



## Individualism-Collectivism And Deviance Among Shop Keepers in Turkey: The Case Of Nigde

Özden Özbay<sup>1-a</sup>, Sabuha Bindik<sup>b\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Fen Edebiyat Fakültesi, Antalya, Türkiye

\*Corresponding author

### Research Article

### ABSTRACT

The link between cultural orientation (individualism-collectivism) and deviance has been one of the understudied topics in criminology in general and especially in Turkey. This relationship is explored by using a non-random, convenient sample of the shop keepers in the province of Nigde, Turkey (N= 498). The findings showed that those who reported acting in collectivistic ways, compared to those who reported acting in individualistic ways, are less likely to engage in deviant acts. However, most variables related with individualism and collectivism are not statistically significant. Also, risk and protective factors (economic strain and work satisfaction) were not conditioned by individualistic and collectivistic cultural orientations.

**Keywords:** Individualism, Collectivism, Deviance, Shop keepers, Nigde

## Türkiye’de Esnaf Arasında Bireycilik-Kollektivizm ve Sapma: Niğde Örneği

### ÖZ

Kültürel yönelim (bireycilik-kollektivizm) ve sosyal sapma arasındaki ilişki dünyada ve özellikle Türkiye’deki suç biliminde (kriminolojide) yetersiz şekilde çalışılmış konulardan bir tanesidir. Bu ilişki Türkiye’de Niğde ilindeki teasesadüfi olmayan, kolay ulaşılabilir örnekleme yolu kullanılarak ilgili ilişki keşfedilmeye çalışıldı (N= 498). Bulgular, kolektif biçimlerde davrandıklarını belirtenlerin, bireyci şekillerde davrandıklarını belirtenler ile kıyaslandığında, daha az sapma eylemlerinde bulduklarını göstermektedir. Fakat, bireycilik ve kolektivizm ile ilişkili çoğu değişkenler sapma davranışı ile ilişkili olarak anlamlı değildir. Ayrıca, risk ve önleyici faktörler (ekonomik stres/gerilim ve iş tatmini) bireyci ve kolektivist kültürel eğilimler tarafından “koşullandırılmamaktadır” (yani, “etkileşim etkisi” yoktur).

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Bireycilik, Kollektivizm, Sapma, Esnaf, Niğde

Copyright



This work is licensed under  
Creative Commons Attribution 4.0  
International License

[ozden\\_ozbay@yahoo.com](mailto:ozden_ozbay@yahoo.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1048-6257>

[sbindik@gmail.com](mailto:sbindik@gmail.com)

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1534-6752>

**How to Cite:** Özbay Özden, Bindik Sabuha, (2022) Individualism-Collectivism And Deviance Among Shop Keepers in Turkey: The Case Of Nigde, International Journal of Current Social Science, 1(1):11-17.

## Introduction

Previous research on deviance/delinquency has concentrated generally on determining protective and risk factors with a little interest in cultural orientation (Le & Stockdale, 2005). In other words, the relationship between cultural orientation (individualism-collectivism) and deviance/delinquency has been an under-researched topic in criminology in general and the Turkish criminology in specific.

There have been no more than a handful of research in the criminology literature on the issue in question (e.g., Bergmuller, 2013; Du et al., 2014; Fukushima et al., 2009; Kotlaja, 2018; Le & Stockdale, 2005; Pokhrel et al., 2017). This is a very important gap in the literature on the relationship between cultural orientation (individualism-collectivism) and deviance/delinquency.

To the author's knowledge, there has not been any study which researched the link between cultural orientation (individualism-collectivism) and deviant act in Turkey. By using a non-random/convenient sample of the shop keepers residing in Nigde (Turkey), in line with the existing criminological research, it is hypothesized that individuals with collectivistic cultural orientation (compared to individuals with individualistic cultural orientation) will be less likely to be involved in deviant acts. Also, it is hypothesized that economic strain (as an important risk factor from Agnew's general strain theory) will have a stronger positive effect on deviance under individualistic than collectivistic culture. Moreover, it is hypothesized that work satisfaction (an important protective factor from Hirschi's social bonding theory) will have a stronger negative effect on deviance under collectivistic than individualistic culture.

