Travel: An escape to deviance? A study on college student's religiosity and deviant behaviors while at home and while traveling.

by

Tyler M. Sims, B.A.

A Thesis

In

Sociology

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
Of Texas Tech University in
Partial Fulfillment for
The degree of

Master of Arts

Approved

Dr. Ignacio Luis Ramirez
Chair
Dr. Jerome R. Koch

Mark Sheridan
Dean of the Graduate School

May, 2014

Acknowledgements

Words fail to convey how indebted I am to Dr. Ignacio Luis Ramirez for all of his time, energy and most of all, his guidance. I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Jerome Koch for his support and words of wisdom.

Lastly, I would like to thank my wonderful partner Lauren Newmyer, for all of her love and support throughout this entire process.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements…..……..ii
Abstract ……..iv
List of Tables ……..v
I. Introduction ……1
II. Theory……3
Classical Theory ……4
Social Bond Theory ……5
Moral Communities ……8
The Social Institution of Religion ……10
III. Literature Review ……...12
Religion & Substance Use ……12
Religion & Sexual Activity ……15
Theory & Literature Synthesis ……17
Hypotheses ……18
IV. Research Design …….....20
V. Data Analysis ……..……22
Demographics……23
T-Test ……25
Chi Squared……28
Regressions ……..…….....29
VI. Discussion …..…….36
VII. Conclusion ……39
References ……40
Appendix ……...43

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to examine and compare the relationship between college student's religiosity and deviant behaviors (alcohol consumption, illegal drug use, and sexual activity) they engage in while traveling as well as within their home location. This study applies social bond theory to better understand how individuals, who are strongly bonded with society, decrease their chances of getting involved with the above deviant behaviors. Drawing from data collected from 461 respondents to an online survey from Texas Tech University, this study will highlight various types of deviant and risk taking behaviors, as well as the degree to which the respondents participate in these acts. Results indicate that as religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting decreases when consuming alcohol with co-workers inside their home location. Also, as religiosity increases, the likelihood that an individual will use an illegal substance while within their home location will decrease.

List of Tables

1. Demographic Variables……..……...……..21
2. Independent Variables Means ……...…….....24
3. Dependent Variable Means…..……....25
4. T-Test on Religiosity by Gender……...……..…25
5. T-Test on Drinks Per Sitting Alone by Gender (Home)……...……...25
6. T-Test on Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers by Gender (Home)…. ..…...…26
7. T-Test on Drinks Per Sitting With Friends by Gender (Home)….....26
8. T-Test on Drinks Per Sitting Alone by Gender (Away)……..26
9. T-Test on Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers by Gender (Away) ….…….27
10. T-Test on Drinks Per Sitting With Friends by Gender (Away)……...….27
11. T-Test on Sexual Activity by Gender (Home)…… ……..……....28
12. T-Test on Sexual Activity by Gender (Away)……..……....28
13. Chi Squared Analysis on Substance Abuse by Gender (Home) ….……..…28
14. Chi Squared Analysis on Substance Abuse by Gender (Away) …….…..…29
15. Hypothesis 1 - Regressions on Drinks Per Sitting Alone (Home)…….……29
16. Hypothesis 2 - Regressions on Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers (Home)..30
17. Hypothesis 3 - Regressions on Drinks Per Sitting With Friends (Home).…….31
18. Hypothesis 4 - Regressions on Drinks Per Sitting Alone (Away)……..…..…31
19. Hypothesis 5 - Regressions on Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers (Away)..32
20. Hypothesis 6 - Drinks Per Sitting With Friends (Away)……...…33
21. Hypothesis 7 - Regressions on Sexual Activity (Home)……...…33
22. Hypothesis 8 - Regressions on Sexual Activity (Away)……34
23. Hypothesis 9 - Regressions on Substance Abuse (Home)……35
24. Hypothesis 10 - Regressions on Substance Abuse (Away)……...35

Chapter I

Introduction

Today, college students across the country travel outside their home location for various reasons. These reasons can include taking a road trip with friends or going to visit friends and family who are scattered throughout the country. Whether a student is traveling or not, their behavior is constantly being examined by others within society. In most cases, students engaging in deviant behavior is the primary concern within the current literature. Local college campuses are constantly conducting research on their students to determine the deviant behaviors students are engaging in. Variables such as religion, have either been included or omitted from much of the previous literature on deviant behavior. Moreover, much of the previous literature neglects religion's effect on behavior while traveling in comparison to an individual's local behavior. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to investigate the relationship between religion and deviance. More specifically, what is the relationship between religiosity and deviant behavior at home and while traveling. This study will investigate the role of religiosity on deviant behaviors, such as excessive alcohol consumption, illegal drug use, and sexuality promiscuity.

Often times, college students tend to be used as participants in various research projects among multiple fields of study. This is because student populations are fairly easy to gain access to, especially for academics working within the university itself. College students' involvement in deviant behavior, such as binge drinking has been one area of interest for researchers. A study by Capace and Lanza-Kaduce (2013), on the social aspects of binge drinking among college students, found that as individuals increase their participation in Greek related organizations, there was an increased risk of binge drinking occurring. Also, the researchers found that students

with grades mostly below a B average were at an increased risk of engaging in binge drinking. In other studies, college students' use of illegal drugs in connection with other variables has been examined. Koch, Roberts, Armstrong and Owen (2010) studied the connection between body art (tattoos & piercings) and deviance. One of their findings was that, "Individuals reporting seven or more piercings were about twice as likely as those with no piercings to use marijuana monthly, report other illegal drug use, or to have been arrested for something other than a traffic violation" (Koch et al. 2010). Lastly, sexual behavior has also been studied as a form of deviance in various ways, such as group affiliation. Other researchers have taken a different approach and indicated that, "opportunity and prior deviance could provide a better explanation of sexual deviance among male college students" (Jackson, Gilliland, & Vaenziano. 2006).

These are just a few studies that begin to shape the current literature on various forms of deviant behavior college students engage in within their home location. However, this paper is also concerned with college students' deviant behaviors while traveling. With this in mind, this paper will examine theories and existing literature on deviant behavior and its connection to religiosity and deviant behavior.

Chapter II

Theory

As individuals interact with each other, their behaviors are regulated by both informal and formal means of social control. These types of social control guide individuals' behaviors through cultural rules called norms. "Norms are the rules a culture develops that define how people should act and the consequences of failure to act in the specified way." (Kimmel & Aronson. 2012) Norms are created by members of a social setting agreeing on what is and is not acceptable behavior. Norms that an individual will adhere to will vary depending on the location and the social setting that an individual is acting in. As individuals follow the norms of a social setting, they will behave in a way that is expected by other individuals within a social setting and be received in a positive manner. However, individuals who choose not to follow the norms within a social setting will be informally or formally sanctioned through either the internal group or by external groups. Informal sanctions are handled within the group and can be various means of public shaming towards an individual who has violated the group norms. This form of social control allows the individual, who has broken a norm, to recognize his or her mistake and provides them with an opportunity to correct his or her behavior. If the negative behavior requires a more severe punishment, formal sanctions can be used. Formal sanctions can be seen as legal action taken against an individual who breaks a norm. This form of social control can be detrimental to an individual who violates a norm because these sanctions can come at a much greater expense. In order to further understand how norms function, we must begin by reviewing classical sociological theory.

Classical Theory

Classically speaking, Emile Durkheim offers an explanation for why individuals align themselves with society. According to Durkheim (1933), there are two types of societies. The first is what he refers to as a simple or mechanical society. Within this type of society, individuals share many of the same responsibilities with other members of the society. Often times, individuals within these societies assist each other with responsibilities, such as gathering or food preparation, for the betterment of the society. As labor divides or individuals are assigned a singular responsibility, the society transitions to what Durkheim refers to as an organic society. Also, Durkheim theorizes that as the division of labor increases within a society, the level of organic solidarity among its members also increases as well. This process allows organic societies to function efficiently at both the micro and macro levels of societies. However, Durkheim (1933) argues that as societies grow in complexity, a state of normlessness or anomie could arise. In other words, individuals would not be able to adhere to the social norms or values because they would not know what they were in the first place. As Durkheim later points out, this state of anomie can produce a great strain on an individual even to the point that he or she would break social norms and become deviant. Another possibility is that one might even take their own life as he points out in his later work on suicide. Individuals, who are only act deviant, face other sanctions from society according to Durkheim (1933). The sanctions an individual faces for violating a norm or law can be restitutive or repressive depending on the social setting. According to Durkheim (1933), repressive sanctions are more common in mechanical societies, whereas organic societies use restitutive sanctions to punish those who have violated the social norm or law. Today, in modern societies, restitution can be seen by severing jail time or having

to pay a traffic ticket. As the years pass, contemporary theorists aim to build upon previous theories in order to further understand how individuals attach themselves to these complex societies.

