To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Jennifer James entitled "Gender Roles and Patterns of Delinquency." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Sociology.

Stephen Norland

Stephen Norland, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

James A. Black

Neal Shover

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Pond

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
T1
J338
cop. 2

GENDER ROLES AND PATTERNS OF DELINQUENCY

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Jennifer James

December 1977

1345703

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Dr. Stephen Norland who untiringly read and reread this manuscript in all of its many versions. His invaluable suggestions and unfailing support were exemplary. I am also indebted to the other members of my committee, Dr. Neal Shover and Dr. James Black, and to my fellow student, Ed Thornton, for their interest in and concern with the quality of my work. Finally, I am grateful to my parents, Dan and Martha, who gave me confidence in my own abilities and much love.

ABSTRACT

Most writers explain the sex differential in delinquency by tracing a linkage from sex to delinquency through gender identification. Boys are presumed to be more delinquent than girls because they are more masculine. Girls are thought to evidence low involvement in rule-breaking behaviors because they are feminine in gender orientation. This study investigated the widespread assumptions in the criminological literature that there is a natural or obvious connection between gender identification as masculine or feminine and patterns of delinquency involvement. Masculine persons may also be more delinquent than feminine persons because individuals with masculine orientation are less attached to conventional others, less committed to and involved in conventional action, less believing that societal rules should be obeyed and more likely to encounter social support for delinquent activities than are feminine persons.

To operationalize the concepts of masculine and feminine gender identification, two instruments were developed. These instruments were found to be both valid and reliable in measuring the independent variables of masculine and feminine gender identification. A self-report scale was used to measure the dependent variable of the frequency of delinquency. Indices were constructed to assess variations in attachment, commitment, involvement, belief, and social support. The data concerning the associations of these variables included crosstabulations and gammas for the relationship of masculinity and femininity to delinquency and for

these bivariate associations when the social control and support variables and sex were held constant.

Contrary to the assumptions in the literature, the responses of this sample of adolescents do not confirm the existence of linkages from sex to delinquency through masculine or feminine self-expectations. Sex is related to delinquency regardless of gender identification. The association of masculinity to delinquency disappears when sex is held constant. No relationship at all exists between femininity and delinquency for members of either sex.

Most of the variables of social control and support do not relate to masculinity or feminity but associate moderately to strongly with delinquency. Support is found for the contentions that the elements of social control constrain involvement in delinquency and that the opportunity for delinquency in the form of social support provides resources facilitating delinquency. The social control factors do not, however, link gender to delinquency. Only the social support for delinquency alters the relationship between gender identification and rule-breaking behaviors, but this effect must be treated with caution since there are methodological difficulties with the small cell frequencies and sample size.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
II. METHOD	32
III. FINDINGS: MASCULINITY AND DELINQUENCY	43
IV. FINDINGS: FEMININITY AND DELINQUENCY	62
V. CONCLUSIONS	74
LIST OF REFERENCES	83
APPENDIXES	90
A. VARIABLE CREATION LIST	91
B. THE RELATIONSHIPS OF SEX, SOCIAL CONTROL AND SUPPORT VARIABLES AND THE FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIORS	96
VITA	98

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Relationship of Masculinity and Frequency of Delinquency	44
II.	Sex and Frequency of Delinquency	45
III.	Percent Highly Delinquent by Sex and Masculinity	45
IV.	Correlations (Gammas) of Selected Concepts with Masculinity and the Frequency of Delinquency	49
V.	Intercorrelations (Gammas) for the Relationship between Masculinity and Delinquency Controlling for Selected Concepts and Sex	49
VI.	Masculinity and the Frequency of Delinquency Controlling for Sex and Social Support	58
VII.	Relationship of Femininity and Delinquency	63
VIII.	Delinquency by Femininity by Sex	64
IX.	Correlations (Gammas) of Selected Concepts with Femininity and the Frequency of Delinquency	67
X.	Intercorrelations (Gammas) for the Relationship between Femininity and Delinquency Controlling for Selected Concepts and Sex	67
XI.	Intercorrelations (Gammas) of Selected Concepts with Sex and the Frequency of Delinquency	96
XII.	Intercorrelations (Gammas) for the Relationship between Sex and Delinquency Controlling for Selected Concepts	97
XIII.	Frequency of Delinquency by Sex Controlling for Social Support	97

INTRODUCTION

Sex differences in criminal behavior have traditionally been taken for granted by sociologists. However, during the past few years a major reevaluation of the categories male and female has occurred. With the introduction of the concept of gender writers in many sociological areas are reexamining the associations of sex to other variables and the interpretations given to those relationships. Concern in the area of criminology centers around the relation between the masculine and feminine gender roles and patterns of delinquency involvement. This study explores the ways gender identification may explain the differential delinquency involvement of adolescents by (1) developing a sociological measure of gender identification and (2) examining the relationship between that measure and the frequency of delinquency involvement.

The idea of gender role evolves from the interpretation that sex and gender are distinct, but socially related, variables. Evidence is mounting that biological sex alone cannot account for differences in behaviors (Weinstein, 1971; Rosaldo and Lamphere, 1969; Oakley, 1972); yet, sociologists tend to employ the variable "sex" when they are actually referring to differences of "gender." Adding to this methodological confusion, sociologists apply the notion "sex roles" to account for the contrast between masculine and feminine behaviors. Since roles are expectations for the behavior of occupants of positions in social systems, sex roles have been defined as behavioral expectations based on the sex of individuals. Sex, however, does not directly affect

behaviors, and a "sex" role must be viewed as logically impossible (Brown, 1975:70). Gender role now supplants the concept of sex role and denotes expectations of an individual's behavior as either masculine or feminine. Gender identification is defined as an individual's expectations for their own behavior in relation to expectations traditionally associated with the masculine and feminine gender roles.

Along with new ideas about the associations between sex and gender roles have come reconsiderations of the nature of the dependent variable, patterns of delinquency involvement. Most theoretical explanations of the patterns of delinquency of males and females are based on official statistics. These statistics emphasize the differences in frequency and type of male and female delinquency, but theoretical and methodological developments call into question the validity of official descriptions of male and female delinquent behavior. Studies of official agencies of social control suggest that a host of other concepts, focusing on the organizational and bureaucratic natures of such agencies, can explain patterns of official data. The findings of studies using self-report data also expose the limitations of official statistics. Girls are found to be heavily involved in traditionally masculine offenses. While fewer than those of boys, the misbehaviors of girls are nearly identical in type and more frequent than ever before expected (Clark and Haurek, 1966; Gold, 1970; Hindelang, 1971).

Even when analyzing self-report findings, the tendency is for researchers to ignore the similarities they have just discovered and to emphasize preconceived differences based on traditional stereotypes about

gender roles (Clark and Haurek, 1966; Gold and Reimer, 1974). There is a tendency among those writing about the connections between masculinity, femininity, and delinquency to assume that a "natural" and obvious association exists between masculinity and delinquency. Delinquent action is defined as either symbolically masculine or as a masculinity verifier (Oakley, 1972; Gold and Reimer, 1974). Adler (1975) in particular argues that the presumed increase in the criminality of women should be attributed to their adoption of more masculine gender orientations. This line of reasoning which ties masculine identification to delinquency is not, however, new in sociological compositions. In 1955 Cohen pronounced:

> The delinquent response, however it may be condemned by others on moral grounds, has at least one virtue: it incontestably confirms, in the eyes of all concerned, his essential masculinity . . . The delinquent is the rogue male. (1955: 140)

Femininity, on the other hand, is so foreign to delinquency that Cohen claims it would be "useless pedantry" to document the relation between two. It is obvious to Cohen and other writers that the essential concerns of girls by virtue of feminine gender identification revolve around sexual attractiveness, and therefore their delinquency is sexual in nature. Extensions of these traditional explanations to self-report findings raise several questions. If girls are seeking feminine expression in sexual behavior, are boys, who engage in at least as many and perhaps more sexual activities, also pursuing feminine expression? Or does this activity represent something different for boys? If boys are expressing masculine identity in theft offenses, are girls when they engage in the same behavior also verifying masculinity?

The heralded relationship between masculine and feminine gender identification and delinquent behavior remains untested since, as implied above, in most research sex and gender are methodologically equated. Relying heavily on common sense notions, most investigators do not even bother to measure masculinity and femininity aside from biological sex classifications. It is the contention of this study that it is not enough to assume that gender identification intervenes between sex and delinquency: this implied interrelation should be empirically examined.

Part of the problem in scrutinizing the direct and indirect associations of gender identification and delinquency rests with the lack of sociological measures of masculinity and femininity applicable to juveniles. The few studies attempting to explore the linkages between sex and delinquency are not concerned with the actual gender-related expectations of juveniles. Instead, they employ lists of personality traits forming semantic differential scales which are based on the suppositions that masculinity and femininity are polar opposites and that the linkage between the two is unidimensional. These "gender trait" explanations are attacked on many fronts including the assumptions of bipolarity and unidimensionality (Norland, Breeding and Shover, 1977; Shover and Norland, 1975a; Tresemer, 1975). To answer these criticisms and to conform to a sociological rather than psychologistic conception of gender roles, indices are constructed as part of this research which compare the expectations an individual holds for their own behavior with the "ideals of behavior thought to be embodied in the masculine and feminine gender roles" (Brown, 1975: 72).

If the assumption that delinquency is a masculine activity and expressive of a masculine gender identity is correct, the measure of masculine identification should associate positively with delinquency. Also implicit in these beliefs is the corollary supposition that femininity is antithetical to delinquency involvement. Should this be the case, the index of feminine orientation will relate in a negative direction with the frequency of delinquency involvement. Whether or not gender identification has these direct effects on delinquency is the focal concern of this study.

CHAPTER I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The subject of female delinquency is long-neglected in discussions of human deviance although the sex differential in crime coming to official attention is one of the most persistent and longstanding of all such differences in crime rates. Contrasted with male misbehavior in volume and extent, female delinquency is typically viewed as less serious and threatening. Women are generally portrayed in criminological writings as primarily sexual beings, interested in emotional and home-centered matters while the deviancy of women is attributed solely to their maladjustment to the natural feminine role, that of wife and mother. Above all, the criminality of women is understood to be entirely different from the criminality of men. Questions, however, are raised about the adequacy of these images and the data upon which they rest. Must of the literature about female criminality is shown to be racist, sexist and classist in nature (Klein, 1973).

Official and Self-Report Statistics

Examining official statistics, notions of the "differentness" of male and female delinquency are upheld. Males are reportedly involved three times as often as females in delinquent behavior. Most offenses in which girls are involved apparently stem from problems in the home. While males tend to have contact with official agencies and representatives because they are accused of theft and other property offenses,

young women's offenses cluster in the area of sexual misbehavior, running away and incorrigibility (Simon, 1975). One-half of all juvenile women brought before the court are charged with noncriminal, behavioral offences. Only one-fifth of boys fall into that category (Decrow, 1974: 243). Official statistics such as those described above are criticized for having only limited utility in the description of the frequency and nature of delinquency since they may measure the activity and biases of officials more than the conduct of adolescents (Kitsuse and Cicourel, 1963; Chesney-Lind, 1973).

The body of evidence gathered in self-report studies diverges from official statistics in two ways: (1) the form of female delinquency is quite similar to that of boys' delinquency with the distribution of female offenses across categories quite closely resembling the pattern of male law-breaking, (2) the quantity of female delinquency is much greater than indicated by official statistics with self-report ratios of male to female delinquency ranging from 2.7:1 to 1.7:1 (Short and Nye, 1958; Clark and Haurek, 1966; Wise, 1967; Gold, 1970; Hindelang, 1971). Norland and Shover comment that limited evidence points to an under-report of delinquency on the part of adolescent girls and an over-report on the part of adolescent boys. Therefore, "it is possible that the 'actual' sex differential in deviance is even narrower than self-report studies have suggested" (1975b: 14).

Studies of police, courts and juvenile agencies offer explanations of the discrepancies between official and self-report accounts of male and female involvement in delinquency. Chesney-Lind argues that ". . . female

delinquency, especially sexual delinquency, is viewed as more serious than male delinquency and is, therefore, more severely sanctioned" (1973: 54). Reporting on juvenile court referrals, she finds that 70 percent of the women and 31 percent of the males are referred for noncriminal offenses which would not be illegal if committed by an adult. The sexual history and condition of girls is of far more interest to court officials than the sexual experience of boys. Seventy to 80 percent of girls as compared to 12 to 18 percent of boys are subjected to court-ordered physical exams. Gynecological exams are ordered even for girls charged with burglary. Furthermore, the cases of girls receive even harsher dispositions than those of boys. After adolescent females are referred to court, they are almost twice as likely as males to end up in a training school. Finally, once in training schools the average stay for girls is 10.7 months while boys average stays of 8.2 months. Girls may be treated in a chivalrous fashion by policemen who make the decision to arrest, but they are obviously treated more harshly at other stages in the criminal justice process. Court spokesmen rationalize longer institutional stays for girls by citing the need to "protect" girls against family abuses and sexually exploitive men. The behavior of court officials shows an interest in the preservation of the daughter's most important commodity, her virginity (Chesney-Lind, 1973; Kratcoski, 1974). Since no such interest is expressed in the sexual behavior of boys, it can only be inferred that court officials believe men and women to be very different creatures indeed.

