

Virginia Commonwealth University VCU Scholars Compass

Theses and Dissertations

**Graduate School** 

2013

# Youth Drug Use in Turkey: A Test of the General Strain Theory

Fatih Cipil Virginia Commonwealth University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd Part of the Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons

© The Author

#### Downloaded from

https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd/3096

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact libcompass@vcu.edu.



## YOUTH DRUG USE IN TURKEY:

A Test of the General Strain Theory

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University

> By Fatih Çipil B.S., Turkish National Police Academy, 1995 M.A., Gazi Universtiy, 2004 Ph.D., Gazi Universty, 2011

> > Director: Robyn L. Diehl

Associate Professor

Virginia Commonwealth University Richmond, Virginia March, 2013



<sup>©</sup>FatihÇipil 2013

All Rights Reserved



#### Acknowledgements

I would never have been able to finish my dissertation without the guidance of my committee members, help from friends, and support from my family.

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my advisor Dr. Diehl for her patience, motivation, enthusiasm, immense knowledge and friendship. Her guidance helped me in all my Ph.D study.

I would like to also thank Dr. JudythTwigg, Dr. Peter S. Kiripatrick, and Dr. Patricia Grant for their valuable contributions as members of my dissertation committee.

Also special thanks to my parents, mom and my brother, Yavuz. They were always supporting me and encouraging me with their best wishes.

Finally, I would like to thank my wife, Handan and my sons Eren, Erden and Eray. You were always there and stood by me through the good times and bad times. My greatest thanks go to God for giving me this opportunity and helping me successfully finish this study.



## **Table of Contents**

List of Figuresvii
List of Tablesviii
List of Equationsix
List of Abbreviations/Acronymsx
Abstractxi
Chapter 11
Introduction1
Purpose of the Study1
Background/ Statement of the Problem and Theoretical Framework1
Drug Use in Turkey among Youth2
Anomie Strain Theory3
Measurement and Analyses4
Significance of the Study5
Overview of the Remaining Chapters
Chapter 27
Literature Review: Youth Drug Use in Turkey7
Introduction7
Youth and Crime
Patterns of Juvenile Crime9
Drug Abuse among Youth10



iii

Peer Group and Drug Usage	
The Role of Extracurricular Activities on Behaviors	15
Parental Support and Drug Usage	16
Prevention of Drug Usage in Turkey	
Drug Usage in Turkey	19
Strain Theory, Delinquency and Drug use	21
Chapter 3	24
Theoretical Background: General Strain Theory	24
History of Strain Theory	24
General Strain Theory	27
Chapter 4	32
Measurements and Analyses	32
Introduction	
Introduction Hypotheses	
Introduction Hypotheses Data	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design Sampling	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design Sampling Descriptive Statistics	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design Sampling Descriptive Statistics Dependent Variables	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design Sampling Descriptive Statistics Dependent Variables Ever Use Marihuana	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design Sampling Descriptive Statistics Dependent Variables Ever Use Marihuana Ever Use Speed	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design Sampling Descriptive Statistics Dependent Variables Ever Use Marihuana Ever Use Speed Ever Use LSD	
Introduction Hypotheses Data Research Approach Research Design Sampling Descriptive Statistics Dependent Variables Ever Use Marihuana Ever Use Speed Ever Use LSD Ever Use LSD	



~ mobi upino muoponuone + unuoros minimuminimuminimuminimumi	40
Lives in Broken Family	41
Emotional and Psychological Support from Family	42
Emotional and Psychological Support from Friends	42
Family Control over the Respondent	42
Believe in and Respect Formal and Societal Rules	43
Have a Social Network with Friends	44
Prone to Suicide	45
Experience of Negative Life Events	46
Cannabis Increases Respect of Friends	47
Scale of Number of Friends Who Use Cannabis	47
Neighbors Control the Neighborhood	48
Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months	48
Scale of Joining Social Networks and Extracurricular Activities	48
Scale of Frequency of Engaging in Criminal Activities	49
Delinquent Peers	50
Neighborhood Network	52
	52
Logistic Regression Analyses	
Logistic Regression Analyses	54
Logistic Regression Analyses Patterns of Marijuana Use The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use	<b>54</b> 57
Logistic Regression Analyses Patterns of Marijuana Use The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use Patterns of Amphetamine Use	<b>54</b> 57 <b>58</b>
Logistic Regression Analyses         Patterns of Marijuana Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use         Patterns of Amphetamine Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use	<b>54</b> 57 <b>58</b> 61
Logistic Regression Analyses         Patterns of Marijuana Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use         Patterns of Amphetamine Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use         Patterns of LSD Use	<b>54</b> 57 <b>58</b> 61 62
<ul> <li>Logistic Regression Analyses</li> <li>Patterns of Marijuana Use</li> <li>The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use</li> <li>Patterns of Amphetamine Use</li> <li>The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use</li> <li>Patterns of LSD Use</li> <li>The Marginal Effect of Strain on LSD Use</li> </ul>	<b>54</b> <b>57</b> <b>58</b> 61 <b>62</b> 65
Logistic Regression Analyses         Patterns of Marijuana Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use         Patterns of Amphetamine Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use         Patterns of LSD Use         The Marginal Effect of Strain on LSD Use         Patterns of Ecstasy Use	54576161626565



Conclusion	70
Chapter 5	71
Conclusion	71
Summary and Discussion of Key Findings	71
Policy Recommendations	71
Limitations	
Recommendations for Future Research	74
Conclusion	
References	76
Appendices	
Vita	



## **List of Figures**

Figure 1 Population of Age Groups by Gender in Turkey in 2010	7
Figure 2 Population of Age Groups by Gender in İstanbul in 2010	8
Figure 3 Number Convicted by Age Groups in Turkey in 2010	9



## List of Tables

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics	37
Table 2 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: Marijuana Use)	55
Table 3 The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use	57
Table 4 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: Amphetamine Use)	59
Table 5 The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use	61
Table 6 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: LSD Use)	63
Table 7 The Marginal Effect of Strain on LSD Use	65
Table 8 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: Ecstasy Use)	67
Table 9 The Marginal Effect of Strain on Ecstasy Use	69



## **List of Equations**

Equation 1 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating Marijuana Use	54
Equation 2 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating Amphetamine Use	58
Equation 3 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating LSD Use	62
Equation 4 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating Ecstasy Use	66



## List of Abbreviations/Acronyms

- TUBIM Turkish Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction
- TADOC Turkish International Academy against Drugs and Organized Crime
- UNODC United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
- TUIK Turkish Statistical Institute
- YIE Youth in Europe
- ECAD European Cities against Drugs
- EMCDDA European Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction
- ICSRA Icelandic Centre for Social Research and Analysis



#### Abstract

#### YOUTH DRUG USE IN TURKEY: A Test of the General Strain Theory

Fatih Çipil, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2013

Dissertation Chair: Robyn L. Diehl Associate Professor

This study examines the effect of strain on youth drug use in Turkey. With its many unexplored fields, Turkey is a haven for social researchers. Adolescent crime and especially drug use is an important yet poorly studied subject in Turkey. Of the many correlates of youth drug use, strain as asserted by the General Strain Theory of Agnew (1985) is chosen as the main explanatory variable in this research. Using Youth in Europe (YIE) survey data administered to a representative sample of high school students in Istanbul City, correlates of marijuana, LSD, amphetamine and ecstasy use among adolescents are analyzed in this study. The logistic regression analyses reveal that, as hypothesized, strain operationalized by the negative life events experienced and having been exposed to physical violence, significantly affect drug use. In order to enhance our understanding of this significance and measure the magnitude of the effect controlling for the effect of other explanatory variables, Post simulation developed and advised by Long and Freese (2006) is used. While holding



all other variables constant, the change in strain from minimum to maximum increases the likelihood of marijuana, LSD, amphetamine and ecstasy use among adolescents by at least 20%.



## Chapter 1

#### Introduction

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the risk and protective factors, specifically, strain and cultural values, as they relate to youth drug usage in Turkey, based upon the data collected by TUBIM (Turkish Monitoring Centre for Drug and Drug Addiction). Specifically this study answers the research question, "Are factors such as social networks, strain, family control and peer delinquency related to youth drug use in Turkey?"

#### Background/ Statement of the Problem and Theoretical Framework

Drug abuse is an important social problem that adversely affects not only individuals but also the society as a whole and the government as well. The fiscal burden of substance abuse on the health, education and judicial systems is substantial. Therefore understanding the causes of drug use is an important step in identifying possible intervention methods and developing policies. However, the complexity of the causes behind drug use is a great challenge for academics and practitioners in both theoretical and practical pursuits for recognizing and offering solutions. The patterns and predictors of drug use may be measured at individual, societal, and institutional levels. Nonetheless, this study is limited to individual attributes and predictors to determine patterns of youth substance use from a strain theory perspective.



#### Drug Use in Turkey among Youth

There is considerable lack of both official and unofficial data concerning the issue of drug use among Turkish youth. The data, as well as the literature regarding the problem is limited and authorities are generally reluctant to acknowledge the problem and thus abstain from facing it. Despite the positive data published by government offices, some say the problem is getting more serious and the situation is getting out of hand. As in most countries the main correlates of drug use are the same: poverty, strain, broken families, peer pressure, and lack of authority(Fuller et al., 2005).Being on the main route of drug trade from the Middle East and Western markets, Turkey is a haven for drug users despite successful operations by the Turkish National Police, whose total amount of drugs captured each year is far greater than the total amount of drugs captured in European countries combined (EMCDDA, 2011).

One of the most influential studies regarding drug usage in Turkey was conducted by United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC, 2003), which states that previously in Turkey, while the existence of the drug abuse problem had been acknowledged, there was little information available at the national level to provide a sound basis for identifying and responding to such a problem. In addition, there has been an apparent lack of a contemporary understanding of drug abuse patterns in Turkey that can act as a baseline for future activities and provide the policy makers and program planners in Turkey with the ongoing information necessary for developing effective drug prevention and intervention policy.

UNODC also stated in the study that there have been no general population surveys on drug abuse done in Turkey (UNODC, 2003). Current information about



drug and alcohol related issues are based primarily on official records from treatment institutions, law enforcement organizations, and several studies that focus on the issue merely in larger cities (Akvardar, Demiral, Ergör, & Ergör, 2004; Burcu, 2003; Çorapçıoğlu & Ögel, 2004; Ögel, Çorapçıoğlu, et al., 2003; UNODC, 2003). One of the most comprehensive and recent studies about drug use in Turkey, for instance, by UNODC (UNODC, 2003) is based on data collected from six major cities in Turkey.

Other studies, such as Eken, et al.'s study (Eken, Evren, Saatçioğlu, & Çakmak, 2003) in which they examined characteristics of patients under treatment in the Alcohol and Substance Treatment Center (ASTC), reflect only data from treatment institutions and general usage patterns. While other studies only examined drug usage in certain age groups or genders (Ögel & Aksoy, 2007; Ögel, Tamar, et al., 2003; Ögel, Taner, Tosun, Gürol, & Liman, 2005).

As a result of the limited number of studies that have examined drug usage in non-treatment and/or indicated citizens in Turkey, it is important to examine the general population of Turkey's drug usage patterns and specifically those of the Turkish youth since they are at greatest risk.

#### Anomie Strain Theory

Although strain theory, which can be traced back to the ideas of Emile Durkheim on anomie, is not a new concept, General Strain Theory (GST, Agnew & White, 1992)is among the recent criminological theories. The basic idea behind the notion of anomie is that during times of societal normlessness or lack of social control, people with unlimited desires would not willingly stop themselves from achieving their desires, whether they are legitimate or not, since there is lack of a



capable external body that can impose restrictions or laws upon those desires (E. Durkheim, 1951).

As an extended version of anomie theory, GST by Agnew mainly asserts that failure to achieve positively valued goals, loss of positively valued stimuli and presence of negative stimuli cause strain, which results in criminal behavior as a way of coping with strain (Agnew, 2006).GST has been empirically tested and supported in various studies of crime, delinquency, and risky behaviors including drug use(Vegh, 2011).

Agnew suggests that in order to cope with strain caused by the adversity of the youth's social environment, the likelihood that others will incite negative reactions from the youth should be reduced and the social support available to the adolescent, especially during stressful times, and the ability of youth to cope with adversity through nondelinquent means (social skills, problem solving, anger control) should be increased(Agnew, 2006).

#### Measurement and Analyses

This study uses secondary data analysis by using the data gathered by the Turkish Monitoring Center for Drugs and Drug Addiction(TUBIM). TUBIM was established in 2002 within TADOC (Turkish Academy of Drug and Organized Crime). However, TUBIM is a national coordination center and its main aim is to collect all relevant data about drugs (trafficking, abuse, addiction, treatment etc.), TUBIM replicated the study of the Youth in Europe (YIE) Drug Prevention Program conducted in 2006. A similar survey was used with a random sample of youth in Turkey in 2006. The survey was given to 2,627 students, and their drug addiction was



examined along many social and demographic questions.

In order to analyze the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variables, logistic regression will be used.

#### Significance of the Study

Turkey plays a key role in the drug trade destined for Europe originating from the Middle East and Afghanistan. Turkey's central geographic position on the crossroads of Europe, Asia, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean Sea gives the country the potential to play a significant role in any kind of trade(Boekhout van Solinge, 1998).These are not mere possibilities. Turkey has many international contacts dating back to the time of the Ottoman Empire. Its spheres of influence are numerous, especially in the east, where relationships are facilitated by the linguistic relationships Turkey has with several former Soviet Republics (Boekhout van Solinge, 1998). However, the main influence of Turkey in the drug market comes from its Diaspora in Europe, comprising of 2,3 million people. An estimated 80% of the heroin on the European market is being processed in Turkish laboratories (Labrousse & Laniel, 1998).

With one of the youngest populations in the world, Turkey needs to recognize, define, understand, and start tackling the drug abuse of youth in schools. This study identifies patterns of drug use among youth in Turkey and offers strategies to deal with the issue. This study fills an important gap and adds to the limited literature on the issue.



## Overview of the Remaining Chapters

Chapter two talks about the problem of drug use among youth in Turkey and makes a comparison between the United States and Turkey regarding the same problem. Although this is not a comparative study, the author believes that it is better to take another country as reference so that the scope of the problem is better understood. Chapter three of the dissertation outlines and explains the Strain Theory and ends with an explanation of how Strain Theory relates to drug abuse among youth. Chapter four explains the data and measurements and provides the statistical analyses. The last chapter discusses the findings and offers future research suggestions.



## **Chapter 2**

## Literature Review: Youth Drug Use in Turkey

## Introduction

Today, young people under the age of 24 make up more than half of the world's population, of which 1.2 billion are younger than 15 (UN-HABITAT, 2010). In Turkey more than half of the population is under the age of 28(TUIK, 2011b). Proportion of the population at ages between 15 and 64 is 66.9% (TUIK, 2011b). Persons between the ages of 15 to 64, which are the working ages, constitute 66.9% of the total population. The percentage of the Turkish population in the age group 0-14 is 26.3% and it is 6.8% for the age group 65 and over (Figure 1).



Figure 1 Population of Age Groups by Gender in Turkey in 2010



The proportion of the population living in İstanbul, the biggest city in the country, is 17.8%. With half of its population below the age 28, Istanbul is an important area to access youth (Figure 2).



Figure 2 Population of Age Groups by Gender in İstanbul in 2010

#### Youth and Crime

Greenberg (1977) argues that an "extraordinary amount of crime in American society is the accomplishment of young people" and "in recent years, more than half of those criminals arrested for the seven FBI index offenses have been youths". According to Levitt (1998), juvenile crime has grown twice as swiftly as that of adults. In another work, Levitt and Lochner (2001)explicitly state that "[c]riminal involvement in the United States rises sharply with the onset of adolescence, peaking in the late teenage years before dropping steadily thereafter." While such is the case in the U.S., the situation is not that different in Turkey. According to the Turkish Statistical Institute's report on juvenile delinquency, the number of juveniles apprehended by the police for criminal involvement in 2010 was 188,044 (TUIK,





2011a). Figure 3 shows the number of convicted in Turkey based on the age groups.

Figure 3 Number Convicted by Age Groups in Turkey in 2010

## Patterns of Juvenile Crime

Understanding patterns of criminal behavior and determining the individual and aggregate level factors that cause delinquency among youth is crucial in developing suitable policies to fight juvenile crime. Recognizing juvenile criminality as an important social problem, many empirical studies have been conducted in order to find the patterns and factors that cause juvenile crime. However, a quick look at the literature reveals that most of these studies focus on youth crime in Western countries. Also most of the criminological theories have been tested within the framework and context of Western societies. Some of the factors such as delinquent peers, broken families, violent environment, poverty and divorce that have been found to affect youth crime are yet to be tested within other social contexts. Hence this study both tries to explain drug use among youth in Turkey and tests one of the widely tested



criminological theories within the Turkish context.

Juvenile crime is a neglected area in Turkey. Due to its saliency and public attention, the only part of juvenile crime that receives attention in Turkey is crime committed by street children. However the official statistics clearly show that there is additional juvenile crime beyond what is committed by the street children. Children in schools are exhibit violent behaviors and abuse drugs on a daily basis and the trend is increasing each year(TUBIM, 2010). One of most commonly reported crimes committed by the youth in schools in Turkey is drug abuse(TUBIM, 2010).

#### Drug Abuse among Youth

"Drug abuse and addiction has become one of the most important public health problems in recent years," especially among the young (Çırakoglu & Işın, 2005).

Understanding drug use at early stages and at younger ages is crucial since early drug use and its level are important indicators of future drug use(Kandel, Yamaguchi, & Chen, 1992). Similarly, it has also been claimed in other studies that use of alcohol or other illegal drugs at an early age is an indicator of future alcohol or drug problems(Hawkins, Horn, & Arthur, 2004). It is further claimed that people who begin abusing drugs earlier in life, especially before the age of 15, will have higher lifetime prevalence of drug use problems than other drug users who started in midadolescence (after the age of 15 up to 18) (Chen, Storr, & Anthony, 2009). Also young people who delay substance use until age 21 almost never develop substance use problems(Chen, et al., 2009).

Since the 1990s and yearly in 21st century, substance use among adolescents has seen a steady increase in many European countries and in the US(Bauman &



Phongsavan, 1999; Hibell et al., 1997). For instance, substance use among adolescents in Iceland, a country with a population of just over 300,000, rose gradually during the 1990s(Hibell et al., 2004; Thorlindsson & Vilhjalmsson, 1991). The percentage of 10th graders who reports that they smoked cigarettes regularly increased from 15% to 23% from 1992 to 1998; those admitting that they had used hashish at some point in their lives rose from 7% to 17% during the same period of time (Thorlindsson & Vilhjalmsson, 1991).

According to a comparative study conducted by the European School Survey Project on Alcohol and other Drugs (ESPAD), Icelandic and Scandinavian adolescents consume more alcohol compared to other European teenagers (Hibell, et al., 1997). The 1995 ESPAD survey revealed that adolescents in Iceland and their peers in other Nordic countries were more likely to become drunk in comparison to other European teenagers.

Moreover, alcohol-related accidents or injuries were more prevalent in Iceland than in most other places in Europe. In fact 14% of Icelandic adolescents report having had such an incident due to drunkenness. These findings clearly indicate that, while more serious in Nordic countries, adolescent substance use is a problem in western and particularly Eastern European countries(A. Kristjansson, I. Sigfusdottir, J. Allegrante, & A. Helgason, 2008). In order to tackle this serious issue several programs have been initiated, one of which is the Icelandic Model of Adolescent Substance Use Prevention.

Kristjansson, Sigfusdottir, Allegrante, & Helgason's (2008) describe the development, implementation, and results of the Icelandic Model of Adolescent



Substance Use Prevention. According to the study, the prevention model they initiated "is a theoretically grounded, evidence based approach to community adolescent substance use prevention that has grown out of collaboration between policy makers, behavioral scientists, field-based practitioners and community residents in Iceland" (A. Kristjansson, et al., 2008). In their study the annual data from two cohorts of over 7000 adolescents (.81% response rate) show that the proportions of those who reported being drunk during the last 30 days, smoking one cigarette or more per day, and having tried hashish once all declined steadily from 1997 to 2007.

The proportion of adolescents which reported spending time with their parents and that their parents knew with whom they were spending their time increased substantially. Other community protective factors also showed positive changes. Although these data suggest that this adolescent substance use prevention approach successfully strengthened a broad range of parental, school, and community protective factors, the evidence of its impact on reducing substance use needs to be considered in light of the correlational data on which these observations were based (A. Kristjansson, et al., 2008).

Kristjánsson et al. (2008) points out that Iceland has seen a steady decline in adolescent substance use. He believes that the decline is in large part due to the assiduous efforts by Icelandic authorities to both reduce risk factors and strengthen a broad range of parental, school, and community protective factors. These protective factors were developed as a result of an evidence-based approach to adolescent substance use prevention that involved a broad range of relevant stake holders who worked together on a community-based effort.



The emphasis of their approach was on getting all relevant stake holders to the table to build a network of support, monitoring, and opportunities for positive youth development at the local community level. They finally developed a prevention model using a four-step study in which they collected data at the national level and assessed the findings. Based on the findings in Iceland, other countries utilizing national youth drug surveys in Europe should be assessed.

