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ABSTRACT

DOES RELIGION MATTER?
A TEST OF TWO CLASSICAL THEORIES OF CRIME ON TWO RELIGIOUS TYPES

By

Jill Hume Harrison
University of New Hampshire, September, 2005

This study uniquely examines two religious types and a control group of nonreligious respondents in relation to two classical theories of crime and deviant behavior. The first objective of this research is to determine whether a conventional religion, Methodism, deters crime and deviant behavior better than an unconventional religious type, Shambhala Buddhism, and a control group of nonreligious respondents. The second objective of this research is to examine the predictive capacities of measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. Constructs for these theories are used to determine the magnitude of mediating and moderating effects on the religion-deviance relationship. I test four separate deviance indices of 1) minor forms of deviance, 2) sexual deviance, 3) illegal drugs and excessive alcohol use, and 4) violent and criminal behavior with ordinary least square regression models on a sample that contains approximately n = 100 of each religious type (n = 305). Both Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) theory of differential
association are predicted to intervene in the religion-deviance relationship, although
evidence for such power is lacking on adult samples and comparative religious
affiliations. Analysis of the direct effects of religious type on four deviant outcomes
shows that nonreligious respondents and Methodists are very similar on all four
measures. Ordinary least squares regression is used to test main effects and partial
effects are examined through mediator and moderator models. Contradicting some of
the literature on the religion-deviance relationship, a traditional religious type does
not reduce deviant and criminal behavior significantly better than the non-affiliated
individuals in the control group. Consistent with some of the research on new
religious movements, however, people who belong to the nontraditional religious type
(Shambhala Buddhism) are significantly more likely than people who belong to a
traditional religion (Methodism) to engage in deviant behavior. While mediator
models show that social bonds and associations with deviant friends can partially
reduce the effect religious type has on deviant outcomes, little evidence surfaced that
these theoretical constructs can significantly moderate the religion-deviance
relationship.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Are Judeo-Christian religions better able to deter crime and deviance than other religions? If people practice a non-traditional religion, should sociologists characterize them as "deviant"? This dissertation addresses these and other questions by comparing people of two different types of religion and a control group of non-religious respondents. The first research objective is to determine whether a conventional religion deters deviant behavior significantly better than a non-conventional religion or no religion at all. Methodism is used as the conventional religious type; Shambhala Buddhism, a "westernized" version of Tibetan Buddhism brought to the United States in the mid-1970s, is used as the unconventional religion; and people who self-identify as having no religious affiliation are used as a control group. The second research objective is to test the possible mediating and moderating effects of Hirschi's (1969) theory of social control and Sutherland's (1947) theory of differential association. I examine whether social bonds, deviant friends and unconventional attitudes can discern mediating and moderating effects of religious types on four separate indices of general, sexual, drug and alcohol, and criminal behavior characteristics. The current Bush Administration apparently believes that the way to improve moral order is to support the role of religion in society. Thus the questions that this dissertation addresses have contemporary, social policy implications as well as theoretical importance.
This chapter is organized in three sections. First I discuss the hypotheses to be tested, include definitions of deviance, and outline the four indices I use as my dependent measures. In this section, I also give a brief account of why I chose the religious types and theoretical perspectives I use. Initial experiences with a Shambhala Buddhist community caused me to suspect that certain socializing aspects might lead to more specific deviant outcomes, and based on these assumptions I chose the theories and the comparative religious type of Methodists that I did.\(^1\)

Secondly, I discuss some of the literature that provides the basis for this study. Finally, I introduce how Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are used to help explain these possible religious variations of deviance and criminal activity. I conclude this chapter with theoretical models for testing each hypothesis.

**Specific Aims**

In this study, I test three hypotheses. My first hypothesis predicts that a conventional religion deters deviant behavior significantly better than other religious types. The second hypothesis predicts that the measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory can predict the effect of religious type on four deviant outcomes by reducing the effect of the religious affiliation on four deviant outcomes. The third hypothesis uses these same outcomes and predicts that measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory can buffer the effect of a religious type on deviant and criminal behaviors through the use of interaction terms.

---

\(^1\) This researcher lived and worked at a northern New England Shambhala Buddhist meditation center for nine months prior to her graduate studies at the University of New Hampshire.
For this dissertation, I use Cohen's (1959) definition that deviant behavior is behavior that violates institutionalized expectations that are shared, recognized, and viewed as legitimate within a social system. I also incorporate Cloward and Ohlin's (1960) definition of a deviant act, which states that a deviance is activity or behavior that violates basic social norms within a society. Based on these definitions, I construct four different types of deviant outcomes. These measures are indices that represent minor forms of deviance, which I refer to as general deviance, sexual deviance, illegal drug and alcohol use, and violence and criminal activity. The specific attributes for each index are listed in the appendix; however I briefly review them here. I construct indices that separate four different areas of deviant and criminal behaviors because based on qualitative data, I suspected that Shambhala Buddhists may be more sexually deviant and use more illegal drugs and alcohol than other religious types. Conversely, I did not expect them to be significantly different from other religious types on constructs designed to measure general or minor forms of deviance or on violence and criminal measures.

Specifically, I construct the measure of *general deviance* as minor behavior that violates basic norms in society, and to this end, this index includes items such as: 1) taking someone else's car without permission; 2) avoiding paying their share of a bill at a restaurant; 3) spying on neighbors or coworkers; 4) lying on income taxes; 5) running a red light; and 6) taking something worth $5 or less from one's place of

---

2 These measures of deviant and criminal activities are composite scores adapted from the adult cohort section of Elliott and Ageton's (1980) National Youth Survey Scale of Delinquent Behaviors.

3 The term "religious type" refers to respondents' religious affiliation rather than belonging to one congregation or specific religious group. The sample contains Methodists and Shambhala Buddhists, although approximately ten of this latter group identify themselves as simply "Buddhists" or "Tibetan Buddhists."
work. My initial working hypothesis suspected little variation by all three religious types and that average scores for each “religious” affiliation would be very similar.

I construct the sexual deviance index with these measures: 1) lying to a spouse or partner; 2) cheating on a spouse or partner; 3) engaging in casual sexual relationships; 4) having two or more sexual partners at once; and 5) engaging in homosexual activity. Because I knew that the spiritual leadership of Shambhala Buddhism engaged in some of these sexually deviant characteristics themselves (Elders 2004), I predicted that the respondents of this unconventional religious type would have significantly higher scores on this index. These cultural aspects associated with sexual deviance of the Shambhala Buddhists are explored more deeply in chapter two.

I also construct an index that measures respondents' illegal drug use and excessive alcohol consumption. This index asks respondents if 1) they ever consume 5 or more drinks in a single sitting; 2) if they ever drink to get drunk; 3) if they ever use prescription drugs without a prescription; 4) if they ever use marijuana; and 5) if they ever use “harder” drugs like cocaine, heroin or ecstasy. Like the sexual deviance index, this index is thought to capture some unique variation specific to Shambhala Buddhism based on initial interview data from senior students of the founder, Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche. I chose to separate these measures from other deviant outcomes, believing that Shambhala Buddhists might be more likely to have higher average scores than the other two religious types. For example, rice wine, sake, is a traditional drink in almost all Shambhala Buddhist activities and is incorporated into religious rituals at every level. Feasts associated with various religious practices also
include beer and wine. Conversations with senior students also document experimentation with hallucinogens, and this was particularly true during “the early years” when Shambhala Buddhism first came to the United States in the 1970’s (Midal 2003; Hillard 1997; Newman 2000; Prenner 2001).

The last of the four outcomes is an index for violence, the threat of violence, and criminal activity. This index includes questions on whether the respondents 1) have ever taken anything worth $50 or more from their workplace; 2) have ever been arrested for driving while intoxicated (DWI); 3) have ever knowingly damaged or destroyed property belonging to someone else; 4) have ever hit or threaten to hit a family member or friend; 5) have ever forced a person to have sexual relations against their will; 6) have ever attacked someone with the intent to seriously hurt or kill someone; and 7) have ever spent time in jail for something other than a motor vehicle related incident. Given that this is an adult population, I suspected few or no significant differences between the religious types on this index.

To make these comparisons between religious types and the four outcomes of general, sexual, drug and alcohol use, and violent and criminal behavior, I adopt as a starting point Kornhauser’s (1978) argument that cultural universals exist in all societies – regardless of religious type - and for this reason, expectations for shared normative standards, particularly on the constructs for violence and crime, permit the comparison of a traditional religion, Methodism, to an unconventional one, Shambhala Buddhism. Through these normative and conventional standards it is argued that society is able to maintain a collective, moral fabric that keeps deviance and crime at bay (Durkheim 1897; 1915; Parsons 1964; Merton 1968). Kroeber and
Kluckhon (1963) also support this notion by stating that many identical values prevail throughout all societies and are controlled through law, although how normative they are may vary from culture to culture. They argue that “human life is… a moral life … because it is a social life” (Kroeber and Kluckhon 1963:353), and this echoes earlier works by Durkheim (1897; 1915), Parsons (1964) and Merton (1968) that support the idea that religious principles are an important part of maintaining a cohesive social and moral order. Thus, the underlying assumption for this study is rooted deeply in the literature: religiosity does matter, and it is the religious members of society who are least likely to violate social norms and moral codes (Stark and Bainbridge 1998; Cochran and Akers 1989; Bell, Weschsler and Johnston 1997; Howard and Dowd 1994; Francis 1997; Burkett and White 1974; Parsons 1964; Merton 1968).

Importantly, by comparing a conventional religious type with an unconventional religious type and a control group, conclusions as to whether significant differences exist between Methodists and Shambhala Buddhists can be made methodically, knowing that variations have not occurred by happenstance, accident, or chance.

I chose the religious types and theoretical perspectives I did because initial experiences with a Shambhala Buddhist community caused me to suspect that certain culturally induced aspects might lead to differences on specific deviant outcomes. And if the Shambhala Buddhists were significantly different, this would be a new finding since they have never been studied in comparative research design before. Also based on what I suspected, I never thought of this group as particularly willful violators of social norms or criminal activity. Leading a religious or spiritual life seemed important enough to them to seek out a new religious movement with which
to identify, yet ties to deviant behavior within this alternative in religious identity was a big unknown. Lacking any social science evidence to the contrary, I thought it would be interesting to pursue some of these suspicions empirically. Because of these initial ideas upon which I began to organize this study, I constructed the four distinct indices of deviant and criminal behaviors to tease out whether and how significantly different the Shambhala Buddhists might be relative to other religious types. The basis for the suspicions of higher average drug and alcohol use and sexual deviance measures relative to Methodists and the control group of non-religious respondents is explained in more detail in chapter two.

These initial inclinations in variations of deviant behavior and/or possible conformity due to social ties to work and family are also the rationale I adopt for testing both Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory and Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory. If there are significant differences in the types of deviant activities by religious type, then a theoretical perspective that incorporates a possible subculture effect is important to consider by using measures for Sutherland’s (1947) theory. Conversely, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory captures the many normative values and moral activities that I also thought I would find among the Shambhala Buddhists. I know that many Shambhala Buddhists have conventional ties to family, work, and other community activities outside of their unconventional religious affiliation. Preliminary data collection and my own experiential knowledge of members in one meditation center brought me to realize that many Shambhala Buddhists had converted from Judeo-Christian religions. Knowing this provided the

---

4 29% of the Shambhala Buddhists in this study report that their family’s original religious affiliation is Protestant, as compared with 18% who report their original family religious affiliation is Catholic;
basis for which the traditional religious group of Methodists was included in the sample. Specific attributes of Methodists as a religious type were also important considerations for inclusion. Unlike Christian Fundamentalists (e.g. Hertel and Hughes 1987; Glock and Stark 1965; Ammerman 1987; Medoff et al. 1992), Methodists' concepts of morality and acts of deviance were thought as having liberal views that may complement, or indeed parallel, those of the Shambhala Buddhist views, thus minimizing the variation of deviance and crime in the sample. In effect, by minimizing the differences between religious types, the study allows for a more straightforward test of the theoretical constructs of Hirschi (1969) social control theory and Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory.

Rationale for the Study

Current research on religion and crime and deviant behavior show mixed results on whether religiosity is a significant form of social control (Baier and Wright 2001). Baier and Wright examine sixty different research designs and report that the evidence of the effect of religion on crime is varied, contested, and often inconclusive. The results of their meta-analysis show that religion has a moderate effect on crime; however, they argue that comparisons between specific religions and with competing theoretical models are widely lacking, as are samples with adult populations. In fact, of the 60 studies they examine, only half use adults. None of the studies directly compares a conventional religious type with a new religious movement (NRM) or unconventional religious type. Kloos (2000), Baier and Wright (2001) suggest that studying different religious denominations for specific religious

22% Buddhist; 4% Jewish; and 27% either having no religious affiliation or the affiliation was not listed.
effects on crime is an important step in advancing the literature in this area. From an EBSCO host search, there are only six recent studies that test specific religious denominations on deviant activities and only three of the six sample adult populations with separate outcomes of alcohol, marijuana, and rape (Welch, Tittle and Petee 1991; Stack and Kanavy 1983; Stack 1983). These studies primarily compare religious types along Durkheimian principles – they dichotomize Protestantism versus Catholicism rather than compare a traditional religious type with a non-traditional religious type. With such limited comparative research to date, Stark and Bainbridge (1998) argue that social science research has not adequately pursued the study of different religious affiliations vigorously enough, either empirically or theoretically.

Thus, this study is significant because it examines the theories of Hirschi’s (1969) control and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theories on four different types of deviant behavior and uses comparative religions with an adult sample. Another reason for choosing these classical sociological theories by Hirschi (1969) and Sutherland (1947) is that the research has routinely used them as general theories of crime that have primarily focused on explaining juvenile delinquency (see Akers and La Greca 1988, 1991; Akers et al. 1989; Sutherland and Cressey 1955; Hirschi 1969; Sampson and Laub 1993). Largely unexplored is the issue of whether these general theories can address adult populations and adult populations in religious settings. An EBSCO host search on religious types and Hirschi (1969) for studies with adults shows six journal articles (Burkett 1987; Cochran 1988, 1994; Linden 1977; Elifson 1983; Tittle 1983), and no articles at all that appear when querying Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory and religion. In sum, the literature
review in chapter two will demonstrate that much more research is needed in this area, not only to advance the discipline of sociology but to potentially advance the application of findings on the religion-deviance relationship in an applied fashion.

A secondary purpose of this dissertation is to acknowledge that social science research can be used in an applied way. The impact of religion on social behavior has broad policy implications. Specifically, it can address the presumably important connection between religion as a social control mechanism and its ability to thwart deviant and criminal behavior in society at large. For this reason, this research has implications for current political decisions and associated social policy. For example, I find this study to be particularly provocative as President George W. Bush continues to support his “faith based initiatives” where millions of federal tax dollars are channeled into Christian religious organizations (www.whitehouse.gov/government/fbci/) with the goal of strengthening the moral fabric of U.S. society. Although some grant monies are channeled into secular organizations including Muslim faith-based initiatives, the overwhelming theme is to support programs with traditional religious ties. For example, in a review of intermediary organizations that receive continuation grants from previous years, one-third of the 2004 recipients are easily - identifiable as Christian organizations. These organizations received over $8 million dollars, or one-third of the $23,736,484 total continuation grants dispersed by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families (2004). By contrast, universities received only half this amount, or $4,294,083 (www.acf.hhs.gov/grants). Less obvious are many organizations, such as the Institute for Youth Development, which received
$2.5 million, and it distributes sub-grants to programs with arguably conservative Christian agendas. For example, this organization awarded monies to the North Shore Christian School, Trinity Baptist Church, the Vision Before Victory Ministry, and a variety of pregnancy resource centers that promote pro-life policies (www.youthdevelopment.org/).

This support for faith-based initiatives, and arguably conservative Christian ones, is problematic because it creates a climate of exclusion for some organizations that do not see "eye to eye" with the current Administration policies. It also weakens the separation of church and state guaranteed under the First Amendment. According to Possami and Lee (2004), new religious movements and the fear of crime have had a significant influence on the creation of anti-cult legislation in France, where for the first time a western government has constructed legislation to potentially limit religious freedom and tolerance. The current Bush Administration presumably believes that the way to sustain moral order is to support the role of religion in society and has pursued a monetary vehicle, called the Compassion Fund, for such purposes.\(^5\)

I believe it is important to revisit this idea and the role religion plays in society as a form of social control based on these current political views. In order to keep the social and moral fabric in tact, particularly in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, I use these data to posit the appropriateness of faith-based initiatives that directs tax revenue into Christian organizations. The results of this study can either directly support this type of social policy or provide evidence against

\(^5\) The New York Times reported on Tuesday, May 3, 2005, that President Bush will provide $8 billion a year to religious-based groups. In the 2000 Presidential Campaign, Mr. Bush also asked Congress to approve new federal grants and change rules to make it easier for religious groups to apply for existing federal grant programs. Approved by Congress, the "Compassion Fund" dispersed $43 million to faith-based initiatives in 2004.
it. If religious affiliation is found to be irrelevant to various types of unethical and immoral behaviors, then policymakers might be forced to deal with other possible root causes of social problems rather than promote funding in support of specific religious doctrine and its associated ideas of morality and ethics (Medoff et al. 1992).

Theoretical Framework

The first hypothesis in this study establishes whether a religious type influences deviant and criminal behaviors. It tests the direct effects of a religious affiliation on the four distinct deviant outcomes of minor forms of deviance, sexual deviance, drug and alcohol use, and violence and criminal behavior. The second goal for hypotheses two and three is to test the ability of two classical theories, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory, as mediators and moderators in the relation between religious type and deviant outcomes. From a sociological viewpoint, these findings contribute to a small body of research illustrating the effects of religious affiliation on deviant outcomes, and secondly, assess the parsimony and predictability of these two classical theories of crime and deviant behavior on religiously-affiliated adults.

Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are used in this study because they test oppositional ideas about human behavior. For example, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory carries with it the underlying premise that human beings are subtly coerced into being “moral citizens” because of their attachments to social structures, such as family, friends, work, and community. Without these social bonds, humans are free to deviate. By contrast, Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory relies on the premise that
humans are fundamentally “moral citizens” from the start, and it is only through an intense socialization process that individuals either learn the ways of deviant and criminal activity or are socialized into conformity. Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory provides an avenue in which to address possible subcultural effects that may be found within an unconventional religious type, as are the Shambhala Buddhists in this study. By analyzing these theories in the same research design, I pose a theoretical tug of war in which the power of religious affiliation on deviant outcomes has the opportunity to play the position of referee. Are religions important social institutions for deterring crime and deviance, or should some be considered a catalyst that thrives from within a deviant subculture? This research puts these opposing views to the test.

I pose three central research questions: 1) To what extent does a traditional religious affiliation deter different kinds of deviant behavior better than other religious types? This question is diagrammed in Figure 1 on page 13, where religious type is regressed on four deviant outcomes. 2) To what extent can Hirschi’s (1969) social control and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theories reduce the effect of religious type on deviant and criminal behavior? This theoretical model is illustrated in Figure 2, which diagrams a mediating-effects hypothesis. This means that the construct of social bonds that represents Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and construct of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes that represent Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory will be able to significantly reduce the religion-deviance relationship. 3) To what extent can the constructs for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory
moderate the effect of religious type on deviant and criminal outcomes? This model is shown in Figure 3. This means the theoretical constructs of social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes are tested to see if they interact differently by each religious type such that a religious affiliation varies depending on the extent that social bonds or deviant friends and attitudes buffer that religion-crime relationship. By setting up the sample to contain Methodists, Shambhala Buddhists, and persons without a religious affiliation as a control group, the magnitude of social bonds and deviant friends and unconventional attitudes and religious affiliation on four separate deviant outcomes can be ascertained.

Model #1 illustrates testing of the direct relationship between religious type and the four different measures of deviance. Model #2 shows the mediating effects model, and Model #3 shows the moderating effects model. In chapter three, I provide more information and outline the specific hypotheses for each model shown here.

1. Model #1: Main Effects Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Religious&quot; Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n= (approx. 100 of each religious type): Methodists, Shambhala Buddhists; No Religion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Deviant Indices
- Subscale 1: general deviance
- Subscale 2: sexual deviance
- Subscale 3: drugs and alcohol
- Subscale 4: crime and violence

In the second model, the components of the two theories are tested for mediating effects. Two indices represent the unique components of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. By adding these indices to the model, these two theoretical constructs are tested to see if
2. Model #2: The Mediating - Effects Relationship

they reduce the effect in the relationship between religious type and the same four deviant measures used in model one. If there are significant mediating effects, the direct effect of religion type on deviance will be reduced. Essentially, the mediator model tests for spuriousness between religion and four deviant outcomes.

3. Theoretical Model #3: The Moderating - Effects Relationship

In the third model, moderating effects are examined. This model requires the use of interaction terms for each theoretical construct *times* each religious type. This model tests to what extent one or both theoretical perspectives moderate the effect of religious type on the same four measures of deviance. In other words, this model examines how the effect of measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and
Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory interact to cause different changes for each religious type on the deviant outcomes. This is discussed in more detail in chapter three and again in the results section of chapter five.

In conclusion, this research is challenging on several fronts. It is the first comparative religious study to directly test specific areas of deviant and criminal behavior on a conventional and unconventional religious type. It directly compares Shambhala Buddhists with Methodists, and this type of comparison is not present in any of the literature. Furthermore, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory have never been tested against one another or tried on “opposing” religious affiliations, so this study generates competition at two levels. First, it challenges the basic notion that belonging to a traditional religion significantly reduces deviant behavior and crime. Secondly, it determines the efficacy and parsimony of two classical theories of deviance as they compete to explain the religion-deviance relationship. Thus, the questions that this dissertation addresses have important theoretical importance and can be applied to guide contemporary social policy issues. Does religion matter? If so, how much importance can we — or should we — place in the effectiveness of religion to help sustain the moral order of society?

Organization of Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into six chapters. The literature review appears in the second chapter, and a thorough review of the methodology can be found in chapter three. Descriptive information about the sample is covered in chapter four. Results and discussion from the OLS regression models that examine mediating and
moderating effects appear in chapter five. This dissertation concludes with a
discussion of the central findings, its social policy implications, and makes
suggestions for future research in chapter six.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review is organized into three sections. I first discuss the studies on the effects of religious affiliation on crime and deviant behavior. In the second section, I turn to the literature on Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory, followed by a review of the literature of Sutherland’s (1947) theory of differential association. In the last section I provide an overview of the three religious types that I use and include related literature associated with new religious movements (NRMs). This section highlights Shambhala Buddhism, as this religious type is probably the least familiar to the reader.

Religion and Crime

Early sociological research that addresses the role of religion on crime and deviant behavior began over a century ago (Lombroso 1911; Durkheim 1895, 1915; Kvareceus 1946; Schur 1969; Bainbridge 1989), yet whether all types of religious beliefs can deter individual criminal behavior is still widely contested. Many of these studies (see Pope 1976; Tittle and Welch 1991; Stack 1983) are variations or replications of Durkheim’s (1895) classic work on suicide in which the samples consisted of comparing Catholics with Protestants rather than a traditional religious type with a nontraditional religious type (see Baier and Wright 2001). Some studies show little or no religious impact on deviant outcomes (Tittle and Welch 1983; Sherkat and Ellison 1999; Hirschi and Stark 1969; Ellis and Thompson 1989), while
fewer still show a dominant and robust effect of the religion-deviance relationship (Rohrbaugh and Jessor 1975; Chadwick and Top 1993).

For example, Tittle and Welch (1983, 1991) find that the geographic context in which religious participation occurs matters, and their results varied based on geographic location. Other studies found that religion provides a unique form of social integration that effectively reduces criminal activity (Sloane and Potvin 1986; Cochran 1987; Cochran and Akers 1989), providing more "across the board" support for the effect traditional religions have on deterring deviant behavior. Despite clear support of a religious affiliation to control crime and deviant behavior, these studies ignore the use of a control group, relying instead on perceived levels of integration and commitment for a basis of comparison. Furthermore, their comparisons have utilized generalized crime rates rather than specific outcomes (Stark et al. 1980, 1982; Welch, Tittle and Petee 1991; Baier and Wright 2001), so it is unclear whether testing for specific types of devianee will produce similar results. The literature that contends that religion reduces crime and deviant behavior clearly focuses on traditional religions, showing that religious integration boosts conformity in the larger society. Cochran (1987), Cochran and Akers (1989), and Sloan and Potvin (1986) find that such trends appear to be more or less uniform across different conditions. This is an important consideration for this study because it is not known if Shambhala Buddhism will have the same effect as a traditional religious type found in these earlier studies. From a social control perspective, the extra bond that they have to their religion affiliation may or may not be helpful in deterring crime and deviant
behavior, particularly when compared to the control group of nonreligious respondents.

The research is sparse on whether there is a religious effect on reducing crime and deviant behavior in adult populations. There are three studies that use adults in their research designs (Welch, Title and Petee 1991; Stack and Kanavy 1983; Stack 1983), and one study from Tokyo that considers why adults might choose an unconventional religion over a conventional one (Miller 1992). Welch et al. (1991) found that individual beliefs and participation in the religious community have a significant effect on drug and alcohol use while other studies have found little religious effects outside “mainstream white populations” (Amey, Albrecht and Miller 1996). But because my research utilizes an overwhelmingly white and mostly “mainstream” sample of well-educated, upper middle-class adults, the expected findings should parallel these earlier results, particularly on the outcome of illegal drug and alcohol use. This study by Welch et al. (1991) however, does not provide evidence for a religious effect on other deviant outcomes, such as general or minor forms of deviance, sexual deviance, and violence and crime that I also use to explore the religion-deviance relationship in this dissertation.

Another study, now over twenty years old, considered the impact of religious ties on forcible rape. Stack and Kanavy (1983) examined the degree of religious integration on rape and found support for their religious integration hypothesis. Although I do not measure rape directly, this is one of the measures included in my index for violence and criminal behaviors. Stack and Kanavy’s (1983) sample consisted of adult Catholics and Protestants, and they based their design on
Durkheim's (1895) original idea that the greater the participation in religion, the greater the adherence to conventional social norms, the greater the number of religious regulations to follow, the greater the probability of less deviant behavior. The moral and social order brought about by religious affiliation should "spill-over," and have the effect of promoting order among members of the larger society (Stark and Kanavy 1983). Durkheim (1895) showed that the more integrated and regulated the Catholics were the lower the rate of suicide in comparison with Protestants (see also Pope 1976). For my purposes, these same principles guide the rationale for the violence and crime index. Religiously-oriented and religiously-integrated individuals may be less likely to engage in violence and crime, of which forcible rape or attempted rape is one indicator. Before now, however, there are no studies that compare these outcomes with both traditional and nontraditional religious groups.

