

Social Control Theory and the Connection With Ideological Offenders Among Israeli Youth During the Gaza Disengagement Period

Mally Shechory

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

Avital Laufer

Netanya Academic College, Netanya, Israel

The present study examined whether social control theory is capable of explaining youth's law violations in instances of conflict between the ideological religious worldview and the laws of the country in which they reside. Differences in the control factors (commitment, belief, attachment, and involvement) were examined among Israeli adolescents who took part in legal activity ($n = 163$) and illegal activity ($n = 99$) during the resistance to the Gaza evacuation. The findings indicate that the model provides a partial explanation for ideological delinquency. It was found that involvement with friends and the absence of belief in the formal legal system were associated with illegal ideology activity. Attachment to friends and parents and involvement with parents had no effect on youth's participation in illegal ideological activities.

Keywords: *social control theory; ideological delinquency; Israeli youth; Gaza disengagement*

On February 16, 2005, a law allowing the implementation of the Gaza disengagement plan was accepted in the Israeli parliament. The disengagement plan called for the evacuation of both the Jewish population and the forces of the Israeli army from the Gaza Strip, as well as that of the Jewish residents from several settlements in Samaria.

Following the Israeli government's decision to implement the Gaza disengagement plan, many residents of the Gaza Strip and the Judea and Samaria settlements answered a call to resist and actively oppose the implementation of the plan. The period of time from the day that the decision was taken until the settlements were evacuated, in September 2005, was marked by media reports, in Israel and abroad, of continuous

Authors' Note: The study was supported by the Samaria and Jordan Rift R&D Center. Address correspondence to Mally Shechory, PhD, Bar-Ilan University, Department of Criminology, 52900, Ramat-Gan, Israel; e-mail: mally@bezeqint.net.

antidisengagement protests. Opposition to the plan's implementation was characterized by intensive teenage activity that included legal activities, such as participation in rallies, demonstrations, public letters of protests and persuasion, a variety of stickers, and the distribution of orange ribbons as a symbol of opposition and identification with opponents. Illegal teenage activities were witnessed as well, such as blocking main traffic arteries, participating in unauthorized demonstrations, and exercising resistance to the security forces during the evacuation process. A considerable number of teenagers were arrested, and they refused to cooperate with the legal authorities.

Most teenagers who participated in antidisengagement activities came from a religious Zionist background. From a religious aspect, this group views holding on to every part of the Promised Land as a religious obligation, and it therefore perceived the evacuation of the settlements as a sin. Moreover, this group is committed to the right-wing ideologies that regard the retention of Gaza, Judea, and Samaria as a means of maintaining Israel's security. Thus, it regarded the evacuation of settlements as a security risk for the existence of the State of Israel (Susskind et al., 2005).

Studies indicate that adolescents are the ones most sensitive to ideological influences (Dawes, 2001; Elder, 1980), owing to the fact that they are going through a crucial stage of psychosocial development, characterized by the search for and consolidation of ego identity (Erikson, 1968; Moss, 1994; Tzuriel, 1990). It is during this stage that worldviews related to political positions and processes are examined and the adolescent's ideological identity is shaped (Archer, 1989). To the best of our knowledge, studies that have examined political ideology during adolescence in the context of international comparisons are few. The study conducted by Ichilov (2005) is unusual in this sense.

Ichilov (2005) indicated that Israeli youth tend to have more developed political identities and a higher ideological awareness than teenagers in other parts of the world. It is reasonable to assume that the reason why is that they live in a country that is under constant threat from an external enemy. Clausewitz (1832/1978) noted that one of the determining factors in the formation of political awareness is such a threat, which is a ever-present reality in Israel. Moreover, Israeli adolescents who identify with hawkish right-wing positions tend to have more consolidated views and be ideologically committed to a far greater extent than adolescents who identify with the political Left (Arian, 1995; Raviv, Raviv, Sadeh, & Silberstein, 1998).

Studies regarding ideology commitment and illegal activities tended to focus on political terrorism, altruistic suicide, and martyrdom among political offenders (e.g., Constantelos, 2004; Post, 2000). Most studies indicated that ideological activities, including violence and illegal activities, tend to occur when the ideas and practices of a particular group are neglected or are threatened by another ideology group. Merton (1957) described the ideological delinquent, the nonconformist, as someone who fights for values and standards that he or she believes in, even if they contradict the law. The goal is to replace social norms with those that are more acceptable to him or her, even if this involves a serious risk of punishment, even death. The ideology

offender will commit a crime in the name of the ideology that he or she believes in, while refusing to accept the claim that law and justice are determined by decision makers in the society in which he or she lives (Ellens, 2004; Schafer, 1974).

Generally, there is a dearth of material on the subject of youth ideological delinquency and that regarding the association between level of youth ideology obligation and one's tendency to be involved in illegal ideology activities. Hence, the present study examines the differences in the ideology obligation of teenagers who participated in legal antisengagement activities and that of those that participated in illegal activities. We expected to find a stronger ideological obligation among youth who were involved in illegal activity as compared to those who were involved in legal activity, although the two groups were committed to the same right-wing ideology. This finding would be supposedly due to the fact that the actions of adolescents who are actively involved in antisengagement illegal activities represent a stronger manifestation of ideological commitment.

To further understand the difference between youth's legal and illegal ideological activity, the current study also examined whether social control theory, commonly used to examine youth delinquency, may be applied for understanding youth ideological illegal activities. Social control theory is regarded as one of the major contributors to the understanding of juvenile delinquency. As a rule, social control theory refers to different types of criminal delinquency while stating that adolescence is the age group in which most criminal activity begins (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1995). Social control theory attempts to understand what prevents people from committing crimes; that is, what stops them from realizing their natural motivation to break the law? According to this theory, most people are conformists because of the social control that is imposed on them.

