandığı kişiler göz önünde bulundurularak bazı küçük suçlar bağlamında irdelenmiştir.

Dindarlık suç ilişkisinin ele alındığı araştırmaların en önemli noktası dindarlığın ölçülmesidir. Dindarlık nedir, nasıl ölçülmelidir? Yapılan literatür taramalarında irdelenen alan çalışmalarının farklı sonuçlar vermesinin büyük ölçüde kullanılan dindarlık ölçeklerinin farklılığından kaynaklandığı görülmüştür. Dindarlığın ölçülmesinin önemli olması düşüncesinden yola çıkılarak geliştirilen anket'in dindarlığı bütün yönleriyle ele alacak bir özellikte olmasına çalışılmıştır. Özellikle dindarlığın ölçülmesi için kullanılan soruların gerçektende anketi cevaplayanlar tarafından da dindarlığın ölçüldüğü sorular olarak kabul edilip edilmediğini anlamak için dindarlığı ölçen soruların, soruları cevaplayanlar açısından da dindarlığı ölçüp ölçmediği, anketi cevaplayanların dindar olup olmamasına bakılmaksızın tespit edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Örneğin, "iyi bir Müslüman günde beş vakit namaz kılmalıdır" önermesine dindarlığın bir ölçütü olarak katılıp katılmadıkları, kendi dindarlıklarına bakılmaksızın sorulmuş ve cevaplandırılmaları istenmiştir. Böylece dindarlığın ölçüldüğü soruların cevaplayıcılar açısından da dindarlığı ölçüp ölçmediği ortaya çıkarılmıştır.

Ayrıca literatürdeki araştırma sonuçları ve bu sonuçların elde edildiği araştırma soruları incelenerek dindarlık ölçeği olarak inanç boyutu ve amel boyutunun farklı sonuçlar verebileceği tespiti yapılmıştır. Bu tespitten

yola çıkılarak dindarlık inanç boyutu ve amel boyutu olmak üzere iki farklı boyutta ölçülmeye çalışılmıştır.

Anketi cevaplayan 435 öğrencinin %54'ü erkek %44.4'ü bayanlardan oluşmaktadır. Elde edilen verilere göre bu çalışmada kullanılan dindarlık sorularının anketi cevaplayanların %90'nına yakın bir bölümü tarafından da dindarlığı ölçen sorular olarak algılandığını göstermektedir.

Anne, baba, arkadaş ve sınıf arkadaşlarının dindarlığının nasıl algılandığının sorulduğu soruların cevaplarına göre ankete cevap veren üniversite öğrencileri en çok oranda annelerini (%71,5) dindar olarak algılamaktadır, daha sonra sırasıyla babalarını (%58) arkadaşlarını (%39,2) ve sınıf arkadaşlarını (%26) dindar olarak algılamaktadırlar.

Öğrencilerin dindarlıklarının ölçüldüğü soruların cevaplarına göre öğrencilerin farklı sorularla ölçülen dindarlıklarının farklılaştığı görülmektedir. Dindarlığın inanç boyutunun ölçüldüğü sorulara göre öğrencilerin %90'nının dindar olduğu görülmektedir. Örneğin, kıyamet gününe inanma, Allah'a hesap verme, cennet ve cehenneme inanma vs. gibi sorulara verilen cevaplara göre öğrencilerin %90'nının bunlara inandıkları ve dolayısıyla dindar olarak kabul edilebilecekleri görülmektedir.

Dindarlığın amel boyutuyla ölçüldüğü sorulara verilen cevaplara göre öğrencilerin %54,7'sinin 30 gün, %17,3' ünün 20 günden fazla Ramazan ayında oruç tuttukları görülmektedir. Günde 5 vakit namaz kıldığını söyleyenlerin oranı %19,5 iken, günde en az bir kere namaz kıldığını söyleyenlerin oranı %15,2'dir. Beklendiği gibi inanç boyutuna göre ölçülen

202

dindarlık düzeyleri, amel boyutuna göre ölçülen dindarlık düzeyinden daha yüksek çıkmaktadır. Dolayısıyla, bu çalışmada yapıldığı gibi dindarlığın her hangi bir konuyla ilişkisinin araştırıldığı çalışmalarda dindarlığın ölçülmesinde bu ayrımın yapılması; dindarlığın hangi boyutuyla ölçüldüğünün belirtilmesi sağlıklı sonuçlara ulaşabilmek için önemli bir ayrım olarak görülmektedir.

