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I. ALICE CAPONE: WHERE ARE YOU AND WHY?

On October 18, 1975, newspaper columnist, Russell Baker, wrote the following in the *Sunday New York Times Magazine*:

Now that all the most wanted men on the Post Office wall are women, a new kind of criminal has emerged in the vibrant world of gunplay. He is the gun moll.

Such a one is... Vito (Pretty Boy) Floyd... widely regarded as Alice Capone's favorite among her nation­wide network of gun molls... Capone, wanted in 50 states for bank robbery, kidnapping, embarassing the FBI, and playing revolution with live ammunition... made Pretty Boy her first moll... after Joan (Mad Dog) Dillinger produced an old pair of high heels from the days of her oppression by males... beat him senseless and now he bears apiked heel dents in both cheeks.

How does Pretty Boy feel about the crime revolution which has reduced men like him, men who once dreamed of becoming small-time hoodlums, to the dreary task of sitting around luxuriously appointed apartments in transparent tuxedoes, waiting for occasional visits from the great heroines of crime? Pretty Boy... is content to leave the glory to Capone. "I want everything to be marvy when she drops in... That's why I iron my spats every day."

If the intent of Baker's piece was to create a caricature of what has been perceived as an increasingly severe social problem, female deviance and delinquency, his paternal sarcasm would not be appreciated by hard-core feminists. However, printed after the appearance of Patty Hearst, Squeaky Fromme, and the publication of two books; Rita J. Simons's *Women and Crime*, and the more highly publicized *Sisters in Crime*, by Freda Adler, Baker's article could have been just another
innocent manifestation of the controversy and concern over a soaring female crime rate. This concern was intensified by the fear that the women's liberation movement was producing and explosion of aggressive, violent, "Female chauvinist sows..." Who think a man's place is in the love nest, reading his Karl Marx and cleaning his bullets. It may still be too early to know if the concern was warranted. The important development is that women criminals started receiving the attention that they have long deserved; recognition that female criminality may exist in a social sphere separate from men's, but promoted and nurtured by many of the same influences which contribute to male criminality.

What was the concrete data that produced the new interest and anxiety over female deviance? In 1972, the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports released data showing an increase in the arrest rate for women during the period beginning in 1960. The results showed that not only was their rate change outpacing the soaring rate for men, but that women were "graduating" from so-called traditional female crimes such as shoplifting and prostitution, to armed robbery, grand larceny, or traditionally masculine endeavours; crimes which are more public, aggressive and violent.

Offenses, often violent, committed by young women, have risen even more rapidly in the past few decades than those for adult females. In fact, evidence gathered for female
crime rates by age group may suggest that the adolescent offenders are starting to enter the territory of more violent crimes, not following traditional female crime patterns. Girls' crimes between 1960 and 1970, increased almost three times the women's, while the boys' was less than twice the men's. Both the total increases in arrest rates for all crimes for women and girls are due mostly to more property crimes; the girls, however, are now resorting to more violent methods. A study by the Institute of Juvenile Research has shown that delinquency among teenage girls has risen to a point where they will cheat, shoplift, fight, and use drugs, as often as adolescent boys, and that more girls today are armed, carrying weapons and participating in gang fights. One explanation is that the girls no longer see the passivity of some of their adult models as a viable role for status growing up with the women's liberation movement may certainly be a factor. Consequently, like other adult models, and boys, they seek action which often takes defiant, illegal forms, to achieve some sort of identity or status among their peers. If such behavior patterns continue through adulthood, then any fear that the female criminal will reach parity with her male counterpart, that we will indeed see a generation of Alice Capones or Patty Hearsts, is appropriate.

The data actually shows that the crime rates for adult and young girls in the U.S. continued to rise until about 1975, and since then, has leveled off, or in some cases, decreased.
Although the differences between the girls' and adult women's offenses are much greater than those for men and boys in terms of total frequencies than when broken down for patterns of offenses, some considerations need to be made. First of all, violent and other crimes have risen more among female delinquents than women, yet serious property crime has risen equally for both of them. Furthermore, the absolute increase in the number of violent crimes for men and boys has been much greater than the female increase; the latter's increase being inflated due to small original base statistics. The significant behavior, therefore, has been in property, not violent offenses.