Social Bond Theory

Over time, there have been many different approaches to studying crime and deviance. Travis Hirschi (1969) developed a new theoretical perspective called Social Bonds Theory that asks what prevents people from being deviant rather than asking why people are deviant and commit crime. Hirschi (1969) argues that having strong social bonds with various social institutions, such as family, religion, work, government and school, prevent individuals from engaging in deviant behavior. Social institutions are social structures where individuals interact with each other to develop and adhere to social norms and values that are negotiated between each of its members. Just as mentioned above, social institutions will create and adhere to different norms based on the type of institution, location and social setting they are in. For example, an individual who attends a Methodist church in Texas might have different norms than an individual attending a Methodist church in Florida. Hirschi (1969) also predicts that an absence or breakdown of social bonds would increase the chances of deviant behavior occurring. These bonds, as outlined by Hirschi (1969), need to be constantly maintained through attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief in order for there to be a low likelihood of deviance occurring.

This theory, which partly gave rise to Social Control Theory, explains why people conform to society's norms and laws rather than being deviant. As Wiatrowski, Griswold, and Roberts (1981) stated, "Since delinquency is intrinsic to human nature, it is conformity that must

be explained." Hirschi (1969) also argues that most individuals have a need for approval from individuals surrounding them. This need for approval and the internationalization of a group's norms and values within various social institutions helps prevent individuals from being deviant and assist them into conforming to the group's norms. However, an individual that deviates from the norms and values of the group will have an increased risk of facing formal or informal social sanctions. These sanctions could range from something informal as a dirty look to being formally removed from the social institution altogether. In the social institution of religion, religiosity can be one of the many underlining variables for controlling an individual's behavior. As individuals increase or strengthen their attachment, commitment, involvement and beliefs to their religion, their overall religiosity is likely to increase as well.

As outlined by Hirschi (1969), the level of attachment to a social institution is one element that can be used to predict deviant behavior. Attachment is the emotional bond that an individual develops as he or she engages with a particular social institution such as, family. Family is one social institution in which this element is often applied to by looking at how close parents are with their children. Within this example, a parent who loves and spends time with their child are more likely to have a high levels of attachment with each other and thus, decrease the risk of that child engaging in deviant behavior. Parents, who neglect and spend little time with their children, are estimated to have low levels of attachment. Here, the lack of or decaying social bond between the child and its parents, can increases the likelihood of the child becoming deviant. As levels of attachment increase or decrease, the level of commitment will also be affected.

According to Hirschi (1969), commitment is another critical component to building or maintaining strong social bonds. Commitment is seen as the level of investment an individual has within a particular social institution such as, higher education. Within this social institution, college students are investing both time and resources in order to earn a college degree. Hirschi (1969) argues that as the investment within a social institution increases, the less likely deviant behavior will occur. Students who have a high levels of investment into their education have more to lose if they get caught being deviant. Again, deviant behaviors could be met with formal or informal social repercussions. Formally, this could mean that a deviant student could be removed from a class or worse, the university itself. Informally, other students might label or stigmatize, as Goffman (1963) outlined, a deviant student to the point where he or she may not want to return to class. However, in order for the commitment element to function properly, there must be a high level of involvement within a social institution.

As individuals commit and attach to various social institutions, involvement becomes the next predictor of deviant behavior according to Hirschi (1969). Involvement can be understood as being the amount of time spent with various social institutions. Drawing again from the student example, as a student's level of involvement in positive activities increases, so does the strength of their social bond to their education or the social institution of higher education. Also, the greater the time spent within a social institution, the stronger an individual's level of attachment and commitment becomes. Hirschi (1969) also viewed this as decreasing the amount of time someone has to be deviant in the first place. The student who takes 15 hours each semester and is involved and attached with other academic activities will have very little time to spare for deviant behavior. This is because his or her time will be devoted to maintaining grades

and involvement in other social activities. These elements work together in a positive direction and decrease the likelihood of an individual becoming deviant.

Lastly, with all their previous elements working together in a positive direction, Hirschi (1969) argues that an individual's beliefs within their social institution would increase and lead to a strengthening of their social bonds to that institutions. In most cases, this is seen as a conformity or form of respect for a social institutions social norms or laws. Again, a student who is highly attached, committed, and involved with earning their college degree, will most likely believe in the "good student norms" that leads them to believe that they need to take notes and study for exams in order to receive a high grade in a course. An individual with low attachment, commitment and involvement, will hold fewer beliefs and therefore will be at a greater risk of becoming deviant. Also, a student who is identified for not sharing the institutions beliefs, could also be stigmatized or even removed from that social institution. As we narrow in social institutions, we can see how moral communities.

Moral Communities

As there was further exploration into the elements that bond individuals to society, researchers begin examining moral communities. Moral communities become of interest to researchers because they are made up of many individuals who share similar morals and values as well as common interests. Referring back to Hirshi (1969), the degree in which an individual is bonded with a community can either increase or decrease depending on the four elements of a social bond. Individuals, who are highly attached, committed, involved, and hold many of the same beliefs as their community, will be less likely to violate many of the shared beliefs and norms. This in turn, will decrease the likelihood of deviant behavior occurring. However,

individuals who are weakly bonded to a community based on their attachment, commitment, involvement, and beliefs, will be at an increased risk of becoming deviant. However, the relationship between religious moral communities and deviant behavior has not always been clear.

One article by Travis Hirshi and Rodney Stark (1969), aims at identifying the degree, if any, religious communities could influence the outcome of deviant behavior occurring. Hirshi and Stark (1969), examine whether or not the proximity to a religious community could influence the likelihood of deviant behavior occurring in some way. After analyzing the data, they conclude that there was no significant relationship between proximity to a religious community and deviant behavior. Soon after this claim was made, other research surfaced that suggested otherwise.

Many years later Stark (1996) himself, reexamined the relationship between religious moral communities and deviant behavior and indicated that there was indeed a relationship. According to Stark (1996), "I suggest that what counts is not only whether a particular person is religious, but whether this religiousness is, or is not, ratified by the social environment. The idea here is that religion is empowered to produce conformity to the norms only as it is sustained through interaction and is accepted by the majority as a valid basis for action." (Stark, 1996) He then goes on to state that, "Religious individuals will be less likely than those who are not religious to commit delinquent acts, but only in communities where the majority of the people are actively religious." (Stark, 1996) This also means that individuals, who belong to a moral community but are outside their community, could be at risk of becoming deviant. Referring back to Durkheim (1933), this could be due to a lack of understanding about the local norms and

values that are being prescribed within the contexts of that social setting. Here, we can begin to see how social bonds and proximity to religious moral communities can influence deviant behavior within individuals. However, in order the fully understand how religious institutions and communities can influence an individual's behavior; we must first examine the religious elements that can either increase or decrease the bonds to that community.

The Social Institution of Religion

Although there are many different social institutions that an individual can belong to at any given time, religion is the primary focus of this study. Within religion, attachment or emotional bonds form between members who attend the same religious institution or ones that are closely related. As individuals interact with each other and begin to develop stronger emotional bonds, their level of commitment and involvement to the religious institutions is likely to increase. This can be seen by an individual participating in religious events, such as bake sales, bible school, or assisting with the churches many other needs. Lastly as all the elements above increase, it is likely that an individual will more strongly develop and hold the beliefs that their religious institution adheres to. These elements working together can increase an individual's religiosity, which can be studied by measuring these key elements that strengthen an individual's bond to their religious institution. The Social Bond Theory, in connection with an individual's social institutions, sets a strong foundation for explaining what prevents individuals from becoming deviant while within their local area or while traveling abroad. Students who are not attached, committed, involved and share similar beliefs as their religious institution, are at a greater risk of acting deviant while at home, as well as when they are traveling. Religiosity's

ability to prevent or deter deviant behavior from occurring can be seen throughout previous studies within the field.