A third study that considers the impact of religion on crime with an adult sample was conducted by Stack (1983). He found that the effect of religiosity on suicide was significant, contending that the decline of institutionalized religion results in increased suicide rates. Although suicide is not a dimension that I use, Stack's (1983) research clearly highlights the important link that continues to be found between religiosity and deviant behavior in adult populations.

Finally, Miller (1992) explored the religion-deviance connection in Tokyo and concludes that weak social bonds can cause an individual to join an unconventional religious organization. Miller (1992) uses principles of Hirschi's (1969) social control theory where weaker levels of commitment and attachments to the larger society were found to increase the likelihood of joining a "deviant" religious organization. His
findings are important to consider for replication purposes here. To support Miller’s (1992) conclusions, the religious effect of Shambhala Buddhism must be reduced or disappear entirely when the level of social bonds are controlled. This is examined by employing a mediating effects model, which is explained in more detail in the next chapter.

In the next two sections, I continue to examine the literature on Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and then turn to Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. In addition to a review of the literature and how it applies to this study, I also outline the unique elements of each theoretical perspective and briefly explain how these components are operationalized as indices to test for mediating and moderating effects of the religion-deviance relationship.

**Hirschi’s (1969) Social Control Theory**

Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory is important for this study because it tests the strengths of the social bonds that the respondents have to family, friends, and community. Social bonds are the levels of commitment, attachment, involvement, and belief one has that ties him or her to the larger society. For example, someone with “strong social bonds” would be characterized as someone who respects the police, never breaks the law, works or goes to school full time, engages in civic duties or volunteers in the community, and is a good friend, father, coach, and so on. If social bonds are strong, deviant behavior is curbed regardless of religious affiliation. Applying Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory means that respondents with strong social bonds are less likely to engage in deviant and criminal outcomes than respondents with weaker social bonds.
By contrast, persons with "weaker bonds" are more likely to deviate because they have less to lose from their actions than those with stronger conventional ties. Essentially, this belief is critical of human nature: unless there are social institutions to inhibit behavior, criminal and deviant activity is likely to surface. Therefore, Hirschi utilizes four types of bonds that he believes are critical to quelling these "natural" human tendencies. Because this is an important piece of the theoretical design in this research, I briefly outline each type of social bond below.

**Commitment** refers to the degree to which individuals are vested in conventional behavior. It addresses the question, "What can the individual lose as a consequence of deviant behavior?" For example, an assumption about religious samples is that their religious bonds provide a form of social control (Bainbridge 1989; Marcos, Bahr, and Johnson 1986; Sampson and Laub 1990). Such persons with strong social bonds are committed to society. For this study, this implies that only two religious types, and not the control group of nonreligulous respondents, are more aptly capable of deterring crime and deviant behavior based on their level of integration – or bonds – to society. For this measure, I ask respondents to rate the statement, "My family is the most important thing in my life."

**Attachment** refers to interpersonal relationships. Hirschi (1969) conceives of attachment as sensitivity to the opinions of others. Individuals with strong interpersonal relationships are more concerned about how others perceive them, and as a result, this inhibits deviance and criminal activity. Individuals are less likely to risk their reputation through non-socially sanctioned behavior. Attachments to spouses and parents are often cited (Liska 1981; Kornhauser 1978; Sampson and
Laub 1990; Miller 1992; Redmon 2000), and this study uses similar constructs. For example, respondents are asked to rate the statement, "I believe it's important to help others who are less fortunate than myself." And also, "It's important to me what other members of my (religious) community think of me."

Involvement refers to the concept of engaging in conventional activities that give individuals less opportunity to commit deviant acts. This idea, "that idle hands are the devil's workshop" (Hirschi 1969), reduces deviant activity because the engagement in meaningful time-consuming hobbies, civic duties, or work, limits the individual's time and energy to do unsanctioned, non-normative activities. The measure for "involvement" in this study incorporates their willingness to work hard at their job and have limited free time due to their work, community, and family obligations. For example in this study, respondents are asked to rate the statement, "Between work, family, and community activities, I don't have much free time."

Belief is the fourth component of Hirschi's (1969) social control theory. This concept is based on the absence of effective belief in the conventional culture. In this sense, it is similar to Durkheim's (1895) concept of anomie, where normlessness is the basis for non-normative, unsanctioned behavior. If the sample population does not believe that conventional norms are worth following, deviant behavior may occur. This study asks respondents the degree to which they respect and abide by the law. For example, respondents rate the statement, "I have a great deal of respect for the police."

Control theory principles have, of course, been used in a variety of past studies, but these studies have focused almost exclusively on membership in more
deviant and arguably "new age" cults (see Dawson 1998) and predominantly tested among juveniles (Hindelang 1970; Rathus and Siegel 1973; Gottfredson and Hirschi 1989; Horwitz 1990; Akers 1996, 1998; Costello 1997; Matuseda 1997, 1998). Some research has criticized control theory for naively assuming value consensus among all members of society (Empey 1985), and this is a continued criticism of this study. There does appear to be widespread acceptance of the moral validity of "conventional social norms," and there is consensus in the literature on what is acceptable and unacceptable behavior within a given societal context (see Hardacre 1984; Nakane 1973; Smith 1985). This general agreement is the basis for support of the type of design I use here.

*Sutherland's (1947) Differential Association Theory*

By contrast, Sutherland (1947) argues that deviance is learned behavior, and that it occurs in intimate social groups through face-to-face interactions. His research downplays the importance of social structures and instead encourages the understanding of deviance through the associations involved in transmitting and learning any behavior, deviant or conforming. When individuals are selectively or differentially exposed to delinquent companions, Sutherland argues that they are likely to acquire "an excess of definitions favorable" to violation of the law over definitions unfavorable to violation of the law. Such individuals consequently engage in deviant activity. Sutherland's (1947) theory of differential association addresses the possible reasons why socialization into a deviant subculture is posited for the Shambhala Buddhists. The reason for this is that Shambhala Buddhism is considered a new religious movement for some, possibly a cult by others, and by controlling for
deviant friends and unconventional attitudes in the sample, a clearer picture of exactly who the Shambhala Buddhists are relative to the other religious types can emerge.

According to Sutherland's (1947) theory of differential association, individuals learn and internalize attitudes that are favorable or non-favorable toward violating the law and engaging in deviant activity through their friends and colleagues. The theory holds that as they associate more with deviant reference groups, their attitudes towards deviance and criminal involvement will increase. This social learning process is examined through the individual's definitions toward crime; others' definitions toward crime; and contact with criminal friends. If there is a subculture effect, the expectation is that Shambhala Buddhists will have significantly higher scores on some or all of the deviant outcomes relative to the other religious types in the sample. Below I outline these three key theoretical components found in the literature for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory.

Individual attitudes toward crime draw on an individual’s degree of tolerance for deviant and criminal behavior, the moral validity of violating the law, and the level of agreement with committing deviant acts. As in previous studies (Akers et al. 1989; Jackson, Tittle, and Burke 1986; Short 1960), this concept can be measured by asking the individual to rate levels of approval or disapproval with a Likert Scale to statements like, *No matter how small the crime, breaking the law is a serious matter.* And a second item, *It is morally wrong to break the law* (Jackson et al. 1986; Matsueda 1989; Silberman 1976; Tittle et al. 1986). To measure adults’ willingness to break the law, other studies have included these items (Krohn, Lanza-Kaduce and Akers 1984; Short 1960): *If someone insulted me, I would be likely to hit or slap*
them, and If breaking the law really doesn't hurt anyone, and you can make a quick buck doing it, then it's really not all that wrong (Burton 1991). I utilize these same measures for a composite score representative of Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory concepts. The complete list of items for this index can be found in the appendix.

Others' definitions toward crime explain how friends and acquaintances can influence individuals. Respondents who have attitudes favorable toward law violation and unconventional attitudes may be socialized into unconventional ways by their peer group or within intimate social settings (Sutherland 1947). The individual is exposed to these definitions, and through this exposure in a primary group, learns attitudes that favor breaking the law (Akers et al. 1979; Cressey 1953; Dull 1983; Griffen and Griffen 1978; Jaquith 1981; Johnson et al. 1987; Short 1960; Tittle et al. 1986; Matsueda 1992; Heimer and Matsueda 1994). This measure can be captured by the following three items: 1) Many of the people I associate with think it's okay to break the law if you can get away with it. 2) Most of the people I associate with would never break the law. 3) I am often in situations where people encourage me to do something illegal. These items are also incorporated into the differential association index used in this analysis.

Having criminal friends is the third measure of Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory. The number of criminal friends and the degree of interaction with them are measured (Akers et al. 1979; Dull 1983; Johnson et al. 1987; Warr and Stafford 1993; Winfree, Griffeth, and Sellers 1989; Alardi, Burton, and Cullen 2000). In Alardi et al. (2000), their model included, In the last 12 months,
how many of your five closest friends have done something they could have gotten arrested for? And I also incorporate this measure in my differential association index.

Empirical studies that have tested the strength of Sutherland’s (1947) theory and Hirschi’s (1969) theory do point to slightly greater explanatory power for differential association measures for adults on some variables (Benda 1994; Conger 1976; Kandel and Davies 1991; Macdonald 1989; Matsueda 1992; Matsueda and Heimer 1987, 1994). The research done in adult settings on Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory (Akers 1998; Akers and LaGreca 1988, 1991; Akers et al 1989; Boeringer, Shehan and Akers 1991; Dull 1983; Orcutt 1987; Tittle, Burke, and Jackson 1986) suggests that having conforming adult social reference groups can reduce criminal behavior. For social control theory (Hirschi 1969), the research also supports this position (Horney, Osgood, and Marshall 1995; Lasley 1988; Sampson and Laub 1993), but Cullen, Alarid and Burton (2000) argue that it is limited. In their study, Cullen, Alarid and Burton (2000) suggest that although several adult tests of social control and differential association measures have assessed deterrence, low self control, social learning theory, strain, and sub-cultural theory measures (see Burton et al. 1994; Ginsberg and Greenley 1978; Makkai and Braithwaite 1991; Tittle 1980), comparative tests are few and worthy of further exploration. Other research suggests that it would be useful to examine the applicability of general crime theories in other venues besides traditional western criminal settings, such as among youth gangs or religious cults, to advance the literature on crime and deviance (Miller 1992). By testing both social control and differential association constructs in this study, support for, or rejection of, these earlier research findings can be reached.
To conclude this chapter, I now provide some background related to the literature on the three religious types I use in my study. These types are Methodists, Shambhala Buddhists, and a control group of nonreligious respondents.

**Overview of the Three Religious Types**

This research project consisted of recruiting individuals from each of the three religious types, with the total \( n \) goal of having 100 respondents from each affiliation.\(^6\) Methodists (\( n = 98 \)) were chosen as the conventional religion because of this researcher's family contacts with two Methodist churches in the New England area. Methodists were also chosen for inclusion because nearly one-third of those identifying as Shambhala Buddhists originally came from a Protestant background.

Based on the literature reviewed above, these respondents were considered to be the least likely to engage in deviant and criminal activities. They were also chosen for inclusion because primarily their "parent" religiosity of Protestantism is widely practiced or acknowledged among the majority (60%) of persons who have a religious affiliation in the United States (U.S. Census 2000). Methodists' norms are congruent with larger societal norms (Cochran 1994), and long-established and culturally acceptable codes of conduct, law, and civility are embedded in this religious type.

Shambhala Buddhists were chosen as the unconventional religion largely because I lived and worked at one of their northern New England meditation centers.

---

\(^6\) Most Methodists identify as "United Methodists" and come from the New England area. Most Shambhala Buddhists come from all over the United States and Europe but use a northern New England center for meditation practice. The Shambhala Buddhist sample contains 8 respondents who identify only as "Buddhists," and they are included in this portion of the sample. The majority of the control group of non-religious respondents also comes from New England, although their geographic origin is more varied. The geographic location of internet-users is not known.
prior to graduate studies at the University of New Hampshire. There are 103 Shambhala Buddhists who participated in this study. Because I still maintain contact with many persons, including senior students and teachers whom I met over the course of 9 months working at the business office at the retreat center, I was persuaded to include them as representing a nontraditional or unconventional religious type. From the outset, this group was a paradox. White, affluent, and well educated, they seemed more like members from traditional families with conventional social ties to the upper middle class rather than members of a “cult” or unorthodox religious movement.

The presumption made here for this study is that Shambhala Buddhism is outside the mainstream religions of Christianity because only 1% of the U.S. population declares “Buddhism” as their religious affiliation in the U.S. Census, and fewer still identify as Tibetan or Shambhala Buddhists. They are also intriguing to study because they have remained “below the radar screen” relative to other new religious movements (see Van Driel and Richardson 1988; Van Driel and Van Belzen 1990). Whereas the proliferation of new religious movements (NRMs) in western societies has evoked considerable opposition from the media and researchers alike (Beckford 1983; Richardson 1983; Van Driel and Van Belzen 1990), Shambhala Buddhists have not been critiqued in the same way. Perhaps because of this group’s closely associated ties with more traditional forms of Buddhism in general and Tibetan Buddhism in particular, it may be viewed as “more acceptable” nestled among other long-standing, eastern religious traditions. Certainly they have not been critiqued or condemned in the same way that other NRMs have in the media or social
science literature. The critiques of NMRs in the 1980s suggest that groups like Shambhala Buddhists must battle for legitimacy because they are often viewed as “deviant” by the dominant culture (Shupe and Bromley 1980; Shupe et al. 1983; Possami and Lee 2004), yet Shambhala Buddhists have not faced the same level of scrutiny that many other NRM have faced over recent years.

Although fundamentally “old” at its core, this “new” religion appeared in the United States in the early 1970’s and can be thought of as one of the many “New Religious Movements” after the post-1965 Cold War era (Miller 2003). Controversy has always accompanied the arrival of new religious ideas and practices in the United States, and Shambhala Buddhism was no exception.

Shambhala Buddhism may be considered “deviant” on two fronts. First, it meets the Stark and Bainbridge (1987) definition that because it is not a widely practiced religious type in the United States it is “deviant.” Only mainstream religions like Catholicism or Methodism are not considered deviant in this strict context. Second, and I consider this the more important reason for including this religious type, it is because this new religious movement may be potentially deviant due to the way it socializes its members away from mainstream values and norms. This assumption was first based on experiential knowledge of the researcher rather than any empirical findings from previous studies. In order to explain why Shambhala Buddhism might be more deviant due to the way it socializes its members, I give a brief overview.

Here I refer to critiques of the Moonies and the Unification Church, The Children of God (Transcendental Meditation), Hare Krishna, the Church of Scientology, the mass suicide in Jonestown, Guyana, and the Oregon-based commune of Bhagwan Rajneeshpuram. For a review of these critiques see Archer (1985), van Driel and Richardson (1988), Carter (1987), Wallis and Bruce (1986), Shupe and Bromley (1980), Richardson (1983).
Shambhala Buddhism first came to the United States and Europe as Tibetan Buddhism and slowly began a “western” transformation beginning in the 1970’s. Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche, a Tibetan monk, founded *Tail of the Tiger* meditation center in a small, northern New England town in the early 1970’s. With a devout group of approximately 30 members, many of whom are now senior teachers in the lineage today, its beginnings were humble. They lived communally in a dilapidated farmhouse. The people attracted by this lifestyle and Trungpa’s teachings were predominately white, well educated, and rebelling against their affluent, largely traditional Christian families. This early group of Tibetan Buddhists sought alternative religious thought and different ideas of morality and justice, largely reflected in their opposition to the Vietnam War (Midal 2003). Through Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche’s teachings and in the environment of a small, cloistered community, sanctions slowly began to disappear around what constituted “normative” behaviors, particularly in the areas of sex, and illicit drug and alcohol use. Both changes were in part supported by the larger “hippie culture” occurring in the United States at the time (Midal 2003; Coleman 2001). Coleman (2001) reports that the Beat subculture of the 1970’s created a sympathetic environment in which Buddhism could develop in the United States. Furthermore, “on a scale never before seen in Western society,” experimentation with psychedelic drugs like LSD seemed compatible with the exotic beliefs that Buddhism offered relative to Christianity and the mainstream culture (2001:65). More precisely, and although never a central tenet of Buddhism, Trungpa Rinpoche may have indirectly encouraged his followers to explore sex,

---

drugs or alcohol use as a way to connect with his teachings (Hilliard 1996; Newman 2001), and it is due to this information that I considered them appropriate for my study.

My connections with this group provided some evidence of non-normative attitudes around sexual behavior and illegal drug and alcohol use. I suspected that on measures of sexual deviance and illicit drug and alcohol consumption that the Shambhala Buddhists would be more deviant than other religious types. The reason I believed sexual deviance occurred was because the spiritual leaders themselves engaged in heterosexual and homosexual activity with two or more partners at once.

In informal interviews with senior students, many examples were provided that supported this notion. One senior student/teacher perhaps summed it up best in an email correspondence when he wrote (Prenner 2003),

I have some judgments about the Sakyong's past behavior (drinking and womanizing)… I might say that alcoholism, infidelity, and arrogance are in some sense supported by the community and to some degree I think they are a reflection of the past and present. Admittedly, alcoholism and infidelity are rampant in society as well, and one can argue that the Sakyong is merely adopting prevalent behaviors and showing that they are in no way an impediment to enlightenment. As a single person being part of a community that drinks and sleeps around is a helluva lot more appealing than being a Baptist. But, if I were married I'm not too sure I'd ever encourage my spouse to join the community if she wasn't already a member. For me, it would be like inviting her to be unfaithful. You know, maybe it is just way too unrealistic to expect fidelity in a relationship anyway. Allowing it or at least accepting it might be the truly sane approach [parentheses from the original].

In her unpublished doctoral dissertation, Lynn Elders (2004) further confirmed some of these same suspicions. In her dissertation, she documents that the spiritual leadership of Shambhala Buddhism engaged in homosexual relations and
trysts with married women. Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche had five wives, one “official” wife and at least four recognized consorts. Some of his older students, now senior teachers, also view his 41-year-old son, the Sakyong and the current spiritual leader of Shambhala International, as yet another “womanizer.” Elders (2004) also documents that another leader of Shambhala Buddhism, the Regent Osel Tenzig, died from AIDS in 1989. Prior to his death, criminal charges alleged that he knowingly engaged in unprotected homosexual and heterosexual relations with many members of the Shambhala Buddhist community and transferred the virus to at least two other members of the religious group. At least one individual later died of the disease (Elders 2004). Lady Diana J. Mukpo, Trungpa’s wife, recently issued this statement to the Shambhala International email distribution list, from which this sample was taken. Mukpo (2005) writes,

There is no doubt that the Vajra Regent Osel Tendzin continued to have unprotected sexual relationships with members of our sangha knowing that he was HIV-positive and failing to disclose that. This was a heinous violation of the student-teacher relationship, and we need to learn from this so that such an event or misuse of power can never again occur in our sangha. What the Vajra Regent did violated the Mahayana principle of not causing harm to others.

In the above statement, Lady Mukpo strongly denounces the sexually deviant activity of the Regent and states in the same address to the Shambhala community, called sangha, that “the Vidyadhara Chögyam Trungpa Rinpoche would never condone any behavior that would be harmful to others” (Mukpo 2005).

Shambhala Buddhists might in fact claim that they have become even more “mainstream,” over the years. They offer many programs to a wide variety of persons who can afford the $200-$300 price tag for a weekend of mountain biking with meditation; flower arranging; dance; and organic gardening. Recently they have
added several weekend programs geared toward gays and lesbians. Shambhala Buddhists might even claim that their religion is an equally potent source of social control, teaching a philosophical tenet of “basic goodness” of compassion and non-violence toward every living thing. Such principles are hardly new and can be found in all Buddhist traditions dating back over 2600 years before the existence of Christianity (Skilton 2003). The concept of compassion continues to be widely used by the Dalai Lama (2003) as the central thread of his teachings to the lay public, emphasizing it as an underlying principle of peace that is attainable and able to unite everyone in a volatile world.

The third group in this sample is a control group of non-religious respondents (n = 102). Approximately 9% of the U.S. population declares that they have either no religious affiliation, are agnostic, or atheists (Miller 2003). Within this sample, one-third of respondents claim to be “atheist” while the remainder claims no religious affiliation at all. Based on the review of previous studies, the nonreligious respondents are expected to deviate more than those with religious ties. Previous studies show that religious affiliation is an important social bond that can deter crime (Tittle and Welch 1983, 1991; Bainbridge 1989; Stark and Bainbridge 1987). As the nonreligious respondents had at least one less bond than everyone else, their deviance was expected to be more apparent, particularly expected in comparison with the Methodist respondents.

The importance of a control group is critical because it helps to clarify similarities and differences that occur between the Methodists and Shambhala
Buddhists. As the relationship between religious type and deviant outcomes needs to be a causal one, the nonreligious control group insures that changes to the deviant outcomes truly result from belonging to a religious type and not due to reasons unaccounted for in the statistical models. Including a control group of persons who claim no religious ties is crucial to make certain that the relationship between deviant outcomes and other religious types does not happen by chance or accident. In other words, the hypothesis can be confirmed only if the traditional religion is significantly less likely to deviate from Shambhala Buddhists and those with no religious ties at all.

Conversely, if I fail to take into account a control group of non-religious respondents, I cannot say with confidence that traditional religious types deter crime and deviant behavior better or that Methodists are significantly less deviant. This comparison group reflects neither traditional nor untraditional religious types. In sum, the use of a control group allows me to make more precise statements about the effect religious type has on deviance and criminal activity.

In conclusion, this study has two main objectives. Based on the literature, it seeks to confirm that a conventional religious type deters deviant behavior significantly better than an unconventional religious type. Secondly, it seeks to replicate the usefulness of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory by testing their mediating and moderating capabilities on the religion-deviance relationship. This research tests these two classical theories of crime and deviant behavior on two opposing religious identities in a way that is currently absent in the literature.
In the next chapter, I discuss the research methodology for this study. I provide information on how these religious types were recruited. I also address how the indices for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory and Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory are constructed. These theoretical indices are used in ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models to test for mediating and moderating effects. These outcomes hold tentative support for the studies reviewed here and open new dialogue for future research on the religion-deviance relationship.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

There are three main objectives of this study. The first objective is to determine the extent to which religious types affect different kinds of deviant and criminal behavior. The second and third objectives are to test the principal theoretical constructs of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory to examine mediating and moderating effects of the religious types on four subscales of deviance and crime. This chapter begins with a discussion of the research design, followed by six sections that address the study population, measurement, data collection methods, instrumentation, hypotheses, and data analysis.

Research Design

The research design consists of a purposive sample of three religious types that are used to test three hypotheses with standard quantitative data analysis techniques. The first hypothesis is that a traditional religious type can reduce criminal and deviant behavior. This hypothesis supports evidence presented in the literature review in chapter two that belonging to a conventional religion integrates and socializes its members into conforming to normative behaviors, attitudes, and actions of the larger society. As a result, members of a traditional religious type may be less deviant than members of a nontraditional religious type.
The second hypothesis states that Hirschi's (1969) social control theory and Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory can significantly reduce the effect of the religious type on four deviant outcomes. This hypothesis tests the degree to which conventional *social bonds* (Hirschi 1969) and *deviant friends and unconventional attitudes* (Sutherland 1947) intervene in the religion-deviance relationship. Support for Hirschi's (1969) theory means that *social bonds* reduce the effect religious identity has on crime and deviant behavior while support for Sutherland's (1947) theory means that a deviant socialization process explains the effect religious type has on deviance and crime.

The third hypothesis in this study states that Hirschi's (1969) social control theory and Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory can significantly moderate the effect of the religious type on deviant and criminal behavior. This hypothesis tests the buffering effects with an index for each theory on the religion-deviance relationship. In other words, the religion-deviance relationship becomes conditional upon levels of either *social bonds* (Hirschi 1969) or *deviant friends and unconventional attitudes* (Sutherland 1947). This moderating effects hypothesis uses interaction terms, and the hypothesis is supported when the interaction terms are significant in the regression models. This is an interesting hypothesis to test because there is no earlier research like this on which to predict the outcomes of these moderator-effects models.

In all models, three dichotomized religious types are used. These individuals are affiliated with either Methodists or Shambhala Buddhists. Persons without a religious affiliation are used as a control group. Once these individuals were recruited
for the sample, respondents completed either an on-line or paper version of a 209-item survey. A copy of this survey is included in the appendix.

To determine specific deviant outcomes by religious type, four subscales of deviant and criminal behavior are used for each hypothesis. These indices are adapted from the adult cohort section of National Youth Survey longitudinal study (Elliott and Ageton 1980) and are designed to measure (1) minor forms of deviance, which I call "general deviance," (2) sexual deviance; (3) illegal drug and alcohol use; and (4) violence and crime. Using ordinary least squares regression techniques (OLS), the extent of these four subscales is examined by religious type, and the control variables of age, gender, and marital status. Because the sample was overwhelming white/Caucasian (99%) and had similar educational backgrounds and reported family income, these typical control measures were left out of the OLS models. For hypotheses two and three, indices for the theoretical constructs of Hirschi's (1969) social bonds and Sutherland's (1947) deviant friends and unconventional attitudes were created and introduced into the analyses.

Study Population

Through purposive and snowball sampling techniques, the total sample of n = 305 was collected in a two-stage process. Purposive and snowball sampling allowed for the collection of approximately n = 100 in each religious affiliation. In the first stage, the Shambhala Buddhist portion of the sample was recruited. Their sociodemographic characteristics were summarized first for the basis of targeting the remainder of the sample of Methodists and persons without a religious affiliation. In stage two, Methodists and the No Religion Group were obtained approximately two
months later. Selected sample characteristics for all three religious types are shown in Table 1 in chapter four.