Explanations of the Relationship between Sex Gender and Delinquency

It is not just police, court and juvenile officials, however, who assume that sexual status is related to patterns of delinquency involvement as causes of such involvement. Various biological, social, and psychological explanations are offered by criminologists concerning the relation of biological sex, gender role and delinquent behavior. It is important to remember that most of the comment is based on rates of involvement gathered from official statistics of arrest rates, court referrals, and studies of incarcerated offenders. Subsequently, these explanations are directed to patterns of delinquency involvement that do not exist.

Biological Explanations

Criminologists who first addressed the sex differential in male/female offense patterns explained that the biological differences between males and females could only produce distinctive rates of criminal activity. Women, according to Lombroso (1916), were intellectually mediocre, physiologically immobile, and psychologically passive, and it followed that their crimes have a smaller range than those of men. Since women were also believed to be more adaptable than men to their social and physical surroundings, they would be less likely to act to change and control that environment in deviant and nondeviant fashions.

Psychological theorists also related biological sex differences to the varying behaviors of men and women. Freud felt that women's lack of

a penis and the response to that deficiency held the key to "normal" female behavior. The woman who accepted her inferior role was defined as healthy (Klein, 1973). In a similar vein Thomas (1923) saw a dichotomy between maleness which was destructive, creative, and outward and femaleness which was motionless and conservative of energy. Observing the social effect of such biological difference, Thomas argued that women were not a threat to property so they were treated leniently for such offenses. For women it was much more important to obey rules of conduct in the sexual realm; thus, they were prosecuted more harshly for sexual transgressions. Viewing the modern women as petty, irregular, ill of health and inserviceable, Thomas called for educating women to be better at their natural functions or, in other words, to adjust themselves to the traditional feminine gender role (Klein, 1973).

Citing another biological difference of men and women, Pollack (1950) saw the reflection of physiological variations in the psychological deceptiveness of women. Since women, unlike men, could pretend to enjoy the sex act and each month practiced deceit in hiding the menstrual period, their deceit in criminal acts was only to be expected. The lower crime rate of women was attributed in part to their greater propensity to hide crimes.

Arguments which imply any biological determinism in male and female behaviors are attacked on many fronts. As stated earlier, biology is important in humans only as it is interpreted by norms and expectations of human culture and society and as it to some degree constrains behavior. Humans share the capacity to interpret and perhaps change biological

factors through the manipulation of symbolic forms as language (Rosaldo and Lamphere, 1969). The inadequacy of the biological explanations is underlined by the difference in official female criminality in countries where gender roles are more or less differentiated for men and women. Where women are more subordinate and protected, the sex differential is wider than in countries where women are more emancipated (Jensen and Eve, 1976: 431-432). Wise (1967) demonstrates that the criminality of boys and girls in the middle class is quite similar in extent and type. She attributes this resemblance to the similarity of gender-role expectations within the middle class in particular. Thus, as Jensen and Eve (1976) note, the sex differential varies with social position, supervision, and the social relations of the sexes. The criminological explanations of those who fail to recognize the limitations of biological determinism have the ultimate effect of upholding the sexual status quo and supporting the segregation of men and women in traditional roles (Klein, 1973).

Gender Trait Perspective

Newer versions of psychological theory relate the connection between a dichotomy of masculine and feminine personality traits and differences in criminal involvement. Each sex is thought to possess either innate or acquired personality traits which then influence the pattern of delinquency for that sex. Any individual's likelihood of being involved in a certain type or frequency of delinquency is then thought to depend on how masculine (meaning aggressive, dominant, independent) or feminine (meaning submissive, passive and dependent) they are. The assumed connection

between masculinity and criminality is well-expressed in the work of Clark and Haurek who write,

> Offenses associated with the cultural role of child decrease through adolescence, offenses less deviant for adults than children increase, and offenses involving some daring and aggression increase to mid-adolescence for males presumably because of their testimonial to masculinity, then decrease as anxiety about masculine identity decreases in later adolescence. (1966: 505)

They are so certain of the connection between masculinity and delinquency that they do not even attempt to explain why the male/female age pattern is quite similar for some offenses. So foreign to delinquency involvement do they consider the feminine personality, which they equate with biological femaleness, they do not even endeavor to explain any pattern of female involvement.

Similarly, Konopka (1966) relates the delinquency of girls, but not that of boys, to dependency and emotional needs and views male and female as occupying different poles on an instrumental-expressive dichotomy (Klein, 1973). It is assumed that a woman who is not normally feminine, or passive, dependent, and submissive, is therefore trying to become more masculine, or aggressive. As Shover and Norland point out,

> Nevertheless underlying many of the discussions of the topic is the assumption that females who have rejected the sharp distinctions characteristic of stereotyped gender expectations have become more aggressive. The same is said to be true of females whose gender traits are more masculine. Presumably they are, for that reason, more likely to engage in misconduct. (1975c: 16)

Yet, as they also observe, there is no reason that a masculine personality should "naturally" relate to delinquency involvement. This literature as a whole lacks specification of the ways traits translate into behaviors.

While a masculine or feminine personality might relate to type of delinquency involvement, there is no reason to believe that it provides a reason for the occurrence of delinquent behavior (Shover and Norland, 1975c: 12). Moreover, self-report studies establish that male and female involvement is very similar in type. If men and women do possess different personality traits, it would appear that delinquency involvement in type is not related to these traits. The connection between these personality traits and the frequency of delinquent behaviors remains open to empirical investigation. There is, however, no reason to a priori assume an interrelation as many theorists have done.

Most of these explanations do not supply a systematic analysis of traits considered to be masculine and feminine (Shover and Norland, 1975a: 8). Often traits are selected in a haphazard fashion to explain official statistics. These traits are quite contradictory in many cases. While Thomas views women as cold and calculating, other stereotypes define women as warm, gentle and compassionate (Broverman, 1972: 67). Lombroso (1916), as mentioned previously, called women inherently more adaptable than men while other stereotypes of women term them frail and weak (Klein, 1973). This entire argument ignores the complex distribution of personality traits across human populations in an attempt to arbitrarily polarize traits as masculine or feminine (Shover and Norland, 1975a: 9; Norland, Breeding and Shover, 1977).

Functionalist Explanations

While some theorists try only to demonstrate that socialization into gender roles produces different personality traits in boys and girls,

others attempt to specify a more complex explanation of the relation between gender-related self-identification and the differential criminality of males and females. One such explanation of the varying involvement of males and females in delinquency is advanced by Grosser (1951) and further explicated by Morris (1964; 1965). Morris hypothesizes that by virtue of their masculine gender role boys are concerned with the "status" goals of power, wealth and prestige. Girls, on the other hand, focus their aspirations and expectations on relational goals of positive affective associations. When legitimate access to these goals is blocked, boys turn to alternative means of attaining economic aims and specialize in property offenses while girls engage in illicit sexual behavior. The relational goals of women are thought to be more easily obtainable by legitimate means than the status goals of men, resulting in a lower rate of female delinquency. Illegitimate opportunity is hypothesized to be more available to boys who are less closely supervised and more likely to participate in delinquent subcultures. So strongly does Morris accept the notion of the essential difference of male and female delinquency, she uses different offenses for males and females in an empirical study of these hypotheses (1965: 256-7). Property offenses are used to indicate the delinquency of males while sexual transgressions are used to gauge the delinquency of girls. Self-report studies, however, show that the largest single category offense for males and females is property crimes and that boys commit as much sexual delinquency as girls although it is viewed differently by authorities (Heidensohn, 1968).

Morris (1964) tries to demonstrate that broken homes and family tensions are more related to the delinquency involvement of females than males since the focal concerns of women are more connected to the home. Conflict in the home is thought to represent blocked access to relational goals. Morris, however, uses an incarcerated sample of adolescents as do others writing of the relation between familial tensions and adolescent misbehavior (Cockburn and Maclay, 1965; Gibbons and Griswold, 1957). From these kinds of samples, it is generally found that delinquent girls are indeed more often from broken homes than delinquent boys. Yet, when Datesman and Scarpitti control for the type of offense for which boys and girls are most often referred to officials, they discover that "A family which is in some way 'broken' may be more prone to refer a daughter than a son to court for mildly rebellious behavior, on the assumption that females need the 'protective' environment of a complete family more often than do males" (1975: 40). Thus, the over-protection of daughters by parents, rather than the frustration of relational goals, may account for the relation between female delinquency and broken homes. Kratcoski (1974) also observes that the parents of girls more often directly ask the court for help in "protecting" their daughters.

Studies linking the differential goals of males and females to variations in delinquency do not include questions about what goals boys and girls feel are appropriate for males and females and what goals they find appropriate for themselves. Here these theorists are guilty of the "fallacy of objectivism" which Shover and Norland define as "a tendency on the part of social analysts to assume that they know, or to take for

granted, the subjective meanings which social actors ascribe to their own actions" (1975a: 10). Since the empirical evidence of self-report studies contradicts the assumptions that the female pattern of delinquency is largely sexual in nature, alternative explanations, free of common sense notions and the limitations of official data, must be sought.

Control and Resource Theories

In the final explication of the contrast in male and female delinquency to be presented here it is also indicated that an individual's social statuses affect their pattern of delinquency involvement. Hirschi (1969) calls this general position on the causes of delinquency the "social control" perspective and argues that delinquent acts result when an individual's bond to the social order is weak or broken. There are four elements of that bond. Attachment to conventional others, commitment to and involvement in conventional action and belief in obeying the rules of the society are all related to the origins of delinquent behavior according to Hirschi. Distinctive rates of delinquency for different social categories of individuals are explained in this perspective on the basis of variations in these concepts. If females commit fewer criminal actions than males, it is because the feminine gender role ensures that women are more closely controlled and supervised and strictly disciplined than are men. Feminine persons are posited to believe more strongly than masculine persons that social rules should be obeyed (Jensen and Eve, 1976: 433). The confines of the masculine and feminine roles also structurally determine opportunity for committing particular offenses

and access to criminally oriented subcultures and careers (Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973). In contrast to other perspectives, social control theories emphasize that women are involved less often in offenses because they are more closely controlled and regulated and encounter fewer resources encouraging delinquency and not because their only interests lie with emotional and home-centered matters. While functionalist theorists assume that delinquency has different social meaning for boys and girls, control theory advocates take for granted that the same variables which explain delinquency for boys would account for the delinquency of girls. From Hirschi, it would be predicted that no major difference would be observed in type of delinquency among categories of adolescents. People, whether male or female, are simply more or less delinquent.

Elements of the Social Bond

Differential delinquency rates, both between and within the sexes, are attributed by social control theorists to various factors which serve as inhibitors upon the commission of delinquent acts. According to Hirschi, these elements include the attachment to parents, school and peers, commitment to conformity, involvement in conventional action, and belief that rules should be obeyed.

Attachment. Examining first the element of attachment, Hirschi argues that attachments to conventional others in the forms of parents, school and peers act as constraints upon delinquency. The nature of the relationship with parents is thought particularly important by control

theorists since much delinquency research demonstrates that delinquents are less likely to be closely tied to parents than are nondelinquents (Glueck and Glueck, 1950; Nye, 1958; Gold, 1963; Hirschi, 1969; Jensen, 1972). The virtual supervision of the parents is important not because more opportunity is afforded for delinquency when supervision is low, but because the psychological presence of the parent serves as a suppressant upon the commission of delinquent acts:

> The important consideration is whether or not the parent is psychologically present when temptation to commit a crime appears. If in the situation of temptation, no thought is given to parental reaction, the child is to this extent free to commit the act. (Hirschi, 1969: 88)

Variation in the attachment to parents may produce differences in the delinquency involvement of masculine and feminine persons if feminine persons are more closely tied to and concerned about the relationship with parents than are masculine persons. The influence of the parents may simply be more compelling for those persons expressing a feminine gender orientation. Writing about the gender-role socialization of males and females, Bardwick and Douvan suggest that girls are encouraged to remain dependent on other people's acceptance, especially that of parents, while boys are rewarded for signs of independence and "real achievements in terms of objective criteria" (1972: 53). They further notice that "Because they continue to depend on others for self-definition and affirmation and are adept at anticipating other people's demands, girls are conformist." Studies demonstrate that even in infancy, mothers tend to touch, handle and talk to their daughters more than their sons. The net result is that girls, in keeping with the ideals of the

feminine gender role, "will become more amenable to social reinforcement and will manifest high degrees of attachment behavior" (Moss, 1972; Goldberg and Lewis, 1972). Boys, on the other hand, are encouraged to break away from this affinity for the parents as they enter adolescence. "The world of adolescent males," argues one writer, "has little mercy on the boy who never managed to make the break away from a too close identification with an attachment to the mother" (Chafetz, 1974: 94). Overall then, masculine persons may be less attached to parents than feminine persons which may produce a higher rate of delinquency among masculine persons.

In addition to detailing the importance of the bond to parents as an inhibitor upon delinquency, Hirschi includes the attachment to the school as an important correlate of delinquent behavior. Drawing a causal chain, he supposes that academic incompetence and poor school performance lead to a rejection of the school's authority which in turn leaves the individual free to commit delinquent acts:

> The boy who does not like school and who does not care what teachers think of him is to this extent free to commit delinquent acts. Positive feelings toward controlling institutions and persons in authority are the first line of social control. Withdrawal of favorable sentiments toward such institutions and persons at the same time neutralizes their moral force. (1969: 127)

The literature on gender-role socialization is replete with observations that girls, more than boys, are sensitive to the demands of teachers and school officials as further consequence of their greater dependence on and attachment to conventional others. Remark Bardwick and Douvan:

> Schools are generally feminine places, institutions where conformity is valued, taught largely by conformist women . . . The reward structure of the school system perpetuates the pattern set by relationships with parents—boys are further pressured to turn to their peers for acceptance and to develop internal criteria and objective achievements; girls are further urged to continue the nondeviant, noninnovative, conformist style of life. (1972: 54)

It is widely noticed that girls receive higher grades in school than boys which means that girls possess more of the characteristics the system rewards and are therefore more likely to exhibit stronger attachment to the school. If, by virtue of the feminine gender role, girls are more closely tied to the conventional institution of the school, it is only to be expected that they would be less delinquent than boys who live within the confines of masculine role expectations.