Chapter III

Literature Review

Over the years, there have been many studies conducted that measure deviant and risk taking behaviors among college students. Furthermore, many researchers have examined the connection between religiosity and deviant behavior. Much of the literature has outlined that excessive alcohol consumption, illegal drug use, and sexual activity are three of the most common types of deviant and risk taking behaviors college student engage in. The concern across college campuses nationwide is that an increase in alcohol, drugs, and sexual activity increases the chances of other deviant behavior occurring. As the literature indicates below, there can be many variations in the relationship between religion and deviance.

Religion & Substance Use

A study conducted by Ford and Kadushin (2002) examines the relationship between religion and alcohol consumption among white and black individuals. Using a random digit telephone based survey, Ford and Kadushin (2002) measure 16,119 respondents' religious affiliation and alcohol consumption over the previous 12 months. Also, the number of times an individual attends church is measured to determine the frequency of church attendance. "The constant in these models indicates those respondents who are at risk for alcohol dependency and who are male, 32 years old, earn between $25,000 and 35,000, have some college education, reside outside the South, have one phone, live with one other person, and report no religious affiliation" (Ford & Kadushin. 2002). When comparing white and black respondents, "The overall pattern within each subgroup indicates that membership in a denomination that objects to the use of alcohol is more important for whites than for blacks, implying that the normative

context provided by religion may play a greater role in predicting risk for alcohol dependency for whites" (Ford & Kadushin. 2002). They conclude their study by indicating that factors such as religiosity and religious denomination, that the white and black respondents belong too, are two underlying variable that can influence the individuals use of alcohol.

Next, Stroltzfus and Farkas (2012) examine the relationship between religious coping and the stress from daily hassles and use of alcohol. Data is collected using a convenience sample. Responses are collected from 423 undergraduate students at a religious Midwestern college. Coping is examined by using an existing four point Likert scale that measured, "perceived spiritual connection, spiritual support, religious forgiveness, collaborative religious coping, benevolent religious reappraisal, religious purification, and religious focus" (Pargament, Smith, Koenig, & Perez. 1998). Daily hassles are measured by a forty-nine item scale that also included seven sub scales. Finally, alcohol is measured by asking students to report the numbers of days that they consumed alcohol over the previous 30 days. Based on the previous question, students were then asked the number of drink they consumed on the days that they drank alcohol. Using the data that Stroltzfus and Farkas (2012) collected, they conclude that as students increase the use of religious coping to deal with the everyday hassles, they report lower rates of alcohol consumption. Stroltzfus and Farkas (2012) also outline that females were the most likely to avoid alcohol abuse as they turn to religious coping. These researchers conclude their study by suggesting that professionals treating college students with a history of alcohol abuse should consider incorporating religious coping into their treatment program because there is evidence that social support system can help prevent deviant behaviors from occurring in the future.

Another study that examines religious factors and deviant behavior did so by looking at respondent's family structure. Researchers, Bahr, Maughan, Marcos and Li (1998), collected data over 13,250 adolescent's respondents using a random sample questionnaire that measures adolescent drug use. Bahr et al., (1998) did this by examining mother, father adolescent bonding, parental monitoring, family aggression, family drug problems, and religiosity. They conclude that as student's religiosity increases, the less likely the student engages in drug use. Researchers, Bahr et al., (1998), also indicate that their findings held true for both males and females. Also, both males and females who identify as being religious are less likely to interact with others individuals who engage in drug use. This also includes not having close friends who engage in drug use. Furthermore, stronger bonds to both mother and father increase the likelihood of an increase in religiosity. This means that as the bonds between an adolescent's mother and father increase, the likelihood of drug use decrease. This study again strongly supports that there is a relationship between social bonds and religiosity and deviant behavior.

While many studies focus specifically on how religion can influence deviant behavior, one study also incorporates moral communities as another influence that can deter deviant behavior. Much like a social support group, moral communities are another reason why morals and direction can be installed in someone. Richard, Bell, and Carlson (2000), suggest that moral communities that are not religiously based could also prevent individuals from engaging in drug use. Data was collected on 193 individuals who were involved in a drug rehabilitation clinic using a random sample. Richard et al., (2000) discovered two important findings. The first, was that with an, "increase in self-help recovery group attendance and church attendance were independently associated with reduction in alcohol use" (Richard et al., 2000). Also that an,

"increase in church attendance was significantly associated with reduction in cocaine use." (Richard et al., 2000).

A study by Wallace, Yamaguchi, Bachman, O'Malley, Schulenberg, and Johnston (2007) examines 16,595 high school students using a hierarchical liner model on national data. This study measures student's religiosity, tobacco, alcohol, and marijuana use and found four significant findings. The first finding indicates that "the higher adolescents' level of religiosity, the less likely they are to be current tobacco users, to engage in binge drinking, or to have used marijuana in the past year" (Wallace et al., 2007). The second finding indicates, "That as the level of religiosity in a school increases, adolescents' frequency of cigarette use, binge drinking, and marijuana use decreases" (Wallace et al., 2007). The third finding indicates, "That the religiosity of the school influences students' substance use, over and above their individual religiosity, but that this relationship exists only for marijuana" (Wallace et al., 2007). The fourth finding indicates, "That the strength of the relationship between individual-level religiosity and individual-level substance use varies depending upon the religiosity of the context, such that adolescents who are highly religious and in highly religious contexts are less likely to engage in binge drinking or marijuana use than those who are equally religious but in less religious contexts." (Wallace et al., 2007). Wallace et al., (2007) concludes their study by saying that further research is needed to build upon their findings to increase the data on the relationship between substance abuse and religion.

Religion & Sexual Activity

A study conducted by Vazsonyi and Jenkins (2010) at Auburn University examines the relationship between religiosity and self-control in older adolescent college students living

within the "Bible Belt". The studies main focus was to measure religiously and self-control to determine how these variables can lead to a, "delay in initiating sexual intercourse or oral sex" (Vazsonyi & Jenkins. 2010) within their sample of 904 college students. The two significant findings made were, "for each one unit increase in self-control, the odds of a male remaining a virgin or of delaying oral sex increased by a factor of 1.82 and 2.84, respectively, while for females, the odds of not engaging in oral sex increased by a factor of 1.67. In addition to the effect of self-control, a one unit increase in religiosity results in the odds of a male remaining a virgin by a factor of 3.86 and 3.30, respectively. For females the odds are increased by a factor of 4.13 and 2.60, respectively. Mediation tests also provided evidence that self-control mediated the effects by religiosity on both dependent measures." (Vazsonyi & Jenkins, 2010). This study concludes that religiosity along with self-control, can influence sexual activity in older adolescents college students.

Another study conducted by Steven Barkan (2006), examines the relationship between religiosity and sexual activity by measuring the number of sexual partners from 1,166 18 year old unmarried adult individuals. Using data gathered from the General Social Survey samples, several significant findings were made. According to Barkan (2006), religiosity can decrease the number of sexual partners for never married adult individuals. Barkan (2006) also outlines that this can be influenced by the stigma that premarital sexual relations has within religious institutions. This study also found that religiosity has an equal effect on adult men and women in regards to the number of sexual partners while being unmarried. This study also uses race as a variable and determines that there was no statistically significant relationship between African Americans adults and the number of sexual partners that have while being un-married. Barkan

(2006) concludes this study by indicating that further research on adult populations is needed to strengthen the existing literature so that findings can gain consistency across other studies that focus on religion and sexual activity.

Lastly, Lefkowitz, Gillen, Shearer, and Boone (2004), studied 205 emerging adults to determine the relationship between religiosity, sexual behaviors, and attitudes during their emerging adulthood. Within this study, religiosity is measured by measuring, group affiliation, church attendance, attitudes, perceptions of negative sanctions, and adherence to sanctions. Next, sexual behavior or activity is measured by measuring, abstinence, age of onset, lifetime partners, and condom use. Lastly, attitudes are measured by measuring, conservative attitudes, perceived vulnerability to HIV, and condom-related beliefs. According to Lefkowitz et al., (2004), sexual activity is greatly influenced by religious behaviors. Furthermore, "Many aspects of religiosity were associated with general sexual attitudes, which was not the case for perceived vulnerability to HIV and condom-related beliefs" (Lefkowitz et al., 2004). They also indicate that, "the importance of considering the specific constructs of religiosity and sexuality assessed in studies of these topics" (Lefkowitz et al., 2004).