With the help of directors, pastors, church members, and senior staff, individuals from all three groups were contacted directly or through email distribution lists. An email to all members on the distribution lists gave general information about the project and provided a link to the web survey site, hosted by the University of New Hampshire’s office of Web Solutions. The website of www.db.unh.edu/surveys/religiousaffiliation began July 26, 2004 and closed December 1, 2004. On this web page respondents saw the title, “A Test of Classical Theories of Deviance on Religious Affiliations” along with the University of New Hampshire name and symbol of the clock tower at Thompson Hall.

The 209-item questionnaire took an average of 20 minutes to complete, consisting of a series of radio buttons, drop down menus, and short “fill in the blank” sections. To obtain the required n=100 individuals for each religious type in a timely manner, the dominant method was to recruit most of the participants through email addresses who were then invited to go to the web site of the survey instrument.

It is important to note that the study population is not randomly selected. Inferential statistics are based on the assumption of random sampling methods to obtain probability samples. According to Healey (1999), probability samples are the only type of sample that allows the researcher to use inferential statistical techniques to support any generalizations to the population under study. Because individuals of specific religious types were not randomly selected, the results cannot be generalized to other religious groups, Shambhala Buddhists, Methodists, or persons without
religious ties. An argument can also be made that these data are gathered cross-sectionally in two short time frames and in two different formats: both paper and web versions of the survey were used. In the first wave of data collection, Shambhala Buddhists’ respondents were targeted. This accommodated a purposive sampling strategy by which the sociodemographic information of the Methodists could be matched with the Shambhala Buddhist respondents. Methodists and nonreligious respondents in the control group were not targeted until two to three months later during the second wave of data collection. Speculation is also appropriate, as some real differences may occur between persons who completed the web version of the survey and those who completed the paper and pen version. Persons who were able to complete the on-line version might be significantly different from those individuals who did not choose, or could not choose to participate on-line, or those who completed a paper and pencil version of the instrument, which was filled out in the presence of the researcher.

The inclusion criteria for the sample was eighteen years or older and a current practicing member of one of the two religious types – Shambhala Buddhism or Methodism – or a nonreligious or atheist person 18 years and over to serve in the control group. After the website closed, the database included several cases that required deletion because they did not meet these inclusion specifications. Ten Buddhists were either 16 or 17 years of age, and their records were deleted because they did not meet the age requirement. Records of three Jewish respondents, two Catholics, and one Muslim were also deleted. These individual cases did not meet the specified religious types for inclusion. Five other cases were deleted because
respondents failed to complete less than one section of the seven sections of the survey. In all, 21 cases were removed from the database. Total study size remains at $n = 305$ individuals from the three different religious types. This breaks down into 103 Shambhala Buddhists; 98 Methodists; and 104 persons with no religious affiliation. Of this latter group, one-third ($n = 33$) reported their current religious status as "atheist." In all two hundred eighty surveys of the total ($n = 305$) were collected over the secure website.

Two immediate problems with the data collection come to mind. 1) It is possible that members in the sample could take the survey more than once. 2) Access was not restricted to the selected respondents. Based on the deletion of 21 cases, persons other than those intended may have completed the survey.

*The Shambhala Buddhists*

This section of the purposive sample was generated first, between the months of July and September 2004. Initially, completed paper and pen versions were obtained by visiting a Shambhala Buddhist meditation site in northern New England. While there, a distribution list of all registered Shambhala Buddhists was obtained, and an email describing the research, along with a link to the survey’s website, was electronically mailed to this distribution list at sanghaannounce.org. It is also through this electronic list that many Shambhala Buddhists have continued to inquire and comment on this research. Two such comments were noted in chapter two.

*The Methodists*

The second part of the sample was collected between September 1 to December 1, 2004. Practicing Methodists were also recruited from the New England
area. Like the Buddhists, the Methodists did not all come from the same congregation. Face to face recruitment also occurred, and invitations to participate in the research was extended via similar email distribution lists. Based on the summary demographic statistics of the Shambhala Buddhists, Methodists were recruited who were middle to upper middle class, disproportionately well educated; classified their race as white/Caucasian; and were approximately 35-55 years of age. With the help of clergy and senior church officials from two New England Methodist churches, potential participants were contacted to complete the 20 minute survey, either on-line or with a paper version of the same instrument. A total \( n = 98 \) Methodists are in the sample population.

The Control Group of No Religious Affiliation

The hypotheses in this study rely on a control group to make comparisons between the Methodists and the Shambhala Buddhists. Individuals for this control group were the most difficult to find. As a result, this part of the sample was also collected between September 1 - December 1, 2004 and involved using a variety of data collection techniques. Because these participants were not subject to similar methods of locating them, i.e. through a known church or religious organization, a snowball sampling technique was used in addition to advertising on the back of a newsletter distributed to 500 sociology students at the University of Rhode Island. The announcement in the newsletter simply asked students if they were interested in participating in a sociological study to go to the web address of the survey site. The researcher did not know the students, and the students received no reward or compensation for their participation. Like the recruitment of the Shambhala
Buddhists and Methodists, some of the participants of the control group also completed a paper and pen version of the survey. Despite having difficulty locating 100 participants for this control group, initial analyses found that the sociodemographic characteristics were surprisingly similar to the other religious types. Although the average age was lower and they were predominately single, this No Religion Group's race, family income, and educational attainment coincided with other religious types. A total of $n=104$ respondents comprise the No Religion Group of the sample.

Protection of Human Subjects

The University of New Hampshire’s Internal Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects approved this research in July 2004. Following the appropriate protocol as outlined by the IRB for scientific research, the purpose of the research was explained either in person for those respondents with paper and pen versions of the survey, or by reading the Informed Consent page on the web site. Individuals either signed two copies of the consent form, kept one for themselves, or clicked on a radio button to agree to their participation for the web version. Only by clicking on the radio button that said, “I understand the purpose of this research and agree to participate,” did individuals arrive at the first page of the on-line survey. For every person in the sample, the importance of maintaining anonymity and confidentially was honored. Participants were also guaranteed that all survey responses remain confidential, and they could choose to discontinue their participation at any time. The UNH office of Web Solutions hosted the survey site.
and guaranteed Internet participants’ computer ip addresses would never be revealed and all information would be securely and confidentially maintained.

The informed consent for the web version of the survey instrument was slightly different from the paper version. In the web version, participants were told that after each section of the survey was completed, they needed to click on a “Submit” button. This button did two things: it saved and stored all the data in that section and then brought the respondent to the next section of the survey. Once the radio button was clicked, the participant’s information was saved and could not be retrieved, erased, or answers changed. With paper versions of the survey, respondents were able to erase, change, or remove any answers in all sections. To this end, paper versions of the survey were more complete. There were several web cases where individuals started and then stopped, or haphazardly skipped through several sections, answering only small portions of all seven sections.

To maintain respondents’ anonymity and confidentiality, paper versions of the survey, informed consent forms, email addresses, the codebook, all data, and back-up disks are stored in a locked filing cabinet in the private office of the researcher at the University of Rhode Island.

**Selection Bias Issues**

It is evident that many selection bias issues need to be addressed at this point. Specifically, there are four areas of concern. First, the method used to collect the sample in this research is not a recognized sampling method, and recruitment for the sample was largely done through the internet or by contacting persons directly through church contacts, their email lists of its members, and acquaintances of the
researcher, the University of Rhode Island, and the Shambhala Buddhist meditation center in northern New England. In large measure, this is a sample of convenience and purposefully constructed to obtain equal numbers of Shambhala Buddhists, Methodists, and the control group of no religious affiliation for similar sociodemographic characteristics. Secondly, although most of the survey participants are thought to be from the New England area, there is no guarantee that other persons did not receive the email, or locate the website out of happenstance. Third, because data were collected over the Internet, persons with relatively easy access to a computer were better able to select themselves for inclusion than other potential respondents who may rely on public forms of access or had no access at all. For example, it is possible that persons who wished to participate could not respond because they did not receive the email, changed their email address, or had no email address at all. Fourth and finally, the database is incomplete. There are 209 data points that each individual needed to enter to complete all seven sections of survey instrument. Due to its length, individual constraints, boredom, or other factors, the on-line surveys were not always finished. Therefore, persons who elected to do the paper version tended to complete all survey questions whereas respondents who chose the web version did not. As a result, a decision was made to delete records of respondents who failed to complete the first and second sections of the electronic version. This decision was based on the need for sociodemographic information required in the first section, and in the second section, important deviant and criminal activities were missing. In the end and despite the convenience of a web-based sampling strategy, I might conclude that old fashion data collection methods that
consist of paper and pen may be more reliable. There is no doubt that posting the
survey on a website facilitated data collection within a reasonable timeframe. It also
cut down on costs, both for travel and time, and being away from work and family
responsibilities. For this reason, and despite its drawbacks, the web version of the
survey was utilized more frequently as data collection proceeded.

Data Collection and Procedures

I traveled to a Shambhala Buddhist center twice during the summer of 2004 to
begin data collection on the first wave of the sample. In the second wave, I also
traveled to Methodist churches in northern and southern New England. During these
site visits, clergy and laypersons, directors and senior Shambhala Buddhist students,
gave the researcher email lists of persons to contact that match the inclusion criteria.
The control group, persons with no religious affiliation, was collected in a slightly
different manner, as no organization or institution housed such members. This section
of the sample was derived by word of mouth, an advertisement in a sociology
brochure, and via local web sources. As with the Shambhala Buddhists and
Methodists, some “non-believers” completed paper and pencil versions of the survey.
In sum, the sample is a composite of respondents from each of the three religious
types in roughly the same proportion, of both paper and web versions of the survey
instrument.

Once the data from the Shambhala Buddhist portion of the sample were
collected, summary statistics of their sociodemographic characteristics were
tabulated, and the second wave of data collection of Methodists and the No Religion
Group began. This second wave of data collection occurred between September 1,
2004 and ran through December 1, 2004 of the same year. By collecting the data in two parts, similar sociodemographic characteristics were roughly matched between all three religious types.

From the University of New Hampshire’s office of Web Solutions which hosted the web survey, the researcher periodically received an excel attachment to an email with the most current information from the on-line survey. The excel file was then converted into a STATA, version 8.0 .dta file. This procedure was repeated several times until the web site closed on December 1, 2004. The final sample yielded a total n of 305, consisting of a database with approximately 63,000 total pieces of individual information from the sample population. Care was taken to reverse-code some variables, collapse others, dichotomize some, and to construct indices for the four dependent variables based on a composite score of general deviance measures, sexual deviance measures, drug and alcohol deviance measures, and violence and crime measures. These are discussed in detail in the next section.

**Measurement**

The unit of analysis is the individual. This method provided a rich source of individual level data, with over 63,000 pieces of information from 305 participants, which included measures on illegal drug use, criminal activity, and sexual deviance that have rarely been used in this type of research. It is possible that an individual completed the survey more than once; however statistical analyses reveal that there are no identical cases in the data set. It is important to recognize that the different levels of measurement used in constructing the four subscales of deviance (general, sexual, drug and alcohol, violence and crime) can result in several problems with
analyses. Two problems were taken into consideration: 1) multicollinearity between individual level factors and the indices; and 2) heteroscedasticity, particularly because large numbers of individual cases comprise portions of some of the dependent variables. A correlation matrix, shown and discussed in the following chapter, and diagnostic graphs for measurement variables indicate that neither problem impeded the results of this study.

Independent Variables

Independent variables used in this study are operationalized below. In the first series of regressions, religious affiliation is the independent variable of interest. The religious types are dummy-coded into three variables, 0 and 1. These are Methodists (Methodists = 1, non-Methodists = 0), Shambhala Buddhists (Shambhala Buddhists = 1, 0 = non-Shambhala Buddhists), and persons without a religious affiliation who serve as a control group were also dummy-coded as 1 = No Religion, 0 = religious type.

The control variable of marital status was not originally dichotomized. Of this group, there are 152 married respondents and 26 respondents who cohabitate with another adult. Three respondents were separated and 2 were widowed. I collapsed these data into a dummy coded variable by joining the cohabitating and married respondents together (married/partnered = 1) and by including the three separated and 2 divorced respondents into the “single” category (single = 0).

Other sociodemographic characteristics included gender, age, race/ethnicity, and family income. Gender was also dummy-coded (1 = female, 0 = male) although I had included a third gender, intersex, as an option on the survey instrument. The last
control variable, *age*, was left as an ordinal variable, with respondents’ ages ranging between 18 and 79. *Ethnicity/race* was dropped from the models because 99% of the survey respondents identified themselves as white/Caucasian. The original database also had separate coding for black/African American, Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and “other.” Because there were so few respondents who identified themselves in these racial categories (n = 10), they were collapsed for analysis. In the end, the *race* variable was dropped from the analysis.

Income and education were used as measures of socioeconomic status. Like race/ethnicity, there was very little variation, and neither proved to be statistically significant for any of the models. With family incomes averaging between $40 - $60,000 annually and most respondents with college educations, differences between all three religious types were not statistically discernable. Subsequently, income and education were excluded from the analyses.

In the second and third series of regressions for hypotheses 2 and 3, measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are constructed to test for mediating and moderating effects. Costello (1997) argues that indices are appropriate for use that measure such theoretical perspectives, despite the four distinct bonds that Hirschi (1969) uses in his theory and the three elements of a deviant socialization process that Sutherland (1947) identifies in his theory of differential association. The use of indices to summarize the theoretical constructs is based on the premise that testing of the single dimension of *social bonds* is ultimately the cornerstone of Hirschi’s (1969) theory, as is the single dimension of a deviant socialization process, constructed as *deviant*
friends and unconventional attitudes, the pillar of Sutherland’s (1947) theory of differential association.

These hypotheses predict that the theoretical constructs of social bonds and deviant friends and unconventional attitudes can mediate (hypothesis 2) and moderate (hypothesis 3) the effect of religious type on the four deviance measures. The variables that correspond to Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are operationalized according to its principle tenets. The theoretical constructs of social bonds and deviant friends and unconventional attitudes are measured using a four-point Likert scale of strongly disagree (SD =1) to strongly agree (SA = 4). The points that correspond to these statements were summed to create a composite score for a social control index and a differential association index. High scores on the social control index reflect higher levels of social bonds. Conversely, high scores on the differential association index reflect higher levels of association with deviant friends and non-normative attitudes that result in definitions more favorable for social norm and law violations.

Hirschi’s (1969) social bonds of commitment, attachment, involvement, and belief are as follows: Commitment is measured by responses to this statement: “My family is the most important thing in my life.” Attachment has 3 measures: 1) “It’s important for me that my family does things together.” 2) “I believe it’s important to help others who are less fortunate than myself.” And 3) “It’s important what other members of my (religious) community think of me.” Hirschi’s bond of involvement is also measured by responses to three statements: 1) “Between work, family, and community activities, I don’t have much free time.” 2) “I see no need for hard work.”
3) “I live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.”

Finally, Hirschi’s (1969) belief bond is measured by responses to these two statements: 1) “I have a great deal of respect for the police.” And 2) “My friends say that I never break the rules.” This index identifies the strengths of the bonds individuals have to society and is used to test the second hypothesis of mediating effects. This same index is also standardized and used for the construction of interaction terms, where religious type times the standardized social control index (social bonds) tests for moderating effects in hypothesis three (Aiken and West 1991). The Cronbach’s alpha for this index is .67. The mean of this index is 32.9 (s.d. = 4.1), with a range of 22 to 44 points.

Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory has three component parts. Like the social control index, the three central themes of Sutherland’s (1947) theory are operationalized using Likert scales. The first construct in the theory is how individuals internalize definitions that are favorable or non-favorable to norm violation. This is measured by responses to three statements: 1) “It is morally wrong to break the law.” (This item is reverse-coded.) 2) “If breaking the law doesn’t hurt anybody it’s really not all that wrong.” And 3) “No matter how small the crime, breaking the law is a serious matter.” (This item is also reverse-coded.)

The second measure of Sutherland’s (1947) theory addresses others’ definitions toward law violation. This concept is measured by responses to two statements: 1) “People I associate with find themselves in situations where other people encourage them to do something illegal.” And 2) “Most people I associate with would never break the law.” This last statement is reverse-coded.
The last construct in Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory is contact with criminal and deviant friends. This is measured by the response to, "In the past 12 months, my closest friends have done something they could have gotten arrested for." This differential association index is used in the mediating effects hypothesis and also standardized for the moderating effects hypothesis (Aiken and West 1991). Interaction terms of religious type times the standardized differential association index (deviant friends and unconventional attitudes) were constructed. The Cronbach’s alpha for this index is .74. The index mean is 13.3 (s.d.= 3.0), with scores ranging from 6 to 22 points.

**Dependent Variables**

There are four indices used as dependent variables in these analyses. They are 1) general or minor forms of deviance, 2) sexual deviance, 3) illegal drug and alcohol use, and 4) violence and crime. Frequencies and distributions of variables were examined for kurtosis and skew, and a log-10 transformation was necessary for the index on violence and crime. To determine whether these indices were reliable and consistent, a Cronbach’s alpha score was computed for each. This alpha measures how well each group of variables in the indices measures a single dimensional construct. If a Cronbach’s alpha score is high, then there is evidence to suggest that the index is measuring the same underlying construct. When the data have a more multidimensional structure, the Cronbach's alpha will be low. Factor analysis was used to determine which items loaded on each area: general, sexual, drug and alcohol, and violence and crime. A complete list of the measures used for each index is included in the appendix, however each is highlighted below.
The first dependent variable is a 20-item index that measures minor forms of deviance. I refer to this index as “general deviance” because it excludes all other types of criminal acts, drug and alcohol use, and so on. This index has seven dummy-coded variables and thirteen Likert Scale variables. The dummy coded variables include items like, “Ever blame a car accident on someone else when you were partially to blame?” And “Ever avoid paying your portion of the bill at a restaurant?” Likert scale items consisted of rating statements on a scale of one (strongly disagree) to four (strongly agree). For example, respondents were asked to rate the statement, “Only fools tell the truth all the time.” And “Sometimes you just have no choice but to break the law.” This index has a Cronbach’s alpha score of .73. It has a mean of 20, with a standard deviation of 5.0. Scores ranged from 8 to 36 points. A complete list of all twenty items in the general deviance index is located in the appendix.

The second dependent variable is an index that measures sexual deviance and consists of 11 items. These 11 items are dummy-coded to represent 1 = yes and 0 = no. Measures from this index include, “Ever cheated on your spouse or partner?” And “Ever had sexual relations with a person you did not know well?” This index had a Cronbach’s alpha score of .76, with a mean score of 2.1 and a standard deviation of 2.0. Scores ranged from 1 to 8 points. A complete list of all eleven items in this sexual deviance index can be found in the appendix.

The third index is a composite of measures for illegal drug and excessive alcohol use.\textsuperscript{11} It is comprised of 6 items. Three of the five items are dummy-coded and the remaining two are based on a 4-point Likert scale. The alcohol measures are,

\textsuperscript{11} The World Health Organization defines “excessive alcohol use” as consuming 5 or more alcoholic beverages in a single sitting. This definition is also supported in the social science literature (see Callahan 1970; Trice 1982, 1988; Greenberg and Grunberg 1995; Markowitz 1984)
“Ever drink five or more alcoholic drinks in a single sitting?” And, “Ever drink to get drunk?” The illegal drug use measures include, “Ever use marijuana?” And, “Ever use hard drugs like cocaine, heroin, LSD, or ecstasy?” This index has a Cronbach’s alpha of .72. The mean score is 3.8 (s.d. = 2.3). The range varies from 1 to 7 points. There is also a copy of this in the appendix.

The fourth index summarizes responses for violence, the threat of violence, and some types of criminal behaviors. This index has 10 dummy-coded items and relies on self-reported criminal and violent activities. Because few violent and criminal activities were found in the sample in general, this index needs to be viewed with caution. Also, it was extremely left-skewed, and as a result, this index was logged for all analyses. Some examples from this index are, “Ever spent time in jail?” “Ever taken something worth $50 or more from your place of work?” And, “Ever gotten into a fight or used physical force against someone?” The Cronbach’s alpha score is .60. The mean score is 1.37 (s.d = 1.4), with a range of 0 to 7 points. A complete list of all items included in this index is listed in the appendix.

Instrumentation

Only one instrument was used in this study. A copy of the survey can be found in the appendix. This instrument was adapted from questions from the National Youth Survey’s longitudinal study, and questions were included or changed slightly for an adult rather than a juvenile population (Elliott and Ageton 1980). The statistical reliability and validity of the overall instrument may be questionable because it is an instrument that, by itself, has never been previously tested. The central tenants of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947)
differential association theory are represented in a variety of questions on the survey instrument in addition to religious information and sociodemographic characteristics. The predictive efficacy of the instrument, as a measure of actual deviance, is another matter and should be a topic of further research.

The survey took most participants 15 to 20 minutes to complete, regardless of whether they completed it on line or in person. It contained seven sections. With the web version of the survey, the informed consent page cautioned participants that their responses would be captured after each section was completed. They could not go back to erase or change their answers after they hit the "Submit" button at the bottom of each section. Once the "Submit" button was clicked, the first page of the next section of the survey would appear. It is evident by the portions of sections left blank that many respondents tired of the survey, and all n=305 participants did not complete all 209 possible data points. Below is a brief description of each of the seven sections of the survey instrument.

Both Shambhala Buddhists and Methodists and nonreligious respondents were invited to answer all questions in the survey instrument. Several e-mail correspondences from survey participants from the control group were dissatisfied with the way some questions were worded. In particular, questions that asked about volunteering in their religious community were construed by the No Religion Group as biased because they volunteered in other community and civic programs, yet the way the question was worded it did not allow them to answer affirmatively.

The first section asked 11 questions that required the respondent to either fill in the blank or click on a drop down menu to select an answer from a list of options.
Sociodemographic data collected in this section included gender, age, race, income, education, marital status, length of time at current address, and religious affiliation for themselves and their families. Names and addresses were not collected.

The second section asked a series of 26 questions where the respondent needed to check off boxes to questions, “Have you ever?” Followed by two more series of boxes if the activity had been done “last month” and/or “last year.” Examples of these 26 items consisted of avoiding payment at a restaurant; knowingly bought or held stolen property; lying to spouse or partner; engaging in extra marital affairs; and taken anything of value ($5 and $50) from their workplace.

The third section of the instrument used Likert Scales, from one to four, and asked the participants to Strongly Agree (4), Agree (3), Disagree (2), or Strongly Disagree (1) to 43 different statements. These statements were largely devoted to collecting information that corresponded to the theoretical tenants of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory, such as, “It’s important for me to have a family that does things together.” Or, “My friends would say that I never get into trouble.” Other statements were, “Only fools tell the truth all the time,” “Rules were made to be broken,” and “I see no need for hard work.”

The fourth section asked respondents to identify their involvement in religious activities. Likert scales and fill-in-the-blank options were used. This section queried respondents to determine the approximate number of hours per week they engaged in religious related events, including Sunday services; their perceived commitment level to their religious organization (Likert scale); and the frequency with which they
volunteer their time or participate in a religious organization or event. This last question was a fill-in-the-blank; and many varied answers made it impossible to code with any continuity and subsequently dropped for consideration.

The fifth section of the survey involved 25 two-part questions that asked about deviant activities that the respondents may have “ever” done, followed by the question, “Do you now?” These questions used Likert Scales from never, once or twice, several, many/often followed by yes, no, or sometimes or rarely in the second part of the question, “Do you now?” These questions measured work behaviors; drinking behaviors; sexual promiscuity; willingness to date members of the same sex; and use of illegal drugs such as heroine, cocaine, ecstasy, and marijuana, and other lesser forms of deviance, such as gossiping, playing cards for money, and driving through a red light.

The sixth section asked six short questions about routine activities that respondents may do during the week. Respondents were asked to approximate the number of hours they spend reading books, watching TV, working at their job, exercising, and attending religious events. Responses in this section were not accurate, as many questions were left blank or had “I don’t know” as a response.

The seventh and final section of the survey was designed specifically to address respondents’ friends’ deviant behaviors. This corresponds to Sutherland’s (1947) third dimension of the socialization process that includes deviant and criminal friends. Ten questions in this section asked them to use a drop down scale of zero through five and “I don’t know” to respond to questions about their five closest friends’ behaviors. Questions included, “In the last 12 months, how many of your five
closest friends have had what you would consider inappropriate sexual relations with another person?” And, “In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have used marijuana?” Although there were many “I don’t know” answers, this section yielded slightly more information on friends’ deviant behaviors than in other sections of the survey.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses stated below are organized to test three main issues: 1) the differences between four different constructs of deviant behaviors by three religious types; 2) the mediating effects of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory; and 3) their interaction effects on the relation between religious type and deviance. The goals are two-fold: to determine if deviant behaviors differ by religious affiliation and to examine the parsimony and predictability of these two classical theories of crime and deviant behavior (Hirschi 1969; Sutherland 1947). The following regression formulas illustrate, model by model, the hypotheses that are tested in my study. For simplicity, I have coded thus: 

\[
\text{Deviance}_1 \text{ refers to the subscale of the general deviance index; deviance}_2 \text{ refers to the sexual deviance index; deviance}_3 \text{ refers to the index of illegal drug and alcohol use; and deviance}_4 \text{ corresponds to the index of violence, the threat of violence, and criminal activity.}
\]

**Main Effects Hypothesis**

The first hypothesis examines the relationship between the three religious types and measures of the four indices of deviant behavior. Each of the four dependent variables are identified as \( \text{deviance}_{1-4} \). In this hypothesis, the objective is
to examine the differences between all three religious groups, so each religious type is
coded 0 and 1, and two religious types are run together in a series of two steps. By
running two separate multivariate models that include two of the religious dummy
variables together, b coefficients of the religious types can be compared directly
against one another. For example, in the first analysis, the No Religion Group is the
omitted group, and the Methodists and the Shambhala Buddhists are placed in the
model. This examines whether the b coefficients for both the Methodists and the
Shambhala Buddhists are statistically different from the b coefficient of the omitted
group. In the second run, the Shambhala Buddhists are omitted, allowing comparisons
between them and the No Religion Group and the Methodists. These same steps are
followed to test the effects of religious type on all four deviant outcomes. Not shown
are the control variables that are included in each model. They are gender, age, and
marital status.

Hypothesis 1: A traditional religion deters deviant behavior: Being a Methodist
makes it significantly less likely to engage in general acts of deviance, sexual
deviance, illegal drug and excessive use of alcohol, and violence and criminal
behaviors than being a Shambhala Buddhist or an individual in the control group
of nonreligious respondents.

