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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND THE LITERATURE

Statement of the Problem

Traditionally, criminologists have studied male offenders almost exclusively when investigating the etiology of crime, the patterns of criminal behavior, and the variables that affect involvement in criminal offenses. Relatively little attention has been given to female involvement in crime. As a result, little is known about the types of crimes women commit or the variables that are associated with female criminality.

Eugene Doleschal in his review of the literature (1970) emphasizes the inadequacy of existing empirical information about the female offender. Ward, Jackson, and Ward flatly state, "Our knowledge of the character and causes of female criminality is at the same stage of development that characterized our knowledge of male criminality some 30 or more years ago" (1969:874). Carol Smart provides a rationale for this state of affairs in saying, "In the past female criminality has not been thought to constitute a significant threat to the social order..." (1977:2).

Because of this dearth of empirical research, much of the literature concerning female criminality is based on conjecture and
stereotypic notions of female behavior. The existing theories of female criminality, by and large, explain the behavior in terms of psychological variables. Within that frame of reference, females are seen to commit crimes because they are psychologically dependent, sexually motivated, or emotionally unstable (Cf. Payak, 1963; deRham, 1969; Anderson, 1967). While these variables may need to be considered in theoretical interpretations of the behavior, they do not explain female criminality, nor its etiology. Criminal behavior results from not only psychological variables but also processes and factors in the milieu and social structure. For the most part, theorists dealing with criminality have made no attempt to include females as the subjects of their theories. Without empirical information, the body of theory surrounding female criminality cannot approach the calibre of theories already put forth to explain criminal behavior by males, and certainly there can be no integration of theories to explain criminality in general.

Recently, an upward trend in female crime rates has been cited. Some have attributed this change to the increasing emancipation of women. As women become more liberated, it is postulated, they will make even greater advances in the illegitimate as well as the legitimate spheres of activity. Whether or not the increased assertion of rights for females are the cause of the phenomenon, most criminologists agree that more women are becoming involved in criminal behavior. According to Simon, in 1953 women comprised one tenth of all persons arrested for serious crime, that is, type I
crimes in the Uniform Crime Reports. In 1972 this proportion was one out of five (1975:35). Crites (1976), Norland and Shover (1977), Vega et al. (1974), Harris and Hill (1977), Payak (1963), and Price (1977) are, like Simon, among the writers who cite a rise in female crime rates and a drop in the discrepancy between male and female crime rates. Adler cites a female arrest rate that has been rising four times faster than that of males, these increases being notable for robbery, fraud, larceny, and burglary, all of which are serious crimes perpetrated for financial gain (1977:103). Noblit and Burcart (1976) in comparing female arrest rates for 1960 to those of 1970 found they had increased by 58%. The corresponding increase for male arrest rates was 12%. The increases cited by these authors emphasize the need for information about female criminals and female criminality.

This study focuses on three areas of interest. The first area of interest is the extent to which women are involved in criminality. The studies of adult female offenders available at the present time rely on official statistics for information about female criminal involvement. Despite the general agreement that female participation in criminal behavior is increasing, there is some debate about the variety and seriousness of crimes committed by women. Although some authors, Adler in particular, assert that women are not only committing a greater variety of crimes but that their crimes are of greater seriousness than in the past, others, while accepting the premise that female crime rates have risen,
deny that crimes committed by females are qualitatively different from their past endeavors. The first problem addressed in this research is the quality and quantity of criminal behaviors engaged in by women. Assessment of female criminality at the present time is necessary if trends in the range and seriousness of crimes committed by women are to be explored.

Second, this study is concerned with the major variables that may affect female involvement in crime. The available information about female offenders is based on official statistics and studies of incarcerated females; it is difficult to distinguish the extent to which data generated from such sources are a consequence of differential decisions of the criminal justice system or reflect real differences in female criminality. The effects of structural and social-psychological variables on criminal behavior need to be examined. Of the major theoretical explanations of criminality, opportunity theory, control theory, role relationship theory, and labeling theory are utilized in the theoretical orientation of this study.

Examination of opportunities for and restraints on criminal behaviors may provide support for or evidence against major theoretical orientations as explanations of female criminal behavior. The importance of perceived opportunities and criminal labels as impetuses to criminal behavior and of role relationships and controls as inhibitors of criminal behavior is assessed.

Third, liberation of women needs to be explored as a major
factor in recent trends in criminal behavior. In this matter, too, there is disagreement in the literature concerning the effects of liberation. While some deny the Women's Movement has had a direct effect on female crime rates (Weis, 1976; Smart, 1977), others contend it has had a significant effect on the opportunities, both legitimate and illegitimate, available for women and, therefore, on their criminal behaviors (Adler, 1975; Simon, 1975; Noblit and Burcart, 1976), and still others assess its effects as greatest in the sphere of attitudes and motivations (Harris, 1977; Harris & Hill, 1977).

This study, then, addresses three major problems: assessment of the extent to which women are involved in crime, determination of theoretical variables that affect female involvement in crime, and delineation of the effects of liberation on female criminality.

Since the present information concerning female criminality is based almost entirely on official sources, the data in this study are gathered in a survey of a sample of women in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The mailed questionnaire addresses the major problems in female criminality and provides a source of information independent of the criminal justice system and other official sources.

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The extent to which women are involved in specific categories of criminal behavior is a focus of this research. Although females are involved in nearly all criminal behaviors (Heidensohn,
1970; deRham, 1969), involvement varies drastically among categories since women tend to concentrate in fewer types of crimes than men (Doleschal, 1970). For the most part, there is general agreement that male criminality exceeds female criminality. Several authors, most notably Pollack (1950) and Reckless and Kay (1966), have in contrast advanced the notion of hidden criminality to account for the large differentials in the criminal patterns of men and women.

The nature of female criminality has yet to be delineated. This is especially true given the lack of stability in the female crime rates and the confusion surrounding the adjectives applied to criminal categories. Norland and Shover (1977) point out that violent crimes are not equivalent to serious crimes, neither of which are equivalent to aggressive crimes and that there is little agreement as to which crime categories are best described by each concept. Until the definitions of such concepts are clearly expressed and agreed upon, the nature of female criminality is clouded by semantic confusion.

The criminal roles of women further complicate the issue of the nature of female criminality. It is difficult to establish the contribution of females to criminal activities performed by a male/female group in that the criminal roles of both sexes are unclear, yet this can have far-reaching implications for the accurate description of female involvement in crime. If, for example, the women in male/female criminal groups have peripheral roles in the criminal activities of the group, their involvement in crime is much
less than if their roles are central to the group's criminal activities.

The distribution of crime in the population is an important factor given the large differences between male and female crime rates indicated by official statistics. Perhaps of even greater importance is the distribution of crime in the female population. As with males, some groups of females are more likely to be involved in criminal behavior given the social and economic forces acting upon them. The types of crimes committed by women, therefore, may also be a function of various social characteristics that influence the criminal patterns of women and affect their involvement in specific categories of crime. These characteristics, as well as the extent and nature of female criminal involvement, must be considered in a discussion of the etiology of female crime. Theories of criminal behavior must give attention to these forces if they are to rise above the biological and psychological theories that have until recently dominated the literature on female criminality.

The female gender role is of central importance in any discussion of female behavior. Female criminal behavior is no exception. Like all social roles, gender roles proscribe appropriate and inappropriate behavior and, thus, affect the criminal behaviors of women to various degrees. Although the full effect of the Women's Movement on the definition of gender roles is not yet known, change in gender roles has been postulated as a basis for perceived changes in female criminal behavior (Simon, 1975; Adler, 1975). These issues have been explored in the existing literature, although few definitive
conclusions have been reached regarding them. This has been due, in part, to the fact that research has not yet provided enough data to form an adequate picture of the forces operating to produce crime in our society.

The Nature and Extent of Female Criminality

Norland and Shover (1977) suggest there are several dimensions of female criminality, all of which must be considered in an encompassing discussion of female criminality. Each of these dimensions is considered in relation to violent, property and victimless crimes, the major foci of female criminal activities.

The role being played by women in the commission of crimes is important in the understanding of female involvement in crime (Norland & Shover, 1977:96). Ward, Jackson, and Ward specify four roles of women in crime: conspirator, accessory, partner, and sole perpetrator (1969:867). In the commission of a criminal act, a woman may play any one of these roles. Traditionally, though, women have been assigned to certain criminal roles in much the same manner as they have been assigned to certain legitimate roles in the wider society: instigators of or accessories to criminal behavior, rather than as partners in or sole perpetrators of criminal acts (Reckless, 1957; deRham, 1969). There is general agreement that women who commit acts of violence usually act alone (Ward, Jackson & Ward, 1969); however, for the most part, women have not been centrally involved in the commission of most property offenses. Women are relegated to a peripheral role in those crimes which are committed...
for economic gain, especially if these crimes involve aggressive behavior (Ward, et al., 1969:873). In passive property crimes, for example, shoplifting or forgery, women often play a more central role (Denys, 1968).

Smart considers the roles played by women in crime to be a direct result of their socialization in society.

Consequently, the differential socialization of girls is reflected not only in the types of offenses committed by women, but also in the nature of their participation (Smart, 1977:67).

Women's crimes reflect different modes of behavior than men's, which may result from socialization practices. These different modes may be dictated solely by the means and resources women have available to them which may account for the less direct roles women play in crime.

The types of offenses committed by women and the extent to which they account for all crimes committed also need to be analyzed (Norland & Shover, 1977:96). There is general agreement that violent crimes are those which involve physical harm to another person, for example, murder, aggravated assault, manslaughter, but which do not necessarily imply economic motivation. Aggressive crimes are those which could involve physical harm to another person, but which have economic motive, a prime example being robbery, which sets up a confrontation that could result in violence. Some aggressive crimes are also violent crimes, but some aggressive crimes are property crimes, for example, burglary and auto theft. There is little agreement about the definition of serious crimes. Certainly serious
crimes would include violent and aggressive crimes but there is little consensus on the seriousness of property crimes which are not aggressive.

The extent of female involvement in crime is also debated. Block (1977) found that in the 1930's during the progressive era in New York, women were involved in theft, gambling, fencing, and other "male" crimes to the extent that they were considered part of the lower levels of syndicated crimes, although all other writings on female crime during that period discussed only prostitution. deRham asserts, "Women commit all the crimes which men commit--that is, crimes against the person, against property, and against the state" (1969:5). Doleschal, however, citing official statistics, says, "A major difference between male and female criminality is that offenses committed by women tend to concentrate in fewer types than those committed by men" (1970:640). Although it is true that women have committed all types of crimes, as a group they are involved to a lesser extent than men in some crime categories.

Hoffman-Bustamante reports that in 1970 female arrests constituted approximately 15% of all arrests (1973:119). Females contributed to a larger percentage of murder/manslaughter, larceny, forgery and counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, narcotics violations, vagrancy, and, of course, prostitution than the over-all average percentage. With the exception of murder/manslaughter, to which women contributed only 15.4% of the total from this crime category, the crimes are neither violent nor aggressive.
Kay found that the largest differentials in the participation of men and women in criminal activities appear in the categories of violent crimes and burglary (See Reckless, 1961:156-157). Nearly a third of the females in her study were incarcerated for crimes of violence while only 11.3% of the male inmates were imprisoned for violent crimes. Men were incarcerated for burglary six times more often than women. In this sample, larger proportions of women than men were incarcerated for forgery and narcotics offenses, while the reverse was true for sex offenses, robbery and auto theft. The larger percentage of women incarcerated for violent crimes does not indicate that females are more violent than males. More likely, men are incarcerated for more crimes and, thus, violent crimes represent a smaller proportion of the total criminal behavior pattern of males. The remaining conclusions are consistent with those of Hoffman-Bustamante in that the property crimes in which women are seen to engage are not aggressive, while those in which men are more likely to be involved are aggressive crimes.

Vega, Silverman, and Accardi (1974), who analyzed the characteristics of male and female prison inmates, found the major crimes for white females to be check forging, narcotics related offenses, and breaking and entering. The major crimes for black females are murder, narcotics related offenses, aggravated assault and grand larceny. These findings are congruent with those of Ward et al. (1969) and Anderson (1967) who found that women convicted of assaultive crimes are more likely to be a member of a minority group, but they are not consistent with Hoffman-Bustamante's findings of
non-violent and non-aggressive crimes for women. However, these data are not strictly comparable. Hoffman-Bustamante utilized arrest statistics while Kay and Vega et al. studied an incarcerated population. Therefore, one might expect the findings on such a population to reveal more serious crimes. Although there are discrepancies in the conclusions of these authors, their findings for the most part reveal that women are not only involved in crimes of passion that lead to violence and relatively safe crimes like larceny, but also in instrumental crimes that entail a great deal of risk. Women's role in crime does not appear as limited as some of the traditional assumptions of woman's nature would indicate.

More important than these findings are recent data indicating that female involvement in crime is increasing. Price found these increases to be greatest in embezzlement, fraud, forgery and counterfeiting while increases in percentages of women involved in crimes of violence have been virtually non-existent for thirty years (1977: 103). Simon concludes that between 1967 and 1972 "the average increase in the proportion of women arrested for serious crimes (that is, index crimes) is greater than the average increase in the proportion of women arrested for all crimes" (1976a:35). For this period, the percentage increase for all crimes was 52% while the percentage increase for serious crimes was 84%. She, like Price, found these increases in non-violent crimes. Simon attributes these increases in female crime rates to expanded employment opportunities and changes in the definitions women have of themselves, the antecedent of both
being the liberation movement for women that gained new vigor in the social consciousness of the Sixties. Although some argue that these increases in official statistics are due to an increased propensity of the justice system to arrest and prosecute women, Simon maintains that "... police behavior alone cannot account for the large increases in larceny, fraud, embezzlement, and forgery arrests over the past six years and for the lack of increase in arrests for homicide, aggravated assault, and other violent crimes" (Simon, 1976a:40).

Noblit and Burcart (1976) cite large increases in property crimes, the largest increase being in larceny. Robbery is classified by Noblit and Burcart as a violent crime rather than a property crime despite the economic motivations for its perpetration. With the exception of robbery, they found, like Simon, little increase in rates of violent crimes. Unlike Simon, though, they attribute the increased crime rate not to increased legitimate opportunities for women but to decreased legitimate opportunities resulting in greater marginality of women in the economic sphere, for although women have increased their numbers in the labor force, they have not increased their authority and prestige (1976:656).

Klein and Kress (1976) report similar findings. Arrest rates for women are increasing, property crime arrests increasing at a much greater pace than violent crimes. They indicate that arrest rate increases for women are exceeding those of men especially in robbery, burglary, auto theft and fraud, the first three of which
are aggressive crimes committed for economic gain, but which indicate no increase in the use of violence by women.

Crites, in assessing the nearly seven percent rise in the proportions of all crimes that are committed by females between 1960 and 1974, also indicates that the rise is due almost entirely to property crimes rather than violent crimes (1976:35). The proportion of all violent crimes committed by females has remained constant, while larceny has become the most common charge for female arrestees (1976:35).

Adler asserts that women are committing more varied types of crimes now than ever before (1975:164). As sex role boundaries have become less distinct, women have engaged in crimes previously committed almost exclusively by men, that is, aggressive crimes (1975:153). Unlike the authors cited above, however, Adler views the present trend in female criminality to be more violent and destructive due to both subjective factors, especially the more assertive reactions of women to the world around them (1975:29), and to objective factors, increased legitimate and illegitimate opportunities for women (1975:167) and the ambiguity of women's present situation (1975:129). She points out, though, that larceny is still the crime most often committed by women.

Weis, unlike the preceding authors, disagrees that women are committing more crimes (1976:17). He indicates that the data do not support the notion that females are committing more crimes than they had previously or that they are committing more varied types of crimes.
The general consensus, however, in the literature is that although the percentage of all crimes committed by women has increased dramatically, they still account for only a small part of all crimes committed. Increases in female criminal behavior have appeared for the most part in property crime rates while violent crime rates have remained relatively stable. One victimless crime, prostitution, by definition a female crime, is accounted for solely by female arrests (Rosenblum, 1975:169). Adler notes an increase in acceptability of prostitution and a concomitant entrance by housewives and other respectable middle class women into the profession (1975:83). Crites found that drunkenness offenses for women did not increase from 1960 to 1974 but that narcotics violations, virtually non-existent in 1960, rose to prominence on the list of female crimes in the 1970's (1976:35).

The motivations for criminal behavior by females are thought by some to be dissimilar to those for male criminal behavior (Datesmen et al., 1975; Payak, 1963; deRham, 1969). Anderson (1976), like Norland and Shover (1977), considers motive to be an important factor in an evaluation of female criminality and stresses the necessity of searching for similarities between male and female crimes rather than differences (1976:355). She contends that for both men and women economic motivations need to be considered, since in the existing literature she found that women are portrayed as unable to act on their own in deviant activities, especially for economic or social reasons (1976:352). Millman (1975) found similar
viewpoints in the deviance literature:

If women occasionally become socially deviant, their deviance is understood as only secondary and politically uninspired. It is derivative of their acting like women: falling in love (with a deviant man), being a little too out of control of their emotions (becoming mentally ill), using their sexuality exploitatively but not that differently from other women (becoming a prostitute), or exhibiting some other neurotic weakness or impulsiveness common to women (becoming a shoplifter) (Millman, 1975:253).

Adler argues "that women have the same basic motivation as men" (1975:8). While Datesmen et al. (1975) and Reckless and Kay (1966) assume that males strive for economic power and status and females seek stable personal relationships, Adler decries the distinction made between male and female psychologies and insists that women do not have different motivations and goals than men do (1975:9).

Beattie (1975), writing about female crime in 18th Century England, found that women did not participate in the general brawls associated with male tavern-goers during this period, that is, unplanned public disturbances, but they were involved as both participants and instigators in public disturbances that protested social inequities and the loss of family possessions or income. More recently, Crites (1976) found a correlation between unemployment and crime for women, indicating a strong economic motivation. To assign to women motivations different from those assigned to men is generally to undermine the importance and distort the direction of female behavior.

The final consideration necessary for clarification of
female involvement in crime is the victims of female criminals (Norland & Shover, 1977:96). Ward et al. found that most victims of female violence are known to the offender, although assault cases are more likely than murder to involve strangers (1969:868). Victims of robberies by women tend to be strangers and victims of burglaries by females are usually commercial establishments (1969:869). In homocides women are as likely to use a household implement as a gun in the perpetration of the crime. For assaults they are much more likely to use a household implement than a gun. In over half of the robberies and nearly all of the burglaries no weapon at all was used (1969:871). This information reveals that crimes by females usually do not involve strangers as often as men and that planned violence is usually not part of the crime. Ward and his colleagues gathered data both in 1963 and 1968, finding that the use of guns in homocides and robberies increased significantly during that time (1969:902).

Little data exist about the victims of female criminality. Given the more restricted interactions of women, suspected male and female criminality is more likely to vary in this respect than in others; however, no comparisons are as yet possible.

Hidden Criminality among Females

The official statistics on female criminality, despite the recent apparent increase in involvement by women, reveal that women are much less likely to be involved in criminal behavior than men. While some authors accept this differential in official crime rates as an indication of the actual differences between males and females,
others have contended that female criminality is, to a greater extent than male criminality, hidden criminality. Hoffman-Bustamante (1973), Weis (1977), and Crites (1976) are among those who belong to the first of these schools. Women are restricted by their traditional roles to fewer and less dangerous crimes than men (Crites, 1976:38; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973:131). Greater conformity is assumed to be characteristic of women, especially given their lack of opportunity for criminal behaviors (Weis, 1977:18).

