

# **RELIGION'S IMPACT ON DELINQUENCY ACCORDING TO SOCIAL SCIENCE BELIEFS AND RESEARCH**

**By: Emily Naegle, Paul Robinson and Julia Witham  
Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah**

## **ABSTRACT**

*In 1969 Hirschi and Stark authored a research report involving over 400 adolescents that concluded religiously oriented families do not reduce juvenile delinquency. In 1984 Stark responded to the growing number of research studies indicating religion does reduce rates of juvenile delinquency by saying his 1969 findings were influenced by social science's historical bias against religion. Over the past twenty years a number of research studies have disagreed as to whether religion does or does not influence juvenile delinquency rates. Naegle & Robinson review all the research related to this issue and identify several methodological factors that seem to have played a role in producing mixed findings.*

## **INTRODUCTION**

In 1969, Stark and Hirschi presented research evidence indicating the practice of religion does not reduce juvenile delinquency. In 1984, Stark came out with a statement saying his 1969 interpretation of the research concerning religion and juvenile delinquency was wrong. He claimed the strong anti-religious attitude of social scientists was at least partly responsible for his colored perspective. He noted that more current research findings have shown religious practices do reduce juvenile delinquency. The purpose of this paper is to look at the social science's possible anti-religious bias and relate it to the possible effect this bias has had on juvenile delinquency in America.

### **Early influences: The background for modern research**

In 1909, Dr William Healy, a British psychiatrist immigrated to the United States. Healy had discovered Freud's work while studying in Vienna and Berlin in 1906 and 1907. He settled in Chicago where he began his work evaluating young offenders for the Juvenile Court. Strongly influenced by Freud, Healy soon became convinced that juvenile delinquents were not caused by heredity, but by unpleasant experiences during their childhood, for instance, repression and unhealthy sexual experiences while very young. Most importantly, he believed that juvenile delinquents were not responsible for their behavior; therefore they should not be punished. He believed that the "cure" for juvenile delinquency was modified Freudian psychoanalysis. He soon received some notoriety from his peers when he published two books describing these beliefs in detail. In 1915, he published *The Individual Delinquent*, and two years later he published *Mental Conflict and Misconduct* confirming his continuing move toward a classical psychoanalytic explanation of juvenile delinquency (Torrey, 1992, p. 148).

It was not long until Healy's work became well known among other professionals in the corrections field. In 1917 he was recruited to Boston to be director of the Judge Baker Guidance Center associated with Harvard University. Soon Healy's work became the foundation of mental hygiene and child guidance movements that were evolving at the time and were dominated by Freud's supporters. It was not long until other child guidance clinics were being patterned after Healy's clinic in Boston (Torrey, 1992, p. 149).

At the same time that Healy was becoming an important Freudian influence on Juvenile Delinquency, Dr. Bernard Glueck was introducing these Freudian ideas for adult offenders. He argued that criminal offenders could also be cured if they were treated by psychiatrists trained in Freudian psychoanalysis. Glueck felt that recidivism could be greatly reduced if all criminals were treated by psychiatrists and other mental health professionals trained in Freudian principles (Torrey, 1992 p. 150).

A third important figure in shaping the attitude and beliefs of criminology in America was Dr. William A. White. In fact, he promoted Freud's ideas even more aggressively than either Healy or Glueck. (Torrey, 1992, pg 151). His textbook, *Outline of Psychiatry*, which was revised fourteen times over a period of three decades helped to train many influential psychiatrists, including Bernard Glueck. He also wrote *Insanity and the Criminal Law* (1923) and *Crimes and Criminals* (1933).

In White's books he depicted criminals as hostages of their unconscious memories and therefore not responsible for their actions. He wrote "Someone has aptly said, that the murderer who sees his victim lying before him and a smoking revolver in his hand is probably of all those who may be present, the most surprised." He also called for "the discarding of the concept of responsibility" for criminal acts. He also believed "that prisons and punishment should both be abolished" and instead there should be a "gradual transformation of prisons into laboratories for the study of human behavior and the conditioning of human conduct" (Torrey, 1992, p. 152).

By 1920, through the influence of Healy, Glueck and White, the theories of Freud were widely discussed in America when issues concerning delinquent and criminal behavior arose. As has already been discussed, Freudian principles were anti-religious. The bible clearly teaches that individuals, who commit crimes, should be held personally responsible and punished. Therefore, in the early 1900's, the mental health professionals within the criminal justice system incorporated their religious and biblical bias into their professional practice. Punishment for criminal acts was considered unjustifiable because individuals who commit crimes are not responsible for the acts they commit. These Freudian trained professionals incorrectly claimed that science had revealed the problem of delinquency, and crime was solvable by treating criminals with a talk-it-out psychoanalytic approach rather than having criminals being held accountable for their actions through the administration of punishment. The blame was to be placed on parents and society when a person's unfortunate childhood was uncovered during psychoanalysis.