\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{Buddhists}) \quad [\text{the no religion group omitted}]
\]

\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{No Religion}) \quad [\text{Shambhala Buddhists omitted}]
\]

\[
\text{Deviance}_2 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{Buddhists}) \quad [\text{the no religion group omitted}]
\]

\[
\text{Deviance}_2 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{No Religion}) \quad [\text{Shambhala Buddhists omitted}]
\]

\[
\text{Deviance}_3 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{Buddhists}) \quad [\text{No religious affiliation omitted}]
\]

\[
\text{Deviance}_3 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{No Religion}) \quad [\text{Shambhala Buddhists omitted}]
\]

\[
\text{Deviance}_4 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{Buddhists}) \quad [\text{No religious group omitted}]
\]

\[
\text{Deviance}_4 = a + bx_1(\text{Methodists}) + bx_2(\text{No Religion}) \quad [\text{Shambhala Buddhists omitted}]
\]
Mediating Effects Hypothesis

In this second series of regressions, the mediating effects of social bonds (Hirschi 1969) and deviant friends and unconventional attitudes (Sutherland 1947) are placed into the regression models. The objective with this series is to determine if and how well these theoretical indices intervene in the relation between religious type and the four deviant outcomes. These indices that function for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are considered mediators when 1) variations in religious type significantly account for variations in the theoretical indices; 2) when variations in the measures of social bonds and deviant friends significantly account for variations in the dependent measures of deviance and crime; and 3) when the relation between the religious types and the four dependent measures become insignificant, is reduced, or disappears altogether (Baron and Kenny 1986).

The indices that correspond to Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are simplistically summarized in the models below. In the first series, the social control index is included. This determines if social bonds mediate the relationship between religious type and the deviant outcomes. In the second series, the differential association index is included to determine if it mediates the relation between religious type and the same four dependent outcomes. In the third and final series, the two theoretical indices are placed in the model together. These models are essentially testing which theoretical index has greater capacity to dominate the religion-deviance relationship. As with the first hypothesis, the religious types are included two at a time with each of the four
dependent measures so that direct comparisons can be made between each religious
category. In all three hypotheses, the first run always includes Methodists and
Shambhala Buddhists. The second run always includes Methodists and the No
Religion Group. Also, to simplify the models, the control variables of gender, age,
and marital status are omitted here but are included in the actual regression series
shown in chapter five.

Hypothesis 2: Social control theory and differential association theory can
predict the effect of religious type on deviance and crime. Social bonds reduce the
effect of the religious type on general forms of deviance, sexual deviance, illegal drug
and alcohol use, violence and criminal behaviors. Secondly, Associations with
deviant friends and holding unconventional attitudes favoring social norm violations
reduces the effect of the religious type on general forms of deviance, sexual deviance,
illegal drug and alcohol use, violence and criminal behaviors.

\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + b\text{Methodists} + b\text{Buddhists} + b\text{social control index}
\]
\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + b\text{Methodists} + b\text{No Religion} + b\text{social control index}
\]
\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + b\text{Methodists} + b\text{Buddhists} + b\text{differential association index}
\]
\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + b\text{Methodists} + b\text{No Religion} + b\text{differential association index}
\]
\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + b\text{Methodists} + b\text{Buddhists} + b\text{social control index} + b\text{differential association}
\]
\[
\text{Deviance}_1 = a + b\text{Methodists} + b\text{No Religion} + b\text{social control} + b\text{differential association}
\]

These regression models shown above only represent the tests for the mediating
effects for the relation between religious types and the index on general deviance.
These same series are subsequently repeated by replacing deviance\(_1\) with dependent
variables deviance\(_2\), deviance\(_3\), and deviance\(_4\) in the same fashion.
Moderating Effects Hypothesis

This hypothesis tests whether interaction terms of the standardized social control index and the standardized differential association index moderate the effect of religious types on deviant and criminal behaviors. The current literature favors standardizing the theoretical indices and the subsequent interaction terms to reduce the effects of multicollinearity (Aiken and West 1991). Standardized variables can accommodate a smaller p-value, so the expected result is to be able to maintain a 95% confidence interval with this relatively small sample size. This hypothesis is tested by using standardized variables in all the regression models except the dummy coded variables of gender and marital status (Aiken and West 1991). The standardized social control index and the standardized differential association index are considered “moderators” when the relationship between religious types and the dependent measures of deviance fluctuate by a third variable, the interaction terms (Baron and Kenny 1986; Jaccard, Turrisi and Wan 1990). Moderators can influence the direction and strength of the relation between the religious type and the dependent variable affecting the zero-order correlation with a significant interaction term. Combining the three dummy-coded religious types times the differential association index and then again times the social control index makes six standardized interaction terms. A moderator effect occurs if the relationship between the religious type and the dependent measure is substantially reduced or reversed when one of these interaction terms is significant (Baron and Kenny 1986; Jaccard, Turissi and Wan 1990). Although not indicated, it is important to note that the dependent variables are also
Hypothesis 3: Indices for social control theory and differential association theory moderate the effect of the religious type on deviance and crime. The social bonds x religious type significantly buffers the effect of the religious type differently from the comparison group on general forms of deviance, sexual deviance, illegal drug and excessive use of alcohol, and violence and criminal behaviors. The deviant friends and unconventional attitudes significantly buffers the effect of the religious type differently from the comparison group on general forms of deviance, sexual deviance, illegal drug and excessive alcohol consumption, and violence and criminal behaviors.

\[ \text{Deviance}_1 = a + b_1(\text{Methodists}) + b_2(\text{Buddhists}) + b_3(\text{social control index}) + b_4(\text{social control})(\text{Methodists}) + b_5(\text{social control})(\text{Buddhists}) \]

\[ \text{Deviance}_1 = a + b_1(\text{Methodists}) + b_2(\text{No Religion}) + b_3(\text{social control}) + b_4(\text{social control})(\text{Methodists}) + b_5(\text{social control})(\text{No Religion}) \]

\[ \text{Deviance}_1 = a + b_1(\text{Methodists}) + b_2(\text{Buddhists}) + b_3(\text{differential association index}) + b_4(\text{differential association})(\text{Methodists}) + b_5(\text{differential association})(\text{Buddhists}) \]

\[ \text{Deviance}_1 = a + b_1(\text{Methodists}) + b_2(\text{No Religion}) + b_3(\text{differential association}) + b_4(\text{differential association})(\text{Methodists}) + b_5(\text{differential association})(\text{No Religion}) \]

These regression models are repeated for dependent variables, \( \text{deviance}_2 \) and \( \text{deviance}_3 \) and \( \text{deviance}_4 \).

In conclusion, these three hypotheses are unique. The first hypothesis tests the assumption that a traditional religious type, Methodism, can deter deviant behavior and criminal activity significantly better than a nontraditional religious type, Shambhala Buddhism, and a control group of nonreligious adults. The second and third hypotheses consider the effectiveness of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory as mediators and moderators in the religion-deviance relationship. These classical theories of crime have never
been tested together in this way before, placed essentially in opposition to one another and on a unique sample of religious adults. Based on some of the evidence in the literature review, I expect to find support for both Hirschi' (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. High levels of social bonds should be expected to reduce the effect the religious type has on all four of the dependent variables of deviance and crime. The index constructed for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory can also presumably account for some of the effect the religious type has on these deviant outcomes, and it will be interesting to see if it significantly impacts the more “deviant” religious type of Shambhala Buddhism. However, these anticipated findings are preemptory at best, given that this study is the first of its kind to examine such specific deviant outcomes on both a traditional and nontraditional religious types with an adult sample.

Data Analysis

I use the software program, STATA, version 8.0, for the statistical analyses. The data were tabulated by zero-order correlations, followed by bivariate regression analyses. Bivariate regressions were examined for strong and significant relationships and examination of multicollinearity between independent and dependent variables. All models use multivariate analysis techniques for ordinary least squares regression, including one log-10 transformation for the dependent measure on violence and crime. The models that correspond with the third hypothesis for testing moderating effects all use standardized variables, with the exception of the dummy coded variables of gender and marital status. Significance of these results assists in generalizability, and for most of the models a conventional alpha of .05 was used as
the cut off point for entry. This particular method was used because theory and prior research did not provide any clear indications of what variables should be included in these models. The results of the descriptive analyses are presented in chapter four, and the multivariate analyses related to the three hypotheses presented here are discussed in chapter five.
CHAPTER 4

DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION

The goal of this chapter is to acquaint the reader with selected characteristics of the sample population. This chapter provides descriptive information on variables that are related to the multivariate analyses. My purpose for providing this supplemental material is to show some of the broad similarities and differences that the three religious types share. This chapter covers frequency distributions, means, and analyses of variances (ANOVA) of selected measures, and ends with a correlation matrix of all variables used in the multivariate OLS models presented in chapter five.

This chapter has three parts. I first give sample characteristics in Table 1. This summarizes sociodemographic information and provides average scores on all four indices of deviance and crime by each religious type. In the second section, Table 2 provides information on select religious characteristics. In the third section of this chapter I briefly consider some of the measures used in the construction of indices for social bonds (Hirschi 1969) and deviant socialization (Sutherland 1947) for each religious type. Summary statistics for these measures are provided in Table 3. In Tables 2 and 3, responses to statements are based on a four-point Likert Scale and are collapsed for convenience. Percentages in the tables reflect the responses of, "strongly agree" and "agree" to the statement provided.
| Table 1: Descriptive Information  
Proportions, Means, and Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) of Select Variables by Religious Types |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender - % Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status - % Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education- % with a 4 year college degree or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (mean range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race- % White /Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Deviance Index (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Deviance Index (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Alcohol Use Index (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In last 12 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Crime Index (mean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In last 12 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Prob. > F, alpha > .05, ** p = .08
Sample Characteristics

Table 1 contains descriptive characteristics on the study population by religious type. Most survey participants are white (99%) and male (54%) with a mean age of 40 years. Methodists have significantly more female participants in the sample (75%) as compared with the Shambhala Buddhists (55%) and the No Religion Group (50%). The control group is also significantly younger, averaging 33 years of age relative to the Methodists' 46 years and the Shambhala Buddhists' 45 years. Other sociodemographic characteristics, such as college education and family income, were not significantly different between respondents. Achieving such similar characteristics was an intentional part of the purposive sampling strategy used in this study.

Methodists

Sixty-one percent of the Methodists are white females and average 46 years of age. Three-fourths are married or partnered (75%), and this is significantly different from the Shambhala Buddhists and the nonreligious respondents. For this reason, marital status is introduced as a control variable in the OLS models in chapter five.

Methodists are also the most well-educated of the sample. Over two-thirds earned a four-year college degree or better. Like the other respondents, they have family incomes that average between $41,000 to $60,000 dollars per year.

Methodists associated with deviant and criminal behavior are much like the control group of non-religious respondents on all four deviant outcomes. On measures of minor forms of deviance, such as running a red light or not paying their share of a restaurant bill, Methodists have a mean score of 18.0 (s.d = 4.6) on this index and their scores ranged from 10 to 31 points.
On three other outcomes, sexual, drug and alcohol use, and violence and crime, Methodists have few incidents to report. Average sexual deviance ranged from 0 to 7 points, with a mean score of 1.7 and a standard deviation of 1.8. Illegal drugs and excessive alcohol use are also low. Their mean score on the drug and alcohol index is 2.8 (s.d. = 2.0), with a range from 0 to 7. Finally, Methodists have very few past criminal behaviors, such as acts or threats of violence. They have an average score of 1.1, with a standard deviation of .65, ranging from 0 to 4 points.

*Shambhala Buddhists*

Slightly less than half (42%) of this group is female. Their average age is 45 years, and they identify as white/Caucasian. Shambhala Buddhists are equally well-educated, with 55% holding a Bachelor’s Degree or better. Fifty-five percent are married or partnered and have a mean income also between $41,000 and $60,000 per year. It is important to note that this group is similar to respondents of other religious types on many of these sociodemographic measures. Readers might suspect that this rather homogeneous group might include immigrants from Asian countries due to their ties with Tibetan Buddhism. But this is not the case with this portion of the sample. What is interesting about this group is that many of these white, Anglo-Saxon Protestant individuals converted to Tibetan Buddhism, now called Shambhala Buddhism, from families whose predominant religious preference was Christian. So it is important to recognize that their current affiliation in a new religious movement involved the rejection of mainly traditional religious ties that many of their family members still hold. I elaborate on some of these religious differences in the next section of this chapter.

---

12 James William Coleman (2001:7) writes that a substantial number of Asian immigrants are responsible for bringing traditional Buddhist practices to the United States.
Table 1 shows that the Shambhala Buddhists are the most deviant of the group, scoring significantly higher than other religious types on general deviance, drug and alcohol use, and violence and crime. When sociodemographic variables are introduced in more sophisticated statistical models in the next chapter, Shambhala Buddhists also score significantly higher on sexual deviance than the other religious types. Shambhala Buddhists average 23.1 points on the general deviance index, with a standard deviation of 4.8 and a range of scores between 13 and 36 points. On measures of sexual deviance, the Shambhala Buddhists have a mean score of nearly twice that of the Methodists and the No Religion Group. Their average score is 3.2, with a standard deviation of 2.2 and a range from 0 to 8.

Illegal drug and excessive alcohol use is also significantly different for the Shambhala Buddhists. They average 5.14, with a standard deviation of 1.8 on this scale, which follows a range from 0 to 7 points. They are three times more likely than Methodists and twice as likely as the nonreligious respondents to use illegal drugs and drink excessively.

Finally, on the index of violence and crime, the Shambhala Buddhists have a logged index score of .72, with a standard deviation of .71. Shambhala Buddhists report twice as many incidents of violence and crime than do the Methodists and the nonreligious group. Yet, overall, it is important to remember that there are very few incidents of crime, violence, or threats of violence in the data in general, so any models that use this index need to be interpreted with extreme caution.
No Religion Group

The control group of nonreligious respondents is called the No Religion Group, although they should not be thought of as a "group" with a cohesive social structure or similar cultural background. Only 37% of this group is female, with an average age of 33 years. They are significantly younger than the Methodists and Shambhala Buddhists, and as a result age is included as a control variable in the statistical models in the next chapter. Half of the respondents in this group identify as married or partnered, and they are overwhelmingly white/Caucasian. Like the Methodists and Shambhala Buddhists, their family incomes hover within the $41,000 to $60,000 range. Slightly less than half (44%) have a four-year college degree.

Minor forms of deviance, sexual deviance, and criminal behaviors are also quite minimal for this group. In terms of their average scores on the deviance and crime indices, they resemble the Methodists. Their general deviance score is 19.1, with a standard deviation of 4.2, and a range of 8 to 31 points. Similarly, their sexual deviance score averages 1.4, with a standard deviation of 1.7 and a range of 0 to 6 points. Like the Methodists, the No Religion Group has similar average scores on the log of violence and crime index, averaging .30, with a standard deviation of .7.

In the area of illegal drug and alcohol use, there is a substantive difference worth noting. The No Religion Group straddles the difference between the Shambhala Buddhists and the Methodists on this index. Their average excessive drinking and illegal drug use score of 3.5 (s.d. = 2.3) falls within a range from 0 to 7 points. For future research, it might be beneficial to measure drug use separately from alcohol consumption to determine if there are more specific and significant differences that can be discerned.
In conclusion, initial comparisons of the sample population confirm that the non-traditional religious group of Shambhala Buddhism is significantly different on three of the four indices of deviant and criminal activity. Despite married Methodists and the younger and predominantly more single non-religious respondents, these two groups are remarkably similar on these deviant and criminal outcomes used in this study.

Religious Attributes

In this next section, I examine some of their religious ties, highlighting their similarities and differences. Table 2 illustrates that both Shambhala Buddhists and Methodists have strong ties to their religious communities. Although Methodists have been affiliated with their religious group on average seven years longer than the Shambhala Buddhists, each group feels that they are an important contributor and devotes “much time and energy” to their religious activities. These two religious types are also alike in that they similarly devote four to five hours per week reading religious materials. Eighty-seven percent of Methodists believe that they are important to their religious community while 72% of Shambhala Buddhists and predictably only 12% of the No Religion Group believe that they felt personally important to their communities.

One interesting area of comparison is in the belief of an afterlife and the idea of spiritual cause and effect, called *karma*. The notion of life after death is strongly associated with Christian philosophy and both Methodists (92%) and Buddhists (79%)

---

10 Coleman (2001:31) defines karma as, “the principle of interdependent causality, (where) everything arises from an infinite chain of past causes and produces effects that have infinite consequences for everything else.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Methodists N= 98</th>
<th>Shambhala Buddhists N = 103</th>
<th>No Religion Group N = 105</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years affiliated with religious group</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with the statement, “I devote much time and energy to my religious community.”</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>40%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average weekly participation in religious community events</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief in life after death. I believe in karma <em>(spiritual cause and effect)</em></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average weekly hours spent reading religious materials</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that the phrase “One nation under God,” should be removed from the Pledge of Allegiance.</td>
<td>28%*</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for gay marriage rights</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception that they are important to their religious community</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>12%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probability of F, alpha > .05
overwhelmingly believe in it. The nonreligious group is significantly different: only 9% agree that there is an afterlife. It is also possible that the Shambhala Buddhists interpret this statement relative to their own religious belief in reincarnation or re-birth, and for this reason similarly concur with the Methodists (Coleman 2001).

Conversely, the idea of karma, associated with many eastern religions, is not as widely supported. The No Religion Group and Methodists are most alike here, while 100% of the Shambhala Buddhists believe that their current actions and events from past lives effect day-to-day outcomes. Despite the fact that the Shambhala Buddhists believe more strongly in karma than all other survey respondents, it is interesting that almost half of the Methodists (42%) believe in karmic events also. This finding perhaps reflects an infusion of eastern philosophy in the larger culture as a result of these old and new religious movements gaining footholds in the United States (Coleman 2001).

Table 2 shows some interesting political similarities and differences by religious type. The most significant similarity is on the issue of gay marriage. It appears that the Shambhala Buddhists, Methodists, and the No Religion Group are somewhat united in their belief that gay marriage should be supported in the larger culture. In fact, one reason for choosing Methodists as a traditional comparative group to the Shambhala Buddhists is because Methodists’ views are thought to be somewhat more liberal than other Christian types, such as Baptist and Catholic.

A more divisive issue refers to the Pledge of Allegiance. Shambhala Buddhists and the No Religion Group wish to delete the phrase, “One nation under God,” while only 28% of the Methodists agree that the Pledge needs to be re-revised. This trend is
Table 3: Selected Index Measures used for Hirschi’s (1969) Social Control Theory and Sutherland’s (1947) Differential Association Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Methodists (N=98)</th>
<th>Shambhala Buddhists (N=103)</th>
<th>No Religion Group (N=105)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;My family is the most important thing in my life.&quot;</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between work, family, and community activities I don’t have much free time.&quot;</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>43%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I believe it’s important to help others who are less fortunate than myself.&quot;</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>89%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I have a great deal of respect for the police.&quot;</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It’s morally wrong to break the law&quot;</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;People I associate with find themselves in situations where others encourage them to do something illegal.&quot;</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>65%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control index (mean)</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Assoc. Index (mean)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Probability of F, alpha > .05
perhaps indicative of the important religious differences and provides evidence for a
pattern of religiosity specific to each religious type under study.

*Religiosity and Classical Theories of Crime*

In this last section, I examine the relationship each religious identity has with
some of the measures for social bonds associated with Hirschi’s (1969) social control
theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. In chapter five, these two
opposing theoretical perspectives are used to determine whether the religion-deviance
relationship is spurious, or whether it varies depending on different levels of social bonds
(Hirschi 1969) or a deviant socialization process (Sutherland 1947). In this section, I
examine some specific measures that are included in these later theoretically-based
indices.

Table 3 shows average scores of these theoretical indices by religious type: Listed
are four selected characteristics that comprise the social bonds index for Hirschi’s (1969)
social control theory and three selected characteristics that measure a deviant
socialization process that represent Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. A
first look at these descriptive statistics verifies that although there are some substantive
differences between their average scores, Methodists, Shambhala Buddhists, and the
control group, have insignificant levels of social bonds that divide them. Methodists
average 35.1 points while Shambhala Buddhists average 32.9 points, and the nonreligious
respondents average 30.6 points on this index. The higher scores reflect higher levels of
social bonds, theoretically capable of reducing deviant and criminal tendencies (Hirschi
1969). Conversely, higher scores for the differential association index reflect greater
deviant associations, which theoretically increase the likelihood of deviant and criminal
behavior (Sutherland 1947). Shambhala Buddhists and nonreligious respondents are most alike with mean scores of 14, while Methodists have substantively fewer links to deviant socialization attributes with a mean score of 11.5 Yet, like their levels of social bonds, each religious type is not significantly different from other types in the sample.

Measures from the Social Control Index

I turn now to consider the four measures associated with the social control index. These are the first four entries in Table 3 located along the left-hand column. Results show that Methodists are much more likely to have a stronger familial bond. Overall, they are more strongly attached to their families than the Shambhala Buddhists or nonreligious respondents. Over eighty percent of Methodists claim that their family is the most important thing in their life. This finding supports Hirschi’s (1969) bond of commitment, and Methodists are slightly more likely to be more committed on this measure than the Shambhala Buddhists and control group of nonreligious respondents.

The second social bond considered is attachment. Respondents are asked if they would help persons in need. Nearly 90% of the No Religion Group wish to help others who are less fortunate than themselves. Both Methodists (98%) and Shambhala Buddhists (99%) also feel strongly on this measure. The religious affiliations are essentially indistinguishable from one another, thus supporting the notion of attachment and connectedness to a larger social structure.

Involvement is the third social bond considered. This measure asks respondents how busy they are in their day-to-day routines. Agreement with the statement, “Between work, family, and community activities I don’t have much free time,” essentially measures how much time might be available to engage in less conforming and more
deviant behaviors. Significantly different from the other two religious types, only 43% of the No Religion Group report they are busy with their work and other social tasks. Methodists (69%) and Shambhala Buddhists (60%) are more alike on this measure.

Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory contends that high levels of involvement produce conformity that in turn reduces the likelihood of committing crimes. Given that less than half of the nonreligious respondents report that they are occupied with work, family, and community activities, Hirschi’s (1969) theory contends that this group is at greater risk for engaging in criminal and deviant behaviors in comparison to the Methodists and Shambhala Buddhists.

The last social bond highlighted in Table 3 is belief in the law. On this measure, respondents are asked if they respect police and law enforcement officials. Slightly fewer Shambhala Buddhists (64%) than nonreligious respondents (76%) and Methodists (82%) report respecting police officers. With this bond, a substantial shift relative to religious types becomes apparent. Shambhala Buddhists and nonreligious respondents are somewhat less likely to have “great respect” for police and law enforcement relative to the Methodists. Like the previous measure, Hirschi’s (1969) theory holds that this weaker social bond may allow them to engage in deviant behaviors somewhat more than the Methodists, although mean scores are not significantly different between the three religious identities.

Measures from the Differential Association Index

Three representative measures of Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are considered next. These indicators are located on the bottom three rows of the left hand side of Table 3. A higher proportion of respondents in agreement represents a
greater likelihood of deviant socialization in support of Sutherland’s (1947) theory. For example, the nonreligious group (65%) is significantly more likely to have friends who find themselves in situations where they could be arrested. Shambhala Buddhists (11%) and the Methodists (6%) are least likely to have such deviant associations.

In the first measure, “It’s morally wrong to break the law,” important differences by religious types emerge. While 65% of Methodists agree or strongly agree with this statement, Shambhala Buddhists and nonreligious respondents are twice as likely to disagree. Only 28% of Shambhala Buddhists and 30% of nonreligious respondents think that it is morally wrong to break the law. This finding supports the idea that traditional religious beliefs are associated with the rule of law and social control (Kornhauser 1978; Sloane and Potvin 1986; Cochran 1987; Cochran and Akers 1989).

Finally, the third component of Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory considers associations with deviant friends. Methodists (14%) are least likely to associate with such friends comparatively, with nearly one-quarter each who has deviant friends from the non-religious respondents (23%) and the Shambhala Buddhists (21%). According to Sutherland’s (1947) theory, this association results in a greater likelihood that Shambhala Buddhists and nonreligious respondents will engage in deviant behavior and commit acts of crime and violence as compared to the Methodists.

Summary

In conclusion, this brief discussion of some of the measures associated with Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory finds some potentially likely patterns of susceptibility toward crime and deviance among the nonreligious respondents and Shambhala Buddhists when compared with the
Methodists. Specifically, it appears that the No Religion Group may have slightly weaker bonds and more ties to deviant friends than both the Shambhala Buddhists and the Methodists. Where the No Religion Group is most unique is in their exposure to deviant and potentially criminal friends.

By contrast, the Shambhala Buddhists appear to have more of a combination of indicators. They have higher levels of social bonds relative to the nonreligious group, but they are also more likely to associate with deviant friends. This contrast of measures potentially reduces expected levels of deviance on the one hand while simultaneously exposes them to higher levels of deviant behavior and criminal activity on the other. Clearly on both measures they are more at risk than the Methodists. Their weakest link appears to be the lower level of importance they give their families, and this contrasts substantively with the Methodists' strong family ties.

As a group, the Methodists place much more importance on these kinds of family ties than the others in the sample. They also have fewer associations with deviant friends than Shambhala Buddhist and nonreligious respondents. These indicators of high levels of social bonds and deviant socialization processes relative to the other religious affiliations are expected to significantly shoulder some of the findings on the religion-deviance connection explored in the next chapter. These relationships are examined using mediator and moderator models. Chapter five considers these causal connections more deliberately with multivariate regression analyses.