The final element of attachment concerns the bond of adolescents to their peers. The attachment to peers is explored from two perspectives in Causes of Delinquency: (1) the influence of actual attachment to peers upon delinquency, (2) the effects of the companionship of delinquent friends on delinquent behaviors. In answering the first question, Hirschi discovers that delinquents are less attached to and respectful of their friends than are nondelinquents. Even boys who have delinquent friends are less delinquent the more they are attached to their friends. To respond to the second question he writes that the delinquency of companions is strongly related to rule-breaking behaviors in his sample of adolescent males (1969: 155-56).

Although Hirschi includes the delinquency of friends as part of the attachment to peers, it is unclear that the delinquency of friends acts as an inhibitor to delinquency. On the contrary, the delinquency of

companions may serve as a resource which provides a "push" into delinquent behavior when controls are weakened. The idea of a "push" into delinquency when controls are attenuated or absent is a refinement of Hirschi's conception of control theory, but the availability of social support for delinquency would seem more logically to fit into a category of resources for delinquency which increase the likelihood of delinquent activity when restraints are weakened or broken. Here the variable of attachment to friends is confined to the importance of having close friends and getting along with others since these factors may serve as constraints upon delinquency involvement.

How might the relationship with peers produce differential delinquency in masculine and feminine persons? If attachment to conventional others, including peers, acts as a constraint prohibiting delinquent behaviors, it would be expected that feminine persons would be less delinquent than individuals with masculine orientation. Most of the literature on gender roles assumes that the feminine role ensures that women are particularly concerned with getting along with others. Men, through masculine role socialization, are thought to be interested in achievements measurable in terms of objective criteria and thus to rely less on others including friends (Lynn, 1969: 49; Chafetz, 1974; Weitz, 1977).

Commitment. Hirschi stresses not only the importance of attachment to conventional others in the etiology of delinquent behavior but also the significance of the commitment to conventional lines of action. The aspirations to achieve occupational and educational goals are interpreted as constraints on delinquent activities. An assessment of Hirschi's data

supports the view that the higher the educational and occupational expectations, the lower the rate of delinquency.

If feminine persons are less delinquent than masculine persons, social control theorists postulate that this effect would be caused by a difference in strength of ties to the conventional order between the two categories. In other words, feminine persons would exhibit stronger bonds to conventional others and lines of action. Although it is expected that feminine persons are more attached to conventional others, the predictions of possible relationships between gender identification and commitment are more complex. The literature on gender roles is filled with accounts that the educational and occupational goals embodied in masculine and feminine role expectations differ. While the gender role most often associated with females is believed to focus attention on marriage and relational goals, the masculine gender orientation is said to foster achievements in the outside world (Oakley, 1972: 184-5; Weitz, 1977: 131). School aspirations of girls are seen to change at adolescence in keeping with the perception that the "feminine gender role centers in domesticity while the male is oriented toward achievement and career" (Oakley, 1972: 185). Conventional lines of action <u>may</u> be different for masculine and feminine persons: this is certainly a question open to empirical examination. If masculine persons do desire jobs in the outside world while feminine persons want to be housewives, high commitment would be indicated by desires for success in terms of the ideals of each respective role. Investment and high aspiration in either world would, if the assumptions of control theory are correct, preclude the risks of delinquent behavior.

Involvement. Another social bond factor thought to inhibit delinquent behavior is, according to Hirschi, the involvement in conventional activities. Some theorists suggest mere involvement in conventional activities restrains delinquency (Cohen, 1967), but Hirschi reports that what the child is doing is more important in explaining delinquency than the fact he is doing something. Conventional commitment underlies involvement in conventional activities; involvement is, to a large extent, a consequence of commitment. Two types of involvement appear particularly important in explaining differences in delinquency. First of all, time spent doing homework is strongly related to the commission of delinquent acts. Secondly, involvement in "working class adult" activities as riding around in a car or sitting and talking with friends away from home associates strongly with delinquency. A third type of involvement may also be significant in explaining delinquency. The involvement with the conventional activities of the family may also preclude delinquent behavior.

Much evidence in the works on gender roles as well as in criminological writings points out that masculine and feminine persons differ in their involvement in conventional activities (Chafetz, 1974; Weitz, 1977). If feminine persons are more involved in the school and family settings as masculine persons are allowed more unsupervised leisure time, it would be predicted that the delinquency involvement of masculine and feminine persons would differ. In support of this view, Weis (1976) finds that "sex-role determined opportunity theory" best explains patterns of rule-breaking. Women are less frequently involved in criminality because they

are less involved in many social situations. The involvement of males and females was, in Weis' sample, most similar in sex-shared social situations as school and shopping. In other words, males and females by virtue of the involvements structured by their respective gender roles are differentially delinquent.

Belief. In writing about the fourth and final element of the tie to the social order, Hirschi proposes that variation exists in the extent to which people believe that social rules should be obeyed. Rather than assuming, as some theorists do, that delinquency is caused by beliefs requiring delinquency, the line of thought in control theory is that delinquency is made possible by the absence of beliefs forbidding delinquency. Hirschi ties lack of the belief that societal rules should be obeyed to the lack of attachment to parents and devaluation of concern for approval of persons in a position of authority.

Since it is argued here that feminine persons are more strongly attached to parents than are masculine persons, it follows that feminine persons would express stronger beliefs in the rules of society. Furthermore, evidence in research on gender-related socialization points to a greater dependence upon and receptiveness to the moral standards of others on the part of girls while boys tend to adopt a more individualistic and relativistic stance toward norms. Early socialization steers girls into accepting rules as given but encourages boys to develop "internal standards and personal control" (Lynn, 1969: 40; Chafetz, 1974: 74). If the above assumptions about the contradictions between masculine and

feminine persons are correct, the two categories would be expected to experience differential rule-breaking.

Resources

While Hirschi includes the delinquency of companions as part of the "attachment to peers," the argument here is that it is conceptually clearer to think of the delinquency of companions as a factor facilitating delinquency when the bond to the social order is already weakened. Supporting this view, Hirschi discovers the delinquency of companions to be strongly related to delinquent behavior regardless of the attachment to friends. The rule-breaking of friends is further considered to influence an individual's delinquency when those friends ask the individual to engage in delinquent behavior rather than merely committing the offense themselves.

The availability of social support for delinquency may be in part responsible for any delinquency differences between masculine and feminine persons. Morris (1965) argues that since delinquent behavior is more severely sanctioned for girls than boys, females have fewer opportunities to associate with others whose attitudes toward the conventional order favor delinquency. Group support for the delinquency of females may simply be less available than companionship for the misbehaviors of boys. Even if friends are delinquent, girls, since they must conform to the confines of the feminine gender role, may be invited less often to participate in delinquent activity.

A Test of Control Theory

In an application of control theory to the sex differential in delinquency, Jensen and Eve analyze Hirschi's data on juveniles to determine whether or not boys and girls are differentially controlled and regulated by others, themselves, and conventional commitment. They hypothesize,

> Compared to boys, girls are typically depicted as more closely bound to conventional persons, values, and institutions, and such sex differences in attachment, commitment, involvement and belief should, according to control theory, lead to a sex-differential in delinquent behavior. (1976: 433)

After considering the closeness of the relationship with parents, attachment to the law and conventional moral norms, attachment to the school and "youth-culture" activities, they discover that all these control variables are related to the delinquency of both boys and girls. While the size of the sex differential is substantially reduced when controlling for such factors, the variable of sex still accounts for 1 to 2 percent of the variance in delinquency rates for males and females. Jensen and Eve note, however, that certain variables are not considered in Hirschi's study. These variables include ". . . social-psychological variables such as 'masculinity' or 'femininity,' sexual identity, or attitudes specifically dealing with sex-role expectations" (Jensen and Eve, 1976: 445).

Thus, the crux of the issues raised in the literature review suggests that an investigation of the relationship of masculinity and femininity to delinquency is needed to further account for differences in the misbehaviors of males and females. In order to gain a more comprehensive

understanding of the linkages between gender identification and delinquency, it is useful to consider the effects of other variables which may be linked with both independent and dependent variables. In other words, do masculine and feminine persons differ in respect to other concepts which then produce differential delinquency involvement? It is expected that any variation in the misbehaviors of masculine and feminine persons results not only from the effects of gender-related identification but also from the kinds of constraints imposed and resources afforded by their respective gender roles (Hirschi, 1969; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; Jensen and Eve, 1976). This study accordingly involves first of all, a test of the direct effects of gender orientation on delinquency and secondly, an investigation of whether or not gender identification is linked to delinquency through variations in constraints or inhibitors upon delinquency.

While absence or attentuation of controls may make delinquency less likely, other investigators postulate that the loss of constraining factors is more apt to result in delinquency when resources, or opportunities, for delinquency are also present. One of the major resources encouraging delinquency when controls are inhibited is the availability of social support for delinquency in the form of delinquent companions. Observe Burkett and Jenses of adolescent marijuana users, "When conventional ties are broken, youth are unlikely to engage in marijuana use in the absence of support from others who use marijuana" (1975: 531). In a similar vein Jensen argues that delinquent friends are important not only because they transmit and/or confirm beliefs

favorable to law violation, but also because ". . . adolescents with delinquent friends are more likely to experience short-run, situationally induced pressures to deviate" (1972: 569). Briar and Piliavin (1965) also note that delinquent behavior is most likely to occur when conventional commitments and situationally induced motives to deviate are present. Since masculine persons may find resources for delinquency more readily than feminine persons, the variable of social support for delinquency is also considered to have effect on any differential delinquency between the two categories.

To restate the above proposed relationsips between masculine and feminine gender identification and delinquency, the following hypotheses are offered:

I. As masculine gender identification increases, the frequency of delinquent behaviors increases.

II. As feminine gender identification increases, the frequency of delinquent behaviors decreases.

Based on the premises of control theory it is further expected that the variables of attachment, commitment, involvement, belief and delinquency resources all intervene in the direct relationship between gender and delinquency. If these variables are statistically controlled, the prediction is that the relationship between gender identification and the frequency of delinquent acts will be substantially reduced. Three sets of subhypotheses specify these proposed linkages. Subhypothesis Set I concerns the relationship between masculinity and the social control and social support variables while Subhypothesis Set II states the

predicted associations between femininity and the factors of social control and support:

Subhypotheses Set I.

1. As masculinity increases, attachment to parents decreases.
2. As masculinity increases, attachment to school decreases.
3. As masculinity increases, attachment to friends decreases.
4. As masculinity increases, commitment to conventional action decreases.
5. As masculinity increases, involvement in conventional activities decreases.
6. As masculinity increases, belief that societal rules should be obeyed decreases.
7. As masculinity increases, the availability of social support for delinquency increases.

Subhypotheses Set II.

8. As femininity increases, attachment to parents increases.
9. As femininity increases, attachment to school increases.
10. As femininity increases, attachment to friends increases.
11. As femininity increases, commitment to conventional action increases.
12. As femininity increases, involvement in conventional activities increases.
13. As femininity increases, belief that societal rules should be obeyed increases.
14. As femininity increases, the availability of social support for delinquency decreases.

Derived from social control theory, the following set of subhypotheses addresses the relationship between the social control and support variables and the frequency of delinquency:

Subhypotheses Set III.

15. As attachment to parents increases, the frequency of delinquency decreases.
16. As attachment to the school increases, the frequency of delinquency decreases.
17. As attachment to peers increases, the frequency of delinquency decreases.
18. As commitment to conventional action increases, the frequency of delinquency decreases.
19. As involvement in conventional activities increases, the frequency of delinquency decreases.
20. As belief that societal rules should be obeyed increases, the frequency of delinquency decreases.
21. As the availability of social support for delinquency increases, the frequency of delinquency increases.

Since a cross-sectional survey design in which all information for each respondent is gathered at one time was employed in this study, the time ordering of these variables can not be investigated directly. Social control theory specifies a time ordering of variables which will be accepted for the purposes of this analysis. Implicit in these three sets of hypotheses, then, are the assumptions that masculinity and femininity influence the social control and social support variables.

Variations in these variables of social control then result in differences in delinquency involvement.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

This chapter focuses on the procedures employed to measure variables and the relationships between variables. The questions raised in the theoretical framework of the relationship between gender identification[1] and delinquency were examined with questionnaire responses of a sample of adolescents. To measure the independent variable, the gender orientation of respondents, a scale was constructed based on their gender-related expectations. The dependent variable was operationalized through fourteen self-report items questioning involvement in a wide range of delinquent behaviors. Several scales were constructed to measure the variables of social control and resources. In analyzing the interrelations of these variables, statistical associations were investigated for (1) the direct effects of masculinity and femininity upon the frequency of delinquency (2) effects of gender identification on delinquency involvement when other variables were introduced. In order to describe the method utilized in this research, this chapter is divided into four sections: (1) research design, (2) sampling, (3) measurement, (4) data analysis.