Worries over the arrest rates have brought with them inquiries concerning the possibility of new motivations behind women's new choice of crimes, and their relationship to their increasing criminal activity. They have been used to demonstrate the changing role of women in society, creating all sorts of cause and effect arguments. New analytical obstacles for criminology theory have arisen, since such theories have usually been based on, and used to explain male behavior. Explanations for female deviance have been proposed, but they have focused on a different level of analysis than those used for male criminals and delinquents; a more individual, psychological and biological level. They have regarded female criminals as pathological creatures, either physiologically
upset or sexually confused. Freda Adler, author of *Sisters in Crime*, has written that more concentration has been placed upon transgressions from the female sex role than the criminal code. In other words, deviance for women has often meant not fulfilling their traditional, acceptable roles, as well as breaking the law. Few of the explanations have included socio-economic and cultural factors to help explain female deviant behavior. Those that have always seem to place these influences as secondary and less important, while primarily emphasizing the mental and physical features supposedly characteristic only of their sex.

Considering that women have been associated with such crimes as infanticide, abortions, attacking or murdering lovers, and prostitution, this emphasis comes as no surprise. Yet, the significance of such an emphasis has long been overlooked. Now that the nature of women's crimes appears to be changing concurrently with their social roles and status, the relationship between their new network of responsibilities and opportunities demands examination. Hence, the influence of the women's movement on women's crimes, and what this phenomenon implies for the future of women in crime, as well as theories of crime and deviance, has become a key issue in female criminology. Has the movement made women more aggressive and criminal, or more 'masculine'; or are their opportunities and reasons for committing more and different kinds of crimes
changing? Why has this shift occurred, and is it really accountable by just women's liberation, or the consequences of women's increased activity in the public sphere (e.g. increased participation in the labor force legal and educational affairs and more financial obligations); factors which provide more practical and economic explanations for the crime rate increase? Furthermore, if their roles and crimes are approaching men's, does this not also indicate that they are being perceived as more equal and competent by themselves and general society? Such perceptions may instill greater confidence or courage to take risks in women, and not be indicative of their nature becoming more evil, more masculine, or more violent as a result of the women's movement. Thus, the more the position of women in society approximates that of men, the more alike may become their conforming and criminal behavior. Similarly, the theories used to describe their conduct need to approximate those employed for male deviance.

As mentioned, most of the recent controversy concerning women's crime generated from the fact that between 1960 and 1972, the arrest rate for females increased three times faster than that for males, with property crimes contributing to a substantial portion of the increase. The most dramatic changes involved larceny, embezzlement, forgery and fraud. In 1953, about a decade before this rate change, roughly one out of
or 20.2 per cent of all female arrests. The 1979 Uniform Crime Reports lists larceny as accounting for 80 per cent of all female arrests for index offenses. Type I, Index Offenses include murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, theft, and motor vehicle theft. They are all serious crimes, and used as a standard to measure crime trends in the U.S. since they constitute the most common, local crime problems. Except for prostitution, which represents about three per cent of all females arrested, there are no other offenses in which women are so highly represented as they are for larceny. Larceny is defined in the Uniform Crime Reporting Program as "...the unlawful taking, carrying, leading, or riding away of property from the possession or constructive possession of another. It includes crimes such as shoplifting, pocket-picking, purse-snatching, thefts from motor vehicles, thefts of motor vehicle parts and accessories, bicycle thefts, etc., in which no use of force, violence, or fraud occurs." The last two categories of this definition are two other areas which have been highly tauted as prime targets for the rising numbers of deviant women. Violent crimes include murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault; offenses which include the use of weapons, physical threats, etc. The proportion of women arrested for violent crimes, however, has remained constant for the last twenty years, or in the cases of homicide.
and aggravated assault, tended to decrease since the beginning of the women's movement in the late sixties. Among violent crimes, the increase for women has been most evident in robbery, defined as "...the taking or attempting to take anything of value from the care, custody, or control of a person or persons by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear." The three additional offenses, which have made a generous contribution to the women's blossoming crime rate are fraud, embezzlement, and forgery and counterfeiting. The FBI defines these offenses as follows:

(1) Fraud—"Fraudulent conversion and obtaining money or property by false pretenses. Included are larceny by bailee and bad checks" (2) forgery and counterfeiting—Making, altering, uttering, or possessing, with intent to defraud, anything false which is made to appear true. Attempts are included." (3) embezzlement—"Misappropriation or misapplication of money or property entrusted to one's care, custody, or control." Forger and counterfeiting for women has in fact been steadily increasing since the 1960's, but has not taken any skyrocketing leaps in any single year. In 1960, roughly one in every six persons arrested for this offense was a woman; by 1972, it was about one in four, and it is now approaching almost one in three. In 1960, women constituted 15.7 per cent of all those arrested for fraud and embezzlement. By 1970,
this figure had reached 29.7 and in 1978, roughly 40.46 per cent.