**Multivariate Analyses**

Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analyses are presented in the next chapter. Three hypotheses are tested with four indices of deviance and crime. The first
hypothesis tests the direct effects of religious type on four deviant outcomes. Hypotheses
two and three explore mediating and moderating effects of measures for Hirschi’s (1969)
social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory, portions of
which were discussed in this chapter. All regressions that correspond to hypothesis three
that test for moderator-effects use standardized variables. Dependent measures of general
deviance, sexual deviance, illegal drug and alcohol use, violence and criminal behaviors,
age, interaction terms, and the indices for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and
Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are standardized (Aiken and West

Finally, a word of caution is needed for the interpretation of the fourth index on
violence and crime. With such few cases present in the data, any multivariate analysis
that utilizes this index can become unstable. This is because there are not enough cases in
each combination of x and y values, and the results can produce high standard errors of
the coefficients in some of the regression models. Such thin cells and high standard errors
are indicative of model instability and the inappropriateness of multivariate techniques
(Hamilton 1992). Because there are such few cases involving this index on violence and
crime, the measure is extremely skewed. The asymmetrical distribution resulted in a log-
10 transformation of the variable, and this is used in all OLS models. In sum, any
interpretation of the results with the index on violence and crime must be viewed with
extreme caution.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Buddhists</th>
<th>2 Methodists</th>
<th>3 No Religion</th>
<th>4 Gender</th>
<th>5 Marital Status</th>
<th>6 Age</th>
<th>7 General Deviance</th>
<th>8 Sex Index</th>
<th>9 Drug Alcohol Index</th>
<th>10 Drug Index</th>
<th>11 Crime Index</th>
<th>12 Control Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.48**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.48**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>0.18**</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29**</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.13**</td>
<td>0.01**</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-tailed significance: * p<.05, ** p<.01
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 Crime Index</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Dif. Assoc. Index</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Control Index</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-0.56**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results and discusses the outcomes of the three hypotheses in this study. Statistical diagnoses for issues of curvilinearity and heteroscedasticity were done through residuals versus predicted plots and were not found to be present in the data. As a result, ordinary least squares models are shown and presented for each hypothesis. Table 5 summarizes the results of hypothesis one, and Tables 6 and 7 present data for hypotheses two and three. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the findings.

The goals are two-fold: to determine the main effects of religious type on deviant behaviors and to examine the partial effects of religious type with measures for Hirschi’s (1969) control and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theories that are hypothesized to mediate and moderate these three religious types on the four deviance outcomes. Recall from the methods section in chapter three, the first hypothesis is a straightforward test of deviant behaviors by the three religious affiliations of Methodists, Shambhala Buddhists, and the control group of non-religious respondents. The hypothesis predicts that a conventional religion deters deviant behavior significantly better than other religious types. The expectation is that Methodists have significantly lower scores on all four dependent measures than the Shambhala Buddhists and the control group of non-religious respondents.
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The second hypothesis examines the mediating effects of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory with an index of social bonds and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory with an index of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes. This hypothesis states that social bonds and deviant friends and unconventional attitudes mediate – or reduce - the effect of religious type on all four deviant outcomes. This hypothesis tests for spuriousness, indicating that other factors, like levels of social bonds or deviant friends and unconventional attitudes might better predict the religion-deviance relationship rather than religious affiliation. From the literature, one expected result is that traditional bonds to family and community will decrease the effect of religious type on the four dependent measures and this finding will support Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory. If high levels of social bonds mediate the religion-deviance relationship, the effect of religious type on deviant outcomes will be reduced or eliminated altogether. A second expectation also based in the literature is that associations with deviant friends and having non-conventional attitudes that violate social norms will mediate the relation between religious type and the same deviant outcomes. In other words, the expected strength of the effect of the religious association on deviant outcomes will be reduced when deviant friends and unconventional attitudes are included in the models. This evidence will support Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory.

The third and last hypothesis examines the extent to which social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes intervene in, or moderate, the relationship between religious affiliation and deviant outcomes. Like the previous mediation hypothesis, this predicts that measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory moderate – or reduce - the religious groups’ effects on
deviance and crime outcomes. To support this hypothesis, the data need to produce significant interaction terms, although the strength and direction of these moderating effects specific to each religious type or deviant outcomes is not known at this point.

The way this chapter is constructed is that I first present a summary analysis of the findings. I follow this summary with a presentation and discussion of results of the straightforward tests of religious affiliation on the four deviant outcomes. In the models, I include the sociodemographic variables of gender, age, and marital status to control for any possible differences among the study population. In the third section, I present the results of the mediation-hypothesis. In this section, I first discuss the results of the effects of the index of social bonds and religious type on deviant outcomes, followed by the results for the effects of religious type and the index of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes on the same deviant outcomes. In the fourth section of this chapter, I present the results for the moderation-hypothesis in the same way, first with the analysis of the moderator effects with the index for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory followed by the analysis for the effects of the index used to measure Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. This chapter concludes with a discussion of these findings.

Summary Analysis

Results show some support of the first hypothesis in which there are fewer deviant outcomes for the conventional religious respondents than there are for the non-traditional religious respondents. The Methodists clearly fare better than the Shambhala Buddhists in preventing crime and deviant behavior, but they do not do substantively better than the control group of non-religious respondents on three out of four dependent measures. Despite this evidence that implies that belonging to a non-traditional religion...
results in higher levels of all deviant outcomes, the overall effect of belonging to a traditional religion is not straightforward as first hypothesized. This is because the control group of non-religious respondents is statistically quite similar to the Methodists on minor forms of deviance, sexual deviance, and violence and crime. I conclude that a traditionally held view that a particular religious faith is overwhelmingly useful in society's attempt to reduce and prevent deviant and criminal activity cannot be supported in the data.

Hypothesis two claims that social bonds, deviant friends and unconventional attitudes mediate the relationship between religious type and all of the dependent variables; however, significant changes only occur in some of the models. In comparing the main effects of the index of social bonds used for Hirschi's (1969) social control theory and deviant friends and attitudes used for Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory, the index for differential association theory appears to provide slightly better results. It provides 12% more explanatory power to the overall regression models for minor forms of deviance; 3% more explanatory power than the index of social bonds on sexual deviance and violence and crime; and is able to explain just 1% more variance on illegal drug and excessive alcohol use than the social control measure. Although differences are small, deviant friends and unconventional attitudes in support of Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory explains more overall variance in all four outcomes than the index for Hirschi's (1969) social control theory.

In the mediator models, the strongest support for Hirschi's (1969) social control theory occurs when Methodists' higher levels of social bonds are found to mediate over 40% of the Methodist-drug and alcohol relationship when compared to the control group.
of nonreligious respondents. This significant effect of Methodists’ higher levels of *social bonds* renders them more likely to use illegal drugs and alcohol than the control group, so the initial difference between the nonreligious respondents and Methodists found in the first hypothesis is not sustained in this analysis. The difference between the *No Religion Group*’s consumption of drugs and alcohol and the Methodists’ consumption is attributable to Methodists’ higher levels of social bonds and not as a result of being a Methodist, per se.

The second conclusion is that there is evidence that *social bonds* and *deviant friends and attitudes* do not uniformly or effectively mediate all religious types on all four deviant indices. *Social bonds* are least effective for all three religious types on sexual deviance. In fact, *social bonds* are often found to suppress the relationship of being a Shambhala Buddhist on all four deviant outcomes. Rather than demonstrating a reduction in religious affiliation, *social bonds* implicate a stronger Shambhala Buddhist connection to deviant behaviors when compared to the *No Religion Group*. Overall, *social bonds* are most effective at reducing the effect of religious type on illegal drug and alcohol consumption. Measures for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory least effectively general forms of deviance but are somewhat more effective in reducing the effect of religious affiliation on the other three indices of sexual deviance, drug and alcohol use, and violence and criminal outcomes. Thus, support for the mediating-effects hypothesis is not straightforward or uniform. Evidence is lacking that these theoretical constructs effectively reduce the religion-deviance relationship.

In the third hypothesis interaction effects are tested in moderator models. The results show that neither theoretical index supports a moderator-interaction effect.
hypothesis very well. This means that the measures for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory and Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory have little or no different effect by religious type on the four deviant outcomes. Both the indices for social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes operate in relatively the same way for each religious affiliation on the four deviant indices. At the risk of making a Type I error, there are some substantive findings worth mentioning. For example, Shambhala Buddhists are much more likely to be sexually deviant relative to the control group, and even more likely when their associations with deviant friends and having unconventional attitudes are accounted for in the model. These findings suggest that sexually deviant behavior is more permissible within the religious context of Shambhala Buddhism. So even though having associations with deviant peers and non-normative attitudes increases their likelihood of engaging in sexually deviant behavior, being a Shambhala Buddhist makes it even more likely.

A second finding of the moderating effect concerns social bonds. Social bonds buffer the effect of being a Methodist on drug and alcohol use when compared to the control group. Although high levels of social bonds do impede drug and alcohol use for the Methodists and nonreligious respondents alike, Methodists are somewhat more likely to use drugs and alcohol with higher levels of social bonds than the nonreligious respondents. This is an important finding because initially Methodists were found to be significantly different from the control group on this measure. Evidence for the conditional effect of their social bonds on drug and alcohol use reduces this religious distinction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Deviance Index</th>
<th>Sexual Deviance Index</th>
<th>Drug and Alcohol Index</th>
<th>Log of Violence and Crime Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 247</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 272</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 193</strong></td>
<td><strong>N = 168</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Methodists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.18 (.770)</td>
<td>-5.17*** (.728)</td>
<td>-.126 (.304)</td>
<td>-.807** (.335)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.53*** (.286)</td>
<td>-2.39*** (.312)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buddhists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Buddhists</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.99*** (.757)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.41*** (.297)</td>
<td>1.59*** (.326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No Religion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No Religion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.99*** (.757)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.41*** (.297)</td>
<td>-1.61 *** (.327)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.509 (.594)</td>
<td>.509 (.594)</td>
<td>.020 (.231)</td>
<td>.263 (.256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.020 (.231)</td>
<td>.029 (.232)</td>
<td>.263 (.256)</td>
<td>.264 (.256)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.003 (.023)</td>
<td>.003 (.023)</td>
<td>-.002 (.009)</td>
<td>-.002 (.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.034*** (.009)</td>
<td>.035*** (.009)</td>
<td>.010 (.010)</td>
<td>.001 (.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.329 (.626)</td>
<td>-.329 (.626)</td>
<td>-.188 (.245)</td>
<td>-.182 (.245)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.188 (.245)</td>
<td>-.182 (.245)</td>
<td>.254 (.270)</td>
<td>.254 (.270)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(married = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.164* (.008)</td>
<td>-.164* (.008)</td>
<td>-.164* (.008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj.R-square</strong></td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05, ** p < .01, two-tailed tests

Standard errors in parentheses ( )
Main Effects Outcome

The first hypothesis focuses on the traditionally held idea that participation in a religion buffers society’s exposure to crime and deviant behavior. These results are shown in Table 5. These initial findings suggest that the overall effect of belonging to a religion is not as significant as first hypothesized. For example, the traditional religious group is less deviant than the non-traditional religious group; however, the non-religious respondents are not significantly different from the Methodists on all four outcomes. I conclude that religious type does matter but not in a straightforward or traditional sense.

As shown in Table 5, Methodists and the *No Religion Group* have non-significant differences, although overall, I find that Methodists do have slightly lower scores on all these indices than their non-religious counterparts. Methodists and non-religious respondents have most similar scores on measures of sexual deviance and violence and criminal activity, and non-religious respondents have marginally higher scores on measures of general deviance and illegal drug and alcohol use. Where the Methodists are clearly less deviant is in their consumption of illegal drugs and alcohol; they are significantly different from the non-religious respondents on this single measure (b = -.807, p < .05). Yet on all four deviant outcomes, the non-traditional group of Shambhala Buddhists is uniquely different and positively associated with all four deviant indices. Their scores on indices of general deviance, sexual deviance, drug and alcohol use, and instances of violence and criminal activity are significantly higher than other religious types. For example, Buddhists’ are nearly four times more likely to engage in acts of general deviance and violence and criminal activity than are the Methodists and one and one-half times more likely to engage in sexual deviance and drug and alcohol use.
Of particular interest is Buddhists' sexually deviant activity relative to the other religious types (b = 1.41, p < .01) because a test of difference between their average scores on sexual deviance and other religious types shows that they have engaged in sexually deviant activity within the last 12 months. Shambhala Buddhists’ mean scores on sexual deviance measures are significantly different from other survey respondents over this time period (X² = 8.60, p = .04). This finding that Shambhala Buddhists are much more sexually deviant than other respondents suggests the possibility of a socialization process unique to this particular religious affiliation. This finding is the only one of its kind, as other outcomes like drug and alcohol use, violence and crime, and minor acts of deviance are not current. Like the other respondents, these other deviant indicators occurred more as historical events and are not indicative of current practices. I conclude that there is no on-going pattern of other deviant and criminal activity among the Shambhala Buddhists in a comparison test of deviant activities either within the last year or last 30 days. As a result, these findings suggest that that there may be a substantive cultural difference that accommodates a pattern of sexually deviant behavior, but the results do not support such a trend for other patterns of minor forms of deviance, criminal behaviors, or excessive alcohol and illegal drug use.

In summarizing these findings, the data present mixed results for support of the first hypothesis. Methodists and the No Religion Group are less likely to engage in acts of minor or general forms of deviance, sexual deviance, drug and alcohol use, and violence and crime than are the Shambhala Buddhists. Shambhala Buddhists are positively and significantly associated with all four outcomes. These results support the notion that ties to a traditional religion reduces deviant outcomes better than ties to a non-traditional
| Table 6a. Unstandardized Coefficients for the Regression of Religious Affiliations on General Deviance: Models with Social Control & Differential Association as Mediators |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| from Table 5                    | N= 252          | N= 237          | N= 241          | N= 229          |
| Model 1                         | Model 2         | Model 3         | Model 4         | Model 5         | Model 6         | Model 7         | Model 8         |
| Methodists                      |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| - 1.18                          | .135            | - 4.63***       | .420            | .369***         | .298            | 3.74***         |
| (.770)                          | (.878)          | (.754)          | (.748)          | (.707)          | (.831)          | (.729)          |
| Buddhists                       |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| 3.99***                        |                 | 4.49***         | 4.11***         |                 | 4.04***         |                 |
| (.757)                          | (.805)          | (.709)          | (.776)          |                 |                 |                 |
| No Religion                     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| [-----]                          | - 3.99***       | [-----]          | [-----]          | [-----]          | [-----]          |                 |
| (.757)                          | (.805)          | (.709)          | (.776)          |                 |                 |                 |
| Gender                          |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| - .509                          | - .463          | .100            | .178            | .178            |
| (.594)                          | (.594)          | (.552)          | (.575)          | (.575)          |
| Age                             |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| .003                            | .003            | .017            | .019            | .019            |
| (.023)                          | (.023)          | (.022)          | (.023)          | (.023)          |
| Marital Status                  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| - .329                          | - .307          | - .103          | - .074          | - .074          |
| (.626)                          | (.626)          | (.585)          | (.650)          | (.650)          |
| Control index                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| [-----]                          | [-----]          | [-----]          | [-----]          | [-----]          | [-----]          | [-----]          | [-----]          |
| Dif. Assoc. Index               |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| [-----]                          | [-----]          | [-----]          | .655***         | .641***         |
| [.100]                          | [.100]          | (.115)          | (.115)          |                 |
| Adj. R²                         | .187            | .217            | .341            | .330            |
| *.p < .10, **.p < .05, ***.p < .01, two-tailed test. Standard errors in () |
### Table 6b. Coefficients for the Regression of Religious Types on Sexual Deviance: Models with Social Control & Differential Association as Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=276 (from Table 5)</th>
<th>N=257</th>
<th>N=261</th>
<th>N=245</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodists</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>-1.53***</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>-1.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.304)</td>
<td>(.286)</td>
<td>(.351)</td>
<td>(.298)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>1.41***</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1.62***</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.297)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.319)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-1.41***</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-1.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.297)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.319)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female = 1)</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.231)</td>
<td>(.232)</td>
<td>(.239)</td>
<td>(.239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.034***</td>
<td>.035***</td>
<td>.030***</td>
<td>.030***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.009)</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>-.182</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>-.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(married = 1)</td>
<td>(.245)</td>
<td>(.245)</td>
<td>(.266)</td>
<td>(.266)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social control index</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>- .031</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.034)</td>
<td>(.034)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diff. Assoc. Index</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, two-tailed tests, standard errors in ()
Table 6c. Coefficients for the Regression of Religious Types of Illegal Drug and Alcohol Use: Models with Social Control & Differential Association as Mediators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(from Table 5) N = 277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodists</td>
<td>-.807**</td>
<td>-2.39***</td>
<td>-.479</td>
<td>-2.23***</td>
<td>-.524</td>
<td>-2.11***</td>
<td>-.394</td>
<td>-2.09***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.335)</td>
<td>(.312)</td>
<td>(.382)</td>
<td>(.323)</td>
<td>(.362)</td>
<td>(.396)</td>
<td>(.340)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>1.59***</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>1.75***</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>1.58***</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>1.70***</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.326)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.348)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.335)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.362)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-1.61***</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-1.75***</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-1.58***</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-1.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.327)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.348)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female = 1)</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>-.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.256)</td>
<td>(.256)</td>
<td>(.263)</td>
<td>(.263)</td>
<td>(.263)</td>
<td>(.263)</td>
<td>(.272)</td>
<td>(.272)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (married = 1)</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.270)</td>
<td>(.270)</td>
<td>(.291)</td>
<td>(.291)</td>
<td>(.279)</td>
<td>(.279)</td>
<td>(.303)</td>
<td>(.303)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-.062*</td>
<td>-.062*</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.037)</td>
<td>(.037)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.043)</td>
<td>(.043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>.128***</td>
<td>.128***</td>
<td>.095*</td>
<td>.095*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.047)</td>
<td>(.047)</td>
<td>(.054)</td>
<td>(.054)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, two-tailed tests, standard errors in ()
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (from Table 5)</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 289</td>
<td>N = 259</td>
<td>N = 266</td>
<td>N = 247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodists</td>
<td>.081 (.107)</td>
<td>-.348*** (.103)</td>
<td>.150 (.127)</td>
<td>-.322*** (.108)</td>
<td>.180 (.118)</td>
<td>-.280*** (.110)</td>
<td>.193 (.132)</td>
<td>-.253** (.114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>.429*** (.104)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.472*** (.115)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>.460*** (.109)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>.446*** (.119)</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.429*** (.104)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-.472*** (.115)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>.460*** (.109)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>.446*** (.119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female = 1)</td>
<td>-.159* (.083)</td>
<td>-.159* (.083)</td>
<td>-.216*** (.087)</td>
<td>-.216*** (.087)</td>
<td>-.157* (.086)</td>
<td>-.157* (.086)</td>
<td>-.170* (.090)</td>
<td>-.170* (.090)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001 (.003)</td>
<td>.001 (.003)</td>
<td>.001 (.003)</td>
<td>.001 (.003)</td>
<td>.002 (.003)</td>
<td>.002 (.004)</td>
<td>.002 (.004)</td>
<td>.002 (.004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (married = 1)</td>
<td>-.164* (.008)</td>
<td>-.164* (.008)</td>
<td>-.108* (.009)</td>
<td>-.108* (.009)</td>
<td>-.147 (.091)</td>
<td>-.147 (.091)</td>
<td>-.133 (.102)</td>
<td>-.133 (.102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-.021* (.013)</td>
<td>-.021* (.013)</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-.004 (.014)</td>
<td>-.004 (.014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>.046*** (.015)</td>
<td>.046*** (.015)</td>
<td>.047* (.018)</td>
<td>.047* (.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, two-tailed tests, standard errors in ( )
religion. However, belief in a traditional religion to curb deviant behavior cannot be fully supported because Methodists are not statistically different from the control group of non-religious respondents. So although belonging to a traditional religion may be beneficial in some small ways, clear evidence is lacking that a traditional religion is better than no religious affiliation at all. Thus, I conclude that I must reject my first hypothesis: A traditional religious affiliation does not significantly deter crime and deviant behavior better than all other religious types.

The Mediation-Effects Outcome

The second hypothesis concerns the extent to which Sutherland’s (1947) differential association and Hirschi’s (1969) social control theories mediate the effect of religious type on the four dependent measures of deviance and crime. These data are presented in Tables 6a through 6d on the next four pages. This hypothesis predicts that the index of social bonds that supports Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory is able to reduce the effect of each religious type on the four deviant outcomes. The second prediction is that the index of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes that supports Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory is able to reduce the effect of each religious type on the same four deviant outcomes. These indices for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory function as mediators when 1) variations in religious type significantly account for variations in the indices of social bonds or deviant friends and attitudes; 2) when variations in social bonds or deviant friends and attitudes significantly account for variations in the dependent measures of deviant behavior; or 3) when religious type, social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes are added to the models, the relation between the religious
type and the dependent outcomes becomes insignificant, is reduced, or disappears altogether (Baron and Kenny 1986). To determine the capacity of indices for social bonds and deviant friends and unconventional attitudes as mediators, the indices need to affect the causal path by reducing the effect of the religious type on the deviant outcomes. The strongest demonstration of mediation occurs when the relation between a religious affiliation and a deviant index disappears or reaches zero. A significant effect is determined when the b coefficient for each religious type is reduced once the theoretical index is added to the model. In this series of multivariate analyses, two series of OLS regressions are given: The first OLS equation excludes the No Religion Group and the second equation excludes Shambhala Buddhists. By testing the hypotheses in a two-run format, the first equation compares both the Shambhala Buddhists and the Methodists against the control group of non-religious respondents. In the second equation, the Shambhala Buddhists are excluded, which allows for direct comparisons of both Methodists and the No Religion Group to the nontraditional religious type of Shambhala Buddhists. This format is followed in Tables 6a-d and 7a-d.

Table 6a summarizes the regression coefficients on general deviance. Table 6b summarizes the coefficients for sexual deviance, followed by Table 6c for coefficients for alcohol and illegal drug use, and Table 6d illustrates the results for mediating effects for the model on the log of violence and criminal activity. Tables 6a-d and 7a-d always include information from Table 5 in the first block as Model 1 and Model 2, with coefficients from the regression equations of the mediating effects of the index of social bonds (Hirschi 1969) in the second block (models 3 and 4), and the mediating effects of the index of deviant friends and attitudes (Sutherland 1947) in the third block (models 5 and
6. The last two columns in Tables 6a through 6d provide two additional models (7 and 8) where both social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes compete together in the same model. The same format described here is followed in Table 7a-d for the moderator-effects hypothesis, although these four tables do not carry models 7 and 8.

The second hypothesis states that measures for Hirschi's (1969) social control theory, operationalized as an index of social bonds, and measures for Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory, operationalized as an index of friends' deviant behavior and respondents' unconventional attitudes toward breaking social norms, mediates, or reduces the effect of the religious type on all four deviant outcomes. The mediator-effects hypothesis has mixed results for both theoretical constructs. I first discuss the mediating effects of religious type and social bonds on the four deviant outcomes and then address the mediating effects of deviant attitudes and friendships on religious type and the four dependent measures of deviant behavior and criminal activity. Simply put, the indices that represent Hirschi's (1969) theory and Sutherland's (1947) theory test whether the religion-deviance relationship is a spurious one for each religious type on each of the four deviant outcomes. I find that social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes do not significantly reduce “across the board” the religion-deviance relationship for all religious types on all deviant outcomes.

Evidence in favor of the social bonds index as a mediator is not strong. There are only four models in which significant but weak reductions in the coefficients occurred. 1) Shambhala Buddhists' high levels of social bonds reduce the religious effect by 16% on minor forms of deviance (b = 5.17, p < .01 to b = 4.63, p < .01) in comparison to the control group of non-religious respondents. 2) Shambhala Buddhists' high levels of social
bonds reduce by 7.5% the religious effect on violence and crime in comparison to the nonreligious respondents on the log of the index of violence and crime (b = .348, p < .01 to b = .322, p < .01). 3) The same 7.5% reduction is also experienced by the Methodists' high levels of social bonds on the log of the index on violence and crime in comparison to the Shambhala Buddhists (b = -.348, p < .01 to b = -.322, p < .01). 4) Finally, an even smaller reduction occurs where the effect of Methodists' high levels of social bonds reduce by 2% the religious effect on sexual deviance (b = -1.53, p < .01 to b = -1.50, p < .01) in comparison to the Shambhala Buddhists. Were it not for Methodists' high levels of social bonds, they would be more likely engage in sexually deviant activity than the nonreligious respondents (b = -.126, p > .10 to b = .053, p > .10).

There was one strong exception in which social bonds as a mediator became clearly evident. By far the best indicator of social bonds reducing the impact of a religious type on a deviant outcome happened when Methodists' scores on the index for illegal drug and excessive alcohol use fell 40.6% in comparison to the nonreligious respondents. Methodists' high levels of social bonds reduced the religious effect by nearly half, making them indistinguishable from the control group (b = -.807, p < .05 to b = -.479, p > .10). The mediation effect of social bonds for Methodists is an important finding. Were it not for the fact that Methodists have high levels of social bonds, they would potentially consume more drugs and alcohol than their nonreligious counterparts. By contrast, Shambhala Buddhists' high levels of social bonds only reduced the religious effect by 6.7% on drug and alcohol use when compared to the Methodists (b = 2.39, p < .01 to b = 2.23, p < .01). This evidence further confirms the notion that being a Shambhala Buddhist is a more deviant religious type than being a Methodist or having no
religious affiliation at all. This is because despite high levels of social bonds, little or no mediating effects make the relationship a spurious one for Shambhala Buddhists on these deviant outcomes. This evidence is also of great consequence because it reduces the importance placed on belonging to a traditional religion for crime prevention. Being a Methodist does not significantly control deviant and criminal behavior better than a person who chooses not to have any religious affiliation. These findings are shown in Table 6a-d.