## Literature Review

Former studies on deviance or delinquency have exclusively limited to identify protective and risk factors with a little interest in cultural orientation (e.g., individualism and collectivism, for exceptions, see Bergmuller, 2013; Du et al., 2014; Fukushima et al., 2009; Kotlaja, 2018; Le & Stockdale, 2005; Pokhrel et al., 2017).

The extant literature has concentrated on two important issues or aims: Whether variables reflecting individualism and collectivism have *direct* impacts on deviance/delinquency and whether individualism and collectivism *interact with* or *condition* (e.g., *context effect*) in the relationship between some risk and protective factors and deviance/delinquency.

Regarding the first issue (e.g., *direct effect*), studies reported that whereas individualism was related to high deviance/delinquency, collectivism was related to low deviance/delinquency (e.g., Bergmuller, 2013; Du et al., 2014; Le & Stockdale, 2005; Pokhrel et al., 2017). For example, Pokhrel et al. (2017) found that while high individualism increased use of substance and risky sexual act, high collectivism directly protected the high school students from risky sexual act in Russian Federation.

Regarding the second issue (*conditioning/interaction or contextual effect*) the general finding of these studies is that individualism and collectivism *conditions* (or "interact" with) the influences of some protective and risk factors on deviance or delinquency (e.g., Du et al., 2014; Kotlaja, 2018; Le & Stockdale, 2005; Pokhrel et al., 2017). For example, Du et al. (2014) found that hopelessness had a complete mediating role in the link between individualism and use of substance and between collectivism and use of substance among the migrants in China.

The existing studies contained, among others, some important limitations: For example, they generally were limited to school or adolescent populations (e.g., Bergmuller, 2013; Fukushima et al., 2009; Kotlaja, 2018; Le & Stockdale, 2005; Pokhrel et al., 2017), carried out across 26 nations (but not including Turkey, Kotlaja, 2018) in Russian Federation (Pokhrel et al., 2017) in China (Du et al., 2014; Le & Stockdale, 2005), Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam (Le & Stockdale, 2005), 62 countries (*only* school students in Turkey, Bergmuller, 2013), Japan and the United States (Fukushima et al., 2009). While Caffaro et al.'s (2014) study focused only on gender differences in the perceptions of honor killing in Italy (considered as individualistic culture) and Turkey (considered as collectivistic culture), honor killing is beyond the scope of the present study. Also, the extant literature on individualism and collectivism did not differentiate such sub-dimensions as *horizontal or vertical individualism* and *horizontal or vertical collectivism* which may have different impacts on deviance. In short, there has not been any test of effects of individualism and collectivism (or its sub-dimensions) on deviant acts among *adults* in Turkey which includes both individualistic and collectivistic cultural features.

Liu (2016; 2017) suggests that collectivism (or "relationism") creates three important cultural values. These are harmony (group/relationship harmony, compromise, self-sacrifice, and conflict avoidance), attachment (the attachment and intimate feelings originating from primary and group relationships, especially inner groups and families), and honor (the honor of the primary group and individual's honor). All these values are the reasons for the acts of individuals and social groups in Asian countries. Agnew (2014; 2015) claims that more collectivistic tendency of eastern societies can decrease the possibility of deviance/delinquency through social harmony, self-discipline, social concern, and positive bonds to other individuals.

Similar to many other countries in the Asian world (Agnew, 2015), Turkey has been undergoing major changes like fast urbanization, developing market economies, putting more importance on economic success and individualism. Hence, the changes in Turkey may raise the possibility that people deal with strains via deviance/delinquency. The changes involve the increase in individualistic values which underline the uncontrolled

pursuing of individual interests in conjunction with the declining significance of collectivistic values which underline self-sacrifice and social harmony (following the logic of Agnew in relation to Chinese case).

Given that the past studies have focused on either *direct* or *interaction effects* of individualism and collectivism in the link between some theoretical risk or protective factors and deviance/delinquency, the present study follows the two aims by using an *adult* sample (e.g., shop keepers) in a culture (e.g., Turkey) blended with both individualism and collectivism.