---

[1] In this chapter and in the following chapters the terms gender identification, gender orientation, masculinity or femininity, and gender expectations are used interchangeably to denote masculine or feminine self-expectations.

Research Design

According to Sellitz, "A research design is the arrangement of conditions for collection and analysis of data in a manner that aims to combine relevance to the research purpose with economy in procedure" (1969: 50). The basic premises of this study were explored through the use of a cross-sectional, survey design. The pertinent behavioral and social variables were measured at one point in time to facilitate a quick and economical process of data collection. After data were gathered on these essential variables, the survey technique

> involves the following steps: cross-classifying two variables, one independent and one dependent; measuring the degree of association between them; and introducing a third variable to assess its effects on the original association. (Denzin, 1970: 166)

Behind these techniques, the primary purpose is exploratory and descriptive, seeking to systematically define the relations between gender orientation and delinquency patterns and to evolve ideas and insights concerning their linkages.

Sampling

The basic propositions of this study concerning gender and delinquency were addressed in a survey which generated the questionnaire responses of 184 ninth to twelfth graders of both sexes living in a medium-sized city. Students were selected to answer the questionnaire on the basis of a random drawing of homerooms in an individual school. To select these schools information was obtained concerning the race of students and the income of students' parents. A sample of three schools was then chosen,

one in the upper income area, another in a lower-middle income section, and the last in a lower income location. A sample representative of the black school population could not, however, be obtained since access to the predominantly black school was denied. The school which had the next largest percentage of blacks was then included, but only thirty black students returned the necessary informed consent forms and actually appeared when the questionnaires were distributed in the school.

From the original sample of 468 students whose parents were sent informed consent forms to be signed by parent and child, 220 students returned the form with affirmative responses. Another thirty-six students were lost from the sample when they moved, graduated, dropped out or were simply absent from the first administration and subsequent return visits aimed at picking up absentees. The school with the greatest percentage of disadvantaged students experienced the most exaggerated version of these problems.

The problems of informed consent and sample mortality were not the only difficulties encountered in sampling. Eleventh graders were under-represented because one teacher would not dismiss students from taking tests each time the questionnaire was given. Twelfth graders who had graduated were missing in return visits to another school.

Measurement

Dependent Variable

To examine the dependent variable of delinquent behavior, it would be possible to look at a number of parameters as frequency, seriousness,

and type of delinquent acts. Using self-report data, similar patterns for males and females are found when examining type and seriousness of delinquent acts, but consistent differences are apparent when the frequency of delinquent behavior for men and women is considered. The evidence of self-report studies, therefore, directs attention to the frequency of delinquent behavior as the key variation in masculine and feminine delinquent behavior. Within this analysis, the independent variables were accordingly related to this major distinguishing parameter, the frequency of delinquent behavior. Students were asked to indicate the number of times during the past year that they had participated in several kinds of offenses (see Appendix A). The number of incidents across all forms of delinquency were summed for each respondent. These scores were the basis for the classification of each respondent as either being involved in a high, medium, or low amount of delinquent behavior (0-4, 5-44, 45 or more delinquent acts).

Independent Variable

In order to operationalize gender role identification the sex role literature was surveyed to collect items which expressed the difference between expectations for the behavior of masculine persons and feminine persons (Mason, 1975). Discussions with ninth through twelfth graders were employed in the writings of other statements concerned with expectations for the behavior of masculine and feminine persons in a wide range of behavioral settings as home, school, dating and leisure activities. Sixty statements resulted from these procedures and were

used to develop two questionnaires. The questionnaires directed students to check how strongly they believed each statement reflected a behavior they would have expected of masculine and feminine persons. Since discussions with students revealed that they thought gender expectations were becoming androgenous, or similar for boys and girls, it was necessary to emphasize that items should be rated according to traditional expectations. Thus, they were instructed to mark items in keeping with the expectations of fifty years ago. On the traditional masculine questionnaire, response categories included definitely masculine, probably masculine, undecided, probably not masculine, definitely not masculine while the traditional feminine role questionnaire offered the responses definitely feminine, feminine, undecided, not feminine, definitely not feminine.

These questionnaires were then administered to a criterion sample of 368 Knoxville students in grades nine through twelve. The items which 75 percent of students of both sexes agreed were definitely or probably masculine were selected to form a list of thirteen items. Thirteen items concerning the behaviors of feminine persons were chosen by the same procedures. These thirteen items for both masculine and feminine behavioral expectations were examined for the range of behavioral settings described, the highest interitem correlations and the highest correlation with the total score of all items, and the reliability estimate. Two five item scales were identified on the basis of these procedures. The items for the masculine expectations scale have a reliability estimate of Alpha = .81 while the reliability estimate for

the feminine expectations scale is .68 (Bohrenstadt, 1969). The items comprising the two scales of gender expectations are listed below:

Traditional-Masculine-Role Scale.

1. Would expect to help fix things like the car.
2. Would expect to ask someone for a date rather than be asked.
3. Would expect to provide most of the income for my family.
4. When on a date, would expect to pay for activities.
5. If married, would expect to take responsibility for major family decisions, such as buying a home or a car.

Traditional-Feminine-Role Scale.

1. If married, would expect to be mainly responsible for housework, whether working outside the home or not.
2. If married, would expect to move to another city if their spouse changed jobs.
3. Would expect to get married and raise a family rather than get a job in the business world.
4. Would expect to take care of younger children in their family and neighborhood.
5. Before going out at night, would expect to tell their parents where they are going.

Since the procedures used to select the masculine and feminine role scales entailed discussions with students and data they themselves provided about gender expectations, the validity of these scales is built-in. However, as a way of obtaining even more information about their validity, they were administered to two groups theoretically

believed to be different. These groups included high school students attending a Mormon church and a Unitarian church. It was predicted that Mormon males would have more traditionally masculine expectations than Unitarian males while Mormon females would be more traditionally feminine than Unitarian females. As was anticipated, Mormon males identified themselves as more traditionally masculine than Unitarian males ($t = 2.94$, $df = 24$, $p = .007$), and Mormon females scored as more traditionally feminine than Unitarian females ($t = 3.15$, $df = 23$, $p = .004$).

To obtain a score for masculine and feminine gender identification, the 184 students in the final sample were asked to indicate how strongly they felt each individual statement reflected their expectations for their own behavior. The five scores on the masculine items were summed to form one score of masculine identification for each student. After summing the five scores on the feminine items, each student was also assigned a score representing feminine gender identification.

Social Control and Resource Variables

To attain clearer and more comprehensive insights into the nature of the linkages between gender identification and delinquent behavior, certain variables believed theoretically related to both independent and dependent variables were also operationalized through questionnaire items. Based on the perspective of social constraints upon and resources for delinquency, these factors thought to intervene between gender and delinquency included the following: attachment to parents, attachment to school, attachment to friends, commitment to conventional action,

involvement in conventional activites, belief in obeying social rules and social support for delinquency. Indices were constructed from questionnaire items to measure each of these linking variables.

The effects of the attachment to parents on both independent and dependent variables were evaluated by scores on a scale constructed from four questionnaire items to measure the degree of closeness to each parent and the degree of paternal and maternal supervision. Each respondent was placed in a category of high, medium, and low attachment to parents on the basis of the sum of the scores on individual items.

To operationalize the attachment to school, a scale was developed from two questionnaire items. After respondents answered two questions concerning the school performance of students and the importance of the reward structure of the school to the individual respondent, the scores were totaled to place each student in a classification of either high, medium, or low attachment to school.

Attachment to friends was measured by a scale combining responses on two questionnaire items which assess the importance of getting along with others and having close friends. Each student was scored as rating high, medium, or low on this variable.

Two questions were employed to explore the effects of commitment upon the possible association between gender identification and the misbehavior of adolescents. These queries were aimed at identifying each respondent in relation to a classification scheme of high, medium, or low educational and occupational aspirations. The responses of those persons seeking to work in the "outside" world were considered separately from those planning to work in the home.

To derive an index measuring involvement in conventional activities, four questions were included. While two questions were directed at the amount of unsupervised leisure time, two other questions evaluated the involvement in conventional realms as the school and the home. Each respondent was assigned a designation of involvement as either high, medium, or low on the basis of responses to these inquiries.

In assessing the effects of beliefs that rules should be obeyed on the frequency of delinquency, three questions were posed. The first concerned whether or not the respondent agreed that it is important to obey all rules no matter how unimportant they may seem; the second sought the degree of agreement with the statement "It is all right to get around the law if you can get away with it." Finally, to investigate the extent of concern for the approval of persons in positions of authority, a question involving the degree of respect for the police was included. Scores on these three questions were added together to produce a ranking for each student as either high, medium, or low on the belief component of the social bond.

The availability of social support for delinquency was operationalized through the use of two questions. One question was concerned with how often the respondents' best friends asked them to take part in something which is against the law while the other involved how often close friends have been picked up by the police. Again, respondents were rated as having a high, medium, or low amount of social support available for their delinquent activities.[2]

---

[2]See Appendix A for specific items used in the creation of scales as well as the recoding of the response categories of some questions

Data Analysis

The purpose of data analysis is, according to Selltiz, "to summarize the completed observations in such a manner that they yield answers to the research questions" (1959: 386). To examine the variables related in the hypotheses of this study, crosstabulational procedures as well as an ordinal level measurement of association have been employed. The computer program adopted to analyze observations presented the information about variables in the form of contingency tables with frequency counts and percentages. It was with these horizontal and vertical percentages that most of the interpretation of data rested. The independent and dependent variables were first cross-tabulated. Then, the control variables were entered into the tables to assess their effects on the original bivariate relationships.

Along with tables describing the relatinship between pertinent variables, zero-order and partial gammas were presented as a measure of association between variables. Since the independent and intervening factors fell at the ordinal level of measurement, gammas were appropriate to describe the connections between variables and to make maximum use of the available data. Other advantages of this particular statistic included (1) its reflection of both positive and negative relationships, (2) the characteristic of direct interpretation, (3) its ability to handle small cell frequencies, and (4) its direct "proportional-reduction-

---

necessary for the construction of the scales to measure attachment, involvement, commitment, belief and social support for delinquency.

in-error" interpretation.[3] If the partial associations as depicted by gammas are smaller than the zero-order relationships between independent and dependent variables, the original relationships may be explained at least in part by the effects of the variables that intervene; on the other hand, if the partial associations remain similar to the originals, the linkage between independent and dependent variables may be "substantially significant" (Nachmias, 1976: 221).

---

[3]See Champion, 1970; Blalock, 1972; Goodman and Kruskal, 1954; Costner, 1965 for elaboration on the characteristics and usage of gammas.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS: MASCULINITY AND DELINQUENCY

To examine the relationships between gender orientation and delinquency, two chapters are presented. The first explores the nature of the association between masculinity and delinquency while the second is directed towards the relationship between femininity and delinquency. In both chapters the direct influence of variations in gender expectations on the frequency of delinquency is described. The effects of social control and resource variables upon the original relationships are also analyzed.

Masculinity and Delinquency

As Table I indicates, there is a moderate positive relationship between masculinity and delinquency. The gamma of .25 signifies that those respondents who have high masculine expectations for their own behavior are more likely to be delinquent than those who are not traditionally masculine. Students who are less masculine most often fall into the category of low delinquency. While the relationship is not exceedingly strong, masculinity does appear to be an influencing factor upon the occurrence of delinquent acts.

Seeking more evidence for this conclusion, it follows that if masculinity is indeed an influence upon delinquency, differences in masculine gender expectations might account for the differential delinquency of males and females. Most analyses attempting to link

masculinity and delinquency insist that because boys are more masculine than girls, they are more delinquent. In other words, when masculinity is held constant, any original relationship between sex and delinquency should disappear.

TABLE I

RELATIONSHIP OF MASCULINITY AND FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY

	MES		
Delinquency	Low	Medium	High
High	24%	38%	39%
Medium	33%	30%	40%
Low	43%	32%	21%
	100%	100%	100%
	(51)	(47)	(52)

Gamma = .25

Table II displays the effect of sex on the volume of delinquency. A gamma of .34 indicates that there is a moderate positive relationship between sex and delinquency. Almost twice as many males as females exhibit a high incidence of delinquency. If this relationship can be explained by masculinity, this zero-order association should disappear when masculinity is controlled.

Strict comparisons of the delinquency involvement of males and females controlling for masculinity are hindered by the absence of females with highly masculine expectations and the lack of males with no masculine expectations. Given these limitations, the frequencies in Table III demonstrate that introducing a control for masculinity has

TABLE II

SEX AND FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY

Delinquency	Sex	
	Female	Male
High	24.3%	41.3%
Medium	34.3%	35.0%
Low	41.4%	23.8%
	100%	100%
	(N = 70)	(N = 80)

Gamma = .34

TABLE III

PERCENT HIGHLY DELINQUENT BY SEX AND MASCULINITY

	Nonmasc.	Intermed.	Highly Masc.
Males	a	48% (27)	37% (51)
Females	24% (50)	25% (20)	b

[a]Only two males had nonmasculine expectations.

[b]No females had highly masculine expectations.

little effect on the original association between sex and delinquency. Males with an intermediate level of masculinity are almost twice as likely to be highly delinquent than females with intermediate masculinity. Even though the zero order gamma for the relationship between masculinity and delinquency is moderate, masculine gender orientation can not explain variations in delinquency by sex.