The following table shows the percentage of arrests which are women, of all people arrested for larceny-theft, fraud and embezzlement, and forgery and counterfeiting; the crimes which supposedly indicate that women are declaring emancipation in the criminal sphere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>larceny-theft</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>32.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fraud/embezzlement</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>40.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forgery/counterfeiting</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>32.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Simon, 1975:40,43; and UCR, 1978:197.

The point to note from these trends is that the most pronounced increases in female arrests has occurred in property crimes, mostly nonviolent. Any new increase in female crimes at this time would have spawned the suggestion that as women become more liberated, and obtain more freedom to behave as they choose, they are becoming more "like men." However, it seems more likely that their opportunities and motivations to commit property crimes have grown with the number of economic responsibilities the liberation movement has allowed them to acquire, particularly where occupations are concerned. An important hypothesis which stems from such figures, and the declining domesticity of women, has been proposed by Rita J. Simon and others ever since the controversy about changes in women's crimes began. She has hypothesized
that "... increased participation in the labor force provides women with more opportunities for committing certain types of crimes, i.e., financial, property offenses. As these opportunities increase, women's participation in larceny, fraud, embezzlement and other financial and white-collar crimes should increase." Simon's hypothesis is logical, but just because more women are working, why would they commit the crimes in the first place? What patterns of criminal behavior have women previously followed and why should greater participation in the labor force induce them to alter these patterns?

Rita Simon has stated that, "The kinds of crimes they committed in the past were different from those of men. They killed their husbands, lovers, other women and babies. Now that's decreasing because you can divorce your husband, leave your lover or abort your baby." Her statement reflects the impression that women committed crimes out of frustration and passion. Their victims have been friends, relatives and lovers. Thus, the relationship between women's crimes and their sexual roles is substantive. For example, Otto Pollak argued in his important work on female criminality, The Criminality of Women, that women have never been more law-abiding than men. Instead, their crimes have been carried out under circumstances which make them difficult to detect; consequently thus, giving them a "masked" character. The narrower sphere of activities that have been open to women in the past has
provided non-public ways for them to commit crimes. These activities have been tied to their roles as caretakers, nurturers, consumers, and sex partners. Pollak suggests that the opportunities available to women in the course of such labors may make feasible abortion, infanticide, child abuse, theft by domestic servants and prostitutes, shoplifting, prostitution, and blackmail. Yet Pollak does not speculate about the extent of husband beating, or other abuse of men by women, since many men might be too ashamed to admit to domination by "the weaker sex." Surely many male crimes remain undetected, too; but Pollak does not consider them at all. He does not even state any assumption that they exist with far less frequency than undetected crimes for women.

Several other crimes committed by women are related to the female sex role in some fashion. Girls have been apprehended for running away from home, ungovernable behavior and sexual mis-conduct; behavior for which boys are either less likely to be condemned for or else capable of guilt up to an age lower than that for girls. In addition to these crimes, which are frowned upon due to the notion that women should remain in a home and behave prudently. Forging or passing bad checks are also offenses connected to women's traditional spheres of activity. Such acts are not uncommon for adult women, who are among the nation's most influential consumers. For example, Hoffman-Bustamente has stated that forgery is an act that is
compatible with the traditional role of women.

as in the case of larceny, (especially shoplifting) the high proportion of women (forgers) is due to the fact that the crime fits well into the everyday round of activities in which women engage, especially their role of buying most family necessities and paying family bills.¹⁷

Smart also argues that women are likely to be involved in social security offenses, especially in cases of cohabitation. "In this case their involvement in crime is related mainly to the state's reinforcement of their economically dependent position in society and to their role of provider for children and the home."¹⁸