### Individualism and Collectivism in Turkey

There has been a binary opposition between individual and collective focus according to such sociologists as Emile Durkheim (not similar others/organic solidarity which is an individual focus and similar others/mechanic solidarity which is a collective focus), Max Weber (Western European Protestantism which is an individual focus and Catholicism which is a collective focus), and Tonnies (relations in small places/"Gemeinschaft" which is a collective focus and association-related relations which is an individual focus in urban places/"Gesellschaft") (Oyserman et al., 2002).

Within collectivism, the central item is the group. An individual must fit in his/her society. An individual is viewed as interrelated and interconnected via relations and group associations. Within individualism, the central item is the individual. Societies survive to support an individual's welfare, and an individual is regarded as different from each other (Oyserman & Lee, 2008). The central aspect of individualism is the presumption that individuals are independent of each other. The central aspect of collectivism is the presumption that social groups unite and reciprocally force people (Oyserman et al., 2002).

Triandis (1995) divides cultural orientation into *horizontal* and *vertical* dimensions. Horizontal dimension consists of a feeling of social solidarity and of integrity with the ingroup's members. Vertical dimension consists of a feeling of attending the ingroup and sacrificing for the ingroup's good and performing one's duty. The vertical dimension embrace inequality, and position has its benefits in both individualist and collectivist cultures.

According to the literature on individualism-collectivism, Turkey is a collectivistic culture with a score of 37 (Hofstede Center, 2014) or have a score of 4 on a scale from 1 (most collectivist) to 10 (most individualist, Diener et al., 1995 cited in Caffaro et al., 2014).

Stated in detail, according to Hofstede Center (2014; Caffaro et al., 2014, p. 299; or see Minkow & Hofstede, 2013; Triandis, 2018):

"Turkey, with a score of 37 is a collectivistic society. This means that the "We" is important, people belong to ingroups (families, clans or organisations) who look after each other in exchange for loyalty. Communication is indirect and the harmony of the group has to be maintained, open conflicts are avoided. The relationship

has a moral base and this always has priority over task fulfillment. Time must be invested initially to establish a relationship of trust. Nepotism may be found more often."

While the West inclines to be individualistic, much of the rest of the world is collectivistic (Kagitcibasi, 2013; Triandis, 1995). However, according to Triandis (1995, p. 27), "no society is 'purely' individualist or collectivist. The cultural pattern is situation specific." In fact, this is the case with the Turkish culture which reflects both individualist and collectivist cultural traits (the measurement sub-title below supports this point).

### Method

#### Data

The data for the study came from 498 shop owners in the city of Nigde on May 2010, a small city with a population of about 105,000 at the time of the survey in the Central Anatolian region of Turkey.

The sample were gathered on the basis of accessibility of the shop owners in three different places in terms of, at least, their population sizes in the city of Nigde by using a self-reported survey. The population size of Nigde was 105,702, that of small city Bor 37,566, and that of small town Ulukisla 5,486. Most of the sample came from Nigde (n= 266 or 53,4%), followed by Bor (n= 110 or 22.1%), and from Ulukisla (n= 53 or 10.6%). The mean age of the shop owners was 34, the percentage of the female shop owners was 13,9, and their mean monthly income was 1,500 TL (1 United States dollar was equal to 1,544 TL; 1 euro was equal to 1,903 TL at the time of the research). The shop keepers were mentioned about the voluntary and confidential nature of the study both in verbal and written forms. Although the purpose of the survey was not explore the link between individualism-collectivism and deviance, because the data contained some questions on individualism-collectivism and deviance, they were used for an exploratory purpose for the first time in the context of Turkey.

### Measurements

#### Independent Variables

Triandis (1995) divided *individualism* and *collectivism* into four sub-dimensions: *Vertical individualism*, *horizontal individualism*, *horizontal collectivism*, and *vertical collectivism*. To measure these constructs, he used a great number of questions/statements; however, a small number of them were chosen for an *exploratory* purpose in the case of the shopkeepers in a small Turkish city.

As measures of *individualism-collectivism*, 6 scenarios with their four associated options (out of 39 total questions) were chosen from Triandis' study, but only 7 of them (one of them contained high missing cases) were used regarding individualism-collectivism for the purpose of an exploratory research (1995, p. 206-213).