In general, one can say that social systems deter a person's tendency to adopt deviant behavior patterns, by means of formal mechanisms (police, prisons, courts) and nonformal mechanisms (religious decrees, cultural leaders, cultural and historical tradition). In relating to social control factors, Hirschi (1969) emphasized the enormous impact of nonformal mechanisms in deterring criminal behavior, mainly with regard to attachment to parents and socialization agents. According to the theory, nonviolation of the law is the result of the internalization of conventional beliefs, laws, and social norms (the inherent strength of the norm; Hirschi, 1969; Meier, 1982) and the respect for the socialization agents that impart these laws and norms (Fagan & Pabon, 1990; Hirschi, 1969; Kaplan, 1995). Specifically, Hirschi refers to the forces controlling criminal behavior as a social bond that comprises four elements: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief.

The concept of attachment indicates the strength of an individual's connection to the accepted social system. Most researchers regard parents as the main socialization and social control agents. They also regard positive social bonds as a function of previous experience in the various socialization systems, such as parents, peer groups, school, and community (Fagan & Pabon, 1990; Gottfredson & Hirschi,

1995; Kraft & Pianta, 2000; Reid, Patterson, & Snyder, 2002; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003). *Commitment* refers to the manner and degree of one's investment in adhering to rules and norms and, subsequently, one's assessment of the loss incurred by violating the law. In fact, we are talking about commitment to long-term educational, occupational, or other conventional goals. *Involvement* refers to participation in conventional activities, such as studies, work, and hobbies. Involvement may be examined in terms of activities in school and with parents and peer groups. The fourth element—belief in the moral validity of the law—refers to the acceptance or nonacceptance of social norms, laws, and conventions.

According to social control theory, the stronger and more positive the fabric of these relationships, the more conformist the individual's behavior; the weaker it becomes, the more liable the individual is to turn to criminal behavior. But although Hirschi argued that the more closely a person is tied to conventional society in any of these ways, the more closely he or she is likely to be tied in other ways (Hirschi, 1969), the dimensions of the social bond can independently influence delinquency (Costello & Vowell, 1999).

Empirical studies on the subject are generally supportive of the theory, (e.g., see Chapple, McQuillan, & Berdahi, 2005; Costello & Vowell, 1999; Wiatrowski, Griswold, & Roberts, 1981). However, the respondents in these studies were either criminal juvenile delinquents or adolescents who had been involved in criminal activities for which they had not been tried. To the best of our knowledge, social control theory was not yet examined regarding youth's political-religious ideological delinquency, although the association between religiosity and social control was vastly examined.

Hirschi and Stark (1969), who examined the effect of religiosity on delinquency, failed to find significant effects. However, their study led other scholars to examine the relevance of religiosity to the etiology of delinquency and deviance (Benda, 1995, 1997; Cochran, Wood, & Arneklev, 1994; Johnson, Joon Jang, Larson, & De Li, 2001). They found that the relationship between religiosity and adolescent deviance becomes nonsignificant after controlling for family and peer variables in multivariate models (Bahr, Hawks, & Wang, 1993; Benda, 1995, 1997; Burkett & Warren, 1987; Cochran, Wood, & Arneklev, 1994; Elifson, Peterson, & Hadaway, 1983; Johnson, Joon Jang, Larson, & De Li, 2001). According to these studies, the effects of religiosity on deviance are mediated by social control and social learning variables. For example, Evans and colleagues (1995) indicated that the effects of religiosity on criminal acts are partly indirect via secular controls, such as legal deterrents and social constraints, with the direct effects remaining significant after holding the secular controls constant. Similarly, a study conducted by Johnson, Cullen, Danaway, and Burton (2001) revealed that the effect of religiosity on delinquency is partly mediated by nonreligious variables of social control and socialization. The authors indicated that adolescent religiosity reduced delinquency partly because religious involvement increases youth disapproval of delinquent acts and the proportion of conventional friends in peer networks.

These studies, however, did not examine delinquency that derives from the offender's religious commitment. Moreover, as mentioned and as far as we know, no studies have been conducted to examine these correlations in the context of juvenile delinquency motivated by ideological considerations.

Therefore, the present study is an attempt to examine whether the control measured enumerated by Hirschi (1969) differentiates between adolescents who share religious ideological perceptions and violate the law or not. In other words, the study examined whether the concept of social control theory may be used to explain violations of the law in cases that constitute a clash between religious ideology and the laws of the country in which one resides.

To find the answers to the above questions, we examined the legal and illegal behavior patterns of adolescents who actively participated in protest activities against the implementation of the Gaza disengagement plan.

Method

Participants

The study involved 262 adolescent participants from 56 settlements in Judea and Samaria, and it consisted of 88 boys (33.6%) and 174 girls (66.4%). To examine the differences between the participants according to the nature of the activity that they were involved in, the sample was divided into two groups: One group consisted of 163 adolescents (64 boys and 99 girls) who participated in illegal activities; the second group consisted of 99 adolescents (24 boys and 75 girls) who participated in legal activities. The average age of the participants was 16.20 years ($SD = 1.18$).

The adolescents had lived in Judea and Samaria for an average of 13.33 years ($SD = 4.26$). Most of them were born in Israel (97.33%) and described themselves as being religious (98.4%). Most of their parents were married (92%). No significant differences were found between the two groups with regard to their backgrounds.

Measurement

Personal Background Questionnaire. The Personal Background Questionnaire questionnaire included demographic questions (age, gender, level of religious observance, family background, etc.). Participants were also asked to provide the reasons that drove them to participate in antidisengagement activity. The questions referred to concern for the Biblical Land of Israel, religious belief, hatred of Arabs, concern for the evacuees, and so forth.

Evacuation process participation questionnaire. This questionnaire determined the extent of an adolescent's participation in the evacuation process, and it included 18 questions relating to active opposition to the disengagement process. Questions

were divided into two categories, according to the nature of the activity: legal activity (distribution of ribbons, stickers, public notices, participation in demonstrations and rallies) and illegal activity (blocking main traffic arteries, arrests, clashes with military/police forces). Participants involved in at least one illegal activity were placed in the illegal activity group. As such, none of the adolescents in the legal activity group were involved in any illegal activity.