### **Looking for scientific support**

Archival research has repeatedly shown that Freud's anti-religious life belief system, along with its psychoanalytic treatment approach, is not based on scientific

evidence. For example, in 1937 a group of Freudian trained mental health professionals initiated a major experiment involving 650 eleven year old boys in an attempt to scientifically validate the idea that Freud's life belief system and his psychoanalytic treatment approach could and would dramatically reduce juvenile delinquency. This study, called the Cambridge-Somerville Delinquency Prevention Project, was quite unique in that it was just about the only scientific experiment carried out by Freudian trained mental health professionals in an attempt to scientifically validate Freud's approach for handling juvenile delinquents.

In 1959 William and Joan McCord finally reported the long awaited results of the Cambridge-Somerville Project. In fact, the results of the Cambridge-Somerville Project were initially analyzed and written up in 1949; however, the results showed the Freudian approach was not effective in reducing criminal behavior. The people carrying out the project were so stunned by the results that they felt somehow the data analysis was faulty. After several years of holding the data, the project directors finally agreed to hire two expert researchers (William and Joan McCord) to conduct a thorough data analysis. The McCords again found the Freudian approach did not work. In fact, Joan McCord's (1978) thirty year follow-up study indicated the Freudian based parenting and counseling approach actually increased criminal behavior.

The Cambridge-Somerville Project results were particularly significant because it was a substantially big and well controlled experiment whose results were consistent with the results of many large ex post facto studies (Burt, 1925; Merrill, 1950; Glueck & Glueck (1950), Sears et al., 1957; Nye, 1958; and Yarrow et al., 1968). The data from all these studies supported the biblical belief that punishment was an effective behavior change procedure that did not provoke delinquency in children. It is interesting to note that present day literature reviews by mental health professionals that typically carry personal anti-religious biases do not include these studies as they looked at the effects of religion on delinquency.

An archival research review of past studies reveals a pattern of mental health professionals either intentionally or unintentionally adjusting the conclusions of their study to show support for Freudian type life belief systems over religiously based life belief systems. For example, two sociological researchers with Freudian biases collected data on one thousand children. Although the data they collected showed that a significantly higher percentage of children in detention centers came from families where mothers used a more permissive Freudian type approach, the Gluecks adjusted the data results by combining measures in a way that allowed them to report that families who used the biblical advocated approach of punishing children were much more likely to produce delinquents than a Freudian type family system.

Glueck and Glueck (1950) did not carry out an experiment where they intentionally manipulated the use of punishment to see its differential effects on people, as was the case with the McCord and McCord (1959) experiment where the Freudian approach was intentionally administered to half their subjects and compared to families using the more traditional reinforcement-punishment based parenting approach. Scientists are much more confident with McCord's findings that Freudian-type permissive parenting increases juvenile delinquency, while consistent use of punishment by parents does not. Traditionally, learning psychologists have studied punishment with an experimental research approach while developmental researchers have typically

studied punishment by comparing punishment and non-punishment groups that already exist (often called Ex Post Facto studies). Ex Post Facto studies are not considered as scientifically powerful as experimental studies.

Ex Post Facto studies can be effective in showing some factor (e.g. punishment) does cause another factor (e.g. change in behavior), but the investigator has to be careful and not let personal biases slip in and confound the findings. For example, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck were developmental researchers who had adopted Freud's life belief system. Their bias becomes apparent when one looks at what the Gluecks conclude from their research. Consider these findings: The Gluecks report 56.8% of boys in detention centers come from homes where mothers are lax and permissive while only 4.4% come from home where mothers are overly strict. The Gluecks also report 26.6% of boys come from homes where father are lax and permissive and 26.1% come from homes where fathers are overly strict. After presenting all their data, the Gluecks' combine the 26.1% figure of fathers being overly strict with the 41.6% figure of fathers being erratic in their use of punishment and conclude parental use of punishment produces 68% of the delinquency.

This would tend to support Freud's claim that parental use of punishment is the major cause of delinquency. However, Freud's theory actually claims mothers play a more important role in raising boys than fathers do. If you look at the figures about mothers you can see that delinquent boys are 13 times more likely (56.8% vs. 4.4%) to come from permissive mothers than punitive mothers. That information does not support Freud's theory, which the Gluecks believed in; therefore the Gluecks did not focus on that data in their conclusions. Instead, the Gluecks included the following statement that is a Freudian-based belief:

*"We must break the vicious cycle of character-damaging influence on children exerted by parents who are themselves the distorted personality products of adverse parental influences..."* (p. 287).