Regarding *individualism-collectivism*, the 6 scenarios used were as follows: First, *You are dividing a bonus among different kinds of workers. What principle should*

be used?: (1) To each according to contribution VI (VI: Vertical individualism), (2) To each equally HI (HI: Horizontal individualism), (3) To each according to need HC (HC: Horizontal collectivism), (4) To each according to status within the corporation VC (VC: Vertical collectivism). This item was named as **dividing bonus** in the statistical analysis below.

Second, *Which is the most important factor in an employees promotion, assuming that all other factors such as tenure and performance are equal. Employee:* (1) is loyal to the corporation (HC), (2) has shown obedience to the instructions from management (VC), (3) is able to think for him/herself (HI), (4) has contributed to the corporation much in the past (VI). The item was called as **employee promotion** in the correlation analysis below.

Third, *Which attribute of a job do you consider most important?:* (1) It links you with friends (HC), (2) It gives you prestige (VI), (3) It allows you to set your own goals (HI), (4) It helps your community (VC). This item was termed as **attribute of job**.

Fourth, *Which factor is most important when hiring an employee? The applicant:* (1) is easy to get along with (HI), (2) has worked for a competitor before (VI), (3) is a relative (HC), (4) is a respected member of the community (VC). It was named as **hiring employee**.

Fifth, *You and your friends decided spontaneously to go out to dinner at a restaurant. What do you think is the best way to handle the bill?:* (1) Split it equally, without regard to who ordered what (HC), (2) Each person decides how much to contribute to the total, and if that does not cover the bill, each person is assessed inversely proportionally to what s/he has contributed (HI), (3) The group leader pays the bill or decides how to split it (VC), (4) Compute each person's charge, according to what that person ordered (VI). The item was called as **handling bill**.

Sixth, *A community has been devastated by a natural event. The government is planning to distribute funds in that community. What principles should be used?:* (1) Those who lost more should receive a greater share (HC), (2) Everyone should get the same amount (HI), (3) Those who are more useful to the community (physicians, teachers, et al.) should receive more than those who are less useful (e.g., the unemployed) (VI), (4) Those who are nationally famous should receive more than the others (VC). This item was termed as **distributing funds**.

The responses of the above each six items (dividing bonus, employee promotion, attribute of job, hiring employee, handling bill, and distributing funds) were dummy coded as *individualism* (coded as 1, the reference category) and *collectivism* (coded as 2). After this procedure, the percentages of individualism and collectivism were as follows: Dividing bonus: individualism 49.4%, n= 246, collectivism 42.2%, n= 210; employee promotion: individualism 27.7%, n= 138, collectivism 59.4%, n= 296; attribute of job: individualism 58.2%, n= 290, collectivism 34.1%, n= 170; hiring employee: individualism 35.1%, n= 175, collectivism 52.6%, n= 262; handling bill: individualism 24.5%, n= 122; collectivism 64.5%, n= 321; distributing funds: individualism 44.8%, n=

223, collectivism 48.2%, n= 240. According to these percentages, collectivistic cultural tendencies generally were greater than individualistic tendencies.

Also, a general index of individualism-collectivism was created on the basis of the above 6 items. Later, the index was divided into *individualism* (those below the median) and *collectivism* (those above the median). This variable also was dummy coded, individualism was the reference category (coded as 0, 29.5%, n= 147; collectivism coded as 1, 38.0%, n= 189). Moreover, although this variable was tried to use as a *contextual* variable (e.g., *conditional/interactional* variable), it was not possible utilize it due especially to its non-significant correlations with deviant acts and with the two theoretical variables below (economic strain and work satisfaction).

Regarding *vertical collectivism*, only 1 scenario was used: *A big event is taking place in your community, and you have received four requests from people to stay with you overnight while they are in town. You only have space for one guest. Which one will you invite?:* (1) a relative (HC), (2) a high-status member of your profession (VC), (3) the one person who is most fun to have around (HC), (4) someone well connected in political circles (VC). This item was also dummy coded, *horizontal collectivism* (coded as 1, the reference category, 60.2%, n= 300) and *vertical collectivism* (coded as 2, 20.5%, n= 102). This item was named as **people to stay with**.