Indeed, women's position in the past has been reflected by the concentration of their activities in the domestic sphere; one indication of their subordinate status and amount of power. However, regarding motivations for criminal behavior, Smart does not note a parallel with the motivations men may have from the exact same role. The financial pressures placed on men as providers for children and their home is nothing new. The difference has been that men have been primarily independent in fulfilling this role, while their wives would help out under extraordinary circumstances (unemployment, divorce, widowhood or just not enough income to adequately provide for the family needs). Coupled with the liberation movement, more and more women have become less dependent, mentally, socially and economically. Single parenting and
two-income families are common. Increased employment has made the norms for maternal, marital and sexual behavior less restrictive and less important in establishing their social status. Rita Simon's hypothesis implies that as women enter the occupational sphere the target of their frustrations shifts to this area from the less public, domestic sphere. This interpretation, proposed by many radical feminists thinkers suggests that women are still oppressed; only the setting has changed, but their subjective problem remains. Unfortunately, this view may be as biased as the previous theories explaining women's criminal behaviors in terms of repressed sexual desires. Furthermore, one needs to remember that frustrations are not unique to the female sex. Nevertheless, their occupational positions and increased range of role choices and duties, warrant a considerable degree of frustration in this day and age.

Over the years, as more women have entered the labor force, the increase of the status of their jobs has not paralleled their proportional increase in the labor market. No major shifts have occurred in the types of employment men and women have engaged in for the past thirty years. Although the number of women in the labor force has almost doubled since 1950, women have remained concentrated in low paying jobs. Their occupational pattern is still substantially based on sex role definitions, filling jobs which require less initiative
and responsibility, and carry less prestige, status, and power. For example, the service industry is their most important employer, with a prominent 63 per cent female population.\textsuperscript{21} Such jobs include personal and medical health services, and education occupations which represent extensions of the female role of caretaker, nurturer, and child socializer. Even though women have made significant gains in the area of government; manufacturing, finance and retail trade, few of them are professionals or managers in these industries. Only one out of ten working women hold full-time jobs all year, with seven out of ten working fulltime at some point during the year.\textsuperscript{22} Their unemployment rates are significantly higher than those for men, and as of 1974, the median income of full-time women workers was 57 per cent that of full-time men workers.\textsuperscript{23} Even when adjusted for hours of work and level of education, a large earnings differential has persisted between men and women, further emphasized by the different classifications of jobs they hold. Add to these financial disadvantages, inflated prices, and the fact that more women remain single longer, or moreover, that the number of families headed by women has risen 73 per cent since 1960, to roughly 13 per cent of all families\textsuperscript{24} then the hypothesis that more women might be tempted to attempt to pass bad checks or forge them, commit welfare fraud, embezzlement or shoplift, appears more plausible. Linking the increases of these types of crimes
for women to a motive of economic necessity has raised the suggestion that this trend represents "extensions" of traditional female role activities rather than new role patterns. Furthermore, the significant increases in property crimes committed by women have been shown to reflect relatively restricted and petty activities in the criminal sphere. Larceny-theft constituted four-fifths of all women's serious crimes, but one quarter of all female crime; the remainder of their arrests being concentrated in the areas of forgery and counterfeiting, prostitution (one in every thirty female arrests is for prostitution) and commercialized vice, and runaways. Although women are now more likely to be charged with larceny/theft, fraud, narcotics and driving under the influence, and less likely to be arrested for prostitution, disorderly conduct, drunkenness, or curfew violations and loitering, a good chunk of their arrests still occurs in the latter categories. Male offenses are still predominantly in the areas of burglary-breaking and entering, vandalism, narcotics, driving under the influence, and drunkenness. The gap for property crimes may be closing between men and women, but the absolute differences remain large. Female arrests for larceny-theft have made a sharp upturn, but their execution of burglaries, auto thefts, and stolen property crimes have not begun to approach staggering proportions by any stretch of the imagination. The large gap between men and women for violent crimes, which has
been pointed out, has not displayed any accelerated rate changes. This is emphasized by the fact that most violent crimes committed by women are personal, involving close relations in domestic settings. The victims are usually smaller, like children, or incapacitated, e.g. drunk. The women may be in the role of wife, lover, mother, or in-law. In public, as she plays consumer, or even forger or embezzler, she may also be attempting to fulfill her duties and obligations as a mother; a provider and nurturer. Moreover, the value that our society places on materials, like having the most convenient household gadgets, wearing the latest fashions, or seeing the most popular movie, is perpetuated by the media. The temptations can whet the appetite of anyone who has contact with the public sphere. Yet, many women do not have all the resources to adequately provide for themselves or any dependents, and satiate even the most mild and understandably materialistic cravings. If they resort to forgery, bad-check writing, narcotics or theft, their behavior does not necessitate actions which are inconsistent with traditional feminine behavior. Furthermore, much of their theft takes the form of shoplifting, not burglary. Burglary would involve behavior that is not typical given the stereotypical roles of women in our society. Burglary, robbery, or motor vehicle theft also employ skills which are frequently learned in a criminal subculture; an environment which is still foreign to most women. Their performance suggests force, in
terms of breaking and entering. A burglar also runs the risk of personal confrontation with victims should he/she be caught in the process.26