While the Gluecks make this Freudian statement, their data does not include indications that parents were a character-damaging influence on their children. For example, there is no difference between delinquent and non-delinquent boys in terms of them feeling loved and having dominating parents. However, there are big differences in delinquent boys making more choices for personal gratification such as staying out late, sleeping other places, smoking, playing away from home, and destroying property. Additionally, Gluecks' statistic of 98.4% of delinquents having delinquent companions in contrast to only 7.4% of non-delinquent boys having delinquent companions strongly suggests delinquency in boys is due more to having delinquent friends than having character-damaging parents.

The Gluecks' data actually supports the biblical idea that parents should be more involved in supervision of their children rather than supporting Freud's idea of parents being more lax and permissive with their children.

In another study done in 1958, Ivan Nye reported the results of survey data he collected from 2300 high school students that included questions about the role and value of parental use of punishment. Nye's results were consistent with Burt (1925) and Merrills' (1950) in showing permissive parenting and erratic use of punishment in parenting were related to delinquency and aggression while consistent parental use of punishment was not a significant cause of delinquency.

Then in 1966, researchers Azrin and Holz reviewed all the scientific research on punishment. They found hundreds of experimental studies that showed punishment to be effective. There were studies that showed different types of punishment, like time out, verbal reprimands, physical punishment, and privilege removal, could be effectively used to reduce behavior. They cited studies which showed various things could be done to increase the effectiveness of punishment such as:

- Make the punishment more immediate.
- Increase the intensity of the punishment.
- Provide positive alternatives to the misbehavior.
- Do not allow subject to avoid the punisher.

Azrin and Holz concluded punishment is perhaps the most effective procedure for changing behavior. Unfortunately few mental health professionals were aware of Azrin and Holz's study, therefore few members of the American public were told. Instead the public was repeatedly told that punishment-free parenting was effective. Azrin and Holz's review of the experimental research on punishment strongly contradicted PET and Freud's unsupported claims that punishment is ineffective, and presented no scientific evidence to support PET and Freud's techniques were more effective than reinforcement and punishment.

In 1969 Travis Hirschi and Rodney Stark attempted to resolve this confusion analyzing self-reports of 4077 junior high and high school students in California. Their goal was to see if religion had a positive effect on reducing delinquency as the religiously oriented American public assumed. They used three different religious effects or "assumptions" and measured them against self-reported and official records of delinquency. Adopting the commonly held belief of most social scientists that religion is a mythically based life belief system with few if any, positive values, Hirschi and Stark reported that delinquency was not reduced by religion. They also said that because they had "proven" that the common conception of the correlation between religion and delinquency was false, they expected to be met with some resistance and accusations. Among these expected accusations they placed "inadequate methods" adjacent to "plain stupidity," as if it would be plain stupidity to question their methodology and the only reason for doing so would be a bias in behalf of religion. Hirschi and Stark finished their paper saying:

*"The church is irrelevant to delinquency because it fails to instill in its members love for their neighbors and because belief in the possibility of pleasure and pain in another world cannot, now and perhaps never could, compete with the pleasures and pains of everyday life."*

In 1970 Rhodes and Reiss carried out an investigation based on data the authors had collected more than a decade earlier found a strong negative correlation between religion and delinquency. However, Rhodes and Reiss were working under the popular social scientist assumption that religion was a superstition based life belief system and consequently the results were downplayed. Rhodes and Reiss stated in their conclusion that "religious effects, if there be such, are small" (Rhodes & Reiss, 98) and the correlation between delinquency and religion, though it existed, was weak.

In 1974 Burkett and White stated that though the *Hellfire and Delinquency* findings were indisputable, the conclusions drawn were rash and subject to further examination. Burkett and White proposed that faith has a notable influence, but that

secular influences and social control are equally effective in keeping nonreligious people from being delinquent. In other words, church attendance and a belief in God may positively influence youth as much as after school activities or athletics. They claimed that to say the secular influence was greater or less than religious influence was not scientifically sound unless a group was controlled for exposure to anything other than religious influence. Burkett and White also claimed that the measurements for delinquency were not entirely adequate. The choice of offenses—larceny, vandalism, and assault—are all heavily discouraged in all societal agencies, not merely churches. Thus, they decided to use additional measures for delinquency, such as the use of drugs and alcohol. These offenses, which had become increasingly accepted by society, were still heavily discouraged by religion. With the societal effect reduced, Burkett and White found that religious commitment reduced the probability that teenagers from several Pacific Northwest cities would be involved in what they called “victimless crimes” of marijuana and alcohol consumption. Thus, the type of crime became an issue.