Since the control for masculinity does not change the relationship between sex and delinquency, it appears that masculinity does not intervene between sex and delinquency. It is possible that the original relationship between masculinity and delinquency is explained by the relationship of masculinity to sex and the connection of sex to delinquency. There is support for this notion in the distribution of masculinity by sex. Two-thirds of the girls express nonmasculine expectations while two-thirds of the boys are strongly masculine. As a further test of this proposition, sex is held constant in the relationship of masculinity to delinquency. Strict comparisons are hindered because there are no women with highly masculine expectations, but among girls who are nonmasculine in orientation 24 percent are highly delinquent. Twenty-five percent of the girls with intermediate masculinity are highly delinquent. Delinquency involvement does not vary for girls with differing masculine self-expectations (Table III).

Only two males fit the category of low masculine identification, but between those with masculine gender identification rated as either high or moderate there is little difference in the volume of delinquency. In fact, those males who answer the masculinity scale with responses in

the bracket of medium masculinity are more often highly delinquent than males who are classified as the most masculine. This finding contradicts the theoretical reasoning which relates masculinity to delinquency in a direct fashion. The zero-order gamma of .25 for the relationship of masculinity and delinquency is reduced to -.06 for males and .03 for females with sex controlled. On the basis of this evidence, it is clear that the relationship between masculinity and delinquency can be explained by the effects of the variable sex.

The following statements summarize the nature of the linkages between masculinity, sex and delinquency:

1. As masculine gender identification increases, the frequency of delinquency does increase.

2. When sex is controlled, the positive association between masculinity and delinquency disappears. Sex explains the zero-order relationship bewteen masculinity and delinquency.

3. When masculinity is held constant in the relationship of sex to delinquency, there is no substantial change in the original association. Males are more delinquent than females at all levels of masculinity.

Masculinity and delinquency are both linked to sex, but masculine identification does not relate to delinquency independently of sex. These data plainly do not support the common assumption that gender intervenes between sex and delinquency. Sex is tied to delinquency regardless of masculinity.

Social Controls and Resources

After examining the direct results of masculinity on delinquency, the effects of the variables of social control and resources upon the original bivariate association were considered. It may be recalled from Chapter II that it was hypothesized that the factors of social control serve as linkages between masculine identification and delinquency through a negative relationship with both masculinity and the frequency of delinquency. Social support was expected to positively relate with the independent as well as the dependent variable. Table IV presents the association of each of the control and resource variables with masculinity and delinquency. To further examine the influence of these control variables upon the factors of primary interest, the first-order partial gammas for the relationship between masculinity and delinquency holding constant the effects of individual control factors are listed in Table V. In assessing these influences, it is important to remember that the gamma for the zero-order relationship between masculinity and delinquency is .25.

Attachment to Parents

Beginning with the variable of attachment to parents, it is stated in Subhypothesis 1 that as masculinity increases, the attachment to parents decreases. This subhypothesis is not supported by the data; the gamma for this relationship is .07 (Table IV). Masculine persons are no more or less attached to parents than are those who are less traditionally masculine. This finding raises questions about the

TABLE IV

CORRELATIONS (GAMMAS) OF SELECTED CONCEPTS WITH MASCULINITY AND THE FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY

	Masculinity	Frequency of Delinquency
Attachment to Parents	.07	-.24
Attachment to School	-.004	-.33
Attachment to Friends	-.30	-.10
Commitment	-.03	-.05
Involvement	-.10	-.51
Belief	.02	-.48
Social Support	.07	.78

TABLE V

INTERCORRELATIONS (GAMMAS) FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MASCULINITY AND DELINQUENCY CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED CONCEPTS AND SEX

	Masculinity and Delinquency		
Controlling for	Total	Males	Females
Attachment to Parents	.21	.18	.02
Attachment to School	.22	.02	.01
Attachment to Friends	.21	-.05	.01
Commitment	.23	-.10	.005
Involvement	.26	.02	.12
Belief	.25	.01	.16
Social Support	.11	-.26	.35

accuracy of conventional gender role stereotypes which cast masculine persons as being relatively free from the influence of parents. In Subhypothesis 15 it is further predicted that attachment to parents acts to inhibit involvement in delinquency. Here the intercorrelation (gamma = -.24) indicates that there is a moderate, negative connection between attachment to parents and the frequency of delinquency, so support is lent to Subhypothesis 15.

While the social control variable of attachment to parents is shown in Table IV to have some importance in explaining delinquency, it does not link masculinity to delinquency. The zero order gamma of .25 for the relationship of masculine expectations to delinquency is only slightly reduced to a first-order partial gamma of .21 when attachment to parents is controlled (Table V). Hence, the relationship between masculinity and delinquency cannot be accounted for by variations in attachment to parents.

Since sex was earlier demonstrated to be an important factor in explaining the original association of masculinity to delinquency, Table V contains also a control for sex. When attachment to parents and sex are both held constant, the relationship between masculinity and delinquency is further reduced, especially for females. Relative to masculinity and attachment to parents, sex is a powerful explanatory variable.

Attachment to School

At least part of the variation in the delinquency of persons with different degrees of masculine identification is believed to be accounted

for by diversity in the attachment to school. Attachment to school is predicted in Subhypothesis 2 to relate inversely to masculinity. Masculine individuals are thought neither to strive for good grades nor to engage in the conformist behavior demanded by the conventional institution of the school. Table IV, page 49, discloses that, contrary to expectations, attachment to school is not tied to masculinity (gamma = -.004).

It is maintained in Subhypothesis 16 that increases in attachment to school are tied to declines in delinquency. As anticipated, attachment to school does influence the involvement in delinquency (gamma = -.33). Examining the linkage of masculinity to delinquency through school attachment, only a slight decrease is found in the original bivariate relationship when attachment to school is considered (Table V, page 49).

Furthermore, there is no association between masculinity and delinquency independent of the effects of sex and attachment to school. While attachment to school does explain some differences in delinquency involvement, most of the reduction in the relationship of masculinity to delinquency results from consideration of sex, not school attachment (Table V).

Attachment to Peers

It is postulated in Subhypothesis 3 that with increases in masculinity come decreases in attachment to peers. As predicted, there is a moderate, negative relationship between masculinity and attachment to friends (gamma = -.30), but this association is significantly reduced

when sex is controlled. The gamma for males decreases to .14 and for females, to .04.

Hirschi (1969) discovers that attachment to friends constrains delinquent behavior whether the friends are delinquent or not, but Hindelang (1973) presents findings which contradict Hirschi's conclusions. Reports Hindelang, "there is a generally direct relationship between the extent of reported identification with friends and the extent of self-reported delinquency" (479). Subhypothesis 17 takes Hirschi's position, but the results of this research confirm neither Hirschi's nor Hindelang's findings. Attachment to friends and the frequency of delinquency are virtually unrelated (gamma = -.10), but the direction of the relationship does lend more support to Hirschi's contentions (Table IV, page 49).

The weak nature of the association of attachment to friends to delinquency and masculinity suggests that attachment to peers has little importance in explaining the original association between masculinity and delinquency. The first-order partial gamma of .21 is only a slight reduction in the zero-order gamma of .25 (Table V, page 49). Remembering that sex accounted for much of the connection between masculinity and delinquency, a control for sex explains as well the relationship between masculinity and delinquency when attachment to peers is held constant.

Commitment

In connecting conventional commitment with the masculine and feminine gender roles, the evidence in the gender role literature points out that the occupational goals associated with the masculine role are

of a different type than those tied with the feminine role. High aspirations in either realm, that of the "outside" world or the home, should suppress involvement in delinquency. In both cases commitment is expected to intervene between masculinity and delinquency. The questionnaire responses, however, show that it is impossible to separate a "masculine" or "feminine" form of commitment for the simple reason that no respondents record aspirations to be housewives. All of the respondents wrote down an occupation in the "outside" world as the job they wished to have when they were finished with their schooling.

According to Subhypothesis 4, high masculinity is accompanied by low commitment. In the data, however, commitment does not relate to masculinity (gamma = -.03). In Subhypothesis 18 it is argued that the higher the educational and occupational aspirations, the greater the constraint upon involvement in delinquency, but the gamma of .05 for this relationship does not confirm this subhypothesis. Commitment, then, is not linked to either masculine identification or the frequency of delinquency (Table IV, page 49).

As suggested in Table V, page 49, consideration of the effects of commitment upon the zero-order association of masculinity and delinquency produces little chance in the original relationship. Since masculinity and delinquency do not co-vary with commitment, this result is to be expected. Once again a control for sex is shown in Table V to account for the original relationship of masculinity and delinquency.

Involvement

Masculinity is hypothesized to emphasize "working-class, adult" activities such as sitting or riding around unsupervised and away from home rather than involvement in conventional lines of behavior. Subhypothesis 5 proposes that as masculinity increases, involvement in conventional activities decreases. To test this premise masculinity was crosstabulated with involvement. The predicted relationship does not hold up under examination of the data. Masculinity does not influence involvement (gamma = .09).

It is contended in Subhypothesis 19 that involvement in conventional activities acts to limit the commission of delinquent acts. Involvement is found in Table IV, page 49, to strongly relate to delinquency (gamma = -.51).

Holding involvement constant in the relationship of masculine orientation to delinquency does not affect the original relationship (Table V, page 49). A substantial reduction in the bivariate association does occur when sex is controlled. The partial gamma of .26 for the relationship of masculinity to delinquency controlling for involvement drops to .02 for males and .12 for females. Involvement does not link masculinity to delinquency, but assuming the time-ordering of variables posited by social control theorists, involvement is important in its influence on delinquency.

Belief

As presented in Subhypothesis 6, masculinity is presumed to relate negatively to beliefs that conventional rules should be obeyed. A gamma of .02 implies, however, that masculinity and belief do not co-vary (Table IV, page 49). Hirschi (1969) hypothesizes and empirically supports the idea that freedom from the constraint of belief in obeying societal rules and laws results in higher delinquency rates in boys. According to Subhypothesis 20, as beliefs in obeying societal rules become stronger, delinquency decreases. Belief does relate to the frequency of delinquency both strongly and negatively (gamma = -.48).

Since belief does not relate to masculinity, it is unlikely that belief influences the relationship between masculine orientations and delinquency. As displayed in Table V, page 49, the first-order partial gamma for the association of masculinity and delinquency accounting for the effects of belief is the same as the zero-order gamma. Separating these gammas for males and females does result in a significant decline in the strength of the bivariate relationship. Repeatedly, the findings suggest that the key variable in explaining the connection of masculinity to delinquency is sex, not the factors of social control.

Availability of Social Support

As proposed in Chapter I, the availability of social support for delinquency is thought to be an important variable in explaining delinquency when social controls are absent or attenuated. This connection has significance for the relationship between masculinity and

delinquency since masculine persons are believed to encounter greater peer support for delinquency and, therefore, to be more widely involved in delinquency. It is argued in Subhypothesis 7 that as masculinity increases, the availability of social support for delinquency increases. An examination of this relationship in Table IV, page 49, demonstrates that, contrary to the prediction, there is virtually no association between masculinity and social support (gamma = .07).

According to Subhypothesis 21, as examples of and encouragement for delinquent activities increase, so does the volume of delinquent behavior. This subhypothesis is strongly supported by this data (gamma = .78). Peer support for delinquency emerges as the most powerful explanatory variable presented in this study. More so than any of the variables of social control, resources in the form of delinquent companions account for the observed variations in delinquency involvement (Table IV).

Since masculinity and availability of social support for delinquency are unrelated, it is surprising to discover in Table V, page 49, that a control for resources does result in a reduction in the strength of the relationship between masculinity and delinquency (gamma = .11). It is also evident from Table V that among males there is a moderate negative relationship between masculine orientation and the frequency of delinquency when social support is held constant (gamma = -.26), but for females this relationship is moderately positive (gamma = .35). This finding is contrary to the trend observed when controlling for each of the factors of social control and sex. Social support is strongly related to delinquency, and a control for the effects of social support on the

relationship of masculinity to delinquency causes new patterns to emerge in the original relationship.

If these observed patterns are real rather than artifactual, it may be that males who see themselves as nonmasculine are more likely to engage in delinquency than males who are more strongly masculine because less masculine males are seeking to establish masculinity through delinquent activities. Delinquency may provide verification of masculinity for those males who are not already traditionally masculine.[1]

Females, however, may not experience the need to verify masculinity when they are low in masculinity. Among females delinquency may be an expression of masculinity which has already been achieved. Adler (1975) argues that the increasing "masculinization" of women at least in part accounts for their greater involvement in crime. The positive gamma of .35 for the relationship between masculinity and delinquency for females signifies that delinquency involvement does increase when masculinity increases if social support is controlled.

This interpretation of the gammas for the relationship between masculinity and the frequency of delinquency when social support and sex are controlled is only one of several possible interpretations, and there are reasons to be cautious about any rationale given for these gammas. First of all, close examination of Table VI shows that the gammas of -.26 for males and .35 for females mask some erratic interaction effects.

---

[1]While writers as Miller (1958) and Cohen (1959) assume that delinquency serves to compensate for deficiencies of masculinity for boys, little specification is offered concerning exactly how the desire to be more masculine translates into delinquent behaviors.