"While the percentage of those who used Ecstasy at least once in their lifetimes was 2.65% in 1998, the figure reached 3.31% in 2001. Male gender, older age, use of alcohol, cannabis, heroin and cocaine, non-medical use of psychotherapeutic drugs and participation in a meeting concerning the adverse effects of substance use were found to be significant variables predicting 'ever use' of Ecstasy in both years by logistic regression analysis." (Çorapçıoğlu & Ögel, 2004)

"Ecstasy use, while low in Turkey, appears to be on the increase and follows a pattern in terms of correlates that is similar to other illicit drugs. Whatever the causes behind the rise in Ecstasy use, creative, personalized and informative educational programs should be conducted in all educational institutions to curb Ecstasy use." (Çorapçıoğlu & Ögel, 2004)

In her research on social control used by the families of young apprentices related to certain deviant behaviors such as alcohol and drug use, Burcu (2003) found that most of the young people who use drugs and alcohol were battered frequently.

## Peer Group and Drug Usage

There is a growing body of research that underscores the importance of the



peer group and the organization of adolescent leisure activities in the formation of adolescent society and lifestyle (Sigfusdottir, Thorlindsson, Kristjnsson, Roe, & Allegrante, 2009). Having friends that smoke, drink alcohol, and use hashish or other drugs increases the likelihood of similar behaviors among adolescents(AguirreMolina & Gorman, 1996; A. L. Kristjansson, James, Allegrante, Sigfusdottir, & Helgason, 2010; Thorlindsson, Bjarnason, & Sigfusdottir, 2007; Warr, 1993). In contrast, very few of the adolescents who report having nearly no friends who use such substances have tried drugs themselves. These findings are consistent with the vast majority of the research on delinquency that has been conducted in numerous countries(Akers, 1985; Sutherland & Cressey, 1978).

According to a study on the effects of psychosocial factors such as peer group, family, and academic self-perception on smoking, alcohol, and substance use by adolescents living in Mersin, Turkey, (1) higher socio-economic status of the family increased the likelihood of smoking and alcohol use in adolescents; (2) the prevalence of alcohol use was higher in adolescents whose mothers had a higher educational level and whose mothers and fathers drank alcohol; (3) there was a significant association between substance use and having a peer who used a substance; (4) the prevalence of smoking was significantly higher in students who perceived their academic performance to be poor(Öner et al., 2006). The study concluded that understanding the role and importance of psychosocial factors associated with smoking, alcohol, and substance use will be crucial to develop preventive measures for adolescents.



#### The Role of Extracurricular Activities on Behaviors

In recent years, researchers have devoted more attention to the role of extracurricular activities in the formation of youth lifestyle and behavior(A. L. Kristjansson, I. D. Sigfusdottir, J. P. Allegrante, & A. R. Helgason, 2008; Thorlindsson, et al., 2007). Numerous studies have revealed that participation in supervised youth work and sports deters adolescent substance use(A. L. Kristjansson, et al., 2010; A. L. Kristjansson, et al., 2008; Sigfusdottir, Kristjansson, Thorlindsson, & Allegrante, 2008; Sigfusdottir, et al., 2009; Thorlindsson, et al., 2007; Thorlindsson & Vilhjalmsson, 1991).

Some researchers have pointed out that supervised youth work is of special importance because it provides adolescents with an opportunity for participation in activities where they can find interesting things to work at while developing valuable skills and goals toward which to strive. Furthermore, controlled youth work provides ways through which adolescents can be reached out, reinforced, and supported in constructive and encouraging ways (Bourdieu & Johnson, 1993). This generally occurs by adolescents participating in mentorship programs or community programs or through informal relationships with an adult, a teacher, or a sports coach (Cullen, 1994).

Schools, much like close community neighborhoods, are important social institutions and serve as a mediating structure in establishing and maintaining community social capital and strengthening the ties and friendship of peers, the relationship between the parents of the peers and enhancing the ties between peers and their friends' parents. Therefore, as the community social capital increases



through strengthening of these ties and relationships, the adolescent in danger of or likely to use drugs is less likely to begin using substances and engage in delinquency. The strength of the personal and community bonds help to prevent the adolescent from engaging in risky behavior(Hirschi, 2003).

In schools where intergenerational closure, a social –capital indicator where parents know the friends of their adolescent children and develop and maintain relationships with the parents of their children's friends, is working properly and healthily, all students benefit from such a communication and relationship between the parents even in cases where their parents are not part of the parental network (Thorlindsson, et al., 2007). Families, friends, jobs, and schools of young people constitute their social environments. The problems they experience in their social environments can lead them to certain deviant and criminal behaviors.

Recently in Turkey, certain crimes committed by adolescents received concern in mass media and in public. An increase in criminal behavior of adolescents who use drugs (solvents, heroin, and hashish), which are obtained easily from the workplaces, was observed(Kizmaz & Bilgin, 2010). Accordingly, analyzing certain social factors such as family structure, workplace, and friend groups which affect deviance is essential.

### Parental Support and Drug Usage

Parental support, responsible monitoring and the amount of time spent with children have long been understood as social assets that decrease the likelihood of substance use among adolescents(Sigfusdottir, et al., 2008; Sigfusdottir, et al., 2009; Thorlindsson, et al., 2007; Thorlindsson & Vilhjalmsson, 1991). Parental support and



monitoring not only directly decrease the likelihood of substance use, they also affect friendship choices. Thus, adolescents who perceive that their parents provide substantial support are less likely to associate with friends who use drugs, and those who acquire friends who use drugs are less likely to start using drugs themselves (Thorlindsson, et al., 2007; Thorlindsson & Vilhjalmsson, 1991; Warr, 1993).

On the other hand family, which is accepted as having a crucial role in the socialization process, is an important social control agent. Because of this, family has an important effect on the deviant behavior of young people. Scott, Scott, and Abcarian(1971, p. 40) found that social control is an important way which makes people follow the accepted norms of society and expected values, roles, and relations in order to fit in. They think that a young person is exposed to social control within his/her circle of family, friends, school, and work.

According to Tittle and Ward (1993), stabilized and influential social control of family and school has positive effects on the behavior of young people. Along with the control and support provided by the family, the amount of time spent with parents, as opposed to the quality of time spent, decreases the likelihood of adolescent substance use. Moreover, the more time adolescents spend with their family outside of school, the less likely they are to use drugs(A. Kristjansson, Sigfusdottir, Karlsson, & Allegrante, 2011; A. L. Kristjansson, et al., 2010; Thorlindsson, et al., 2007; Thorlindsson & Vilhjalmsson, 1991).

Strengthening the ties between parents and children in the local community serves as an important deterrent to adolescent substance use. Moreover, schools become an avenue in which parents are most likely to meet and exercise both direct



and indirect control of their children.

Another study on neighborhood, family and individual effects on substance use by Browning and Erickson (2007)shows that there is a significant relationship between neighborhood, family, and individual factors and the use of alcohol and marijuana by Canadian high school students drawn from the Drugs, Alcohol, and Violence International (DAVI) study.

At the neighborhood level, they tested the relative utility of neighborhood disadvantage (poverty, immigrant concentration, unemployment) and collective efficacy (trust and shared expectations among neighbors) in predicting patterns of substance use. They extended the logic of collective efficacy to the individual level and examined the impact of 'school efficacy' and 'family efficacy' on substance use as well. Results indicated that collective efficacy was more useful in the prediction of substance use than any measure of neighborhood disadvantage was. In addition, they found noticeable differences in the useful predictors for alcohol versus marijuana use.

## Prevention of Drug Usage in Turkey

The increased problems associated with drug use came to the attention of the Turkish society during the 1990s(Ögel & Aksoy, 2007; Ögel, Çorapçıoğlu, et al., 2003; Ögel, et al., 2005; Ögel, Taner, Tosun, Liman, & Demir, 2006; Öner, et al., 2006). The Turkish government has made many efforts to stop drug trade and to provide more treatment. Besides governmental institutions, there are several non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that aim to increase social awareness against drug and alcohol use in Turkey. The Turkish government's approach to the problem is more health focused rather than treating it as a social problem (Ögel, Tamar, et al.,



2003; Ögel, et al., 2005;UNODC, 2003).

In terms of treatment, the Turkish Ministry of Health established the AMATEM (Alcohol and Substance Abuse Treatment and Training Center in ANKARA) in order to create more possibilities individuals who want to be treated for their drug addiction problems. Since 1983, the government has established nine treatment facilities and supported treatment facilities established at university hospitals.

Compared to other European countries, the drug problem in Turkey is still at lower levels. However, studies show that the prevalence of drug use in Turkey has been increasing significantly. Although there have been several efforts to prevent the increase of the problem by the Turkish government, they are not enough. The general goal of government programs has been to increase knowledge about the social, health, and legal problems caused by drug, alcohol, and tobacco use. Additionally, these programs should also emphasize the values of the Turkish society, such as being attached and respectful to the family and other social based protective factors which may assist in countering the negative effects of peers and other risk factors.

### Drug Usage in Turkey

Burcu (2003) examined the subculture of apprentices in Turkey. She analyzed the relationship between deviant acts of apprentices and social control used by their families. More specifically, she studied the social control used by the families of apprentices related to certain deviant behaviors such as alcohol and drug use. The relationship between deviant acts of young people and social control used by their families was analyzed in comparison to socioeconomic status of the family and the



relations between family members. She found that most of the young people who use drugs and alcohol were battered frequently.

Akvardar et al. (2004)examined substance use and abuse, including nicotine and alcohol, among students who were at various stages of a medical career in Dokuz Eylul University Medical School in Turkey. They also assessed the anxiety and depression levels in order to determine the relationship of the substance use and anxiety and depression. Using an anonymous, self-administered questionnaire, they surveyed 121 junior, and 52 senior medical students, 73 residents and 80 practicing physicians who completed the questionnaire.

Their findings indicated that alcohol was the most frequently used substance in all groups; lifetime smoking prevalence was as high as 50%; the age of onset for nicotine and alcohol use was earlier in first-year medical students than the other groups; benzodiazepines (alprazolam, diazepam) were the most frequently used sedative-hypnotics. They also reported that the use of illicit substances was rare in all four groups, with cannabis being the most commonly used illicit substance. They concluded that smoking and alcohol abuse amongst medical students and physicians should be taken more seriously because their own attitudes towards substances may influence their professional behavior.

In another study conducted by Burcu(1997), it is pointed out that young apprentices and skilled workers have families with low socioeconomic status. According to the study, parents of the apprentices and the workers are from rural areas and have low educational levels. Moreover, families of these young workers have migrated from rural areas to urban settings and they suffer several economic



problems and face serious deprivation. These apprentices are frequently exposed to oral abuse and physical violence such as swearing, insulting, and battering by their families. These young people are also frequently exposed to swearing, insulting and battering by their masters in their workplaces (Saran, 1979).

In Turkey, though limited in number and scope, research about oral and physical abuse against children or young people indicates that physical violence instead of persuasion is often directed against young people especially in traditional family structure (Kizmaz & Bilgin, 2010; Saran, 1979; Soysaldi, 2007). The frequency of battering of the youth in the family decreases if the socioeconomic level of the family increases.

Social, cultural, and economic characteristics of family structure are important for a successful transition from childhood to youth or from youth to adulthood. Those apprentices and skilled workers who are exposed to oral and physical violence such as battering, swearing, and insulting in both their families and workplaces are affected negatively especially if we consider the important biological, psychological, and sociological changes they experience. This may increase these youth likelihood of finding alternate ways to cope with this violence. So, young people may use negative coping behaviors such as deviance and specifically alcohol and drug use.

#### Strain Theory, Delinquency and Drug use

Many scholars in the field of criminology express considerable dissatisfaction with existing theories of crime and deviance(Sorenson & Brownfield, 1995). Scholars consistently and persistently present extensive discussion of criticisms of crime and deviance theories. One of the main criticisms of these theories is the lack of



substantial and conclusive research and thus the absence of real explanatory power provided by these abstract, mostly normative and untested ideas. Most researchers acknowledge that nearly every theory that strives to explain crime and deviance requires some level of empirical support.

One of the theories that tries to explain crime and deviance is the strain theory. There are many studies that provide empirical support for the propositions Agnew has set forth in his General Strain Theory. Wareham, Cochran, Dembo and Sellers (2005)provide an extensive list of such studies that have reported a significant positive relationship between various strain measures and delinquency.

Although primarily developed as a micro-level social psychological theory, Agnew's (1992)general strain theory (GST) hypothesized that crime and delinquency resulted from certain adaptations to strain. Agnew defined strain as "negative or aversive relations with others" (Agnew, 1992, p. 61). GST argues for three major types of strain that may lead to criminal and deviant behavior (Agnew, 1992, p. 59): 1) failure to achieve positively valued goals, 2)removal of positively valued stimuli, 3) presentation of negative stimuli. Thus Agnew suggests that each experience of strain will cause an experience of negative emotion and negative affect for the individual. He spans these negative emotions ranging from depression to anxiety to despair.

Anomie theory not only tries to explain the emergence but also the concentration of crime and thus has been applied in delinquency research in several different societies and cultures. The theory, mainly, is based on Durkheim's(1951) theory of socially accepted values and individual capacities. Durkheim (1951) asserts


that modern societies will have higher crime rates because of the rapid changes in the social structure and individual values.

The theory emphasizes the conflict between valued cultural ends and legitimate societal means to those ends (Cullen & Agnew, 2011). Anomie is classified into two specific categories: macro and micro level. Macro level anomie is when society fails to establish clear limits on goals and is unable to regulate the conduct of members in the society. Micro level, which is more commonly referred to as strain, is when the individual capacities and societal expectations are not parallel and thus individuals who are not able to meet those expected goals resort to illegal means.

Strain theory, specifically GST is appropriate to explain the patterns of youth drug use in Turkey. Thus this study will use GST in order to statistically test the relationship between strain and drug use among juveniles.

The next chapter will outline and detail the theoretical framework for the study by explaining the strain theories.



# Chapter 3

### **Theoretical Background: General Strain Theory**

#### History of Strain Theory

Throughout the years, various versions of strain theory have been proposed in the field of criminology. The main assertion of the theories is that in times of increased normlessness or anomie where the ability of the state is too low to regulate the social life, the social structures may pressure the public to delve into delinquency in order to cope for the gap between the legalized means and aspirations valued by society. The idea comes originally from Durkheim (2003), who argues that when anomie, a breakdown in the ability of society to regulate the natural appetites of individuals, occurs, the state of deregulation causes stress within the public and creates an environment conducive to crime.

Merton (1938)used the idea of anomie in order to propose his own criminological theory, which was pretty distinct from the popular biological or rational explanations of crime at the time. He argued that crime resulted from the strain caused by the breakdown of the social structure. In a society where the focus is more on the achievement of the culturally valued goals than the means of accomplishing those goals, whether or not illegal means are used to obtain the valued goals is of little or no concern.

Particularly, observing the desire for monetary success within the American



society, Merton realized that not everyone can achieve such success uniformly across the country via conventional and legalized means and a sense and state of frustration is developed. This frustration leads the individuals to search for other means to achieve those so dearly valued goals and usually the means chosen by the frustrated are unconventional and illegal.

According to Merton(1938), there are five individual modes of adaptation to respond to goal blockage: conformity, innovation, ritualism, retreat and rebellion. Conformists accept the goals and the means offered to them by the society. In other words, these are the law abiders. Innovators, while accepting the goals epitomized by the society, reject the socially accepted means to achieve those goals and innovate new means instead. These means are generally illegitimate and innovators are generally criminals. Ritualists accept both the goals and the institutional means but they fail in reaching those goals. Those retreating reject both the cultural goals and socially approved means. Rebels are like innovators in the sense that they reject both the goals and the means and try to establish an alternative value system and goals and means to achieve these goals.

Following Merton, Cohen (2003)expanded on strain theory and applied it to explain juvenile gangs since he asserted that there is a delinquent subculture in the delinquent neighborhoods. Cohen argued that even though delinquent adolescents grow up to become law abiding adults, the tradition of delinquency and gang membership is continued and maintained by the juveniles that succeed them.

Unlike Merton, Cohen (2003) asserts that juveniles develop such delinquent subcultures as a means of tackling their adaptation and adjustment problems of



gaining status and acceptance. Since these young people cannot accomplish the respectable statuses established by the society as they cannot meet the criteria of the system, they develop their own criteria according to the delinquent subculture(Cohen, 2003).

Cohen (2003) adds two important points in his theory which distinguishes his research from earlier strain theories. His first contribution is in differentiating between adult crime and youth crime. According to Cohen (2003), assuming that *crime is crime* and *child and adult criminals are practitioners of the same trade* is a false over simplification since juveniles commit non-utilitarian, malicious, and negativistic crimes. For instance, Cohen claimed that juveniles do not steal for rational and utilitarian purposes, in contrast to most adult crime, their crimes seem to serve no useful purpose because juvenile gangs steal things they do not want or really need.

Cohen's second contribution is to focus on whether juveniles commit crimes in groups or individually. Cohen (2003)claimed that because of the need to obtain status and gain respect within the framework of the delinquent subculture, juveniles commit crimes in groups rather than independently.

Another extension to the classical strain theory was offered by Cloward and Ohlin (2003), who argued that if one is resorting to illegitimate means as a result of strain in order to achieve socially valued goals, one needs to readily access the illegitimate means. However, this may not always be the case as there are many illegal means and illegitimate structures. This differential structure of illegitimate means makes victims of strain turn to only the readily available illegitimate means. And, the availability of those means depends on one's location and status within the



society, the set of skills required for obtaining and using those skills and the values required to use those illegitimate means.

Another argument based on strain is offered by Messner and Rosenfeld, (2003)

#### General Strain Theory

General Strain Theory is a modified version of earlier strain theories (Cloward & Ohlin, 2003; Cohen, 2003; Merton, 1938), which argue that criminal behavior results from the structurally-induced gap between aspirations and expectations. Extending the classical Mertonian view of strain and delinquency, GST argues for a social psychological view focused on negative relationships (e.g., poor academics, failed romantic relationships, financial crisis, interpersonal violence, job loss, etc.)(Agnew, 1985; Agnew & White, 1992). Though maintaining the original notion of strain by Merton (1938), the revised theory posits three types of strain: the failure to achieve positively valued goals, the removal of positively valued goals, and the presentation of noxious stimuli.

The addition of the new types of strain addresses some of the noteworthy weaknesses of Merton's (1938)strain theory, which include "criminal and delinquent behaviors that are spontaneous, violent and emotionally-charged, and of which social structure is not a foundational factor" (Vegh, 2011, p. 17). Agnew's perception of strain(1985, 1987, 2006)allows for a wider application of the theory on criminal and delinquent acts, such as substance use, traffic violations, juvenile crime, and relational crime.



Agnew's General Strain Theory (GST) has three main sources of strain. One of the sources is from Merton's theory which is the failure to achieve positively valued goals or blocked goals. The other two sources of strain are the loss of positively valued stimuli and the presence of negative stimuli. These can put strain on adolescents who can respond in several different ways. The ways that an adolescent could respond to strain are fear, anger, depression, and disappointment. Anger is the most critical of these emotional reactions to strain since it is the most important pathway to criminal activity.

According to GST there are multiple coping strategies with strain. These include internal coping strategies, external coping strategies, and constructive or nonconstructive strategies. The non-constructive ways are where delinquency and drug/alcohol use show up in adolescents. There are certain factors which will affect the adolescent to be more inclined to delinquency. These factors are temperamental variables, whether delinquency was reinforced in the past, the adolescent's beliefs, and what the adolescent's attributions are regarding causes of his or her adversity. The adolescent's attributions refer to whether the adolescent believes it was caused by internal or external causes.

According to Agnew(2006)strain can be objective or subjective with objective strains being disliked by the majority of individuals, while subjective strains are disliked by the person directly experiencing the strains and stressors. Agnew (1992, 2006)argues that subjective strains are highly related with criminal behavior as there is an increased prospect that strains and stresses that are personally experienced generate the negative emotions that lead to criminal and delinquent behavior.



Agnew and Froggio (2006)tested whether there really are two types of strains and found considerable support for the argument that distinguishing between the two types of strain is important. The extent, closeness in time, and length of negative events determine the influence of strain on an individual (Agnew, 1992). In other words, how damaging a strain or stress is perceived by an individual and more recent in time the factors are, the more strain is perceived. In addition, the more an individual is exposed to stressful events, the more likely s/he will perceive strain (Agnew, 2006).

In further detailing his theory, Agnew (2006)provides other characteristics that are more likely to lead an individual to participate in criminal or deviant activities. These characteristics include strain types that are considered by the individuals as undeserved (e.g., poor grade at school), associated with low social control, and induce, motivate, or pressure the individual to engage in crime(Agnew, 2006).

Consequently, experience of subjective strains that cause a sense of being overwhelmed with multiple stressors may lead to feelings of anger, angst, frustration, or being upset and nervous. Such negative feelings, when joined with the lack, or perceived lack, of social support, and combined with friends who engage in the use of drugs or alcohol to cope with their problems, may increase the possibility that the person will deal with strain negatively, and engage in substance use.

In the refined version of his theory, Agnew (1992) clearly asserts that anger is the most important negative emotion that is caused by strain because it is a more personal adverse feeling, which may encourage one to take retaliatory action. People who experience anger may engage in behavior which they may not otherwise do due



to the "rush" of energy, personal justification and satisfaction in taking action, and the loss of self-consciousness and self-control (Agnew, 1992).

There are several policy implications and recommendations from Agnew's GST. This theory would recommend prevention before delinquency starts, like school-based programs, family programs, and other programs that would prevent delinquency. The best policies would be prevention and control, but if these are unsuccessful, teach adolescents coping strategies that are healthy and non-delinquent.