Table 6 also provides information on the mediating effects of the index of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes that supports Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. These b coefficients are listed in Models 5 and 6. Although there appear to be slightly greater mediating effects for deviant friends and unconventional attitudes that favor violating social norms, the differential association index is not overwhelmingly supported as an effective mediator for all religious types on all four deviant outcomes. There are four important findings for the mediating effects of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes that reduce the effect of religious type on deviant outcomes. 1) Associations with deviant friends and having unconventional attitudes that favor violating social norms reduce the effect of being a Shambhala Buddhist by 28.6% on general deviance when compared to the Methodists (b = 5.17, p < .01 to b = 3.69, p < .01). Despite the fact that associations with deviant friends and holding unconventional attitudes accounts for nearly one-third of the religious effect on minor forms of deviance, it does not reduce to insignificance the effect of the religious affiliation. The Shambhala Buddhists remain more likely to engage in minor forms of deviance when compared to the traditional religious type. 2) Associations with deviant friends and unconventional
attitudes reduce the effect of being a Shambhala Buddhist on sexual deviance by 17.6% when compared to the Methodists (b = 1.53, p < .01 to b = 1.26, p < .01), yet they remain significantly more likely to engage in sexually deviant behavior relative to both the nonreligious respondents and the traditional religious type. 3) Shambhala Buddhists’ associations with deviant friends and their unconventional attitudes mediate 19.5% of the effect of the religious type on the log of the index on violence and crime when compared to the Methodists (b = .348, p < .01 to b = .280, p < .01); however, as before, this mediating effect does not reduce the coefficient significantly, and the relation is not spurious. 4) The largest mediating effect was found when associations with deviant friends and unconventional attitudes reduced the religious effect of being a Methodist on illegal drug use and excessive alcohol consumption by 35% (b = - .807, p < .05 to b = - .524, p > .10). Although in the original model shown in Table 5 (Model 1) identified Methodists as being significantly less likely to consume excessive amounts of alcohol and illicit drugs relative to the nonreligious respondents, controlling for deviant friends and unconventional attitudes significantly alters this relation. Thus, by controlling for deviant associations, Methodists are more likely to consume excessive amounts of alcohol and use illicit drugs than their nonreligious counterparts.

Contrary to the mediation-effects hypothesis in support of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory, social bonds were found to suppress some of the religious effect of being a Shambhala Buddhist on four deviant outcomes. In this context, a suppressor effect means that that the index of social bonds “protects” the religion-deviance connection. In other words, when controlling for possible mediating effects to reduce the effect of the religious type on a deviant income, the relation between religious type and a deviant income
outcome actually increases instead. Most significantly, suppressor effects hide the connection of Shambhala Buddhism on each deviant outcome by a small percentage when compared to the control group of nonreligious respondents. This evidence of four small suppressor effects found with social bonds is cited here. 1) High levels of social bonds suppress 11% of the relationship between Shambhala Buddhists and minor forms of deviant behavior in comparison to the control group (b = 3.99, p < .01 to b = 4.49, p < .01). 2) High levels of social bonds also suppress the relation of Shambhala Buddhists on sexual deviance by 13% in comparison to the control group (b = 1.41, p < .01 to b = 1.62, p < .01). 3) High levels of social bonds also increase the effect of being a Shambhala Buddhist on illegal drug and alcohol use by 9% relative to the nonreligious counterparts (b = 1.59, p < .01 to b = 1.75, p < .01); and 4) high levels of social bonds suppress 6.7% of the effect of being a Shambhala Buddhist on the log of the index of violence and crime relative to the control group (b = 1.59, p < .01 to b = 1.75, p < .01).

These findings reduce the predictability of social bonds as an effective mediator specifically for use with a nontraditional religious type shown here. Yet, at a practical level, testing for social bonds makes more apparent potential deviant behaviors otherwise imbedded into a subculture or “deviant” religious type by examining the relation for suppressor effects. And although this refutes Hirschi’s (1969) premise that any kind of social bond can potentially defray deviant and criminal behavior, it paradoxically strengthens the evidence of the unconventional religious bond on deviance for future research of this type. In this context, the parsimony of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory has broadened by using its theoretical constructs to test for such suppressor
effects. This analysis unveils potentially deeper connections of the religion-deviance relationship otherwise left unnoticed.

Two suppressor effects are also worth mentioning relative to the index of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes on the Methodist-general deviance relationship and the Methodist-violence and crime relationship, although it is important to point out that they are not as significant as the suppressor effects found for social bonds on the Shambhala Buddhist-deviance relationships discussed above. Although the Methodists are not significantly different from the control group on their general deviance scores or violence and crime scores, associations with deviant friends and holding unconventional attitudes suppress 64% of the religious effect of being a Methodist on general deviance in comparison to the control group (b = -1.18, p = .12 to b = .420, p = .50), and 27% of the effect of being a Methodist on the log of the index on violence and crime relative to the control group (b = .081, p = .40 to b = .180, p = .18). Although these trends are only suggestive, it may be beneficial in future research to apply these theoretical constructs in a more deliberate way to test for suppressor effects, particularly with a larger sample. The implications are important because the evidence, although tentative, suggests that a conventional religious type does not deter crime and deviant behavior significantly better than people without a religious affiliation. In this study, when controlling for their social bonds and deviant associations, Methodists become likely to engage in some forms of deviant behavior more so than the nonreligious respondents.

The mediation capability for measures of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory do show that high levels of social bonds can reduce the effects of religion on the four deviant outcomes for Methodists and non-religious respondents alike, but the effects are
subtle, and reflect small tendencies rather than a significant reversal. Controlling for social bonds does not make the religion-deviance relationship disappear. The mediation hypothesis finds the most support for its effect on Methodists’ drug and alcohol use. Methodists’ ties to family and community significantly reduce the traditional religion’s effect on drug and alcohol use, and herein lies the most significant support for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory as a mediator. Yet in many cases, higher social bonds do not alter the religious effect of being a Shambhala Buddhist on the four deviant outcomes, and in fact suppresses its effect rather than reduces it. Nor do social bonds significantly provide a basis from which to distinguish non-religious respondents from the Methodists. Overall, higher social bonds changed the models only slightly. The social bonds index explained an average of only 3% more variance in the general deviance and alcohol and drug outcomes when compared to the main effects models shown in Table 5. It is not a significant predictor for the outcome on sexual deviance, and it actually reduced by 2% the amount of variance explained on the log of the index on violence and crime when compared to the original model.

In conclusion, the index of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes that favor violating social norms provides some evidence in support for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory, but like the social bonds index, it is not overwhelming. Associations with deviant friends and like attitudes suggests that Methodists, as a religious type, do not refrain from deviant activity, and in fact use illegal drugs and consume excessive amounts of alcohol potentially more than the control group. Conversely, the Shambhala Buddhists’ levels of deviant behaviors are largely unaffected by their deviant associations and attitudes favoring social norm violation. This trend
suggests a pattern of behavior and values consistently different from the nonreligious’ and Methodist respondents’. Such evidence points to a cultural effect among the Shambhala Buddhists where the definitions in favor of norm violation appear to condone or excuse some deviant behaviors within the religious context of Shambhala Buddhism. Indeed, the effect of their religious identity grows stronger relative to the four deviant outcomes when social bonds are considered as suppressors in the Shambhala Buddhist – deviance relationship.

This second hypothesis tested the extent to which measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory effectively mediate the relation between religious types on four deviant outcomes. Having high levels of social bonds was predicted to significantly reduce the religious effect, which is in support of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory. I conclude that the mediation capability for my social control index is weak. Although I find that high levels of social bonds mediate the religious effects on the four deviant outcomes for Methodists, this reduction is largely suggestive. The mediation hypothesis finds the most support for its effect on Methodists’ drug and alcohol use and does not provide significant mediation on minor forms of deviance, sexual deviance, or violence and criminal activity. Additionally, higher social bonds do not alter the religious effect of Shambhala Buddhists on the four deviant outcomes, nor can it clearly assist in distinguishing differences between the non-religious respondents and the Methodists in this sample. The evidence for support of the mediation capabilities of constructs for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory is not supported in the data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(from Table 5) N = 252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodists</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>-5.17***</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.921***</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.671***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.770)</td>
<td>(.728)</td>
<td>(.183)</td>
<td>(.163)</td>
<td>(.156)</td>
<td>(.148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>3.99***</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>.863***</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>.730***</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.757)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.167)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.147)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.757)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.167)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female = 1)</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.594)</td>
<td>(.594)</td>
<td>(.121)</td>
<td>(.121)</td>
<td>(.109)</td>
<td>(.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.023)</td>
<td>(.023)</td>
<td>(.068)</td>
<td>(.068)</td>
<td>(.061)</td>
<td>(.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (married = 1)</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>-.329</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.626)</td>
<td>(.626)</td>
<td>(.137)</td>
<td>(.137)</td>
<td>(.116)</td>
<td>(.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-.196*</td>
<td>-.246**</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.111)</td>
<td>(.116)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Term X Methodists</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.164)</td>
<td>(.166)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Term X Buddhists</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.155)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Term X No Religion</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.155)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>.295***</td>
<td>.485***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.093)</td>
<td>(.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Term X Methodists</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.139)</td>
<td>(.147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Term X Buddhists</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.139)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Term X No Religion</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.139)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, two-tailed tests. Standard errors in ( ) All non-dummy variables are standardized.
Table 7b. Standardized Coefficients for the Regression of Religious Types on Sexual Deviance: Models with Social Control & Differential Association Indices as Moderators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (from Table 5) N = 276</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3 N = 257</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>N = 261 Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.126 (.304)</td>
<td>-.153*** (.286)</td>
<td>.093 (.176)</td>
<td>-.610*** (.155)</td>
<td>-.034 (.160)</td>
<td>-.522*** (.152)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buddhists</strong></td>
<td>1.41*** (.297)</td>
<td>-.703*** (.160)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.488*** (.148)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>.020 (.231)</td>
<td>.029 (.232)</td>
<td>.025 (.115)</td>
<td>.025 (.115)</td>
<td>.062 (.110)</td>
<td>.062 (.110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>.034*** (.009)</td>
<td>.035*** (.009)</td>
<td>.219*** (.065)</td>
<td>.219*** (.065)</td>
<td>.268*** (.061)</td>
<td>.268*** (.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td>-.188 (.245)</td>
<td>-.182 (.245)</td>
<td>-.061 (.129)</td>
<td>-.061 (.129)</td>
<td>.022 (.117)</td>
<td>.022 (.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(married = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Index x Methodists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Index x Buddhists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SC Index x No Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DA Index</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DA Index x Methodists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DA Index x Buddhists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DA Index x No Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adj. R²</strong></td>
<td>.187 (.187)</td>
<td>.187 (.187)</td>
<td>.199 (.199)</td>
<td>.199 (.199)</td>
<td>.248 (.142)</td>
<td>.248 (.142)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, two-tailed tests. Standard errors in ( ). All non-dummy variables are standardized.
Table 7c. Standardized Coefficients for the Regression of Religious Types on Illegal Drug and Alcohol Use:
Models with Social Control & Differential Association as Modifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(from Table 5) N = 277</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 4</td>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>Model 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodists</td>
<td>-.807**</td>
<td>-.239***</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>-.108***</td>
<td>-.318*</td>
<td>-.949***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.335)</td>
<td>(.312)</td>
<td>(.174)</td>
<td>(.152)</td>
<td>(.167)</td>
<td>(.112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>1.59***</td>
<td>.851***</td>
<td>.851***</td>
<td>.632***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.326)</td>
<td>(.158)</td>
<td>(.158)</td>
<td>(.153)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.161***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.632***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.327)</td>
<td>(.158)</td>
<td>(.153)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>-.264</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.133</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(female = 1)</td>
<td>(.256)</td>
<td>(.256)</td>
<td>(.115)</td>
<td>(.115)</td>
<td>(.115)</td>
<td>(.115)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.010)</td>
<td>(.065)</td>
<td>(.065)</td>
<td>(.065)</td>
<td>(.065)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(married = 1)</td>
<td>(.270)</td>
<td>(.270)</td>
<td>(.129)</td>
<td>(.129)</td>
<td>(.122)</td>
<td>(.122)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.260***</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.104)</td>
<td>(.111)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index x Methodists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.330**</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.154)</td>
<td>(.157)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index x Buddhists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.149)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index x No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.149)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.120</td>
<td>.341***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.097)</td>
<td>(.112)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index X Methodists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.146)</td>
<td>(.155)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index x Buddhists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.146)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index x No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.146)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, two-tailed tests. Standard errors in (); All non-dummy variables are standardized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Table 5) N = 289</td>
<td>N = 258</td>
<td>N = 263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodists</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.345***</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.265**</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.261**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.107)</td>
<td>(.103)</td>
<td>(.133)</td>
<td>(.18)</td>
<td>(.124)</td>
<td>(.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhists</td>
<td>.429***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.415***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.405***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.104)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.119)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.114)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.429***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.415***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.405***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.104)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.119)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.114)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.159*</td>
<td>-.159*</td>
<td>-.225***</td>
<td>-.225***</td>
<td>-.150*</td>
<td>-.150*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.083)</td>
<td>(.083)</td>
<td>(.087)</td>
<td>(.087)</td>
<td>(.086)</td>
<td>(.086)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.003)</td>
<td>(.003)</td>
<td>(.049)</td>
<td>(.049)</td>
<td>(.047)</td>
<td>(.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.008)</td>
<td>(.099)</td>
<td>(.099)</td>
<td>(.092)</td>
<td>(.092)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.079)</td>
<td>(.079)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index x Methodists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.196</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.120)</td>
<td>(.123)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index x Buddhists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Index x No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.072</td>
<td></td>
<td>.248***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.072)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.084)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index x Methodists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.109)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index x Buddhists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.109)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA Index x No Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R²</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10, **p < .05, ***p < .01, two-tailed tests, standard errors in ( ); All non-dummy variables are standardized.
Likewise, the index of *deviant friends and attitudes* provides only some evidence in support of Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. However, there is a subtle difference in comparing the theoretical constructs’ effectiveness. In Table 6, models 7 and 8 show that on every outcome tested, the index of *deviant friends and attitudes* significantly contributes to all four models. In particular, the *deviant friends and attitudes* index was effective on the general deviance index \( (b = .641, p < .01) \) as compared to the *social bonds* index \( (b = .092, p = .942) \), and on the outcome of sexual deviance, the *deviant friends and attitudes* index was more effective \( (b = .171, p < .01) \) than the *social bonds* index \( (b = .041, p = .329) \). Associations with *deviant friends and holding unconventional attitudes* that violate social norms discern some substantive decreases in average deviance scores for the Methodists, mediating the effect of the religious type on drug and alcohol use relative to the nonreligious respondents. On average, this index for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory discerned that Methodists were more likely to engage in minor forms of deviance and sexual deviance relative to the nonreligious respondents. Thus, I reject the second hypothesis relative to Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory as originally stated. Rather than finding that my differential association index significantly reduces the effect of the religious type on the four deviant outcomes, I conclude that this mediation effect is not supported in the data. Replication studies with larger sample sizes are certainly appropriate in order to establish support for the veracity of these conclusions.

**The Moderator-Effects Outcome**

The third and final hypothesis examines the extent to which measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association
theory moderate the effect of the religious types on the four measures of deviance. This information is presented in Tables 7a through 7d on the preceding four pages. In this series of analyses, the same measures of social bonds represent the theoretical constructs for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and deviant friends and attitudes favoring norm violation represent Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory. These constructs are now considered as “moderators.” A moderated causal relationship is one in which the relationship between the religious type and the dependent measures of deviance is changed by a third variable, for which this analysis uses both an index for social bonds and an index for deviant friends and attitudes in which to create interaction terms.

Moderators are variables that affect the direction and strength of the relation between the predictor variable, religious type, and the dependent variable, one or all of the four indices of deviance and crime. The moderators are a third variable that affects the zero-order correlation between the two other variables and is made by combining a religious type times the differential association index or the social control index. As a result, six interaction terms represent the three religious affiliations times the social control index (social bonds) and a separate set of three terms correspond to the three religious types times the differential association index (deviant friends and unconventional attitudes). In a regression model, a moderator-interaction effect occurs if the relationship between the religious type and the dependent measure is substantially reduced or reversed (Baron and Kenny 1986; Jaccard, Turrisi, and Wan 1990).

Like the mediation hypothesis, social bonds, deviant friends and attitudes are predicted to interact or buffer the religion-deviance relationship. The index used for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory is predicted to moderate the effect of a religious
type on deviant outcomes differently relative to a comparison group. Likewise, the index
used for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory is predicted to moderate the
effect of a religious type on deviant outcomes differently relative to an omitted group. To
test this hypothesis, interaction terms are introduced into the original regression model,
previously shown in Table 5, and a significant effect is determined by having significant
first order terms for the religious identity and the theoretical indices and their associated
interaction term. These moderator-models are shown in Tables 7a-d for each dependent
measure, and all non-dummy variables are standardized to reduce the effects of
multicollinearity among the variables used in composite scores (Aiken and West 1991).
Models 1 and 2 restate the b coefficients from the original models in Table 5 for each
outcome. Models 3 and 4 show standardized coefficients for all non-dummy variables
with the social bonds index and the social bonds x religious type interaction terms.
Models 5 and 6 illustrate the standardized coefficients of all non-dummy variables with
the deviant friends and attitudes index and the deviant friends and attitudes index x
religious type interaction terms. Like the previous tables in this chapter, the first models
in every series (Models 1, 3, 5) exclude the control group of non-religious respondents,
and the second model in every series (Models 2, 4, 6) exclude the non-traditional religion
of Shambhala Buddhists.

Overwhelmingly, these moderator-models do not yield the same levels of statistical
significance as the mediator models. This is because the measures for Sutherland’s
(1947) differential association theory and Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory have
little or no different effect by religious type in comparison to an omitted group on the
four deviant outcomes. Both the indices for social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes
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operate in relatively the same way for each religious affiliation on the four dependent measures. However, at the risk of making a Type I error, there are some substantive findings worth mentioning. There are only two interactions at the p < .01 level to discuss, and two somewhat substantive interactions at the p < .05 and p < .10 levels. In the latter, the use of the 90% confidence interval in this context is used only to highlight a possible trend for future research and should be viewed with caution.

Two significant findings are that the interaction terms of the differential association index x Shambhala Buddhists and differential association x No Religion Group intervene in the relation between the religious type and sexually deviant behavior. Shambhala Buddhists are more likely to engage in sexually deviant activity relative to the nonreligious respondents, and even when they have associations with deviant friends and unconventional attitudes they are still even more likely to engage in sexually deviant behavior relative to the control group (b = .462, p < .01). The opposite effect occurs for the nonreligious respondents, where although having deviant friends and unconventional attitudes makes it more likely for the No Religion Group to engage in sexually deviant behavior, their associations with deviant friends and unconventional attitudes actually makes it less likely for them to be sexually deviant when compared to the Shambhala Buddhists (b = .462, p < .01). Thus, the moderator-effect hypothesis is partially supported only for Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory on the relation between the nonreligious affiliation on sexually deviant behavior and not the Shambhala Buddhists.

Two interaction effects of substantive interest are both social bonds x Methodists and deviant friends and attitudes x Methodists on the index for illegal drug and excessive
alcohol consumption. Although Methodists’ *social bonds* make it less likely for them to use drugs and alcohol, they are more likely to use drugs and alcohol than the control group with high levels of *social bonds* ($b = .330, p < .05$). The opposite effect is likely when comparing Methodists to Shambhala Buddhists on drug and alcohol consumption. Although associations with deviant friends and attitudes favoring norm violation make it more likely to use illegal drugs and drink excessively for both Methodists and Shambhala Buddhists alike, it is less likely that the Methodists will choose to consume these substances when compared to the Shambhala Buddhists ($b = -.269, p < .10$). These findings indicate partial support for Hirschi’s (1969) theory and Sutherland’s (1947) theory that predicted that the indices of *social bonds* and *deviant friends and unconventional attitudes* could moderate the effect of a religious type on a deviant outcome. In this case only, the effects of the theoretical constructs only on the index of illicit drug and excessive alcohol consumption buffer the religious affiliation.

In conclusion, the last hypothesis in this dissertation proposed that measures for Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory could significantly moderate the effect of the religious types on four deviant outcomes. This hypothesis is not supported by the data; however at a substantive level, associations with *deviant friends and unconventional attitudes* showed some moderation capabilities for Methodists on drug and alcohol use when compared to the Shambhala Buddhists, and showed more significant moderation effects for the control group relative to the Shambhala Buddhists on sexual deviance outcomes. By comparison, only one social control interaction term was marginally useful, although it did not reduce the effect as stated in the third hypothesis. Having high levels of *social bonds* differentially
influenced the greater likelihood of Methodists using drugs and alcohol relative to the No Religion Group. In sum, much evidence was lacking to support a moderation effects hypothesis for both classical theories. There were no significant interactions to report on two of the four outcomes tested: general forms of deviance and violence and criminal activity. In one instance, narrower confidence intervals also had to be used to discern possible trends at all. As a result, I conclude that there is not enough evidence to support the moderator-effects hypothesis in the data.

**Summary**

The initial findings from the straightforward test of religious types on four dependent measures of general, sexual, drug and alcohol, and violence and crime measures, suggest that Methodists are statistically different from the Shambhala Buddhists and only somewhat different from the control group of non-religious respondents. In fact, the nontraditional religion of Shambhala Buddhism has significantly higher scores on all four deviant outcomes. Despite this evidence that belonging to a non-traditional religion results in higher scores on all deviant outcomes, the overall effect of belonging to a traditional religion is not as straightforward as first hypothesized. The control group of non-religious respondents is found to be statistically quite similar to the Methodists on three of the four deviant outcomes. Only on the outcome of drugs and alcohol use are the Methodists significantly different. However, as shown in the mediator-effects models, this difference is attributable to higher levels of social bonds and not due to the religious affiliation of being Methodist, per se. So although the initial findings do support the notion that belonging to a traditional religion results in lower average scores on all four deviant outcomes relative to the non-traditional religion of
Shambhala Buddhism, the fact is that the Methodists are not significantly different from
the control group. This evidence casts doubt on whether belonging to a traditional
religion can actually reduce and control criminal and deviant behavior.

The second hypothesis tested mediating effects of constructs of social bonds for
Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and deviant friends and attitudes for Sutherland’s
(1947) differential association theory. The hypothesis predicted that these constructs
would mediate or reduce the religious effect on all four deviant outcomes. Evidence was
mixed and weak for this hypothesis. However, a clearer picture of the effect of religious
type on the four dependent measures began to emerge. Mediator effects models discerned
suppressor effects for the Shambhala Buddhists, while it also elevated Methodists’
potential for deviant activities relative to the control group. The use of the mediator-
effects models is important for this reason. Without these models, the initial findings
would erroneously conclude that traditional religious types were an important control
mechanism for a society; yet, the use of the mediator-models helps to suggest otherwise.

Associations with deviant friends and having attitudes that favor violating social norms
confirms that Methodists, as a religious type, do not refrain from deviant activity, and
that the relationship between Methodists and these four deviant outcomes actually
increases in comparison to the No Religion Group. Equally important is the recognition
that having high levels of social bonds or controlling for deviant friends does little to
effect the religious type of Shambhala Buddhism on all four deviant outcomes. The
evidence supports a cultural effect where such social norm violation and deviant behavior
may be condoned or supported to some degree within the context of the nontraditional
religion of Shambhala Buddhism.
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The third hypothesis tested the extent to which *social bonds* and *deviant friends and attitudes* could function as moderators. Despite the weak evidence for both theoretical constructs with these moderator-effects models, the interaction term of *social bonds x Methodists* further provided evidence that Methodists were somewhat more likely to use drugs and alcohol even with higher levels of social bonds when compared to the nonreligious respondents. This finding corroborated earlier results from the mediation models. Also importantly, the interaction term of *deviant friends and attitudes x Shambhala Buddhists* further incriminated this nontraditional religious type as more likely to engage in sexually deviant behavior relative to the nonreligious respondents despite their associations with deviant friends. In sum, although a great degree of evidence was lacking for both the mediation and moderation hypotheses, these findings do support the evidence first uncovered in the main-effects models of the first hypothesis. The first hypothesis was rejected because belonging to a traditional religious type did not alter their relation to deviance and criminal behaviors significantly better than having no religious identity. At best, these findings illustrate that *carte blanche* belief that traditional religions uphold the moral fabric of society better than no religion at all is unfounded. Evidence presented from the tests of all three hypotheses cast doubt on the expectation that belonging to a traditional religion significantly reduces and controls acts of deviance and criminal behavior better than those people who choose to have no religious affiliation at all even while taking into consideration high levels of social bonds and associations with deviant friends and unconventional attitudes. Rather, it is perhaps more plausible to believe that commitment to family and involvement in the community are potentially more powerful deterrents than a particular religious faith.
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

This research tested the extent to which members of two different religions and a control group of nonreligious respondents were associated with criminal and deviant behavior. These three “religious” affiliations were used to test the predictive capabilities of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory as mediators and moderators on four deviant outcomes. The first hypothesis was a straightforward test of whether a conventional religion had the ability to deter criminal and deviant behaviors better than a unconventional religion. Here few differences emerged between the control group of non-religious respondents and the Methodists. These two groups were statistically indistinguishable from one another on general deviance, crime, and sexual deviance measures. Shambhala Buddhists emerged as the most significant religious type as a predictor for deviant and criminal behaviors. Yet the overall effect of belonging to a religion was not as significant as suggested at the outset of this research.

In the second hypothesis, measures from social control theory (Hirschi 1969) and differential association theory (Sutherland 1947) were predicted to mediate the relationship of the religious types by reducing the effect of the religion on the four deviant outcomes. There were only four significant instances in which social bonds mediated the effect of the religious affiliations on deviant outcomes. The strongest social bonds mediation effect occurred for Methodists on illegal drug and alcohol consumption.
Methodists’ higher levels of social bonds accounted for nearly half of their effect on drug and alcohol use relative to the control group, and this finding rendered them statistically similar to their nonreligious counterparts on all four deviant outcomes. This evidence then only partially supported constructs for Hirschi’s (1969) control theory as a mediator because it could not completely reduce or eliminate the connection between religious type on criminal and deviant behaviors. In general, the relationship between religious type and deviant outcomes was not found to be spurious. Specifically, high levels of social bonds actually suppressed the religious effect of Shambhala Buddhism on all four deviant measures when compared to the nonreligious respondents. Controlling for social bonds provided even more evidence that belonging to an unconventional religious type made it much more likely that Shambhala Buddhists were the more deviant and crime-prone group.

With few exceptions, deviant friends and unconventional attitudes provided slightly better mediation effects between religious types on all four deviant measures, but overwhelming support for these constructs of Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory was not evident in the data. Although controlling for deviant friends and attitudes more significantly decreased the effect of religious affiliation on deviance and crime, across the board support was not forthcoming. Controlling for associations with deviant friends and unconventional attitudes suggested that Methodists do not refrain from deviant activity and potentially use more illegal drugs and consume excessive amounts of alcohol in comparison to the control group. It also appears that deviant friends and attitudes reduced the effect of being a Methodist on sexually deviant activity when compared to the nonreligious respondents. Methodists were more likely to be sexually
deviant than the nonreligious respondents when deviant friends and attitudes were controlled. This same mediating trend was also found on violence and criminal activity for the Methodists, although it is only suggestive and in need of further testing with a larger sample.