Official rates of criminal behavior for either sex may underestimate the true levels of crime. The fact that female criminality is underestimated to a larger extent than male criminality has not been supported by data. Reliance on official rates of female criminality is pervasive in the literature. No attempts have been made to validate the figures compiled by the criminal justice system on female criminality, although a study by Katherine Howard (1975) supports official statistics when comparing self-reported crime rates to official figures. Klein and Kress deny that women's criminality approaches that of men, indicating the obstacles in the illegitimate spheres of behavior are as great as those in the legitimate spheres (1976:41).

Pollack does not follow the view that incidence of female criminality is less than that of male criminality (1950:1). He contends that the crime rates are lower for women than men because a large proportion of female crime is hidden by the nature of the roles women play in society (1950:3). Women can more easily conceal their
crimes given the context in which they live and work. He further
interates that women are inherently deceitful which increases their
ability to hide their wrong-doings (1950:8); men are protective of
them and do not report their offenses to official agencies (1950:1);
and excuses are made for women because they are not expected to have
the strong moral characters that men possess (1950:10). Despite the
obvious lack of scientific basis for his statements, other authors
have supported this assumption that female crime is more hidden than
male crime (Reckless & Kay, 1966; deRham, 1969; Price, 1977), although
they do concede greater self-containment on the part of women that
would contribute to lower rates of crime for females than males.

There can be little doubt that both male and female crime
is underestimated by official statistics, but there is no evidence
that female criminality is underestimated to a greater extent than
that of males. There is, therefore, a need for self-reported data to
provide some bases for evaluating the trends reported in the literature.

Major Characteristics of Female Offenders

Major variables associated with female criminality are,
as yet, largely untested. Although studying personal characteristics
of female criminals tends to put the onus of undesirable behavior on
the individual, it is important to know with some certainty which of
these characteristics are related to criminal behaviors and if they
are related, to ascertain the relationship between personal character-
istics and specific categories of crime. Peters (1977) refers to the
effects of ethnicity and class on crime rates, interpreting ethnicity
and class as "crucial indicators of structural inequalities within society" (Peters, 1977:77). All personal characteristics of offenders may be valuable indicators of structural inequities and should be viewed as such. While many personal characteristics associated with high crime rates have traditionally been viewed as inherent weaknesses of the individual, the very existence of the associations provides some evidence that the relationships between personal characteristics and criminal involvement are structurally mediated. Heidensohn suggests that some groups in society are more likely to be involved in criminal behavior than others (1970:132). Males are more likely to be involved than females and some females are more likely to be involved than other females in criminal behavior. Sex, like other characteristics, helps to determine the likelihood of involvement in criminal behavior.

The characteristics of female offenders delineated in the literature must be viewed tentatively, for they describe incarcerated samples which may not accurately represent the distribution of characteristics in the female criminal population. Furthermore, most of the studies from which these conclusions are drawn do not consider interaction effects between variables, but merely report the effects of major characteristics.

Vega et al. found that most female offenders are younger than 30 years old, although male offenders are likely to be younger than female offenders at the time of admission to a correctional facility. Black females are, on the average, older than white females at admission (1974:8). Heidensohn found that female
criminality peaks in late adolescence and that another peak occurs in the 30 to 40 year age range. She adds that cessation of criminal activities is not as pronounced as that indicated by male rates (1970:134). Cavan (1952) reports similar conclusions and refers to the gradual decrease in female crimes with age.

Adler views race and social class as strongly colinear and as a result postulates a qualitative distinction between the crimes of white women and those of black women. She cites the lower average earnings of black women and the lower unemployment rates of white women to partially account for the differences in the crime rates of the two groups (1975:149).

Other authors agree that there is a significant difference between the crimes of these two groups. Anderson (1967) reports a higher incidence of violent crimes for black women than either white or Mexican-American women. Klein and Kress (1976), although acknowledging the discrimination against blacks and the poor in the criminal justice system, assert that "... the gap between black women and men in the commission of crimes of survival is narrower than that between white women and men" (Klein & Kress, 1976:44). Vega et al. (1974) found black women more likely to be involved in violent crimes and white women in property crimes, while white women more often use narcotics and black women more often use alcohol. These authors propose social and cultural differences between white and black women, the early emancipation of black women and attendant responsibilities (Adler, 1975; Klein & Kress, 1976), the subculture of
violence in the existence of blacks (Vega et al., 1974; Anderson, 1967) and the lower economic status of many black women in comparison to white women (Adler, 1975; Crites, 1976; Klein & Kress, 1976), as variables affecting the differential involvement of black and white women in specific categories of criminal behavior.

Sandhu and Irving (1974) in a study of incarcerated men and women found that female inmates are, on the average, more likely than males to be married, to have suffered marital disruption and to have been married more than once. They postulate that the anti-social behavior of the subjects of their sample usually results from disruption of relationships with significant others, the most significant of these being husband or lover relationships. Suval and Brisson (1974) also found a high degree of marital instability among female offenders and stress the importance of primary relationships to women. Vega et al. attribute the greater likelihood of female offenders to be married to the expectations of the female role. While 55% of the males in their sample are single, only 41% of the females have not been married.

Although social class is considered a major predictor of criminal involvement for men, it is rarely discussed in the literature on female criminality. For males, the types of crime engaged in are dependent, to some extent, on the social status and occupational position of the actor. There is no reason to believe the situation is different for women. For women, of course, social class is thought to be derived from their partner's standing which would decrease
the predictive power of this variable in higher social classes, for their position would not necessarily imply attendant opportunities for criminal behavior. Social class is, nevertheless, an important variable that accounts to some extent for the differential opportunities and treatment of members of society which may, in turn, affect their behaviors.

Two components of social class, educational attainment and occupational attainment, must be considered specifically. Both, to some degree, mediate the means and opportunities available for criminal behavior. Also, educational and occupational attainment may negate or contribute to the necessity of criminal behavior.

Vega et al. found the education levels of males to be higher than those for females. Educational achievement, however, is similar to that of males (1974:5). Although male criminals are likely to have completed more years of school than female criminals, female criminals are able to score as well on measures of knowledge gained as male criminals. Occupationally, women are likely to be in clerical or service categories (1974:6). Crites found, too, that female inmates often have dependents, are generally poor, and work in low status occupations. She refers to the "declining survival options" of female criminals, supporting her stance with a report of the median annual incomes of men and women. Women's earnings in 1973 were 57% of those of men (1976:37). According to data gathered by the U. S. Department of Justice on federal female prison populations, nearly half of the inmates had more than one dependent (1977:6), a quarter of them received some assistance from public funds.
when arrested (1977:7), 78% had had no vocational training before arrest although nearly three-fourths had completed at least high school (1977:8), and only half reported employment prior to arrest and, of those, a large majority earned less than $8,000 per year.

Although the figures presented in the literature indicate that female offenders are often from minority groups, are poor, and have low status occupations (Crites, 1976; Velimesis, 1975), it must be remembered that the populations studied were incarcerated females. Lower class women, like lower class men, often commit conventional street crimes. Because of the value placed on private property in the U.S. society by middleand upper class people and the fact that participation in street crimes is mainly a lower class phenomenon, these conventional criminals of often dealt with harshly by the criminal justice system which embodies middle and upper class values (Clinard & Quinney, 1973:145). This means that lower class women because of the nature of their participation in criminal behavior, are more likely to be incarcerated than middle or upper class women who are more likely to be involved in crimes that are less visible and less severely sanctioned. Minority women, too, are often treated more harshly by the system than white women and suffer many inequities in the general society as well; both factors help to account for differential rates of imprisonment across racial categories. Certainly, official rates of female criminality cannot be accepted without qualifications and without comparisons to survey data on the subject.
Official conventional crime rates would indicate that for women who are involved in criminal behaviors the Women's Rights Movement is meaningless (Velimesis, 1975; Crites, 1976; Noblit & Burcart, 1976; Weis, 1976). Price concurs with the perceptions of these authors but adds, "There is, however, debate around the question of whether the liberation movement among women in the general society may be at least responsible for the rise in female crime" (1977:102). Smart, too, considers the general effect of the Women's Movement on female criminals. The Women's Rights Movement may not be particularly meaningful to classes from which female criminals come, but the objective material conditions of their roles and positions may result in conclusions similar to those drawn by supporters of the Women's Movement (1977:74). Noblit and Burcart (1976) postulate that the marginality of conventional female criminals has increased, in part because of the Women's Movement, resulting in an increase in property crimes. The relationship of the emancipation of women to their criminal behaviors requires a clarification of assumptions and the investigation of the empirical reality upon which those assumptions are based.

Weis (1976) spells out some of the assumptions concerning liberation in the literature on female criminality and calls into question the veracity or accuracy of some of these assumptions. Most importantly, perhaps, he asserts that liberation as discussed in theories of female criminality is actually "cultural liberation—emancipation from sex role restraints" rather than total sexual equality, an improbability in a classist, racist, and sexist society.
(1976:26). He and others further question the extent of even cultural liberation. Women have made some gains, socially, politically, and economically, but to say that women are nearing equality with men in even one of these spheres is an overstatement (Cf. Simon, 1975; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; Heidensohn, 1970; Klein & Kress, 1976; Peters, 1977; Smart, 1977).

One effect of the Women's Rights Movement has been a change in gender role expectations. Tresemer (1975) specifies three basic models of gender role change. The first involves role reversal, in which the basic separation between gender roles remains, but men and women enter the fields of the opposite sex. People of each sex reject their gender roles and adopt the gender role of the other. Those sex-role theories that are specific to females and view female crime as the masculinization of female behavior follow this model of gender role change (Weis, 1976:17). The second model presumes a lessening of differences between the sexes until everyone is identical. Weis (1976) refers to corresponding theories of criminal behavior of females as role convergence theories, in which the criminal behaviors of men and women become more and more similar. Weis rejects both of these models in that both view the female criminal as rejecting the feminine role and therefore as inferior to the conforming female. Adler (1975) is an example of the theorists who posit these models as explanations of recent increased in female criminal behavior (Weis, 1976). "The tone of the book (Adler's Sisters in Crime) celebrates women becoming more like men..." (Peters, 1977:74).

Weis posits a role validation or opportunity theory of
female criminality. Females engage in criminal behavior as "an illegitimate expression of femininity rather than as a symbol of masculinity" (Weis, 1976:18). This viewpoint is similar to Hoffman-Bustamante's role expressive interpretation of criminal behavior. Both Weis (1976) and Hoffman-Bustamante (1976) reject the role reversal or role convergence theories of female criminality. A problem with role validation theories is that women's roles and men's roles are assumed to be bipolar and unidimensional, a criticism raised by Tresemer of gender role theory in general (1976: 314-315).

Tresemer, however, describes a third model which incorporates a developmental view of gender roles, with men and women retaining their gender roles and congruent behaviors but adding others (1976: 324). This model provides a degree of synthesis between role expressive and role convergence theories of behavior. This model implies no rejection of the female or male role, only that these roles may, as individuals extend their roles, overlap to an even greater extent than they do at present. As they do so the varieties of illegitimate as well as legitimate behaviors may increase. The thesis, then, that as women become more "liberated" they will be involved in a larger number of and more serious criminal behaviors, does not imply a rejection of the female role but greater freedom within that role to engage in behaviors previously denied them.

The characteristics presented here represent those which mediate between the social structure and the behavior of the individual.
Opportunities, social controls, and societal reactions vary according to these characteristics. Therefore, consideration of these variables is essential.

**Biological and Psychological Bases of Female Criminality**

Theories of female criminality must not only explain female criminality but also explain why crime rates for females are lower than those of males. Biological and psychological theories in general have been generated to explain the former with only occasional references to the latter. Theories dealing with biological and psychological variables often are based on an assumption of greater hidden criminality for women than men, an assumption which decreases the importance of the theoretical requirement that differential rates be explained.

Historically, biological factors have played a significant role in the study of female criminality. Lombroso's investigations of physical traits in an effort to distinguish biologically criminals from non-criminals set the stage for development of a biological perspective in this area (Lombroso-Ferrero, 1972:X1). His conclusions that female criminals are more primitive than non-offending females and, of course, males has been a recurrent theme in the literature proposing a biological basis for female behavior (Klein, 1976).

The Gluecks (1934) following the work of Lombroso and the Positivist school studied physical and psychological traits of criminal women, concluding that many are not mentally stable
enough to survive by legitimate means (1934:299), have been mal-adjusted from childhood (1934:300), have histories of sexual misbehavior (1934:300), exhibit irresponsible behavior (1934:301), and in general are "anti-social misfits" (1934:303). Pollack (1950), following the tradition set by these writers, discusses the influence of the lesser physical strength of women and their generative phases on female crime rates. Although Pollack espouses a view that integrates social and biological factors, he emphasizes the latter. He looks to the factors that distinguish men from women as the basis for the psychological traits that influence women to commit crimes. He sees menstruation, pregnancy and menopause as criminogenic phases in the lives of women. "Women undergo in the years of maturity a number of physiological crises which do not occur in the maturation process of men" (1950:104).

This biological view of female criminality did not and with the publication of Pollack's classic work on female criminality. Pollack is one of the most quoted writers in this field and his influence on the study of female criminality continues. Bertha Payak, writing as recently as 1969, characterizes female criminality, in part, as the result of behavioral changes which are biologically based. Payak characterizes female criminals as emotionally immature. Because of this immaturity, they are unable to deal with life processes and as a result of more likely to engage in criminal behaviors (1969:11).

The search for individual characteristics to explain female criminality continued with the investigation of psychological variables.
that would explain the existence of crime among females. Research in this area focused on comparisons of female offenders to male offenders and analyses of psychological variables associated with women in prison communities.

Freud's interpretations of the female psyche is evidenced in much of the literature discussed here. Although Freud's discussion of female psychology and sexuality has been subject to much criticism, it serves as a foundation for the postulations presented by these authors. His theories present an immutable distinction between male and female psychologies (Brown, 1972:135), inducing many authors to search for explanations of a female psychology rather than a human psychology (Adler, 1972; Klein, 1976).

As in his discussion of biological characteristics, Pollack produces an artificial chasm between men and women. Unlike the rational nature that persists in man, the nature of women is first and foremost irrational, for she is guided by her emotions rather than her reason. For this reason, female criminality is also distinguished from male criminality. Pollack refers to the secondary participation of women in economically motivated crimes and attributes any primary involvement of women in such crimes to the "masculinization of female crime" (1950:29). Reckless also distinguishes men psychologically and criminally when he asserts that the role played by women in society and in crime is determined by their psychological and constitutional differences (1957:2).

A natural outgrowth of this separation between male and female psychologies is a delineation of traits attributed to women
which contribute to the specification of their gender roles and to their oppression. The attribution of these traits to women and not to men is an example of bipolarity as discussed by Tresemer (1975).

Lombroso attributed to women a natural maternal instinct which in his view was lacking in criminal women. Society in general adheres to the existing division of labor, wherein women have the major responsibility for the care of minor children; belief in a maternal instinct justifies this division of labor as a biological necessity. "The structure of the family itself is legitimated by the ideology of sexism, which assures us that the roles filled by women are their 'natural' ones. Women are meant above all to be wives and mothers, either because of their physiology (not only do women bear children, they are soft and weak as well) or their psychology (women are passive, gentle, irrational, personal, expressive)" (Klein & Kress, 1976:37). Equating femaleness with a maternal instinct provides a justification for the theme that women who commit crimes are not only less feminine than their non-offending counterparts, but also less female. Women criminals are viewed as rebellers against their natural feminine role, which requires conformity and "goodness" to a greater extent than the masculine role (Klein, 1977). According to this perspective, female worth is measured by gender role performance and female criminal behavior is failure to fulfill gender role expectations (Weis, 1976:17).

Another theme that surfaces in the psychological explanations of female criminality is based on the dependency of women
(Pollack, 1950; Payak, 1969; Reckless & Kay, 1967). Payak, referring to the "natural dependency of women" (1969:10), reduces dependence to an immutable psychological characteristic of all women. Furthermore, if the security of dependent women is disrupted, they may, because of psychological or economic problems, resort to criminal behavior (Payak, 1960:10). Ursel (1977) characterizes the relationship between men and women as interdependent rather than dependent, but the sexual division of labor has resulted in status differentiation; women's domain, because the reproductive role has reduced mobility, has been defined as less important than the male role (1977:33). Since man controls property and the means of production he is in a superordinate position and can exploit women, who are in a subordinate position (1977:33). Women, then, are not inherently dependent. They are in a dependent position because of the division of labor. Crimes resulting from this dependence must be economically rather than psychologically motivated.

Women are generally portrayed in theories of female crime to be emotional rather than rational (Thomas, 1923; Pollack, 1950; Payak, 1969). "Any woman's driving motivations, accordingly, tend to be emotional. Her major aim is emotional security, as her principle satisfactions are measured by the non-material values of love, affection, and service to her family" (Payak, 1969:10). This irrationality attributed to women provides justification for the conclusions that women criminals are often psychologically abnormal (d'Orban, 1971), and that they are selfishly motivated (Payak, 1969).
Whether these traits explain criminality in females is open to question. Since they presume concomitant responsibilities, it also seems that they could help to account for the lower crime rates for women than men. It is not at all certain, however, that women inherently possess these traits, an important consideration in that the assumption that natural traits of females distinguish them from males underlies the psychological theories of female criminality.

The study of physiological and psychological factors in the investigation of female crime began in the latter part of the 19th century. By utilizing anthropometry and the metric system, Kellor (1899) recorded various anatomical measurements which were designed to determine the relationship between heredity and environment to crime. In searching for psychological traits associated with female criminality, she tested memory, color-blindness, and accuracy of the physical senses, respiration and association of ideas, which in turn led to the investigation of environmental variables and the conclusion, like Fernald's, that "environmental factors are at least as important as constitutional factors" (Fernald, 1920:529).

Weidensall (1916) tested some psychological and physical characteristics comparing women offenders while incarcerated to 15 year old working girls and older university women. Height, weight, grip, dexterity, efficiency of recall, and various other learning abilities were tested. Weidensall found that a third of her offender sample "... are at least as intelligent and efficient in whatever these tests measure as is the average Cincinnati working girl of fifteen" (1916:269). Although this quotation is taken out of context,
it is important to consider just what it is the tests measure. Weidensall's analysis of body size and manual dexterity is similar to the biological experiments of Lombroso.

The emphasis on mental capacity seems to imply that female offenders could be differentiated from the general female society in their ability to think; however, the research does not tend to support this. Murphy (1963) tested the hypothesis that female criminals are less intelligent than non-criminals. Her study did not support this hypothesis but she cites the studies of Fernald (1920) and Blueck (1934) which did. Mazie Rappaport (1957) attests to the lower intelligence quotient of female offenders, but qualifies her assertion, stating that, overall, female criminals are uneducated and unorganized.

Ward, Jackson, and Ward (1969) included in their study I.Q. and psychological disabilities. In a comparison of violent offenders to offenders against property and narcotics offenders, they found that violent offenders had lower I.Q.'s than the other offenders, although not significantly so when they controlled for race, and are psychologically disturbed more often than the other offenders.

Reckless cites the study of Kay in which she compared female to male offenders. Male offenders were found to have higher I.Q.'s than female offenders while female offenders were found to be more alienated and more likely to feel isolation and despair than male criminals (1967:157).
These writers have attributed crime among women to either the inherent qualities of women or to a dysfunction in the individual female, reducing all female crime to a psychological level, while ignoring economic motivations and structural factors in female criminality. Although the theories of male criminality have moved from this psychological perspective to consideration of societal variables, theories of female criminality have until recently adhered to the themes and assumptions of psychologically based behavior presented here.

The studies based on these themes and assumptions searched for differences in female criminals that would distinguish them from other females. A major drawback of these studies is that the research often involves the study of women in prison populations who may not be representative of the total population of female criminals and whose responses may be distorted given the context of their existence.