Agnew (1987, 1992, 2006)suggests four recommendations that would help prevent delinquency. The first recommendation is to reduce the adversity of the youth's social environment. The second recommendation is to reduce the likelihood that the youth will provoke negative reactions to and from others. The third recommendation would be to increase the social support available to adolescents, especially during stressful times. The fourth recommendation would be to increase the ability of the youth to cope with adversity through non-delinquent means.

The type of programs that would be consistent with these recommendations would be family programs, school-based programs, and peer-based programs. Family programs show some promise but are not effective for all families. The cost and intensity might make them be limited to high risk families, even though all families could uses this type of program if structured appropriately.

The school based programs have found some small, positive impact in certain areas where it has been tested. The peer-group programs are showing small success but still need more evaluation and research done on them. Most of the programs that would help an adolescent learn better coping skills have shown small success, but like



all programs, more evaluation and research must be completed to show where improvement can be done and what is working currently.



### **Chapter 4**

#### **Measurements and Analyses**

### Introduction

In this chapter, the statistical analyses and the results are presented. First I will state the hypotheses based on the main research question. Following the variable descriptions and measurements, I provide the results of the regression analyses and discuss the results.

# Hypotheses

Drug usage will be lower among those Turkish youth who experience little or no negative life events.

Drug usage will be lower among those Turkish youth who experience little or no exposure to physical violence.

Drug usage will be lower among those Turkish youth who participate in recreational- or extracurricular activities.

Drug usage will be lower in those Turkish youth whose neighborhood social networks increase.

Drug usage will be lower in those Turkish youth whose parental support/relationship with parents increase.

Drug usage will be lower in Turkish youth whose parental monitoring



increases.

Drug usage will increase as peer delinquency increases.

### Data

The data used in this study is part of a longitudinal study conducted by the Youth in Europe (YIE) project<sup>1</sup>. YIE is a research oriented international drug prevention project, started by the Pan-European Cities against drugs organisation, ECAD in 2005, in cooperation with European Cities. The main goal of the project is to compare preventive strategies and identify critical success factors in drug prevention in order to provide a valuable source of information for all those who are involved in the ongoing task of protecting young people from the injurious effects of drugs.

The project started with a 2006 comparative study by administering questionnaires simultaneously in all the participating cities. İstanbul City in Turkey was one of the participating cities that administered the questionnaire to a population sample, fully representative of the age group 15-16 years old with approximately 2800 students. Since a participating city had the right to add questions to the questionnaire as well as to exclude or transform a question in cooperation with the steering committee, the survey conducted in Turkey was adapted to the social context of the country and additional questions were included by TUBIM, the administering organization. The survey was administered in Turkish language and permission was obtained from both the school authorities and the parents of the children whom were included in the survey.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Information about the project is obtained from the official website: <u>www.youthineurope.org</u>



The TUBIM was established in 2002 within TADOC (Turkish Academy of Drug and Organized Crime). However, TUBIM is a national coordination center and its main aim is to collect all relevant data about drugs (trafficking, abuse, addiction, treatment etc.), TUBIM replicated the study of the Youth in Europe Drug Prevention Program conducted in 2006. As explained above, an adapted yet basically same survey was used with a random sample of youth in Turkey in 2006. The survey was given to 2627 students, and their drug addiction was examined along many social and demographic questions.

The 2006 Turkey survey was administered in Istanbul to a randomly selected sample of 2627 high school level students. The questions used in the survey mainly inquire the use and the frequency of the use of cigarettes, alcoholic drinks and psychotropic substances. The questions were derived from surveys used in similar studies and from the surveys developed by the Icelandic Centre for Social Research and Analysis (ICSRA).

The survey used in this study includes sections on criminal and violence tendencies and capacities (crimes prevalent in adolescence, applying physical violence, exposure to physical violence, exposure to violence by a group or being part of a group that applies violence on others), personal values and opinions (approval of violence, positive thinking, conformity to societal rules, signs of anger, selfdescriptions, obtaining peer approval through inappropriate behavior), details of substance abuse and demographics.

In the survey the use and frequency of use of several drugs and psychotropic

34



substances were asked to the participants. These substances and drugs are: sleeping pills and tranquilizers without prescription, marijuana, amphetamine (speed), LSD (acid), ecstasy (chemical pills), cocaine, relevine, magic mushroom, volatile substances, anabolic steroids, commercial alcoholic drinks, home-made alcoholic drinks, and cigarettes.

#### Research Approach Research Design

This study will use a cross-sectional design in examining secondary data. The cross-sectional design is most popular among social scientists when measuring behavioral and attitudinal patterns of individuals (Nachmias & Nachmias, 1996).

### Sampling

The population of interest for this study is all high school students from the Bagcilar district of Istanbul, Turkey. The youth population in this district is 22,075. The sampling frame was obtained from records of Bagcilar Public School District. Simple random samples of 2,627 youth were chosen. In terms of demographics, 46% of the sample was male, whereas 52% was female. The age of samples ranged between 13 to 17 and 62% of them were 15 years of age when the survey was conducted. A majority of the respondents (89%) indicated that they were living with their families in which parents live together. According to official statistics, there are 6 million youth between the age of 15 and 19.

The study sample cannot be considered representative of the original population of interest since the samples were chosen at convenience. Still, Istanbul can be considered a cross-section of Turkey because of the population density. In Istanbul almost 2400 people fall in every kilometer-square, while in Turkey the



average is 92. Bagcilar is a district of Istanbul with a population 720,000 people. It is more crowded than 52 out of 81 cities of Turkey. Besides, sample size is high enough to conduct a descriptive study of this type.

### **Descriptive Statistics**

Frequency distributions, means, standard deviations, and ranges were used to generate the descriptive statistics of all the variables. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for the variables.



Variable Name	Ν	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
				_	
Gender: Male	2590	0,47	0,50	0	1
Age	2608	16,39	0,73	14	19
Lives in Broken Family	2602	0,10	0,30	0	1
Economic Status of Family	2598	4,60	1,17	1	7
Success at School	2596	4,97	0,96	1	7
Emotional and Psychological Support from Family	2563	14,51	3,48	1	20
Emotional and Psychological Support from Friends	2562	15,92	3,52	1	20
Family Control over the Kid	2602	33,67	6,10	1	44
Believe in and Respect Formal and Societal Rules	2545	30,39	6,27	3	40
Have a Social Network with Friends	2601	18,81	5,04	1	28
Mothers Educational Level	2627	6,20	21,90	0	99
Fathers Educational Level	2627	5,09	18,94	0	99
Prone to Suicide	2542	2,17	2,59	0	10
Experience of Negative Life Events	2627	3,54	3,85	0	32
Cannabis Increases Respect of Friends	2463	1,58	1,06	1	5
Scale of Number of Friends Who Use Cannabis	2627	15,12	34,00	1	99
Neighbours Control the Neighbourhood	2564	10,77	4,63	1	25
Ever Use Marihuana	2627	0,14	0,34	0	1
Ever Use Speed	2627	0,13	0,33	0	1
Ever Use LSD	2627	0,13	0,34	0	1
Ever Use Ecstasy	2627	0,13	0,34	0	1
Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months	2627	0,22	0,42	0	1
Social Networks and Extracurricular Activities	2400	38,75	16,77	2	110
Scale of Frequency of Engaging in Criminal Activities	2371	18,28	10,63	1	98
Engage in Ganglike Activities	2409	6,88	3,36	1	30
Delinquent Peers	2293	8,25	3,69	1	30
Family has Good Networking with Neighbors	2599	24,04	5,54	1	30

# **Table 1 Descriptive Statistics**

# Dependent Variables

In order to operationalize youth drug use several dependent variables were

created.

Ever Use Marihuana



This dependent variable is a dichotomous variable where the value 0 (zero) is no marihuana use and the value 1 (one) is marihuana use.

#### **Ever Use Speed**

This dependent variable is a dichotomous variable where the value 0 (zero) is no speed use and the value 1 (one) is speed use.

#### **Ever Use LSD**

This dependent variable is a dichotomous variable where the value 0 (zero) is no LSD use and the value 1 (one) is LSD use.

#### **Ever Use Ecstasy**

This dependent variable is a dichotomous variable where the value 0 (zero) is no ecstasy use and the value 1 (one) is ecstasy use.

#### Independent Variables

Independent Variables can be categorized into three groups. The first group of independent variable measures demographics such as age, gender, and parental education and marital status. The second group of independent variables measures strain such as experience of negative life events, anomie/alienation, anger, anxiety, and depressed mood. Third group of independent variables measures social control such as parental monitoring, adolescent community ties, peer delinquency, perceived parental attitudes to substance use, and participation in recreational or extracurricular activities.



Before delving into the analyses and description of the variables, I will provide brief explanations as to why certain variables have been chosen as control variables. It should be noted that most of the control variables included in the models are mainly derived from criminological or crime theories. Since those theories strive to explain the phenomenon of crime and the dependent variable in this part is crime clearances, which is a correlate of crime, whatever explanations brought forth by mainstream crime theories should be incorporated into any model that explains the variation in correlates of crime.

The literature suggests that crimes are mostly committed by people between the ages 13 and 24 and then start to decrease as the age increases (Farrington, 1986). Therefore a measure of age is included in the models. According to Merton (1938) and Messner and Rosenfeld (2003) when social institutions such as the family are weak in developing the social norms anomic or normlessness ensues, causing higher crime rates. On the other hand, due to lack of collective efficacy communities become disorganized (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 2003; Shaw & McKay, 2003) and when informal social control mechanisms (social bonds and self-control) do not operate efficiently (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 2003; Hirschi, 2003; Reckless, 2003) criminal behavior occurs. Thus measures of broken families and social networks and controls are added in the models. There are also theories that argue that males are more likely than females to engage in crime (Messerschmitt, 2003)

Some of the variables are index variables that are a combination of various other variables that measure the same phenomenon. Although there is no certain cutoff point that is agreed upon for Cronbach's alpha, the generally accepted minimum



value is .7 (Chatterjee, Hadi, & Price, 2000). The alpha value for the indices is given in the footnotes.

#### **Demographic Independent Variables**

Demographic variables are crucial information in establishing theoretically correct and viable models in testing relationships between social and individual contexts and drug use since most crime theories make assumptions based on demographic properties of individuals or more aggregate level units such as neighborhoods. Thus, demographic characteristics have a strong explanatory power on crime and correlates of crime. Demographic changes can explain most of the variation in crime displacement, victimization, trends in offending and general crime patterns (Fox, 2000).

On the other hand, demographic characteristics such as age, gender, income, marital status, education, employment status, and occupation are important correlates of crime since these demographic "attributes carry with them shared expectations about appropriate behavior and structural obstacles that both enable and constrain one's behavioral choices", which in turn lead to established daily patterns of routine activities or learning experiences within certain chosen environments that might increase or decrease risk or being a victim or perpetrator of a crime (Miethe & Meier, 1994, p. 32).

Due to the nature of the sample and the way the questions in the survey are asked, only there demographic variables are used in this study; gender, age and economic status of family. Discrimination based on race is not an issue that is studied in Turkey. All respondents were chosen from schools and they are not employed.



Thus race, education and employment are not present in the data. However, mothers and fathers education were included in the analyses.

### Lives in Broken Family

This variable is a dichotomous variable. The respondents were asked whether they lived with their parents or somebody else. Here the reference group is living with parents with value 0 (zero). If the respondent lives with people other than her parents the value is 1 (one).

The literature suggests that family is an important factor in predicting drug use. Eker(2010)found that while living with both parents reduced the likelihood of illegal drug use, all other situations within the family increased the likelihood of drug use more than expected in his study. Interestingly, Eker(2010)also revealed in his study that juveniles who lived with a single parent had lower levels of drug use when compared to juveniles who lived with a step parent. Another interesting result of Eker's(2010)study is that young people who lived at a shelter or dormitory had one of the lowest substance use rates as opposed to other comparison groups, a result with very crucial implications for policymakers.

#### **Success at School**

This variable is a Likert scale type variable. The success of the respondents at school was not measured officially by getting records from the schools or from the teachers. The measure is based on self-reported information. The respondents were asked to evaluate their own success in the questionnaire.



### **Emotional and Psychological Support from Family**

Emotional and psychological support from family is an index variable<sup>2</sup> created by summing four questions that measures whether the respondent receives affection and warmth, recommendations concerning the school and help for the homework and other projects, and all other kinds of support from the family. The resulting variable is a numeric variable.

### **Emotional and Psychological Support from Friends**

Emotional and psychological support from family is an index variable<sup>3</sup> created by summing four questions that measures whether the respondent receives affection and warmth, recommendations concerning the school and help for the homework and other projects, and all other kinds of support from her friends. The resulting variable is a numeric variable.

### Family Control over the Respondent

Family control is an index variable<sup>4</sup> created by summing several survey questions. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The measures that were combined are as follows;

- a) My parents find it important that I do well in my studies,
- b) My parents set definite rules about what I can do at home,
- c) My parents set definite rules about what I can do outside the home,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The Cronbach's alpha<sup>2</sup> value (scale reliability coefficient) for the index is .745 <sup>3</sup>The Cronbach's alpha<sup>3</sup> value (scale reliability coefficient) for the index is .773 <sup>4</sup>The Cronbach's alpha<sup>4</sup> value (scale reliability coefficient) for the index is .769



- d) My parents set definite rules about when I should be home in the evening,
- e) My parents know whom I am with in the evenings,
- f) My parents know where I am in the evenings,
- g) My parents know my friends,
- h) My parents know the parents of my friends,
- i) My parents often talk to the parents of my friends,
- j) My parents and the parents of my friends sometimes meet to talk to one another,
- k) My parents follow what I do in my recreational time.

# **Believe in and Respect Formal and Societal Rules**

Believe in and respect formal and societal rules is an index variable<sup>5</sup> created by summing several survey questions. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The measures that were combined are as follows;

- a) One can break most rules if they don't seem to apply,
- b) I follow whatever rules I want to follow,
- c) In fact there are very few absolute rules in life,
- d) It is difficult to trust anything, because everything changes,
- e) In fact nobody knows what is expected of him/her in life,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>The Cronbach's alpha<sup>5</sup> value (scale reliability coefficient) for the index is .732



- f) One can never be certain of anything in life,
- g) Sometimes one needs to break rules in order to succeed,
- h) Following rules does not ensure success.

#### Have a Social Network with Friends

Social network with friends is a combination of several Likert scale variables that measure frequency of the following activities with friends. The resulting variable is a numeric variable.

- a) How often do you watch TV with your friends?
- b) How often do you watch VCD with your friends?
- c) How often do you go to movies or theater with your friends?
- d) How often do you do sports or other outdoor activities with your friends?
- e) How often do you play computer games with your friends?
- f) How often do you chat with your friends?
- g) How often do you go out with your friends?



### **Prone to Suicide**

Proneness to suicide is an index variable<sup>6</sup> created by summing several survey questions. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The measures that were combined are as follows;

a) Has somebody told you that he/she was thinking about committing suicide?

b) Has anyone of your acquaintances or anyone else you are familiar with at any time tried to commit suicide?

c) Has anyone of your acquaintances or anyone else you are familiar with committed suicide?

d) Has anyone of your friends or someone else close to you ever tried to commit suicide?

e) Has anyone of your friends or someone else close to you ever committed suicide?

- f) Have you ever thought about committing suicide?
- g) Have you ever seriously thought about committing suicide?
- h) Have you ever told anyone that you want to commit suicide?
- i) Have you ever made a serious attempt to commit suicide?
- j) Have you made an attempt to commit suicide during this school year?

<sup>6</sup>The Cronbach's alpha<sup>6</sup> value (scale reliability coefficient) for the index is .85

### **Experience of Negative Life Events**

This variable is a count variable that measures strain of the respondent. The questionnaire lists several negative life events and asks the respondents whether and at what frequency they experienced those events. Each negative event is asked whether it was experienced within the last 30 days, during the last 12 months or more than 12 months ago. A total of 19 negative events are listed. Thus a total of 57 variables were merged in order to create the variable. For instance if a respondent experienced a serious accident within the last 30 days, and also during the last 12 months and also more than 12 months ago, she scores 3 on the first item on the list. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The negative life events are listed below:

- a) A serious accident
- b) A severe illness
- c) A separation or divorce of your parents
- d) A serious argument with your parents
- e) Witnessed a serious argument by your parents
- f) Witnessed a physical violence in your home were an adult was involved
- g) Been involved in physical violence in your home where an adult was involved
- h) The death of a parent or sibling
- i) The death of a friend
- j) A break up with a girlfriend/boyfriend



- k) Been rejected by your friends
- 1) A separation from a friend
- m) Received an exceptionally low grade
- n) Father or mother lost a job
- o) Been dismissed from class or sent to the principal's office
- p) Been expelled from school
- q) Experienced sexual abuse (victim)
- r) Experienced sexual abuse where an adult from within the family was involved
- s) Experienced sexual abuse where an adult from outside the family was involved

#### **Cannabis Increases Respect of Friends**

This is a Likert scale variable. The respondents were asked whether they perceive that they would receive more respect from their friends if they use marijuana.

### Scale of Number of Friends Who Use Cannabis

This is a count variable. The respondents were asked the number of friends they have who use marijuana. The self-reported scale was operationalized



### Neighbors Control the Neighborhood

Neighbors control the neighborhood is an index variable<sup>7</sup> created by summing several survey questions. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The respondents were given several situations and were asked how likely their neighbors are to react in case of such a situation which are as follows;

- a) The youths in the neighborhood are skipping school and hanging around,
- b) The youths are graffing on houses in the area,
- c) The youths disrespect the adults,
- d) If a fight breaks out in front of your house,
- e) Somebody is breaking into a car or a house on your street.

### Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months

This is a dichotomous variable. The respondents were asked whether they have been a victim of physical violence in the last 12 months. Here the reference group is not victimized with value 0 (zero). If the respondent has been victimized the value is 1 (one).

#### Scale of Joining Social Networks and Extracurricular Activities

The scale of joining social networks and extracurricular activities is created by summing several questions where the frequency of engaging in different activities was asked to the respondents. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The individual activities are as follows;

فسل كم للاستشارات

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>The Cronbach's alpha<sup>7</sup> value (scale reliability coefficient) for the index is .777

a) Participate in sports and physical training in school, outside the compulsory classes (Phys. Ed. Class),

- b) Engage in sports (practice or compete) in a sports club/team,
- c) Exercise or practice sports, outside school and outside a club/team,
- d) Exert yourself physically so you exhaust yourself or sweat,
- e) Take part in any organized recreational- or extracurricular activities,
- f) Spend time with friends where no adult is present,
- g) Go to the cinema/movies,
- h) Go to a café,
- i) Stroll around and have a look at the shops,
- j) Spend time downtown during the evening or on the weekends,
- k) Hang out inside or outside a news agent/shopping centre,
- l) Go to a party,
- m) Go to a fast-food restaurant,
- n) Go to sporting events,
- o) Go to a swimming pool outside school hours,
- p) Go to a theatre,
- q) Go to a library,
- r) Go to classical concerts,
- s) Go to concerts, other than classical ones,
- t) Go to places with live music,
- u) Go to museums or art galleries.

#### Scale of Frequency of Engaging in Criminal Activities

The scale of frequency of engaging in criminal activities is created by summing several questions where the frequency of engaging in different criminal



activities was asked to the respondents. The resulting variable is a numeric variable.

The individual criminal activities are as follows;

- a) Stolen something worth less than 3 normal movie tickets,
- b) Stolen something worth more than 3 normal movie tickets,
- c) Used physical violence in order to rob/steal,
- d) Broken into a building or a car to steal things that did not belong to you,
- e) Destroy or damage goods that do not belong to you,
- f) Commit other crimes,
- g) Punched somebody,
- h) Knocked somebody over,
- i) Kicked somebody,
- j) Hit/slapped somebody,
- k) Held somebody by their neck,
- 1) Threatened somebody with violence,
- m) Forced somebody to have sexual relations with you,
- n) Forced somebody to have sexual intercourse with you.

### **Delinquent Peers**

The scale of delinquent peers is created by summing several questions where the criminal activities of the respondents' friends were asked. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The questions concerning peer delinquency in the questionnaire are as follows;



a) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following criminal activity in the last 12 months? : Stolen something worth more than 3 normal movie tickets,

b) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following criminal activity in the last 12 months? : Broken into a building or a car to steal things that did not belong to him/her,

c) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following criminal activity in the last 12 months? : Destroy or damage goods that do not belong to him/her,

d) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following activity? :Smoke cigarettes,

e) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following activity? :Drink alcohol (beer, wine or other spirits),

f) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following activity? :Get drunk at least once a month,

g) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following activity? :Smoke cannabis or marijuana,

h) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following activity? : Start a fight,

i) How many of your friends do you think have engaged in the following activity? :Look for trouble.



#### **Neighborhood Network**

The scale of neighborhood network is created by summing several questions. The resulting variable is a numeric variable. The respondents were asked how much they agreed or disagreed with the following statements;

- a) My parents have friends that live close to our home,
- b) My parents know many of our neighbors by name,
- c) My parents sometimes visit some of our neighbors,
- d) My neighbors sometimes visit my parents,
- e) Sometimes we borrow things from our neighbors (e.g. milk or tools),
- f) Our neighbors sometimes borrow things from us (e.g. milk or tools).