Concerning *horizontal collectivism*, the questions below were used: (1) *My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me* (HC), (2) *I feel good when I cooperate with others* (HC). An attempt was made to create an index in relation to the above two items; however, the creation of the index was failed due to a very low level of its internal reliability. The two items were also dummy coded, "disagree" (coded as 1, the reference category) and "agree" (coded as 2). The first item was called as **happiness** ("disagree:" 23.9%, n= 119; "agree:" 70.1%, n= 349), and the second item was called as **cooperation** ("disagree:" 15.5%, n= 77; "agree:" 77.1%, n= 384).

In terms of *horizontal individualism*, the question below was used (although there was another question regarding this sub-dimension, it was not used due to having high missing cases): *One should live ones life independently of others* (HI). Moreover, this item was also dummy coded, "disagree" (coded as 1, the reference category, 48.2%, n= 240) and "agree" (coded as 2, 43.8%, n= 218). This item was termed as **independent life**.

Finally, as for *vertical individualism*, two questions were used: (1) *Competition is the law of nature* (VI), (2) *Without competition it is not possible to have a good society* (VI). The response categories ranged from strongly disagree (coded as 1) to strongly agree (coded as 5). The above two items were combined to create a *competition index* (cronbach's alpha= .72) which corresponded to vertical individualism. The index was named as **competition**, greater scores indicated greater competition.



Also, **economic strain** (from Agnew's (2006) strain theory) was used as one of the theoretical variables because the 2007-2008 financial crisis hit the Turkish economy as well as the world economy. Also, some studies in the relevant literature have examined whether the effects of some criminogenic factors vary depending on cultural orientation (e.g., individualism and collectivism). Economic strain was an index (Cronbach's alpha= .79) which included the frequency with which the shopkeepers were stressed in terms of losing great amount of money during or after the 2007-2008 financial crisis, losing money for other reasons, not earning enough money daily, getting strained as a result of not paying loan back to banks, becoming strained due to not paying money back to moneylender, getting strained owing to not paying money back to acquaintances, becoming strained as a result of debt payment difficulty by customers (in Turkey, payments for goods or services may not take place immediately after the related goods or services are provided especially in rural places). The response items ranged from "never" (1) to "completely" (4). Higher scores in the index showed higher economic strain or stress.

**Work satisfaction** (from Hirschi's (1969) social bonding theory) was used as another theoretical variable which was composed of two items (Cronbach's alpha= .73): "I generally feel bored at my work" and "I can not be satisfied with my work." The original options varied from "never agree" (1) to "completely agree" (5). The items were reverse coded so that higher scores corresponded to higher work satisfaction. This variable can be considered as *attachment or commitment to work* when Hirschi's social bonding theory is extended to adult population. Because the data contained shopkeepers, using work satisfaction especially after the 2007-2008 financial crisis was important. Due to the data restrictions, it was not possible to use some other theoretical variables in the analysis.

### Dependent Variables

Five dependent variables were used for the study: A general measure of life-time deviance index, deviance (at least one deviant act), violence, theft, and alcohol use. **Life-time deviance** (Cronbach's alpha= .73) was an index, composed of how many times a shop keeper had done the following acts in his/her life: Detained or going in trial, attempted or committed violence, tried or used illegal drugs, and involving in property crime. The response categories were "none" (1), "1-2 times" (2), "3-5 times" (3), "6-9 times" (4), "10 and plus times" (5). The higher scores indicated greater involvement in deviance or crime. Also, the above life time-deviance index was divided into two groups, those who were "not involved in deviance" (coded as 0, 40.2%, n= 200), and those who were involved in "at least one deviant act" (coded as 1, 47.0%, n= 234), named as **deviance**.

**Violence:** The shop keepers were asked to indicate how many times s/he attempted or committed violence against a person. The original response items were none (1), 1-2 times (2), 3-5 times (3), 6-9 times (4), 10 and plus

times (5). The item was recoded, "none" (coded as 0, 48,8%, n= 243) and "at least once" (coded as 1, 37,6%, n= 187).