The Female Gener Role as a Factor in Criminal Behavior

Implicit in many of the writings on female criminality is a distinction between male and female crime that is traced to the biological and psychological factors previously discussed or to the roles women play in the larger society. Because of these factors, women are perceived to be incapable of certain motive and actions.

Chesney-Lind (1973, 1974) found that, among adolescents, different standards of behavior exist for girls and boys. This double standard continues to exist throughout adulthood (Conway, 1977; Smart, 1977; Simon, 1976a; Adler, 1976, Payak, 1969). Politically, economically, socially, and sexually, women are viewed as
subordinate to men (Klein & Kress, 1976; Ursel, 1977; Klein, 1976). Society expects greater conformity from women than men, resulting in greater restraints on the behavior of women. Because of these societal expectations, women's expectations of themselves are also limited. As a group, they do not perceive of themselves as capable of certain actions, behaviors, and ideas, or if they think themselves capable, they do not feel that their role allows them the freedom to engage in such behaviors (Firestone, 1970). Criminal behaviors are only one example of behaviors considered incongruent with the female role. Creative behaviors, such as those thought essential to the arts, are also thought to be outside the realm of female capabilities and are not thought to be an appropriate female role anyway (Firestone, 1970).

The double standard that exists in the larger society also is pervasive in the criminal justice system (Conway, 1977). Women have historically been less involved in criminal behavior than have men. The criminal behavior in which they did become involved was soon categorized by the people of the criminal justice system and by academicians as sexually based. For example,

There is impressive evidence that chronic shoplifting, particularly among women who can afford to buy, is sexually motivated. With many female thieves, the compulsion to steal is a form of sexual sublimation and may be minimized by psychiatric treatment of the sexual problems which causes it (deRham, 1969:13).

This sexualization of crimes committed by females discussed by Chesney-Lind allows the larger society to recognize female criminals without disengaging her from the female role. To impute economic
motivations to female crimes is to separate the female criminals from the female role and impart to her masculine characteristics.

Some crimes are more in tune with female roles than others and it has been these crimes in which women have traditionally been involved to the greatest extent. While shoplifting may have a variety of causes, it is true that women, when performing tasks associated with the housewife role, for example, shopping, are presented with an opportunity for criminal behavior. Other roles present other opportunities for criminal behavior and it is the lack of or presence of opportunity in combination with other factors that determines the likelihood and type of criminal offenses (Smart, 1977). Hoffman-Bustamante in discussing and analyzing major factors which when taken together, form a paradigm to view criminality, concludes,

Where the crime requires behavior that is consistent with expected female roles, women appear to make up a large number of petty criminals... and

Women tend not to be arrested for crimes that require stereotyped male behavior, i.e., robbery, burglary (Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973:131).

This viewpoint of female criminality is consistent with the non-aggressive, dependent role attributed to women in general. Women in performing acts of a criminal nature generally stay within the boundaries of their defined role with its concomitant restrictions and limitations. As the expectations of the female have expanded and as the female role has become less confining, women have engaged in various new behaviors, criminal behavior being only one (Simon, 1975; Adler, 1976; Harris, 1977; Smart, 1977). Adler, especially
declares the more serious and aggressive nature of female criminality, citing the larger increases in female criminality rates than male rates. Whether this is tied to the female role, especially as related to aggression, is questioned by Crites (1974) and by Norland and Shover (1977) when they call for more research and clarification of variables in this area. They cite a relatively steady rate of violent offenses, for example, by women which indicates their skepticism is warranted. They call for conceptual clarification of gender roles and criminal roles so that, with research, actual trends in female criminality can be assessed and their relationships to gender roles can be explored.

Adler's thesis (1975, 1977) that "as the social and economic disparity between the sexes decreases, there is a correlative increase in female criminality" is a major hypothesis in the field at the present time. Whether this increase is a latent result of the women's movement, of a subjective change in women's self-evaluations, of increased opportunities for criminal behavior, or a combination of these or other factors, or if indeed gender roles are related to female criminality, remains to be determined by future research. Woman's role has undergone a great deal of change and is still in a state of flux. Women's involvement in criminal behavior has increased. To what extent and in what manner these two phenomena are correlated subsumes much of the current discussion of female criminality.

While some authors postulate a subjective change in women's perceptions and attitudes as well as an objective change in their immediate environments and the wider social structures (Simon, 1975;
Adler, 1975; deRham, 1969; Klein, 1976; Vega et al., 1974), others deny the proposed relationship between liberation and criminality (Smart, 1977; Crites, 1976; Weis, 1976; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973). Weis, Hoffman-Bustamante, and Smart view the lack of opportunity as an explanation for the lower crime rates of women; in short, the nature and extent of female criminality reflect the oppression of women rather than the liberation of women (Weis, 1976:19). Role validation, as opposed to role convergence, provides an important tool for the explanation of lower crime rates for women than men, according to these authors. They do not support the contention that women have undergone a subjective alteration as a result of the Women's Movement that increases the likelihood of involvement in law-breaking behavior.

It is inevitable, therefore, that some criminologists will attempt to place the responsibility for the apparent changes in female criminality and delinquency on the Woman's Movement rather than seeing both as an outcome of changing social and economic conditions (Smart, 1977:26).

These authors agree that objective conditions and not subjective perceptions of self are major determinants of criminal behavior. Opportunities distributed by the social structure on the basis of the biological characteristic, sex, are deemed to be more likely associated with criminal behavior.

Others, notably Harris and Hill (1977), acknowledge the effect of both subjective and objective forces, but their research indicates the greater importance of subjective factors. Changes in socialization patterns and sex-role typing are discussed as attitudinal variances that affect the rates of female criminality. Harris
and Hill cite the higher rates of criminality for juvenile women than adult women and the larger decrease in the sex ratio of juvenile females to juvenile males than adult females to adult males, both findings failing to support the objective opportunity theories.

Summary

Greater development of gender roles results in greater overlap between male and female roles; higher rates of female crime, however, do not automatically follow from this. The Women's Movement has both fostered and been supported by economic changes and change in the subjective perceptions women and men have of themselves. Given the economic basis for criminal behaviors, as economic conditions for women improve, the female crime rates should decrease, except that economic conditions are not improving for all of the population, especially for that group which is most likely to commit street crimes. For those women whose legitimate opportunities are increasing, the illegitimate opportunities are also increasing, while at the same time the chance of detection and prosecution are decreasing due to their more protected positions in the economic system.

According to the existing literature, women do not commit as much crime as men and the crimes they do commit, for the most part, are within the purview of the feminine role. Although some variables have been defined as associated with female criminality, the research supporting such suggestions is superficial.

The need for research is clear. Neither the nature of female criminality nor the variables that affect involvement is substantiated.
in the literature. The relationship of the Women's Rights Movement to changes in female criminality remains to be delineated. The data on which the assumptions and propositions are based are not sufficient to provide an adequate picture of female criminality. The research thus far studies female offenders who are members of prison populations or relies on official data, neither of which can stand alone as reliable data collection methods. Research in the general population is needed to go beyond the commonsensical conjectures about female criminality that make up a large part of the theory of female criminal behavior.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

Introduction

In the literature on female criminality, few theories have been advanced to explain its existence or the lower rates of crime for females than males. The presence or absence of opportunities and the criminal and non-criminal type-scripts of women have been advanced by various authors as important variables in the understanding of female crime and female criminals. In this chapter these variables are incorporated into a theory of criminal involvement. Because women are less likely than males to commit crimes, control theory and constraints on behaviors are also included in this theoretical orientation.

A theoretical perspective that strives to provide an explanation of female criminality alone is as inadequate as the current theories of male criminality in the criminological literature. What is needed is a general theory of criminality (Harris, 1977; Heidensohn, 1968), one that explains criminality by both males and females and that accounts for the similarities and differences in the types of crimes committed, the rates of criminal behaviors, and the variables associated with criminal acts. A theory that explains
both male and female criminal behavior must account for the differential rates of involvement by men and women. A general theory of criminal behavior is discussed in the following pages.

**Gender Roles and Theories of Criminal Behavior**

Although there has been some disagreement in the previous literature on female criminality, most authors in current discussions abhor the notion that females are psychologically different from males and that female criminals are different from male criminals. While biological differences between the sexes are certainly present, they cannot account for social behaviors, nor do they indicate inherent psychological properties of either sex. Sex is, though, a biological characteristic that interacts with the impact of structural, institutional and situational variables. Sex determines the gender role to which one is exposed and the expectations of the gender role to which one is socialized.

(Being a woman) meant and means that one is perceived differently, treated differently, responded to differently, and the subject of different expectations (Adler, 1975:39).

Gender roles, as do any social roles, prescribe and proscribe behavior. While some behaviors may be appropriate for one role, they may be entirely incorrect for another social role. Likewise, while some roles are played by nearly everyone at one time or another, for example, student or worker, others are age, sex, or class specific. Those roles that are sex specific and prescribe or proscribe actions and/or attitudes are gender roles. Therefore, society expects certain
behaviors from gender role occupants, just as the occupants have expectations of themselves. Gender roles are socially determined and, as such, do not describe immutable characteristics of the occupants of the gender roles.

Many ambiguities surround the female gender role; the conflicting literature and research centering on sex roles indicates a general uncertainty about the makeup of the female and male gender roles, in part because these roles are culturally determined and in part because the fluidity of the roles results in fluctuations and overlap between roles. For women, criminal behavior can be viewed as either role rejective or role expressive behavior (Weis, 1976). Tresemer (1975) has described a developmental model of gender role change in which occupants of gender roles retain their traditional role and yet incorporate attitudes and behaviors into that role not traditionally defined as appropriate. In this model women who engage in criminal behaviors are not automatically perceived to be rejectors of the feminine role, even if they are engaged in criminal behaviors that are not congruent with that role. This wider conception of gender expressive behaviors allows for flexibility in the female gender role, especially important considering the changes occurring as a result of the Women's Rights Movement. Gender roles may be an important consideration in the criminal behaviors of women for as the female gender role expands, women may be more or less likely to be involved in criminal behaviors.

The theoretical perspective adopted for the explanation of crime by women utilizes three existing paradigms: opportunity
theory, control theory, and labeling theory. This theoretical perspective is delineated and explicated in this chapter. As mentioned, a theory of female criminality must not only account for involvement in crime by females but also why women are less likely than men to be involved in criminal behaviors.

The structures of opportunities, both legitimate and illegitimate, have long been recognized as factors in the explanation of criminal behaviors. That they are important considerations in the explanation of female as well as male criminal behaviors is evidenced by the restricted access women have to the economic, social, and political structures of society and the concommitant inaccessibility of both types of opportunities associated with these areas.

Constraining role relationships and controls exerted by society on the behaviors of men and women must also be taken into account. The criminal must be viewed in terms of the forces impinging upon him or her by virtue of the level of integration of the individual into society. The bond of the individual to the society may inhibit involvement in criminal behaviors. Those persons with high levels of integration, then, may be less likely to commit criminal behaviors than those who are less integrated into society.

Lastly, different groups in society are involved in crime at differential rates. One explanation advanced for the differences in involvement in crime across groups is grounded in social reaction theory. "Type-scripting," which refers to the process by which behavioral expectancies are defined for various types of people, comes essentially from a labeling perspective, but views the labeling process as a group phenomenon. The individual then takes cues from
the definitions of his/her group by the larger society for his/her own behavior.

Women, as a group, have fewer opportunities than men to participate fully in the economic and political power structure. At the same time, they have not had opportunities for illegitimate behaviors, in part because of the greater intimacy of their social roles, that is, greater involvement in their role relationships, and the greater control exerted over their behavior by others. Furthermore, women, as a group, are viewed differently by the general society than are men. This affects their self-perceptions and the behaviors in which they may become involved. As gender roles expand, the effects of opportunity structures, constraining role relationships, and type-scripts may increase or decrease. The changes may lead to increases or decreases in the criminal involvement by women. In this chapter, opportunity structures, controls, type-scripts, and liberation are discussed in terms of their effects on criminal involvement.

Gender Roles and Opportunity

As previously stated, sex is a characteristic that affects structural, institutional, and situational factors in crime. Of interest here are the opportunities, legitimate and illegitimate, that are available to women. According to Cloward and Ohlin's theory of delinquency and opportunity, blocked legitimate opportunities force the adolescent to turn to illegitimate means to achieve societally defined goals (1961:155). Women, however, have had free
access to neither legitimate nor illegitimate means by which to reach their goals (Klein & Kress, 1977).

The opportunities available to both men and women are structurally determined (Cloward & Ohlin, 1961), that is, the opportunities available to individuals are differentially determined by factors other than their personal characteristics. Whether the opportunities are legitimate or illegitimate, the structural distribution remains. Major institutions of our society propagate norms and values antithetical to another societal value, equal opportunity. In the legal sphere, women have often been treated as persons without responsibility for their actions. While many laws have often had the net effect of being less stringently enforced for women in comparison to men, the double standard of the legal system supports the notion that females are somehow less than males. The political power of women has been neutralized to the extent that while women are a majority of the population they constitute a minute proportion of those with political power, especially of those with national political power. As a result, women are not likely to have the opportunities men have for legitimate or illegitimate behaviors.

Because women, on the whole, have neither legal nor political clout, their opportunities for advancement in the work place are also limited. Barriers to success in the work place include family roles, which according to the existing division of labor are defined to be most important to women, sex segregation, nonprovision of training, the female culture, and different life
experiences (Zellman, 1976). While men are socialized to fulfill their work roles, women are socialized to fulfill their family roles. Since women, according to this scheme of events do not belong in the work place permanently they are given neither sufficient training nor sufficient opportunity to remain there in any capacity except as a low-level wage earner. Advancement to the higher ranks of business and industry is exceedingly rare for females. Because of this, legitimate opportunities for economic success are denied women. Given the importance society places on the familial responsibilities of women, it is not surprising that women spend a large proportion of their time fulfilling family roles. Even those women with careers outside the home spend nearly as much time on family responsibilities as on their outside careers. That this limits opportunities, both legitimate and illegitimate, is obvious.

Simon hypothesizes that greater participation in the labor force will yield more opportunities for some kinds of crime, for example, fraud, embezzlement, etc. (1975:19), and that as women's opportunities for criminal behavior increase, their criminal patterns will be more similar to those of males (1975:47). Although women's participation in the labor force has increased, their standing has not (Simon, 1976; Klein & Kress, 1976; Crites, 1976). Smart found that most white-collar crimes are not open to women; women seldom find themselves in the positions necessary for involvement in white collar crime (1977:24). In fact, the lack of opportunity for illegitimate behaviors for women decreases the probability of involvement by women in organized, professional, or white-collar crimes.
Since these crimes require acceptance by the group engaged in illegitimate behavior, it is unlikely that women will be able to break the barriers to participation in the sexist illegitimate structures (Klein & Kress, 1976).

According to Thio (1973) it is the powerless people in society who are most likely to commit conventional crimes. Like lower-class men who are dominated by males in the middle and upper classes who have many legitimate opportunities and opportunities for "safe" illegitimate endeavors, women are a powerless group in society. They are exploited in their positions as free laborers in the household, in their positions as child care agents, in their positions as sexual objects, and in their positions as reserve laborers for the industrial sector of the society (Klein & Kress, 1976:37-38).

The problem with opportunity theory as it applies to women, then, is that given the blocked legitimate opportunities and the powerless positions of women in society, they should have higher rates of criminal behavior than males, or at least their crime rates should approximate those of lower class men. If, however, the availability of legitimate and illegitimate opportunities vary together and both are structurally determined, opportunity theory may help to explain criminal behavior and account for the differential between male and female rates of crime (Harris, 1977).

The viability of opportunity theory may also be enhanced by a distinction between perceived opportunities, both legitimate and illegitimate, and real opportunities. How women individually
and as a group perceive the availability of opportunities available to them may be more closely related to criminal behavior than real opportunity structures. Perception of opportunities is related to the socialization of women. Although socialization of women is not directly examined in the present research, socialization is viewed as a factor that may affect the perceptions of both men and women. Even though women are a powerless group in the general society, their crime rates may not approach that of males for reasons other than their lack of opportunities, both real and perceived, for illegitimate behaviors. A major factor to be considered in the crime rates for women is the amount of control over their behavior exerted by institutions and significant others in their environments.

Gender Roles and Control

The constraints placed on the behaviors of men and women vary as do the opportunities available to them. A narrower range of behaviors is acceptable for women than men; thus, constraints on or inhibitors of unacceptable behavior are usually much greater for women than men (Harris, 1977). The roles played by women place many constraints upon their behaviors; the positions of women in the family, community, and broader social structures determines the type and extent of these constraints. Greater constraints on behavior result in different and fewer deviations from defined and accepted standards of behavior.

A major factor to be considered in constraints on behavior is the level of integration of the individual into society. Durkheim, speaking on integration in terms of the relationship of integration
to suicide, refers to the cohesion of society and the absence of extreme fluctuations from the collective will or conscience (1951: 378). These collective forces, in turn, serve to regulate social life and limit the level of individual expression in society. Integration is a multi-dimensional concept which includes a close relationship between the individual and the group, a clearly defined position for the individual within the structure of society, and a collective conscience that guides individual beliefs and practices (1951:15). Integration inhibits any significant deviation from standards of appropriate behavior defined by the collective conscience. The relationship between society and the individual results in controls over the individual's attitudes and behaviors by various groups in society.

Travis Hirschi, in his presentation of control theory, has delineated four variables which reflect basic dimensions of Durkheim's conceptions of integration. The first of these, attachment, is defined in terms of sensitivity or insensitivity to others.

If a person does not care about the wishes and expectations of other people—that is, if he is insensitive to the opinion of others—then he is to that extent not bound by the norms. He is free to deviate (1969:18).

The second variable, commitment, indicates loyalty to conventional behavior.

When or whenever he considers deviant behavior, he must consider the costs of this deviant behavior, the risk he runs of losing the investment he has made in conventional behavior (1969:20).
The third variable, involvement, embraces the principle of limited
time and energy.

The assumption, widely shared, is that a person may
be simply too busy doing conventional things to find
time to engage in deviant behavior (1969:22).

The fourth variable, belief, "assumes the existence of a common
value system within the society or group whose norms are being
violated" (1969:23). People accept this common value system to
varying degrees; thus their degree of acceptance may be a factor in
criminal behavior.

All of Hirschi's variables are strongly associated. This
is especially true of attachment and commitment (Hirschi, 1971). In
Hirschi's analysis, commitment adds little to the variance explained
by attachment in the explanation of criminality. The importance of
involvement is ambiguous; Hirschi does not establish its importance
in his analysis. Thus, two of Hirschi's variables, attachment and
belief, are utilized in this explanation of female criminality. The
attachments and beliefs of women and the relationship of these
variables to involvement in criminality are examined.

Control theory, then, explains why people do not commit
crimes. Thus it ought to be significant in dealing with the question
of the differential rates of female and male involvement in criminal
behavior. If women as a group feel a greater degree of attachment
and more strongly hold to societal beliefs than men as a group do,
they are less likely, on the whole, to be involved in criminal behaviors.
Furthermore, those women who feel to a greater extent that they are
attached to significant others and believe in the general norms and values of the society are less likely to become engaged in criminal behavior than those who do not.

Within the general framework of control theories, and in particular Hirschi's attachment variable, Friday and Halsey postulate that as intimacy of role relationships increases, the probability of criminal behaviors decreases. Intimacy is high if one has few role partners, is engaged in a wide variety of activities, knows his or her role partners well, and his or her role partners and role activities overlap (1977:143). These factors determine the integration of the individual into the wider society through role relationships. A person who is well integrated into society is likely to have stronger attachment to others and greater acceptance of societal beliefs, for the frequency, duration, self-disclosure, and overlap of interaction, the major components of intimacy, determine the likelihood of being socialized into the dominant norms of the society (Friday & Hage, 1976:355). The total integrative function of the role set, across family, work, school, community, and/or peer role relationships (Friday & Halsey, 1977:142), because it affects the degree to which the individual is socialized into the dominant norms of society determines the influence of controlling or criminogenic social relationships.