### Logistic Regression Analyses

Since the dependent variables are dichotomous, logistic regression is used. In order to facilitate the interpretation of the statistical findings for each of the dependent variables, the results of the analysis are presented using Spost simulation technique. Spost provides substantial post-estimation interpretation of categorical dependent variable regression models (Long & Freese, 2006). For each of the dependent variables, all factors, except for one or two significant explanatory variables, are kept at a constant value and the change in the dependent variables based on the change in the explanatory variables is observed.

Since in logistic regression, unlike OLS, we predict probabilities instead of predicting actual values, the substantial interpretation of the coefficients obtained in



the analysis can be enhanced by computing the predicted probabilities for various values of the independent variables using a simulation technique. For this purpose, the SPost post-estimation software (Long & Freese, 2006) is used for interpretation of the results of analysis in the models. The logit coefficients show the effect of a unit change in each independent variable on the cumulative normal distribution of the probability of using information for resource allocation or redistricting decisions.

Since the cumulative normal is an S-shaped curve and not linear, the size of the effect is different at different points of the curve. Location on the curve depends on the values of all the variables included in the model. Certain values can be assigned to the independent variables and by changing the value of the independent variable that is of most interest while holding all independent variables constant, the change in predicted probabilities associated with varying values of the independent variables can be calculated. Spost post estimation software also provides the standard errors for each predicted probability.

For each model, two different representative characteristics of the cases were constructed by changing the values for the main explanatory variables that measure strain (experiencing negative life events and ever battered physically) from minimum to maximum. In a sense a standard profile is created after each analysis where all attributes are kept at their mean and strain variables at their minimum. The probability of using each of the four drug types represented by the dependent variables is calculated. In the next step, a second profile is created after each analysis where all attributes are kept at their mean and strain variables at their maximum and the probability of using each of the four drug types represented by the dependent variables is calculated again. The difference in the probabilities shows the marginal



effect of strain on one's probability of using drugs.

### Patterns of Marijuana Use

$$\begin{split} Y_{marijuana\ use} &= \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{gender:male} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{broken\ family} \\ &+ \beta_4 X_{economic\ status} + \beta_5 X_{school\ success} + \beta_6 X_{family\ support} \\ &+ \beta_7 X_{friend\ support} + \beta_8 X_{family\ control} + \beta_9 X_{social\ rules} \\ &+ \beta_{10} X_{social\ network} + \beta_{11} X_{mothers\ education} + \beta_{12} X_{fathers\ education} \\ &+ \beta_{13} X_{suicidal} + \beta_{14} X_{strain} + \beta_{15} X_{cannabis\ respect} \\ &+ \beta_{16} X_{friends\ use\ cannabis} + \beta_{17} X_{neighbor\ control} + \beta_{18} X_{ever\ battered} \\ &+ \beta_{19} X_{extra\ activities} + \beta_{20} X_{engage\ in\ crime} + \beta_{21} X_{ganglike\ activities} \\ &+ \beta_{22} X_{delinquent\ peers} + \beta_{23} X_{neighbor\ network} + \varepsilon \end{split}$$

### Equation 1 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating Marijuana Use

First of all the model was run as a normal OLS regression model and checked for heteroskedasticity. Since the Cook-Weisberg test showed existence of heteroskedasticity, robust standard errors were used in the logit model in STATA and the Pseudo R-squared is based on that model.

The regression table for the logistic regression where the dependent variable is marijuana use is given in Table 2.



Variable Name	Coefficient	Robust Standard Error	z Value	P Value
Gender: Male	0,45	0,28	1,63	0.103
Age	0,12	0,15	0,75	0.455
Lives in Broken Family	-0,43	0,35	-1,21	0.228
Economic Status of Family	-0,10	0,10	-1,00	0.316
Success at School	0,11	0,11	1,00	0.317
Emotional and Psychological Support from Family	0,03	0,03	0,82	0.410
Emotional and Psychological Support from Friends	-0,03	0,04	-0,92	0.358
Family Control over the Kid	-0,03	0,02	-1,55	0.121
Believe in and Respect Formal and Societal Rules	-0,03	0,02	-1,48	0.138
Have a Social Network with Friends	0,05	0,03	2,06	0.039
Mothers Educational Level	0,02	0,01	2,62	0.009
Fathers Educational Level	-0,01	0,01	-1,05	0.294
Prone to Suicide	0,07	0,05	1,47	0.141
Experience of Negative Life Events	0,06	0,02	2,55	0.011
Cannabis Increases Respect of Friends	0,50	0,08	5,91	0.000
Scale of Number of Friends Who Use Cannabis	0,02	0,01	2,78	0.005
Neighbours Control the Neighbourhood	0,03	0,03	1,11	0.266
Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months	0,58	0,25	2,34	0.019
Scale of Joining Social Networks and Extracurricular Activitie	s 0,01	0,01	0,99	0.323
Scale of Frequency of Engaging in Criminal Activities	0,04	0,01	3,86	0.000
Engage in Ganglike Activities	0,08	0,03	2,70	0.007
Delinquent Peers	0,01	0,03	0,38	0.707
Family has Good Networking with Neighbors	-0,02	0,02	-0,73	0.464
Constant	-7,47	3,05	-2,45	0.014

Table 2 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: Marijuana Use)

N: 1922 Wald chi2(23) : 233.56 (p>0.000)Pseudo R<sup>2</sup>: 0.3685 Robust standard errors are used.

For outliers and influential cases the diagnostics suggested by Long and Freese(2006) were followed. Residuals were examined in order to check for outliers but none were found. The models were examined for influential leverage of the cases but no influential cases were found that would affect the model<sup>8</sup>.

Bivariate Logistic regression between the dependent variable Marijuana use

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> For outliers standardized residuals were examined on a scatter plot. For influential cases Cook's distance values were examined.



and the main explanatory variables and the independent variables correctly predicts the model. There is no improvement in the categorization of the dependent variable. The chi-square statistics, therefore the overall model is statistically significant (chi-square=233.56, p=.000).

The direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth Marijuana use and the main explanatory variable: youth strain index is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.02). In other words young people that experience more negative life events are more likely than young people that experience less negative life events to use Marijuana. Also, the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth Marijuana use and the other strain measure: physically battered is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.019). In other words young people that experience physical violence are more likely to use Marijuana. Two of the main hypotheses are retained.

The scale of joining social networks and engaging in extracurricular activities is not statistically significant. Emotional and psychological support from family and family control over the kid are also not statistically significant. Thus the alternative hypotheses are rejected. Surprisingly, peer delinquency is not significantly associated with marijuana use.

Having a social network with friends is positively and significantly associated with marijuana use. Interestingly mother's education level is significantly but positively associated with marijuana use. This might indicate that well educated mothers have less or no time to spare for their kids since they work and thus have decreased parental supervision. Since there is no measure for parents' occupational status in the data set this assumption yet to test.



The belief that using cannabis increases friends' respect is also positively and significantly associated with marijuana use. Moreover, as the number of friends who use cannabis increases the likelihood of marijuana use significantly increases. These findings show that peer pressure and learning is in important factor in explaining marijuana use among high school students.

#### The Marginal Effect of Strain on Marijuana Use

In this analysis the probability of using marijuana is calculated for a profile where the Gender is male and the variables are Experience of Negative Life Events and Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months are kept at their minimum value while the rest of the variables are kept at their mean value. The change in the probability is given in Table 3.

---

Table 3 The Margina	l Effect of Strain	on Marijuana Use
---------------------	--------------------	------------------

.....

	Probability of Using Marijuana
Experience of Negative Life Events = MIN Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MIN	0.03
Experience of Negative Life Events = MAX Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MAX	0.24

As seen from Table 3 the probability of using marijuana increases by almost 24% as the experience of negative life events and experience of physical violence increase from minimum to maximum. In other words, keeping all other variation constant, the change in the experience of negative life events affect marijuana use by 24%.



### **Patterns of Amphetamine Use**

# Y<sub>amphetamine use</sub>

 $= \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{gender:male} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{broken family}$  $+ \beta_4 X_{economic status} + \beta_5 X_{school success} + \beta_6 X_{family support}$  $+ \beta_7 X_{friend support} + \beta_8 X_{family control} + \beta_9 X_{social rules}$  $+ \beta_{10} X_{social network} + \beta_{11} X_{mothers education} + \beta_{12} X_{fathers education}$  $+ \beta_{13} X_{suicidal} + \beta_{14} X_{strain} + \beta_{15} X_{cannabis respect}$  $+ \beta_{16} X_{friends use cannabis} + \beta_{17} X_{neighbor control} + \beta_{18} X_{ever battered}$  $+ \beta_{19} X_{extra activities} + \beta_{20} X_{engage in crime} + \beta_{21} X_{ganglike activities}$  $+ \beta_{22} X_{delinguent peers} + \beta_{23} X_{neighbor network} + \varepsilon$ 

#### **Equation 2 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating Amphetamine Use**

First of all the model was run as a normal OLS regression model and checked for heteroskedasticity. Since the Cook-Weisberg test showed existence of heteroskedasticity, robust standard errors were used in the logit model in STATA and the Pseudo R-squared is based on that model.

The regression table for the logistic regression where the dependent variable is amphetamine use is given in Table 4.


Variable Name	Coefficient	Robust Standard Error	z Value	P Value
Gender: Male	0,34	0,28	1,22	0.224
Age	-0,03	0,15	-0,20	0.843
Lives in Broken Family	-0,77	0,45	-1,70	0.089
Economic Status of Family	-0,07	0,10	-0,71	0.477
Success at School	0,16	0,11	1,45	0.148
Emotional and Psychological Support from Family	0,03	0,04	0,69	0.489
Emotional and Psychological Support from Friends	-0,05	0,04	-1,15	0.249
Family Control over the Kid	-0,01	0,02	-0,55	0.584
Believe in and Respect Formal and Societal Rules	-0,04	0,02	-2,13	0.033
Have a Social Network with Friends	0,03	0,03	1,26	0.209
Mothers Educational Level	0,02	0,01	4,37	0.000
Fathers Educational Level	-0,01	0,01	-1,74	0.082
Prone to Suicide	0,10	0,05	2,14	0.032
Experience of Negative Life Events	0,08	0,02	3,38	0.001
Cannabis Increases Respect of Friends	0,33	0,09	3,54	0.000
Scale of Number of Friends Who Use Cannabis	0,02	0,01	3,24	0.001
Neighbours Control the Neighbourhood	0,03	0,03	1,05	0.296
Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months	0,53	0,27	1,93	0.053
Scale of Joining Social Networks and Extracurricular Activities	0,01	0,01	1,48	0.140
Scale of Frequency of Engaging in Criminal Activities	0,04	0,01	3,88	0.000
Engage in Ganglike Activities	0,04	0,03	1,44	0.149
Delinquent Peers	-0,01	0,03	-0,15	0.881
Family has Good Networking with Neighbors	0,00	0,02	0,07	0.941
Constant	-5,16	2,97	-1,74	0.083

Table 4 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: Amphetamine Use)

N: 1922 Wald chi2(23) : 210.44 (p>0.000)Pseudo  $R^2$ : 0.3321 Robust standard errors are used.

For outliers and influential cases the diagnostics suggested by Long and Freese(2006) were followed. Residuals were examined in order to check for outliers but none were found. The models were examined for influential leverage of the cases



but no influential cases were found that would affect the model<sup>9</sup>.

Bivariate Logistic regression between the dependent variable Amphetamine use and the main explanatory variables and the independent variables correctly predicts the model. There is no improvement in the categorization of the dependent variable. The chi-square statistics, therefore the overall model is statistically significant (chi-square=210.44, p=.000).

The direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth Amphetamine use and the main explanatory variable: youth strain index is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.02). In other words young with people that experience more negative life events are more likely than young people that experience less negative life events to use Amphetamine. Also, the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth amphetamine use and the other strain measure: physically battered is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.05). In other words young people that experience physical violence are more likely to use amphetamine. Two of the main hypotheses are retained.

The scale of joining social networks and engaging in extracurricular activities is not statistically significant. Emotional and psychological support from family and family control over the kid are also not statistically significant. Thus the alternative hypotheses are rejected. Surprisingly, peer delinquency is not significantly associated with amphetamine use.

Interestingly mother's education level is significantly but positively associated with amphetamine use as with the marijuana use. This again might indicate that well

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> For outliers standardized residuals were examined on a scatter plot. For influential cases Cook's distance values were examined.



educated mothers have less or no time to spare for their kids since they work and thus have decreased parental supervision. Being prone to suicide is a variable that is positively and significantly associated with amphetamine use.

The belief that using cannabis increases friends' respect is also positively and significantly associated with amphetamine use. Moreover, as the number of friends who use cannabis increases the likelihood of amphetamine use significantly increases. These findings show that peer pressure and learning is in important factor in explaining amphetamine use among high school students.

Another important and significant relationship with youth amphetamine use is with belief in and respect for formal and societal rules. As the level of respect to rules increases, the likelihood of amphetamine uses decreases.

# The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine Use

In this analysis the probability of using amphetamine is calculated for a profile where the Gender is male and the variables are Experience of Negative Life Events and Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months are kept at their minimum value while the rest of the variables are kept at their mean value. The change in the probability is given in Table 5.

Table 5 The Marginal Effect of Strain on Amphetamine	Use	
--	-----	--

	Probability Amphetamine	of	Using
Experience of Negative Life Events = MIN Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MIN	0.02		
Experience of Negative Life Events = MAX Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MAX	0.2		



As seen from Table 3 the probability of using amphetamine increases by almost 20% as the experience of negative life events and experience of physical violence increase from minimum to maximum. In other words, keeping all other variation constant, the change in the experience of negative life events affect amphetamine use by 20%.

#### Patterns of LSD Use

$$Y_{LSD use} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{gender:male} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{broken family} + \beta_4 X_{economic status} + \beta_5 X_{school success} + \beta_6 X_{family support} + \beta_7 X_{friend support} + \beta_8 X_{family control} + \beta_9 X_{social rules} + \beta_{10} X_{social network} + \beta_{11} X_{mothers education} + \beta_{12} X_{fathers education} + \beta_{13} X_{suicidal} + \beta_{14} X_{strain} + \beta_{15} X_{cannabis respect} + \beta_{16} X_{friends use cannabis} + \beta_{17} X_{neighbor control} + \beta_{18} X_{ever battered} + \beta_{19} X_{extra activities} + \beta_{20} X_{engage in crime} + \beta_{21} X_{ganglike activities} + \beta_{22} X_{delinguent peers} + \beta_{23} X_{neighbor network} + \varepsilon$$

# Equation 3 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating LSD Use

First of all the model was run as a normal OLS regression model and checked for heteroskedasticity. Since the Cook-Weisberg test showed existence of heteroskedasticity, robust standard errors were used in the logit model in STATA and the Pseudo R-squared is based on that model.

The regression table for the logistic regression where the dependent variable is amphetamine use is given in Table 6.



Variable Name	Coefficient	Robust Standard Error	z Value	P Value
Gender: Male	0,18	0,26	0,67	0.502
Age	-0,02	0,15	-0,17	0.867
Lives in Broken Family	-0,62	0,41	-1,53	0.126
Economic Status of Family	-0,14	0,10	-1,39	0.165
Success at School	0,25	0,11	2,29	0.022
Emotional and Psychological Support from Family	0,01	0,04	0,21	0.830
Emotional and Psychological Support from Friends	-0,03	0,04	-0,93	0.353
Family Control over the Kid	-0,01	0,02	-0,59	0.553
Believe in and Respect Formal and Societal Rules	-0,04	0,02	-2,39	0.017
Have a Social Network with Friends	0,04	0,03	1,39	0.165
Mothers Educational Level	0,01	0,01	2,21	0.027
Fathers Educational Level	-0,01	0,01	-0,99	0.324
Prone to Suicide	0,05	0,05	0,99	0.323
Experience of Negative Life Events	0,10	0,02	4,18	0.000
Cannabis Increases Respect of Friends	0,36	0,09	4,18	0.000
Scale of Number of Friends Who Use Cannabis	0,02	0,01	2,87	0.004
Neighbours Control the Neighbourhood	0,03	0,03	1,04	0.300
Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months	0,65	0,26	2,51	0.012
Scale of Joining Social Networks and Extracurricular Activities	0,00	0,01	-0,03	0.973
Scale of Frequency of Engaging in Criminal Activities	0,05	0,01	4,49	0.000
Engage in Ganglike Activities	0,05	0,03	1,68	0.093
Delinquent Peers	-0,02	0,03	-0,58	0.562
Family has Good Networking with Neighbors	0,01	0,02	0,38	0.702
Constant	-5,01	2,95	-1,70	0.090

Table 6 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: LSD Use)

N: 1922 Wald chi2(23) : 183.62 (p>0.000)Pseudo R<sup>2</sup>: 0.3194 Robust standard errors are used.

For outliers and influential cases the diagnostics suggested by Long and Freese(2006) were followed. Residuals were examined in order to check for outliers but none were found. The models were examined for influential leverage of the cases



but no influential cases were found that would affect the  $model^{10}$ .

Bivariate Logistic regression between the dependent variable LSD use and the main explanatory variables and the independent variables correctly predicts the model. There is no improvement in the categorization of the dependent variable. The chi-square statistics, therefore the overall model is statistically significant (chi-square=183.62, p=.000).

The direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth LSD use and the main explanatory variable: youth strain index is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.02). In other words young with people that experience more negative life events are more likely than young people that experience less negative life events to use LSD. Also, the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth LSD use and the other strain measure: physically battered is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.01). In other words young people that experience physical violence are more likely to use LSD. Two of the main hypotheses are retained.

The scale of joining social networks and engaging in extracurricular activities is not statistically significant. Emotional and psychological support from family and family control over the kid are also not statistically significant. Thus the alternative hypotheses are rejected. Peer delinquency is not significantly associated with LSD use.

Mother's education level is significantly but positively associated with LSD use. Being prone to suicide is not significantly associated with LSD use. There is also

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> For outliers standardized residuals were examined on a scatter plot. For influential cases Cook's distance values were examined.



a significant relationship with youth LSD use and belief in and respect for formal and societal rules. As the level of respect to rules increases, the likelihood of LSD use decreases.

The belief that using cannabis increases friends' respect is also positively and significantly associated with LSD use. Moreover, as the number of friends who use cannabis increases the likelihood of LSD use significantly increases. These findings show that peer pressure and learning is in important factor in explaining LSD use among high school students.

# The Marginal Effect of Strain on LSD Use

In this analysis the probability of using LSD is calculated for a profile where the Gender is male and the variables are Experience of Negative Life Events and Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months are kept at their minimum value while the rest of the variables are kept at their mean value. The change in the probability is given in Table 7.

	Probability of Using LSD
Experience of Negative Life Events = MIN Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MIN	0.02
Experience of Negative Life Events = MAX Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MAX	0.27

#### Table 7 The Marginal Effect of Strain on LSD Use

As seen from Table 3 the probability of using LSD increases by almost 27% as the experience of negative life events and experience of physical violence increase from minimum to maximum. In other words, keeping all other variation constant, the change in the experience of negative life events affect LSD use by 27%.



# Patterns of Ecstasy Use

$$Y_{ecstasy use} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{gender:male} + \beta_2 X_{age} + \beta_3 X_{broken family} + \beta_4 X_{economic status} + \beta_5 X_{school success} + \beta_6 X_{family support} + \beta_7 X_{friend support} + \beta_8 X_{family control} + \beta_9 X_{social rules} + \beta_{10} X_{social network} + \beta_{11} X_{mothers education} + \beta_{12} X_{fathers education} + \beta_{13} X_{suicidal} + \beta_{14} X_{strain} + \beta_{15} X_{cannabis respect} + \beta_{16} X_{friends use cannabis} + \beta_{17} X_{neighbor control} + \beta_{18} X_{ever battered} + \beta_{19} X_{extra activities} + \beta_{20} X_{engage in crime} + \beta_{21} X_{ganglike activities} + \beta_{22} X_{delinquent peers} + \beta_{23} X_{neighbor network} + \varepsilon$$

#### **Equation 4 Logistics Regression Formula for Estimating Ecstasy Use**

First of all the model was run as a normal OLS regression model and checked for heteroskedasticity. Since the Cook-Weisberg test showed existence of heteroskedasticity, robust standard errors were used in the logit model in STATA and the Pseudo R-squared is based on that model.

The regression table for the logistic regression where the dependent variable is amphetamine use is given in Table 8.



Variable Name	Coefficien	Rohust St 7	Value	P Value
Gender: Male	0.37	0.27	1 38	0.167
A go	0,57	0,27	1,50	0.107
Age Lines in Duction Fourity	-0,05	0,15	-0,52	0.731
	-0,55	0,38	-0,88	0.377
Economic Status of Family	-0,11	0,1	-1,16	0.246
Success at School	0,22	0,11	2.00	0.045
Emotional and Psychological Support from Family	0,03	0,04	0,86	0.388
Emotional and Psychological Support from Friends	-0,05	0,04	-1,32	0.185
Family Control over the Kid	-0,03	0,02	-1,27	0.204
Believe in and Respect Formal and Societal Rules	-0,04	0,02	-2,3	0.021
Have a Social Network with Friends	0,02	0,03	0,95	0.340
Mothers Educational Level	0,01	0,01	1,99	0.046
Fathers Educational Level	-0,01	0,01	-0,8	0.426
Prone to Suicide	0,11	0,05	2,43	0.015
Experience of Negative Life Events	0,08	0,02	3,28	0.001
Cannabis Increases Respect of Friends	0,33	0,08	3,91	0.000
Scale of Number of Friends Who Use Cannabis	0,02	0,01	3,08	0.002
Neighbours Control the Neighbourhood	0,02	0,03	0,74	0.459
Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months	0,43	0,11	1,64	0.039
Scale of Joining Social Networks and Extracurricular Activities	0.00	0,01	0,01	0.993
Scale of Frequency of Engaging in Criminal Activities	0,04	0,01	3,87	0.000
Engage in Ganglike Activities	0,02	0,03	0,65	0.515
Delinquent Peers	0,04	0,03	1,22	0.222
Family has Good Networking with Neighbors	0,02	0,02	0,96	0.339
Constant	-4,44	2,81	-1,58	0.115

Table 8 Logistics Regression (Dependent Variable: Ecstasy Use)

N: 1922 Wald chi2(23) : 205.94 (p>0.000) Pseudo R<sup>2</sup>: 0.3042 Robust standard errors are used.