**Theft:** Likewise, the respondents were asked to report how many times did s/he get but did not return money, belongings etc. without owner's knowledge. The original responses were none (1), 1-2 times (2), 3-5 times (3), 6-9 times (4), 10 and plus times (5). This item was recoded, "none" (coded as 0, 77,7%, n= 387) and "at least once" (coded as 1, 8,4%, n= 42).

**Alcohol use:** The shop owners were asked to write what is the situation of their alcohol use in the following from "daily" (1) to "never" (7). Again, this item was recoded as "never" (coded as 0, 49%, n= 244) and "various degrees of use" (coded as 1, 30,3%, n= 151). Although alcohol use is a "lawful" act for adults in Turkey, however it was also a "forbidden" act (e.g., sin) due to its Islamic belief system.

### Findings

Because the data contained some missing variables as well as small sample size problem, it was not possible to use individualism-collectivism as "contextual" or "conditional" variable to perform multivariate statistical analysis. Because the present study was *the first study to explore* the link between individualism and collectivism in Turkey, it should not be a problem not being able to use some multivariate statistical analyses given these data limitations. For the purpose of an exploratory research, a correlation analysis was done as follows. Below, first, a direct effect of individualism and collectivism variables on deviant acts were mentioned. Second, according to the extant literature, the relationships between some criminogenic factors and deviance vary on the basis of cultural orientation (individualism and collectivism). As mentioned, due to data limitations, this contextual relationship was explained in relation with correlation analysis (e.g., the results of the correlation analyses did not allow to go further for a multivariate statistical analyses).

### Bivariate Analysis: Pearson Correlation Analysis

When the correlational analysis results are examined, many correlations between individualism and collectivism and deviant acts are not statistically significant (Table 1). Employee promotion ( $r = -.12$ ), handling bill ( $r = -.17$ ), cooperation with others ( $r = -.12$ ) are negatively associated with deviant acts. Stated in details, compared to employee promotion in individualistic ways, employee promotion in collectivistic ways is inversely associated with theft. Likewise, in comparison to handling bill in individualistic ways, handling bill in collectivistic ways is negatively correlated with theft. Similarly, compared to "disagree" with cooperation with others, those "agree" with cooperation with others are less likely to engage in deviance.

Compared to those who prefer to invite *people to stay with* in horizontal collectivist sense, those who prefer to invite *people to stay with* in vertical collectivist sense are

associated positively with theft ( $r = .11$ ). Also, in comparison to those who “disagree” with an independent life, those who “agree” with an independent life tend to involve in alcohol use ( $r = .18$ ).

The two variables *economic strain* (from Agnew’s (2006) general strain theory) and *work satisfaction* (from Hirschi’s (1969) social bonding theory) are not correlated

with both deviant acts and individualism-collectivism variables. That is, only economic strain is correlated positively with alcohol use ( $r = .22$ ). None of the strain and social bonding variables are correlated with any of the individualism and collectivism variables.

**Table 1.** A Correlational Analysis of Individualism-Collectivism and Deviance \*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Deviance index														
2. Deviance (yes)	<b>.59**</b>													
3. Violence (yes)	<b>.58**</b>	<b>.83**</b>												
4. Theft (yes)	<b>.59**</b>	<b>.30**</b>	<b>.26**</b>											
5. Alcohol (yes)	<b>.24**</b>	<b>.24**</b>	<b>.20**</b>	.10										
6. Dividing bonus (collectivism)	-.05	-.00	.00	.01	-.01									
7. Employee promotion (collect.)	.01	-.01	-.01	<b>-.12*</b>	-.00	-.08								
8. Attribute of job (collectivism)	-.02	-.01	.04	-.03	-.00	-.06	.00							
9. Hiring employee (collectivism)	-.06	-.03	-.04	-.05	-.01	.01	-.02	.02						
10. Handling bill (collectivism)	-.07	-.00	-.05	<b>-.17**</b>	.01	-.02	.05	.07	<b>.12*</b>					
11. Distributing funds (collectivism)	-.01	-.04	-.02	.03	-.01	-.02	-.02	-.05	-.08	-.06				
12. Collectivism (above median)	-.07	.02	.04	-.09	.01	<b>.22**</b>	<b>.33**</b>	<b>.34**</b>	<b>.36**</b>	<b>.36**</b>	<b>.12*</b>			
13. People-stay with (vertical collect.)	.10	.00	-.04	<b>.11*</b>	.10	-.04	.03	-.04	-.10	.08	-.02	-.01		
14. Happiness (horizontal collect.)	-.09	-.02	-.00	-.08	-.03	.01	-.08	<b>.10*</b>	-.00	.08	-.02	.03	-.03	
15. Cooperation (horizontal collect.)	<b>-.12*</b>	-.02	-.06	-.01	-.06	.03	-.03	.07	-.02	.02	.07	.06	-.04	<b>.15**</b>