The third hypothesis focused on moderating effects. Here I tested the extent that social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes intervened in the relation between religious type on the same four dependent measures of deviance and crime. Overwhelmingly, these moderator-effects models did not produce the same levels of statistical significance as the mediation models. This is because social bonds and deviant friends and attitudes operated in relatively the same fashion for each religious affiliation on the four deviant outcomes. Evidence for only two important distinctions surfaced. Despite associations with deviant friends and attitudes that caused more sexually deviant behavior to occur, Shambhala Buddhists were even more likely to be sexually deviant when compared to the control group. The second interesting finding was that although high levels of social bonds tended to reduce excessive alcohol and illegal drug use for both Methodists and the No Religion Group alike, Methodists were found to be somewhat more likely to use drugs and alcohol than the control group despite their higher levels of social bonds.

Yet, although I conclude that religious type does matter, clear evidence to support a traditional religion over no religion is not substantiated in the data. The findings presented here do not favor the traditionally held view that a particular religious faith is overwhelming useful in reinforcing the moral fabric of society by reducing crime and deviant behavior.
Theoretical Considerations

Building on the ideas of Durkheim (1895;1995 [1912]), the generally accepted view of functionalists has been that all religions provide civility and stability for a complex, organic society. Religions are social products, and they are also social institutions that are not intended to make us think or enrich our knowledge, but rather to make us act and to help us live.\textsuperscript{13} As social institutions, religions are thought to effectively reduce the risk of anomie by providing guidelines for behaviors, attitudes, and values that are conducive for a society to operate smoothly. Durkheim (1995 [1912]) believed that religion awakens feelings of support and safety, and provides protective guidance that binds individuals to the religious group, or in this case, new religious movements, and simultaneously to society. No matter the religious affiliation, different religious groups ultimately help to create ties to the larger society. In this regard Shambhala Buddhists function in a very Durkheimian way. Paraphrasing Durkheim (1995:421-425 [1912]),

Society should be above all an active cooperation... Religion is the principal feature of collective life...the epitome of collective life. If religion gave birth to all that is essential in society, that is so because the idea of society is the soul of religion. Thus, religious forces are human forces, moral forces...

Although Durkheim might not think Shambhala Buddhists are particularly "moral," based on the evidence presented in this study, the solidarity of the Shambhala Buddhists as a new religious movement functions exactly as Durkheim predicted. By extension, this perspective provides a context in which to pursue the examination of the intimate relationship between society, crime, and religion. If we believe that religion can

\textsuperscript{13} paraphrasing Durkheim in Elementary Forms of Religious Life (1995:419-425 [1912])
have a role in establishing moral boundaries and provide a basis for the rule of law, then addressing how religions are social products and encourage group formation in new religious movements assists in understanding how deviations from the moral code occurs. Like religion, functionalists see crime as also another way that operates to build social bonds and moral boundaries from the other end of the social spectrum, strengthening in-group solidarity, and reducing societal tensions (Cohen 1955; Merton 1938; Pfohl 1994; Erikson 1966). Durkheim (1915) would also argue that "deviance" needs to be culturally defined and placed within the context of the new subculture rather than comparing their behaviors to larger cultural mores and behaviors, as was done in this study. Despite this limitation, and although this research is not exhaustive and cannot be generalized to the larger populations of Methodists, Shambhala Buddhists, and to people without a religious preference, the findings of this study can partially reinforce some of these Durkheimian principles that are said to be fundamental for a cohesive, moral order both from a crime and religion perspective.

The evolution of Shambhala Buddhism as a social product and a deviant subculture in the form of a new religious movement, is a good place to start to question these important connections that Durkheim addressed nearly one hundred years ago. Placing its genesis in the context of larger social movements of the 1970’s, Shambhala Buddhism entered as a “polar opposite” relative to the dominant Christian theology of which its new practitioners were once a part. From a Durkheimian perspective, society is responsible for such social products, functioning in a way that it produces new religious movements not unlike how it produces crime and deviant behavior. Critical elements within the larger culture were taking place that contributed to disenfranchising some
upwardly mobile, white, and well educated young adults of the 1960's and 1970's, who in turn looked elsewhere for possible answers in this new, westernized Buddhism. The birth of Shambhala Buddhism perhaps operated in much the same way crime waves happen, gangs form, or suicides appear in aggregate after economic and social upheavals. These political events, or social products, triggered a minority of others to seek and establish a different outcome by constructing and adopting other moral boundaries and new sense of group solidarity.

From Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory, the development of individual, or psycho-social, motivations that lead people to accept or reject the dominant culture has important implications and is connected to these earlier Durkheimian principles. Based on the evidence in this study, by understanding the motivations by which people self-select into deviant socialized groups, this appears to be the best, more direct approach to explain higher levels of non-conformity, deviance and crime within a new religious movement. As mainstream religions construct the dominant culture, they are at the same time constructing its opposition. This division is how Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory can explain these polar dimensions in crime and deviant behavior relative to individual choice and selection. Those who chose to become a Shambhala Buddhist are a latent effect of the larger society.

Sutherland (1947) believed that modern society became divided into a variety of ethnic and normative subcultures, and this happened due to competition in economic and social strata (Pfohl 1994). Through the dominant culture's focus on individualism, accumulation of wealth, and social mobility, subcultures competed with each other for social, economic, and political access to effect change in the larger cultural arena.
Because these subcultures possessed differential access to social resources, political and otherwise, their ability to construct, define, negate, or criminalize social norms, values, and behaviors was limited. Stronger groups, with more social, economic, and political clout became able to impose their cultural standards on others. This "culture conflict" is the underlying cause of differential association (Sellin 1938; Sutherland 1947).

The theoretical implications of Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory are clear when viewed from the Shambhala Buddhist perspective. From the evidence in this study and its general support of differential association measures as significantly contributing to the overall effect of the religion-deviance relationship, the origins of Shambhala Buddhism provide an example of a recent, yet contemporary tale of "culture clash." As a religious type, Shambhala Buddhism grew out of the rejection of individualism, the accumulation of wealth, and the anti-Communist rationale used to justify the Vietnam War (Midal 2003; Coleman 2001). Shambhala Buddhism flourished in the United States precisely when it did because it entered the national landscape during a time of great political unrest and social upheaval. The religious interest clearly represented a polar alternative to the dominant Christian status quo at the time. Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche, the founder of Shambhala Buddhism, effectively recruited people to the religious subculture by teaching non-western philosophy to the "hippie generation" of the 1970's. This generation defined itself in opposition to mainstream values and was largely dissatisfied with the dominant culture’s emphasis on materialism and anti-communism (Midal 2003; Coleman 2001). It is this group of people who are the Shambhala Buddhists in this study, with higher average scores for all measures of crime and deviant behavior than any other religious type.
Constructs for Sutherland's (1947) differential association theory were used to provide a clearer picture of this religion's deviant and criminal activities. Recall that the two core assumptions of differential association are that 1) deviance occurs when persons define a certain human situation as an appropriate occasion for violating social norms, and 2) that the ability to define a situation in a particular way is acquired through the individual’s learning in association with deviant others. The focus of the theory lies in unearthing the social-psychological process by which individuals come to select definitions of a given situation that allows them to either conform or to deviate. Based on the situation, the individual acquires the motives, attitudes, and rationalizations that are used to justify their actions, whether it is condoning the use of psychedelic drugs, cheating on one’s taxes, or engaging in “threesomes,” all activities among the Shambhala Buddhists in this study. The degree to which one chooses such norm violations depends on the frequency, duration, priority, and intensity of one’s associations with those who define the deviance (Pfohl 1994:302).

There are four important factors for the Shambhala Buddhists’ level of deviance, particularly their sexual deviance, that that can be understood from this differential association perspective. The first factor lies in the basic tenets of the religious doctrine itself. The Shambhala Buddhist religion does not teach or condone instances of deviance because the larger framework of the religion does not incorporate notions of sin, evil-doing or “wrongness” that can be found within Christian doctrine. Instead, Shambhala Buddhists’ idea of karmic activity addresses how all humans can overcome obstacles in their life by relating directly with their emotions. Feelings of passion, ignorance, aggression, or jealousy are looked upon as opportunities to explore how one’s mind
works. By meditating, the practitioner cuts through these emotional “ego attachments” and develops “skillful means” by which they become enlightened. Notions of “bad behavior” around any action or thought, including sexual behavior, disobeying the law, using illegal drugs, or consuming excessive amounts of alcohol, are not apparent in the teachings. In fact, it might be argued that some of these “deviant” activities shifted from the profane to the sacred within a specific context of the subculture. The religion does not impose external rules for the sake of cultural controls or ensuring appropriate, non-offensive conduct. Nor does it focus on a particular set of values or social norms for its practitioners to follow. It does not seek social control or provide a framework for any human behavior (Midal 2003). Simply, there are virtually no sins and virtually no rules.

In email correspondence with several senior students who studied with the founder of Shambhala Buddhism here in the United States, many recall that their spiritual leader, Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche, encouraged them to explore a wide variety of ways in which to develop “skillful means,” and this included making up guidelines for communal living as they saw fit. In this regard, “deviance” became newly defined based on subgroup definitions and not necessarily based on behaviors and attitudes from the larger culture. For example, Trungpa Rinpoche himself also wished to relate very directly with his students, and he adopted ways in which to assimilate with his new followers. For example, he chose to wear the same western clothes, drink the same alcohol, and use the same drugs, like LSD, that were more in vogue during the 1970’s and part of the larger hippie culture in the United States at the time (Midal 2003; Coleman 2001).

Although anecdotal, it is well documented by the Nalanda Translation Committee, Boulder, Colorado, that has transcribed Trungpa’s early talks from the 1970’s. These “talks” are available often only to senior students and practitioners based on their level of practice. Many are not made available to the public.
Secondly, it is well documented that both Chogyam Trungpa Rinpoche, and his son, the Sakyong, who is the current lineage holder, did not and do not disapprove of a wide variety sexual activity. Once a celibate monk, Trungpa Rinpoche discarded his robes, took five wives, and generally condoned sexual exploration as simply another path toward understanding one’s true nature (Midal 2003). In Trungpa’s words,

The everyday practice [of Buddhism] is simply to develop a complete acceptance and openness to all situations and emotions, and to all people, experiencing everything totally without mental reservations and blockages, so that one never withdraws or centralizes onto oneself.

This freedom of acceptance and openness also needs to be placed within the context of Tibetan people themselves. As a culture, Tibetans tend to be open about their sexuality, which has also been documented to include more liberal views on homosexuality than attitudes found in dominant western cultures (Midal 2003; Harrer 1997). The result is that definitions of what constitute deviant behavior only occur within the context of the larger culture, rarely within the subculture itself. Therefore, what accounts for deviant behavior is never a direct teaching, and behaviors are not shunned or disapproved because they receive no label or are stigmatized as such. The only caveat, or social control, seems to be that any thought, action, or deed should not be done to deliberately hurt someone or something else. This complies with what many senior students might call the “only rule” of Shambhala Buddhism, and that is all activity should transpire with compassion.

Without compassion, any behavior can become deviant. In this context, swatting and killing a mosquito without compassion can constitute a deviant act. Yet lying to one’s spouse or sleeping with another’s girlfriend may not be (Midal 2003). In engaging in deviant activities, mental, physical, or otherwise, the Shambhala Buddhist generates
karma, and it is through his or her karma that the practitioner is put on or off the road to becoming an enlightened bodhisattva. One's karma may be a form of social control, but many Buddhist scholars debate its existence. Furthermore, if it does exist, karma is always changing, and there is very little that can be done by the individual to control its outcome no matter what course of action is pursued. In this regard, it can almost be seen as a neutralizer or justification for deviant behavior (Sykes and Matza 1957).

A third important factor is that many Shambhala Buddhist practitioners of this lineage study in somewhat cloistered and remote communities, living in close proximity with one another for days, weeks, and months at a time with few outside influences. The original meditation center was a converted old farmhouse in Vermont where people slept on the floor at night and listened to Trungpa Rinpoche's teachings by day. Lady Diana Mukpo, Trungpa's first wife, recalled that she and Rinpoche had a lengthy and heated discussion at one point about whether people should be required to knock on their bedroom door before entering or refrain from following Trungpa Rinpoche while he used the bathroom (Midal 2003). This environment generated, and continues to generate to a lesser degree today, a communal intimacy that is unlikely to be found among larger congregations of more traditional church communities, particularly when most church attendance happens only on a weekly basis. Parishioners of contemporary traditional religions, like Methodists, live apart and maintain private lives outside of their religious affiliation. Shambhala Buddhist group meditation programs are often done at a variety of centers, located in Canada, Scotland, France, Vermont, and Colorado, where the participants spend weekends or months living and studying together. Compounded with
intimate living quarters are the teachings of a religious doctrine that offers its practitioners few expectations for normative behavior.

The fourth factor that also explains this difference in deviant behavior among the Shambhala Buddhists is not linked to the religious subculture but rather to the larger events that occurred within the U.S. culture in the 1970's, when Shambhala (Tibetan) Buddhism was first introduced to a western audience. Demographics show that most Americans who self-selected into Tibetan Buddhism, as it was known then, were already liberal-minded, well-educated, and predominantly part of the middle and upper-middle classes. Their parents were practicing Protestants and Catholics. These mainstream sons and daughters of predominantly Christian religious affiliations chose to reject the dominant status quo of which they were a part. Many senior students tell of burning their draft cards and practicing peaceful civil disobedience in their opposition to the Vietnam War. This opposition to the dominant culture included the rejection of the anti-Communist slogans that continued to fuel the realities of the Cold War and nuclear proliferation (Midal 2003). Also at this same time, the larger culture was embracing the second wave of the women's movement, and the threat of deadly sexually transmitted diseases was not on the horizon. With these factors as a backdrop, this group of "hippies" embraced what is now known as Shambhala Buddhism. Single, liberal-minded, and in their early twenties, members of this new religious movement essentially arrived with carte blanche permission to engage in a wide variety of activity, sexual and otherwise, in their intimate, spiritual enclaves. Potentially what can be learned from this discussion is the important social and political forces that drove young, educated individuals to reject
mainstream cultural values and turn instead to a new religion that gave them permission to reject and critique the dominant conservative culture in which they had been raised.

The implications from Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory provide an interesting critique at this point. Although strong bonds do assist in crime reduction, they do not appear as effective as understanding the entire process of deviance by only addressing the levels of bonds. Social bonds do not address how society creates environments that foster deviant socialization or why unconventional religious groups grow in the first place. Neither can it address how members choose to stay or drop out of a deviant subculture. An area of future research is certainly to explore the possibility that the causal order may be in the reverse: deviant processes, as a result of strain or status frustration, may weaken normative bonds to society. In this regard, “in-group” bonding within a particular new religious movement is not dissimilar to joining a street gang, as it potentially replaces lost or weakened bonds once held from the larger society. In this regard, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory does not account for the quality of the bond, only that a bond exists. Functionalists like Cohen (1955) and Merton (1938), on the other hand, do recognize this distinction, and this is potentially a critical piece that is missing from control theory. The reasons for this criticism is because it can be argued that Shambhala Buddhists were in fact highly bonded to society, yet they were still the most likely to deviate. A plausible explanation is that prior delinquency and deviance weakened social bonds that in turn could have resulted in a self-selection process into a new religious movement. This is an argument for exploring reverse causality and also expanding the units of analysis to groups rather than individuals.
For example, control theorists like Hirschi (1969) predict that religious affiliation binds individuals into a web of conformity and thus restrains individuals from engaging in deviant behavior. By bonding with specific values, attitudes, and behaviors, less crime and deviant behavior occurs. According to Hirschi, “delinquent acts result when an individual’s bond to society is weak or broken” (Hirschi 1969:13). Socialization into conventional beliefs about how one should act, toward whom, where, and when are considered, characterized by the social-psychological controls of belief in a system to which one belongs. Attributes like commitment to family and community together make people sensitive to the opinions of others, thus strengthening the individual to the larger network of “appropriately” socialized others. If, however, acts of deviance and crime caused individuals to identify outside traditional social bonds to family and community, just the reverse happens. In-group cohesion within a deviant subculture is strengthened and the socialization process through which individuals learn to deviate leads to the replacement of that traditional religious bond with an untraditional one. To this end, the Shambhala Buddhists are building a sense of community in a very “Durkheimian” way because they are creating social solidarity from within the new religious movement.

Hirschi’s (1969) theory of social control treats Methodists and Shambhala Buddhists as essentially the least likely candidates to deviate, although this is clearly not the case. According to control theory, persons without religious ties have potentially less investment in conformity, and as a result, they would be the group with weaker ties and tendencies for greater deviation. Yet even though the non-religious respondents were slightly younger, male, single, and worked less than the Shambhala Buddhists and Methodists, their deviance and crime scores were not significantly different from the
majority of female, married, hard-working, volunteer-prone group of Methodists. Recall that the non-religious respondents had similar scores when compared to the Methodists on three out of the four indices of deviant and criminal behavior in this study. Potentially the most bonded to society, Methodists did not appear to have significantly lower crime and deviance scores than the respondents who said they were either atheists or had no religion affiliation at all. And when Methodists’ social bonds were taken into consideration on measures for illegal drug and excessive alcohol use, they were found to be more deviant than the control group. If religion provides such an important societal control mechanism, it would have been the non-religious respondents with higher average scores on the four deviant outcomes than anyone else, including the Shambhala Buddhists.

**Social Policy Implications**

Durkheim (1995 [1912]) once said that individuals do not exist without a social context, and the way in which they perceive the world is shaped by the perceptions and values they gain by participating in a society. A civil society maintains social cohesion by fostering adherence to particular actions and behaviors of its members. Pfohl (1994:254) writes,

> Durkheim asserted that there is no human nature without society. Individuals have no existence apart from society. What people thought, how they perceived the world, how they conceived of their relationship to the world – all these things are shaped by participation in society.

Participation in society is measured with control theory principles of commitment, attachment, involvement and belief (Hirschi 1969). So if people perceive themselves as unable to participate – or bond – to the larger society, this in turn shapes how they view their social position in relation to everyone else. With less participation and potentially
fewer attachments, there is room for deviant behavior, including membership in a new religious movement. Given the limited direct effects shown for a traditional religion to deter crime and deviant activity from the evidence presented in this study, this researcher finds it problematic that there is a great deal of renewed interest in religion at the highest levels of government. Faith-based initiatives are receiving widespread support at the national level (DeParle 2005; Shapiro 2003). For example, $8 billion dollars in federal grants have been deliberately channeled to support and promote largely conservative and traditional religious views through the guise of social welfare programs (DeParle 2005). There is no separation between church and state with such initiatives, and what is problematic is that White House officials deny that these funds are being used to promote religious ideals that bring a social and political conservatism to the larger culture. An emphasis on the role of religion to provide social control is a risky venture. If the results of this study are placed in the context of generating a more "civilized society" by increasing social control through traditional religious ties, these data do not support such advocacy. In *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Durkheim wrote, "When we set the ideal society in opposition to the real society, like two antagonists supposedly leading us in opposite directions, we are reifying and opposing abstractions; the ideal society is not outside the real one but is part of it" (1997:425 [1912]). Durkheim's remarks speak to the dual nature of societies where latent and manifest functions are always present. Exclusionary tactics based on which religion to promote to maintain the moral fabric of society aptly addresses two sides of the same issue that are presented in this study: Not

---

15 A list of one year continuation grant recipients of the Compassion Fund, established to support faith-based initiatives, is located in appendix E. Christian groups and ministries directly received over one-third of the total available grant money disbursed by the Department of Health and Human Services in 2004.
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unlike crime and deviant behavior, new religious movements can be viewed as the latent effects of a less than inclusive social, economic, and political system.

These results are politically challenging because they imply that there is misplaced emphasis on social control measures through religious ties. An example of this is the White House's endorsement of the Compassion Fund through which faith-based initiatives receive federal grant dollars. As mentioned in the Introduction and itemized in Appendix E, Christian religious organizations receive a large portion of annual funding from the federal government's Department of Health and Human Services in 2004. This research suggests that it is potentially more important to focus on the self-selection process into alternative and deviant lifestyles than unmitigated support for such religious-based programs. Perhaps it is exactly this kind of exclusionary trend that motivates subcultures to grow and deviate rather than participate and conform. The Shambhala Buddhist example provides a glimpse into perhaps re-thinking the less than inclusive tactics of the Bush Administration's support for largely, conservative, Christian-based agendas. Based on the lop-sided distribution of grants awarded to predominantly Christian organizations discussed earlier, it can be argued that these faith-based initiatives are not inclusive, and non-traditional religions are not encouraged to apply (McNeil News Hour 2003; New York Times 2005; Public Broadcasting Corporation 2005).

The story of the genesis of Shambhala Buddhism reveals that deviation from normative beliefs, attitudes, and actions does and will occur even among individuals who had many differential opportunities to conform and participate in society. If the larger culture seeks exclusionary tactics to maintain a civilized society, marginalizing groups of people who do not share traditional and conservative religious values, this potentially
reduces social cohesion rather than increases it. Thus, the process through which individuals learn to deviate, adopt non-normative beliefs, and become defined as deviants, is a greater possible outcome than conformity.

Limitations of the Study

The evidence from this research certainly needs further validation and investigation in a number of methodological and theoretical areas. Applications of Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory should be tested with a larger sample size and include other religious types, both traditional and non-traditional affiliations. Based on religious affiliation, the traditional religion, Methodism, supports some predictive capabilities for both control and differential association theories, however it is unknown if all traditional religions, such as Catholicism or Judaism, would yield the same conclusions. In addition, Shambhala Buddhism was chosen as the non-traditional religion, although it was not intended to represent all alternative, non-dominant religions. It would be interesting to expand the tests to incorporate other specific religious types, which would allow a greater examination of these outcomes with a wider basis for comparison.

A second limitation of this study is that it did not examine generational effects, nor did it have the ability to tract the reasons for the religious choice in a longitudinal research design. In future studies, it would be important to pursue whether the cohort that initiated Shambhala Buddhism in the 1970’s shared similar or different views in relation to other age groups who choose to join the subculture now. It is possible that individual problems identified with measures associated with Merton’s (1938) strain theory or
Cohen’s (1955) subculture of delinquency theory can discern similar and/or different motivations for self-selection and in-group cohesion.

A third limitation of the study is in its use of web-based sampling. Not every online respondent always completed the 209-item questionnaire. Some data entries had to be deleted for this reason. Importantly, too, is that the respondents were not randomly selected, and the researcher was not able to verify if every person who completed the questionnaire actually met the inclusion criteria or answered honestly. Because the sampling methodology was purposive, generalizations to the larger populations of Shambhala Buddhists, Methodists, and non-religious respondents are only suggestive at best and conclusions relative to these groups and wider social policy implications must be viewed tentatively.

The data were also gathered cross-sectionally, in two timeframes and in two different formats. This created another limitation within the methodological framework. Real differences might exist between these two groups, those persons who completed paper and pencil versions and those persons who completed the on-line version of the survey instrument. Therefore, it is important to reiterate that this was a sample of convenience and a recognized random stratified sampling methodology for each religious type would be more appropriate in future research.

Overall, one major criticism of this study is that this adult sample had few self-reported incidents of deviant behaviors in general, and in particular, even fewer incidents of criminal acts, violence, or threats of violence. This means that the statistical comparisons for these three religious affiliations were largely based on historical incidents rather than contemporary acts of deviance and crime. Only on one index, sexual
deviance, did Shambhala Buddhists exhibit more current deviant behaviors than any other religious type. This finding that Shambhala Buddhists were much more sexually deviant than the Methodists or No Religion Group suggests the possibility of a socialization process unique to this particular religious affiliation that is on-going. Importantly, it cannot be argued that Shambhala Buddhists continue to socialize their members into excessive alcohol use, illicit drug consumption, general forms of deviance, or criminal activities, violence, or threats of violence. There is no evidence from this research for such a conclusion. For future research, it may be prudent to combine all four deviant indices from within the last 12 months or 30 days into one index in order to determine if current, deviant and criminal socialization processes are at work for a particular religious type.

At least three theoretical limitations need mentioning that are beyond the scope of this analysis. Interestingly, Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory that focuses on the bonding process to societal institutions, like work and family, generally affected the non-religious respondents slightly more than they affected the Methodists or the Shambhala Buddhists. Although certainly requiring more research, one explanation might fall along Weberian, rather than Durkheimian, lines. Weber (1946) suggested that more industrialized societies would see a waning of religious beliefs as individuals became trapped in a disenchanted world, and instead people would look for social institutions within a framework of science and technology to control normative behavior (Gerth and Mills 1946). According to Weber, religion, as a potential functional control source, was thought to be dead (Gerth and Mills 1946). Amplifying the survey instrument to include measures for the effects of a “rationalized world” relative to deviance and crime could
provide an interesting examination of Weber's theory. Significant for measures on
violence and crime, the index representing Hirschi's (1969) social control theory operated
somewhat predictably for the non-religious respondents; yet could not produce similar
effects for the Methodists or the Shambhala Buddhists. This research suggests that
specific societal bonds might provide a powerful component for persons without religious
ties that serve, replace, or are used instead of, religious institutions as mechanisms of
social control. Although outside the scope of the theoretical principles discussed here,
this is an area worth exploring in future research.

A second area that is beyond the scope of this research but interesting to pursue is
one measure of psychological distress that appeared consistently as a predictor for a
variety of deviant outcomes. Increased levels of depression by gender varied across
religious affiliations on the four different deviant and criminal measures. It would be
interesting to conduct a longitudinal study to examine the effects of depression on
different deviance and criminal behavior outcomes to clarify these potentially causal
relationships. Related to this methodology is the application of Merton's (1938) strain
theory that might be useful in discerning reasons for the self-selection process into a
deviant religious movement.

A final theoretical area that is worthy of consideration is changing the units of
analysis to explore a reversal causal order hypothesis by religious group. By focusing on
religious groups as the unit of analysis rather than individual members, researchers can
explore the notion that deviance causes specific subgroup formation. Some sociologists,
including Durkheim, argue that definitions of deviance should be defined at the group
level rather than based on what constitutes "normative" or "non-normative" behavior
from the larger culture. This idea is reinforced by Cohen’s (1955) subculture of
delinquency theory that states status frustration is the root cause of subculture
development. My research assumed that subgroup formation occurred first, which in turn
produced deviant behavior. However, using Merton’s (1938) strain theory and Cohen’s
(1955) theory of delinquency, the reasons into which individuals self-select different
religious affiliations and choose to define what is deviant and criminal may be an
important, alternative consideration for future investigation. It would be interesting to test
this comparatively with new religious movements in a follow-up study to this one.