For outliers and influential cases the diagnostics suggested by Long and Freese(2006) were followed. Residuals were examined in order to check for outliers but none were found. The models were examined for influential leverage of the cases



but no influential cases were found that would affect the  $model^{11}$ .

Bivariate Logistic regression between the dependent variable Ecstasy use and the main explanatory variables and the independent variables correctly predicts the model. There is no improvement in the categorization of the dependent variable. The chi-square statistics, therefore the overall model is statistically significant (chisquare=205.94, p=.000).

The direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth ecstasy use and the main explanatory variable: youth strain index is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.001). In other words young with people that experience more negative life events are more likely than young people that experience less negative life events to use ecstasy. Also, the direction of the relationship between the dependent variable: youth ecstasy use and the other strain measure: physically battered is positive and the relationship is statistically significant (p=.03). In other words young people that experience physical violence are more likely to use ecstasy. Two of the main hypotheses are retained.

The scale of joining social networks and engaging in extracurricular activities is not statistically significant. Emotional and psychological support from family and family control over the kid are also not statistically significant. Thus the alternative hypotheses are rejected. Peer delinquency is not significantly associated with ecstasy use.

Mother's education level is significantly but positively associated with ecstasy use. Being prone to suicide is not significantly associated with ecstasy use. There is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> For outliers standardized residuals were examined on a scatter plot. For influential cases Cook's distance values were examined.



also a significant relationship with youth ecstasy use and belief in and respect for formal and societal rules. As the level of respect to rules increases, the likelihood of ecstasy use decreases.

The belief that using cannabis increases friends' respect is also positively and significantly associated with ecstasy use. Moreover, as the number of friends who use cannabis increases the likelihood of ecstasy use significantly increases. These findings show that peer pressure and learning is in important factor in explaining ecstasy use among high school students.

# The Marginal Effect of Strain on Ecstasy Use

In this analysis the probability of using ecstasy is calculated for a profile where the Gender is male and the variables are Experience of Negative Life Events and Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months are kept at their minimum value while the rest of the variables are kept at their mean value. The change in the probability is given in Table 9.

	Probability of Using Ecstasy
Experience of Negative Life Events = MIN Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MIN	0.02
Experience of Negative Life Events = MAX Ever Battered Physically in the Last 12 Months = MAX	0.2

#### Table 9 The Marginal Effect of Strain on Ecstasy Use

As seen from Table 3 the probability of using ecstasy increases by almost 24% as the experience of negative life events and experience of physical violence increase



from minimum to maximum. In other words, keeping all other variation constant, the change in the experience of negative life events affect ecstasy use by 24%.

# Conclusion

The statistical analyses show that the patterns of youth drug use in Turkey can be explained through the general strain theory. Using sPost after the logistic regression analyses, we can determine the impact of strain on the use of certain drugs among the high school youth. While holding all other variables constant and controlling for their unique effects, the effect of strain variables on increasing the likelihood of drug use is by at least 20% as the value of strain variables go from minimum to maximum.



# Chapter 5

# Conclusion

### Summary and Discussion of Key Findings

This study examined the relationship between strain and youth drug use patterns in Turkey. The main assertion of the study is that as strain increases as measured by negative life events experienced in one's life and ever been battered physically, the likelihood of engaging in drug abuse increases.

The results of the statistical analyses show that the main assertion of the study holds. Negative life experiences, when controlled for other explanatory variables, have significance in explaining youth drug use in Turkey. There are also other very important explanatory variables that significantly affect drug abuse. For instance as the level of believing in and respect for societal rules increases, the likelihood of using amphetamine, LSD and ecstasy use significantly decreases. This result also supports the previous findings in the literature that self-control as asserted by Hirschi(2003)inhibits the use of drugs.

## Policy Recommendations

Schools are not only key institutions within one nation's educational system but also main building blocks of a society. Recognizing the problems of the within the school system and resolve those issues promptly and appropriately within the educational system will help avoid further issues that might arise later in social life.



Drug abuse as a way that some students adopt to strain during school can evolve into much more serious and dangerous means at later ages.

Prevention of delinquency before it even starts through understanding and support is an important aspect of crime prevention. However with negative life events the case might not be that easy. In such situations where the delinquency prone adolescent is not responsive to prevention programs, then the adolescent can at least be given coping skills in case prevention efforts fail.

Agnew (1985, 1987, 1992, 2006) provides several recommendations in order cope with strain and prevent delinquency: (1) reduce the adversity of the youth's social environment, (2) reduce likelihood that youth will provoke negative reactions to other, (3) increase the social support available to adolescent, especially during stressful times and (4) increase the ability of youth to cope with adversity through nondelinquent means (social skills, problem solving, anger control).

Previous policy efforts have shown that family programs can help families resolve interpersonal conflicts, and help parents negotiate behavioral contracts with their children more effectively through establishing discipline and positive reinforcement. These programs have shown some promise but they are not effective for all and not all families are willing to join in such programs due to the cost involved and sometimes the intensity might make those programs limited merely to high risk families. School-based programs, good preschools, interactive teaching, proactive classroom management, and anti-bullying programs are others ways to help adolescents cope with strain.



# Limitations

This study is limited with the context of Turkey and the questionnaire administered is limited, in a sense, to an urban setting. Thus, caution is advised in generalizing the results of the study in other settings and other geographical areas. Since the data used is cross-sectional, the variations in the casual relationship over time cannot be determined.

This study used secondary data and employed a quantitative approach in testing the hypotheses. This means that this study carries all limitations that come with use of secondary data in hypothesis testing. Thus, the way the variables are constructed and measures are selected is limited to the original research's methodology. Also any biases, errors or other limitations known to the original researcher are unknown to the current researcher. The structure of the analyses might have been different if the writer were to collect his own data. Yet, the wide scope of the questions in the survey instrument made it possible for the writer to construct a satisfactory methodology with the secondary data.

Another limitation when compared to similar studies is lack of certain demographic variables in the study. Race or ethnicity was not included in the analyses since the issue is not socially regarded as an issue and not studied by social researchers. Besides, as mentioned above, due to use of secondary data not all variables could be operationalized aptly but as a proxy for the intended measure. However, all dependent variables and main explanatory variables were operationalized appropriately and fittingly for the data analyses.



# Recommendations for Future Research

This study focused on the effects of strain on youth drug use patterns. However strain can also help explain and understand better other types of criminal activities. Thus future studies can employ the variables used in this study to explain other types of crimes. Also variables such as the effect of social programs, the success of school, teacher-student relationships have not been evaluated since these were absent in the data set. Such variables can be added in the research further studies.

Moreover, students' ease of access to drugs should also be studied. While many factors might lead youth to use drugs, unless they have access to drugs they cannot abuse drugs. Proximity of risk areas to the school, lack of capable guardians such as the school police and physical structure of the schools should be studied in understanding the relationship between social environment and routine activities and youth drug use.

Another possible research venue in examining the relationship between availability of drugs and youth drug use is financing terrorism through organized crime. Terrorist organizations are known to resort to drug trafficking in order to finance their terrorist operations. Youth drug abusers might be a good target in that sense. Furthermore, schools are also highly convenient places for finding terrorist recruits. In a sense, terrorist organizations will not only find funding via drug dealing but also find possible recruits at schools.



# Conclusion

Recognizing types of strain and helping young people cope with strain is a crucial step is fighting drug abuse among youth. This study shows that strain plays an important role in understanding drug use among youth. The study should be replicated under different settings and relevant policies should be set in fighting drug abuse at schools. Possible connections of drug abuse and terrorist funding and recruitment should be examined especially within the context of Turkey. This study clearly shows that fighting drug abuse among youth can only be possible via collaborative and cooperative efforts of various formal and informal structures of the society; police, social services, school administrations, municipalities, families and neighborhoods.



# References

- Agnew, R. (1985). A Revised Strain Theory of Delinquency. [Journal]. *Social Forces*, 64(1), 151-167.
- Agnew, R. (1987). On 'Testing Structural Strain Theories'. [Article]. Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency, 23(4), 281-286.
- Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general Strain Theory of Crime and Delinquency. *Criminology*, *30*(), 47-87.
- Agnew, R. (2006). *Pressured Into Crime: An Overview of General Strain Theory* (1st ed.). Los Angeles, Calif.: Roxbury Pub. Company.
- Agnew, R., & Froggio, G. (2006). The relationship between crime and "objective" versus "subjective" strains. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(1), 81-87. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.11.017
- Agnew, R., & White, H. R. (1992). An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory. *Criminology*, *30*(4), 475-500. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9125.1992.tb01113.x
- AguirreMolina, M., & Gorman, D. M. (1996). Community-based Approaches for the Prevention of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Use. [Review]. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *17*, 337-358. doi: 10.1146/annurev.pu.17.050196.002005
- Akers, R. L. (1985). Deviant Dehavior: A Social Learning Approach (3rd ed.).Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Pub. Co.



- Akvardar, Y., Demiral, Y., Ergör, G., & Ergör, A. (2004). Substance Use among Medical Students and Physicians in a Medical School in Turkey. [Article].
   Social Psychiatry & Psychiatric Epidemiology, 39(6), 502-506.
- Bauman, A., & Phongsavan, P. (1999). Epidemiology of Substance Use in Adolescence: Prevalence, Trends and Policy Implications. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 55(3), 187-207. doi: 10.1016/s0376-8716(99)00016-2
- Boekhout van Solinge, T. (1998). Drug Use and Drug Trafficking in Europe. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie, 89*(1), 100-105. doi: 10.1111/1467-9663.00010
- Bourdieu, P., & Johnson, R. (1993). *The field of cultural production : essays on art and literature*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Browning, S., & Erickson, P. (2007). Neighborhood, Family, and Individual Effects on Substance Use: A Multilevel Study of Toronto Secondary Students. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Burcu, E. (1997). A Sociological Study on The Subculture Group Young Apprentices and Skilled Workers. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 28(2), 134-156. doi: 10.1023/a:1023037011535
- Burcu, E. (2003). Alcohol and Drug Use in Young Apprentices: Effect of Social Control in the Family. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32(4), 291-299. doi: 10.1023/a:1023037011535
- Chatterjee, S., Hadi, A. S., & Price, B. (2000). *Regression Analysis by Example* (3rd ed.). New York: Wiley.



- Chen, C.-Y., Storr, C. L., & Anthony, J. C. (2009). Early-onset drug use and risk for drug dependence problems. *Addictive Behaviors*, 34(3), 319-322. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2008.10.021
- Cloward, R. A., & Ohlin, L. E. (2003). Delinquency and Opportunity. In F. T. Cullen
  & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings* (2nd ed., pp. 191-197). Los Angeles, Calif.: Roxbury Park.
- Cohen, A. K. (2003). Delinquent Boys. In F. T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings* (2nd ed., pp. 186-190). Los Angeles, Calif.: Roxbury Park.
- Cullen, F. T. (1994). Social support as an organizing concept for criminology:
   Presidential address to the academy of criminal justice sciences. *Justice Quarterly*, *11*(4), 527-559. doi: 10.1080/07418829400092421
- Cullen, F. T., & Agnew, R. (2011). *Criminological theory : past to present : essential readings* (4th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Çırakoglu, O. C., & Işın, G. (2005). Perception of Drug Addiction among Turkish University Students: Causes, Cures, and Attitudes. *Addictive Behaviors*, 30(1), 1-8. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2004.04.003
- Çorapçıoğlu, A., & Ögel, K. (2004). Factors Associated with Ecstasy use in Turkish Students. *Addiction*, 99(1), 67-76. doi: 10.1111/j.1360-0443.2004.00572.x
- Durkheim, E. (1951). Suicide: A Study in Sociology. Glencoe, Ill.,: Free Press.
- Durkheim, É. (2003). Anomie. In M. Slattery (Ed.), *Key Ideas in Sociology* (pp. 22-26). U.K.: Nelson Thornes Limited.
- Eken, B., Evren, C. E., Saatçioğlu, Ö., & Çakmak, D. (2003). The Relation between Personality Disorder, Sociodemographic Characteristics, Depression and



Anxiety in the Alcohol Dependents. *The Journal of Psychiatry and Neurological Sciences*, 16(2), 71-79.

- Eker, A. (2010). Analyzing Patterns of Juvenile Delinquency in Turkey: A Multilevel Approach. Doctorate Dissertation, George Mason University.
- EMCDDA. (2011). Statistical Bulletin 2011 Retrieved from http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/stats11
- Farrington, D., P. (1986). Age and Crime. In M. H. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research (Vol. 7). Chicago University of Chicago Press.
- Fox, J. A. (2000). Demographics and U.S. Homicide. In A. Blumstein & J. Wallman (Eds.), *The Crime Drop in America* (pp. 288-317). Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuller, C. M., Borrell, L. N., Latkin, C. A., Galea, S., Ompad, D. C., Strathdee, S. A., & Vlahov, D. (2005). Effects of Race, Neighborhood, and Social Network on Age at Initiation of Injection Drug Use. *Am J Public Health*, *95*(4), 689-695. doi: 10.2105/ajph.2003.02178
- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (2003). A General Theory of Crime. In F. T. Cullen
  & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present* (2nd ed., pp. 240-252). Los Angeles, Calif: Roxbury Park.
- Greenberg, D. F. (1977). Delinquency and the Age Structure of Society. *Crime, Law* and Social Change, 1(2), 189-223. doi: 10.1007/bf00728871
- Hawkins, J. D., Horn, M. L. V., & Arthur, M. W. (2004). Community Variation in Risk and Protective Factors and Substance Use Outcomes. *Prevention Science*, 5(4), 213-220. doi: 10.1023/b:prev.0000045355.53137.45



- Hibell, B., Andersson, B., Bjarnason, T., Ahlström, S., Balakireva, O., Kokkevi, A., & Morgan, M. (2004). The ESPAD 2003 Report: Alcohol and Other Drug Use
  Among Students in 35 European Countries *The European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs*. Stockholm: The Swedish Council for
  Information on Alcohol and Other Drugs.
- Hibell, B., Andersson, B., Bjarnason, T., Kokkevi, A., Morgan, M., & Narusk, A. (1997). The 1995 ESPAD Report: Alcohol and Other Drug Use Among Students in 26 European Countries *The European School Survey Project on Alcohol and Other Drugs*. Stockholm: The Swedish Council for Information on Alcohol and Other Drugs.
- Hirschi, T. (2003). Social Bond Theory. In F. T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present* (2nd ed., pp. 231-239). Los Angeles, Calif: Roxbury Park.
- Kandel, D. B., Yamaguchi, K., & Chen, K. (1992). Stages of Progression in Drug Involvement from Adolescence to Adulthood: Further Evidence for the Gatway Theory. J. Stud. Alcohol, 53(5), 447-457.
- Kizmaz, Z., & Bilgin, R. (2010). The Children Working/Living in the Streets and Crime: Diyarbakir Case Study. [Article]. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(32), 269-311.
- Kristjansson, A., Sigfusdottir, I., Allegrante, J., & Helgason, A. (2008). Social Sorrelates of Cigarette Smoking among Icelandic Adolescents: A Populationbased Cross-sectional Study. *BMC Public Health*, 8(1), 86.
- Kristjansson, A., Sigfusdottir, I., Karlsson, T., & Allegrante, J. (2011). The Perceived Parental Support (PPS) Scale: Validity and Reliability in the 2006 Youth in



Europe Substance Use Prevention Survey. *Child Indicators Research*, 4(3), 515-528. doi: 10.1007/s12187-010-9095-x

- Kristjansson, A. L., James, J. E., Allegrante, J. P., Sigfusdottir, I. D., & Helgason, A.
  R. (2010). Adolescent substance use, parental monitoring, and leisure-time activities: 12-year outcomes of primary prevention in Iceland. [Article]. *Preventive Medicine*, *51*(2), 168-171. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2010.05.001
- Kristjansson, A. L., Sigfusdottir, I. D., Allegrante, J. P., & Helgason, A. R. (2008).
  Social correlates of cigarette smoking among Icelandic adolescents: a population-based cross-sectional study. [Article]. *BMC Public Health*, *8*, 86-93.
- Labrousse, A., & Laniel, L. (Eds.). (1998). The World Geopolitics of Drugs: 1997/ 1998 Annual Report (Vol. 4): Springer New York.
- Levitt, S. D. (1998). Juvenile Crime and Punishment. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 106(6), 1156-1185.
- Levitt, S. D., & Lochner, L. (2001). The Determinants of Juvenile Crime. In G. Jonathan (Ed.), *Risky Behavior among Youths: An Economic Analysis* (pp. 327 374). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Long, J. S., & Freese, J. (2006). *Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata* (2nd ed.). College Station, Tex.: StataCorp LP.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). Social Structure and Anomie. In F. T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings* (2nd ed., pp. 178-185). Los Angeles, Calif.: Roxbury Park.



- Messerschmitt, J. W. (2003). Masculinities and Crime. In F. T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present* (2nd ed., pp. 430-440). Los Angeles, Calif: Roxbury Park.
- Messner, S. F., & Rosenfeld, R. (2003). Crime and the American Dream. In F. T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings* (2nd ed., pp. 198-207). Los Angeles, Calif.: Roxbury Park.
- Miethe, T. D., & Meier, R. F. (1994). Crime and Its Social Context: Toward an Integrated Theory of Offenders, Victims, and Situations. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Nachmias, C., & Nachmias, D. (1996). *Research methods in the social sciences* (5th ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Ögel, K., & Aksoy, A. (2007). Substance Abuse Among Convicts. [Article]. *Journal* of Dependence, 8(1), 11-17.
- Ogel, K., Çorapçıoğlu, A., Tot, Ş., Doğan, O., Sir, A., Bilici, M., . . . Tamar, M. (2003). Ecstacy Use in Secondary School Students in Turkey. [Article]. *Journal of Dependence*, 4(2), 67-71.
- Ögel, K., Tamar, D., Özmen, E., Aker, T., Boratav, C., & Liman, O. (2003). Prevalence of Cigarette Use in Istanbul. [Article]. *Journal of Dependence*, 4(3), 105-108.
- Ögel, K., Taner, S., Tosun, M., Gürol, T., & Liman, O. (2005). Substance Abuse of Inpatients. [Article]. *Journal of Dependence*, 6(2), 76-83.
- Ögel, K., Taner, S., Tosun, M., Liman, O., & Demir, T. (2006). Juvenile Offences Among Hospitalized Adolescent Inhalant Users in Istanbul: A Comparison



Regarding Place of Residence. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 38(3), 297-304.

- Öner, S., Şaşmaz, T., Resul, B., Öner Kurt, A., Ful, U., & Tezcan, H. (2006). The Prevalance of Substance Abuse, Cigarette Smoking and Alcohol Consumption among Adolescents in Mersin. [Article]. Bulletin of Clinical Psychopharmacology, 16(1), 15-21.
- Reckless, W. C. (2003). Containment Theory. In F. T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present* (2nd ed., pp. 227-230). Los Angeles, Calif: Roxbury Park.
- Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (2003). Collective Efficacy and Crime. In F. T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present* (2nd ed., pp. 118-125). Los Angeles, Calif: Roxbury Park.
- Saran, N. (1979). Delinquency of Children and Broken Families. *Journal of Social Anthropology*, 3(1), 16-21.
- Scott, J. P., Scott, S., & Abcarian, G. (1971). *Social control and social change*. Chicago,: University of Chicago Press.
- Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (2003). Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas. In F.
  T. Cullen & R. Agnew (Eds.), *Criminological Theory: Past to Present: Essential Readings* (2nd ed., pp. 104-110). Los Angeles, Calif.: Roxbury Park.
- Sigfusdottir, I. D., Kristjansson, A. L., Thorlindsson, T., & Allegrante, J. P. (2008).
  Trends in prevalence of substance use among Icelandic adolescents, 1995-2006. [Article]. Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention & Policy, 3, 1-9. doi: 10.1186/1747-597x-3-12



- Sigfusdottir, I. D., Thorlindsson, T., Kristjnsson, A. L., Roe, K. M., & Allegrante, J.
  P. (2009). Substance Use Prevention for Adolescents: the Icelandic Model. *Health Promotion International*, 24(1), 16-25. doi: 10.1093/heapro/dan038
- Sorenson, A. M., & Brownfield, D. (1995). Adolescent Drug Use and a General Theory of Crime: An Analysis of a Theoretical Integration. *Canadian Journal* of Criminology, 37(19).
- Soysaldı, M. (2007). Cigarette, Alcohol and Drugs: Turkish Youth's Challenges. [Article]. *e-Journal of New World Sciences Academy (NWSA)*, 2(2), 80-101.
- Sutherland, E. H., & Cressey, D. R. (1978). *Criminology* (10th ed.). Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Thorlindsson, T., Bjarnason, T., & Sigfusdottir, I. (2007). Individual and Community Processes of Social Closure. *Acta Sociologica*, *50*(2), 161-178. doi: 10.1177/0001699307077657
- Thorlindsson, T., & Vilhjalmsson, R. (1991). Factors Related to Cigarette Smoking and Alcohol Use among Adolescents. *Adolescence*, *26*(102), 399-418.
- Tittle, C. R., & Ward, D. A. (1993). The interaction of age with the correlates and causes of crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 9(1), 3-53. doi: 10.1007/bf01064236
- TUBIM. (2010). Turkish Drug Report *National Report*. Ankara: TURKISH MONITORING CENTRE FOR DRUGS AND DRUG ADDICTION.
- TUIK. (2011a). Juveniles Received Into Security Units: Turkey. Ankara: Turkish Statistical Institute.