Control Theory Questionnaire. Hirschi's Control Theory Questionnaire (1969) is a self-reporting questionnaire that includes 36 questions, divided into four dimensions: attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. Responses to the questionnaire items are graded according to a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all*, 5 = *very much*). The full questionnaire is presented in Appendix A.

Hirschi (1969) differentiated between attachment to and involvement with parents, school, and friends but did not separate commitment and belief with regard to these groups (parents, school, and friends). Therefore, the present study examined attachment and involvement measures with regard to relationships with parents and friends.

The attachment measure consists of 16 questions, 9 of which relate to the nature of the adolescent's relationship with parents ("To what extent do your parents understand you?" "To what extent do you take your parents' opinions into consideration?"; $\alpha = .84$). The remaining 7 relate to the adolescent's relationship with friends ("To what extent do your friends understand you?" "To what extent do you take your friends' opinions into consideration?"; $\alpha = .79$).

The involvement measure includes three questions that relate to the amount of time devoted to involvement with parents and shared activities that are unconnected to household routine ("To what extent are you and your parents involved in shared activities that are unconnected with household routine?"; $\alpha = .69$). The measure also includes three questions relating to activities and involvement with friends ("To what extent do you participate in the activities of your group of friends?"; $\alpha = .60$). These two measures have rather moderate internal consistencies, and results pertaining to them should be interpreted with caution. However, because we considered the study as an exploratory study, we decided to include these two measures.

We should note that both measures, involvement with parents and involvement with friends, include the identical question "To what extent do you watch television together with your [parents/group of friends]?" which was not included in the analyses. This question was found to be inappropriate for the research population, given that few in the religious population watch television on a regular basis and some families do not even own a television set.

The commitment measure includes four questions that relate to both the extent to which the individual invests in conventional activities and the extent of his or her motivation to succeed ("Are you willing to volunteer for a social activity that you are not obliged to take part in?"; $\alpha = .82$).

The belief measure includes four questions that relate to acceptance of norms and laws: "At school I comply with the set rules and regulations" (reverse), "Most offenders are not to blame for their actions," "It's okay to violate the law as long as you are not caught," "In order to get ahead, I may have to do things that do not always comply with accepted norms" ($\alpha = .36$). In light of this low internal consistency in the belief measure, we decided to check it using only one question, as follows: "In order to get ahead, I may have to do things that do not always comply with accepted norms."

We chose this question because it represents the perception that the person will be prepared to violate the law solely for the sake of achieving his or her objective.

Ideological Obligation Questionnaire. The Ideological Obligation Questionnaire (Solomon & Laufer, 2004) examines ideological obligation without reference to the respondents' political views. Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 5 = *very much*) how much each of 20 statements reflects their position—for example, "I'm willing to participate in demonstrations," "I'm willing to try to persuade other people to believe in my political views," "It bothers me that some people hold political views opposed to mine." The full questionnaire is presented in Appendix B. The score comprised the mean of the participant's responses. Internal consistency for the scale was $\alpha = .82$. This questionnaire was administered in another study on Israeli youth and was found to be reliable (Solomon & Laufer, 2004).

Procedure

The sample is a targeted one whereby research assistants visited entertainment, leisure, and other places and events (youth movement meetings, rallies) where adolescents residing in Judea and Samaria gather. There, research assistants asked adolescents in the relevant age group to participate in the study, and they clearly stated that the aim was to examine teenagers who had taken an active part in the struggle against the disengagement. Thus, the sample included only those adolescents who actively participated in anti-evacuation-related activity. The participants did not receive any incentives, and participation was voluntary.

Because the participants were adolescents, they were given an information page for them and their parents, requesting their participation and emphasizing that the questionnaires are for research purposes only. Some 20 adolescents refused to participate in the study, although they claimed that they had participated in antidisengagement activities. They suspected that the purpose of the study was to serve the requirements of Israel's security services.

The questionnaires were distributed during the period of the implementation of the Gaza disengagement process. The data were collected over a period of about 6 weeks, from the beginning of August 2005 until mid-September.

Analytical methods used SPSS 13.0 and included descriptive statistics for legal and illegal activities, z tests for comparing boys with girls, multiple variance analyses for

ideology, Hirschi's scales (1969) by type of activity (legal/illegal) and gender (2×2), and linear regression analysis.

Results

Background Data Relevant to the Evacuation

Research findings indicate that 79% of the adolescents reside in settlements that may be slated for evacuation at some time in the future. The majority (82.2%) are personally acquainted with people who were evacuated from their homes in the current disengagement process, including family members (38.8%), friends (35.8%), and other acquaintances (25.4%).

Activity Patterns in Antidisengagement Protests

Table 1 presents the distribution of disengagement activity involvement among the evacuation youth, according to type of activity and gender. It represents the positive answers only, and the percentages represent adolescents who answered each item.

Table 1 show that 60% of the adolescents participated in some kind of illegal protest activity. In addition, with regard to legal activity, the most common activity (over 90%) included participation in rallies and prayer sessions for the annulment of the decree, as well as demonstrations held outside the evacuated areas. Regarding gender, boys tended to participate in illegal activity more than girls ($\phi = -.15, p < .05$).

In response to the question about the reasons and motivation that drove the participants to take part in antidisengagement activity (according to the Personal Background Questionnaire), 80% to 90% of the adolescents in both groups noted that the main motivation behind opposition to the evacuation was ideological belief, followed by religious belief. No clear differences were found between boys and girls and between legal and illegal groups in response to this question. It appears that ideology was the motivation behind the adolescents' participation in both legal and illegal activity.

Examination of Ideological Obligation

To examine the differences between the groups regarding ideological obligation, we conducted a two-way variance analysis. Table 2 presents the means, standards deviations, and variance analysis of the ideological obligation measure according to activity pattern and gender.

The findings indicate that adolescents involved in illegal activity tend to have higher levels of ideological obligation than do adolescents involved in legal activities, $F(1, 256) = 28.89, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$. Regarding the differences between genders, girls tended to have a higher level of ideological obligation than that of boys, $F(1, 256) = 8.91, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$. No interaction was found between gender and type of activity, $F(1, 256) = 1.21, ns, \eta^2 = .01$.