Theory & Literature Synthesis

As the above literature indicates, religiosity can decrease the likelihood of deviant behavior occurring within various individuals and groups. These studies also outline how many variables, such as proximity to moral communities, age, gender, and race can also have a relationship with religiosity and deviant behavior depending on the situations in which they are measured. Again, distance is important because if an individual travels outside a moral community, then he or she may not fully understand what the norms are within their new social

setting. This according to Durkheim (1933) could put an individual at an increased risk of becoming deviant. Also, an individual's social bonds could diminish if the distance from an individual's moral community increases too much according to Hirschi (1969). Drawing from the above theoretical perspective and the body of literature, the hypotheses below will be tested. The aim of this study is to determine how religiosity can influence an undergraduate student's deviant behavior while at home or away.

Hypotheses

Alcohol Consumption

H_1: As religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting while within their local area will decrease when drinking alone.

H_2: As religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting while within their local area will decrease when drinking with coworkers.

H_3: As religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting while within their local area will decrease when drinking with friends.

H_4: As religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting while traveling will decrease when drinking with alone.

H_5: As religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting while traveling will decrease when drinking with coworkers.

H_6: As religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting while traveling will decrease when drinking with friends.

Sexual Activity

H_7: As religiosity increases, the likelihood that an individual will have sex with an acquaintance or someone they recently met while within their local area will decrease.

H_8: As religiosity increases, the likelihood that an individual will have sex with an acquaintance or someone they just met while traveling will decrease.

Illegal Substances

H_9: As religiosity increases, the likelihood that an individual will use an illegal substance while within their local area will decrease.

H_{10}: As religiosity increases, the likelihood that an individual will use an illegal substance while traveling will decrease.

Chapter IV

Research Design

An online survey was conducted on 461 undergraduate students at Texas Tech University. The data was collected during the fall 2013 and the spring 2014 semester using participants who were enrolled in undergraduate sociology, anthropology and history classes. No personal information such as, names or IP addresses were collected during the entire study so that participants could answer the questioner with complete anonymity.

A convenience sample was used since participant's emails were easily accessible through professors of sociology, anthropology, history, and women's studies classes. This sample was also used since many students travel from campus to the location they originally moved from during times when school is not in session. These participants are also very proficient at working with online software such as questionnaires. This study's independent variable is alcohol, drug, and sexual activity usage and the dependent variable is the respondent religiosity.

The questionnaire utilized a closed-ended style and was developed by drawing from the literature and sociological theories to ensure the instrument was measuring accurately. The survey begins by having the respondent answer multiple choice questions regarding their demographics such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, classification, education, etc. These questions are placed at the beginning of the survey so that the respondent could familiarize themselves with the online answering system. Also, placing these questions first decreases the chances of problems such as the respondents not answering these questions. The survey then transitions to the second section which measures the respondents behaviors while within their local area over the past 12 months by using Likert scales and multiple choice questions. These questions

measure the frequency and amount of alcohol, drug, and sexual activity while the respondent is within their home location. Next, the respondent is asked if he or she has traveled on business within the past 12 months. If the respondent did travel on business, the survey measures the frequency and amount of their alcohol, drug, and sexual activity while traveling on business using Likert scales and multiple choice questions. If the respondent did not travel on business, the survey will apply skip logic to bypass this section and move directly to the fourth section of the questionnaire. Here, respondents will be asked if they have traveled for any reason other than business within the past 12 months. If yes, the survey again measures the frequency and amount of their alcohol, drug, and sexual activity while traveling for any reason other than business using Likert scales and multiple choice questions. If the respondent never traveled for any reason other than business, the survey will apply skip logic to bypass this section and movie directly to the fifth section. This portion of the survey measures the respondent's religiosity using Likert scales and multiple choice questions that were used by Koch & Ramirez (2010).

On February 26th, 2014 at 10am, the study's data collection portal was closed and therefore not allowing any further surveys to be completed. The collected data was then downloaded into SPSS format for cleaning and analysis.

Chapter V

Data Analysis

Table 1 describes the demographic information of all 461respondents used within this sample. This sample consists of 37.36 percent male, 62.20 percent females, and .44 percent other. The race/ethnicity variable was condensed down to a dichotomy of Caucasian and Non-Caucasian. Non-Caucasian category consists of Asian, African American, Native American, Mexican American, and other. The dichotomy was created due to the samples low number Non-Caucasian respondents. This resulted in 35.59 percent Non-Caucasian respondents and 64.41 percent Caucasian respondent. Student's current classification is also measured within this study. Out of the total population, 22.84 percent report being freshmen, 21.57 percent report being a sophomore, 26.90 percent report being a junior, and 28.68 percent report being a senior. The average respondent's age within this sample was 21 years old with a yearly average income between $0 - $15,000.

Demographics

Table 1 Demographic Variables
(N = 461, N Will Vary Due to Missing Data)

Gender	**N**	**Percent**
Male	170	37.36
Female	283	62.20
Other	2	00.44
Ethnicity		
Caucasian	295	64.41
Non-Caucasian	163	35.59
Asian		
African American		
Mexican American		
Other		
Classification		
Freshman	90	22.84
Sophomore	85	21.57
Junior	106	26.90
Senior	113	28.68
Age (Mean)	453	21 years old
Income (Mean)	**N**	**Thousands**
Personal Income Mean	447	$0 - $15,000

Tables 2 outlines this study's independent variables and there means. The first independent variables used within this study are number of drinks per sitting alone, with co-workers, and with friends while at home and away. The second set of variables measures the likelihood someone will use an illegal substance while at home and away. Lastly, the number of times an individual has sex with an acquaintance or someone they just recently met while at home and away. Religiosity is used as the dependent variable within this study (Table 3). The strength of an individual's faith, the importance of religion in their daily life, beliefs about God, closeness to God, church attendance, and frequency of prayer are the mean scale used for the

independent variable to measure a respondent's religiosity. The five answer choices for each of the questions range from a non-existent score to very high score.

0. None
1. Very Low
2. Moderately Low
3. Moderately Strong
4. Very Strong

A reliability analysis was conducted on the religiously scale which measured a statistically significant Cronbach's alpha of .897. The range of the religiosity scale ranks 6 as being the lowest possible score or the lowest in religiosity and 31 being the highest possible score or the highest in religiosity.

Table 2 - Independent Variables
(N = 461, N Will Vary Due to Missing Data)

Drinks Per Sitting: Alone

	N	Mean
Home	194	1-2 Drinks per sitting
Away	44	1-2 Drinks per sitting

Table 2 – Continued

Drinks Per Sitting: Co-Workers

	N	Mean
Home	129	1-2 Drinks per sitting
Away	23	2 Drinks per sitting

Drinks Per Sitting: Friends

	N	Mean
Home	323	2-3Drinks per sitting
Away	182	2-3Drinks per sitting

Table 3 - Dependent Variables

Religiosity (Mean)

	N	Mean
Total	373	21.15

T-Test

As shown in table 4, a t-test was used to determine religiosity by gender. On average, females had an average religiosity score of 21.65, whereas males had an average religiosity score of 20.30. This is an average religiosity score difference of 1.35 between females and males.

Table 4 – Religiosity by Gender

	N	(Mean)
Female	236	21.65
Male	133	20.30

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0433

As shown in table 5, a t-test was used to determine average number of drinks per sitting alone by gender while within their home location. On average, females had an average of 1.36 drinks per sitting, whereas males had 1.94 drinks per sitting. This is a difference of .588 drinks per sitting between females and males.

Table 5 - Drinks Per Sitting Alone by Gender (Home)

	N	(Mean)
Female	111	1.36
Male	78	1.94

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0002

As shown in table 6, a t-test was used to determine average number of drinks per sitting with co-workers by gender while within their home location. On average, females had an average

of 1.68 drinks per sitting, whereas males had 2.20 drinks per sitting. This is a difference of .523 drinks per sitting between females and males.

Table 6 - Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers by Gender (Home)

	N	(Mean)
Female	72	1.68
Male	54	2.20

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0041

As shown in table 7, a t-test was used to determine average number of drinks per sitting with friends by gender while within their home location. On average, females had an average of 2.25 drinks per sitting, whereas males had 3.31 drinks per sitting. This is a difference of 1.058 drinks per sitting between females and males.

Table 7 - Drinks Per Sitting With Friends by Gender (Home)

	N	(Mean)
Female	193	2.25
Male	126	3.31

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0000

As shown in table 8, a t-test was used to determine average number of drinks per sitting alone by gender while traveling. On average, females had an average of 1.44 drinks per sitting, whereas males had 1.60 drinks per sitting. This is a difference of .164 drinks per sitting between females and males.