TUIK. (2011b). Turkey in Statistics. Ankara: Turkish Statistical Institute.



- UN-HABITAT. (2010). State of the Urban Youth, 2010/2011: Leveling the Playing Field: Inequality of Youth Opportunity. Nairobi, Kenya: United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-HABITAT).
- UNODC. (2003). *Health Services, Education & Community Action Preventing Drug Abuse in Turkey*. Ankara: UNODC, Project office for Turkey.
- Vegh, D. T. (2011). College Students and the Illicit Use of Prescription Drugs: A Test of General Strain Theory. Ph.D. Dissertation, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts. Retrieved from <a href="http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.ohiolink.edu:9099/pqdweb?did=2332027691&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=7987&RQT=309&VName=PQD">http://proquest.umi.com.proxy.ohiolink.edu:9099/pqdweb?did=2332027691&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=7987&RQT=309&VName=PQD</a> Available from A&I Dissertations & Theses database. (AAT 3449880)
- Wareham, J., Cochran, J. K., Dembo, R., & Sellers, C. S. (2005). Community, Strain, and Delinquency: A Test of a Multi-Level Model of General Strain Theory. *Western Criminology Review*, 6(1), 117-133.
- Warr, M. (1993). Parents, Peers, and Delinquency. [Article]. *Social Forces*, 72(1), 247-264. doi: 10.2307/2580168



Appendices



Appendix 1, Turkish Version of the Questionnaire

# ECAD YIE 2008

# BAĞCILAR SAHA ARAŞTIRMASI

# BAĞCILAR İLÇESİNDE YAŞAYAN GENÇLERİN YAŞAM KOŞULLARI

#### KOD: 09030. . . .

#### Lütfen! Cevaplarınızı hem soru kitapçığına hem de cevap anahtarına <u>birlikte</u> işaretleyiniz... !

# Öğrencilere:

Bu kitapçık içinde cevaplandırmanızı istediğimiz sorular içermektedir. Bu sorular sizin, değişik yaşam aktiviteleriniz veya benzeri önemli konulardaki düşünceleriniz ile ilgilidir. Büyük olasılıkla daha önce buna benzer konular içeren bir ankete katılmadınız. Biz sizin bu sorulara mümkün olduğunca dürüst cevaplar vereceğinizi biliyoruz. Düşüncelerinizi en iyi yansıtan cevaplar vermeniz anketin sonuçları ve geliştirilecek sosyal programlar için çok önemlidir.

Bu anket bir sınav değildir, hatta tamamıyla farklıdır çünkü hiçbir cevap diğerinden daha doğru değildir. Burada tek amaç sizin bakış açınızı bilmektir.

Birçok soruda, sizin, içlerinden sadece birini cevaplandırmanız gereken seçenekler mevcuttur. Cevaplandırmak istediğiniz sorunun seçeneğinin yanı başındaki kutucuğa "X" koyun. Soluk yazan kalem kullanmayın ve ayrıca seçtiğiniz cevap kutucuğunu tamamı ile karalamayın. Bir soruda cevabınızı değiştirmek isterseniz, bunun için en iyi yol yanlış cevap verdiğiniz soruyu kutucuğu ile birlikte tamamen karalamaktır, böylece beyaz boşluklar görünmeyecektir. Her sorudaki cevaplardan dilediğinizi seçmek size kalmıştır, ancak size uyanın en iyisini seçmeniz gerekmektedir. Eğer cevapların size uygun olmadığını ya da tam anlamı ile sizi ifade etmediğini hissederseniz, sizin doğru cevabınıza <u>en yakın</u> olan seçeneği işaretleyiniz.

Verdiğiniz cevaplardan ve yazdıklarınızdan sizin tanınmanız <u>imkânsızdır</u>. Kimse, ne öğretmenleriniz, ne aileniz, ne de sizi tanıyanlar veya arkadaşlarınız, sizin verdiğiniz cevaplara ulaşamayacaklardır. İsminizi ya da sizi tanımlayabilecek herhangi bir numarayı soru sayfalarına ve sorularla beraber gelen zarfa <u>vazmayın</u>. Soruları tamamen cevaplamayı bitirdiğinizde soru kitapçığını zarfa koyun, kapatıp yapıştırın ve masanızın üzerine bırakın. Zarflar herkes soruları bitirdiğinde toplanacaktır.

Eğer takıldığınız soru olur da soru sormak isterseniz, <u>kitapçığınızı kapatın</u> ve elinizi kaldırın. Görevli ya da öğretmen <u>masanıza elinde cevaplanmamış bir kitapçık ile gelecek ve cevaplarınızı</u> <u>görmeden</u> size yardım edecektir.



1. Cinsiyetiniz nedir ?

□ 1 Erkek □ 2 Kız

2. Doğum yılınız ? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

3. Kaçıncı sınıftasınız? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

- □ 1 8. sm1f
- **2** 9. smif
- **3** 10.smif

4. Kimlerle aynı evde yaşıyorsunuz? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

- □ 1 Annem ve babamla
- **2** Babam olmadan annemle
- **3** Annem olmadan babamla
- **4** Annem ve üvey babamla
- **5** Babam ve üvey annemle
- **6** Yalnız
- **7** Akraba
- **8** Büyükbaba-büyükanne
- 9 Yurt-pansiyon
- □ 10 Diğer
- 5. Annenizin eğitim durumu nedir? (Eğer sizi üvey anneniz yetiştirdiyse onun için yanıtlayınız. Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyiniz)
  - □ 1 Okur yazar değil.
  - 2 Lise/ortaokul/ilkokul mezunu
  - **3** Üniversiteden terk
  - 4 Üniversite mezunu
  - **5** Bilmiyorum
- 6. Babanızın eğitim durumu nedir? (Eğer sizi üvey babanız yetiştirdiyse onun için yanıtlayınız. Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)
  - □ 1 Okur yazar değil.
  - 2 Lise / ortaokul / ilkokul mezunu
  - **3** Üniversiteden terk
  - **4** Üniversite mezunu
  - **5** Bilmiyorum



7. Anneniz evin dışarısında çalışıyor mu? (Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

- □ 1 Annem ev hanımı
- **2** Annem evin dışarısında yarı zamanlı çalışıyor
- **3** Annem evin dışarısında tam zamanlı olarak çalışıyor
- 4 Annem işsiz
- **5** Annem çalışamaz durumda
- □ 6 Annem emekli
- **7** Annem öğrenci
- **8** Bilmiyorum/ yukarıdaki seçeneklerin hiçbiri uymuyor

8. Babanız evin dışarısında çalışıyor mu ? (Yalnızca bir şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

- **1** Babam evde çalışıyor (ev işlerini yapıyor )
- **2** Babam ev dışında yarı zamanlı çalışıyor
- **3** Babam ev dışında tam zamanlı olarak çalışıyor
- 4 Babam işsiz
- □ 5 Babam çalışamaz durumda
- **6** Babam emekli,çalışmıyor.
- **7** Babam öğrenci
- **8** Bilmiyorum/ yukarıdaki seçeneklerin hiçbiri uymuyor

9. Bu ülkede mi doğdunuz? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz)

□ 1 Evet □ 2 Hayır

10. Ebeveynleriniz (anne-baba) bu ülkede mi doğup büyüdü? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz)

a) Annem bu ülkede doğup büyüdü.b) Babam bu ülkede doğup büyüdü.

Evet	Hayır
$\Box_1$	$\square 2$
$\Box$ 1	$\square 2$

11. Ülkenizdeki diğer ailelere kıyasla, kendi ailenizin ekonomik durumunu nasıl değerlendiriyorsunuz? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz)

- 🗖 📔 Çok iyi
- Oldukça iyi
- **3** Biraz iyi
- **4** Diğerleri kadar iyi
- 🗖 5 🛛 Biraz kötü
- Goldukça kötü
- **7** Çok kötü

12. Oturduğunuz semtteki bir okula mı gidiyorsunuz? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz)

Evet Hayır  $\Box_1$   $\Box_2$ 

13. Okulunuzun ilk yarıyılındaki başarılarınızdan ne kadar memnunsunuz? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz)

Çok memnunum Oldukç	ta memnunum pek m	ıemnun değilim Hiç⊤ □3	memnun değilim
---------------------	-------------------	---------------------------	----------------



14. Yaşıtlarınızla karşılaştırıldığında, okulda (derslerde) ne kadar iyi olduğunuzu düşünüyorsunuz? (Yalnızca BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

- 1 Mükemmel, muhtemelen en iyilerden biriyim
- **2** Ortalamanın çok üzerinde
- 3 Ortalamanın üzerinde
- **4** Ortalama
- **5** Ortalamanın altında
- **6** Ortalamanın çok aşağısında
- **7** Kötü, muhtemelen en kötülerden biriyim

15. Ödev yapmak için genelde HER GÜN ne kadar zaman harcıyorsunuz? (Yalnızca BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

- Hiç ödev yapmam
  Yarım saatten az
  Yarım saat civarı
  1 saat civarı
  2 saat civarı
  3 saat civarı
- **7** 4 saat civarı
- $\square 8$  4 saatten fazla

16. Bu dönem, aşağıdaki derslerden aldığınız notlar kaçtır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	1'in altında	2 civarı	3 civarı	4 civarı	5 civarı		
a) Matematik		<b>2</b>	<b>□</b> 3	4			
b) Dil ve Anlatım		<b>2</b>	□3	□4	5		
17. Geçtiğimiz 30	) gün içinde k	taç tam gü	n okula gid	lemediniz?	(HER kategor	iden BİR seçen	eği işaretleyiniz.)
		Hiç	1 gün	2 gün	3-4 gün	5-6 gün	7 ya da daha fazla gün
a)Hastalık nedeniy	yle	□ <mark>1</mark>	<b>2</b>	<b>□</b> 3	□4	□ 5	<b>□</b> 6
b)Okuldan kaçtığı okulu kırdığınız iç	nız ya da çin	<b>1</b>	□2	□3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6
c) Diğer sebeplerl	e	□ <mark>1</mark>	□ <u>2</u>	□3	□4	5	
18. Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)							

	hemen hemen her zaman uyar	sıklıkla uyar	bazen uyar	ender olarak uyar	hemen hemen hiçbir zaman uymaz
a) Okul derslerini yararsız buluyorum.			□3	□4	5
b) Derslerden sıkılıyorum				□ 4	5
c) Dersler için önceden yaptığı hazırlıklar yetersiz	m 🗖 1	□ <u>2</u>		4	5



d) Dersler için yeterince çaba harcamadığım kanısındayım			□3	4	5
e) Bence dersler çok kolay		<b>2</b>		□4	5
f) Bence dersler çok zor		<b>2</b>		4	5
g)Okulda kendimi kötü hissediyoru:	m <mark>□1</mark>			□4	
h) Okuldan ayrılmak istiyorum		2		□4	5
i) Okulumu değiştirmek istiyorum		<b>2</b>	□3	□ 4	5
j)Öğretmenlerimle iyi anlaşamıyoru	m <mark>□1</mark>			□ 4	5

19. Bu okuldan mezun olduktan sonra ne yapmayı düşünüyorsunuz?

□ 1 Üniversiteye gitmeyi

2 Meslek okulu( yüksekokula) gitmeyi

**3** Çalışmaya başlamayı/İş aramayı

20. Sizce üniversiteye gitme olasılığınız nedir? (Yalnızca BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

<b>1</b>	Hiç olası deği
<b>2</b>	Olası değil
3	Olası
4	Çok olası

21. Geçtiğimiz 7 gün süresince aşağıdakileri ne sıklıkta yaptınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Hiç	1 kez	2 kez	3 kez	4 kez	5 kez	6 kez	7 kez
a) Bütün bir geceyi evde geçirdim		□ <u>2</u>	□3	□4	5	□ <mark>6</mark>	<b>□</b> 7	8
b) Akşam 8 den sonra dışarıdaydım				□4	□ 5	□ <mark>6</mark>	<b>□</b> 7	<mark>□</mark> 8
c) Gece 10'dan sonra dışarıdaydım			3	4	5	□ <mark>6</mark>	7	8
d) Dışarı çıktım ve gece yarısından sonra eve geldim	□ <mark>1</mark>	□2	□3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	<b>□</b> 7	8

22. Aşağıdaki davranışları ebeveynlerinizden görmeniz ne kadar kolay ya da ne kadar zordur? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

		Çok zor	Zor	Kolay	Çok kolay
a) b) c) d) e)	Sıcaklık ve ilgi Karşı cinsle ilişkiler ile ilgili konuşmak Derslerle ilgili tavsiyeler Başka konular (projeler) hakkında tavsiyeler Diğer başka şevlerde yardım		□ 2 □ 2 □ 2 □ 2 □ 2 □ 2	□ 3 □ 3 □ 3 □ 3 □ 3	□ 4 □ 4 □ 4 □ 4 □ 4



# 23. Aşağıdaki davranışları arkadaşlarınızdan görmeniz ne kadar kolay ya da ne kadar zordur? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

		Çok zor	Zor	Kolay	Çok kolay		
<ul> <li>a) Sıcaklık ve ilgi</li> <li>b) Karşı cinsle ilişkiler il</li> <li>c) Derslerle ilgili tavsiye</li> <li>d) Başka konular (projel</li> <li>c) Diğer başka şeylerde ş</li> </ul>	e ilgili konuşmak :ler er) hakkında tavsiyele yardım	□1 □1 r □1 □1	$ \begin{array}{c}       2 \\       2 $	□ 3 □ 3 □ 3 □ 3 □ 3	□ 4 □ 4 □ 4 □ 4 □ 4		
24. Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)							
	Neredeyse hiç	Nadiren	bazen	Sıklıkla	hemen hemen her zaman		
<ul> <li>a) Hafta içi okuldan sonra ola vaktimi ebeveynlerimle geçiri</li> </ul>	n 🗖 rim		□3	□4			
b) Hafta sonlarımı ebeveynler geçiririm	imle 🔲	□ <u>2</u>		4	5		

25. Aileniz hafta sonu gecelerinizi nerede geçirdiğinizi bilir mi? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

$\Box 1$	Hemen her zaman
$\square 2$	Sıklıkla
3	Bazen
<b>4</b>	Nadiren
	Neredeyse hiçbir zaman

26. Aşağıdaki ifadeler sizin durumunuza ne kadar uymaktadır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

1	Benim durumuma tamamen uyuyor	Benim durumuma oldukça uyuyor	Benim durumuma pek uymuyor	Benim durumuma hiç uymuyor
a) Ebeveynim için derslerimde başarılı olmam önemlidir.			□3	4
b) Ebeveynim evde neler yapabileceğime dair kesin kurallar koyar			□3	□4
c) Ebeveynim evin dışında neler yapabileceği dair kesin kurallar koyar	me 1		3	4
d) Ebeveynim akşamları ne zaman evde olman gerektiğine dair kesin kurallar koyar	m 🗖 1			4
e) Ebeveynim akşamları kimlerle olduğumu b	ilir 🗖 1			□4
f) Ebeveynim akşamları nerede olduğumu bili	r 🗆 1	□2		□4
g) Ebeveynim arkadaşlarımı tanır				4
h) Ebeveynim arkadaşlarımın ebeveynini tanı	r 🗆 1	<b>2</b>	□ 3	4
i) Ebeveynim sıklıkla arkadaşlarımın ebeveyniyle sohbet eder.		2	3	4



j) Ebeveynim ve arkadaşlarımın ebeveyni bazen sohbet etmek için buluşurlar.	□2	□3	4
<ul> <li>k) Ebeveynim boş zamanlarımı değerlendirme ve eğlence zamanlarımda neler yaptığımı takip eder.</li> </ul>		□3	4

27. Aşağıdaki ifadeler sizin için ne kad	27. Asağıdaki ifadeler sizin icin ne kadar gecerlidir? (HER kategoriden BİR seceneği isaretleviniz.)							
	Tamamen Geçerli	Biraz Geçerli	Emin Değilim (karar veremiyorum)	Pek Geçerli Değil	Hiç Geçerli Değil			
a) Ebeveynimin evimize yakın oturan yakın arkadaşları vardır.			□3	4	5			
b) Ebeveynim komşularımızın çoğunu ismen bilir.			3	□4	5			
c) Ebeveynimin bazen bazı komşularımızı ziyaret eder.	<b>□</b> 1	□ <u>2</u>	□ 3	4	5			
d) Komşularım bazen ebeveynimi ziyaret eder.		2	3	4	5			
e) Komşularımızdan bazen bazı şeyler (örn. süt ya da alet) ödünç alırız.		<b>2</b>	□3	4	5			
f) Komşularımız bazen bizden bazı şeyle (örn. süt ya da alet) ödünç alır.	er 🔲 1	2	3	□4	5			

28. Komşularınızın aşağıdaki durumlarla karşılaştıklarında HERHANGİ BİR TEPKİDE BULUNMA olasılıkları ne kadardır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Çok olası	oldukça olası	Hiçbiri	pek olası değil	Hiç olası değil
a)mahalledeki gençler okuldan kaçarsa ve etrafta oyalanırlarsa		□2	□3	4	5
b) gençler etraftaki evlerin duvarlarına yazı/resim çizerlerse	□1	2	□3	4	5
c) gençler yetişkinlere saygısızlık ederse	<b>□1</b>		□3	□4	5
d) evinizin önünde bir kavga çıkarsa				□ 4	
e) biri sokağınızdaki bir eve ya da arabaya zorla girmekteyse	□1	□ <u>2</u>		4	5

29. Lütfen her soruyu her kategoriden bir şık seçerek cevaplandırınız.



	Neredeyse Hiç	Biraz	Birkaç	Çok	Neredeyse hepsi
a) Size yakın oturan, göz aşinalığı ile tanıdığınız	z 🔲 1	<b>□</b> 2	3	□4	5
ne kadar genç var? b) Size yakın oturan, sizin yaşıtınız olan		□2	3	4	5
<ul> <li>c) Size yakın oturan, sizin yaşıtınız olan ne kadar gençle konuşuyorsunuz?</li> </ul>		<b>2</b>	□3	□4	5

#### 30. Lütfen aşağıdaki durumların size ne kadar uyduğunu belirtiniz. (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Neredeyse hiç	Nadiren	Bazen	Sıklıkla	Hemen hemen her zaman
a) Ebeveynim mali bakımdan yoksulluk çeker			3	4	5
<ul><li>b) Ebeveynimin bir araba satın alabilecel mali gücü yoktur.</li></ul>	k <b>□1</b>		3	4	5
<ul> <li>c) Ebeveynim, ihtiyaçları (örneğin yiyece ev giderleri, telefon) karşılayacak par zar zor bulur.</li> </ul>	ek, <b>□1</b> rayı	□2	3	4	5
d) Ebeveynlerimin, katılmak istediğim kol (klüp)faaliyetlerini (örnek: müzik çalmak ya da spor etkinlikleri) ödeyel kadar paraları yoktur.	□1 aleti bilecek	2	□3	4	5

#### 31. Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum	Biraz Katılıyorum	Pek Katılmıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum
a) Bazı durumlarda insanları dövmek ya da onlara vurmak haklılık taşır.			3	4
b) Biri bana kötü davrandığında onu dövmeye ya da ona vurmaya hakkım olduğunu düşünürüm.	□1	2	3	4
e) Bazen akran grubunuzdaki onurunuz korumak amacıyla insanlara vurmanız ya da onları yumruklamanız gerekir	ru 🔲 1	2	3	4
d) Arkadaş grubumda, kişisel bir saldır uğradığında saldırgana vurarak ya da döverek karşılık vermeyen birinin kork olduğu düşünülür.	1ya 🗖 1 ak		3	4

32. Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)


	Kesinlikle uyuyor	Biraz Uyuyor	Pek Uymuyor	Kesinlikle Uymuyor
a)Bazen akran grubundan dışlanmamak için sigara içmek gerekebilir.			□3	4
b) Bazen akran grubundan dışlanmamak için içki içmek gerekebilir.				4
c) Bazen akran grubundan dışlanmamak için esrar içmek gerekebilir.				4

33. Sizce ne yapmak arkadaşlarınızın saygısını kazandırır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

S	aygıyı çok fazla yükseltir	Saygıyı biraz yükseltir	Etkisi yoktur	Saygıyı biraz düşürür	Saygıyı çok fazla düşürür
a) Okulda başarılı olmak		□2	<b>□</b> 3	4	5
b) Sportif faaliyetlerde başarılı olmak			3	4	5
c) içki içmek			□3	□4	5
d) Sigara içmek		<b>□</b> 2	□3	4	5
e) esrar içmek			<b>□</b> 3	4	
f) İyi görünmek		<b>□</b> 2	□3	4	5
g) Yetişkinlerin kurallarına karşı olmak	□ <u>1</u>		□3	4	5
h) Dükkanlarda hırsızlık yap	mak 🗖	□ <u>2</u>	<b>□</b> 3	□4	5
i) Müzik hakkında bir hayli ç	çok 🔲	<b>2</b>	<b>□</b> 3	□4	5
şey bilmek J) Şiddet uygulamak			<b>□</b> 3	□ 4	