TABLE VI

MASCULINITY AND THE FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY CONTROLLING FOR SEX AND SOCIAL SUPPORT

	Females									Males								
	Social Support									Social Support								
	Low			Med			High			Low			Med			High		
Frequency of	Masculinity			Masculinity			Masculinity			Masculinity			Masculinity			Masculinity		
Delinquency	Low	Med	Hi	Low	Med	Hi	Low	Med	Hi	Low	Med	Hi	Low	Med	Hi	Low	Med	Hi
Low	77% (10)	75% (6)	0	47% (9)	12% (1)	0	0	0	0	100% (1)	50% (1)	62% (5)	0	25% (3)	24% (4)	0	11% (1)	12% (2)
Medium	23% (3)	25% (2)	0	37% (7)	38% (3)	0	36% (5)	67% (2)	0	0 (1)	50% (3)	38%	0	50% (6)	59% (10)	0	0	29% (5)
High	0	0	0	16% (3)	50% (4)	0	64% (9)	33% (1)	0	0	0	0	0	25% (3)	18% (3)	100% (1)	89% (8)	59% (10)
	Gamma = .05			Gamma = .65			Gamma = -.56			Gamma = .16			Gamma = -.07			Gamma = 0.62		

For example, among females there is no relationship between masculinity and delinquency at the lowest level of social support; there is a strongly positive association with a moderate amount of social support; and there is a strongly negative connection at the highest level of social support. The theoretical literature surveyed provides no reasons to expect that kind of specification. Most discussions of these concepts present the relationships between them as monotonic.

Furthermore, caution is required in explaining these gammas because of the very small sample sizes. In most of the subtables of Table VI a small change of two or three individuals in the cell frequencies could drastically alter the direction and magnitude of the relationships.

There is some evidence that the reduction of the original relationship between masculinity and delinquency when social support is held constant may be artifactual in nature. The computer program utilized to analyze the data discards the responses of those individuals who have left blank questions on any one or more of the variables that are included in the crosstabulations and computations of gammas (Nie et al., 1975: 229). While the zero-order gamma for the relationship between masculinity and delinquency is .25 for those who completed the questions concerning masculinity and the frequency of delinquency, this original bivariate gamma is .13 for those respondents who answered all questions dealing with masculinity, delinquency and peer support for delinquency. Therefore, the pertinent zero-order gamma of .13 is reduced only to .11 when the delinquency of companions is held constant. The bulk of evidence presented in Tables IV and V, page 49, and Table VI supports the

conclusion that the important factor in explaining the association of masculinity to delinquency is sex, not the factors of social control and resources.

Conclusion

When explaining differences in the delinquency of males and females, most writers have relied upon the common sense assumption that males are more involved in delinquent behavior than females because males are more masculine. The recent attention to a presumed increase in the criminality of women focuses on similar explanations. Hence, the rise in female delinquency is attributed to changing gender roles and the masculinization of women. At the heart of this argument is the belief that gender links sex and delinquency. This research does not provide support for that contention. Males and females with traditional masculine expectations are no more delinquent than those with less masculine identification. The zero-order relationship between masculinity and delinquency is explained by the relationship of sex to masculinity and delinquency. Hypothesis I is not corroborated by this data.

The variables of social control and social support were postulated to intervene between masculinity and delinquency and to account for the original association between them. The social control and support variables were not found to have this effect because they do not co-vary with masculinity. As indicated in Table IV, page 49, Subhypothesis Set I is not substantiated. Attachment, commitment, involvement, belief and social support are all unrelated to masculine gender identification.

Attachment to peers is moderately associated with the independent variable, but this effect is explained when sex is controlled.

Subhypothesis Set III, which links variations in social controls and resources to the frequency of delinquency, is strongly supported by the data in Table IV, page 49. Commitment and attachment to peers are the only social bond variables which do not play a significant part in explaining delinquency. While the other control variables are important in accounting for variations in delinquency, they are not linkages through which masculinity affects delinquency because they do not relate to masculinity. Controlling for these factors has little effect on the relationship between masculinity and delinquency as is shown in the partial gammas in Table V, page 49. Rather, sex is most important in explaining the zero-order relationship between masculinity and delinquency.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS: FEMININITY AND DELINQUENCY

Most writers theorize a positive connection between masculinity and delinquency while assuming that feminine gender identification inhibits delinquency involvement. In the last chapter the direct association between masculinity and delinquency was demonstrated to be dependent on the effects of the variable "sex." Although masculinity cannot explain differences in delinquency, the possibility that feminine orientation is negatively related to rule-breaking behaviors is not necessarily precluded. It is to the direct relation between femininity and delinquency, along with the possible linkages between the two, that attention is now directed.

Femininity and Delinquency

A quick glance at Table VII discloses that the direct association between feminine self-expectations and the volume of delinquency is negligible. It is true that those respondents who are low in femininity are involved in high amounts of delinquency more often than in low amounts, but the respondents who are highly feminine are equally distributed across all categories of delinquency. While predictions based on traditional gender-role stereotypes focus on the inverse nature of the relationship between femininity and delinquency, the gamma of -.08 is hardly persuasive that any linkage exists between femininity and

delinquency. The sign indicating the direction of the relationship is, nevertheless, negative as was expected.

TABLE VII

RELATIONSHIP OF FEMININITY AND DELINQUENCY

Delinquency	Femininity		
	Low	Medium	High
Low	27.7%	36.1%	31.8%
Medium	31.9%	34.4%	36.4%
High	40.4%	29.5%	31.8%
	100%	100%	100%
	(49)	(52)	(51)

Gamma = -.08

The literature review suggests that girls most often encounter socialization practices designed to foster feminine expectations and that these feminine orientations are related negatively to delinquency. Gender is therefore expected to intervene in the association of sex and delinquency. Table VIII presents the relationship between femininity, sex and the frequency of delinquency. Subjecting the bonds between sex and delinquency to a control for femininity produces little change in the original relationship. Males are more likely to be highly delinquent than females regardless of the level of femininity. It appears that feminine gender identification can no more explain the relationship of sex and delinquency than can masculine identification.

When sex is held constant in the relationship between femininity and delinquency, that negligible association changes little; variation

in feminine gender identification is unrelated to the frequency of delinquency for males and females (Table VIII). Males with high feminine scores are most often high in delinquency while females high in femininity are most frequently involved in low amounts of delinquency. Among those low in femininity, females most often exhibit low or moderate delinquency, but males tend to again be highly delinquent. This finding again disputes the notion of a direct relationship between femininity and delinquency.

TABLE VIII

DELINQUENCY BY FEMININITY BY SEX

	Sex					
	Females			Males		
	Femininity			Femininity		
Delinquency	Low	Med	High	Low	Med	High
Low	35.7%	44.4%	41.4%	24.2%	30.3%	13.3%
Medium	35.7%	29.6%	37.9%	30.3%	39.4%	33.3%
High	28.6%	25.9%	20.7%	45.5%	30.3%	53.3%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	(29)	(24)	(17)	(20)	(28)	(33)

Gamma = -.07 (Females) Gamma = .02 (Males)

The nature of the association between sex, feminine gender identification and the frequency of delinquency is outlined as follows:

1. Feminine self-expectations have little value in accounting for variations in delinquency. Hypothesis II which states that increases in femininity are accompanied by decreases in delinquency is not supported.

2. Controlling sex in the relationship of femininity to delinquency produces no change in the original relationship.

3. When femininity is held constant in the association of sex and delinquency, sex is still moderately linked to delinquency. Regardless of femininity, males are more delinquent than females.

As is the case with masculine gender identification, the relationship of sex to delinquency is not explained by differences in femininity. Femininity at this point is shown to have no important in explaining delinquency.

Social Controls and Resources

After looking at the connections between femininity and delinquency from a number of different angles, the conclusion was reached that femininity does not directly account for delinquency involvement. In the second chapter it is hypothesized that the factors thought to inhibit delinquency vary positively with feminine gender orientation since traditional gender-role stereotypes define feminine persons as more closely controlled by constraints from within, from others, and from conventional institutions. Variables which may facilitate delinquency such as the availability of social support, are believed to be less accessible to respondents with highly feminine expectations. A control for these variables is anticipated to reduce the strength of the original relationship between gender and delinquency. But there is no association between femininity and rule-breaking behavior to be explained by the factors of social control and resources. It is possible, however, that

a change in the relationship between femininity and delinquency could be observed when these variables are held constant if, as predicted, femininity relates positively to the controls and the controls associate negatively to delinquency. In these instances attachment, commitment, involvement, belief and the delinquency of companions may intercede to cancel out, reduce or conceal the true relation between independent and dependent variables.

To examine these relationships, two tables are presented. Table IX displays the zero-order gammas for the associations of the factors of social control and resources to both femininity and delinquency. These linkages are explored further in Table X where partial gammas represent the effects of the control and resource variables on the zero-order relationship of femininity and delinquency. A control for sex is also presented in Table X.

Attachment to Parents

While masculine persons are thought to be encouraged to achieve independence from conventional others, especially parents, femininity is assumed in Subhypothesis 8 to vary positively with attachment to parents. As the gamma in Table IX signifies, attachment to parents does increase as femininity increases. A close relationship with parents is found by Hirschi to be one element of the social bond which acts to suppress delinquency. This relationship, stated in Subhypothesis 15, is also supported in Table IX (gamma = -.24).

Since attachment to parents interrelates with both femininity and delinquency, it may provide a linkage from femininty to delinquency.

TABLE IX

CORRELATIONS (GAMMAS) OF SELECTED CONCEPTS WITH FEMININITY AND THE FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY

	Femininity	Frequency of Delinquency
Attachment to Parents	.42	-.24
Attachment to School	.08	-.33
Attachment to Friends	.32	-.10
Commitment	.12	-.03
Involvement	.05	-.51
Belief	.24	-.48
Social Support	-.06	.78

TABLE X

INTERCORRELATIONS (GAMMAS) FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEMININITY AND DELINQUENCY CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED CONCEPTS AND SEX

	Femininity and Delinquency		
Controlling for	Total	Males	Females
Attachment to Parents	-.05	.02	.05
Attachment to School	-.05	.07	-.08
Attachment to Friends	-.08	.03	-.06
Commitment	-.12	-.12	.11
Belief	.06	.11	.06
Social Support	-.10	.04	-.12

The gammas in Table X demonstrate, however, that this is not the case. Femininity and delinquency remain unrelated when attachment to parents is considered for males and females both separately and together. Attention to attachment to parents adds little to the previous observation that there is no relationship between femininity and delinquency.

Attachment to School

Feminine persons, as part of their greater conformity to the demands of conventional others, are presumed to be more highly attached to the school than are masculine persons. It is stated in Subhypothesis 9 that as femininity increases, so does the attachment to the school. The connection of school attachment to femininity is demonstrated in Table IX to be negligible (gamma = .08). Subhypothesis 16 which ties attachment to school to constraints on delinquent activities is, on the other hand, confirmed by a gamma of -.33. Yet, because femininity and school attachment do not co-vary, the gammas in Table X indicate that a consideration of attachment to school has no effect on the lack of an observed relationship between femininity and delinquency. The original gamma of -.08 is reduced only to a partial gamma of -.05 when attachment to school is controlled.

Attachment to Peers

The attachment to peers is defined here as the importance of having friends and getting along with others. In the gender role literature, it is suggested that feminine persons place more importance on

relationships with others than do masculine persons; therefore, the premise of Subhypothesis 10 is that as femininity grows, the attachment to friends also increases. This subhypothesis is substantiated by the data (gamma = .32). The assumption of Subhypothesis 17 that attachment to friends and the volume of delinquency share a negative connection is not, however, lent credence by a gamma of only -.10.

The information in Table X, page 67, concerning a link from femininity to delinquency through attachment to friends implies that attachment to friends does not tie feminine orientation to the frequency of delinquency. The gamma for the association of femininity to delinquency does not change with a control for attachment to friends.

Commitment

Feminine persons are believed to experience different forms of commitment to conventional actions because they are thought to be most interested in home-centered jobs, but the data presented here reveals that all these respondents desire jobs in the "outside" world. It is possible that feminine persons are high in commitment as part of their conformity to the demands of conventional others. Thus, it is proposed in Subhypothesis 11 that commitment increases as femininity increases. Table IX, page 67, reveals that there is a slight, positive association between femininity and commitment (gamma = .12). Subhypothesis 18 which draws connections between high commitment and low delinquency is not confirmed by the gamma of -.05. A linkage cannot be traced from femininity to delinquency through commitment since the first order

partial gamma of -.12 is not basically different from the zero-order gamma of -.08 (Table X, page 67).

Involvement

Subhypothesis 12 contends that with increases in femininity come increases in involvement. Feminine persons are believed to be more involved in conventional activities and less included in "working-class, adult" ways of spending time than are masculine persons. From these data scant support is given to this subhypothesis (gamma = -.05). It is asserted in Subhypothesis 19 that involvement in conventional activities inhibits rule-breaking behaviors. This subhypothesis is verified by a gamma of -.50 (Table IX, page 67). Involvement does strongly link to delinquency.

The influence of this variable of social control upon the association between femininity and delinquency is virtually imperceptible which is only to be expected since femininity and involvement are unrelated (Table X). The partial gammas when involvement and sex are controlled as well as the zero-order gammas for femininity and delinquency indicate the absence of an association between femininity and delinquency.

Belief

Assumptions in the gender role literature focus on the presumed tendency of feminine persons to hold strong beliefs that rules should be obeyed. Subhypothesis 13 reflects this position when it ties high belief to high femininity. Testing this proposition, a moderate positive

relationship is discovered between femininity and belief (gamma = .24). It is further suggested in Subhypothesis 20 that the absence of beliefs prohibiting rule-breaking behavior frees the individual for involvement in delinquent behaviors. The gamma of -.48 in Table IX, page 67, shows that belief does check delinquent activities. Even though belief relates both to femininity and delinquency, controlling for belief in the bivariate relationship does not alter significantly the zero-order gamma of -.08 (Table X, page 67). The major importance of the concept of belief rests with its very strong influence on the volume of delinquency.