Kanunun suç saydığı bazı davranışların aynı zamanda günah olarak algılanıp algılanmadığının sorulduğu sorulara verilen cevaplara göre, ankete cevap veren öğrencilerin yaklaşık %90'ının "başkalarının malına, canına (yaralama ve öldürme) zarar verme, uyuşturucu kullanma" vs. gibi suçları aynı zamanda günah olarak algıladıkları görülmektedir. Bu cevaplar ve buna benzeyen sorulara öğrencilerin verdiği cevaplar öğrencilerin bazı önemli suçları aynı zamanda günah olarak algıladıklarını göstermektedir. Bu anlamda dindarlığın suça karşı önemli bir sosyal kontrol fonksiyonu yerine getirebileceği beklenebilir.

Ayrıca öğrencilere başkalarının malına veya canına zarar vermek gibi bir durumla karşılaşmaları durumunda kendilerini bu eylemden alıkoyacak en önemli faktörün ne olacağı sorulmuş, öğrencilerin %65'i bu soruyu bu eylemin günah olması sebebiyle işlemeyeceklerini belirterek cevaplandırmışlardır. Bu sonuç da dinin suça karşı suçu önleyici bir sosyal kontrol fonksiyonu üstlenebileceğini gösteren önemli bir bulgudur.

Aynı şekilde uyuşturucu kullanmakla ilgili soruya verilen cevaplarda öğrencilerin %40,9'u uyuşturucu kullanmayı hiç düşünmediklerini, çünkü uyuşturucu kullanmanın günah olduğunu belirtmişlerdir. Sağlığa zararlı

olması nedeniyle uyuşturucu kullanmayı düşünmeyenlerin oranı ise %44,7'dir. Bu sonuçlar ve benzeri sorulara verilen cevaplara göre dinin ve dini değerlerin önemli bir sosyal kontrol fonksiyonu üstlenebileceği görülmektedir. Ancak dinin bu sosyal kontrol fonksiyonlarının insanların suç işlemesini önleyip önleyemediğinin, farklı suçlara farklı etkisinin olup olmadığının, insanların suç işlemelerini etkileyen diğer faktörlerle dindarlığın ilişkisinin vs. araştırılarak dindarlık suç ilişkisinin bütün boyutları ile ortaya çıkarılması gerekmektedir.

Bu çalışmanın ana eksenini dinin ve dindarlığın, çeşitli yollarla suç konusunda oluşturduğu sosyal kontrol fonksiyonlarının ortaya çıkarılması oluşturmaktadır. Ancak çalışmada dindarlık ve suç işleme arasındaki ilişkinin irdelendiği bir bölüm de yer almaktadır. Bu bölümde araştırmanın örneklemi göz önünde bulundurularak dindarlık ile bazı küçük suçların işlenmesi arasındaki ilişki irdelenmiştir. Öncelikle dindarlığın inanç boyutu ve amel boyutu göz önünde bulundurularak yapılan dindarlık ölçümlerine göre dindarlık ile ele alınan suçlar arasında herhangi bir ilişki olup olmadığı araştırılmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçların dindarlığı gösteren yüzdelik dağılımları ile ele alınan suçlar arasında bir ilişki olup olmadığına; dindarlık oranı arttıkça suç işleme yüzdelerinin azalıp azalmadığına bakılmıştır. Sonuçlar yüzdelik dağılımlar itibariyle dindarlık ile suç işleme arasında negatif bir ilişki olduğunu göstermektedir. Bu ilişki inanç boyutu ile dindarlığın ele alınıp yapıldığı karşılaştırmalarda daha az belirgin iken dindarlığın amel boyutu ile ele alınıp dindarlık ile belirtilen suçlar arasındaki ilişki irdelendiğinde ilişkinin daha açık bir şekilde ortaya çıktığı görülmektedir.