34. Aşağıdaki ifadeler geçen hafta içindeki ruh halinizi ne kadar iyi tanımlıyor? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Neredeyse hiç	Nadiren	Bazen	Sıklıkla
a) Kolayca sinirlendim ya da öfkelendim		<b>2</b>	□3	□ 4
b) Kontrol edemediğim öfke nöbetleri yaşadım		<b>□</b> 2		4
c) Eşyaları kırmak ya da ezmek istedim		□ <u>2</u>		□ 4
d) Birisiyle kavga ettim			3	□ 4
e) Birilerine bağırdım ya da bir şeyleri fırlattım			□3	□ 4

35. Aşağıdaki ifadeler sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)



	Tamamen geçerli	Oldukça geçerli	Pek geçerli değil	Hiç geçerli değil
a) Gelecekte nasıl görüneceğimi düşününce mutlu oluyorum		<b>□</b> 2	3	□ 4
<li>b) Çoğunlukla çirkin olduğumu ve çekici biri olmadığımı düşünüyorum</li>		<b>2</b>	3	4
c) Vücudumdan memnunum		<b>2</b>		□4
d) Vücudumda son yıllarda meydana gelen fiziksel değişimlerden hoşnudum.		2	3	4
e) Kendimi fiziksel olarak güçlü ve sağlıklı hissediyorum		<b>2</b>		4
f) Hayatımdan memnunum		<b>2</b>	3	□4
g) Mutluyum				□ 4

36. Aşağıdaki ifadelere ne ölçüde katılıyorsunuz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Tamamen katılıyorum	Biraz katılıyorum	Bilmiyorum	Pek katılmıyorum	Hiç katılmıyorum
a) Önemli gözükmeyen pek çok kural çiğnenebilir		2	3	4	5
b) Uymak istediğim kurallara uyarım				4	5
c) Aslında hayattaki kati kurallar çok azdır			□3	4	
d) Herhangi bir şeye güvenmek çok zordur çünkü her şey değişir			□3	4	
e) Aslında kimse hayatta kendisini neyin beklediğini bilmiyor		2	□3	4	5
f) Hayattaki hiçbir şeyden emin olamazsınız	□ <mark>1</mark>	<b>2</b>	□3	□4	5
g) Bazen başarıya ulaşmak için kuralları çiğnemek gerekir.	□ <u>1</u>	<b>2</b>		4	5
h) Kurallara uymak başarıyı garantileme	z 🗖 1	<b>□</b> 2	□3	□ 4	5



37. Geçtiğimiz hafta içinde	aşağıdaki ruhsal ya c	la fiziksel rahatsızlık	ları ne sıklıkta yaş	adınız? (HER kategoriden
BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)				
	(M	M. 41.	D	0.1.1.1.1

(Nei	redeyse) Hıç	Nadiren	Bazen	Siklikla
a) Sinirliydim		2		4
b) Ani korku duydum			□3	□ 4
c) Gergindim		2	3	4
d) Üzgündüm ve bir şeyler	. 🗆 1		□3	4
yapmak için olan isteğim çok azdı e) İştahım çok azdı		<b>□</b> 2		□4
f) Kendimi yalnız hissettim	$\Box_1$		□3	□4
g) Kolayca ağladım ya da			□3	4
ağlamak istedim h) Uyku sorunları yaşadım			□3	□ 4
i) Üzgün ya da kederli hissettim			□3	4
j) Hiç bir şey yapmak bana heyeca	n 🗖	2	□3	□ 4
k) Yavaş hareket ettim ya da az				□ 4
enerjim vardı l) Gelecek umutsuz gözüküyordu m) İntihar etmeyi düşündüm			3	4
n) Herkesin beni hayal kırıklığına		<b>2</b>	□3	4
uğrattığını hissettim o) Konuşacak hiç kimsem yoktu		<b>□</b> 2	□3	□ 4

38. Aşağıdaki ifadelerden herhangi biri sizin için geçerli mi? (HER kategorid	len BİR se F	içeneği işa Evet	retleyiniz.) Hayır
a) Daha önce hiç tanıdığınız biri size <u>intihar etmeyi</u> düşündüğünü söyledi mi?	I	<b>1</b>	□2
b) Daha önce hiç tanıdığınız biri <u>intihar girişiminde bulundu mu?</u>		□ <mark>1</mark>	<b>2</b>
e) Daha önce hiç tanıdığınız biri <u>intihar etti mi?</u>	I	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
d) Arkadaşlarınızdan biri ya da size yakın biri hiç <u>intihar girişiminde</u> bulundu mu?	[	<b>]</b> 1	□ <u>2</u>
e) Hiç arkadaşlarınızdan biri ya da size yakın biri <u>intihar edip öldü mü?</u>	I	<b>1</b>	□2
f) İntihar etmeyi hiç düşündünüz mü?	I	<b>□</b> 1	<b>2</b>
g) <u>Ciddi olarak</u> intihar etmeyi hiç düşündünüz mü?		□ <mark>1</mark>	□ <u>2</u>
h) Birisine intihar etmeyi düşündüğünüzü hiç söylediniz mi?		<b>1</b>	<b>□</b> 2
i) Hiç <u>ciddi</u> bir intihar <u>girişiminde</u> bulundunuz mu?		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
j) <u>Bu okul yılında</u> bir intihar girişiminde bulundunuz mu?			2



işaretleyiniz.)	Evet, son 30 gün içinde	Evet, son 12 ay içinde	Evet, son 12 aydan çok daha önce	Наун
a) Ciddi bir kaza				□ 4
b) Ağır bir hastalık		<b>2</b>	□ 3	4
c) Ebeveyninizin ayrılması ya da boşanması		□2	3	4
d) Ebeveyninizle ciddi bir kavga		<b>2</b>	□ 3	4
e) Ebeveyninizin yaptığı ciddi bir tartışmaya tanık olmak			□3	4
f) Evinizde bir yetişkinin de karıştığı fiziksel bir şiddete tanık olmak			□3	4
g) Evinizde bir yetişkinin de karıştığı fiziksel bir şiddete karışmak			□3	4
h) Bir ebeveynin yada kardeşin ölümü			3	□4
i) Bir arkadaşın ölümü		2	3	4
j) Sevgiliden ayrılma		<b>□</b> 2		4
k) Arkadaşlarınız tarafından reddedilme			□3	4
l) Bir arkadaştan ayrılma		2	3	4
m) Çok düşük bir not alma			3	
n) Babanız ya da annenizin işini kaybetmesi	<b>1</b>		□3	4
o) Sınıftan kovulma ya da müdürün odasına gönderilme	<b>1</b>		3	4
p) Okuldan atılma				□4
q) cinsel istismar				□4
r) Aile içinden bir yetişkinin uyguladığı cinsel istismar			3	4
s) Aile dışından bir yetişkinin uyguladığı cinsel istismar		<b>2</b>	□3	4

39. Aşağıda belirtilen olaylardan herhangi birini daha önce hiç yaşadınız mı? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği isaretleviniz.)





40. Aşağıdaki ifadeler sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)					
Tamar	nen geçerli	Oldukça geçerli	değil	geçerli değil	
a) Kendimi en az diğer insanlar kadar değerli hissediyorum		□2	3	4	
b) Birçok iyi niteliğim olduğu kanısındayım		<b>2</b>		4	
c) Tamamıyla başarısız bir kimse olduğuma inanıyorum	<b>1</b>		3	4	
d) Bir şeyleri çoğu insan kadar iyi yapabilirim		<b>2</b>	3	4	
e) Gurur duyulacak pek fazla bir şeyim olmadığı kanısındayım		2	3	4	
f) Kendime karşı olumlu bir yaklaşımım var		2	3	4	
g) Genel olarak kendimden memnunum		<b>2</b>	3	4	
h) Kendime olan saygımın daha fazla olmasını isterdim			3	4	
i) Bazen hiçbir şekilde başarılı olmadığımı düşünüyorum			3	4	
j) Bazen kesinlikle işe yaramaz biri olduğumu düşünüyorum				4	

41. Aşağıdaki kurumlara ne kadar güveniyorsunuz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	çok fazla	çok	az	çok az
a) Dini kurumlar		<b>□</b> 2		4
b) İlkokullar		<b>2</b>	3	<b>□</b> 4
c) Mahkemeler			3	□ 4
d) Polis			3	4
e) Meclis			3	□ 4
f) Hükümet			3	□ 4
g) Medya			3	4
h) Sendikalar			3	4
i) Hastane, sağlık ocakları gibi sağlık servisleri			□3	4



#### 42. Aşağıdaki ifadeler sizin için ne kadar geçerlidir? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Tamamen Geçerli	Biraz Geçerli	Pek Geçerli Değil	Hiç Geçerli Değil
a) Mahallemde/çevremde epey canlı bir sosyal hayat var.			□3	4
b) Mahallemde/çevremde yaşamak iyi	idir 🗖 1	2	3	□ 4
c) Gelecekte de, şu anda yaşadığım mahallemde/çevremde yaşamaya deva etmek isterim.	□ <mark>1</mark> am	2	□3	4

43. Son 12 ay içinde...? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	evet	hayır
a)farklı bir mahalleye/çevreye taşındınız mı?		<b>2</b>
b) okul değiştirdiniz mi?		
44. Son 5 yıl içinde? (HER kategoriden BİR se	çeneği işaretleyiniz.) evet	hayır
a)farklı bir mahalleye/çevreye taşındınız mı?		□2
b) okul değiştirdiniz mi?	$\Box_1$	□ <u>2</u>

45. Kilonuz kaç kilogramdır?

**KİLOGRAM** 

46. Boyunuz kaç cm.dir?

SANTİMETRE

#### 47. Aşağıdaki ifadeler size ne kadar uymaktadır? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

]	Bana hiç uymaz	Bana pek uymaz	Bana biraz uyar	Bana tamamen uyar
a)Allah'a inanırım				4
b) İnancım benim için önemlidir			□3	□ 4
c) Allah'a düzenli olarak dua ederim		2	□3	4
d) Düzenli olarak kutsal kitabımı oku	ırum 🗖	□2		□ 4
e) Toplu dini ibadetlere (örn:Cuma namazı v.b) düzenli olarak katılırım			□3	4
f) Toplu ibadetlerin dışındaki dini faaliyetlere düzenli olarak katılırım			3	4





g) İhtiya sığınabil	ç duyduğumda irim	a Allah'a			2	3	□4			
h) Daha Allah'a s	h) Daha önce ihtiyaç duyduğumda Allah'a sığındım					3	4			
i) En iyi arkadaşlarım dindardır				2	<b>□</b> 3	□4				
j) Çoğu t	tanıdığım dind	ardır			2		□4			
k) Annem (üvey annem) dindardır				2	□3	□4				
l) Babam (üvey babam) dindardır						□3	4			
48. Aşağıdaki insanlardan herhangi biri günlük olarak sigara içiyor mu? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)										
işarottoyiniz.)			Hayır	Evet	Uymuyor					
a) Babar	n			□ <u>2</u>	□ 3					
b) Anner	n									
c) Karde	ş(lerim)			2	3					
49. Hay	atınız boyund	ca kaç kez siga	ra içtiniz? (Ya	lnızca BİR seçen	eği işaretleyiniz	z)				
Hiç	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10 <b>-</b> 19 kez	20 <b>-</b> 39 kez	40 kez ya da dal	ha fazla			
□ <mark>1</mark>		□ 3	4	5	□ <u>6</u>	7				
50 Geçtiğimiz 30 gün içinde ortalama olarak ne sıklıkta sigara içtiniz? (Yalnızca BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz)										
I	□ 1 Sigara kullanmam									

- **2** haftada 1 sigaradan az
- **3** günde 1 sigaradan az
- **4** günde 1-5 sigara
- **5** günde 6-10 sigara
- **G** günde 11-20 sigara
- **7** günde 20 sigaradan fazla

#### 51. Aşağıdakileri hayatınız boyunca ne sıklıkta kullandınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Kullanmıyorum	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-19 kez	20-39 kez	40 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Tütün çiğnemek (Maraş otu dahil)		<b>□</b> 2	□3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	7
b) Enfiye		□2	<b>□</b> 3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	7





#### 52. Aşağıdakileri son 30 gün içinde ne sıklıkta kullandınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Kullanmıyorum	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-19 kez	20-39 kez	40 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Tütün çiğnemek		<b>2</b>	□3	<b>□</b> 4		<b>□</b> 6	□7
b) Enfiye		□ <u>2</u>	<b>□</b> 3	□4	5	<b>6</b>	

53. Aşağıdakileri hayatınız boyunca ne sıklıkta kullandınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

k	Hiç ullanmadım	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-19 kez	20-39 kez	40 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Size reçeteyle yazılmış <u>Ritalin</u>			□3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	<b>□</b> 7
b) Reçetesiz/dokto tarafından tavsiye edilmediği halde <u>Ritalin</u>	or 🔲 1	<b>2</b>	3	□4	5	6	□7

54. Son 30 gün içinde aşağıdaki içkileri ne sıklıkta tükettiniz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

1	Alkol kullanmam	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-19 kez	20-39 kez	40 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Bira		<b>□</b> 2		□ 4	5	□ <u>6</u>	<b>□</b> 7
<ul> <li>b) Alkollü hafif</li> <li>içecekler(alkopo</li> </ul>	□ <mark>1</mark> op)	□2	□3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	<b>□</b> 7
c) Şarap	□1	<b>□</b> 2	3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
d) Alkollü sert içkiler (rakı vs)		<b>2</b>	3	□ 4	5		

#### 55. Herhangi türde bir alkollü içkiyi ne sıklıkta içtiniz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

k	Alkol ullanmam	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-19 kez	20-39 kez	40 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Hayatınızda	a 🗆 1	<b>□</b> 2	□3	□4	5	□ <mark>6</mark>	□7
b) Son 30 gün icinde		<b>2</b>	□3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	<b>□</b> 7

56. Kaç kez sarhoş oldunuz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Alkol kullanmam	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-19 kez	20-39 kez	40 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Hayatınız	da 🔲 1		□3	□ 4	5	<b>□</b> 6	<b>□</b> 7
b) Son 30 gü içinde	in 🗆 1		3	□ 4	5	□ <u>6</u>	<b>□</b> 7



#### 57. Aşağıda belirtilen yerlerde içki içer misiniz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Alkol kullanmam	Asla	Nadiren	Bazen	Sıklıkla
a) Evinizde		<b>□</b> 2		□4	
b) Başka birinin evinde		<b>2</b>		□4	5
c) Şehir merkezinde		<b>□</b> 2	□3	<mark>□ 4</mark>	5
d) Açık havada herhangi bir yer	de 🔲	<b>□</b> 2		□ 4	5
e) Bir klüpte ya da barda		<b>□</b> 2		4	
f) Bir okul dansında/balosunda		<b>2</b>	□3	□4	5
g) üniversite dansında/balosunda	a 🗖 1	<b>2</b>	3	4	5
h) Bir gençlik klubünde/		<b>□</b> 2	□3	□4	5
<ul><li>merkezinde</li><li>i) Eğitim ya da kültür gezilerind</li></ul>	e 🛛 1	<b>□</b> 2		□4	□ 5
j) Başka bir yerde		<b>□</b> 2		□4	5

58. Aşağıdaki uyuşturucuları (eğer kullandıysanız) ne sıklıkta kullandınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Hiç	1-2 kez	3-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-19 kez	20-39 kez	40 kez ya da
a) Reçetesiz satılan uyku ilaçları ya da ya da sakinleştiriciler		<b>□</b> 2	3	4	5	6	$\square 7$
b) Esrar (marihuana ya da ot)		<b>□</b> 2	<b>□</b> 3	<b>□</b> 4	5	□ <mark>6</mark>	□7
c) Amfetamin (speed)		<b>2</b>		<b>□</b> 4	5	6	<b>□</b> 7
d) LSD (asit)		<b>□</b> 2		<b>□</b> 4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
e) Ecstasy (kimyasal haplar)		<b>□</b> 2	<b>□</b> 3	<b>□</b> 4	□ <u>5</u>	□ <u>6</u>	<b>□</b> 7
f) Kokain		□ <mark>2</mark>	<b>□</b> 3	<b>□</b> 4	□ <u>5</u>	□ <u>6</u>	<b>□</b> 7
g) Relevin		<b>□</b> 2	<b>□</b> 3	□4	5	□ <u>6</u>	<b>7</b>
h) Sihirli mantar (magic mushroor	n) 🗖	<b>□</b> 2	3	<b>□</b> 4	5	□ <mark>6</mark>	□7
i) Bali, tiner ya da diğer uçucular		<b>2</b>	□3	□ 4	5	□ <mark>6</mark>	□7
j) Anabolik streoidler		□ <u>2</u>	<b>□</b> 3	<b>□</b> 4	□ <u>5</u>	□ <u>6</u>	<b>□</b> 7
k) Ev yapımı / kaçak içkiler		□ <u>2</u>	□3	4	5	□ <u>6</u>	□7





#### 59. Aşağıda belirtilenleri ilk ne zaman yaptınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Hiçbir zaman	11 yaş ya da daha genç	12 yaş	13 yaş	14 yaş	15 yaş ya da daha büyük
a) İçki içmek		<b>2</b>	□3	□4	5	□ <u>6</u>
b) Sarhoş olmak		□ <u>2</u>	□3	<b>□</b> 4	<b>□</b> 5	□ <u>6</u>
c) Sigara içmek			□3	<b>□</b> 4	5	<b>□</b> 6
d) Günlük olarak sigara içmek			<b>□</b> 3	□4	□ <u>5</u>	<b>□</b> 6
e) Esrar (marihuana ya da ot) kullan	mak 🗖 1		<b>□</b> 3	□4	□ <u>5</u>	□ <u>6</u>

60. Son 12 ay içinde aşağıda belirtilenleri ne kadar sıklıkta yaptınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

:	Hiç yapmadım	1 kez	2-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-13 kez	14-17 kez	18 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Değeri 3 sinema biletinden <u>daha</u> <u>az</u> olan bir şeyi çalmak		□2	□3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
b) Değeri 3 sinema biletinden <u>daha fazla</u> olan bir şeyi çalmak	□ <mark>1</mark>	<b>□</b> 2	3	4		6	<b>□</b> 7
c) Soygun/hırsızlık yapmak için fiziksel şiddet kullanmak	□ <mark>1</mark>	□2	3	4	□5	6	□7
d) Hırsızlık yapmak için bir bina ya da arabaya zorla girmek	□ <mark>1</mark>	□2	□3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
e) Size ait olmayan bir şeylere hasa vermek ya da tahrip etmek	r 🗆 1	<b>□</b> 2	□3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
f) Başka suçlar işlemek	□ <mark>1</mark>	<b>□</b> 2	□3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
61. Liitton asačudaki soruları sizo	uyaun hir	sobildo		UTER L	tagoridan Bİ	P sacanaği isa	retleviniz)

61. Lütfen aşağıdaki soruları size uygun bir şekilde cevaplayınız. (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)								
	Шç	I KCZ	2-3 KCZ	0-9 KCZ	10-13 Kez	14-17 KGZ	daha fazla	
a) Son 12 ay içinde fiziksel şiddet mağduru oldunuz mu?		<b>□</b> 2	□3	□4	5	□ <u>6</u>	□7	
b) Son 12 ay içinde fiziksel şiddet uyguladınız mı?	<b>□</b> 1	<b>2</b>	3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	<b>□</b> 7	



62. Aşağıda belirtilenlerle hayatınız boyunca (eğer olduysa) ne sıklıkta ilginiz oldu? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Hiç	1 kez	2 kez	3-4 kez	6 kez ya da
a) Alkol ya da madde kullanımından ötürü <u>rehabilitasyon/terapi</u> gördünüz		2	□3	4	$\Box \frac{1}{5}$
b) Suçla ilginiz bulunduğu <u>şüph</u> esiyle polis tarafından <u>sorguy</u> a çekildiniz		2	□3	4	5
c) <u>İşlemiş</u> olduğunuz bir suçu <u>kabul</u> ettiniz	□1	□2	□3	4	5
d) Polis tarafından sorgulanırken <u>işlemediğiniz</u> bir suçu <u>kabul</u> ettiniz		□2	□3	4	5
e) Polis tarafından sorgulanırken <u>işlemiş</u> olduğunuz bir suçu <u>reddettiniz</u>	□ <mark>1</mark>	<b>□</b> 2	3	4	5
f) Hapis cezası alarak ya da almayarak bir suctan ötürü hüküm giydiniz		2	3	4	5

63. Aşağıdakileri yaparsanız ebeveynlerinizin nasıl tepki göstereceklerini düşünüyorsunuz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Tamamen karşı olurlar	Çok karşı olurlar	Az-çok karşı olurlar	Umursamazlar
a) Sigara içerseniz		<b>2</b>		4
b) Sarhoş olursanız		2	3	□ 4
c) Esrar içerseniz			3	4