Women, because of strong family and community ties, are likely to have integrative role sets. If women work or attend school, their careers are usually defined as complementary to
family factors, increasing the integrative function of the role set. The division of labor that keeps women in secondary and powerless positions also increases the controlling social relationships of women. Even the peer group, which for adolescents can be crimino-genic if its role relationships are not overlapped with other role relationships (Friday & Hage, 1976:364-5), is likely to be integrative for women in that it is likely to support the same norms as other role relationships.

Even if women engage in criminal behaviors, given the lack of illegitimate opportunities they are unlikely to be members of criminal subcultures (Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973). They, thereby, have little chance to learn the techniques, motivations, and rationalizations of some types of crimes. Furthermore, because of the content of gender roles and attendant ideas of female abilities, women often do not learn some legitimate skills that can be used for illegitimate purposes. For example, women are less likely than men to be familiar with auto mechanics, a skill which may contribute to auto theft.

In order for illegitimate behavior to occur, there must be present opportunity for its perpetration. While opportunities for illegitimate behaviors increase the likelihood of their occurrence, constraints on behavior decrease the likelihood of criminal behaviors. That women are less likely than males to have available both legitimate and illegitimate opportunities is evidenced by their lack of participation in the economic and political institutions of our society. The power structure of American society is inhabited by
males and it is this power structure that inhibits the participation of females in the major institutions of society. It is this same power structure that has perpetuated the "truism" that women are more loving and nurturant than males and so biologically justify the division of labor that keeps women in the home and men in the marketplace. That women have stronger attachment and belief than men is not as obvious as the absence of opportunity for women, but the socialization of women and the intimacy of relationships of which women are a part would lead to such a conclusion. The interdependence and integration of these relationships allow for the development of those factors which Hirschi delinates. Until women gain independence and become a significant force in the marketplace, they will be relegated to the home and, as such, will be protected from fragmented relationships and a compartmentalized existence, both of which prohibit the development of attachment and acceptance of common beliefs. As such, according to control theory, they are less likely to be perpetrators of criminal behaviors outside of the feminine role. But, as such, they are denied access to the power structure of male society. As women have left the home to a greater and greater extent and entered the economic and political spheres, the patterns of their relationships have more closely approximated those of men. If the result of this process is decreased controls on the behaviors of women, their involvement in crime is likely to increase.
Gender Roles and Type-Scripts

Opportunity theory specifies a necessary condition for criminal behavior and control theory provides an explanation for non-criminal behaviors, that is, why some people are conventional and law-abiding regardless of the opportunities for non-normative behavior. This is especially important in a theoretical orientation that strives to account for female as well as male criminal behaviors. Neither the presence of opportunity nor the absence of controls, however, provides a rationale for involvement in criminal acts (Harris, 1977; Harris & Hill, 1977; Hirschi, 1971). Causative factors are specified in neither of these perspectives, although both contribute to an integrated explanation of criminal behavior.

Many authors have recognized this deficiency in nearly all deviance theory. Alex Thio (1973), in adopting and adapting labeling as an important process in the study of deviance, highlights an important issue. In recognizing that some groups in society are more inclined toward some criminal behaviors than others, he advances the notion that some groups, notably powerless groups, perceive of themselves as prone to commit certain types of crimes, in their case, conventional or street crimes. Rosenberg (1974) also emphasizes the importance of social types and self-labeling in deviant behavior, both of which are strongly affected by the ascribed social characteristics of the actor, gender being of major importance.

Harris (1977) refers to these behavioral expectancies as type-scripts, which define for groups of people in our society what...
behaviors are congruent with or antagonistic to their social identities.

One dominant order-maintaining function of type-scripts, then, involves specification of what types of actors are to commit what types of deviance in society and—perhaps more illuminating—what types of deviance are seen as unlikely or 'impossible' for other types of actors to commit (Harris, 1977:12).

Unlike traditional labeling theory which addresses the labels of individuals and secondary deviation but not primary deviation, the orientation explicated by Thio, Rosenberg, and Harris, because it defines a process of group labeling that affects self-labeling, more fully accounts for all deviant behaviors. A person who commits a crime for the first time has not been labeled a criminal previously, but the group to which the actor belongs may, whether or not they are overly involved in criminal behaviors, be viewed as likely to be involved in such behaviors. The reverse is also true; membership in some groups prohibits involvement in deviant or criminal behaviors. The view society holds of various groups in society inhibits or increases their involvement in criminal behavior. This societal type-script increases or decreases the probability of criminality by various groups.

Ascribed and achieved social characteristics affect the type-scripts assigned to various groups in society. Indeed, any characteristic on which society is stratified may affect the application of type-scripts. The application of type-scripts does not affect the content of the roles people play. Rather, type-scripts align certain types of actors with particular sets of social roles (Harris, 1977:12).
Gender, like social class, race, age, and so on, affects the view society holds and therefore the likelihood that specific role sets, for example, criminal role sets, are associated with a particular group of people. Type-scripts, then provide and limit the role choices and social identities available to groups in society.

Women are less likely than males to be assigned a criminal type-script and are therefore less likely to assume a criminal identity since criminal roles, for the most part, are denied women by the type-scripting process. Harris attributes the reluctance of the dominant segments of society to apply a criminal type-script to women to the indespensability of women in the home. In contrast, lower class, that is, powerless, men are not essential to the maintenance of society. Therefore, their type-scripts may align them with criminal behaviors and criminal identities (1977:12). If the type-scripts of women are more closely associating them with criminal roles than in the past, the result is likely to be greater involvement in crime in women.

Gender Roles, Liberation, and Crime

As the Women's Rights Movement has had an increased effect on the thinking of men and women, the roles of men and women have begun to overlap to a greater extent and the polarity between the roles has decreased. This has already occurred, to some extent, as appropriate roles for men and women are re-evaluated and redefined. The total effect of this process on the nature and type of female
criminality is as yet undetermined. There is general consensus that female involvement in crime has risen since the middle Sixties. While violent crime rates for females, that is, those crimes which involve some physical harm to another person, have remained stable, other crime rates have risen substantially.

Greater involvement in crime by females could be indicated by either or both of two trends. Increased percentages of female criminals within crime categories would indicate that women are involved to a greater extent in some crimes than they had previously. Some criminologists (Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; Crites, 1976) assert that any increased participation by females in crime is due to greater involvement in specific categories of criminal behavior, that is, typically feminine crimes. However, even if percentages remain stable in those categories, greater involvement would be indicated by female involvement in all categories of criminal behavior, regardless of the percentage of involvement. Harris refers to this latter state as pattern parity. As might be expected, other authors document that pattern parity is indeed developing (Simon, 1975; Adler, 1975; Price, 1977). By almost everyone's measure, females are not even approaching rate parity in relation to males. Pattern parity, though, seems to be an appropriate indicator of female involvement. Since the involvement of women is considerably less than that of men, rate increases and advances toward pattern parity are the focal points of concern.

As definitions of gender roles develop beyond the polarized perceptions held thus far by academicians, the variance within the
female population will be recognized as well as that between males and females. The hypothesis that female crime rates will approach those of males as equality between the sexes becomes greater is not necessarily a part of the theoretical orientation explicated here. Liberation for women may or may not result in more opportunities for illegitimate behavior, fewer constraints on behavior, and criminal role sets for women. Given the developmental model of gender role change, however, it is unlikely that the criminality of women will reach rate and pattern parity with the criminal behavior of men. Indeed, gender role change, increased constraints on behavior, or even more conforming role sets for women may result in less, not more, criminal involvement by women. At any rate, the utility and veracity of this theoretical base is not dependent upon the eventual equalization of the criminal behaviors of men and women (Harris, 1977).

Hypotheses

The theoretical orientation of this research stresses the importance of available opportunities, constraints, and type-scripts. Opportunities for illegal acts are essential for their commission; opportunity to a great extent determines not so much whether but more likely what types of crimes will be committed. Constraints on behavior decrease the possibility of illegal acts. While illegitimate opportunities and type-scripts may entail impetuses toward deviant behavior, constraints control these impetuses, with the end result being conventional behavior. Criminal type-scripts may also be
mitigated by the availability of opportunity and the presence of constraints on behavior. Conversely, the absence of constraints on behavior and the presence of a criminal type-script and illegitimate opportunities may lead to criminal behaviors.

The following hypotheses have been derived from this theoretical orientation:

1. Social class affects the opportunities, real and perceived, of women and ultimately their involvement in criminal behavior.

Social class as used here refers to one's relative standing in the general society according to occupational and educational achievements. Since the social class of a woman may be dependent upon the educational achievements of her husband or partner, then, are seen as intervening variables between social class and criminal involvement. These opportunity structures, both real and perceived, mediate the effects of social class on criminal behaviors. Perceived opportunity structures, however, are postulated to have a greater impact on criminal involvement, given the ubiquity of real opportunities for some type of criminal behavior, than real opportunities.

1a. The higher the social class, the greater the legitimate opportunities perceived.

1b. The higher the social class, the fewer the illegitimate opportunities perceived.

1c. The greater the legitimate opportunities perceived, the fewer the illegitimate opportunities perceived.

1d. The higher the social class, the greater the real illegitimate opportunities perceived.

1e. The greater the illegitimate opportunities perceived, the greater the involvement in criminal behavior.
If. The greater the legitimate opportunities perceived, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

Ig. The greater the real illegitimate opportunities, the greater the involvement in criminal behavior.

Ih. The impact of perceived illegitimate opportunities on criminal behavior is greater than the impact of real illegitimate opportunities on criminal behavior.

Ii. The higher the social class, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

2. Intimacy of role relationships is related to integration, which, in turn, is related to involvement in criminal behaviors.

Integration, as previously defined, refers to the ties of the individual to society. Durkheim (1951) proposes a conception of integration that refers to the bond between the individual and society as well as the position of the individual within the social structure. Integration in these terms is properly contrasted with egoism and individualism. It is this conception of integration that best fits the theoretical orientation presented here.

Intimacy of role relationships is a combination of behavioral variables associated with the interactions of the individual. These variables include the frequency, overlap, self-disclosure, and duration of interaction. Integration and acceptance of societal beliefs are seen as intervening variables between intimacy and control of role relationships and involvement in criminal behaviors, although intimacy and control of role relationships may affect involvement in criminal behavior directly.

2a. The greater the intimacy of role relationships, the greater the control of role relationships.
2b. The greater the control of role relationships, the greater the integration.

2c. The greater the integration, the greater the belief in commonly held values.

2d. The greater the control of role relationships, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

2e. The greater the belief in commonly held values, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

2f. The greater the integration, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

3. Type-scripting is related to involvement in criminal behavior.

The membership groups of an individual may affect the commission of criminal behaviors. The type-script of a group may inhibit or increase criminal behaviors, in that the type-script may associate criminal or non-criminal roles with the group.

3a. The greater the social class, the less the likelihood of a criminal type-script.

3b. The greater the likelihood of a criminal type-script, the greater the involvement in criminal behavior.

3b.1. The higher the age of the respondent, the less the likelihood that a criminal type-script has been applied.

3b.2. Women in unattached statuses are more likely to have a criminal type-script than those in attached statuses.

3b.3. White women are less likely to have a criminal type-script than non-white women.

4. The effects of liberation on involvement in criminal behavior are inhibited or enhanced by the effects of liberation on opportunity structures, constraining role relationships and the application of type-scripts.

For purposes of this study liberation is limited to cultural
liberation. Joseph Weis defines cultural liberation as "emancipation from sex-role constraints" (1976:25n). Liberation in terms of the wider social stratification system and the relationship of gender to the class structure are beyond the scope of liberation as used here, given the global nature of these relationships. The emancipation from sex-role restraints through the expansion of traditional male/female roles and the fluidity of boundaries between male/female roles are inherent in the concept used here.

The greater the perceived liberation of women,

4a. the greater the perceived legitimate opportunities.
4b. the fewer the perceived illegitimate opportunities.
4c. the greater the intimacy of role relationships.
4d. the greater the control of role relationships.
4e. the greater the belief in commonly held values.
4f. the greater the integration.
4g. the less the likelihood of the application of a criminal type-script.
4h. the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

The theoretical model advanced here as an explanation of female criminality is tested in the following chapters. In Chapter III the research design is discussed including operationalization of the variables discussed here.
CHAPTER III
The Research Design

Introduction

The information provided in this chapter describes the sampling procedures utilized, the population from which the sample is drawn, the data collection process, operationalization of the variables, the hypotheses, and the analysis of the data.

The Population and the Sample

The data for this study were gathered in Kalamazoo, Michigan, which has a population of 86,000 people, 34,000 of whom are women over 18 years old. Of the women in Kalamazoo, approximately 36% are single, 48% are married, 11% are widowed, and 5% are divorced. In 1970, the median income was $9,852 and the mean income was $12,077 (U. S. Census, 1970).

A sample of all women over 18 years of age in Kalamazoo was drawn using the City Directory of Kalamazoo (1977) as the listing of the population. A total sample of 728 women was selected, a sample large enough to assess adequately variations within the female population of the community and small enough to allow follow-up of the sample to encourage participation. The sample met one of the criteria
for randomness, that is, every element in the population had an equal probability of being selected for the sample. All possible combinations of elements, however, were not equally likely to form a sample. From each page of the City Director, a woman's name was randomly chosen with the aid of a random number list. This random/systematic procedure was utilized for two reasons. First, the problems inherent in drawing a simple random sample from so large a population precluded the development of a totally random sample. This is especially pertinent when the inadequacies of the City Director are considered. Second, anonymity of the people selected for the sample was and is a high priority of this research. A combination of random/systematic selection, rather than systematic selection alone, assured that the sample could not be duplicated except by chance. Furthermore, the random/systematic sample approximates a random sample, whereas no statements of probability can be made about a systematic sample.

Reliability and Validity

Given the scope of this research, the reliability and validity of the measures described in this chapter cannot be adequately assessed. In the final chapter attempts to assess reliability and validity are made. Replication of this study is required for an adequate evaluation of the reliability of measurement. The scaling procedures described in this chapter contribute to the assessment of validity; however, evaluation of the validity of all the measures requires replication with a larger number of items.
Walizer and Wienir define validity as "...the degree of match between the conceptual definition of a variable and the operational definition of that variable" (1978:39). Phillips identifies four major types of validity: content validity, face validity, pragmatic validity, and construct validity. In all cases, validity refers to the extent to which an investigator is actually measuring what s/he thinks if being measured. Content validity and face validity are dependent upon the common sense of the researcher. Pragmatic validity is established by correlating independent measures of the same process or event. Construct validity is judged according to the consistency of constructs and hypotheses and the general usefulness of the constructs in the entire theoretical scheme. Another test of construct validity is the extent to which the measurements of the construct correlates with criteria which should either be highly correlated or not correlated at all with the construct (1971:16-19).

Reliability refers to the consistency of measurement. Stability reliability refers to consistency of measurement for each individual in repeated measures while equivalency reliability refers to consistency of measurement across various types of measures at the same time (Walizer & Wienir, 1978:404). In some cases the results of other research are utilized in the measurement processes described in this chapter. In most cases, however, previous research described male samples. Inconsistency of the findings presented here with previous results does not necessarily indicate unreliability since
this sample consists entirely of women, who for the most part have not been the subjects of such research.

Data Collection

The data were collected in a mailed questionnaire that surveyed the sample on variables that might account for variations in involvement in criminal behaviors. The questionnaires were mailed with business reply envelopes to facilitate their return. A follow-up postcard was mailed to each woman in the sample to remind her to return the questionnaire. Anonymity of the respondents was guaranteed and strictly maintained.

Operationalization

Social class, legitimate and illegitimate opportunities, integration, intimacy of role relationships, control of role relationships, acceptance of commonly held beliefs, likelihood of criminal type-scripts, and liberation are measured and considered in this survey, as well as demographic characteristics.

Social class, the relative status of the individual in the society, is determined by a combination of factors. If the respondent is single, separated, divorced or widowed, her occupational and educational levels are combined with the total household income to determine this relative status. Since women who are married or living with a partner in most cases remain dependent upon their partners for definition of their social status, the social class of married women
and women living with a partner is determined by combining the partner's occupational and educational levels with household income. This procedure reflects the societal practice of assigning a woman the social status of her partner.

Perceived legitimate opportunities are measured by the following items proposed as a scale of legitimate opportunities for women:

1. I can't do the kind of work I want because I don't have enough education.
2. Most people are better off than I am.
3. The world is usually good to people like me.
4. I don't have the opportunities most people have.
5. If I work hard I can get ahead.

These items are adaptations of items used by Landis et al. (1965) to measure the perception of legitimate opportunities by juvenile males. Three of the items (1, 2, and 4) proposed for the legitimate opportunity scale are worded so that agreement implies a perception of few legitimate opportunities while agreement with items 3 and 5 implies perception of many legitimate opportunities. All of these items are coded so that low scores indicate perception of many opportunities and high scores indicate perception of few opportunities, that is, items 1, 2 and 4 are reverse coded.

Perceived illegitimate opportunities are measured by a proposed scale of illegitimate opportunities. Agreement with the following items reveals perception of many illegitimate opportunities.
by the respondent. Disagreement reveals perception of few illegitimate opportunities available to the respondent.

1. Most successful people probably used illegal means to get ahead.

2. Government officials must hush up many things.

3. If necessary, I could support myself by committing crimes.

4. I intend to attain my goals even if I have to break the law now and then.

5. Criminals have to break the law in order to get along.

Illegitimate opportunity theory is associated with disorganized neighborhoods in which legitimate and illegitimate behaviors are often associated (Cloward, 1959). Inherent in illegitimate opportunity theory is the notion that illegitimate behaviors are necessary, given the structure of society. Both of these emphases are reflected in the illegitimate opportunity items. The first item is found on the Landis opportunity scale. The remaining items are derived by the researcher from Cloward's (1959) discussion of opportunity structures.

Real illegitimate opportunities include the opportunities for illegal behavior that exist in the activities of the individual. Respondents are rated on the presence or absence of illegitimate opportunities, based on descriptions of their employment settings and activities.

Integration, or the lack of it, is measured by the Srole anomie scale. Despite the name of this scale, it more closely represents egoism. While anomie/integration focuses on the regulation of the individual's wants and needs by the society and the processes
by which these needs and wants are fulfilled, egoism/integration emphasizes the bond of the individual to the society and the individual as an integral part of the society as a whole. As can be seen by the following statements, Srole concentrates on the individual's relationship to the rest of society. Disagreement with these assertions indicates the respondent is integrated into society. Agreement indicates egoism and the lack of ties between the individual and society.

1. These days a person doesn't really know whom to count on.

2. Most people in public office are not really interested in the problems of the average person.

3. In spite of what some people say, the situation of the average person is getting worse, not better.

4. Most people don't really care what happens to the next person.

5. Nowadays, a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.

6. You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile anymore.

7. It's hardly fair to bring a child into the world with the way things look for the future.

8. Next to health, money is the most important thing in life.

9. To make money, there are no right and wrong ways anymore, only easy ways and hard ways.

Intimacy of role relationships refers to the patterns of interaction in which individuals are involved. The effectiveness of these interactions in inhibiting involvement in criminal behavior is measured by the following variables:
1. Frequency of interaction is measured by the participation in activities with various individuals or groups—partners, parents, children, other relatives, neighbors, church, friends, and work and/or school groups.

2. Overlap of role relationships is measured by the number of times per month the respondent engaged in activities with more than one group or individuals at a time.

3. Self-disclosure of role relationships is measured by the extent to which the respondent shares personal information and advice with others. The respondent was asked to rank her interactions with others in terms of the sharing of personal information or advice.