\* Ns varied dependent on the variables used and their number of missing values. Significant relationships were bolded. \*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ . The relevant correlations for the study were italic.

### Conclusion and Discussion

What is the relationship between cultural orientation (or individualism-collectivism) and deviance and does cultural orientation condition (or act as a context) have been one of the least studied issues in the criminology literature in general and the Turkish criminology in specific. In fact, to the author’s knowledge, there have been no studies that have explored the issue at hand in the Turkish criminology. This is a crucial omission in the relevant literature which deserves much attention. In order to test both direct and conditioning (or context or interaction) effects of individualism and collectivism, data from a non-random sample of the shopkeepers in a small Anatolian city in a central region of Turkey are used.

Regarding the *direct effect* of individualism and collectivism, as expected, the study shows that those individuals who reported to use employee promotion, handle bill, and cooperate with others in collectivistic ways in comparison to individualistic ways are less likely to commit deviant acts (for similar findings, see

Bergmuller, 2013; Du et al., 2014; Le & Stockdale, 2005; Pokhrel et al., 2017). Although this is the case, nevertheless, there are very few significant correlations, and the sizes of correlation coefficients also are smaller ( $r < .30$ ). These findings, among others, can be interpreted in several ways. First, due to a small sample size problem, some significant correlations may not appear in the results. Second, using a very limited number of individualism and collectivism items may not reflect a real effect of these variables (e.g., measurement error). Third, having both collectivistic and individualistic cultural orientations at the same time in a cultural context may cancel out each orientation’s real effects.

As for the *conditioning/contextual effect (or interaction)* of individualism and collectivism, because the theoretical factors *economic strain* (from Agnew’s strain theory) and *work satisfaction* (from Hirschi’s social bonding theory) generally are not correlated with both individualism and collectivism and deviant acts. Relatedly, although an attempt is made to analyze economic strain and work satisfaction *within* individualism and collectivism categories, it is not possible to use

multivariate statistical analysis (e.g., linear regression analysis) due to a high number of the missing cases related to the relevant core variables in the study. So, the findings related to the *conditioning/contextual effect (or interaction)* of individualism and collectivism are not in line with the previous studies (e.g., Du et al., 2014; Kotlaja, 2018; Le & Stockdale, 2005; Pokhrel et al., 2017).

The study has some important limitations. Among others, first, the study includes a limited number of individualism and collectivism items in relation to the number of survey questions or items in Triandis' original study (1995), this is an important omission. Likewise, the dependent variable deviant behaviour is limited to certain types of deviant acts and does not include some other types of crime (e.g., white collar crime, homicide etc.). Second, the data cover a small number of non-random cases (N= 498) which does not allow to use some multivariate statistical analyses (as well as a great number of missing values for some important variables). Although some procedure for missing values are used, they decrease the sizes of the coefficients to lesser degrees. Also, literature on statistical procedures in dealing with missing values are not suggested. Third, the study is limited only to a group of shopkeepers in a small Turkish city which can not reflect both the shopkeepers and also adults in Turkey. Fourth, it is not possible to test the link between some other important theoretical variables from important theories of deviance (e.g., labeling, social learning, shaming, deterrence, rational choice etc.) given the data limitations. Fifth, it is a cross-sectional data which can not allow to control for some important factors regarding the link between individualism-collectivism and deviance (e.g., past deviant act).