64. Son 12 ay içinde aşağıda belirtilenleri ne kadar sıklıkta yaptınız? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Hiç	1 kez	2-5 kez	6-9 kez	10-13 kez	14-17 kez	18 kez ya da daha fazla
a) Birini yumruklamak		<b>□</b> 2	<b>□</b> 3	<b>□</b> 4	□ <u>5</u>	□ <u>6</u>	□7
b) Birine vurarak devirmek		<b>2</b>	<b>□</b> 3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
c) Birini tekmelemek		<b>2</b>	□3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6	7
d) Birine vurmak/tokatlamak		<b>□</b> 2	□3	□ 4	5	<b>□</b> 6	<b>7</b>
e) Birini boğazından tutmak		<b>□</b> 2	□3	□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7
f) Birini şiddet kullanarak tehdit		□ <u>2</u>	□3	□4		<b>□</b> 6	<b>□</b> 7
etmek g) Birini sizinle <u>cinsel yakınlığa</u> girmesi için zorlamak		<b>□</b> 2	□3	□4	5	□ <mark>6</mark>	□7
h) Birini sizinle <u>cinsel birleşmeye</u> girmesi için zorlamak				□4	5	<b>□</b> 6	□7

## 65. Kaç arkadaşınızın son 12 ay içinde aşağıda belirtilenleri yaptığını düşünüyorsunuz? (HER kategoriden BİR seceneği işaretleviniz )

seşenebi işineneşinmi)	Hiç	Çok azı	Birkaçı	Çoğu	Hemen hemen hepsi
a) Değeri 3 sinema biletinden daha <u>fazla olan</u> bir şeyi çalmak		<b>□</b> 2	3	<b>□</b> 4	5
b) Hırsızlık yapmak için bir bina ya da arabaya zorla girmek		□2	□3	4	5
c) Onlara ait olmayan bir şeylere hasar vermek ya da onları tahrip etmek	<b>□</b> 1	2		□4	5

66. Kaç arkadaşınızın aşağıdakileri yaptığını düşünüyorsunuz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Hiçbiri	Çok azı	Birkaçı	Çoğu	Hemen hemen hepsi
a) Sigara içmek		□ <u>2</u>	□3	□ 4	5
b) İçki içmek (bira, şarap ya da alkollü sert içkiler ) c) Ayda en az 1 kere sarhoş olmak		<b>2</b>	<b>□</b> 3	□ 4	5
		<b>2</b>	□3	4	5
d) Esrar ya da marihuana içmek		<b>2</b>	□3	4	5
e) Kavga çıkarmak		<b>2</b>	□ 3	4	5
f) Bela aramak				□4	

67. Herhangi bir sportif faaliyet ya da beden eğitimi yapıyor musunuz? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

Neredeyse	Haftada	Haftada	Haftada	Haftada	Hemen hemen
hiç	1 kez	2 kez	3 kez	4-6 kez	her gün
			□ 4	5	<b>6</b>

68. Aşağıdaki sorular spor ve aerobik aktivitelerle ilgilidir. (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

Ν	Veredeyse hiç	Haftada 1 kez	Haftada 2 kez	Haftada 3 kez	Haftada 4-6 kez	Hemen hemen her gün
<ul> <li>a) Okulda zorunlu beden eğitimi dersleri dışında ne sıklıkla bir spo antrenmanına katılıyorsunuz?</li> </ul>	or 1	□2	3	□4		<b>□</b> 6
<ul> <li>b) Ne sıklıkla bir spor klubünde/ takımında sporla ilgileniyorsunuz (idman ya da yarışma)</li> </ul>	□ <mark>1</mark> ??	□2	3	4	5	<b>□</b> 6
c) Okul ya da spor klubü/takım dışında ne sıklıkta egzersiz ya da spor yapıyorsunuz?	<b>1</b>	□2	□3	4	5	
d) Kendinizi yorgunluk ya da terleme derecesinde ne sıklıkta yoruyorsunuz?	□1	□2	□3	4	5	6



## 69. Kol (klüp) faaliyetleri dışındaki sosyal organizasyonlara ya da boş zamanları değerlendirme ve eğlence organizasyonlarına katılıyor musunuz? (Yalnızca BİR şıkkı işaretleyiniz.)

Neredeyse	Haftada 1'den	Haftada	Haftada	Haftada	Hemen hemen
hiç	az	1 kez	2-3 kez	4-5 kez	her gün
	<b>□</b> 2		□4	5	□ <u>6</u>

70. Aşağıdaki aktiviteleri ne sıklıkta yapıyorsunuz? (HER kategoriden BİR seçeneği işaretleyiniz.)

	Neredeyse hiç	Yılda birkaç kez	Ayda birkaç kez	Haftada 1-2 kez	Haftada 3 kez ya da daha fazla
a)Yetişkinlerin bulunmadığı bir ortamda	1 🗆		□3	□4	
arkadaşlarla vakit geçirmek b) Sinemaya gitmek				<b>□</b> 4	5
c)Kafeye gitmek			□3	4	
d)Dışarıda gezinmek ve mağazalara				<b>□</b> 4	5
goz atmak e) Hafta sonları ya da akşamları şehir				□4	
merkezinde vakit geçirmek f) Bir alışveriş merkezinde vakit geçirme	ek 🛛 1			□4	□ 5
g) Bir partiye/eğlenceye gitmek			□3	□4	
h) Bir fast-food restoranına gitmek			3	□4	
i) El sanatları, dikiş ya da giysi tasarımı			3	4	
j) Okul saatleri dışında bir yüzme			3	□4	
k) Tiyatroya gitmek		<b>□</b> 2		□4	5
l) Kütüphaneye gitmek				<b>□</b> 4	
m) Klasik müzik konserlerine gitmek			3	□4	
n) Klasik müzik konserleri dışındaki		<b>2</b>		4	5
o) Canlı müzik olan eğlencelere gitmek				4	5
p) Müze ya da sanat galerilerine gitmek		□ <u>2</u>	3	□4	5

#### ANKETİMİZE KATILDIĞINIZ İÇİN ÇOK TEŞEKKÜR EDERİZ...

#### LÜTFEN ANKET KİTAPÇIĞINI ZARFA KOYUN, AĞZINI KAPAYIN VE <u>CEVAP</u> <u>KAĞIDI İLE BİRLİKTE</u> ÖĞRETMENİNİZE VERİN.

#### TÜM SORU KİTAPÇIKLARI VE CEVAP ANAHTARLARI İSTATİSTİK PROGRAMINA AKTARILDIKTAN SONRA <u>İMHA EDİLECEKTİR...</u>

Appendix 2, Original Version of the Questionnaire

+

+

# Youth in Europe 2008

## Youth and welfare

## A survey of the life and living conditions of European youth

- Confidential -

© ICSRA 2008



+

108

+

+

www.manaraa.com

#### To students

This booklet contains several questions which you are being asked to respond to. These questions concern your opinions on various issues, as well as different types of activities you are, or might be, involved in. You have probably never participated in a survey regarding similar issues, but we still hope you can respond to these questions as conscientiously as possible, because your responses are very important. It is also important that you respond to the questions in a way which best describes your opinion. This is completely different from examinations, *as no answers are more correct than others.* The only important thing here is for your opinions to be made known.

+

Most of the questions have several options to choose your answer from, and you need to choose only one of them. Put an X in the box next to the answer you have chosen. Do not use a very faint pencil, and also, do not fill the box you have chosen completely. If you change your mind, the best thing to do is to completely erase the wrong answer or completely shade the box with the wrong answer, so that no white spaces can be seen. A few of the questions are such that no answers are provided, and you are requested to write your answer. In such cases, you must write very clearly, using capital letters, and put only one letter in each box. It is up to you to decide whether you will respond to each particular question, but we ask that you answer all questions to the best of your ability. If you feel that none of the answers provided to certain questions accurately describes your opinion or accurately suits you, choose the answer that you think is closest to the truth.

It will be impossible to trace your answers to you, in other words, no one you know, not your teachers, parents, acquaintances or friends, could ever access your personal responses. Make sure you do not write *your name or any personal identification numbers* on the questionnaire sheets or on the envelope provided with it. When you have finished answering all the questions, put the questionnaire in the envelope, seal it completely, and leave it on your desk. The envelopes will be collected when everyone has finished, all the questionnaires will be collected.

If you have any questions to ask about certain items, close your booklet and raise your hand. An employee or teacher will come to your desk with an unanswered version of the questionnaire to assist you without seeing your answers.

With deep gratitude and appreciation,

Page 2

[The research team ]

Youth in Europe 2008

+



+

+

#### 1. Are you a boy or a girl?

🗆 Boy 🛛 Girl

+

2. Year of birth? (Choose only ONE option)

□ 1990 □ 1991

1992

1993

1994

- 1995
- 1996

#### 3. Grade/Class in school? (Choose only ONE option)

🛛 9th grade/class

10th grade/class

#### 4. Which of the following persons live in your home? (Choose only ONE option)

□ Both parents

8th grade/classs

- Mother but not father
- Father but not mother
- □ Mother and her partner
- Father and his partner
- □ I live with friends
- □ I live on my own
- □ I live in different arrangements

#### 5. What is the highest level of schooling your mother completed? (If you are mostly brought up by a

- fostermother you answer for her) (Choose only ONE option)
  - **Primary s**chool or less
  - Started high school but has not finished
  - Graduated from high school
  - Started junior college or trade school but has not finished
  - Graduated from junior college or trade school
  - Started university but has not finished
  - Graduated from a university
  - □ I don't know/doesn't apply

#### Page 3

+

Youth in Europe 2008

+



110

+

#### 7. Does your mother work outside the home? (Choose only ONE option, the one that suits best)

- Mother works at home (takes care of the household)
- □ Mother works part-time outside the home
- □ Mother works full-time outside the home
- □ Mother is unemployed
- □ Mother is disabled
- Mother is retired (has finished her working career)
- □ Mother is studying
- □ Mother is studying and works outside the home
- Don't know/doesn't apply



+	+			
10. Are your pare	nts born and raised	l in this country	?	
(Choose ONE	l option in EACH ca	tegory)		
	-	Yes	No	Elsewhere

a) Mother is born in this country		
b) Mother is raised in this country		
c) Father is born in this country		
d) Father is raised in this country		

11. Is [NATIVE LANGUAGE of Country] spoken in your home? (Choose only ONE option)

Yes	Yes, together with a different language	No, only a different language

+

#### 12. How well off financially do you think your family is in comparison to other families in your country? (Choose only ONE option)

Much better off

- Considerably better off
- A little better off
- Similar to others
- A little worse off
- Considerably worse off
- Much worse off

#### 13. Which religious sect or community do you belong to? (Choose only ONE option)

- Catholic
- Lutheran
- 🗆 Muslim / Islam
- □ Orthodox
- An Independent or Autonomous church
- Other
- I am outside religious communities

#### 14. Do you go to school in the neighborhood you live in? (Choose only ONE option)

+

Yes	No

Page 5

Youth in Europe 2008 +

المنسارات

#### 17. What have your grades been in the following subjects this semester?

(Choose ONE option in BOTH categories)

	Less	About	About	About	About	About	About	About
	than 4	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a) Mathematics								
b) [NATIVE LANGUAGE]								
c) [SECOND LANGUAGE	]							

#### 19. How well do the following statements apply to you ?

(Choose ONE option in EACH category)

	2	Applies almost ilways to me	Applies often to me	Applies sometimes to me	Applies seldom to me	Applies almost never to me
a)	I find the school studies point	less 🗖				
b)	I am bored with the studies					
c)	I am poorly prepared for classes					
d)	I feel I do not put enough effo into the studies	ort 🛛				
e)	I find the studies too easy					
f)	I find the studies too difficult					
g)	I feel bad at school					
h)	I want to quit school					
i)	I want to change schools					
j)	I get on badly with the teachers					

#### 23. How easy or hard would it be for you to receive the following from your parents?

	Very difficult	Rather difficult	Rather easy	Very easy
a) Caring and warmth				
b) Discussions about personal affairs				
c) Advice about the studies				
d) Advice about other issues (projects) of yours				
e) Assistance with things				



		Applies very well to me	Applies rather well to me	Applies rather poorly to me	Applies very poorly to me
a)	My parents find it important that I do well in my studies				
b)	My parents set definite rules about what I can do at home				
c)	My parents set definite rules about what I can do outside the home				
d)	My parents set definite rules about when I should be home in th evening	.e			
e)	My parents know whom I am with in the evenings				
f)	My parents know where I am in the evenings				
g)	My parents know my friends				
h)	My parents know the parents of my friends				
i)	My parents often talk to the parents of my friends	s 🗖			
j)	My parents and the parents of my friends sometimes meet to talk to one another				
k)	My parents follow what I do in my recreational time				

#### 27. How well do the following statements apply to you ? (Choose ONE option in EACH category)

#### 29. How likely or unlikely is it that your neighbours would do something about it if...?

		Very likely	Rather likely	Neither	Rather unlikely	Very unlikely
a)	the youths in the neighbourhood were skipping school and hanging around					
b)	the youths were graffing on houses in the area					
c)	the youths disrespected the adults					
d)	if a fight broke out in front of your house					
e)	somebody were breaking into a car or a house on your street					



#### 32. How well do the following statements apply to you?

		Strongly agree	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Strongly disagree
a)	Sometimes there are situations that justify people being beaten up or hit				
Ъ)	When someone treats me badly I thin it is okay to beat up him/her or hit him/her	k 🗆			
c)	Sometimes you need to hit or punch people in order to protect your honou in your peer group	□ 11			
d)	He/she who does not respond to a personal attack by hitting or beating up the person is considered a coward in my group of freinds				



### 33. How well do the following statements apply to you? (Choose ONE option in EACH category)

+

+

a)	Sometimes it is necessary to smoke cigarettes in order not to be left out in the peer group	Strongly agree	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Strongly disagree
b)	Sometimes it is necessary to drink alcohol in order not to be left out in the peer group				
c)	Sometimes it is necessary to smoke cannabis in order not to be left out in the peer group				

#### 34. What do you consider important to do to gain respect from your friends?

(Choose ONE option in EACH category)

	Increases	Increases	Has	Decreases	Decreases
	respect	respect	no	respect	respect
	a lot	somewhat	effect	somewhat	a lot
a) To do well in school					
b) To do well in sports					
c) To drink alcohol					
d) To smoke cigarettes					
e) To smoke cannabis					
f) To look good					
g) To be against the rules of adults					
h) To steal from shops					

#### 35. How well does the following describe your mood in the past week?

(Choose ONE option in EACH category)

		Almost never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often
a)	I was easily annoyed or irritated				
b)	I experienced outbursts of anger th I could not control	nat 🗖			
c)	I wanted to break or damage things				
d)	I had a row with someone				
e)	I yelled at somebody or threw thing	gs 🗖			

Youth in Europe 2008

Page 12

+

116

+

#### 37. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

(Choose ONE option in EACH category)

		Strongly agree	Agree somewhat	Don't know	Disagree somewhat	Strongly disagree
a)	One can break most rules if they don't seem to apply					
b)	I follow whatever rules I want to follow					
c)	In fact there are very few absolute rules in life					
d)	It is difficult to trust anything, because everything changes					
e)	In fact nobody knows what is expected of him/her in life					
f)	One can never be certain of anything in life					
g)	Sometimes one needs to break rules in order to succeed					
h)	Following rules does not ensure success					

#### **39. Does any of the following apply to you?** (Choose ONE option in EACH category)

		Yes	No
a)	Has somebody told you that he/she was thinking about committing suicide?		
b)	Has anyone of your aquintances or anyone else you are familiar with at any time tried to commit suicide?		
c)	Has anyone of your aquintances or anyone else you are familiar with committed suicide?		
d)	Has enyone of your friends or someone else close to you ever tried to commit suicide?		
e)	Has enyone of your friends or someone else close to you ever committed suicide?		
f)	Have you ever thought about committing suicide?		
g)	Have you ever seriously considered to commit suicide?		
h)	Have you ever told anyone that you were thinking about committing suicide?		
i)	Have you ever made an attempt to commit suicide?		
j)	Have you made an attempt to commit suicide during this school year?		



40. Have v	you experienced an	v of the following?	(Choose ONE	or MORE o	ptions in EACH category )
		,	(		paces and manager, /

	Yes,	Yes,	Yes,	
	during last	during last	more than	
	30 days	12 months	12 months ago	No
a) A serious accident				
b) A severe illness				
c) A separation or divorce of your parents				
d) A serious argument with your parents				
e) Witnessed a serious argument by your parents				
<ul> <li>f) Witnessed a physical violence in your home were an adult was involved</li> </ul>				
g) Been involved in physical violence in your hom were an adult was involved	ne 🗖			
h) The death of a parent or sibling				
i) The death of a friend				
j) A break up with a girlfriend/boyfriend				
k) Been rejected by your friends				
l) A separation from a friend				
m) Received an exceptionally low grade				
n) Father or mother lost a job				
<ul> <li>Been dismissed from class or sent to the principal's office</li> </ul>				
p) Been expelled from school				
q) Experienced sexual abuse (victim)				
<ul> <li>r) Experienced sexual abuse where an adult from within the family was involved</li> </ul>				
s) Experienced sexual abuse where an adult from outside the family was involved				



		Applies very well to me	Applies rather well to me	Applies rather poorly to me	Applies very poorly to me
a)	I feel that I am worth at least as much as others				
Ъ)	I feel that I have number of good qualities				
c)	All in all I am inclined to feel that I am a failure				
d)	I am able to do things as well as most other people				
e)	I feel I do not have much to be proud	of 🛛			
f)	I take a positive attitude towards myself				
g)	On the whole I am satisfied with mysel	f 🗆			
h)	I wish I had more respect for myself				
i)	At times I think I am no good at all				
j)	I certainly feel useless at times				

#### 41. How well do the following statements apply to you? (Choose ONE option in EACH category)

#### 45. Have you, during the last 5 years ....? (Choose ONE option in EACH category)

	Never	Once	Twice	Three times	Four times	Five times or more
a)moved to a different						
b)changed schools						

#### 49. Does someone of the following persons smoke tobacco on a daily basis?

	No	Yes	Doesn't apply
a) Father			
b) Mother			
c) Sibling (one or more)			



#### 53. How often have you used the following <u>during the last 30 days</u>?

(Choose ONE option in EACH category)

	Never	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40 times
		times	times	times	times	times	or more
a) Chewing tobacco							
b) Snuff							

#### 56. How often have you had a drink of alcohol of any kind? (Choose ONE option in EACH category)

	Never	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40 times
		times	times	times	times	times	or more
a) In your life time							
b) During the last 30	days 🗖						

#### 59. How often (if ever) have you used any of the following drugs?

		Never	1-2	3-5	6-9	10-19	20-39	40 times
			times	times	times	times	times	or more
a)	Over the counter sleepin pills or or tranquillisers	ng 🗖						
b)	Cannabis (hashish or marijuana)							
c)	Amphetamines (speed)							
d)	LSD (acid)							
e)	Ecstasy (E-tablets)							
f)	Cocaine							
g)	Heroin							
h)	Relevine							
i)	Mushrooms							
j)	Sniffing (e.g. glue)							
k)	Anabolic steroids							
1)	Homemade brews/pote	en 🗖						



#### 61. How often (if ever) have you done any of the following during the last 12 months?

(Choose ONE option in EACH category)

				2-5	6-9	10-13	14-17	18 times
		Never	Once	times	times	times	times	or more
a)	Stolen something worth <u>less than</u> 3 normal movie ti	 .ckets						
b)	Stolen something worth <u>more than</u> 3 normal movie	□ tickets						
c)	Used physical violence in order to rob/steal							
d)	Broken into a building or a car to steal							
e)	Damaged or vandalized things that did not belong t	D to you						
f)	Committed other offence							
	What other offence:							

## **65. How many of your friends do you think have done the following during the last 12 months?** (Choose ONE option in EACH category)

	None	A few	Some	Most	Almost all
a) Stolen something worth more than 3 movie ticket	s 🗖				
b) Broken into a building or a car in order to steal					
c) Damaged or vandalized things that did not belong to them	<sub>5</sub> □				

#### 68. Do you engage in any form of physical training or sport? (Choose only ONE option)

Almost	Once	Twice	3 times	4-6 times	Almost
never	a week	a week	a week	a week	every day



	Almost never	Less than once a month	1-3 times a month	1-3 times a week	4 times a week or more
a) Spend time with friends where no adult is present					
b) Go to the cinema/movies					
c) Go to a café					
d) Stroll around and have a loc at the shops	ok 🛛				
e) Spend time downtown duri the evening or on the weeke	ng 🗖 mds				
<li>f) Hang out inside or outside a news agent/shopping cent</li>	Te				
g) Go to a party					
h) Go to a fast-food restaurant					
i) Go to sporting events					
<li>j) Go to a swimming pool outside school hours</li>					
k) Go to a theatre					
l) Go to a library					
m) Go to classical concerts					
n) Go to concerts, other than					
classical ones					
o) Go to playses whith live mu	isic 🗖				
p) Go to museums or art galleries					

#### 71. How often do you do the following? (Choose ONE option in EACH category)



## Please put the questionnaire in the envelope, paste it and return to the teacher.

## All questionnaires will be destroyed after the data entry.

## We thank you very much for your participation

© ICSRA 2008

Youth in Europe 2008

المنسارات

+

+

*Page 26* +

+

### Vita

Fatih Cipil was born in Turkey in 1974. He graduated from Police College, Ankara, Turkey in 1991. He received his Bachelor of Arts in Criminal Justice from Turkish Police Academy. He received a Master of Science in Institute of Naturel and Applied Sciences from Gazi University in 2004. Also he received Doctorate of Philosophy degree in Environmental and Technical Research of Accidents. He taught as an adjunct faculty at Firat University. Cipil has several publications.