In 1975 presidential address to the American Psychological Association Donald Campbell openly acknowledged and condemned the bias against religion in the mental health community. He criticized psychologists and psychiatrists for being so needlessly hostile toward religion. He also pointed out that religion taught that human traits such as lust, selfishness, and greed should be bridled while psychiatry “not only describe man as selfishly motivated, but implicitly and explicitly teach that he ought to be so” (Campbell, 1975 p. 1104-04). Campbell closed his talk by warning against the “epistemic arrogance of behavioral and social scientists” (Campbell, 1975 p. 1120-21).

Two additional attempted replications in 1977 gave an even more convincing look at the moderate, yet existing correlation between religion and delinquency. The first of these was conducted in Atlanta, Georgia by Paul Higgins and Gary Albrecht. Using self report methods, similar to those of Hirschi and Stark, a sample of 1,383 tenth graders showed a moderate negative relationship between church attendance and delinquent behavior. Higgins and Albrecht suggested several possible explanations for the differing results. First, there was a difference in how delinquency was measured. Hirschi and Stark used only six minor offenses and Higgins and Albrecht used a 17-item list which included many serious offenses. It was suggested that perhaps religion affects only the commission of major offenses. However, even the minor offenses, which Hirschi and Stark had also used (e.g. petty theft, auto theft, and taking part in a fight), proved to be moderately significant.

Higgins and Albrecht additionally hypothesized that perhaps the differing results were due to the region in which the studies had been conducted. They suggested that *“one might suppose that religion is more of a concern in the South than it is in California, and thus those who go to church in the South are more religiously oriented than those who go to church in California.”* In other words, the religious social atmosphere may determine whether or not individuals live by their proclaimed beliefs. Higgins and Albrecht concluded that while Hirschi and Stark’s findings may be true in California, they could not be generalized to the greater population of the U.S.

The second study of 1977 conducted by Stan Albrecht, Bruce Chadwick, and David Alcorn, had a considerable impact for several reasons. They first offered a solution to the reason why so many previous studies, including that of Hirschi and Stark, found no significant relationship between religion and delinquency. They recognized the fact that

the issue of delinquency and religion fell under the more general boundaries of attitude-behavioral relationships which had previously been studied using a bivariate approach called the “postulate of consistency” perspective. Over time, this approach proved inadequate to explain the complexity of the attitude-behavioral problem. Albrecht et al. suggested that this complexity called for more than the simple bivariate approach, but for multivariate models. They claimed that when attitude, including religious beliefs, is a poor predictor of behavior, it is because attitude is only one variable in a complex relationship. Thus, it has an effect, but that effect can be either smothered or enhanced depending on the other situational variables.

Albrecht et al. performed their study with this multivariate approach and measured not only for delinquency and religion but also for peer and family influences. Using self reports of church members in three western states they found a significant negative correlation between religion and delinquency. The results of the study proved supportive of the multivariate approach claiming a significant relationship between religious variables and delinquent behavior. Contrary to previous research, Albrecht et al. concluded that while religion alone may not be a reliable prediction of delinquency, it is a strong contributing factor.

In 1982 Stark returned to the field of study to reevaluate his 1969 findings in light of the success of more recent research. Stark suggested that Higgins and Albrecht’s emphasis on ecology, or religious climate, was the key to understanding the contradictory findings. Stark used three data sets from the archives on delinquency, one national sample and two extreme communities: Provo, with the highest church membership rate in the nation at 96.6%, and Seattle, a highly secularized community at only 28% church membership. A significant relationship was found and Stark concluded, “*Religion does seem to constrain delinquency, but only where the religious convictions of the individual are reinforced by their social environment.*”

In a presidential address fifteen years after he published his 1969 article, which claimed religion had no effect on delinquency, Rodney Stark (1984) pointed out that more recent research findings showed religion did have an influence on delinquency. Moreover, he went on to try to explain why there were situations where religion did not appear to have an effect on an individual’s behavior. Stark argued that the influence of religion on people cannot be identified through a psychological analysis of individuals. It requires a sociological analysis. According to Stark, “*religious effects seem allergic to psychological interpretation and do not show themselves except to authentic sociologists.... we cannot assess propositions about groups by examining traits of individuals*” (Stark 1984, p.273, 276). While we disagree with several things Stark (1984) brought up in his attempt to explain his change of mind to believing in religious effects, we believe his argument about psychological perspectives not being able to explain religion is erroneous.