4. Duration of role relationships is measured by the number of free hours per week the respondent spends with others. The questions designed to ascertain the frequency, duration, self-disclosure, and overlap of interactions are in Appendix A where the complete questionnaire is reproduced. Although Friday and Hage (1976) and Friday and Halsey (1977) do not specify the specific items to be used for measurement of their variables, these authors do operationalize their variables.

Control of role relationships is the effect of interaction on the attitudes of the respondent and is measured by the following items:

1. To what extent are the opinions of your family important to you?

2. To what extent are the opinions of your friends important to you?
Belief in commonly accepted values is determined by presenting the respondent with a list of values, specified by Clark and Wenninger (1963), and asking her to rank them. Included in the list are values considered to be societal and those considered to be subterranean; agreement with the former indicates acceptance of societal values. A sum of the positions into which the respondent placed the societal values produces a score of acceptance. The lower the total score, the greater the acceptance of commonly held beliefs. The following values were presented for ranking. The starred items, which according to Clark and Wenninger represent the societal as opposed to the subterranean values, are added into the respondent's score.

- helping others when they need it*
- being able to handle any trouble that comes my way
- sticking up for people I feel are important*
- keeping busy at something most of the time*
- being able to have nice things*
- getting my share of the fun and excitement
- being my own boss
- being a success at what I do*
- playing my luck or breaks to get the most out of them

Type-scripting is the application of a group label that links criminal or non-criminal role sets to that group. These societal expectations of group behavior are contingent upon the characteristics of the group, that is, demographic characteristics contribute to the likelihood that a criminal or non-criminal type-script will be
attached. In addition, social class represents the relative power of the group in the society and so exerts an influence on the type-scripting process. The following questions from Earnest & Dinitz (1965) to which the respondent was asked to express agreement or disagreement are utilized to measure the extent to which the type-scripts of the respondents are criminal or non-criminal. Agreement with any of these items indicates a criminal type-script has been applied.

1. If I found a friend was leading me into trouble, I would continue to go around with him or her.
2. People think that I will get into trouble with the law.
3. People have told me that I am headed for trouble with the law.
4. Some of my friends have been in trouble with the law.
5. Do you ever think of yourself as "criminal?"
6. Do your groups ever think of themselves as "criminal?"

It was necessary to determine if the characteristics of the individual were similar to those of her group, since type-scripting is a group process that filters down to the individual. The respondents were asked to specify similarities between themselves and their groups on age, race, sex, and financial status.

The final independent variable included in the data collection instrument is liberation. The lessening of constraints on the attitudes and behaviors of women are, in part, indicated by a lessening of traditionality of the views of women. The following items were used to measure traditionality of views:
1. In an effort to limit the size of her family, a woman should use any birth control method suitable for her needs.

2. If a woman is pregnant and she does not want the child, she should not have the right to have an abortion.

3. Single persons, male and female, should be able to adopt children.

4. Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession.

5. Even today, women live under unfair restrictions that should be done away with.

6. The Equal Rights Amendment should become part of our laws.

Agreement with items 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 indicates non-traditionality of views, while items 2 and 5 indicate traditionality. This orientation reflects the position taken by persons in the Women's Movement. The right of women as individuals to make their own choice, a central thesis of the liberation of women, is reflected in items 1, 3, 4, 6, and 7. Items 2 and 5 indicate that the activities of women are determined by tradition. The non-traditionality items are reverse coded so that low scores represent non-traditional views and high scores represent traditional views.

The dependent variable, involvement in criminality is addressed by the self-reports of the respondents, who were asked how often in the last five years they had:

1. Changed the price tickets on merchandise in the store?
2. Taken something from a store without paying?
3. Taken money or something else from work?
4. Taken something from someone else's house without permission?
5. Taken money from another person without his/her permission?

6. Accepted something you knew was stolen?

7. Received money or gifts for not reporting someone else's misdeeds?

8. Signed someone else's name for monetary gain?

9. Changed the amount on a check given you?

10. Received money you weren't entitled to without returning it?

11. Turned in false claim to your insurance company?

12. Been paid for sexual favors?

13. Drive while intoxicated or drinking?

14. Been intoxicated in public?

15. Deliberately hurt or threatened to hurt someone?

16. Taken a car without the owner's permission?

17. Taken money by force from someone?

18. Entered a building without the owner's knowledge or permission?

19. Cheated on your income tax?

20. Altered your electric meter so it registered less electricity than you used?

Involvement in crime is the sum of all responses to this question. Involvement in violent or aggressive crimes, those which could involve physical harm to another person, include items 15, 16, 17, and 18; involvement in crimes with an economic motive include items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 19, and 20; involvement in "victimless" crimes include items 12, 13, and 14. There is, for the most part, agreement in the literature on the distinctions between these items.
Simon (1976b), for example, follows in general this distinction between items. Noblit and Burcart (1976) place robbery in the economic crime category. Since, however, the items in the violent crime category set up a possible confrontation in which violence could take place, robbery is included in this category. Factor analysis of these items did not reveal this trichotomy of items. These data, however, do not meet the requirements of factor analysis that the items by symmetric and robust. For example, only one respondent revealed involvement in item 9, item 16, and item 17. Consequently, the validity of the factor analysis is questionable and substantive criteria are used for the distinction between these items.

Analysis

The analysis of the data collected in this study has four major foci: a description of the characteristics of women engaged in criminal behaviors, the formation and testing of attitude scales, hypothesis testing, and measures of the relationship between the variables specified in the hypotheses. The age, marital status, educational status, employment level, occupational status, and socio-economic status are examined. The attitude scales in this research include perception of illegitimate opportunities, perception of legitimate opportunities, traditionality of views, and the Srole scale of integration. The use of the Guttman scalogram analysis technique to analyze the underlying interrelationships between the items of the scale requires that the items all measure the same dimension and
that the items are ordered according to difficulty, that is, those respondents who answer affirmatively to the most difficult item (the item that is least often answered affirmatively) have also answered affirmatively to all of the items on that scale. Agreement with any item on the scale requires that all items on the scale that are less difficult, that is are agreed with by more respondents are also agreed to. The ordinal nature of Guttman scales means the items that survive the scalogram analysis are cumulative. It is this cumulative score that is related to the other variables in the research. The patterns established for Guttman scales are ideal representations of data. The degree to which the data collected in this study approximate these patterns are represented by the coefficient of reproducibility and the coefficient of scalability. The coefficient of reproducibility represents the extent to which the scores on individual items can be reconstructed when only the cumulative score is known. The coefficient of scalability represents the extent to which the items, taken together, measure the underlying dimension. The scalability, then, refers to the sensitivity of the scale. Convention dictates that the coefficient of reproducibility be at least .90 and the coefficient of scalability be around .60. Of the scales in this study, only the Srole scale is an established scale. The reproducibility and sensitivity of this scale has been assessed even though it is an established scale, since the sample consists entirely of women. The perceived legitimate opportunity scale is taken from a scale by Landis et al. (1965) who scaled their items for juvenile males. Scalogram analysis for all of the scales in
this study revealed the extent to which the items approach the
perfect pattern of Guttman scales and the sensitivity of the scales.

The testing of the hypotheses involves the computation of
sample statistics and the probability that these statistics accurately
describe the population of women from which the sample is drawn.
The variables in the hypotheses stated in Chapter II and operationally
defined here in Chapter III have either ordinal or interval levels
of measurement. Social class, as used in this study, is ordinal and
measurement of the relationship between social class and other
variables in the study is reflected in gamma. The Pearson Product
Moment Correlation Coefficient is used as the measure of association
between interval level variables. Dichotomous variables, including
real illegitimate opportunities, marital status, and application of a
criminal type-script, are treated as interval level variables since
the one interval in dichotomous variables is equal to itself (Nie
et al., 1975).

The hypotheses of the relationships between the variables in
this study are tested with the level of significant of the appropriate
measure, gamma or the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.
If the probability that the relationship exists by change is less
than 5% (p < .05), the hypothesis is supported. Rejection of the
hypothesis is warranted if the probability that the relationship
occurred by chance exceeds 5% or if the relationship is in the opposite
direction than expected. Probability levels of .01 and .001 are
reported for those relationships which are statistically significant
at these levels, that is, those relationships for which the probability
that they occurred by chance is less than 1% or .1%.

The hypotheses delineated in Chapter II are supplemented by a model of criminal behavior by women, which includes opportunity theory, role relationship theory, and type-scripting (See Figure 1). Path analysis is used to assess the strength of the relationships between the variables since it allows comparison of the complete model of criminal involvement to the data collected. How well the model fits the data is measured by the standardized multiple regression coefficients which measure the amount of change in the dependent variable for every unit change in the independent variable. These path coefficients are an advantage over the simple correlation or regression coefficients in that the influence, direct and indirect, of the other variables in the model is measured since the variables are considered simultaneously. If the probability that a relationship occurred by chance is less than five percent, the relationship is retained in the model of female criminality and is postulated to hold true for all women. Conversely, a relationship that is not supported is dropped from the model and presumed to be unnecessary in the explanation of female criminality. Further research, of course, includes the testing of all the relationships proposed here for support or refutation.
Figure 1. General Model of Forces in Female Criminality
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

Of the 728 women surveyed, 189 returned questionnaires with sufficient information, a 26% return rate. The findings presented in this chapter are based on these 189 cases. Of the women who returned the questionnaire, nearly 60% are married or living with a partner, 20% are widowed, divorced, or separated, and 20% are single. Their ages range from 19 to 92. The mean age is 43.8 and and median age is 39.2. Nearly 20% of the women are 25 years old or less and approximately 15% are over 65 years of age. Although the U.S. Census reports that 10% of the Kalamazoo population is Black, only 9 Black women responded to this survey, less than 5%. As a result, race is not considered in the present analysis; all non-white women are, however, retained in the sample. Fifty-six percent of the respondents work outside of their homes; nearly a quarter of these have worked at the same job for more than five years.

As stated in Chapter III, this analyses has four foci: a description of the characteristics of women engaged in criminal behavior, the formation and testing of attitude scales, hypothesis testing and measures of the relationships between variables. The
findings are presented for each of these and are related to the problems stated in the first chapter. The extent to which females are involved in criminal acts, the effects of perceived opportunities, constraining role relationships, and criminal type-scripts on female involvement, and the influence of liberation on each of these are examined.

The Extent and Nature of Female Criminality

According to the self-reports of the respondents, over 60% have committed at least one crime in the past five years. Sixteen percent have been involved in violent or aggressive acts which include assault, robbery, burglary, and auto theft. Over 50% of the respondents have committed crimes with an economic motive, and nearly 40% have engaged in crimes against the public order, most notably driving while intoxicated and public intoxication. Although public intoxication is now decriminalized in Michigan, it was against the law for the greater part of the time period pertinent for this survey (November, 1973 to November, 1978) and is included in criminal involvement. Both public intoxication and driving while intoxicated are reported by a similar number of respondents (28%). Of the crimes with an economic motive, taking items or money from work, receiving money to which the respondent was not entitled, and shoplifting are prominent.

Of those respondents who have committed crimes with an economic motive, 70% committed 6 or fewer economic crimes and 10%
have been involved in 25 or more economic crimes. Sixty percent of the respondents involved in crimes against the public order, that is, victimless crimes, report involvement in 6 or fewer offenses. The frequency of involvement in violent crimes is less than that of the other categories. Sixteen percent (31) of the sample reported involvement in violent crimes; 87% of these were involved in 6 or fewer violent crimes. A summary of involvement in economic crimes, violent crimes, victimless crimes, and all crimes is reported in Table 1.

For all the categories of criminal involvement, the modal category is 1 to 6. According to the literature, female criminality is more likely to include violent crimes and crimes against the public order than economic crimes; however, in this survey, the number of respondents involved in economic crimes (52% of all respondents) exceeds the number of respondents involved in violent crimes (16% of all respondents) or victimless crimes (39% of all respondents). Of those respondents engaging in 25 or more crimes, 50% are engaged in victimless crimes. The categories of criminal involvement are neither mutually exclusive or inclusive; therefore, a particular respondent may be represented in one or more of the categories or may not be represented at all.

The nature and extent of female involvement in crime shown by Table 1 do not totally reflect the expectations indicated in the literature. Crimes of violence are limited to the lower frequencies of involvement. Of the respondents committing at least one crime, the frequency of victimless crimes (mean=19.45) exceeds the frequency
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Table 1
Number of Respondents Involved in Crime by Frequency of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement</th>
<th>Economic Crimes</th>
<th>Violent Crimes</th>
<th>Victimless Crimes</th>
<th>All Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>68 (70.1%)</td>
<td>27 (87.1%)</td>
<td>44 (60.3%)</td>
<td>66 (56.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>15 (15.5%)</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
<td>13 (17.8%)</td>
<td>14 (12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>4 (4.1%)</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>10 (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (4.1%)</td>
<td>6 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.7%)</td>
<td>3 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>7 (7.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>8 (11.0%)</td>
<td>17 (14.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97 (100.0%)</td>
<td>31 (100.0%)</td>
<td>73 (100.0%)</td>
<td>116 (100.1)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding

of economic crimes (mean=11.2). The total number of respondents engaged in economic crimes (97), however, is greater than the total number of respondents engaged in victimless crimes. The crimes of women, then, do not concentrate in a particular type of crime but are
distributed across the categories of economic, violent, and victimless crimes. There is, however, a tendency for their criminal activities to concentrate in specific crimes (for example, driving while drinking) within these categories of criminal behavior.

Characteristics of Women Involved in Crime

Age, marital status, employment level, occupational status, educational status, and social class are considered in this discussion of characteristics of female criminals. As stated previously, the small number of non-whites excludes race from the analysis.

As can be seen in Table 2.1, 40% of the respondents involved in crime are less than 30 years old. Age is significantly related to involvement in crime (Pearson's r = .2702) and the relationship is inverse. As women grow older, they are less likely to be involved in criminality. Although the age category 20 to 29 has the largest percentage of respondents involved in crime, these data do not support the contention by Vega et al. (1974) that most female offenders are younger than 30 years. These data are consistent, however, with the conclusions by Heidensohn (1970) and Cavan (1952) who refer to the gradual cessation of female crime with age. The younger age categories, 20 to 29 and 30 to 39, are more likely to include respondents who have been involved in more than 12 incidents of criminal behavior. Criminal behaviors decrease through the 70 to 79 age category. No criminal involvement is reported by women 80 and over. The significant relationship between age and involvement holds for economic, violent, and victimless crimes (see Tables 2.3, 2.4,
Table 2.1  
Age of Respondents Involved in Crime  
by Frequency of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>40-59</th>
<th>60-69</th>
<th>70-79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39.1%)</td>
<td>(53.3%)</td>
<td>(56.2%)</td>
<td>(90.9%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.7%)</td>
<td>(23.3%)</td>
<td>(18.8%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13.0%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.7%)</td>
<td>(3.3%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.3%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26.1%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
<td>(9.1%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.9%)*</td>
<td>(99.9%)*</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding  
Pearson's r = -.3702  
Significant level = .001

Marital status is not significantly related to involvement in crime. Although women with unattached statuses are more likely to be involved in high frequencies of crimes than women with attached statuses, the difference is not significant (See Table 3.1). Analysis of the relationships between economic crimes and marital status,
and victimless crimes and marital status reveal that none are significant. Therefore, marital status does not appear related to involvement in criminal behavior. A central emphasis of control theory is that persons in attached statuses are more likely to be integrated than those who are not and should, therefore, commit fewer crimes. This thesis is not supported by the data in this study.

Table 3.1
Marital Status of Respondents Involved in Crime by Frequency of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement</th>
<th>Unattached statuses</th>
<th>Attached statuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>23 (51.1%)</td>
<td>43 (60.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>7 (15.6%)</td>
<td>7 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>8 (11.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>3 (6.7%)</td>
<td>3 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (4.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>10 (22.2%)</td>
<td>7 (9.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45 (100.0%)</td>
<td>71 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square = 7.75  Degrees of Freedom = 5
Not significant

*Due to rounding

Unattached statuses include the single, separated, divorced, and widowed marital status categories.

Attached statuses include the married and living together categories.
In the literature, social class is seldom specified as a predictor of female involvement in crime. These data, likewise, do not demonstrate that social class and involvement are significantly related. Of those women who have been involved in at least one incident of criminal activity, the distribution across socio-economic statuses reveals no significant difference (See Table 4.1). For specific categories of criminal behavior, too, the relationship between social class and criminal involvement is not significant. Because women who have a husband or family are often in dependent position, however, the social class of a nuclear family unit is generally derived from occupational and educational statuses of the male member of the family unit. The computation of social class for those women who are married to or living with a man, then, does not take into account the occupational and educational statuses of the respondent. Therefore, these variables are explored separately.

Examination of Table 5.1 reveals that occupational status of the respondent is not significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior. In each category of occupational status, about 75% of the respondents report at least one incident of criminal behavior. Adler (1975) has postulated that as women gain higher positions in the legitimate world, their opportunities for and involvement in criminal behaviors increase. Support for this position is not evident in the data presented in Table 5.1. Furthermore, the occupational status of the respondent is not significantly related to specific categories of criminal behavior. This is especially
Table 4.1
Social Class of Respondents Involved in Crime by Frequency of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>18 (72.0%)</td>
<td>18 (52.9%)</td>
<td>16 (55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>2 (8.0%)</td>
<td>5 (14.7%)</td>
<td>5 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>2 (8.0%)</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
<td>4 (13.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>1 (4.0%)</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (8.8%)</td>
<td>1 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>2 (8.0%)</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (10.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25 (100.0%)</td>
<td>34 (99.9%)*</td>
<td>29 (99.9%)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding Gamma = +.1471 Not Significant

Important for economic crimes for a low association between economic crimes and occupational status undermines Adler’s thesis even further.

Although women in higher occupational statuses are not more likely to be involved in criminal behavior than women in lower occupational statuses, 75% of the women in all the occupational statuses have been involved in criminal activities. Only 60% of the women in the sample have been involved in criminality. The larger
### Table 5.1

**Occupational Status of Respondents Involved in Crime by Frequency of Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(48.3%)</td>
<td>(55.8%)</td>
<td>(60.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>(11.6%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(7.0%)</td>
<td>(10.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.3%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.8%)</td>
<td>(18.6%)</td>
<td>(20.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(100.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100.0%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(100.0%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{Gamma} = -0.0490 \quad \text{Not Significant}\]

The percentage for those in occupational statuses involved in criminal behaviors is an indication that employment and involvement in criminal behavior are related. Examination of Table 6.1, however, reveals that the relationship between employment and involvement in criminal behavior is not significant. If, however, all of the women in the sample are considered, the relationship between employment and involvement in criminal behavior is significant and direct (See Table 6.2 in
Table 6.1

Employment Level of Respondents Involved in Crime by Frequency of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>Not Employed</th>
<th>Employed Part-time</th>
<th>Employed Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>22 (64.7%)</td>
<td>12 (46.2%)</td>
<td>32 (57.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>4 (11.8%)</td>
<td>4 (15.4%)</td>
<td>6 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (11.5%)</td>
<td>4 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>2 (5.9%)</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>3 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.8%)</td>
<td>2 (3.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
<td>3 (19.2%)</td>
<td>9 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 (100.0%)</td>
<td>26 (99.9%)*</td>
<td>56 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding Gamma = +.0887 Not Significant

Appendix B). Furthermore, women employed part-time are more likely to be involved in criminality than women who do not work at all and women who are employed full-time are more likely to be involved in criminal behaviors than those employed part-time or not at all. This relationship holds for all categories of criminal behavior (See Tables 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5 in Appendix B). Although work is postulated to be integrative for adolescents, this does not appear to be the case for adult females.
Table 7.1 demonstrates that female criminals are not poorly educated. Of the women involved in at least one incident of criminality, the modal education category includes women who have some college education as well as those who have a bachelor's degree. In contrast, the least educated members of the sample, those with less than eight years of education, have not been involved in criminality. The direct relationship between educational status and crime is, however,
not significant. If all of the women in the sample are considered, the relationship between educational status and crime is significant at the .05 level (See Table 7.2 in Appendix B.) This relationship holds for education and involvement in victimless crimes and economic crimes but the relationship between education and violent crimes is not significant (See Tables 7.3, 7.4, and 7.5 in Appendix B).