Table 1
Distribution of Activity Patterns of Adolescents
During the Evacuation Process

	Boys		Girls		Total		Difference <i>z</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	
Legal activity	88	100.0	174	100.0	262	100.0	—
Distribution of orange ribbons	72	81.8	126	72.4	198	75.6	1.67
Distribution of stickers	63	71.6	108	62.1	171	65.3	1.53
Involvement in organization of protest activities (headquarters)	37	42.0	71	40.8	108	41.2	0.19
Hanging of public notices	33	37.5	46	26.4	79	30.2	1.84
Participation in rallies and prayer sessions for annulment of decree	76	86.4	160	91.9	236	90.1	1.43
Participation in demonstrations outside evacuation area	81	92.0	164	94.3	245	93.5	0.68
Participation in demonstrations within evacuation area	53	60.2	119	68.4	172	65.6	1.31
Persuasion of soldiers to refuse orders	39	44.3	84	48.3	123	46.9	0.61
Participation in establishment of protest tents	31	35.2	62	35.6	93	35.5	0.07
Move to reside in Gush Katif	19	21.6	72	41.4	91	34.7	3.17***
Illegal activity	64	72.7	99	56.9	163	62.2	2.49*
Participation in blocking roads	41	46.6	63	36.2	104	39.7	1.62
Physical confrontation with the army	31	35.2	68	39.1	99	37.8	0.61
Physical confrontation with police force	32	36.4	59	33.9	91	34.7	0.39
Arrest and time in prison	25	28.4	28	16.1	53	20.2	2.34
Participation in burning tires and using caltrops	19	21.6	25	14.4	44	16.8	1.47
Dismantling of evacuation-related military equipment	16	18.2	26	14.9	42	16.0	0.67
Physical confrontation with Palestinians	13	14.8	19	10.9	32	12.2	0.90
Physical confrontation with Leftist demonstrators	8	9.1	22	12.6	30	11.5	0.85

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Social Control Measures: Commitment, Belief, Attachment, and Involvement

To examine the differences between the groups according to social control measures as described by Hirschi, we conducted a multiple variance analysis. Table 3 presents the means, standard deviations, and multiple variance analysis of commitment, belief, attachment, and involvement according to activity pattern and gender.

The findings in Table 3 indicate that adolescents who were involved in illegal activity tend to have a lower sense of belief and a higher level of involvement with

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Variance Analysis of Ideological
Obligation According to Activity Pattern and Gender (*n* = 260)

	Boys				Girls				<i>F</i> (1, 256)		
	Legal Activity		Illegal Activity		Legal Activity		Illegal Activity		According to Gender	According to Activity Pattern	Gender × Activity Pattern
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Ideological obligation	3.56	0.57	3.86	0.54	3.69	0.60	4.14	0.37	8.91** ($\eta^2 = .03$)	28.89*** ($\eta^2 = .10$)	1.21 ($\eta^2 = .01$)

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Table 3
Means, Standard Deviations, and the Multiple Variance Analysis of
Belief, Commitment, Attachment, and Involvement According to
Activity Pattern and Gender (*n* = 231)

	Boys				Girls				<i>F</i> (1, 227)		
	Legal Activity		Illegal Activity		Legal Activity		Illegal Activity		According to Gender	According to Activity Pattern	Gender × Activity Pattern
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Belief	4.08	0.88	3.86	1.23	4.26	0.98	3.58	1.35	0.10 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	6.94** ($\eta^2 = .03$)	1.82 ($\eta^2 = .01$)
Commitment	3.70	0.46	3.76	0.63	4.05	0.43	3.84	0.52	8.16** ($\eta^2 = .04$)	1.03 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	3.08 ($\eta^2 = .01$)
Attachment–Parents	3.21	0.54	3.20	0.60	3.56	0.71	3.37	0.71	6.80** ($\eta^2 = .03$)	1.05 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	0.82 ($\eta^2 = .01$)
Involvement–Parents	2.56	0.69	2.47	0.73	2.82	0.72	2.59	0.72	3.28 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	2.24 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	0.52 ($\eta^2 = .01$)
Attachment–Friends	3.43	0.68	3.58	0.64	3.54	0.73	3.59	0.59	0.42 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	1.03 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	0.30 ($\eta^2 = .01$)
Involvement–Friends	3.62	0.60	3.88	0.69	3.43	0.77	3.72	0.52	3.22 ($\eta^2 = .01$)	7.99** ($\eta^2 = .03$)	0.02 ($\eta^2 = .01$)

***p* < .01.

friends when compared to adolescents who were involved in legal activity. Regarding the differences between boys and girls, the girls tended to have a higher level of commitment to conventional activity as well as a higher attachment level with parents. No interaction was found between gender and type of activity.

The association between Hirschi’s social control measures (1969) and ideological obligation was examined via Pearson correlation. The findings in Table 4 indicate

Table 4
Pearson Correlation Between the Study Variables

	Ideology	Belief	Commitment	Attachment– Parents	Involvement– Parents	Attachment– Friends
Belief	.04					
Commitment	.24***	.38***				
Attachment–Parents	.24***	.14*	.28***			
Involvement–Parents	.06	.07	.18**	.41***		
Attachment–Friends	.29***	.02	.25***	.38***	.13*	
Involvement–Friends	.27***	.07	.24***	.14***	.21***	.41***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 5
Linear Regression Analysis to Predict Illegal Activity

		<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β	<i>R</i> ² change (%)
Step 1	Gender	.15	.06	.15*	2.3
Step 2	Ideology	3.42	.05	.37***	15.1
Step 3	Belief	-.10	.04	-.14**	6.1
	Commitment	-.09	.05	-.10	
	Attachment–Parents	-.06	.04	-.09	
	Involvement–Parents	-.00	.04	-.00	
	Attachment–Friends	.01	.04	.01	
	Involvement–Friends	.11	.04	.16**	
<i>R</i> ²					23.6

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

significant associations between ideology and (a) attachment and involvement with friends, (b) commitment, and (c) attachment to parents. No significant associations were found regarding the associations between ideology and belief and between ideology and involvement with parents.