Stark reminds the reader of the trend of social scientists to be skeptical of religion as he notes:

*“The thrust of social science writing is to associate superstitious beliefs with religion, indeed to regard all forms of supernaturalism as manifestations of faith in irrationality and of distrust in science and reason... For generations social scientists have predicted that the spread of scientific nationalism will soon dispel the illusions of religion”* (p. 280).

Stark points out that contrary to popular belief people who claim to have no religious affiliation are much more willing to accept mysticisms, magic, and superstitions than people who are affiliated with religion (Bainbridge & Stark, 1981). In line with this is the fact that while Sigmund Freud was against religion and claimed it was based on myths and illusions he was involved with the occult, numerology, and séances.

While the mental health profession erroneously criticized religion for being based on myths and illusions, its members created three so called humanistically based family life belief systems that have been shown to be scientifically unsound. Sigmund Freud's humanistically based child raising theory strongly emphasized toilet training experiences as being very important in determining adult personality characteristics. Four scientific studies were carried out to test that part of Freud's theory. According to E. Fuller Torrey (1992), "*The results in all four showed no relationship between toilet training experiences and later personality characteristics.*" (p. 220)

Freud's life belief system emphasized the importance of events in the oral, anal, and oedipal stages of development in determining adult personalities. According to Torrey (1992) "*There is not a single study verifying Freud's theory that events in the anal stage of development determine adult personality characteristics. The same conclusion is reached when studies relating to the oral and the oedipal stages are examined*" (p. 220).

In 1986 Douglas M. Sloane and Raymond H. Potvin responded to the assumption that ecology was a determining factor in finding significance with their hypothesis that *how* the correlation is measured has a more basic impact. In their study Sloane and Potvin used self-report data of 1,121 American adolescents drawn from the master sample of the Gallup organization; including boys and girls from across the nation ages 13 to 18. As Albrecht et al. suggested they addressed the issue with a bivariate and multivariate approach. When Sloane and Potvin used PRE-variety measures and chi-square statistics with multiple degrees of freedom to test and describe the relationship, they found weak associations for some offenses which varied depending on how religion was measured. When odds ratios and more sensitive tests of significance were used, they found strong effects of religion on all offenses regardless of how religion was measured. Sloane and Potvin concluded that "*there is an association between religion and delinquency that is not confined to certain offenses or to certain subgroups or social contexts.*" (Sloan & Potvin, 104).

In 1995 Brent B. Benda conducted a study of 1,093 high school students in Oklahoma, Maryland, and Arkansas and found that religion remained significantly predictive of delinquency. His findings expanded the scope of possible conflicts in finding a relationship between religion and delinquency suggesting that the differences were due to limitations in methodology, use of theory, and consideration of contingency contexts. To address these limitations Benda analyzed bivariate relationships after controlling for socio-demographic variables and viewed the relationships as an important element of social control theory. Benda's results supported those of several other studies done in the previous years which also suggested a significant correlation between religion and several different forms of delinquency (Fernquist, 1995; Cochran et al., 1994; Chadwick & Top, 1993).

More recent investigations support the relevance of religiosity in delinquent behavior. In 2001 Baier and Wright reviewed sixty studies published between 1969 and

1998 dealing with the effect of religion on delinquency. Table 1 compares those sixty studies on several dimensions. After looking at the results of all sixty studies Baier and Wright conclude, “These findings show that religious behavior and beliefs exert a significant moderate deterrent effect on individuals’ criminal behavior” (p. 14).