Although the present study contains the above limitations, however, it has been one of the very few existing studies on the relationship between cultural orientation and deviance carried out in the world. Similarly, it has been the *first study* which has tested cultural orientation (individualism-collectivism) and deviance by using an adult sample in a small city in Turkey.

The future studies in Turkey should test the above proposed relationships with both a children and/or young and adult samples (as well as rural-urban or gender differences) to examine comparatively because the younger people are exposed to more capitalistic/individualistic values while older people have more collectivistic values in relation to a more comprehensive forms of deviant behavior.

## References

1. Agnew, R. (2006). *Pressured into crime: An overview of general strain theory*. Roxbury.
2. Agnew, R. (2014, 20 June). *Presidential address to the American Society of Criminology social concern and crime: Moving beyond the assumption of simple self-interest*. *Criminology* 52(1), 1-32.
3. Agnew, R. (2015). *Using general strain theory to explain crime in Asian societies*. *Asian Criminology* 10, 131–147.
4. Bergmüller, S. (2013). *The relationship between cultural individualism–collectivism and student aggression across 62 countries*. *Aggressive Behavior* 39, 182–200.
5. Caffaro, F., Federico F. & Susanna S. (2014). *Gender differences in the perception of honour killing in individualist versus collectivistic cultures: Comparison between Italy and Turkey*. *Sex Roles* 71, 296–318.
6. Diener, E., Diener, M. & Diener, C. (1995). *Factors predicting the subjective well-being of nations*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69, 851–864.
7. Du, H., Xiaoming, L., Danhua, L. & Cheuk C. T. (2014). *Hopelessness, individualism, collectivism, and substance use among young rural-to-urban migrants in China*. *Health Psychology & Behavioural Medicine* 2(1), 211–220.
8. Fukushima, M., Susan F. S. & Emiko, K. (2009). *Bond to society, collectivism, and conformity: a comparative study of Japanese and American college students*. *Deviant Behavior* 30, 434–466.
9. Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. University of California Press.
10. Hofstede Center, (2014). *What about Turkey?* Retrieved from <https://www.hofstedeinsights.com/country/turkey/#:~:text=Turkey%20scores%20high%20on%20this,be%20old%20what%20to%20do>.
11. Kagitcibasi, Ç. (2013). *Adolescent autonomy-relatedness and the family in cultural context: What is optimal?* *Journal of Research on Adolescence* 23(2), 223-235.
12. Kotlaja, M. M. (2018). *Cultural contexts of individualism vs. collectivism: Exploring the relationships between family bonding, supervision and deviance*. *European Journal of Criminology* 1–18.
13. Le, T. N. & Gary D. S. (2005). *Individualism, collectivism, and delinquency in Asian American adolescents*. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology* 34(4), 681–691.
14. Liu, J. (2016). *Asian paradigm theory and access to justice*. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 32(3), 205–224.
15. Liu, J. (2017). *"The New Asian paradigm: A relational approach" in Comparative Criminology in Asia* (pp. 17-32) edited by Jianhong Liu, Max Travers, & Lennon Y. C. Chang. Springer International Publishing.
16. Minkow, M. & Geert, H. (2013). *Cross-cultural analysis: The science and art of comparing the world's modern societies and their cultures*. Sage.
17. Oyserman, D. & Spike W. S. L. (2008). *Does culture influence what and how we think? Effects of priming individualism and collectivism*. *Psychological Bulletin* 134(2), 311–342.
18. Oyserman, D., Heather M. C. & Markus K. (2002). *Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses*. *Psychological Bulletin* 128(1), 3–72.
19. Pokhrel, P.; Brooke, L. B.; Sakshi, R.; Bulat, I.; Artur, G.; Leila, A. & Steve S. (2017). *Individualism-collectivism, social self-control and adolescent substance use and risky sexual behavior*. *Substance Use & Misuse* 53(7), 1-11.
20. Triandis, C. H. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism (New directions in social psychology)*. Westview Press.
21. Triandis, C. H. (2018). *Individualism and collectivism (New directions in social psychology)*. Routledge.