Associations Among Ideology Obligation, Social Control Measures, and Illegal Activities

A linear regression analysis for predicting illegal activity was conducted. The first step included gender; the second, ideological obligation; and the third, social control measures: belief, commitment, attachment to parents and friends, and involvement with parents and friends. As shown in Table 5, results indicate that ideological obligation had the highest partial correlation coefficient and the highest explained variance for illegal activity. Other variables that were found to be significantly associated with illegal activity are disbelief in authority and being male.

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to examine the differences between adolescents who took part in legal ideology activity and illegal ideology activity during the resistance to the Gaza evacuation, using variables that deal with ideological obligation and four social control factors: belief in the formal legal system, commitment to conventional activity, attachment and involvement with friends, and attachment and involvement with parents. While examining these differences, we attempted to examine whether social control theory, with regard to the correlation between weakened control factors (belief, commitment, attachment, and involvement) and criminal delinquency, was capable of explaining law violations in instances of conflict between ideological religious worldview and the laws of the country in which one resides.

Nature of Antidisengagement Activity and the Extent of the Adolescents' Ideology

Findings in the present study indicate that, as a rule, all the participants took part in some kind of activity in opposition to the implementation of the disengagement plan. The most common form of legal activity involved participation in rallies and prayer sessions for the annulment of the decree, in demonstrations, and in the distribution of ribbons and stickers. The high involvement of the youth in legal activity indicates that even the ideological offenders first tried the legal path to achieve their targets. Therefore, it seems that the illegal activities of the youth do not represent a completely different path of activity but may be regarded as an exaggeration of the legal path. It seems that for some ideological youth, illegal activity is an extension of legal activity when the latter seems to fail. Therefore, further studies should examine the point at which legal ideological activity changes and becomes illegal.

Support for the assumption that illegal ideological activity is to a large extent an extension of legal ideological activity may be garnered from the similarity of the motivation factors that were behind the involvement of teenagers in the disengagement. Those who participated in only legal activities, like those who participated in illegal activities, stated that their main motivation to participate was based on ideology—concern for the Greater Israel. In fact, 90% of the adolescents claimed that they were primarily motivated by ideological–political considerations. The second motivation that was mentioned by both groups was based on religion—the belief that abandoning parts of the Holy Land constitutes a religious sin. The similarity in the motivation source of both groups suggests that participation in illegal, as well as legal, activity derived from the same commitment to the adolescent's value system. In other words, the adolescents in the study regard the evacuation of land belonging to the Land of Israel as being in total contradiction to their religious and ideological beliefs. This being the case, they felt the need to act to express their opposition to the government's action, by either legal or illegal means.

Although there were no differences between the two groups with regard to the motivation for activity, there was a difference between their levels of ideological obligation. The illegal group was characterized by higher and more extreme ideology obligation as compared to the group that did not take part in illegal activity. In other words, although the two groups had a common ideological base, the degree of ideological obligation found among adolescents who turned to illegal activity was more extreme. This finding indicates that it is not ideological belief that is liable to motivate adolescents toward involvement in illegal activities but rather the strength of their commitment to that belief. The stronger and more rigid the belief, the greater the chances are of involvement in illegal ideological activity.

Overall, these results support our assumption that adolescents who took part in illegal activity cannot be defined as criminal juvenile delinquents but are rather examples of ideological delinquency, because it is their ideological beliefs that fuel their activities. It seems that their ideological beliefs are served to justify their illegal activity. The common view among ideological delinquents is clearly shown in the present study, according to which “the means justify the end” even if the means are illegal (Ellens, 2004; Merton, 1957).

Legal Activity, Illegal Activity, and Social Control Theory

The focal point of the study was to examine whether the social control factors indicated by Hirschi (1969) are effective in explaining ideological delinquency. Regarding the differences between the groups according to social control factors, the study revealed that adolescents who turned to illegal activity differed from those who took part exclusively in legal activity, with regard to two measures: belief and involvement with friends. The level of belief among those who violated the law was lower, whereas their involvement with their peer group was higher, when compared to adolescents who did not violate the law. With regard to the remaining measures, attachment to friends and parents and involvement with parents, no differences were found between the groups.

In the present study, the dimension of belief examined acceptance of norms and formal laws. Involvement with friends refers to the time devoted to shared activity with friends. The findings indicate that the adolescent ideological delinquent lacks belief in the broad system, especially when the law is not compatible with the goals that derive from the youth system of expectations. Therefore, the youth will more easily tend to break the laws that he or she regards as being unworthy and unjust.

These findings indicate that the teenagers in this group regard the law as being conditional, that is, to be adhered to only if it is compatible to their basic beliefs. To the extent that a discrepancy exists between their basic beliefs and the law, they prefer adherence to their beliefs, even if it entails breaching the broader norms.

A similar study conducted by Kaniel (2003) indicates that among the young generation of settlers, there is a tendency to have a high level of obligation to the inner-group religious ideological value system. Part of those young settlers do not only

have a high religious and ideology obligation but also do not accept the sovereignty of the Israeli government to determine issues that contradict their value system.

The second measure associated with illegal activity was involvement with peers. Researchers have emphasized the fact that social bonds and friends' delinquency retain important direct effects on youth's delinquency (Costello & Vowell, 1999). Studies have also found that delinquent peer associations offer norms that undermine conventional beliefs in family and religion (Burkett, 1993; Paternoster, 1988). Although these findings refer to criminal delinquency, they may be able to explain, at least partially, the findings in the present study. In this regard, there is a clear similarity between the ideological offender and the criminal.