In summary, the data gathered in this study reveal greater involvement in crime by women under 30 and a gradual decline in criminal activity after 30. Marital status, socio-economic status, and occupational status are not significantly related to criminal involvement. If all of the women in the sample are considered, women who are employed are significantly more likely to engage in criminal behaviors than those who are not employed. Education and involvement in criminal behavior are related but not in the direction most often postulated, that is, education and involvement are directly related. Except for age and employment status, the demographic characteristics of women are not significantly related to criminal involvement and do not contribute substantially to an explanation of female criminality. These variables may, however, affect involvement through other variables. Further analysis will help to determine such relationships.

The Formation and Testing of Attitude Scales

Four attitude scales are proposed in Chapter III: perceived legitimate opportunities, traditionality of views toward women, integration, and perceived illegitimate opportunities. As explained
in Chapter III, Guttman scalogram analysis reveals the reproducibility and scalability of the items included on each scale.

The legitimate opportunity scale refers to the perceptions of the respondents of their legal means to attain their goals. The items, taken from Landis, et al., are delineated in the methods section of this study. Although these items are included in a legitimate opportunity scale devised by Landis, et al., no all of the items can be retained for the purposes of this study. The scalability and reproducibility levels of the five items necessitate that two of the items be dropped from the scale, that is, the error for these two items exceeds tolerable limits. The items retained for the scale are:

1. I can't do the work I want because I don't have enough education.
2. I don't have the opportunities most people have.
3. Most people are better off than I am.

The errors on this scale appear randomly distributed; the number of items is low increasing the probability of spurious scalability. This is offset by the use of five answer categories for each of the items on the scale. Finally, the error of each item in the scale is less than the non-error. The coefficient of scalability is .6512 and the coefficient of reproducibility is .9371. Based on these criteria, the scores for each respondent are obtained by summing the response categories across these three items, yielding a range from three to fifteen, three representing perception of high legitimate opportunities and fifteen representing low legitimate
opportunities.

The srole anomie scale which is used to measure anomie consists of the following four items:

1. These days a person doesn't really know whom to count on.

2. You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile anymore.

3. It's hardly fair to bring a child into the world with the way things look for the future.

4. Next to health, money is the most important thing in life.

Again, the errors appear random. As with the perception of legitimate opportunity scale, the disadvantage of the low number of items is offset by the number of response categories. Non-error exceeds error for each item of the scale. The coefficient of scalability is .6232 and the coefficient of reproducibility is .8750. Summing the response categories for each respondent results in a range from 5 to 20. The low end of the scale, 5, represents low integration while the high end of the scale, 20, represents high integration.

An attempt to scale the items designed to measure traditionality of views toward women resulted in low scalability and reproducibility. Factor analysis of these items revealed two factors. A major criterion of Guttman scalogram analysis is that the items measure one dimension. The existence of two factors indicates that at least two dimensions underlie the traditionality items. Since traditionality of views is not a predictor variable but is one of the four measures of liberation, the weak scales do not warrant
inclusion in the study.

The final scale, which measures perceived illegitimate opportunities, retains all five items proposed. Like the integration and perceived legitimate opportunity scales, the error seems random and non-error exceeds error for each item. Spurious scalability is unlikely given the number of items and the number of response categories. The coefficient of scalability is .6637 and the coefficient of reproducibility is .9534. Summing the response categories yielded a range from 5 to 17, 5 representing high perception of illegitimate opportunities and 17 representing low perception of illegitimate opportunities.

These scales, then, produced three new variables for use in the testing of hypotheses and the theoretical model explicated in Chapter II. Perception of legitimate opportunities, perception of illegitimate opportunities, and integration, as well as other predictor variables are examined in the next section.

Hypotheses

The testing of the following hypotheses fulfills two purposes: to examine the bivariate relationships between the major theoretical variables in this study and to assess the probability that the relationships found in this sample of women also exist in the population from which the sample is drawn. Since the relationships between variables are examined in a path analysis, major emphasis here is placed on the significance level of the association between
variables, that is, the probability that the association occurs in the population as a whole. The association between interval level variables is measured with the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) which can vary from -1 to +1. The association between variables that are ordinal is measured by gamma (G). Like r, gamma can vary from -1 to +1. Rejection of the null hypotheses that there is no association between the variables in question or that the association if in the opposite direction than expected is warranted by a significance level of .05.

For the major hypothesis that social class affects opportunities which in turn affect involvement in criminality, analysis of the data reveals the following:

1. The higher the social class of the respondent, the greater the perceived legitimate opportunities.

   The relationship between social class and perceived legitimate opportunities is significant but inverse (gamma = -.4884). Social class is related to perceived legitimate opportunities but the higher the social class, the lower the perceived legitimate opportunities. Thus, this hypothesis is not supported.

2. The higher the social class of the respondent, the fewer the illegitimate opportunities perceived.

   Again, the relationship between these two variables is significant, but in the opposite direction than expected. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

3. The greater the legitimate opportunities perceived, the fewer the illegitimate opportunities perceived.

   The relationship between perceived legitimate and perceived
illegitimate opportunities has a correlation coefficient of -.2793. This coefficient is significant at the .001 level and reveals that the hypothesized direction between these two variables is appropriate.

4. The higher the social class, the greater the real illegitimate opportunities.

Social class is significantly related to real illegitimate opportunities. The appropriate measure of association between these two variables, gamma, is +.2950, significant at the .05 level. The direct relationship reveals that persons in higher social classes are likely to have more real illegitimate opportunities than persons in lower social classes.

5. The greater the illegitimate opportunities perceived, the greater the involvement in criminal behavior.

The relationship between perceived illegitimate opportunities and involvement in criminal behavior is significant at the .05 level. This relationship, however, is inverse. The correlation coefficient is -.1450. The correlation between perceived illegitimate opportunities and violent crimes is -.1733, perceive illegitimate opportunities and economic crimes is -.1684, and perceive illegitimate opportunities and victimless crimes is -.0168. Of these, involvement in violent crimes and involvement in economic crimes are significant at the .05 level.

6. The greater the legitimate opportunities perceived, the lesser the involvement in criminal behavior.

Perception of legitimate opportunities is not significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior and is the opposite direction as that expected. The correlation coefficient is .0924.
Of the associations that exist between legitimate opportunities and specific categories of criminal behavior, involvement in economic and victimless crimes and perceived legitimate opportunities are negatively related, as hypothesized. The relationships, however, are not significant.

7. The greater the real illegitimate opportunities, the greater the involvement in criminal behavior.

Real illegitimate opportunities are significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior. The correlation between these two variables is -.0635. As can be seen, the direction of this correlation is in the opposite direction as that hypothesized.

8. The impact of perceived illegitimate opportunities on criminal behavior is greater than the impact of real illegitimate opportunities on criminal behavior.

The correlation between perceived illegitimate opportunities and involvement in crime is -.1450. The correlation between real illegitimate opportunities and crime is -.0635. Since, however, these variables are related in the opposite direction than expected, this hypothesis is not supported.

9. The higher the social class, the lesser the involvement in criminal behavior.

Social class is not significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior. The correlation between social class and involvement in crime is +.1476. This correlation is not in the direction hypothesized. Of the three categories of criminal involvement, only violent crimes are negatively related to social class.

10. The greater the intimacy of role relationships, the greater the control of role relationships.

Of the variables that make up intimacy of role relationships,
only self-disclosure of role relationships is significantly related to control of role relationships. The correlation between self-disclosure and the importance of the opinion of family members is +.1419 which is also significant at the .05 level. Self-disclosure of role relationships is positively related to the influence of the opinions of family members. The frequency, duration, and overlap of role relationships are not significantly related to control of role relationships.

11. The greater the control of role relationships, the greater the integration.

Importance of the opinions of family members and integration are significantly related in a positive direction. The correlation coefficient is +.1417 and the level of probability is .05. Importance of the opinions of friends is not significantly related to integration but the positive correlation coefficient, +.1132, indicates that the relationship is positive.

12. The greater the control of role relationships, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

The importance of neither friends' nor family members' opinions are related to involvement in criminal behaviors. The importance of the opinions of friends is significantly related to involvement in economic crimes ($r = +.1575, p < .05$) and violent crimes ($r = +.1344, p < .05$). The importance of the opinions of family members is negatively related to violent crimes at the .05 level. The correlation is -.1248. The greater the influence of family members, the less the involvement in violent crimes. Importance of the opinion of family members is not significantly
related to economic or victimless crimes.

13. The greater the integration, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

Of the three categories of criminal behavior, integration is significantly related only to involvement in violent crimes ($-1.506; p < .05$). The relationship is inverse as hypothesized. The relationships between integration and involvement in economic crimes, victimless crimes, and criminal behaviors overall are also inverse but are not significant.

Two sub-hypotheses of this major hypothesis involved the variable, acceptance of a societal belief system. As explained in Chapter III, prioritization of a list of values by the respondents revealed the degree of acceptance of societal values over subterranean values. The rankings of the societal values and the subterranean values, then, should not be highly correlated. Correlations of the values used to measure acceptance of a societal belief system, however, reveal some high correlations between values associated with the general belief system and values associated with subterranean belief systems. Consequently, the variable acceptance of a general belief system is dropped from this hypothesis and the forthcoming path model.

For the major hypothesis that social class affects the likelihood of a criminal type-script, the presence of which affects involvement in criminality, the following is revealed in the analysis:

14. The higher the social class, the less the likelihood of a criminal type-script.
Social class and the application of a criminal type-script are not significantly related. The correlation coefficient, +.0447, reveals a weak positive association between these two variables.

15. The application of a criminal type-script increases the probability of involvement in criminal behavior.

The application of a criminal type-script is significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior. The correlation coefficient is +.3073 and the level of significance is .001. Of the three categories of criminal behavior, application of a criminal type-script is significantly related to economic crimes and victimless crimes at the .001 level. The correlation coefficients are +.3316, and +.1596, respectively. The association between the application of a criminal type-script and involvement in criminal behavior is direct, as hypothesized.

16. The higher the age of the respondent, the less the likelihood that a criminal type-script has been applied.

Age and the application of a criminal type-script are negatively correlated, as hypothesized. The correlation coefficient is -.2518 which is significant at the .001 level.

17. Single, separated, and divorced persons are more likely to have a criminal type-script than married persons.

The correlation between marital status and the application of a criminal type-script is -.2052, significant at the .05 level. As hypothesized, the relationship is inverse; married persons are less likely to have a criminal type-script than single people.

18. White persons are more likely to have a criminal type-script than non-white persons.
As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the low number of non-white persons in the sample precludes analysis of this variable.

For the major hypothesis that liberation leads to involvement in criminality, analysis reveals:

19. The greater the perceived liberation of women, the greater the perceived legitimate opportunities.

Perceived liberation and perceived legitimate opportunities are negatively related at a significant level, .001. The correlation between these two variables is -.3107.

20. The greater the perceived liberation of women, the fewer the perceived illegitimate opportunities.

The correlation coefficient reveals a significant (r = +.3038, p < .001) correlation between perceived illegitimate opportunities and perceived liberation. The relationship, however, is direct. Therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

21. The greater the perceived liberation of women, the greater the intimacy of role relationships.

Of the variables that contribute to intimacy of role relationships, only duration is significantly related to perceived liberation at the .05 level (r = -.1282). The other variables are positively related, as hypothesized, to liberation but the relationships are not significant. Since duration of relationships and intimacy of role relationships are negatively related, this hypothesis is not supported.

22. The greater the perceived liberation of women, the greater the control of role relationships.

Perceived liberation is significantly related to neither the importance of the opinions of family nor the importance of the
opinions of friends. The negative correlations, -.0997 and -.0608, respectively, reveal weak association.

23. The greater the perceived liberation of women, the greater the integration.

Liberation and integration are significantly related. The positive association is +.2566 and is significant at the .001 level.

24. The greater the perceived liberation of women, the lesser the likelihood of the application of a criminal type-script.

The correlation between these two variables is -.1028. Although the correlation is in the direction hypothesized, the relationship is not significant.

25. The greater the perceived liberation of women, the lesser the involvement in criminal behaviors.

Perceived liberation is significantly related to involvement in criminal behaviors at the .05 level. The direction of the association is as hypothesized, -.1671. Of the three categories of criminal involvement, only involvement in economic crimes is significantly related to perceived liberation (-.2523). Again the direction is as hypothesized. The significance level is .001. Perceived liberation is negatively related to involvement in violent and victimless crimes but the relationships are not significant.

To facilitate examination of these findings, a summary matrix of the measures of association and the levels of significance for the hypotheses is presented:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesized Direction</th>
<th>Measure of Association</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social class - perceived legitimate opportunities</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>G = -.4884</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class - perceived legitimate opportunities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = +.5010</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived legitimate opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceived illegitimate opportunities -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r = -.2793*</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class - real illegitimate opportunities + G</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>G = +.2950*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived legitimate opportunities involvement in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. criminal behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r = -.0924</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. violent crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r = +.0535</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. economic crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r = -.0328</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. victimless crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>r = -.1129</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived illegitimate opportunities involvement in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. criminal behavior</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.1450</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. violent crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.1733</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. economic crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.1684</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. victimless crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.0168</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real illegitimate opportunities involvement in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. criminal behavior</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.0635</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. violent crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = +.0209</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. economic crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.0197</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. victimless crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.1660</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class - involvement in:</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = +.1476</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. criminal behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = -.0650</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. violent crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = +.0144</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. economic crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G = +.0742</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy of role relationships - importance of the opinions of family members:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = -.0977</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-disclosure of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = +.1419*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overlap of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = +.0096</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Duration of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>r = +.0145</td>
<td>N/S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesized Direction</th>
<th>Measure of Association</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Intimacy of role relationships—importance of friends' opinions

1. Frequency of interaction + $r = -0.0835$ N/S
2. Self-disclosure of interaction + $r = +0.1610^*$ .05
3. Overlap of interaction + $r = -0.1471$ .05
4. Duration of interaction + $r = +0.0529$ N/S

#### Control of role relationships—integration

1. Importance of opinions of family members + $r = +0.1417^*$ .05
2. Importance of friends' opinions + $r = +0.1132$ N/S

#### Importance of family opinions—involved in:

1. criminal behavior - $r = -0.0321$ N/S
2. violent crimes - $r = -0.1248^*$ .05
3. economic crimes - $r = -0.0274$ N/S
4. victimless crimes - $r = -0.0144$ N/S

#### Importance of friends' opinions—involved in:

1. criminal behavior - $r = +0.0660$ N/S
2. violent crimes - $r = +0.1344$ .05
3. economic crimes - $r = +0.1575$ .05
4. victimless crimes - $r = +0.1069$ N/S

#### Integration—involved in:

1. criminal behavior - $r = -0.1257$ N/S
2. violent crimes - $r = -0.1506^*$ .05
3. economic crimes - $r = -0.0565$ N/S
4. victimless crimes - $r = -0.0035$ N/S

#### Social class—likelihood of criminal type-script

- $r = +0.0447$ N/S

#### Age—likelihood of criminal type-script

- $r = -0.2518^*$ .001

#### Attached statuses—likelihood of criminal type-script

- $r = -0.2052^*$ .01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Hypothesized Measure of Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Directions Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of criminal type-script-involvement in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. criminal behavior</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. violent crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. economic crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. victimless crimes</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation-perceived legitimate opportunities</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation-perceived illegitimate opportunities</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation-intimacy of role relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Frequency of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Self-disclosure of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Overlap of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Duration of interaction</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation-control of role relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Importance of opinions of family members</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Importance of friends' opinions</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation - integration</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation - likelihood of criminal type-script</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation-involvement in:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. criminal behavior</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. violent crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. economic crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. victimless crimes</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates hypothesis is supported NS = Not Significant

According to these hypotheses, the major predictor variables of involvement in criminal behavior are illegitimate opportunities.
(perceived), the application of a criminal type-script, and liberation. Importance of friends' opinions is related to specific categories of criminal behavior at a significant level. These variables are examined in the following path model to determine their influence in conjunction with other variables of female criminality.

Path Analysis

Preliminary testing of the interrelations among the variables in this study revealed that several direct paths are not significant. Intimacy and control of role relationships are not significantly related to application of criminal type-scripts in the present model. Similarly, neither the role relationship variables nor the opportunity variables are significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior. The model presented in Figure 2 reflects the theoretical orientation explicated in Chapter II. Such a model allows the examination of several variables simultaneously. The standardized regression coefficients on the paths reveal the amount of change in each dependent variable for each unit change in the independent variables.

The relationships between the variables in the model must be significant at the .05 level or less to be retained in the model. Assessment of the significance of the standardized regression coefficients in Figure 2 reveals that age, marital status, real illegitimate opportunities, liberation, application of a criminal type-script, and involvement in criminal behavior are retained for further testing.

Figure 3 reveals the ordering of these variables and the
standardized regression coefficients of the relationships between them. The relationships among all of these variables are significant. Type-scripting is partially explained by age, marital status, and real illegitimate opportunities. These variables contribute to the likelihood that a criminal type-script will be applied. The application of a criminal type-script and liberation are related to involvement in criminal behavior. While a criminal type-script contributes to the probability of involvement in criminal behavior by women, liberation inhibits the probability of criminality.

Summary

Testing of the hypotheses and analysis of the path model provides a test of the theoretical orientation presented in Chapter II. The model presented in Figure 2 represents this theoretical orientation. The more parsimonious model in Figure 3 reveals the significant variables and relationships in this theoretical orientation. These variables do not completely explain female criminality nor the lower rates of crime for women than men. This analysis reveals, however, that these variables do contribute to an explanation of the rates of female criminality. The implications and limitations of this analysis are discussed in the following chapter.
Figure 2. Tested Model of Forces in Female Criminality
Figure 3. Refined Model of Forces in Female Criminality
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Implications of the Findings

Introduction

The findings presented in Chapter IV include important implications for the study of female criminality. The variety, extent, and seriousness of female criminality, the characteristics of female criminals, the explanatory power of opportunity theory, role relationship theory, and type-scripting, and the importance of the emancipation of women in the processes that lead to criminal behaviors are considered. In addition to the implications of these data, the limitations of this study are discussed with suggestions for future research.

Female Criminality and Female Criminals

The sample of women surveyed report a wide variety of crimes, although crimes with an economic motive and crimes against the public order far exceed crimes of violence.

Of the 189 women in the sample, 116 report involvement in crime; seventeen of these report involvement in 30 or more crimes.

113
The major crimes for the women in this sample are theft, public intoxication, and driving while intoxicated, although all categories are represented. These findings are consistent with both Hoffman-Bustamante's assertion (1973) that the crimes of women are predominantly non-violent and non-aggressive and deRham's observation (1969) that women commit as many types of crimes as men. Furthermore, the high percentage of economic crimes indicates that the motives for female criminality may be similar to those for male criminality and emphasizes the need to look for similarities rather than differences between male and female criminality (Anderson, 1976).

With the exception of age, employment level, and educational status, the characteristics of the women in the sample are not significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior. The gradual cessation of female crime with age is a finding congruent with the observations in the literature. The lack of significance of the relationship between marital status and involvement in crime undermines the conclusions by Sandhu and Irving (1974) and Suval and Brisson (1974) that marital status and instability in marriage are variables directly associated with female criminality.