Table 8 - Drinks Per Sitting Alone by Gender (Away)

	N	(Mean)
Female	18	1.44
Male	23	1.60

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.5897

As shown in table 9, a t-test was used to determine average number of drinks per sitting with co-workers by gender while traveling. On average, females had an average of 1.41 drinks per sitting, whereas males had 2.63 drinks per sitting. This is a difference of 1.21 drinks per sitting between females and males.

Table 9 - Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers by Gender (Away)

	N	(Mean)
Female	12	1.41
Male	11	2.63

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0088

As shown in table 10, a t-test was used to determine average number of drinks per sitting with friends by gender while traveling. On average, females had an average of 2.29 drinks per sitting, whereas males had 3.14 drinks per sitting. This is a difference of .848 drinks per sitting between females and males.

Table 10 - Drinks Per Sitting With Friends by Gender (Away)

	N	(Mean)
Female	104	2.29
Male	75	3.14

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0001

As shown in table 11, a t-test was used to determine average number of times a respondent had sex with a friend or someone they just recently met by gender while within their home location. On average, females had an average of .272 sexual encounters, whereas males had .494 sexual encounters. This is a difference of .222 sexual encounters between females and males.

Table 11 - Sexual Activity by Gender (Home)

	N	(Mean)
Female	283	.272
Male	170	.494

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0180

As shown in table 12, a t-test was used to determine average number of times a respondent had sex with a friend or someone they just met by gender while traveling. On average, females had an average of .070 sexual encounters, whereas males had .241 sexual encounters. This is a difference of .170 sexual encounters between females and males.

Table 12 - Sexual Activity by Gender (Away)

	N	(Mean)
Female	283	.070
Male	170	.241

Pr (|T| > |t|) = 0.0029

Chi Squared

As shown in table 13, a chi squared analysis found that while within the respondent's home location, there was no statistically significant difference between substance abuse and gender.

Table 13 – Substance Abuse by Gender (Home)

Substance Abuse (Home)

What gender do you identify with?	No 0	Yes 1	Total
Female	240	43	283
Male	134	36	170
Total	374	79	453

Pearson chi2(1) = 2.6396 Pr = 0.104

As shown in table 14, a chi squared analysis found that while respondents were traveling, there was no statistically significant difference between substance abuse and gender.

Table 14 – Substance Abuse by Gender (Away)

Substance Abuse (Away)

What gender do you identify with?	No 0	Yes 1	Total
Female	257	26	283
Male	147	23	170
Total	404	49	453

Pearson chi2(1) = 2.0757 Pr = 0.150

Regressions

H_1: As religiosity increase, the number of drinks per sitting while within their local area will decrease when drinking alone.

Table 15 indicates that hypothesis 1 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between the number of drinks per sitting alone at home and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Table 15 - Drinks Per Sitting Alone (Home)

N = 150
Prob> F = 0.2660
R-squared = 0.0433

DPSalone	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>|t|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
Religiosity	-.0002433	.0136496	-0.02	0.986	-.0272228	.0267363
Age	-.0196347	.0250271	-0.78	0.434	-.0691025	.0298332
Gender	.3733741	.1695285	2.20	0.029	.0382884	.7084599
Female = 1 |						
Male = 2 |						
RaceGroups	.1523344	.1845707	0.83	0.411	-.2124834	.5171522
N/Caucasian=1 |						
Caucasian=2 |						
Income	.0295518	.0331491	0.89	0.374	-.0359698	.0950734
cons	1.23234	.7178048	1.72	0.088	-.1864555	2.651135

H_2: As religiosity increase, the number of drinks per sitting while within their local area will decrease when drinking with coworkers.

Table 16 indicates that hypothesis 2 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between the number of drinks per sitting with co-workers at home and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did discover statistically significant findings. As religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting with co-workers while within their home location, decreases by -.032. Also, as religiosity increases, the number of drink by gender increases by .454.The model itself is statistically significant with a probability of F, that is 0.0167 and with a predictability power of 0.0862.

Table 16 - Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers (Home)

```
N          =    103
Prob> F    =  0.0167
R-squared  =  0.1310

DPScoworker  |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |   -.032066   .0154829    -2.07   0.041    -.0627954   -.0013367
         Age |  -.0504903   .0280439    -1.80   0.075    -.1061497    .0051691
      Gender |   .4544852   .1925757     2.36   0.020     .0722756    .8366947
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
   RaceGroups|  -.3753257   .2121699    -1.77   0.080    -.7964242    .0457728
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |   .0418791   .0318581     1.31   0.192    -.0213504    .1051087
        cons |   3.600126   .8509803     4.23   0.000     1.911165    5.289086
```

H_3: As religiosity increase, the number of drinks per sitting while within their local area will decrease when drinking with friends.

Table 17 indicates that hypothesis 3 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between the number of drinks per sitting with friends at home and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Table 17 - Drinks Per Sitting With Friends (Home)

```
N          =    261
Prob> F    =  0.0000
R-squared  =  0.1302

   DPSfriend |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |  -.0230843   .0143921    -1.60   0.110    -.0514268    .0052583
         Age |  -.0345052   .0273327    -1.26   0.208    -.0883318    .0193215
      Gender |   .9668998   .1723239     5.61   0.000     .6275405    1.306259
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
   RaceGroups|  -.2536664   .1851267    -1.37   0.172    -.6182383    .1109055
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |   .0473057   .0422361     1.12   0.264    -.0358702    .1304817
        cons |   2.812065   .7422217     3.79   0.000       1.3504     4.27373
```

H_4: As religiosity increase, the number of drinks per sitting while traveling will decrease when drinking with alone.

Table 18 indicates that hypothesis 4 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between the number of drinks per sitting alone while traveling and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Table 18 - Drinks Per Sitting Alone (Away)

```
N          =    30
Prob> F    =  0.2727
R-squared  =  0.2213

   tDPSalone |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |  -.0263654    .022658    -1.16   0.256    -.0731291    .0203984
         Age |   -.031463   .0423265    -0.74   0.464    -.1188207    .0558947
      Gender |  -.1060151   .2568419    -0.41   0.683    -.6361108    .4240805
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
Relationship |  (omitted)
  RaceGroups |   .4603955   .2755711     1.67   0.108    -.1083554    1.029146
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |  -.2327442   .2150522    -1.08   0.290    -.6765901    .2111018
        cons |   2.381141   .9822704     2.42   0.023      .353834    4.408447
```

H_5: As religiosity increase, the number of drinks per sitting while traveling will decrease when drinking with coworkers.

Table 19 indicates that hypothesis 5 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between the number of drinks per sitting with co-workers while traveling and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Table 19 - Drinks Per Sitting With Co-Workers (Away)

```
N          =    17
Prob> F    =  0.2242
R-squared  =  0.4302

tDPScowork~s |     Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |  -.0808352   .0491716    -1.64   0.128    -.1890612    .0273909
         Age |  -.1714658   .2325074    -0.74   0.476    -.6832112    .3402795
      Gender |   1.423117    .591584     2.41   0.035     .1210497    2.725185
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
Relationship |  (omitted)
   RaceGroups|  -.3637427   .5290415    -0.69   0.506    -1.528155    .8006697
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |   .0133518   .2000345     0.07   0.948    -.4269211    .4536246
        cons |   5.823422   4.709647     1.24   0.242     -4.54244    16.18928
```

H_6: As religiosity increase, the number of drinks per sitting while traveling will decrease when drinking with friends.

Table 20 indicates that hypothesis 6 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between the number of drinks per sitting with friends while traveling and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Table 20 - Drinks Per Sitting With Friends (Away)

```
N          =    146
Prob> F    =  0.0021
R-squared  =  0.1246

tDPSfriends  |     Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |  -.0351564   .0192099    -1.83   0.069    -.0731353    .0028226
         Age |  -.0540651   .0329171    -1.64   0.103    -.1191439    .0110137
      Gender |    .783069   .2259488     3.47   0.001     .3363562    1.229782
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
   RaceGroups|  -.1187607     .23846    -0.50   0.619     -.590209    .3526876
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |    .079827    .073986     1.08   0.282    -.0664472    .2261013
        cons |   3.557721   .9461016     3.76   0.000     1.687227    5.428214
```

H_7: As religiosity increase, the likelihood an individual will have sex with an acquaintance or someone they recently met while within their local area, will decrease.