Conclusion

What first drew my attention to this research on religion and crime was President
George W. Bush’s continued interest in supporting traditional, faith-based organizations
in an attempt to allegedly foster greater social cohesion after the somewhat anomic period
following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. The connection between President
Bush’s faith-based initiatives and the social control implications from this study is simply
political food for thought. Given that social bonds and religious affiliation were not
generally found to prevent deviant outcomes or provide significant social control, this
researcher finds it problematic that millions of federal grants are deliberately channeled
and overwhelmingly encouraged to support and promote traditional religious views
through the guise of fortifying civil society. Although tentative, the research presented
here does not support the view that a particular traditional religious faith is overwhelming
useful in reducing criminal and deviant behavior. Clearly, there has been a sweeping
religious fervor that is on the verge of generating renewed “cultural clashes,” and this has
profound social, political and religious implications. The results of this study indirectly
challenge such rationales that ardently support this Administration’s focus on Christian religions, its principles, and programs. This political focus has the potential to negatively affect the way in which the United States is viewed by its allies and how its people view their country. If we believe, as Durkheim did, that religions are social products and *society is the soul of religion*, then studying how people feel included and how they conceive of their relationships to their communities, their religions, and society at large may help to foster a clearer understanding of what it takes to actually reinforce the moral fabric of society and assist in broadening a more *collectively conscious* political landscape. Durkheim once wrote, “A society is not constituted simply by the mass of individuals who comprise it, the ground they occupy, the things they use, or the movements they make, but above all by the idea it has of itself” (1997:425 [1912]).

To place specific religious ideals at the center of what it means to be an “American,” or belong to a civil, democratic society ultimately marginalizes many types of people who do not share the same traditional or conservative religious values. Thus, the process through which individuals learn to deviate, adopt non-normative beliefs, and become defined as deviants, is a greater possible outcome than the conformists it intends to create (Foucault 1994). This unsubstantiated belief in the importance of traditional religions to maintain social cohesion fuels potentially greater culture clashes, not less. Yet law-abiding or criminal, people of different religious preferences, or those with none at all, lose the opportunity of inclusion and participation when the social fabric of the larger culture is interwoven so tightly with specific religious ideology. From such a limited perspective, there is little room for broadening the *collective conscious* of the larger society. The few religious differences distinguished here from this study present
tentative evidence that traditional religions do not warrant the praise they enjoy as mechanisms of social control, nor, by inference, the lucrative government support they receive. Government is the social institution that has the definitive power to negate, define, and deny others. Using social institutions in this way, particularly religious ones, conditions the larger culture to evaluate others as problematic and unwanted (Foucault 1994). Social institutions, like government, are shaped by culture, and in turn, are always restricted by the shared meanings by which people define deviance, create it, and are able to devalue others' experiences, attitudes and behaviors (Kornhauser 1978; Erikson 1966). Perhaps it behooves social scientists to pay closer attention to such affiliations. In the end, they may be a more surreptitious form of deviance and social control than we could ever imagine.
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Statement of Research: The purpose of this research is to examine religious affiliation and its connection to crime and deviant behavior. Crime and deviant behavior are, from a sociological perspective, important for a society to function smoothly. Such events in a person's life come from everyday, ordinary frictions in every community. This research proposes to test two theories that may be able to explain some of these items.

What You Need to Know about Your Participation: Data collected for this study come from personal experiences, but your answers will not be traced to you. The information provided here is strictly confidential and your identity remains anonymous. Individual answers are never used on their own. You or your religious affiliation will never be mentioned by name, nor will there be any identifying characteristics, remarks, or notes of any kind about you or your organization.
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If you choose to participate, simply click on the button below and you will be taken to the first page of the survey. Clicking on this button means that you have given your consent to participate in this research and that you understand what the research is about. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. As you finish each section, the data will be entered and saved into the database. If, at any time, you do not wish to answer a question, simply skip the question and move on to the next one. You may exit the survey at any time. Please know that none of your answers will be saved if you do not complete a section.

The information you provide to us on the web survey will be accessed through the University of New Hampshire's server and is secure on the server. No one, other than technical support at Web Solutions and the researchers, will be able to access the password-protected information.

Please complete all that you can. There are 130 questions on the survey, and your answers are important to us.
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Survey on Religion and Deviance

University of New Hampshire
Department of Sociology

Directions: Please try to answer all questions by either checking a box or filling in a brief answer. Remember that all answers are confidential. Do not put your name on this survey. Thank you again for your participation.

1. Section One: Please provide us with some general background information about yourself.

   1. Please indicate your sex:
      - female
      - male
      - intersex

   2. Please indicate your age:
      - Age: ________________

   3. About how long have you lived at your current address?
      - Approximate length of time: ________________

   4. Education: Which of the following best represents the highest level of education that you have completed?
      - Some high school or less
      - High school graduate
      - Attended some college
      - Associates degree
      - Bachelors degree
      - technical or trade school graduate
      - graduate school

   5. What church, religious organization, or group do you belong to?
      - African Methodist Episcopalian
      - Assemblies Of God
      - Atheism
      - Baptist
      - Buddhist
      - Catholic
      - Church of Christ
      - Congregationalist
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Episcopalian
Jewish
Lutheran
Islam
Methodist
Mormon (Latter Day Saints)
Pentecostal
Presbyterian
Quaker
Unitarian
Wicca
other - not listed: ________________________
no religious affiliation

6. What church, religious organization, or group does your family belong to?
   African Methodist Episcopal
   Assemblies Of God
   Atheism
   Baptist
   Buddhist
   Catholic
   Church of Christ
   Congregationalist
   Episcopalian
   Jewish
   Lutheran
   Islam
   Methodist
   Mormon (Latter Day Saints)
Pentecostal
Presbyterian
Quaker
Unitarian
Wicca
other - not listed: ________________________
no religious affiliation

6a. Do you currently consider yourself affiliated with a religious group or organization?
   Yes
   No
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6b. If yes, please tell us your current religious affiliation and the length of time you have been affiliated with this group, organization, or community:
   Name of religious group or organization: ______________________
   Length of time affiliated: ______________________

7. Please indicate your race/ethnicity (Check all that apply):
   White/Caucasian
   Hispanic/Latino
   African American/Black
   Asian
   Native American
   Other(s): ______________________

8. Please check the marital status that best describes you:
   single
   married
   widowed
   divorced
   separated
   cohabitating with another adult

9. Please indicate your yearly family income:
   $10 thousand or less
   $10-20 thousand
   $21-40 thousand
   $41-60 thousand
   $61-80 thousand
   $81-100 thousand
   Over $100 thousand

10. I currently live:
    by myself
    with my spouse/partner and child or children
    with my spouse/partner only
    with a parent
    with both parents
    with one of my children or children
    with a relative or relatives
    with a boyfriend or girlfriend
    with a friend or friends
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Other

11. Thinking back over the last five years, have you lived in the same house (1999-2004)?
   yes
   no, I've moved once or twice
   no, I've moved several times

Section II: In this section, we are interested in learning about your opinions on several different issues and values. Please mark the statement that most closely reflects your opinions and values to the following statements:

12. It's important for me to have a family that does things together.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree

13. It's important for me to have friends who include me in their activities.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree

14. My friends would say that I never get into trouble.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree

15. My friends would say that I never break the rules.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree

16. It is important to me what other members of my religious community think of me.
    Strongly Agree
    Agree
    Disagree
    Strongly Disagree
17. I spend a lot of my free time volunteering in my religious community.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

18. I try hard to abide by my religious principles on a day-to-day basis.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

19. I tell good stories, even if they aren't the whole truth.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

20. I am usually a pretty cautious person.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

21. I devote much time and effort to my religion or religious community.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

22. I devote little thought to the future and take one day at a time.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

23. I try to save as much money as I can.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

24. Only fools tell the truth all the time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Rules were made to be broken.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I see no need for hard work.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I volunteer a lot at my church or religious organization.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Sometimes I take a risk just for the fun of it.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I believe in karma.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I share my thoughts and feelings with other members in my religious community.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I live for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Disagree
Strongly Disagree

32. My family members believe it is important to practice a religion.
   Extremely Important
   Somewhat Important
   Not Very Important
   Not At All Important

33. My best friend believes his/her religion is very important in his/her life.
   Extremely Important
   Somewhat Important
   Not Very Important
   Not At All Important

34. I would like to be the kind of person my mother is.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

35. I would like to be the kind of person my father is.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

36. I believe that the phrase, "One nation under God," should be removed from the
    Pledge of Allegiance.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

37. I support the idea of gay marriage.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

38. There is life after death.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
39. I enjoy the fellowship of my church or religious community.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

40. I would date someone of the same sex.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

41. My family is the most important thing in my life.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

42. My friends are a very important part of my life.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

43. Between work, family, and community activities, I don't have much free time.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

44. I have a lot of respect for the police.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

45. Before getting involved in my church or religious community, I had a lot of free time.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree
46. It's okay to get around the law once in awhile if you can get away with it.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

47. No matter how small the crime, breaking the law is a serious matter.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

48. It is morally wrong to break the law.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

49. Sometimes you just don't have any choice but to break the law.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

50. If someone insulted me, I would be likely to hit or slap them.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

51. If breaking the law really doesn't hurt anyone, then it's really not all that wrong.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

52. Many people I associate with think it's okay to break the law if you can get away with it.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree
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53. Most of the people I associate with would never break the law.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

54. People I associate with find themselves in situations where other people encourage them to do something illegal.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

55. In the last 12 months, my closest friends have done something they could have gotten arrested for.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

56. Other people say that I'm a pretty cautious person.
   Strongly Agree
   Agree
   Disagree
   Strongly Disagree

III. In this section, we are interested in learning a little more about your participation in religious services or events. Please tell us a little information about your participation in religious services, activities or events by responding to the following questions:

57. On average, how many hours per week do you spend doing religious activities?

   (approximate # of hours weekly:) _______________

58. In general, how important would you say your religion is to you in your daily life?

   Extremely Important
   Somewhat Important
   Not Very Important
   Not At All Important
APPENDIX B, Continued

59. In general, how committed would you say you are to your religious group or organization?
   Extremely committed
   Somewhat committed
   Not Very committed
   Not At All committed

60. On average, how many hours per week do you help out, volunteer, or participate in activities or events sponsored by your religious organization?
   (approximate # of hours weekly:) ______________________

IV. In this section, we are interested in learning a little more about the kinds of things you may have tried while growing up and perhaps those things that you still may participate in now. Please mark the single appropriate response to the question, "HAVE YOU EVER..............?" AND "DO YOU NOW.................?"

61. Played on an organized sport?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

62. Stayed away from religious activities and practices because you've had better things to do?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

63. Not gone to work simply because you didn't feel like it?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

64. Consumed five or more alcoholic beverages at a single serving?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times
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65. Drank to get drunk?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

66. Ignored work related responsibilities or "slacked off" in some way while on the job?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

67. Stolen or tried to steal things worth between $5 and $50 from your place of work?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

68. Not gone to work simply because you didn't feel like it?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

69. Driven while you had been drinking?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

70. Used marijuana?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

71. Used non-prescription drugs like cocaine, crack, heroin, speed, ecstasy?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times
72. Had something stolen from you?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times

73. Felt depressed?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

74. Used someone's car without permission?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

75. Gossiped about another person?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times

76. Had sexual relations with a person with whom you did not know well?
   never
   once or twice
   several times
   many times

77. Had a homosexual encounter or engaged in homosexual activity?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times

78. Used swear words?
   Never
   Very infrequently
   Occasionally
   Many Times/Often

79. Had sex with more than one person at the same time?
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Never
Once or Twice
Several Times
Many Times

80. Been intentionally excluded from a group or event?
Never
Once or Twice
Several Times
Many Times

81. Gambled?
Never
Once or Twice
Several Times
Many Times

82. Played cards for money?
Never
Once or Twice
Several Times
Many Times

83. Lied to family members or friends?
Never
Once or Twice
Several Times
Many Times

84. Gotten paid for having sexual relations with someone?
Never
Once or Twice
Several Times
Many Times

85. Had a sexual relationship with someone other than your spouse or partner?
Never
Once or Twice
Several Times
Many Times

86. Shown up late for work for no reason?
Never
Once or Twice
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Several Times
Many Times

87. Hid a personal problem from your friends or family?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times

88. Felt very depressed?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times

89. Lied for a friend?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times

90. Borrowed something of value and never returned it to its owner?
   Never
   Once or Twice
   Several Times
   Many Times

91. Driven at least 10 to 20 miles per hour over the speed limit?
   Never
   Very infrequently
   Occasionally
   Many Times/Often

92. Cheated on your income tax?
   Never
   Very infrequently
   Occasionally
   Many Times

Section V: In this section, we are interested in knowing how much time you spend doing certain activities on a weekly basis. Please answer to the best of your ability approximately how Many HOURS per week you spend doing the following things.
We suggest you use a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 represents "1 hour" and 10 represents "10 hours," etc. If you do not participate in these activities, please indicate this by using the number 0 (zero).

93. Watch TV? ___________ HOURS/Week

94. Read books, magazines, or newspapers? ___________ HOURS/Week

95. Read religious materials? ___________ HOURS/Week

96. Talk to friends in your religious community? ___________ HOURS/Week

97. Volunteer or work at a religious related event? ___________ HOURS/Week

98. Attend events at your religious organization (include weekly services)? ___________ HOURS/Week

99. Spend time with friends from your religious group or church? ___________ HOURS/Week

100. Work at your job? ___________ HOURS/Week

Section VI: In this section, we are interested in knowing a little bit about your friends. In choosing your answers, please think about the people you consider to be your five closest friends. Please give us your best guess to the following questions.

101. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have participated in a religious sponsored event or engaged in a religious activity that you also attended?

   zero
   1
   2
   3
   4
   5
   I don't know

102. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have done something that you think they could be have been arrested for?
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103. In the last 12 months, about how many of your five closest friends have skipped work for no apparent reason?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

104. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have used marijuana?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

105. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have done something they are embarrassed about or not proud of?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

106. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have routinely consumed 5 or more alcoholic drinks in a single sitting?
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107. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have engaged in what you would consider inappropriate sexual relations with another person?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

108. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have had sexual relations with persons other than their spouse or partner?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

109. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have done something illegal?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

110. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have used swear words or take the Lord's name in vain?
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111. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have been drunk in a public place?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

112. In the last 12 months, how many of your five closest friends have been worried about their physical or mental health?

zero
1
2
3
4
5
I don't know

Section VII. In this last section, we are interested in learning a little more about you. In this last section, we will ask you about some other activities that you may have done in the past and also engage in presently. Please check the boxes if the answer is “YES” to the question. Be sure to check all three columns if they apply to you. In your answer, you will be asked to respond to “have you ever?” And, “In the past year?,” and “In the past month.” Thank you for thinking about these issues and answering as honestly as you can.

1. Have you ever?  2. Have you in the past year?  3. Have you in the past month?
113. Avoided paying at restaurants or at a movie theater?

114. Knowingly bought, held, or sold stolen property?

115. Taken someone else's vehicle without their permission?

116. Taken anything ($5 or less) from your job?

117. Taken anything (between $5 and $50) from your job?

118. Taken anything (over $50) from your job?

119. Purposely damaged or destroyed property belonging to a family member?

120. Purposely damaged or destroyed property belonging to a spouse, partner, or friend(s)?

121. Broken into a building or vehicle?

122. Thrown objects at cars or other property?

123. Drank alcoholic beverages before the age of 21?

124. Had five or more alcoholic drinks in a single sitting?

125. Stolen or tried to steal things worth between $5 and $50?

126. Had sexual relations with more than one person at once?
127. Cheated on your spouse or partner?

128. Used marijuana?

129. Lied on income tax?

130. Used hallucinogens like LCD?

131. Used amphetamines (e.g. speed) or barbiturates?

132. Had driven a vehicle when you were stoned or drunk?

133. Had heroin?

134. Had cocaine?

135. Used other drugs (cocaine, heroin, crack, ecstasy, speed)?

136. Engaged in homosexual relations?

137. Used physical force to get money from someone?

138. Hit or threatened to hit a family member?

139. Hit or threatened to hit a friend/spouse/partner?

140. Had or tried to have sex with someone against their will?

141. Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing them?

142. Written checks illegally or used phony money to pay for something?
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143. Written a check when you knew you didn’t have money in your account (intentional overdrafts)?

144. Used or tried to use someone’s credit card without the owner’s permission?

145. Been arrested by the police for anything other than a traffic offense?

146. Tried to cheat someone by selling them something that was worthless or not what you said it was?

147. Carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife?

148. Gotten paid for having sexual relations with someone?

149. Paid someone to have sexual relations with you?

150. Been beaten up or threatened with being beaten up by someone?

151. Been detained by the police for something other than a traffic violation?

152. Spent time in jail?

Thank you very much for completing this survey. We sincerely appreciate the time you’ve given us to help with this research. If you are interested in learning the results, please contact the principal investigator at jhh3@cisunix.unh.edu.
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Independent Measures
Two indices were adapted from the Hirschi’s (1969) social control theory and Sutherland’s (1947) differential association theory for this study. The index of social bonds represents Hirschi’s (1969) theory, and an index of deviant friends and unconventional attitudes represents Sutherland’s (1947) theory. Here is an itemized description of each index.

1. The social bonds index:

The Cronbach’s alpha for this index is .67. It comprised at least one Likert Scale variable, and in some cases 2 to 3 Likert Scale variables for the four bond components of Hirschi’s (1969) theory. The Likert Scale variables were coded as 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree = 4 = strongly disagree. There were a total of 271 observations, with a mean score of 32.9 and a standard deviation of 4.1. The median score was 33.0. Index scores ranged from 22 to 44 points. The higher the index score, the higher the social bonds were.

Commitment:
1. famimport: My family is the most important thing in my life. (1-4)

Attachment:
2. familyimport: It’s important to me that my family does things together. (1-4)
3. relgcomthinks: It’s important to what other members of my (religious) community think of me. (1-4)
4. helpothers: I believe it’s important to help others less fortunate than myself. (1-4)

Involvement:
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5. norefetme: Between work, family, and community activities, I don’t have much free
time.(1-4)
6. hardwork – reverse coded: “I see no need for hard work-”

Belief:
8. respolice: “I have a great deal of respect for the police.”
9. brkrules: “My friends would say that I never break the rules.”
10. trouble: “My friends would say that I never get into trouble.”

2. The deviant friends and unconventional attitudes index:

This index used six items. The Cronbach’s alpha for this is .74. This index utilized Likert
Scale measures for the 3 different areas that represent Sutherland’s 91947) differential
association theory: self-definitions favorable to norm violation, and deviant friends. The
Likert Scale variables were coded as 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree = 4 =
strongly disagree. There were a total of 277 observations for this index. It had a mean
score of 13.3, with a standard deviation of 3.0. The median score was 13.0. Scores ranged
from 6 to 22 points. The higher the index score, the higher the average number of deviant
friends and unconventional attitudes were.

Self-definitions favorable to norm violation:
1. morally wrong (RC) “It’s morally wrong to break the law.”
2. brklawhurt (RC) “If breaking the law doesn’t really hurt anyone, then it’s not all that
wrong.”
3. Rclawserious: reverse of “No matter how small the crime, breaking the law is a serious
matter.”

Others’ definitions favorable to norm violation:
4. doillegal: “People I associate with find themselves in situations where other people
encourage them to do something illegal.”
5. peoplenever (Reverse coded) “Most people I associate with would never break the
law.”
Association with deviant friends:
6. friendsarrest: "In the past 12 months, my closest friends have done something they could have gotten arrested for."
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Dependent Measures
Four indices were adapted from the adult cohort section of Elliott and Ageton’s (1980) National Youth Survey Scale of Delinquent Behaviors. Four indices measure 1) general, or minor forms of deviance, 2) sexual deviance, 3) illegal drug and alcohol use, and 4) crime, the threat of violence, and violent acts toward others.

Here is a description of the measures for each index.

1. General Deviance: This index comprises 20 items using dichotomized and Likert Scale measures. The Cronbach’s alpha is .730. The construction of the index resulted in a total of 256 observations, with a mean and median scores of 20.1 and a standard deviation of 5.04. Answers ranged from 8 to 36 points. The items are:

   Dummy coded items:
   1. Ever avoid paying at a restaurant? (1 = yes, 0 = no)
   2. Ever take someone else’s car without their permission? (1, 0)
   3. Ever intentionally damage someone else’s property? (1, 0)
   4. Ever blame a car accident on somebody else when you were partially to blame? (1, 0)
   5. Ever ran a red light because you were late to work? (1, 0)
   6. Ever lied on your income taxes? (1, 0)
   7. Ever taken something worth $5 or less from your place of work? (1, 0)

   Likert Scale Items: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree 3 = agree, 4 = strongly agree:
   8. Only fools tell the truth all the time (1-4)
   9. Sometimes you just have no choice but to break the law (1-4)
   10. Ever ignored work or slacked off while on the job? (1 = never, 2 = once or twice, 3 = several times, 4 = many times)
   11. Ever gossiped about another person? (1 = never, 2 = once or twice, 3 = several times, 4 = many times)
   12. Ever used swear words? (1-4)
   13. Ever gambled? (1-4)
   14. Ever play cards for money? (1-4)
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15. Ever use someone’s car without permission? (1-4)
16. Ever spy on your neighbors or coworkers? (1-4)
17. Ever lie for a friend? (1-4)
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18. Ever borrow something of value and not return it? (1-4)
19. Ever take risks for fun? (1-4)
20. It’s okay to get around the law once in a while if you can get away with it. (1-4)

2. Sexual Deviance: This index comprises 11 items using dichotomized measures.

The Cronbach’s alpha is .76. The construction of the index resulted in a total of 280 observations, with a mean score of 2.1 and a standard deviation of 2.1. The median score is 1.0. Answers ranged from 1 to 8 points. The items are:

Dichotomous items (1 = yes, 0 = no):
1. Ever lied to your spouse or partner? (1, 0)
2. Ever cheated on your spouse or partner? (1, 0)
3. Ever had sex with more than one person at once? (1, 0)
4. Ever had sexual relations with persons you did not know well? (1, 0)
5. Ever had a homosexual relationship or same sex encounter with someone? (1,0)
6. Ever had an affair? (Likert scale: 0 = never, 1 = once or twice, 2 = several times, 3 = many times)

3. Illegal Drug Use and Excessive Alcohol Consumption: This index comprises 6 measures, two of which are Likert Scale items and the other four are dichotomized variables. The Cronbach’s alpha is .72. The construction of the index resulted in a total of 263 observations, with a mean score of 3.8 and a standard deviation of 2.3. The median score is 4.0. Answers ranged from 1 to 7 points. The items are:

1. Ever drink 5 or more drinks in a single sitting? (1 = yes, 0 = no)
2. Ever use marijuana? (1,0)
3. Ever use hard drugs like cocaine, LSD, heroin or ecstasy? (1,0)
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4. Ever drink to get drunk? (Likert scale: 0 = never, 1 = once or twice, 2 = several times, 3 = many times)
5. Ever use prescription drugs without a prescription? (Likert Scale 1 – 4)
6. Ever drink when you were under the legal age (18 or 21)?

4. Crime, Threats of Violence, and Violent Acts: There were relatively few measures for this index, and it was positively skewed (1.5). As a result, a log-10 transformation is used with all regressions shown in chapter five. The Cronbach’s alpha is .60. This index is constructed using 10 dichotomous variables. There are a total of 293 observations within this index. Mean score is 1.37, with a standard deviation of 1.4. The median score is 1.0. The index scores ranged from 0 to 7 points. The items are:

10 dichotomous variables (1 = yes, 0 = no):
1. Ever taken something worth $50 or more from your place of work?
2. Ever been arrested for anything other than a traffic violation?
3. Ever knowingly had stolen property in your possession?
4. Ever deliberately damaged or destroyed property belonging to someone else?
5. Ever hit or threaten to hit a family member or friend?
6. Ever been arrested for driving while under the influence of alcohol (DWI or DUI)?
7. Ever spent time in jail?
8. Ever force a person to have sexual relations against their will?
9. Ever gotten into a fight or used physical force against someone?
10. Ever attack someone with the intent to seriously hurt or kill someone?
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Compassion Fund Recipients for 2004*

**Demonstration Program Grants/Intermediary Organizations - Funding in Year 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Citizens for the Committee of New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>$410,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Foundation for Community Empowerment</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>761,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Greater Minneapolis Council of Churches</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Holy Redeemer Institutional Church of God</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>824,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Kentucky River Foothills Development Council</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>527,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. National Center for Neighborhood Enterprise</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>655,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. United Way of Tucson &amp; Southern Arizona</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>903,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. We Care America, Inc.</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>936,868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediary Organizations (Continuation Grantees) - Funding in Year 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Associated Black Charities</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Catholic Charities of Central New Mexico</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Christian Community Health Fellowship</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>1,128,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CJH Educational Grant Services, Inc.</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1,116,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clemson University</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>792,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Community Tech Centers’ Network</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1,499,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emory University</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>1,499,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Institute for Youth Development</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. JVA Consulting, LLC</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1,008,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mennonite Economic Development</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Northside Ministerial Alliance</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>895,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Nueva Esperanza, Inc.</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2,466,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Operation Blessing International</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. S.V.D.P. Management, Inc.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>673,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Southeast Asia Resource Center</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>682,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. National Center for Faith-Based Initiatives</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. University of Hawaii</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. University of Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1,171,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Volunteers of America</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>563,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SOURCE: Dept. of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families
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<td>11. Northside Ministerial Alliance</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>895,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Nueva Esperanza, Inc.</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>2,466,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Operation Blessing International</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. S.V.D.P. Management, Inc.</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>673,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Southeast Asia Resource Center</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>682,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. National Center for Faith-Based Initiatives</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. University of Hawaii</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. University of Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>1,171,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Volunteers of America</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>563,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SOURCE: Dept. of Health and Human Services Administration for Children and Families