**Table 3. Study Data Used in Meta-Analysis**

Year	Author	Year of Data	Sample Type	Sample Size	Sample Region	Proportion Male	Type of Crime	Effect Size
1962	Middleton, Putney	NA	Non-Prob	554	Mixed	.47	GI	.00 <sup>1</sup>
-	Middleton, Putney	NA	Non-Prob	554	Mixed	.47	VL	-.06 <sup>1</sup>
1967	Allen, Sandhu	NA	Non-Prob	377	South	1.0	GI	-.13 <sup>1</sup>
1969	Preston	NA	Non-Prob	576	South	NA	VL	-.14 <sup>1</sup>
1969	Hirschi, Stark	1964	Non-Prob	4,077	Pacific	.65	GI	.00 <sup>1</sup>
1972	Roth	1971	Non-Prob	4,101	Midwest	.51	VL	-.05 <sup>1</sup>
1972	Gorsuch, McFarland	NA	Non-Prob	84	NA	.45	GI	-.16 <sup>1</sup>
1974	Burkett, White	1971	Non-Prob	855	Pacific	.51	GI	-.07 <sup>1</sup>
-	Burkett, White	1971	Non-Prob	855	Pacific	.51	VL:	-.08 <sup>1</sup>
1975	McLuckie, Zhan, Wilson	1971	Non-Prob	27,175	Northeast	NA	VL	-.16 <sup>2</sup>
1975	Rohrbaugh, Jessor	1971	Non-Prob	475	Mountain	.44	VL	-.30 <sup>1</sup>
-	Rohrbaugh, Jessor	1971	Non-Prob	221	Mountain	.48	VL	-.25 <sup>1</sup>
1976	Kandel et al.	1972	Non-Prob	1,112	Northeast	.42	VL	-.05 <sup>2</sup>
1977	Higgins, Albrecht	1970	Non-Prob	1,383	South	.49	Com	-.05 <sup>1</sup>
1977	Burkett	1971	Non-Prob	837	Pacific	.51	VL	-.07 <sup>1</sup>
1977	Jessor, Jessor	1972	Non-Prob	432	Mountain	.44	VL	-.17 <sup>1</sup>
-	Jessor, Jessor	1973	Non-Prob	205	Mountain	.45	VL	-.21 <sup>1</sup>
1977	Donovan	1972	Non-Prob	13,122	National	.48	VL	-.21 <sup>1</sup>
1977	Albrecht, Chadwick, Alcorn	1974	Non-Prob	244	Mixed	.45	Com	-.30 <sup>1</sup>
1979	Turner, Willis	1975	Non-Prob	379	Northeast	.47	VL	-.22 <sup>1</sup>
1979	Wechsler, McFadden	1977	Non-Prob	7,083	Northeast	.45	VL	-.04 <sup>1</sup>
1979	Jensen, Erickson	1975	Non-Prob	3,268	Mountain	NA	GI	-.02 <sup>1</sup>
-	Jensen, Erickson	1975	Non-Prob	3,268	Mountain	NA	VL	-.03 <sup>1</sup>
1980	Burkett	1972	Non-Prob	323	Pacific	.42	VL	-.18 <sup>1</sup>
1981	McIntosh et al.	NA	Non-Prob	1,358	South	.53	VL	-.12 <sup>2</sup>
1982	Nelson, Rooney	1977	Non-Prob	4,491	Northeast	NA	VL	-.18 <sup>3</sup>
1982	Krohn	1977	Non-Prob	3,065	Midwest	NA	VL	-.03 <sup>1</sup>
1982	Stark, Kent, Doyle	1966	Non-Prob	1,799	National	1.0	GI	-.06 <sup>1</sup>
1983	Tittle, Welch	1972	Prob	1,993	National	.53	Com	-.07 <sup>1</sup>
1983	Elifson, Peterson, Hadaway	1974	Non-Prob	600	South	.50	GI	-.08 <sup>1</sup>
-	Hadaway, Elifson, Peterson	1974	Prob	600	South	.50	VL	-.11 <sup>1</sup>
1985	Perkins	1982	Non-Prob	1,514	Northeast	NA	VL	-.16 <sup>2</sup>
1986	Marcos, Bahr, Johnson	1985	Non-Prob	2,626	Mountain	.47	VL	-.15 <sup>2</sup>
1986	Sloane, Potvin	1975	Prob	1,121	National	.48	GI	-.06 <sup>1</sup>
-	Sloane, Potvin	1975	Prob	1,121	National	.48	VL	-.05 <sup>1</sup>
1986	Amoateng, Bahr	1982	Non-Prob	17,000	National	NA	VL	-.18 <sup>2</sup>
1987	Burkett, Warren	1981	Non-Prob	264	Pacific	.48	VL	-.11 <sup>2</sup>
1987	Bock, Cochran, Beeghley	1976	Prob	4,530	National	.44	VL	-.04 <sup>1</sup>
1987	Johnson, Marcos,							