Table 21 indicates that hypothesis 7 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between sexual activity at home and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Table 21 - Sexual Activity (Home)

```
N          =    354
Prob> F    =  0.3551
R-squared  =  0.0157

         sex |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |    -.01381   .0086161    -1.60   0.110    -.0307562    .0031361
         Age |  -.0032432   .0141201    -0.23   0.818    -.0310145    .0245282
      Gender |    .136532   .1076632     1.27   0.206    -.0752204    .3482844
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
   RaceGroups|  -.0753322   .1106282    -0.68   0.496    -.2929163    .1422518
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |   .0220178   .0295313     0.75   0.456    -.0360644       .0801
        cons |    .626199   .4276552     1.46   0.144    -.2149151    1.467313
```

H_8: As religiosity increase, the likelihood an individual will have sex with an acquaintance or someone they just met while traveling, will decrease.

Table 22 indicates that hypothesis 8 was tested using a liner regression to determine the relationship between sexual activity while traveling and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did not support the hypothesis.

Table 22 - Sexual Activity by Gender (Away)

```
N          =    354
Prob> F    =  0.0764
R-squared  =  0.0281

        tsex |      Coef.   Std. Err.      t    P>|t|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |  -.0032734   .0053726    -0.61   0.543    -.0138403    .0072935
         Age |   .0052178   .0088046     0.59   0.554    -.0120992    .0225348
      Gender |    .171267    .067134     2.55   0.011     .0392276    .3033064
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
   RaceGroups|  -.0889825   .0689828    -1.29   0.198    -.2246582    .0466932
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |   .0164909   .0184144     0.90   0.371    -.0197266    .0527084
        cons |  -.0122331   .2666668    -0.05   0.963    -.5367145    .5122483
```

H_9: As religiosity increase, the odds of an individual using an illegal substance while within their local area will decrease.

Table 23 indicates that hypothesis 9 was tested using a logistic regression to determine the likelihood of using illegal substances at home and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis did discover that religiosity was statistically significant at .003.The overall model was also statistically significant with a probability chi squared of .012.

Table 23 - Substance Abuse (Home)

```
N           =   354
Prob> chi2  = 0.0123
Pseudo R2   = 0.0448

         sub |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |  -.0688904   .0234699    -2.94   0.003    -.1148905   -.0228903
         Age |  -.1066685   .0581131    -1.84   0.066     -.220568     .007231
      Gender |  -.0680322   .2904067    -0.23   0.815    -.6372189    .5011545
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
   RaceGroups|  -.1934206   .2992179    -0.65   0.518    -.7798769    .3930358
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
      Income |   .0463049   .0625255     0.74   0.459    -.0762428    .1688526
        cons |   2.385088   1.433811     1.66   0.096    -.4251305    5.195306
```

H_{10}: As religiosity increase, the odds of an individual using an illegal substance while traveling will decrease.

Table 24 indicates that hypothesis 10 was tested using a logistic regression to determine the likelihood of using illegal substances while traveling and religiosity, age, gender, race/ethnicity and income. The regression analysis found religiosity to be statistically significant at .009. However, the overall model measured .077 and was not statistically significant and therefore did not support the hypothesis.

Table 24 - Substance Abuse (Away)

```
N           =    302
Prob> chi2  =  0.0775
Pseudo R2   =  0.0582

        tsub |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
 Religiosity |  -.0851179   .0327425    -2.60   0.009    -.1492921   -.0209437
         Age |  -.0290451   .0659802    -0.44   0.660     -.158364    .1002738
      Gender |   .0203976   .3927094     0.05   0.959    -.7492987    .7900939
   Female = 1|
     Male = 2|
   RaceGroups|  -.8864978   .3993882    -2.22   0.026    -1.669284   -.1037114
N/Caucasian=1|
  Caucasian=2|
 Classifica~n|  -.0024213   .1929688    -0.01   0.990    -.3806333    .3757907
      Income |  -.0810971   .2015021    -0.40   0.687    -.4760339    .3138397
        cons |   1.577682   1.611147     0.98   0.327    -1.580109    4.735472
```

Chapter VI

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to make a unique contribution to the growing body of literature on religiosity and its relationship with deviant behavior. The unique contribution is made by comparing religiosity's effect on deviant behaviors while an individual is at home and away. Within this sample, there were two statistically significant findings. The first is that as religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting decreases when drinking with co-workers while within their home location. The second is that as religiosity increases, the likelihood of an individual using an illegal substance while within their home location decreases. Religiosity's ability to prevent individuals from being deviant again refers back to Travis Hirschi's (1969) Social Bond Theory. Individuals within this study, who measure higher in the religiosity scale, are more likely to have stronger social bonds to a religious institution. One possible reason for the prevention of deviance could stem from the informal sanctions that could be placed on an individual who does engage in deviant behaviors as indicated by Hirschi (1969) and Barkan (2006).

Even though this study does suggests that religiosity can reduce the likelihood of deviant behavior from occurring, this type of behavior can still happen. As mentioned in previous sections, many individuals are bonded to many different social institutions at any given time. If an individual is bonded more strongly with a social institution other than religion, they could choose to follow those norms and values rather than those of their religious institution. When an individual temporally chooses another social institution that has few restrictions on deviant behavior, there is a possibility of deviant behavior occurring. One possible example would be

religious college students consuming large amounts of alcohol at parties with their friends. In this example, a student chooses to minimize his or her religious norms and maximize norms from other social institutions that may have fewer sanctions on those who consume large amounts of alcohol.

Although this study did yield significant findings, using an online survey did impose limitations to this study. One of the first limitations of this study was that an online convenience sample was used to collect the data. This limited the study because it did not control for response rate. This prevents the studies data from being comparable against respondents from various classes and departments. Furthermore, it prevents this study's findings from being generalizable beyond this studies sample population.

Truthfulness is another limitation to this study. When conducting research using questioners, there is not an absolute way of knowing how truthful the respondent is actually answer the questions. It is also possible that the survey's internet link could have been intercepted by someone who was not a Texas Tech student. Respondents who did not complete the survey were not counted in the data collection. In other research studies, some researchers are able to determine a certain percentage of the questionnaire a respondent did answer and assess whether it can still be used within the study or if the incomplete response should be removed from the study. Since the incomplete data was not stored, this process was not possible.

Also, the sample size itself was a limitation. This could have been caused by the late distribution of the survey link from professors of various classes and departments. This assumption arises due to the highest number of respondents took the survey towards the

beginning of the semester whereas, the lowest number of respondents occurred as the semester progressed even if the link was new to the course. Also, it is believed that several professors did not distribute the survey link at all.

Other theoretical perspectives, such as rational choice theory, can explain deviant behavior. This theoretical perspective argues that individuals weigh the costs and benefits before behaving in a certain way. Using the above example, a college student will weigh the cost and benefits before consuming large amounts of alcohol at a party. If the rewards outweigh the costs of behaving deviant, excessive drinking or other deviant behaviors are more likely to occur. On the other hand, if the risks outweigh the benefits, he or she will most likely choose not to engage in the deviant behavior. If this study would have found that religiosity has no effect on deviant behavior while an individual was traveling, it could suggest that the rewards of engaging deviant behavior outweighed the costs or risks. Perhaps one way this could occur, would be from an individual traveling outside of the social institutions monitoring range. As an individual reaches a location that is unmonitored, he or she can engage in deviant behavior without the fear of informal sanctions being placed on them. Although this theory has been used to study deviant behavior in the past, it does have a few limitations. First, it assumes that all human beings are rational at all times and that their decision making is guided based on self-interest needs. It also outlines that individuals consciously weigh the rewards and cost of every action they take. Applying this theory is also problematic because it is difficult to determine if an individual is following their own action or following social norms. This problematic outcome arises from the idea that individuals act on behalf of their own self-interest.

Chapter VII

Conclusion

This study examined the relationship between religiosity and deviant behaviors among college students while they are at home and away. The two statistical significant findings were, as religiosity increases, the number of drinks per sitting with co-workers and the likelihood an individual would use illegal substances, decreases while within their home location. Future research on religiosity and deviant behavior could be beneficial in that it could help develop and shape future religious programs to assist college students in correcting or prevent deviant behaviors from occurring in the future.

References

Bahr, S. J., Maughan, S. L., Marcos, A. C., & Li, B. (1998). Family, Religiosity, and the Risk of Adolescent Drug Use. *Journal Of Marriage & Family*, *60*(4), 979-992.