Availability of Social Support

Two subhypothesis concern the relationship of resources in the form of social support for delinquency to femininity and delinquency: (1) as femininity increases, resources for delinquency decrease; (2) as resources expand, delinquency also increases. Subhypothesis 14 which links the delinquency of companions and femininity is not supported by the data since there is virtually no association between feminine gender identification and the availability of social support (gamma = -.06). There is, however, strong evidence verifying the notion that as resources for delinquency increase, so does involvement in misbehaviors (gamma = .78). The variable of resources for delinquency does not produce changes in the original relationship between masculinity and rule-breaking behavior primarily because social support has little connection to the independent variable. The zero-order gamma of -.08 changes only slightly when the availability of social support is held

constant (gamma = -.10). This is generally the case when considering the other concepts posited to intervene between feminine gender identification and delinquency.

Conclusion

Although feminine gender identification generally relates to delinquency negatively, the association is so small that assumptions which historically have tied gender identification to delinquency are not validated. A stronger gamma than -.08 is necessary to establish any connection between femininity and delinquency and to verify Hypothesis II. Expectations prevalent in the literature that masculinity links positively with delinquency and femininity is negatively allied are not confirmed, at least by the measures of gender identification utilized in this research. Sex is a much more powerful predictive tool than gender identification.

The association between femininity and delinquency is virtually zero. When the effects of variables thought to influence both independent and dependent factors are examined, the original bivariate relationship changes little. It had been postulated that the negative association between the control variables and delinquency and a positive one between the controls and femininity might mask the "true" relationship of femininity and delinquency. This is shown not to be the case primarily because femininity does not affect the variables of social control and resources. Most of the assumptions in Subhypothesis Set II are not confirmed by the gammas presented in Table IX, page 67.

There are exceptions to the general findings that the control variables are not linked to femininity. In the case of attachment to parents and belief, the control variable does correlate with both femininity and delinquency but does not significantly effect the relationship between the two. Attachment to peers is linked with femininity but not delinquency so it does not revise the basic nature of the association between femininity and delinquency. While a few of the subhypotheses in Set II and most of the subhypotheses in Set III are lent support by this data, Table X, page 67, shows that the control and resource variables do not intervene between femininity and delinquency.

The importance of the variables of social control and social support does not lie in the linking of femininity and delinquency any more than with tying masculinity to delinquency. These factors have independent value in explaining the volume of delinquency. They must be considered as more significant in investigations of the etiology of delinquent behavior than either of the concepts of masculinity or femininity.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

Most writers explain the sex differential in delinquency by tracing a linkage from sex to delinquency through gender identification. Boys are presumed to be more delinquent than girls because they are more masculine. Girls are thought to evidence low involvement in rule-breaking behaviors because they are feminine in gender orientation. This study investigated these widespread assumptions in the criminological literature that there is a natural or obvious connection between gender identification as masculine or feminine and patterns of delinquency involvement.

It is also suggested by some writers (Hoffman-Bustamente, 1973; Jenses and Eve, 1976; Weis, 1976) that certain other variables affect the relationship between gender and delinquency. These variables concern social controls and the availability of social support. The bond of the individual to the social order has been demonstrated to influence involvement in delinquency (Hirschi, 1969: Jensen and Eve, 1976; Hindelang, 1976). Masculine persons may be more delinquent than feminine persons because individuals with masculine orientation are less attached to conventional others, less committed to and involved in conventional action, and less likely to believe that societal rules should be obeyed than are feminine persons.

Several other theorists (Briar and Piliavin, 1965; Jensen, 1972; Burkett and Jensen, 1975), argue that freedom from the constraint of

social bond elements is most likely to result in delinquency when resources, or opportunities, facilitating delinquency involvement are also present. The availability of social support for delinquency is one major resource for delinquency. Masculine persons are thought to more easily find delinquent companions than feminine persons. Masculinity and femininity may link to delinquency through the availability of social support as well as the factors which inhibit delinquency (Briar and Piliavin, 1965; Jensen, 1972; Burkett and Jensen, 1975).

To operationalize the concepts of masculine and feminine gender identification, two instruments were developed. These instruments were found to be both valid and reliable in measuring the independent variables of masculine and feminine gender identification. A self-report scale was used to measure the dependent variable of the frequency of delinquency. Indices were constructed to assess variations in attachment, commitment, involvement, belief, and social support. The data concerning the association of these variables included crosstabulations and gammas for the relationship of masculinity and femininity to delinquency. These bivariate associations were reexamined when the social control and support variables were held constant.

Contrary to the assumptions in the literature, the responses of this sample of adolescents do not confirm the existence of linkages from sex to delinquency through masculine or feminine self-expectations. Sex is related to delinquency regardless of gender identification. The association of masculinity to delinquency disappears when sex is held constant. No relationship at all exists between femininity and delinquency for members of either sex.

Most of the variables of social control and support do not relate to masculinity or femininity but associate moderately to strongly with delinquency. Support is found for the contentions that the elements of social control constrain involvement in delinquency and that the opportunity for delinquency in the form of social support provides resources facilitating delinquency. The social control factors do not, however, link gender to delinquency. Only the social support for delinquency alters the relationship between gender identification and rule-breaking behaviors, but this effect must be treated with caution since there are methodological difficulties with the small cell frequencies and sample size.

Problems with the Concept of Gender Identification

Gender identification is not a simple concept to operationalize largely because it is a complex phenomenon. Masculinity and femininity are not bipolar opposites with individuals being masculine and not feminine or feminine and not masculine. Writing about sex role identity, Mednick and Weissman argue, "Thus evidence suggests that masculinity and femininity are not opposites; each should be conceptualized and measured independently" (1976: 123). Although an attempt was made in this study to minimize the assumption of bipolarity through the development of two separate scales of expectations, it was predicted that these two measures would relate to delinquency and the variables of social control and resources in opposite directions. If masculinity and femininity coexist in each individual as part of their larger behavioral repertoires, it may

be more realistic to assume that an interaction between masculinity and femininity aids in explaining delinquency.

In constructing the gender expectation scales, several behavioral settings were covered, but given the number of situational variables which might possibly elicit forms of gender-related behaviors, it may be unreasonable to assume consistency in the definition and ultimate influence of gender identification across all behavioral contexts. Reporting on their massive study of sex differences, Maccoby and Jacklin advise, "We have found a number of instances in which sex differences are situation-specific . . . . These situational subleties have gone largely unnoticed in existing research" (1976: 111).

Stereotypical conceptualizations of masculinity and femininity do exist, but that in itself does not guarantee that all men and women are personally expressive of and influenced by masculinity and femininity in the same fashion. Gender roles are thought to vary by age, race, and social class as well as by sex; thus, they are refined and modified depending on the social context. Tresemer observes,

> . . . it is easy to see that the ghetto man's view of the male gender role, perhaps including a sense of the streetbound territory to be protected, and the middle class prep school male's view of masculine poolside heterosexual style are utterly different. (1975: 317)

The same may be said of the feminine gender role. There is no <u>one</u> masculine or <u>one</u> feminine gender role in American society. Since gender identification develops from the types of rewards and opportunities afforded on the basis of gender, the kinds of role models available, and the gender-related expectations encountered, the degree of development

of gender identification as well as the content of that gender identification may vary from individual to individual (Stoll, 1974: 41).

In a similar vein, it has been suggested that an individual's behavior is likely to be stable across situations and across time with respect to only those attributes that are central to his self-definition. In addition, Maccoby and Jacklin write, ". . . it is reasonable to believe that 'masculinity' and 'femininity' are essential self-defining attributes for some people but not for others" (1976: 114). If the individual thinks of him/herself as a masculine or feminine person and considers it important to be as masculine or feminine as possible, then he/she will monitor behaviors to take note of how masculine or feminine he/she is being and will correct the behavior if it does not measure up to masculine or feminine expectations. No attempt was made in this study to discover how important and central the concepts of masculine and feminine identification were to each respondent. If individuals who did not consider masculinity or femininity central to their self-concepts were over-sampled in this study, then one might expect to find no relation between gender and delinquency.

Problems exist with the concept of gender identification that are both theoretical and methodological in nature. These difficulties should at least emphasize that caution is advisable when relating gender to any form of behavior, including delinquency. The direction for future research implied by this study is away from these nebulous social-psychological variables and the "postfactum" interpretations given to their relation to delinquency and towards interpersonal relationships and structural positions.

The Relationship of Sex to Delinquency

Although there are problems with an operationalization of the concept gender identification, this study did take care and precaution to measure masculinity and femininity as they are theoretically defined. The instruments developed to assess variations in masculine and feminine identification were subjected to tests for both reliability and validity and were found to be adequate in both regards. Yet, gender identification does not intervene between sex and delinquency involvement, but instead gender differences and delinquency involvement both relate to sex.

The purpose of this study was exploratory and descriptive. It is necessary, then, to look to new variables when preliminary findings suggest the original factors do not explain the observed relationships. The concept to which attention should be directed on the basis of the data is sex, not gender. The notion of gender identification seems fairly useless in predicting delinquency. There is a moderate difference in the volume of delinquency for males and females, but when sex is controlled, there is virtually no difference in the rule-breaking behaviors of more or less masculine or feminine persons. Sex is a much better indicator of delinquency patterns than is gender identification as masculine or feminine.

Sex, Social Controls and Support and Delinquency

While gender orientation does not link sex and delinquency, other variables may intervene in that relationship. These variables concern social controls upon and resources for delinquency. The contention

stated earlier was that social constraints and opportunities are connected to both gender and delinquency. For the most part, these intervening variables are not related to masculinity or femininity but are linked to delinquency. It follows that the elements of control and resource play no part, or only an insignificant one, in linking gender to delinquency. Yet, if constraints upon and opportunities for delinquency are differentially distributed by sex, they may serve to link sex to delinquency. It has already been demonstrated that these social control concepts are moderately to strongly associated with delinquency. The gammas for the relationship of sex to the variables of social control and support uniformly suggest that boys are less constrained by the social bond elements and are more likely to encounter opportunities for delinquency than are girls (Appendix B). The differences are slight for the most part, but they are in the predicted direction. As an example, 36.4 percent of females report low involvement in conventional activities while 42.2 percent of males score in that category. Belief and commitment do not relate to sex at all. Attachment to friends appears to be linked to both sex and delinquency, but the association with delinquency is very weak. The gammas in Appendix B indicate that a slight intervening function might be filled by attachment to parents and involvement, but the strength of the connections of attachment to parents and involvement to sex is certainly unimpressive. The availability of social support for delinquency, however, has a moderate association with sex and a strong one with delinquency. Since it ties both with sex and delinquency, the availability of social support may be an intervening variable between sex and delinquency.

The relationship of sex to frequency of delinquency controlling for the encouragement offered by friends to engage in delinquent activities is also presented in Appendix B. As indicated by the gammas, the relationship between sex and delinquency is eradicated in the intermediate and high levels of social support for delinquency. Even at the lowest level of social support, the percentages suggest there is little difference in the delinquency of males and females. It is clear that the relationship between sex and delinquency largely disappears when the delinquency of companions is taken into consideration. Were it not for the differences in the social support for delinquency in terms of examples for and encouragement of delinquency, there would be little difference in the delinquency involvement of males and females.

Some Final Observations

The social-psychological variables of masculine and feminine gender identification fail to explain the connection between sex and delinquency. Convincing evidence is, however, presented in the literature that sex does not inherently relate to behaviors. Something must intervene between sex and delinquency, and in this study the variable of social support for delinquency apparently does just that. Yet, saying that boys are more delinquent than girls because they have more delinquent companions really answers no questions about why boys are more likely to be delinquent and thus to encounter more delinquent companions. Why are those delinquent companions involved in delinquency in the first place? This is plainly a question which needs to be addressed in future research.

As for the present research, no simple answers can be offered explaining the sex differential in delinquency. There is strong support for the contention that the social control and resource variables relate to involvement in delinquency. It is revealed that sex is linked to delinquency regardless of variations in gender identification. Why sex associates with delinquency and the availability of social support for delinquency remain unanswered inquiries.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adler, Freda
1975 Sisters in Crime: The Rise of the New Female Criminal. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bardwick, Judith M. and Elizabeth Douvan
1972 "Ambivalence: the socialization of women." Pp. 52-58 in Judith M. Bardwick (ed.), Readings on the Psychology of Women. New York: Harper and Row.

Blalock, Hubert M.
1972 Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bohrenstadt, George W.
1969 "A quick method for determining the reliability and validity of multiple-item scales." American Sociological Review 34 (August): 542-48.

Briar, Scott and Irving Piliavin
1965 "Delinquency, situational inducements, and commitment to conformity." Social Problems 13: 35-45.

Broverman, Inge K. et al.
1972 "Sex-role stereotypes: a current appraisal." Journal of Social Issues 28: 59-78.

Brown, Susan
1975 A Theoretical Perspective on Gender Differences. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee.

Burkett, Stephen R. and Eric L. Jensen
1975 "Conventional ties, peer influence, and the fear of apprehension: a study of adolescent marijuana use." Sociological Quarterly 16 (Autumn): 522-33.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman
1974 Masculine/Feminine or Human? Itasca, Illinois: Peacock.