The significance of the employment level of the respondent reveals that employment outside of the home is of greater importance than the occupational status of the respondent. The marginality of women, represented by their lower occupational positions (Noblit & Burcart, 1970) is not as important as the opportunities for criminal behavior made available by employment of the home (Simon, 1975). Contrary to the conclusions of those who have studied official
data, educational status is not inversely related to criminal behavior.

This may mean that educational status is inversely related to processing by the criminal justice system rather than to criminal behavior.

**Theoretical Implications of the Hypotheses**

Of the hypotheses derived from opportunity theory, only the relationship between illegitimate and legitimate opportunities is supported by the data. The following relationships are significant in the opposite direction than that hypothesized.

1. The higher the social class, the greater the perceived legitimate opportunities.
2. The higher the social class, the fewer perceived illegitimate opportunities.
3. The greater the perceived illegitimate opportunities, the greater the involvement in criminal behavior.

Opportunity theory, then when used in conjunction with social class is significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior. Since the opportunities available to men and women are structurally determined, social class is viewed as a structural characteristic which helps to determine the availability of opportunities for a particular individual. The women in this sample have varying perceptions of their opportunities. The association between these perceptions and involvement in crime, however, is not predicted by opportunity theory. The inverse relationship between social class and perceived legitimate opportunities and the direct relationship between social class and perceived illegitimate opportunities are,
like the inverse relationship between illegitimate opportunities and involvement, unexpected in the logic of opportunity theory. If further replications reveal that opportunity theory is not supported in female populations, the relationship of perceived opportunities to social class and involvement in criminal behaviors must be re-examined in terms of the statuses women hold in society and the effects of opportunities on the behaviors of women. The present findings suggest that opportunity theory as currently stated is not applicable to female populations.

Further, opportunity theory does not predict that only perceived illegitimate opportunities are related to involvement in criminal behavior. The finding that perceived legitimate opportunities are not related to involvement in criminal behavior except indirectly is a finding inconsistent with opportunity theory. Here, perceived legitimate and illegitimate opportunities vary inversely. According to opportunity theory, opportunity structures vary directly, that is, those persons without access to legitimate structures are not likely to have access to illegitimate opportunities. The inverse relationship between perceived illegitimate and perceived legitimate opportunity structures call for a shift in the emphasis of opportunity theory to explicitly re-examine the association between legitimate and illegitimate opportunity structures.

The significant hypotheses derived from role relationship theory are:

1. The greater the self-disclosure of role relationships, the greater the importance of friends' opinions.
2. The greater the self-disclosure of role relationships, the greater the importance of the opinions of family members.

3. The greater the overlap of role relationships, the greater the importance of friends' opinions.

4. The greater the influence of family opinions, the greater the integration.

Although the variables of role relationship theory and integration are interrelated to some extent, the control of role relationships and integration are not significantly related to involvement in crime. Examination of the relationship of the various categories of criminal behavior reveals, however, that integration is related to involvement in violent crimes at the .05 level of significant (r = -.1506). Furthermore, the association of the importance of family opinions with involvement in violent crimes (-.1344) reveal the importance of control of role relationships between importance of friends' opinions and involvement in both economic (+.1575) and violent (+.1344) crimes reveal the importance of control of role relationships to some categories of criminal behavior. It is especially interesting that the influence of family opinions are negatively related to involvement in violent crimes while the influence of friends' opinions on involvement in both economic and violent crimes is positive. The direction of these relationships have consistently been observed for juvenile males and females. For adult women, however, it was postulated earlier that friends' opinions, like family opinions are integrative. That this is not the case is supported by the negative relationships
found between the influence of family opinions and criminal behaviors and the positive relationships found between the influence of friends' opinions and involvement in criminality, a finding to be considered in future examinations of adult female criminality.

Of the variables included in intimacy of role relationships, only self-disclosure is significantly related to the influence of family opinions. This relationship is positive. Self-disclosure and overlap are significantly related to the importance of friends' opinions. These relationships are inverse, that is, as self-disclosure and overlap of role relationships increase, the opinions of friends become less important. This finding is congruent with the predictions of role relationship theory with respect to juvenile males. For women, it was hypothesized that this relationship is direct, that is, as self-disclosure and overlap increase, the importance of friends' opinions also increase. That this hypothesis is not supported adds to the credibility of role relationship theory in its application to the behaviors of women.

Of frequency, self-disclosure, duration, and overlap of role relationships, none are directly related to involvement in criminal behavior. The utility of role relationship theory and integration in the explanation of involvement in criminal behavior by females lies in their influence on specific categories of criminal behavior. Explanations of violent crimes, especially, may benefit from greater exploration of these variables. The influence of friends on involvement in economic crimes, although
not entirely expected, is consistent with control theories in
general and role relationships in particular. Violent crimes are
related to both family and friends' opinions and economic crimes
are related to friends' opinions. Attention to these relationship
in future studies is likely to benefit explanations of adult female
criminality. The strong effect on self-disclosure indicates a need
for greater attention to the quality, rather than the quantity of role
relationships.

The importance of the type-script associated with various
groups is revealed by the following:

1. The presence of a criminal type-script increases the
   likelihood of involvement in criminal behavior.

2. The higher the age of the respondent, the lesser the
   likelihood that a criminal type-script has been applied.

3. Women in unattached statuses are more likely to have
   a criminal type-script than those in attached statuses.

The strong association between the presence of a criminal
type-script and involvement in criminal behavior emphasizes the
importance of this process in explaining female criminality. In this
process, individual characteristics are viewed as indicators of
structural inequality, that is, the relationships between individual
characteristics and involvement in criminal behavior are mediated by
the application of a group label which either contributes to or
inhibits criminal involvement, depending upon the content of the label.
Application of a label that contributes to criminal involvement is
negatively related to age. Persons in attached marital status are
also less likely to be involved in criminal behavior. The application
of a criminal type-script is significantly related to all categories of criminal behavior, although the relationships are stronger for crimes with an economic motive and victimless crimes than crimes involving the use of violence. Violent crimes may be less likely to result from type-script processes because there is less planning and premeditation involved and, therefore, less time for the criminal or non-criminal type-script to have an effect on behavior.

The effects of liberation on criminal behavior delineated by this research are contrary to conclusions presented in the literature on female criminality. The relationships suggested in the following hypotheses are significant although in the opposite direction than that hypothesized.

1. The greater the perceived liberation, the greater the perceived legitimate opportunities.

2. The greater the perceived liberation, the fewer the perceived illegitimate opportunities.

The following hypotheses are supported in the present study.

1. The greater the perceived liberation, the greater the integration.

2. The greater the perceived liberation, the less the involvement in criminal behavior.

A recurring theme in the literature on female criminality is the expectation that increased liberation of women results in greater involvement in criminality by women (Adler, 1975, 1977; Klein, 1976; Price, 1977; Simon, 1975, 1976a, 1976b). Others deny that liberation has had a significant impact on female criminality (Weis, 1976; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; Smart, 1977). The findings presented here
indicate that liberation does affect female criminality contrary to the expectations of Weis, Hoffman-Bustamante, and Smart, but that the effect is less involvement in criminal behavior rather than more as postulated by Adler, Klein, Price, and Simon.

Although a trend over time can not be observed in this study, women reporting high liberation are compared to women reporting low liberation. The results of this analysis reveal that greater liberation affects perceived opportunities and integration as well as involvement in criminal behavior. Liberation is inversely related to involvement in crimes with an economic motive, crimes of violence, and victimless crimes. Only the relationship between economic crimes and liberation is significant, however. Liberation, then decreases involvement in economic crimes but has little effect on involvement in victimless and violent crimes. The conclusions that liberation is related to economic but not violent or victimless crimes is consistent with much of the literature on female criminality. Simon (1975, 1976a, 1976b) and Noblit and Burcart (1970), especially take the position that increases in female crime are due to increases in economic crimes. The finding that liberation is inversely related to involvement in economic crimes, however, is not congruent with their findings, perhaps because in their analysis of official data, liberation is assumed over a time frame and differential perceptions of liberation are not considered. In this study, the respondents have been asked their perceptions of their own liberation which were then correlated with criminal involvement.
Replication of these findings, given their lack of support in the literature, is especially important to determine if the findings of this study result by chance. Although the significance levels for the relationships between liberation and economic crimes and criminal involvement indicate that the probability of these relationships occurring by chance is low, replication is necessary for greater confidence in these findings.

Theoretical Implications of the Path Analysis

As stated in Chapter III, path analysis requires a causal ordering of the variables and, therefore, allows an examination of the interrelationships between the variables. In testing the hypotheses above, only two variables were considered at a time. If one effect is related to more than one predictor variable (for example, involvement in criminal behavior is significantly related to the presence of a criminal type-script and liberation.) path analysis divides the total amount of variance explained into the variance explained by each of the predictor variables. Thus, it is possible to know the effect of each of the predictor variables, the presence of a criminal type-script and liberation, on involvement in criminal behavior.

Although path analysis allows clear specification of the ordering of the variables, the results of this segment of the analysis are consistent with the results of hypothesis testing. Liberation and the presence of a criminal type-script remain important in the explanation of female criminality. Perception of opportunities,
however, when considered in conjunction with other major variables of this research are no longer significantly related in either direction to involvement in female criminality. As the hypotheses revealed, role relationship theory and integration are not significantly related to criminal involvement.

The effects of age and marital status on the application of a criminal type-script remain significant, but the variance explained by liberation in the application of a criminal type-script is not significant. While real illegitimate opportunities is not significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior, this variable is related to the application of a criminal type-script. Persons with real illegitimate opportunities are less likely to have a criminal type-script applied than those with fewer real illegitimate opportunities. Real illegitimate opportunities, then, is related to criminal involvement through the type-script process.

Refinement of the path model presented in Chapter III results in a six variable model. Marital status, age, liberation, and real illegitimate opportunities are exogenous variables; 41% of the variance in the application of criminal type-scripts is explained by age, marital status, and real illegitimate opportunities. Twenty-one percent of the variance in involvement or lack of involvement in criminal behavior is attributed to the effects of liberation and the application of a criminal type-script. The major variables of this study, then, are reduced to age, marital status, liberation, real illegitimate opportunities, the application of a criminal type-
script, and involvement in criminal behavior. The only discrepancy between the findings of the hypotheses and the results of the path analysis concerns the importance of real illegitimate opportunities in the path model. Although real illegitimate opportunities are not related to involvement in criminal behavior, persons with real illegitimate opportunities by virtue of their positions are not likely to be associated with criminal roles in the type-scripting process. This application of a criminal type-script provides an impetus for criminal behaviors among those without real illegitimate opportunities.

The success of the theoretical orientation presented in Chapter II in explaining involvement in criminal behavior by adult women is limited. Clearly, the type-script process and liberation are important variables, but other forces must be delineated and tested if female criminality is to be explained.

General Implications of this Research

The major findings of this research include: (1) that control theory is linked to specific categories of criminal behaviors, (2) that the type-scripting process that occurs in our society is related to criminality, and (3) that liberation not only does not cause criminality but is in fact negatively related to involvement in criminal behavior. The literature on female criminality does not fully reflect or predict these findings.

Although the control of role relationships and integration do not contribute significantly to a general theory of criminal behavior, their importance for specific categories of criminal
behavior must not be ignored. If the same associations hold true for men, refinement of the variables in role relationship theory in particular and control theory in general may lead to further explanations of violent crimes in the population as a whole. Examination of the role relationships of various racial and ethnic groups may lead to an explanation of the differentials in their rates of violence. Perhaps the most significant finding within the role relationship framework is the criminogenic nature of the influence of friends for adult women. While the negative influence of the peer group is well established for adolescents, the relationship has not been tested in the adult population. Paradoxically, the influence of friends is positively correlated with integration even though the influence of friends is positively correlated with all categories of crime and integration is negatively correlated with all categories of crime. If this contradictory relationship holds in replications with various measures of control and integration, other intervening variables between control of role relationships and involvement in criminal behavior must be sought.

The strong association between type-script and involvement in criminal behavior has strong implications in the practical application of these theoretical findings. Although greater attention has recently been paid to the effects of labeling individuals, the labeling of groups is not widely viewed as criminogenic. If the effect of criminal group labels is indeed more involvement in crime, elimination of the labels rather than treatment of the individual offenders may be more effective.
Explanation of the link between liberation and crime must be redefined to account for the negative relationship between liberation and crime. If we adhere to Tresemer's (1975) model of liberation and role relationships, that is, the effect of liberation is expansion of the female role rather than rejection or validation of it, attitudes are also likely to expand. Behaviors previously considered outside of the female role may not be feasible. These behaviors may be legitimate as well as illegitimate. The increased options available to women due to the effects of liberation may result in less involvement in criminal behavior. If liberation increases the options available to women, decreased criminality can result from increased liberation. The "declining survival options" of female criminals reported by Crites (1976) add to the credibility of this explanation. This and other explanations of the inverse relationship between liberation and crime must be tested in subsequent research. If the direction of this relationship holds through replication, other factors must be explored to account for the rise in female criminality over the past decade that has been attributed directly to liberation.

Reliability and Validity of this Research

The validity of the measures in this research may be checked in several ways. As described in Chapter III, Phillips identifies four types of validity: content validity, face validity, pragmatic validity, and construct validity. Reliability of the measures can not be established in the present research. Replication of the
measures with a larger number of items is required.

The validity of the attitude scales used in this research is established by the scaling procedures used in Guttman scalogram analysis. The items on the scales are highly correlated with each other since they measure a single dimension. The variables for which the scales are used, however, do not, in all cases correlate in the expected direction with other variables. Given the unexpected relationships of perceived legitimate opportunities and perceived illegitimate opportunities to other variables, the measurement of these two variables is suspect. Integration must be questioned in terms of its validity given its contradictory relationships with influence of friends' opinions and involvement in criminal behavior. Unfortunately, the scales are the only measures of these variables; consequently, pragmatic validity cannot be assessed for these three variables.

Perceived liberation is expected to be highly correlated with input into important decisions and input into money matters. Both of these correlations are significant at the .001 level establishing the pragmatic validity of the measurement of this variable. The consistency of the findings for the relationships of this variable across data analysis techniques is an indication of its construct validity.

The measurement of acceptance of a common value system, a variable eliminated from the analysis, has no construct validity. Unexpectedly high correlations between societal and subterranean values reveal that the measure of belief in a common value system
is not valid. Although the importance of this variable has not been determined in this research, the detection of lack of validity in this measurement is an important finding. Future research, in order to examine the effects of value systems in the constellation of values that cause female criminality, must resolve this problem in measurement.

The type-script variable measures the label applied to the individual and her group. As such, this variable actually taps perceptions of the individual as well as perceptions of the groups she spend her time with. High correlations of the items with each other and consistency in the relationships between type-scripts and other variables in the study are indications of the validity of this concept.

The measurement of the intimacy of role relationships and the control of role relationships have high face validity since these variables are operationalized in the theory presented by the authors. Again, these variables correlate with each other as expected and factor into one factor.

In summary, except for the belief in societal values variable, the face validity and construct validity are high in the measurement of the variables in this study. For the most part, however, pragmatic validity cannot be established. In general, multiple measures of the variables are not available. This lack of multiple measures is a limitation of this research; further limitations are discussed in the following section.
Limitations of this Research

This research has three major limitations: (1) the non-respondent bias, (2) the lack of information on some aspects of female involvement in criminal behavior, and (3) the lack of comparison data for males. Each of these limitations is discussed and suggestions are offered for future research.

A major threat to survey research is the nonresponse rate. Of the 726 women drawn for the sample used in this research, 189 returned the questionnaire. Nearly 75% of the women surveyed, then are non-respondents. A major consideration is the extent to which the data are systematically biased by the non-response rate. That is, are the characteristics of the non-respondents significantly different from the characteristics of the respondent?

Friday and Sonnad (1979) have compared the characteristics of the respondents to non-respondents in a survey in Stockholm, Sweden. Since the characteristics of the entire sample were available in official records, it was possible to compare the respondent characteristics to non-respondent characteristics. The only variable on which significant differences were found between these two groups was social class. Respondents were likely to have higher social status than non-respondents.

The findings presented by Friday and Sonnad, however, may not be applicable to an American sample, given the cultural differences between Sweden and the United States. Assessment of non-response bias for this particular study is not possible, given the
anonymity of the sample.

Despite the disadvantages of non-response in surveys of criminal behaviors, self-report data can augment the information available through official sources. The reliance of most studies of female criminality on official data limits the confidence which can be placed on the conclusions, given the differential treatment of various groups in the population by the criminal justice system. There are other problems in self-report studies, however.

Threats to the validity of crime rates ascertained by surveys include false reporting of criminal behaviors, inability of the respondent to recall some criminal behaviors, incorrect classification of incidents as crimes, and changing definitions of criminality (Levine, 1976). The use of self-reports in conjunction with police records works to alleviate the problems in either methods of data collection. Use of only one data collection method in this survey is a major limitation. The results of this survey, however, can be compared to official rates of female criminality in Kalamazoo as well as the results of other means of data collection, for example, victimization surveys may provide a data comparison source.

The second major limitation is the lack of information on some aspects of female involvement in criminal behavior. No information was collected on the criminal roles of women, that is, whether they play a central or peripheral role in the crimes reported, or on the victims of female crime. Thus, no comparisons are possible in terms of the centrality of roles played by women across categories of crime or in terms of the victims of economic and violent crimes committed.
by women. The exploratory nature of this study resulted in a lengthy
data collection instrument. This length prohibited inclusion of
items to determine the rates and victims of female criminality.
Furthermore, questions used to assess the utility of the theoretical
orientation had priority in this research.

No questions concerning the use of narcotics were asked.
The crime survey section of the questionnaire examines a sensitive
area of behavior. Inclusion of narcotics use on this questionnaire
could increase its sensitivity to the extent that response rate would
be intolerably low. The increased importance of narcotics use among
women in the 1970's (Crites, 1976), however, indicates the importance
of this variable.

A final area about which there is a lack of information
in this study concerns the relationship between race and crime.
The low frequency of non-whites among the respondents prevented the
inclusion of race in the analysis. There are several reasons which
might explain the low number of non-whites among the respondents.
It is possible that the sample, by chance, included an unexpectedly
small number of non-whites. The sample may also have included a
small number of non-whites because the list of the population (The
City Director of Kalamazoo, 1977) underrepresents the number of non­
whites in the population. Names are included in The City Directory
on a voluntary basis. Non-whites may be less likely to submit their
names for publication in The City Directory. Finally, non-whites
may be less likely to respond to survey questionnaires than whites.

Subsequent studies should take greater care to include some
or all of these variables. Complete information is necessary from
segments of the population for a thorough understanding of female criminality. Accumulation of the results of studies on female criminality will eventually yield this understanding.

The third major limitation of this research is that comparisons cannot be made between male and female criminality. Self-reports of criminal behaviors by males are not available. Thus comparisons are not possible between the extent, seriousness, and variety of crimes by males and females, the aggressive or passive nature of crimes by males and females, or explanatory variables of male and female crime. This research does, however, provide a base for further research and a comparison point for data collected concerning female criminality. Subsequent research will allow the analysis of trends over time, which is essential to the exploration of changes in female crime rates, an important issue in the field. This research provides some assessment of female criminality at the present time. Comparisons of these data to official data and to future assessments of criminality will provide further insights into the problem of female criminality.