Moreover, the fact that illegal ideological activity is associated with peer involvement may indicate that the illegal activity is performed because of peer pressure and conformity to the ideological norms and beliefs of the peer groups. One claim is that ideological offenders associate with groups that espouse the same ideology (Gurr, 1980). In this way, the high involvement level with peers, in our opinion, reinforces their commitment to the in-group worldview, even at the expense of commitment to broader systems. This may be seen in the significant association between ideology obligation and peer involvement. Hence, among this group, high involvement with peers seems to be associated with a strengthened obligation to the in-group ideology belief. As described by Merton (1957), ideological offenders have a strong commitment to small group values, which seems to override commitment to preserve the values of the broader social context and, in fact, allows for their violation.

Thus, here lies the similarity between ideological offenders and criminal offenders. Both these groups have a low belief level in legal institutions and broader social norms, and both score high in involvement with their friends (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987; Junger & Marshall, 1997; Rankin & Kern, 1994; Rankin & Wells, 1990; Wiatrowski et al., 1981). This low belief in the broader norm system and the high involvement with the peer group, together with intensified ideological obligation, seem to be the force that drive these youth to engage in illegal activities. Nevertheless, the ideological offender is different from the criminal offender with regard to several measures, especially their attachment with parents.

Hirschi's theory (1969) states that one of the main factors in the involvement of adolescents in illegal activity involves the lack of parental social control, which is manifested in low attachment and involvement levels. Although studies have shown that criminal offenders have low attachment with parents (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1987; Junger & Marshall, 1997; Rankin & Kern, 1994; Rankin & Wells, 1990; Wiatrowski et al., 1981), this was not found regarding ideological offenders.

The present study shows that adolescents who were involved in illegal ideological activity had high attachment and involvement levels with parents and friends that were similar to the nonoffenders' levels. In our opinion, the fact that the attachment level to parents and friends among those who took part in illegal activity is no different from that of adolescents who took part in legal activity reinforces the assumption that their participation, whether legal or illegal, is compatible with the values of the

limited social group to which they belong. In other words, their illegal activity is a manifestation of high attachment to the religious and ideological values held by their parents. This finding can be supported by the fact that ideological obligation was positively associated with attachment to parents and friends.

In fact, the claim that the evacuation is illegal and perceived as a betrayal by the government was raised by the adult right-wing leaders and supporters (Halbental, 2005). In other words, viewing the government's actions as illegal, together with extreme ideological obligation, can be perceived as being compatible with parental values. It therefore follows that participation in illegal activity is not only an action not directed against parental values and social attachments but a manifestation of extreme commitment to these. Illegal activity in this case points to admiration and respect for socialization agents that instilled the ideological and religious values that led to this activity. This is very much in accordance with Benda's claim (1995) that "religious adolescents are bonded to and socialized by religious institutions" (p. 26), and so their behavioral patterns are guided by sanctions derived from the religion to which they are committed. These adolescents therefore have a lower tendency to violate the norms of the social group to which they belong and to engage in criminal activity. However, when the norms of their group are clashing with the norms of the society, as in the case of the disengagement, it appears that they will be more inclined to violate the norms of the larger society.

It seems that known explanations found in the literature with regard to the importance of family and parental control as factors that inhibit or facilitate delinquency (Datesman & Scarpitti, 1975; Hirschi, 1969; McCord, 1991; Wells & Rankin, 1986) cannot be applied when examining illegal activity resulting from ideological and religious beliefs. Perhaps, this is even truer with regard to girls.

Girls were found to have a higher attachment level to their parents when compared to boys, and they also demonstrated higher ideological obligation. We believe that their higher ideological obligation is in part a manifestation of their higher commitment to parents and inner group norms. Contrary to findings indicating that criminal activity tends to result from low attachment with parents (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1995; Hirschi, 1969; Zabriskie & McCormick, 2003), this does not seem to hold true with regard to ideological delinquency, especially when considering girls' ideological criminality.

Overall, the results indicate that although all the adolescents in the study were from a similar familial, ideological, and religious background, only some of them violated the law. It seems that intensified ideology obligation, greater involvement with the peer group, and lower belief in the law system encouraged the development of illegal ideology behavior. Nevertheless, according to our findings and the subsequent interpretations discussed here, this peer group influence does not seem to have weakened the adolescents' attachment to family or religion, nor did it undermine the values and beliefs imbibed in the home and religious environments. It seems that in the case of an ideological delinquent, the influence of the peer group merged with and reinforced the influence of the family and the religious ideology.

It may be that these findings can be explained according to the principles of social learning, according to which, behavior, beliefs, and tendencies are learned from the social environment through social interactions with other people. For example, Sutherland's differential association theory provides a good illustration of this perspective. According to the theory, both criminal and conventional behaviors are learned in association with significant others. Briefly, this theory states that people learn to commit deviant acts through interpersonal interactions with their social environment (Bartol, 2002; Sutherland, 1955).

Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that proponents of this approach would claim that ideological delinquency is similar to criminal delinquency in that the behavior is learned in both cases. As such, the ideological illegal activity is the result of the youth's learning of the accepted norms of his or her social environment. Hence, when the social group does not accept the law of the country as the ultimate adjudicator, there is more opportunity for youth illegal ideological activity to elevate.

With regard to Hirschi's social control theory (1969), the findings indicate that the motives behind ideology-based delinquency differ from those based on crime. Social control theory describes conformism in accordance with formal and nonformal social control factors as a result of primarily nonformal social control factors, especially, the parents. The assumption is that nonviolation of the law depends on the internalization of conventional beliefs, laws, and social norms—the inherent strength of the norm (see also, Meier, 1982)—and on admiration and respect for the socialization agents that impart those laws and norms (see also, Fagan & Pabon, 1990; Kaplan, 1995). As the findings of this study show, it is possible that in the clash between formal social norms (laws) and nonformal social norms (the fulfillment of ideological and religious values), the strength of nonformal mechanisms increase. In the present instance of ideological delinquency, it appears that it is the nonformal control factors that encouraged the adolescents to violate the law.

However, when examined with ideological obligation, ideology was found to be the basic motivation that was associated with the illegal ideological activity, over and above the effect of the social control mechanisms. As noted, attachment to and involvement with friends and attachment to parents were positively associated with ideological obligation. Therefore, it seems that high ideological obligation is a risk factor for youth illegal activity, especially when the ideology is part of a strong attachment to the inner group.

Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Continued Research

The present study has several limitations. First, the research population included only those adolescents who participated in antidisengagement activity and who agreed to complete the questionnaire. As stated above, the purpose of the study was to examine which of the adolescents who took part in the anti-evacuation protests would turn to illegal activity. We therefore lack information on adolescents who live

in the settlements and did not take part in antidisengagement activity. Hence, we are not able to apply the study's findings and conclusions to the overall religious adolescent population residing in Judea and Samaria. In future studies, attention should be given to a comparison with adolescents who are not involved in ideological activity with regard to the social control-related variables indicated by Hirschi (1969).

We should also note that the girls sample is larger than the boys sample. Nevertheless, although it was a target sample, girls were more willing to participate in the study. It was not indicated in any way that the girls were more prepared than the boys to participate in illegal activities. It is probably due to the fear of exposure that fewer boys volunteered to cooperate. However, because the statistical analyses include comparisons between the genders and all the data take into the consideration the size of the groups, in our opinion, the numerical differences between the girls and the boys have no impact on the findings.

Moreover, the present study did not examine the characteristics that define self-control and the individual psychological traits that differentiate adolescents involved in illegal and legal activity. These variables are pertinent (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1995) and worthy of investigation in future studies.

Appendix A:

Control Theory Questionnaire

1. Are you willing to volunteer for social activities when you are not obliged to participate?
2. Whatever I do, I try to do it properly.
3. In the future I am interested in a job in which I will be able to learn new things and new skills.
4. Do you do your homework on a regular basis?
5. Do you sometimes bunk lessons at school?
6. Do you sometimes shirk your responsibilities?
7. I usually try to keep my promises.
8. To what extent do you take part in activities related to your circle of friends?
9. To what extent do you take part in activities related to the educational institution where you study?
10. To what extent do you spend time with your friends?
11. To what extent are you in the habit of watching television with your friends?
12. To what extent are you involved in sports (or any other) activities with your friends?
13. To what extent do you spend time with your parents?
14. To what extent do you take part in activities with your parents that are not connected to routine household chores?
15. To what extent are you in the habit of watching television with your parents?
16. How much time do you usually spend with your parents in sports (or any other) activities?
17. To what extent is your relationship with your parents a good one?
18. To what extent do your parents understand you?

19. To what extent do you feel that your parents demand too much from you?
 20. To what extent do you share your thoughts and feelings with your parents?
 21. To what extent do your parents show an interest in your school activities?
 22. To what extent do your parents know of your whereabouts when you are not at home?
 23. To what extent do your parents know whom you are with when you are not at home?
 24. To what extent do you take into consideration (do you care about) your parent's opinions?
 25. To what extent do you think your parents will stand by (help) you if you get into trouble?
 26. To what extent do your close friends understand you?
 27. To what extent do you share your thoughts and feelings with your close friends?
 28. To what extent do your close friends know of your whereabouts when you are not at home?
 29. To what extent do your close friends know whom you are with when you are not at home?
 30. To what extent do you take into consideration (do you care about) your close friends' opinions?
 31. To what extent do you think your close friends will stand by (help) you if you get into trouble?
 32. To what extent is it important what your close friends think of you?
 33. When at school, I behave according to the school rules.
 34. In order to get ahead I need to do things that are not always in accordance with accepted norms.
 35. In my opinion, it is quite okay to violate the law as long as one is not caught out.
 36. Most offenders are not to blame for their deeds.
-

Appendix B: Ideological Obligation Questionnaire

1. I am willing to participate in demonstrations to express my political opinions.
2. I am willing to distribute stickers to drivers in order to express my political stance.
3. I am willing to volunteer to help a political movement that I believe in.
4. I participate in a political social movement where most members have similar political opinions to mine.
5. When someone else has political opinions opposed to mine, I am willing to argue with him.
6. It is important for me to convince those with political opinions opposed to mine that they are mistaken.
7. I think that some politicians should not be interviewed in the media as their opinions endanger the country.
8. I am irritated when I hear interviews with people whose opinions are opposed to mine.
9. I am not sure that my political viewpoint is the correct one.
10. When I listen to opinions opposed to mine, I sometimes agree with them and I am convinced that they are correct.
11. When I listen to an interview with a politician whose opinion differs from mine, I listen to him and try to think whether he is right.
12. My political opinion influences many of the things I do.
13. I think that I will have the same political views in the future too.
14. It's important for me to have an influence on events in the country.
15. I am willing to volunteer to persuade other people to vote for the political party that I support.

16. Very often I argue with a political rival in my head and convince him that I am right.
 17. It disturbs me that there are people with political opinions different to mine.
 18. I agree with the claim that there is not only one political opinion that is correct.
 19. If everyone accepted my political opinion, we would have a far better country.
 20. I agree with the claim that a part of the population in Israel adhere to a political stance that is dangerous for the country.
-