Ayrıca ele alınan bu ilişkinin istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki olup olmadığının test edildiği Logistic Regression analizlerinin sonuçlarına göre en az bazı dindarlık ölçümleri ile (amel açısından yapılan ölçümler) ölçülen dindarlık ve ele alınan suçlar arasında negatif bir ilişkinin olduğu sonucu ortaya çıkmıştır. Ancak inanç boyutu açısından yapılan dindarlık ölçümlerine göre oluşturulan dindarlık ile ele alınan suçlar arasında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir ilişki bulunamamıştır.

Bu çalışma ile dindarlık suç ilişkisinin araştırılması yoluyla dinin ve dindarlığın sosyal kontrol fonksiyonlarının ortaya çıkarılması hedeflenmiştir. Çalışmada suç konusunda dinin oluşturduğu sosyal kontrol fonksiyonları, dinin ve dindarlığın diğer formal ve informal sosyal kontrol mekanizmalarıyla ilişkisi; onlara etkisi ve öğrencilerin tutumlarına yansıması vb. konular irdelenerek ortaya çıkarılmış, ancak bir davranış olarak suç işleme ile dindarlık arasındaki ilişkinin irdelenmesi suç olarak ele alınan küçük suçlarla sınırlı kalmıştır. Sonuçlarının dinin sosyal kontrol fonksiyonlarını ne ölçüde ortaya çıkardığı, çalışmada dinin ve dindarlığın tutumlara ve davranışlara etkisinin ayrı bölümler halinde ele alındığı ve bu bağlamda suç ile ilişkisinin araştırıldığı göz önünde bulundurularak değerlendirilmelidir.

Bilindiği gibi 'sosyal kontrol teorisi' herkesin prensip olarak suç işlemeye eğilimli olduğunu, ancak sosyalizasyon yoluyla insanların toplumla kurdukları bağın güçlülüğü nispetinde insanların bu eğilimlerinin ortadan kaldırılabildiğini ileri sürmektedir (Junger ve Polder, 1993; 416). En genel anlamda, çalışma ile dinin ve dindarlığın insanların toplumun formal ve

informal yapılarıyla bağ oluşturmalarını nasıl etkilediği, onları topluma ne düzeyde ve hangi yollarla entegre edebildiği, tutumlarını nasıl değiştirebildiği ve bu yollarla nasıl bir sosyal kontrol oluşturabildiği araştırılmıştır. Dinin ve dindarlığın bu sosyal kontrol fonksiyonunun yanında bir davranış olarak suç işleme ile dindarlık arasındaki ilişkide ayrıca araştırılmıştır.

Değişik başlıklar altında değerlendirilen verilerden dinin ve dindarlığın insanların tutumlarında toplumun formal ve informal sosyal kontrol mekanizmalarının kurallarıyla uyumlu tutumlar geliştirmelerine katkıda bulunarak, insanların topluma entegre olmalarını artırıcı bir fonksiyon yerine getirdiği ve 'sosyal kontrol' teorisinde ileri sürüldüğü anlamda insanların suç işlemelerini azaltacak yönde etkilediği sonucu ortaya çıkmaktadır. Ayrıca dindarlığın bir davranış olarak insanların suç işlemelerine etkiyle ilgili elde edilen verilerden çalışmanın örneklemi göz önünde bulundurularak ele alınan bazı küçük suçlarla dindarlığın bazı ölçümleri arasında negatif bir ilişki olduğu görülmüştür. Ancak, dinin ve dindarlığın sahip olduğu bu sosyal kontrol fonksiyonunun bir davranış olarak büyük suçları işleme ve diğer konularda hangi düzeylerde ve hangi yollarla ne tür sonuçlar verdiği; dindarlığın yol açtığı tutumların davranışlara nasıl yansıdığı yeni çalışmalarla ortaya çıkarılmalıdır.

VITA

Tacettin Güneş was born in İhsaniye on March 18, 1965. He received his B.S
degree in Sociology from Middle East Technical University in 1989 and M.S.
degree in Sociology from the Middle East Technical University in 1993. He
has been working in Youth National Agency. His main areas of interests are
family, family members and youth's problems in general.