Summary

This research provides information about female criminality and female criminals not previously available. Previous research was limited to attempts to describe the activities and characteristics of female criminals. Although explanations of female criminality have been presented in the literature, no attempt has been made to assess empirically the adequacy of the explanations.
One such explanation is based on opportunity theory. The opportunities available to women are thought to affect their involvement in criminal behaviors. The findings of this study in relation to opportunity theory are mixed. They point out new directions for study but must be utilized carefully given the questionable construct validity of perceived opportunity.

A second explanation, based on control theory, is the association between role relationships and integration. The relationship between egoism/integration and involvement in violent crimes indicates that this explanation may be more fruitful than it has been thus far.

A third explanation depends upon the concept of type-scripts, which provide a linkage between types of persons and criminal or non-criminal roles. This variable is significantly related to involvement in criminal behavior, according to the present findings. This research has specified three predictor variables of type-scripts, age, marital status, and real illegitimate opportunities.

A fourth explanation of female criminality relates the liberation of women to involvement in criminal behavior. The findings presented here, however, show this relationship to be inverse rather than direct as is often postulated. For this variable, especially, empirical assessment provides new information that challenges the assumptions of the explanation.
A combination of these explanations contributes to the explanation of female criminality. Further refinement of the variables specified by these explanations may increase their explanatory power. This study provides some of the information necessary to understand female criminality and provides a basis for future research in this area.
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APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUMENT
Dear Respondent:

I am a graduate student at Western Michigan University studying some of the problems women have and their opinions. Since few people have bothered to ask women themselves about their situations, I hope the following questions will provide some information to better understand the problems of women.

Please answer these questions completely and honestly. It will only take about 30 minutes of your time and I think you will find the task interesting. I am mailing this questionnaire to you because I happened to pick your name along with those of 600 other women from the city director. I cannot identify you in any way so YOUR ANSWERS ARE COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS.

I have enclosed an envelope which needs no stamp for you to return the questionnaire to me. It is very important that you return this questionnaire—YOUR answers and opinions are necessary for my research. The numbers on the right side of the page of column numbers for the computer. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE QUESTIONS ARE ON BOTH SIDES OF THE PAGES.

The first 14 questions are about you and your situation:

1. Are you
   ___Single       ___Divorced
   ___Married      ___Widowed
   ___Living Together       ___Other
   ___Separated

2. How old are you?________

3. Do you consider yourself
   ___American Indian       ___Oriental
   ___Black                   ___White
   ___Mexican                 ___Other

4. How many people live in your household?____________________

5. Do you work for pay outside of your home now?
   ___Not at all
   ___Part time (Less than 40 hours per week)
   ___Full time (40 hours per week or more)

   If your answer to question 5 is Not at all, please to to question 10.

6. How long have you worked at your present job?________

7. What do you do in your job? (Tell me the what kinds of things you do.)
   ________________________________________________
8. Why do you have a job? (Please check all that apply).

- Necessary for family support
- For extra spending money
- To come into contact with others
- Interest in the work
- Other ________________________________

9. About how much do you earn per year? ______________________

10. What is your total household income per year? ________________

11. If you have a partner, what does he do for a living? __________

12. Is there anyone in your household who wants to work but is presently unemployed?

   - Yes  ____ No  ____ If yes, what is their relationship to you? __

13. How many years of school have you had? _________________

14. How many years of school has your partner had? ____________

The next few questions may be a little difficult to answer, but I would like to know a little about how you spend your free time and about your friends and family. You may find it interesting, too, so please read the directions carefully and answer the questions as completely as you can.

15. About how many hours of free time do you have per week? _______

16. What are the things you most frequently do during this time? Please write your free-time activities on the lines to the left of the chart below (for example, chatting, exercising, crafts, movies, etc.).

17. Across the top of the chart I have listed several individuals and groups to which you may belong. How often each month do you do each activity with each of the individuals and groups listed? Write the number of times per month to the right of each activity and below each group or individual. If it is less than once a month, put in an X; if not at all, put in a 0. If the individual or group listed does not apply to your situation, write in N/A.

| ACTIVITIES | Your Partner | Your Parents | Your Children | Your Other | Your Church
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
18. Do you sometimes do the activities you have listed above with more than one of the groups or individuals at a time?

If not at all, check here
If yes, check all that apply to your situation on the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I do these activities with:</th>
<th>My Work &amp;/or School Groups and</th>
<th>My Friends and</th>
<th>My Church &amp; Other Groups and</th>
<th>My Neighbors and</th>
<th>My Other Relatives and</th>
<th>My Children and</th>
<th>My Parents and</th>
<th>My Partner and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
19. For each group, choose the person to whom you are closest and answer this question about him or her. How much do you talk to this person? Do you share secrets or advice, etc? After each of the groups and individuals below, place the number of the following that best describes your relationship.

1 = Not close at all
2 = We talk some but it is not about very important things
3 = We talk a lot, but do not share secrets or advice
4 = We confide in each other about some things
5 = We share a lot of personal information and go to each other for advice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Partner</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Parents</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Children</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Other Relatives</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Neighbors</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Church or Other Groups</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Friends</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Work &amp;/or School Groups</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Please write the number of free hours you spend per week with each group or individual.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Partner</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Parents</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Children</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Other Relatives</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Neighbors</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Church or Other Groups</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Friends</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Work &amp;/or School Groups</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How are you doing? I hope you are going to finish this questionnaire. Many of the next questions ask your opinions so if you don't often get a chance to say how you feel, here is a good opportunity.

I would like to ask you a few questions about men and women. Please circle your response below each question. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers on the questionnaire. I am interested in YOUR opinion.

SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  DC = Don't Care  D = Disagree  SD = Strongly Disagree

21. In an effort to limit the size of her family, a women should use any birth control method suitable for her needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. If a women is pregnant and she does not want the child, she should not have the right to have an abortion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Single persons, male or female, should be able to adopt children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession.
SA A DC D SD

25. Even today, women live under unfair restrictions that should be done away with.
SA A DC D SD

26. The Equal Rights Amendment should become part of our laws.
SA A DC D SD

The following questions are about people in general and about your particular situation:

27. Most successful people probably used illegal means to get ahead.
SA A DC D SD

28. I can't do the kind of work I want because I don't have enough education.
SA A DC D SD

29. Government officials must hush up many things.
SA A DC D SD

30. Most people are better off than I am.
SA A DC D SD

31. If necessary, I could support myself by committing crimes.
SA A DC D SD

32. The world is usually good to people like me.
SA A DC D SD

33. I intend to attain my goals even if I have to break the law now and then.
SA A DC D SD

34. I don't have the opportunities most people have.
SA A DC D SD

35. Criminals have to break the law in order to get along.
SA A DC D SD

36. If I work hard I can get ahead.
SA A DC D SD

Now I would like to ask you some questions about you and your friends.

37. If I found a friend was leading me into trouble, I would continue to go around with him or her.
   ___Yes     ___No
38. People think that I will get into trouble with the law. 
    ____Yes  ____No

39. People have told me that I am headed for trouble with the law. 
    ____Yes  ____No

40. Some of my friends have been in trouble with the law. 
    ____Yes  ____No

41. Do you every thing of yourself as a "criminal"? 
    ____All the time  ____Often  ____Once in a while  ____Never

42. Do the people in your groups ever think of themselves as "criminals"? 
    ____All the time  ____Often  ____Once in a while  ____Never

43. My friends are the same race as I am. 
    ____Most  ____About half  ____Some  ____None

44. My friends are about the same age as I am. 
    ____Most  ____About half  ____Some  ____None

45. Compared to my friends, my family is financially 
    ____Much better off  ____Better off  ____About the same  ____Worse off

46. My friends are female. 
    ____  ____About half  ____Some  ____None

I would like to know how you feel about your particular situation.

47. How much input do you have into the important decisions made in 
    your household? Place a mark on the line below. 
    0%________________________________________ 100%

48. To what extent do you handle the money in your household? 
    Place a mark on the line below. 
    0%________________________________________ 100%

49. Recently, a lot has been written about the liberation of women. 
    Please indicate to what degree you feel you are liberated. 
    0%________________________________________ 100%

50. Do you have any comments about how liberated you feel? 
    __________________________________________

51. What percent of the time do you spend outside of your home on a 
    regular basis? Place a mark on the line below. 
    0%________________________________________ 100%

52. To what extent are the opinions of your family important to you? 
    Place a mark on the line below. 
    0%________________________________________ 100%
53. To what extent are the opinions of your friends important to your? Place a mark on the line below.

0%_________________________100%

54. Which of the following best describes what is important to you? Please put them in order of important to you by numbering them 1 through 9 (1 = most important; 9 = least important).

1. Helping others when they need it
2. Being able to handle any trouble that comes my way
3. Sticking up for people I feel are important
4. Keeping busy at something most of the time
5. Being able to have nice things
6. Getting my share of the fun and excitement
7. Being my own boss
8. Being a success at what I do
9. Playing my luck or beaks to get the most out of them

This is certainly a long questionnaire. I hope you are still filling it out. It won't last too much longer and the information is very important to me. There isn't too much more so let's go on to the next question.

55. This question is an aid to understanding the assertiveness of women and their needs in the justice system. Write the number of times you have done any of the following on the line. Include only those activities in the last five years. And be honest. After all, almost everyone has done something illegal or unethical at one time or another. Remember this questionnaire is anonymous.

How often have you

1. Change the price tickets on merchandise in the store?
2. Taken something from a store without paying?
3. Taken money or something else from work?
4. Taken something from someone else's house without permission?
5. Taken money from another person without his/her permission?
6. Run a red light while driving your car?
7. Accepted something you knew was stolen?
8. Received money or gifts for not reporting someone else's misdeeds?
9. Signed someone else's name for monetary gain?
10. Changed the amount on a check given to you?
11. Received money you weren't entitled to without returning it?
12. Not stopped for a school bus that had its flashing lights on?
13. Turned in a false claim to your insurance company?
14. Been paid for sexual favors?
15. Driven while intoxicated or drinking?
16. Sneaked a book out of the library?
17. Been intoxicated in public?
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____ Taken advantage of a vending machine that dispensed
merchandise without money?
____ Deliberately hurt or threatened to hurt someone?
____ Taken a car without the owner's permission?
____ Taken money by force from someone?
____ Parked your car without putting money in the meter?
____ Entered a building without the owner's knowledge or permission?
____ Cheated on your income tax?
____ Altered your electric meter so it registered less electricity
than you used?

More opinion questions coming up! Please circle your response below
each statement.

SA = Strongly Agree  A = Agree  DC = Don't Care  D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

56. These days a person doesn't really know whom to count on.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

57. Most people in public office are not really interested in the
problems of the average person.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

58. In spite of what some people say, the situation of the average
person is getting worse, not better.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

59. Most people don't really care what happens to the next person.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

60. Nowadays, a person has to live pretty much for today and let
tomorrow take care of itself.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

61. You sometimes can't help wondering whether anything is worthwhile
anymore.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

62. It's hardly fair to bring a child into the world with the way
things look for the future.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

63. Next to health, money is the most important thing in life.
SA  A  DC  D  SD

64. To make money, there are no right and wrong ways anymore, only
easy and hard ways.
SA  A  DC  D  SD
Well, that's the end. I do hope you enjoyed it and I THANK YOU VERY MUCH for filling this out. Just put it in the envelope I sent to you and drop it in the mailbox. You do not need a stamp.

Again, I appreciate your cooperation. I am sure that your answers will provide more information for understanding the problems of women. Thank you.

Doris Cubbernuss

Sociology Department
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008
APPENDIX B

Characteristics of Female Criminals--Additional Tables
Table 2.2
Age of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>(36.0%)</td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td>(52.2%)</td>
<td>(93.3%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31.0%)</td>
<td>(44.4%)</td>
<td>(36.0%)</td>
<td>(45.5%)</td>
<td>(47.8%)</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>(19.4%)</td>
<td>(12.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.3%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99.9%)*</td>
<td>(99.9%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3
Age of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Violent Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>35 (60.3%)</td>
<td>30 (83.3%)</td>
<td>24 (96.0%)</td>
<td>22 (100.0%)</td>
<td>22 (95.7%)</td>
<td>15 (100.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>16 (27.5%)</td>
<td>5 (13.9%)</td>
<td>1 (4.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (4.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>5 (8.6%)</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 8</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58 (99.9%)</td>
<td>36 (100.0%)</td>
<td>25 (100.0%)</td>
<td>22 (100.0%)</td>
<td>23 (100.0%)</td>
<td>15 (100.0%)</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>1 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Pearson's $r = -.3543$
Significance level = .001
Table 2.4
Age of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Economic Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25.9%)</td>
<td>(27.8%)</td>
<td>(60.0%)</td>
<td>(72.7%)</td>
<td>(52.2%)</td>
<td>(93.3%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24.1%)</td>
<td>(30.5%)</td>
<td>(32.0%)</td>
<td>(22.7%)</td>
<td>(30.4%)</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15.5%)</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
<td>(2.8%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15.5%)</td>
<td>(11.4%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(4.5%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(99.9%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)*</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(99.9%)*</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Pearson's r = -.4480
Significance level = .001
Table 2.5

Age of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Victimless Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(44.3%)</td>
<td>(52.8%)</td>
<td>(52.0%)</td>
<td>(68.2%)</td>
<td>(82.6%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.7%)</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td>(24.0%)</td>
<td>(18.2%)</td>
<td>(17.4%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(13.6%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
<td>(5.6%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
<td>(8.3%)</td>
<td>(8.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.2%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.2%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(12.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(99.9%)*</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Pearson's r = -.3679
Significance level = .001
Table 3.2
Marital Status of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>Unattached Statuses</th>
<th>Attached Statuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42.3%)</td>
<td>(36.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.5%)</td>
<td>(38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9.0%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.6%)</td>
<td>(7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.8%)</td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0%)</td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.8%)</td>
<td>(6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(99.9%)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Chi-Square = 8.35
Degrees of Freedom = 6
Not Significant
Table 4.2
Social Class of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17 (40.5%)</td>
<td>8 (19.0%)</td>
<td>13 (31.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>18 (42.9%)</td>
<td>18 (42.9%)</td>
<td>16 (38.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
<td>5 (11.9%)</td>
<td>5 (11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>4 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
<td>1 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>2 (4.8%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
<td>3 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 (100.0%)</td>
<td>42 (99.9%)*</td>
<td>42 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Gamma = +.1476
Not Significant
Table 5.2
Occupational Status of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8 (21.6%)</td>
<td>14 (24.6%)</td>
<td>4 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>14 (37.8%)</td>
<td>24 (42.1%)</td>
<td>6 (42.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>6 (16.2%)</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>2 (5.4%)</td>
<td>5 (8.8%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.3%)</td>
<td>1 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>3 (8.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>4 (10.8%)</td>
<td>8 (14.0%)</td>
<td>2 (14.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 (99.9%)*</td>
<td>57 (100.1%)*</td>
<td>14 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Gamma = -.0768
Not Significant
Table 6.2

Employment Level of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>Not Employed</th>
<th>Employed Part-time</th>
<th>Employed Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (100.0%)</td>
<td>69 (99.9%)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>47 (58.0%)</td>
<td>12 (31.6%)</td>
<td>13 (18.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>22 (27.2%)</td>
<td>12 (31.6%)</td>
<td>32 (46.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>4 (4.9%)</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>6 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
<td>3 (7.9%)</td>
<td>4 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>3 (4.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
<td>5 (13.2%)</td>
<td>9 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Gamma = +.4254
Significance level - .001
Table 6.3

Employment Level of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Violent Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement in Violent Crimes:</th>
<th>Not Employed</th>
<th>Employed Part-time</th>
<th>Employed Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>72 (88.9%)</td>
<td>31 (81.6%)</td>
<td>54 (78.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>8 (9.9%)</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>11 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (5.3%)</td>
<td>4 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 8</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (100.0%)</td>
<td>69 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gamma = +.2769  
Significance level = .05
Table 6.4

Employment Level of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Economic Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement in Economic Crimes:</th>
<th>Not Employed</th>
<th>Employed Part-time</th>
<th>Employed Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>52 (64.2%)</td>
<td>13 (34.2%)</td>
<td>26 (37.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>15 (18.5%)</td>
<td>11 (28.9%)</td>
<td>20 (29.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>8 (9.9%)</td>
<td>5 (13.25%)</td>
<td>9 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>6 (8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12</td>
<td>3 (3.7%)</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>7 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (99.9%)*</td>
<td>69 (99.9%)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Gamma = +.3127
Significance level = .001
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement in Victimless Crimes:</th>
<th>Not Employed</th>
<th>Employed Part-time</th>
<th>Employed Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>66 (81.5%)</td>
<td>20 (52.6%)</td>
<td>29 (42.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>8 (9.9%)</td>
<td>9 (23.7%)</td>
<td>19 (27.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>2 (5.3%)</td>
<td>4 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1 (2.6%)</td>
<td>4 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>2 (5.3%)</td>
<td>4 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>2 (2.5%)</td>
<td>4 (10.5%)</td>
<td>7 (10.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (100.0%)</td>
<td>69 (99.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Gamma = +.4926
Significance level = .001
Table 7.2
Educational Status of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement:</th>
<th>4 - 8 years</th>
<th>9 - 12 years</th>
<th>13 - 13 years</th>
<th>17 - 20 years</th>
<th>21 - 24 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>25 (42.4%)</td>
<td>34 (35.1%)</td>
<td>5 (25.0%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>20 (33.9%)</td>
<td>37 (38.1%)</td>
<td>8 (40.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
<td>7 (7.2%)</td>
<td>4 (20.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
<td>7 (7.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
<td>8 (8.2%)</td>
<td>2 (10.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>59 (100.0%)</td>
<td>97 (100.0%)</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Gamma = +.2190
Significance level = .05
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Table 7.3
Educational Status of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Violent Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement in Violent Crimes</th>
<th>4 - 8 years</th>
<th>9 - 12 years</th>
<th>13 - 16 years</th>
<th>17 - 20 years</th>
<th>21 - 24 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>52 (88.1%)</td>
<td>80 (82.6%)</td>
<td>15 (75.0%)</td>
<td>4 (80.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>6 (10.2%)</td>
<td>11 (11.3%)</td>
<td>4 (20.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>4 (4.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 8</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>59 (100.0%)</td>
<td>97 (100.1%)*</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding
Pearson's r = +.1135
Not Significant
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Table 7.4

Educational Status of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Economic Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement in Economic Crimes:</th>
<th>4 - 8 years</th>
<th>9 - 12 years</th>
<th>13 - 16 years</th>
<th>17 - 20 years</th>
<th>21 - 24 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>29 (49.2%)</td>
<td>45 (46.4%)</td>
<td>8 (40.0%)</td>
<td>3 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>19 (32.2%)</td>
<td>21 (21.6%)</td>
<td>5 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.1%)</td>
<td>16 (16.5%)</td>
<td>3 (15.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (6.8%)</td>
<td>7 (7.2%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (6.8%)</td>
<td>7 (7.2%)</td>
<td>2 (10.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>59 (100.1%)</td>
<td>97 (99.9%)</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding

Pearson's r = +.1274
Significance level = .05
Table 7.5

Educational Status of Respondents by Frequency of Involvement in Victimless Crimes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Involvement in Victimless Crimes:</th>
<th>4 - 8 years</th>
<th>9 - 12 years</th>
<th>13 - 16 years</th>
<th>17 - 20 years</th>
<th>21 - 24 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>38 (64.4%)</td>
<td>59 (60.8%)</td>
<td>10 (50.0%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>11 (18.6%)</td>
<td>19 (19.6%)</td>
<td>6 (30.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>5 (5.2%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>1 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
<td>4 (4.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 15</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (8.5%)</td>
<td>5 (5.2%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>2 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7 (100.0%)</td>
<td>59 (100.0%)</td>
<td>97 (100.1%)*</td>
<td>20 (100.0%)</td>
<td>5 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Due to rounding

Pearson's $r = +.1339$

Significance level = .05
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