References

- Archer, S. L. (1989). Gender differences in identity development: Issues of process, domain, and timing. *Journal of Adolescence, 12*, 117-138.
- Arian, A. (1995). *Security threatened*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bahr, S. J., Hawks, R. D., & Wang, G. (1993). Family and religious influences on adolescent substance abuse. *Youth and Society, 24*, 443-465.
- Bartol, R. C. (2002). *Criminal behaviour: A psychosocial approach*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Benda, B. B. (1995). The effect on adolescent delinquency revision. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 32*, 446-466.
- Benda, B. B. (1997). An examination of a reciprocal relationship between religiosity and different forms of delinquency within a theoretical model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 34*, 163-186.
- Burkett, S. R. (1993). Perceived parents' religiosity, friends' drinking and hellfire: A panel study of adolescent drinking. *Review of Religious Research, 35*, 136-154.
- Burkett, S. R., & Warren, B. O. (1987). Religiosity, peer associations and marijuana use: A panel study of underlying causal structures. *Criminology, 25*, 109-131.
- Cernkovich, S. A., & Giordano, P. C. (1987). Family relationship and delinquency. *Criminology, 25*, 295-321.
- Chapple, C. L., McQuillan, J. A., & Berdahi, T. A. (2005). Gender, social bonds, and delinquency: A comparison of boys and girls models. *Social Science Research, 34*, 357-384.
- Clausewitz, C. V. (1978). *On war*. New York: Penguin. (Original work published 1832)
- Cochran, J. K., Wood, P. B., & Arneklev, B. J. (1994). Is the religiosity delinquency relationship spurious? A test of arousal and social control theories. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 31*, 92-123.
- Constantelos, D. J. (2004). Altruistic suicide or altruistic martyrdom? Christian Greek orthodox neo martyrs: A case study. *Archives of Suicide Research, 8*, 57-71.
- Costello, B. J. & Vowell, P. R. (1999). Testing control theory and differential association: A reanalysis of the Richmond youth project data. *Criminology, 37*, 815- 843.
- Datesman, S. K., & Scarpitti, F. R. (1975). Female delinquency and broken homes: A reassessment. *Criminology, 13*, 33-55.
- Dawes, A. (2001). Psychologies for liberation: Views from elsewhere. In R. V. Agner & D. J. Christie (Eds.), *Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology for the 21st century* (pp. 295-306). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Elder, G. (1980). Adolescence in historical perspective. In J. Adelson (Ed.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (pp. 3-46). New York: Wiley.
- Elifson, K. W., Petersen, D. M., & Hadaway, C. K. (1983). Religiosity and delinquency: A contextual analysis. *Criminology, 21*, 505-527.
- Ellens, J. H. (2004). *The destructive power of religion: Violence in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity and crisis*. New York: Norton.
- Evans, T. D., Cullen, F. T., Danaway, G. R., & Burton, V. S. (1995). Religion and crime reexamined: The impact of religion, secular controls and social ecology on adult criminality. *Criminology, 33*, 195-224.
- Fagan, J., & Pabon, E. (1990). Contributions of delinquency and substance use to school dropout among inner-city youth. *Youth and Society, 21*, 306-354.

- Gottfredson, M. R., & Hirschi, T. (1995). National crime control policies. *Society*, 32, 30-37.
- Gurr, R. (Ed.) (1980). *Handbook of political violence*. New York: Free Press.
- Halbental, M. (2005). Religious and ideological dimensions of the Israeli settlements issues: Reframing the narrative? *Negotiation Journal*, 21, 177-191.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T., & Stark, R. (1969). Hellfire and delinquency. *Social Problems*, 17, 202-213.
- Ichilov, O. (2005). Pride in one's country and citizenship orientations in a divided society: The case of Israeli Palestinian Arab and orthodox and non-orthodox Jewish Israeli youth. *Comparative Education Review*, 49, 44-61.
- Johnson, B., Joon Jang, S., Larson, D. B., & De Li, S. (2001). Does adolescent religious commitment matter? A reexamination of the effects of religiosity on delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 38, 22-44.
- Junger, M., & Marshall, I. H. (1997). The interethnic generalizability of social control theory: An empirical test. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34, 79-112.
- Kaniel, S. (2003). *Psychological aspects of the Hilltop Settlers in Samaria and Judea*. Ariel, Israel: Ariel College.
- Kaplan, H. B. (1995). *Drugs, crime, and other deviant adaptations*. New York: Plenum.
- Kraft, S. M., & Pianta, R. C. (2000). *Enhancing the transition to kindergarten: Linking children, families and school*. Charlottesville, VA: National Center for Early Development and Learning, University of Virginia.
- McCord, J. (1991). The cycle of crime and socialization processes. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 82, 211-228.
- Meier, R. F. (1982). Perspectives on the concept of social control. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 8, 35-55.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). *Social theory and social structure*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Moss, R. A. (1994). *Theoret al gil hahitbagrut* [Theories of adolescence]. Tel Aviv, Israel: Sifriyat Hapoalim.
- Paternoster, R. (1988). Examining three wave deterrence models: A question of temporal order and specification. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 79, 135-179.
- Post, J. M. (2000). Terrorist on trial: The context of political crime. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 28, 171-178.
- Rankin, J. H., & Kern, R. (1994). Parental attachments and delinquency. *Criminology*, 32, 495-515.
- Rankin, J. H., & Wells, L. E. (1990). The effect of parental attachments and direct control on delinquency. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 27, 140-165.
- Raviv, A., Raviv, A., Sadeh, A., & Silberstein, O. (1998). The reaction of the youth in Israel to the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin. *Political Psychology*, 19, 255-278.
- Reid, J. B., Patterson, G. R., & Snyder, J. (2002). *Antisocial behavior in children and adolescents: A developmental analysis and model for intervention*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schafer, S. (1974). *The political criminal: The problem of morality and crime*. New York: Free Press.
- Solomon, Z., & Laufer, A. (2004). In the shadow of terror: Changes in world assumptions in Israeli youth. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma*, 9, 353-364.
- Susskind, L., Levine, H., Aran, G., Kaniel, S., Seleg, Y., & Halbental, M. (2005). Religious and ideological dimensions of the Israeli settlements issue: Reframing the narrative? *Negotiation Journal*, 21, 177-191.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1955). *Principles of criminology*. Philadelphia: Lippincot.
- Tzurriel, D. (1990). Zehut hani leumat pizur hani begil hahitbagrut [Ego identity compared to ego-diffusion during adolescence]. *Megamot*, 32, 484-509.
- Wells, L. E., & Rankin, J. H. (1986). Self concept as a mediating factor in delinquency. *Social Psychological Quarterly*, 46, 11-22.
- Wiatrowski, M. D., Griswold, D. B., & Roberts, M. K. (1981). Social control theory. *American Sociological Review*, 46, 525-542.
- Zabriskie, R. E., & McCormick, B. P. (2003). Parent and child perspectives of family leisure involvement and satisfaction with family life. *Journal of Leisure and Research*, 35, 163-189.