Barkan, S. E. (2006). Religiosity and Premarital Sex in Adulthood. *Journal For The Scientific Study Of Religion*, *45*(3), 407-417.

Capece, M., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (2013). Binge Drinking Among College Students: A Partial Test of Akers' Social Structure-Social Learning Theory. *American Journal Of Criminal Justice*, *38*(4), 503-519.

Durkheim, Emile. (1933). *The Division of Labor in Society*. George Simpson, trans. New York: Macmillan.

Ford, Julie and Charles Kadushin. (2002). Between sacral belief and moral community: A multidimensional approach to the relationship between religion and alcohol among whites and blacks. *Sociological Forum 17*(2):255–79.

Goffman, Erving. (1963) *Stigma; notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Casues of delionquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hirschi, T., & Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and delinquency. *Social Problems*, *17*(2), 202-213.

Jackson, A., Gilliland, K., & Veneziano, L. (2006). Routine Activity Theory and Sexual Deviance Among Male College Students. *Journal Of Family Violence*, *21*(7), 449-460.

Kimmel, Michael & Aronson, Amy. 2012. *Sociology Now, Census Update*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Koch, J. R., & Ramirez, I. (2010). Religiosity, Christian Fundamentalism, and Intimate Partner Violence Amoung U.S. College Students. *Review Of Religious Research*, *51*(4), 402-410.

Koch, J. R., Roberts, A. E., Armstrong, M. L., & Owen, D. C. (2010). Body art, deviance, and American college students. *Social Science Journal*, *47*(1), 151-161.

Lefkowitz, E. S., Gillen, M. M., Shearer, C. L., & Boone, T. L. (2004). Religiosity, Sexual Behaviors, and Sexual Attitudes During Emerging Adulthood. *Journal Of Sex Research*, *41*(2), 150-159.

Pargament, K. I., Smith, B. W., Koenig, H. G., & Perez, L. (1998). Patterns of positive and negative religious coping with major life stressors. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *37*(4), 710–724.

Richard, Alan J., David C. Bell, and Jerry W. Carlson. 2000. Individual religiosity, moral community, and drug user treatment. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 39(2):240–46.

Stark, R. (1996). Religion as Context: Hellfire and Delinquency One More Time. *Sociology Of Religion*, *57*(2), 163.

Stoltzfus, K. M., & Farkas, K. J. (2012). Alcohol Use, Daily Hassles, and Religious Coping Among Students at a Religiously Affiliated College. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *47*(10), 1134-1142.

Vazsonyi, A. T., & Jenkins, D. D. (2010). Religiosity, Self-Control, and Virginity Status in College Students from the "Bible Belt": A Research Note. *Journal For The Scientific Study Of Religion*, *49*(3), 561-568.

Wallace, J. R., Yamaguchi, R., Bachman, J. G., O'Malley, P. M., Schulenberg, J. E., & Johnston, L. D. (2007). 'Religiosity and adolescent substance use: The role of individual and contextual influences': Erratum. *Social Problems*, *54*(3), 395-397.

Wiatrowski-Michael-D, Griswold-David-B, & Roberts-Mary-K. (1981). Social control theory and delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *46*(5), 525-541.

Appendix

Questionnaire

Hello,

We are researchers in the Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work Department from Texas Tech University in Lubbock, Texas. We are conducting a study looking at the degree to which people become deviant while traveling outside their local area. This will be done by comparing different deviant behaviors an individual does within their local area as compared to when traveling. This survey will take about 5 to 15 minutes of your time, and we will use the results for a research study. We will not be able to identify you individually – please do not put your name on any portion of this survey. If you would prefer not to answer a question, please leave it blank. Your participation is voluntary and you can stop at any time. Your decision to participate or not to participate, will not affect your grade in anyway.

The research project you are being asked to participate in is entitled "Travel: An Escape to Deviance?"

Contact Information:

For questions about the study or the procedures, contact Dr. Ignacio Luis Ramirez or Mr. Tyler Sims of the Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work Department at Texas Tech is in charge of the study. The phone number is 806-742-2400. You can also email us, Dr. Ignacio Luis Ramirez at L.Ramirez@ttu.edu or Mr. Tyler Sims at tyler.sims@ttu.edu.

You may also contact the Human Research Protection Program at Texas Tech University at 806-742-2064 if you have questions.

Thank you for helping us with this research.

1. What state are you currently living in? If you are not currently living in the United States, please select not from the United States.

Not from the United States
Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
Arkansas
California
Colorado
Connecticut
Delaware
Florida
Georgia
Hawaii
Idaho
Illinois
Indiana
Iowa
Kansas
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico
New York
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
Oregon
Pennsylvania
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Tennessee
Texas
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

2. What is your age in years?

1	21	41	61	81
2	22	42	62	82
3	23	43	63	83
4	24	44	64	84
5	25	45	65	85
6	26	46	66	86
7	27	47	67	87
8	28	48	68	88
9	29	49	69	89
10	30	50	70	90
11	31	51	71	91
12	32	52	72	92
13	33	53	73	93
14	34	54	74	94
15	35	55	75	95
16	36	56	76	96
17	37	57	77	97
18	38	58	78	98
19	39	59	79	99
20	40	60	80	100+

3. What gender do you identify with?
   0. Female
   1. Male
   2. Other

4. Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?
   0. Single
   1. Dating
   2. Married

5. Which race/ethnic group do you consider yourself to be a member of?
   0. Asian
   1. African American (Black)
   2. Caucasian (White)
   3. Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian)
   4. Hispanic
   5. Other

6. Which of these answers best represents your current or highest level of education?
    0. Less than high-school
    1. Some high-school
    2. Completed high school
    3. Currently an undergraduate
    4. Some college completed
    5. Completed college
    6. Currently a graduate student
    7. Some graduate school completed
    8. Completed graduate school

7. What is your current classification?
    0. College Freshman
    1. College Sophomore
    2. College Junior
    3. College Senior
    4. College Graduate (Masters)
    5. College Graduate (Ph.D.)

8. Please estimate, in US dollars, how much money you currently earn or receive a year (even if unemployed).
    0. $0 - $15,000
    1. $15,001 - $30,000
    2. $30,001 - $45,000
    3. $45,001 - $60,000
    4. $60,001 - $75,000
    5. $75,001 - $90,000
    6. $90,001 - $105,000
    7. $105,001 - $120,000
    8. $120,001 - $135,000
    9. $135,001 - $150,000
    10. $150,001 - $165,000
    11. $165,001 - $180,000
    12. $180, 001 - $195,000
    13. $195, 001 - $210,000
    14. $210, 001 - $225,000
    15. $225, 001 - $240,000
    16. $240, 001 - $255,000
    17. $255, 001 - $270,000
    18. $270, 001 - $285,000
    19. $285, 001 - $300,000
    20. $300, 001 - $315,000
    21. $315, 001 - $330,000
    22. $330, 001 - $345,000
    23. $345, 001 - $360,000
    24. $360, 001 - $375,000
    25. $375, 001 - $390,000
    26. $390, 001 or more

9. If you have children, please indicate the number of children you have within each age range by using the drop down menus on each category/row. Please leave any category/row that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

0. Newborn – 1 year of age
1. 2 – 3 years of age
2. 4 – 6 years of age
3. 7 – 10 years of age
4. 11 – 15 years of age
5. 16 – 18 years of age
6. 19 – 20 years of age
7. 21 and older

10. Using your best estimate, how many times have you traveled outside your local area for more than a day within the past 12 months?

0. None
1. 1-2 times
2. 3-4 times
3. 5-6 times
4. 7-10 times
5. 11-12 times
6. 13-14 times
7. 15 or more

11. If you have ever been a victim of a crime while traveling, please check all that apply. If not, please select "never been a victim".