Champion, Dean J.
1970 Basic Statistics for Social Research. Scranton: Chandler.

Chesney-Lind, Meda
1973 "Judicial enfircement of the female sex role: the family court and the female delinquent." Issues in Criminology 8 (Fall): 51-71.

Clark, John P. and Edward W. Haurek
1966 "Age and sex roles of adolescents and their involvement in misconduct." Sociology and Social Research 50 (July): 495-508.

Cockburn, James J. and Inga Maclay
1965 "Sex differentials in juvenile delinquency." British Journal of Criminology 5 (July): 289-308.

Cohen, Albert K.
1955 Delinquent Boys. Glencoe: The Free Press.

1967 "Middle-class delinquency and the social structure." Pp. 203-7 in Edmund W. Vaz, Middle-Class Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Harper and Row.

Costner, Herbert L.
1965 "Criteria for measures of association." American Sociological Review 30 (June): 341-53.

Datesman, Susan K. and Frank R. Scarpetti
1975 "Female delinquency and broken homes: a reassessment." Criminology 13 (May): 33-55.

DeCrow, Karen
1974 Sexist Justice. New York: Vintage.

Denzin, Norman
1970 The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods. Chicago: Aldrine.

Gibbons, Don C. and Manzer J. Griswold
1957 "Sex differentials among juvenile court referrals." Sociology and Social Research 42 (November-December): 106-10.

Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck
1950 Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gold, Martin
1963 Status Forces in Delinquent Boys. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

1970 Delinquent Behavior in an American City. Belmont, Cal.: Brooks/Cole.

Gold, Martin and D. J. Reimer
1974 Changing Patterns of Delinquent Behavior among Americans 13 to 16 Years Old 1967-72. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Goldberg, Susan and Michael Lewis
1972 "Play behavior in the year-old infant: early sex differences." Pp. 30-33 in Judith M. Bardwick (ed.), Readings in the Psychology of Women. New York: Harper and Row.

Goodman, L. and W. E. Kruskal
1954 "Kolmogorov-Smirov tests for psychological research." Psychological Bulletin 5: 160-68.

Grosser, George H.
1951 Juvenile Delinquency and Contemporary American Sex Roles. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Department of Social Relations, Harvard.

Heidensohn, Frances
1968 "The deviance of women: a critique and an enquiry." British Journal of Sociology 19 (June): 160-75.

Hindelang, Michael J.
1971 "Age, sex and the versatility of delinquent involvements." Social Problems 18 (Spring): 5222-34.

1973 "Causes of delinquency: a partial replication and extension." Social Problems 20 (Spring): 471-87.

Hirschi, Travis
1969 Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hoffman-Bustamante, Dale
1973 "The nature of female criminality." Issues in Criminology 8 (Fall): 117-37.

Jensen, Gary
1972 "Parents, peers and delinquent action: a test of the differential association perspective." American Journal of Sociology 78 (November): 562-75.

Jensen, Gary and Raymond Eve
1976 "Sex differences in delinquency: an examination of popular sociological explanations." Criminology 13 (February): 427-48.

Kagan, Jerome
1964 "Aquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity." Pp. 137-67 in Martin L. Hoffman and Lois W. Hoffman (eds.), Review of Child Development Research, Vol. 1. New York: Russell Sage.

Kitsuse, John I. and Aaron Cicourel
1963 "A note on the use of official statistics." Social Problems 11 (Fall): 131-39.

Klein, Dorie
1973 "The etiology of female crime: a review of the literature." Issues in Criminology 8 (Fall): 3-30.

Konopka, Gisela
1966 The Adolescent Girl in Conflict. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Kratcoski, P. L.
1974 "Differential treatment of boys and girls by the justice system." Child Welfare 53: 16-22.

Lombroso, Caesar and William Ferrero
1916 The Female Offender. New York: Appleton.

Lynn, David B.
1969 Parental and Sex Role Identification. Berkeley: McCutchan.

Maccoby, Eleanor Emmons and Carol Nagy Jacklin
1976 "Summary and commentary." Pp. 104-21 in Sue Cox (ed.), Female Psychology: The Emerging Self. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Mason, Karen Oppenheim
1975 Sex-Role Attitude Items and Scales for U.S. Sample Surveys. Rockville: National Institute of Mental Health.

Mednick, Martha and Hilda J. Weissman
1976 "The psychology of women-selected topics." Pp. 122-36 in Sue Cox (ed.), Female Psychology: The Emerging Self. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Miller, Walter B.
1958 "Lower class culture as a generating milieu of gang delinquency." Journal of Social Issues 14: 5-18.

Morris, Ruth R.
1964 "Female delinquency and relational problems." Social Forces 43 (October): 82-89.

1965 "Attitudes toward delinquency by delinquents, non-delinquents and their friends." British Journal of Criminology 5 (July): 254-65.

Moss, Howard A.
1972 "Sex, age and state as determinants of mother, infant interaction." Pp. 22-29 in Judith M. Bardwick (ed.), Readings in the Psychology of Women. New York: Harper and Row.

Nachmias, David and Chava Nachmias
1976 Research Methods in the Social Sciences. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Nie, Norman et al.
1975 Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Norland, Stephen, Jennifer Breeding and Neal Shover
1977 "Gender role expectations of juveniles." Unpublished Paper, Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee.

Nye, Ivan F.
1958 Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York: John Wiley.

Oakley, Ann
1972 Sex, Gender and Society. New York: Harper and Row.

Pollack, Otto
1950 The Criminality of Women. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Rosaldo, Michelle and Louise Lamphere
1969 "Introduction." Pp. 1-17 in Rosaldo and Lamphere (eds.), Women, Culture, and Society. Stanford: Stanford Press.

Sellitz, Claire et al.
1959 Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Simon, Rita
1975 The Contemporary Women and Crime. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Mental Health.

Short, James and Ivan F. Nye
1958 "Extent of unrecorded juvenile delinquency: tentative conclusions." International Journal of Criminology and Penology 2 (February): 296-302.

Shover, Neal and Stephen Norland
1975a "Sex roles and criminality: science or conventional wisdom?" Unpublished paper, Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee.

1975b "Sex differentials in criminality: a review and a model." Unpublished Paper, Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee.

1975c "Research proposal for sex roles and patterns of delinquency." Unpublished proposal, Department of Sociology, University of Tennessee.

Stoll, C.
1974 Female and Male: Socialization, Social Roles, and Social Structure. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown.

Thomas, William S.
1923 The Unadjusted Girl. Boston: Little.

Tresemer, David
1975 "Assumptions made about gender roles." Pp. 308-39 in Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter (eds.), Another Voice. New York: Anchor.

Weinstein, Naomi
1971 "Psychology constructs the female." Pp. 207-224 in Vivian Gornick and Barbara Moran (eds.), Women in a Sexist Society. New York: New American Library.

Weis, Joseph G.
1976 "Liberation and crime: the invention of the new female criminal." Crime and Social Justice 6 (Fall-Winter): 17-27.

Weitz, Shirley
1977 Sex Roles: Biological, Psychological and Social Foundations. New York: Oxford University.

Wise, Nancy
1967 "Juvenile delinquency among middle-class girls." Pp. 179-87 in Edmund Vaz (ed.), Middle-Class Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Harper and Row.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

VARIABLE CREATION LIST

Frequency of Delinquency: Students were requested to indicate the number of times in the past year they had engaged in each of the following behaviors. These frequencies were then summed to obtain one score measuring the involvement in delinquency. The delinquency items include:

44. Run away from home.

45. Taken a car for a ride without the owner's permission.

46. Used marijuana.

47. Broken into and entered a home, building or store.

48. Had sexual relations with a member of the other sex (except spouse).

49. Used LSD or other chemicals to get "high," or for kicks.

50. Engaged in a fist-fight with another person.

51. Bought or drank beer, wine or alcohol without your parents' permission.

52. Used a weapon in a fight with another person.

53. Taken something of small value (less than $10.00) which did not belong to you.

54. Taken something of larger value (more than $10.00) which did not belong to you.

55. Drove a car while strongly under the influence of alcohol or other drugs.

56. Used a weapon to take money or something else of value from another person.

57. Destroyed or damaged someone else's property on purpose.

Attachment to Parents: Scores on the following four items were totaled to obtain one measure of the attachment to parents:

84. Does your mother know where you are when you are away from home?

0 Never
1 Sometimes
2 Usually
3 Almost always

85. My relationship with my mother is:

2 Very close
1 Generally close
0 Not at all close

86. Does your father know where you are when you are away from home?

0 Never
1 Sometimes
2 Usually
3 Almost always

87. My relationship with my father is:

2 Very close
1 Generally close
0 Not at all close

Attachment to School: An index of the attachment to the school was derived from the next two items. Responses on item 77 were condensed into three categories before being summed with responses on item 78.

77. What kinds of grades do you usually get in school?

8 Mostly A's
7 Mostly A's and B's
6 Mostly B's
5 Mostly B's and C's
4 Mostly C's
3 Mostly C's and D's
2 Mostly D's
1 Mostly D's and F's
0 Mostly F's

78. How important is getting good grades to you personally?

2 Very important
1 Somewhat important
0 Not at all important

Attachment to Peers: A scale assessing attachment to peers was created from these questions:

23. How important is it to you personally to have close friends?

    0 Not very important
    1 Undecided
    2 Important
    3 Very important

24. How important is it to you personally to be able to get along well with most other people?

    0 Not very important
    1 Undecided
    2 Important
    3 Very important

Commitment to Conventional Activities: To operationalize commitment responses to the following questions were totaled:

80. How much schooling would you like to get eventually?

    0 Some high school
    1 High school graduation
    2 On the job apprenticeship
    3 Trade or business school
    4 Some college or junior college
    5 College graduation (four years)

82. In the space below, please write in the name of the kind of job you would like to have after you are all finished with your schooling:

    _____

    _____

Involvement in Conventional Activities: An indicator of involvement was constructed from the sum of scores on these questionnaire items:

79. On the average, how much time do you spend doing homework outside school?

    0 We are not given any homework
    1 About 1/2 hour a day
    2 About 1 hour a day
    3 About 1 1/2 hours a day
    4 About 2 hours a day
    5 3 or more hours a day

89. When you go out in the evening on school nights, about what time do your parents want you to get home?

0 Before 8 o'clock
1 Before 9 o'clock
2 Before 10 o'clock
3 Before 11 o'clock
4 Before 12 o'clock
5 Midnight or later
6 No set time
7 I never go out

28. About how many hours a week do you spend riding around in a car, either by yourself or with friends?

0 None at all
1 Less than one hour
2 1-2 hours
3 3-4 hours
4 5-6 hours
5 7-8 hours
6 9 hours or more

29. About how many hours a week do you spend sitting around talking with friends, away from home?

6 9 hours or more
5 7-8 hours
4 5-6 hours
3 3-4 hours
2 1-2 hours
1 Less than one hour
0 None at all

Belief in the Law: From the next questions, a measure of respondents' beliefs that social rules should be obeyed was created:

61. It is all right to get around the law if you can get away with it.

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

59. I have a lot of respect for the Knoxville police.

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

7. I think it's important to obey all rules, no matter how unimportant they might seem.

Strongly Agree Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

Resources for Delinquency: The following items were used to form an index of resources available to respondents for delinquent activities. The six responses on item 43 were combined into three responses for purposes of comparability with the responses to item 27.

27. About how often do your best friends ask you to take part in something which is against the law?

    0 Never
    1 Occasionally
    2 Often

43. Have any of your close friends ever been picked up by the police?

    0 No
    1 One friend has
    2 Two friends have
    3 Three friends have
    4 Four or more friends have
    5 Don't know

APPENDIX B

THE RELATIONSHIPS OF SEX, SOCIAL CONTROL AND SUPPORT VARIABLES AND THE FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIORS

TABLE XI

INTERCORRELATIONS (GAMMAS) OF SELECTED CONCEPTS WITH SEX AND THE FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY

	Sex	Frequency of Delinquency
Attachment to Parents	-.14	-.24
Attachment to School	-.18	-.33
Attachment to Friends	-.51	-.10
Commitment	-.05	-.05
Involvement	-.16	-.51
Belief	-.07	.48
Social Support	.23	.78

TABLE XII

INTERCORRELATIONS (GAMMAS) FOR THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEX AND DELINQUENCY CONTROLLING FOR SELECTED CONCEPTS

Controlling for	Sex and the Frequency of Delinquency
Attachment to Parents	.32
Attachment to School	.31
Attachment to Friends	.32
Commitment	.33
Involvement	.33
Belief	.30
Social Support	.10

TABLE XIII

FREQUENCY OF DELINQUENCY BY SEX CONTROLLING FOR SOCIAL SUPPORT

	Social Support					
	Low		Medium		High	
Delinquency	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Low	63.6%	76.2%	26.7%	37.0%	10.7%	0
Medium	36.4%	23.8%	53.3%	37.0%	21.4%	41.2%
High	0	0	20.0%	25.9%	67.9%	58.8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Gamma = .30		Gamma = .06		Gamma = .09	

VITA

Jennifer Ann James was born in Louisville, Kentucky in October of 1951. She was raised and attended high school in Louisville, graduating in 1969. The following fall she entered college and began work towards a Bachelor of Arts degree. She graduated from the University of South Carolina with highest honors in December, 1974. The next year she began graduate studies in sociology at the University of Tennessee. She received the Master of Arts degree in December of 1977.