	Bahr	1985	Non-Prob	768	Pacific	.45	VL	-.11 <sup>2</sup>
1987	Dudley, Mutch, Cruuise	1984	Non-Prob	721	National	.48	VL	-.27 <sup>1</sup>
1988	Cochran	1975	Non-Prob	3,065	Midwest	.48	GI	-.06 <sup>1</sup>
-	Cochran	1975	Non-Prob	3,065	Midwest	.48	VL	-.10 <sup>1</sup>
1989	Cochran, Akers	1975	Non-Prob	3,065	Midwest	.48	VL	-.13 <sup>2</sup>
1989	Ellis Thompson	1985	Non-Prob	354	Mountain	.39	GI	-.05 <sup>1</sup>
-	Ellis Thompson	1985	Non-Prob	354	Mountain	.39	VL	-.10 <sup>1</sup>
1990	Clarke, Beeghley, Cochran	1982	Prob	7,326	Midwest	.48	GI	-.06 <sup>1</sup>
1991	Gramsick, Bursik, Cochran	1989	Prob	330	Midwest	.47	GI	-.29 <sup>1</sup>
1991	Brownfield, Sorenson	1979	Non-Prob	1,206	Pacific	.73	VL	-.06 <sup>1</sup>
1991	Welch, Tittle, Petee	1984	Non-Prob	2,487	National	1.0	Com	-.08 <sup>2</sup>
1993	Adeseum	1977	Prob	1,437	National	.53	Com	-.03 <sup>2</sup>
1993	Chadwick, Top	1990	Non-Prob	1,398	Mixed	.46	GI	-.24 <sup>1</sup>
-	Chadwick, Top	1990	Non-Prob	1,398	Mixed	.46	VL	-.28 <sup>1</sup>
1993	Burkett	1981	Non-Prob	264	Pacific	.48	VL	-.09 <sup>2</sup>
1993	Burkett, Ward	1981	Non-Prob	612	Pacific	.48	VL	-.13 <sup>1</sup>
1994	Cochran, Wood, Arneklev	1992	Non-Prob	1,591	Midwest	.44	GI	-.07 <sup>2</sup>
-	Cochran, Wood, Arneklev	1992	Non-Prob	1,591	Midwest	.44	VL	-.12 <sup>2</sup>
1994	Free	1988	Non-Prob	916	Mixed	.40	GI	-.11 <sup>1</sup>
-	Free	1988	Non-Prob	916	Mixed	.40	VL	-.17 <sup>1</sup>
1994	Ross	1989	Non-Prob	221	Northeast	.57	GI	-.03 <sup>1</sup>
1995	Benda	1992	Non-Prob	17,000	South	.46	GI	-.07 <sup>1</sup>
-	Benda	1992	Non-Prob	17,000	South	.46	VL	-.16 <sup>1</sup>
1995	Donahue, Benson	1992	Prob	30,150	National	.48	GI	-.16 <sup>1</sup>
-	Donahue, Benson	1992	Prob	30,150	National	.48	VL	-.17 <sup>1</sup>
1995	Evans et al.	1992	Prob	555	Midwest	.42	Com	-.07 <sup>2</sup>
1995	Fernquist	1990	Non-Prob	178	Mountain	.49	GI	-.22 <sup>1</sup>
-	Fernquist	1990	Non-Prob	178	Mountain	.49	VL	-.47 <sup>1</sup>
1996	Amey, Albrecht, Miller	NA	Non-Prob	11,728	National	.51	VL	-.02 <sup>1</sup>
1996	Stark	1980	Non-Prob	11,995	National	.48	Com	-.02 <sup>1</sup>
1996	Evans et al.	1991	Non-Prob	263	Midwest	.48	VL	-.05 <sup>2</sup>
-	Evans et al.	1991	Non-Prob	263	Midwest	.48	Com	-.04 <sup>2</sup>
1997	Madray, van Hulst	1992	Non-Prob	2,727	National	NA	GI	-.08 <sup>2</sup>
-	Madray, van Hulst	1992	Non-Prob	2,727	National	NA	VL	-.12 <sup>2</sup>
1997	Benda	1992	Non-Prob	1,093	South	.46	GI	-.14 <sup>1</sup>
-	Benda	1992	Non-Prob	1,093	South	.46	VL	-.12 <sup>1</sup>
1997	Benda, Corwyn	1992	Non-Prob	724	South	.48	Com	-.07 <sup>2</sup>
1997	Powell	1994	Non-Prob	521	South	.38	GI	-.47 <sup>2</sup>
1998	Chard-Wierschem	1990	Non-Prob	987	Northeast	.74	GI	-.12 <sup>1</sup>
-	Chard-Wierschem	1990	Non-Prob	987	Northeast	.74	VL	-.11 <sup>1</sup>

## Conclusion

Based on the information presented, it is quite apparent that in the past religious bias has greatly influenced scientific studies dealing not only with religion and delinquency, but permissive vs. punitive parenting techniques. An extensive review of the

research strongly suggests that religion does have a significant impact on delinquency and that consistent punishment from parents improves children's' behavior.

Religion has always been an issue actively avoided by mental health professionals because of religion's assumed opposition to science. However, if we are studying human processes and attempting to improve the human experience while ignoring one of man's most basic instincts, to believe in a supreme being, we miss so much of what is human. In the future we as mental health professionals should be more sensitive to the issue and have an open mind to research and theories linked to religion.

## REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S.L., Chadwick, B.A., and Alcorn, D.S. (1977). "Religiosity and Deviance." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 16:263-274.
- American Psychological Association. (1992). Ethical Principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1597-1611.
- Azrin, N.H. and Holz, W.C. (1966). *Punishment*. In W.K. Hong's (ed.) *Operant Behavior: Areas of Research and Application*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Baier, C.J. and Wright, B.R.E. (2001). "If You Love Me, Keep My Commandments': A Meta-Analysis of the Effect of Religion on Crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 38(1), 3-21.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Benda, B.B. (1995) "The Effect of Religion on Adolescent Delinquency Revisited." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 32(4), 446-466
- Benda, B.B. (1997) "Religion and Delinquency: The Relationship After Considering Family and Peer Influences." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 36(1). 81-93
- Benjet, C. and Kazdin, A.E. (2003) Spanking Children; the controversies, findings and new directions. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 23, 197-224.
- Bergin, A.E. and Garfield, S.L. (1971). *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Berrett, R.D. (1975). Adlerian mother study groups: An evaluation. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 31(2), 179-182.
- Burkett, S.R. and White, M. (1974) "Hellfire and Delinquency: Another Look." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*. 13:455-462.
- Campbell, D. (1975). "On the Conflicts between Biological and Social Evolution and between Psychology and Moral Tradition," *American Psychologist*, 30, 1103-1121.
- Chadwick, B.A. and Top, B.L. (1993) "Religiosity and Delinquency among LDS Adolescents." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 32(1), 51-67.
- Cochran, J.K., Wood, P.B., and Arneklev, B.J. (1994) "Is the religiosity-delinquency relationship spurious? A test of arousal and social control theories." *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency* 31(1), 92-123.
- Cortes, A.J. (1999). Antecedents to the conflict between psychology and religion in America. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 27(1), 20-32.

- Fernquist, R.M. (1995). "A research note on the association between religion and delinquency." *Deviant Behavior* 16(2), 169-175.
- Glueck, S., and Glueck, E. (1950). *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gove, W.R. and Crutchfield, P.D. (1982). The family and juvenile delinquency. *Sociological Quarterly*, 23, 301-319.
- Healy, W. (1915). *The Individual Delinquent*. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith republished 1969.
- Healy, W. (1917). *Mental Conflicts and Misconduct*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Higgins, P.C. and Albrecht, G.L. (1977) "Hellfire and Delinquency Revisited." *Social Forces*. 55:952-958.
- Hirschi, T., and Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and Delinquency. *Social Problems*, 17, 202-213.
- Lewy, Guenther (1996). *Why America Needs Religion*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Murray, E.J. (1956). A content-analysis method for studying psychotherapy. *Psychological Monographs*, 70 (13), 420.
- Robinson, P. and Robinson, M. (2005). *The Rise and Fall of the American Family*. Unpublished Manuscript—Send request to Paul Robinson, Dept. of Psychology, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah 84602.
- Rhodes, A.L. and Reiss, A.J. (1970). "The Religious Factor and Delinquent Behavior." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 7:83-98.
- Shafranske, E.. P. (ed.) (1995). *Religion and the Clinical Practice of Psychology*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Sloane, D.M. and Potvin, R.H. (1986) "Religion and Delinquency: Cutting Through the Maze." *Social Forces* 65(1), 87-105.
- Spock, B. (1946). *The Common Sense Book of Baby and Child Care*. New York: Duell, Sloan, and Pearce.
- Stark, R., Kent, L., and Doyle, D.P. (1982) "Rediscovering and Delinquency: The Ecology of a "Lost" Relationship." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 19:4-24.
- Stark, R. (1984). Religion and Conformity: Reaffirming a Sociology of Religion. *Sociological Analysis*, 45(4), 273-282.
- Stark, R. (1996). "Religion as Context: Hellfire and Delinquency One More Time." *Sociology of Religion* 57(2), 163-173.
- Torrey, E. Fuller (1992). *Freudian Fraud*. New York: Harper-Collins.
- Walters, G.C. and Grusec, J.E. (1977). *Punishment*. San Fransico: Freeman.
- Weber, W.A., Crawford, J., Roff L.A., and Robinson, C. (1983). *Classroom Management: A Review of the Teacher Education and Research Literature*. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service.
- White, W.A., (1923). *Insanity and Criminal Law*. New York: MacMillan.
- White, W.A., (1933). *Crimes and Criminals*. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.
- White, W.A., (1933). *Forty Years of Psychiatry*. New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Publishing Company.

Wolfgang, M.E. (1983). Delinquency in two birth cohorts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 27, 75-86.