Theft / Robbery
Sexual Assault
Domestic Violence
Terrorism
Vandalism
Other
Never been a victim

12. Within your local area, please select how often and how many drinks per sitting you have within each category/row listed below. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Drink alcohol alone:
Drink alcohol with just your co-workers:
Drink alcohol with family/spouse excluding children under the age of 21 years old:
Drink alcohol with family/spouse including children under the age of 21 years old:
Drink alcohol with your personal friends but excluding your co-workers and family/spouse:

How Often You Drink:	**Drinks Per Sitting:**
Daily	1-2 drinks per sitting
Weekly	3-4 drinks per sitting
Monthly	5-6 drinks per sitting
Yearly	7-8 drinks per sitting
	9-10 drinks per sitting
	11-12 drinks per sitting
	13-14 drinks per sitting
	15 or more drinks per sitting

13. Within your local area, please select all of the following substances you currently use? I do not use any of these substances

Marijuana	Mushrooms
Cocaine	LSD (Acid)
Crack	PCP (Angel Dust)
Ecstasy	Heroin
Methamphetamine (Speed, Crank, Crystal Meth)	Inhalants

14. Within your local area, please select how often you use and how many times you use any of the substances you selected on the previous question. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Use substances alone:
Use substances with just your co-workers:
Use substances with family/spouse excluding children under the age of 21 years old:
Use substances with family/spouse including children under the age of 21 years old:
Use substances with your personal friends but excluding your co-workers and family/spouse:

How Often You Use Substances:	**How Many Times You Use Substances:**
Daily	1-2 times
Weekly	3-4 times
Monthly	5-6 times
Yearly	7-8 times
	9-10 times
	11-12 times
	13-14 times
	15 or more times

15. Within your local area, please select how often and how many times you do any of the items within the categories/rows listed below. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Pay for sex
Have sex with acquaintances other than your partner
Have sex with someone you recently met (none paid).

How Often:	**How Many Times:**
Daily	1-2 times
Weekly	3-4 times
Monthly	5-6 times
Yearly	7-8 times
	9-10 times
	11-12 times
	13-14 times
	15 or more time

16. In the past 12 months, have you traveled for business?
    0. No
    1. Yes

17. On average, please select how often you travel on business? Then select the number of times you travel on business within the timeframe you selected.

How Often:	**How Many Times:**
Daily	1-2 times
Weekly	3-4 times
Monthly	5-6 times
Yearly	7-8 times
	9-10 times
	11-12 times
	13-14 times
	15 or more

18. While traveling on business, please select how often and how many drinks per sitting you have within each category/row listed below. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Drink alcohol alone:
Drink alcohol with just your co-workers:
Drink alcohol with family/spouse excluding children under the age of 21 years old:
Drink alcohol with family/spouse including children under the age of 21 years old:
Drink alcohol with your personal friends but excluding your co-workers and family/spouse:

How Often You Drink:	**Drinks Per Sitting:**
Daily	1-2 drinks per sitting
Weekly	3-4 drinks per sitting
Monthly	5-6 drinks per sitting
Yearly	7-8 drinks per sitting
	9-10 drinks per sitting
	11-12 drinks per sitting
	13-14 drinks per sitting
	15 or more drinks per sitting

19. While traveling on business, please select all of the following substances you currently use? I do not use any of these substances

Marijuana	Mushrooms
Cocaine	LSD (Acid)
Crack	PCP (Angel Dust)
Ecstasy	Heroin
Methamphetamine (Speed, Crank, Crystal Meth)	Inhalants

20. While traveling on business, please select how often you use and how many times you use any of the substances you selected on the previous question. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Use substances alone:
Use substances with just your co-workers:
Use substances with family/spouse excluding children under the age of 21 years old:
Use substances with family/spouse including children under the age of 21 years old:
Use substances with your personal friends but excluding your co-workers and family/spouse:

How Often You Use Substances:	**How Many Times You Use Substances:**
Daily	1-2 times
Weekly	3-4 times
Monthly	5-6 times
Yearly	7-8 times
	9-10 times
	11-12 times
	13-14 times
	15 or more time

21. While traveling on business, please select how often and how many times you do any of the items within the categories/rows listed below. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Pay for sex
Have sex with acquaintances other than your partner
Have sex with someone you recently met while traveling on business (none paid).

How Often:	**How Many Times:**
Daily	1-2 times
Weekly	3-4 times
Monthly	5-6 times
Yearly	7-8 times
	9-10 times
	11-12 times
	13-14 times
	15 or more times

22. While traveling on business, how often do you attend a place of worship (church, synagogue, etc.) now?

0. Never
1. Once or twice a year
2. Several times a year
3. About once a month
4. Weekly or more often

23. While traveling on business, about how often do you pray?
    0. Never
    1. Less than once a week
    2. Once a week
    3. Several times a week
    4. Daily
    5. Several times a day

24. Within the past 12 months, have you traveled for any reason other than business?
    0. No
    1. Yes

25. On average, please select how often and how many times you have traveled outside your local area for any reason other than business?

How Often:	**How Many Times:**
Daily	1-2 times
Weekly	3-4 times
Monthly	5-6 times
Yearly	7-8 times
	9-10 times
	11-12 times
	13-14 times
	15 or more

26. While traveling for any reason except for business, please select how often and how many drinks per sitting you have within each category/row listed below. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Drink alcohol alone:
Drink alcohol with just your co-workers:
Drink alcohol with family/spouse excluding children under the age of 21 years old:
Drink alcohol with family/spouse including children under the age of 21 years old:
Drink alcohol with your personal friends but excluding your co-workers and /spouse:

How Often You Drink:	**Drinks Per Sitting:**
Daily	1-2 drinks per sitting
Weekly	3-4 drinks per sitting
Monthly	5-6 drinks per sitting
Yearly	7-8 drinks per sitting
	9-10 drinks per sitting
	11-12 drinks per sitting
	13-14 drinks per sitting
	15 or more drinks per sitting

27. While traveling for any reason except for business, which of the following substances you currently use?

I do not use any of these substances
Marijuana
Cocaine
Crack
Ecstasy
Methamphetamine (Speed, Crank, Crystal Meth)
Mushrooms
LSD (Acid)
PCP (Angel Dust)
Heroin
Inhalants

28. While traveling for any reason except for business, please select how often you use and how many times you use any of the substances you selected on the previous question. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Use substances alone:
Use substances with just your co-workers:
Use substances with family/spouse excluding children under the age of 21 years old:
Use substances with family/spouse including children under the age of 21 years old:
Use substances with your personal friends but excluding your co-workers and /spouse:

How Often You Use Substances:
Daily
Weekly
Monthly
Yearly

How Many Times You Use Substances:
1-2 times
3-4 times
5-6 times
7-8 times
9-10 times
11-12 times
13-14 times
15 or more time

29. While traveling for any reason except for business, please select how often and how many times you do any of the items within the categories/rows listed below. Please leave any category that does not apply to you blank. Click next when you have finished.

Pay for sex
Have sex with acquaintances other than your partner
Have sex with someone you recently met while traveling for any reason except for business (none paid).

How Often:	**How Many Times:**
Daily	1-2 times
Weekly	3-4 times
Monthly	5-6 times
Yearly	7-8 times
	9-10 times
	11-12 times
	13-14 times
	15 or more times

30. While traveling for any reason except for business, how often do you attend a place of worship (church, synagogue, etc.) now?
    0. Never
    1. Once or twice a year
    2. Several times a year
    3. About once a month
    4. Weekly or more often

31. While traveling for any reason except for business, about how often do you pray?
    0. Never
    1. Less than once a week
    2. Once a week
    3. Several times a week
    4. Daily
    5. Several times a day

32. In general, would you consider your religious faith to be?
    0. Non-Existent
    1. Very Weak
    2. Moderately Weak
    3. Moderately Strong
    4. Very Strong

33. Which religion would you consider yourself a member of?
    0. I do not consider myself a member of any religion
    1. Catholic
    2. Baptist
    3. Methodist
    4. Non-denominational protestant/Christian
    5. Jewish
    6. Muslim/Islamic
    7. Other

34. How important is religion in your daily life?
    0. Not at all
    1. Somewhat Important
    2. Moderately Important
    3. Very Important
    4. Extremely Important

35. Please select from the following items which best describes your beliefs about God.
    0. I don't believe in God
    1. I don't believe in a personal God, but I believe in a higher power of some kind.
    2. I find myself believing in God some of the time, but not at other times.
    3. While I have some doubts, I feel that I do believe in God.
    4. I know that God really exists and I have no doubts about it

36. How close would you say you are to God?
    0. Not close at all
    1. Somewhat close
    2. Moderately close
    3. Very close
    4. Extremely Close

37. Within your local area, how often do you attend a place of worship (church, mosque, synagogue, etc.) now?
    0. Never
    1. Once or twice a year
    2. Several times a year
    3. About once a month
    4. Weekly or more often

38. Within your local area, about how often do you pray?
    0. Never
    1. Less than once a week
    2. Once a week
    3. Several times a week
    4. Daily
    5. Several times a day

Thank you for taking the time to take this survey!