Even in the shoplifting field male and female stealing habits have been found to contrast. Gibbens and Prince27 found in a study in England, that women steal mostly food, items usually of little value, and clothes. Men tend to steal books and objects other than food and clothes. Cameron28 found that most shoplifters are noncommercial pliferers, who appear to have no present or sustained contact with a criminal subculture. She found that two per cent of all women and 12 per cent of all men had a prior criminal record; that they were mainly "respectable" employed persons or equally "respectable" housewives. The value of the merchandise was too small to ever be used for sale through criminal channels, and the median value of items stolen by women was less than that for men. Franklin29 studied the differences between male and female employees who committed theft during the course of their employment in a large retail organization. Once again most thefts of high value were committed by male employees, and men committed more thefts against the organization although they constituted a minority in the work force. Embezzlement accounted for the greatest value in theft loss; a crime which requires sophistication in accounting and financial manipulation and is closely associated with upper-level
positions occupied by men. Female thefts were mostly petty, ranging from one to one hundred-fifty dollars. Franklin concluded that the data demonstrates a relationship exists between sex roles in the organization and the amount and type of theft. The more stereotypical the role relative to the traditional functioning of men and women, the higher the rate of theft committed by that particular sex. The petty nature of the female employees' theft reflected not only a lack of opportunity, but also a lack of skill in certain types of record and financial manipulation. Hence, the sex of the offender was related to the rate of theft, position in the organization, and the amount of theft involved. Franklin also points out that women's positions in such an organization, primarily in sales and clerical, are in the mainstream of the store and therefore, more visible and easily detected. Following Pollak's concept of the "masked" character of female crime, and the emancipation argument, it makes sense that as more women become more "visible" by entering the labor force, and enter the most visible positions in the work force, their arrest rate for larceny may be subject to a double-whammy effect. Certainly, this breakdown of the larceny-theft category should make one accept Simon's hypothesis about women and their increased participation in white collar crime with caution. Their organizational roles make their crimes, which make a significantly smaller contribution to financial loss in
the first place, more vulnerable to detection. If any un-
masking of important crimes is necessary, it would be most ben-
eficial to examine the upper-level management sectors; behind
the closed doors. A typical female white collar worker may
easily have access to committing individual acts of income
tax fraud, check forgery, credit card fraud, and individual acts
of embezzlement as a bank teller, salesperson or secretary.
However, the hard-core white collar crimes are, with few
exceptions, still off-limits to women. This situation is
perhaps best exemplified by the condition that "... it is
relatively easy for a woman to become a bank teller, though
still uncommon for a woman to become a bank lending officer.
Thus, the opportunity structure permitting embezzlement is
relatively open; structural access to fraudulent lending
schemes is less so." 30

If anyone still has qualms about women's liberation rap-
idly producing a generation of violent, heartless women,
he/she may rest assured that if Rome was not built in a day,
neither will the Alice Capone Syndicate. The status, positions
and power women hold in this country are not yet ideally
conducive to providing them with the types of jobs that will
grant them the opportunities to commit devastating rip-offs.
Although their psychological or socio-economic motivations may
be similar, or rapidly becoming more similar to men's in their
willingness to commit crimes, until the opportunities expand,
it is unlikely that women's crime rates will show a remarkable increase. The fact that their arrest rate has leveled off since 1975, may be the best evidence for this situation. Whether or not legal chivalry by our paternalistic judicial system has played a major role is an entire debate in itself; the evidence is spotty, but the issue will be discussed later. Nevertheless, if women are fighting more than ever for equality with men, "... not only for urban social change, but for sexual equality," it is doubtful that many of them are consciously fighting for it in the criminal world; at least, not until they get it in the regular world first.

The most meaningful ramification of the resurrection of the emancipation argument probably concerns the attention it has brought for the reshaping of female theories of criminality. Where the sexes are concerned the rule for traditional criminology has been to treat their different crimes with different theories and explanations. From time to time social factors have entered the literature on female criminology, but hardly with the frequency and emphasis that they have for male offenders. It has not been until quite recently, with women's criminal behavior just beginning to resemble certain characteristics of their male counterparts, that the importance of using the same socio-structural concepts to explain women's crimes, has been deemed an important issue. The unfortunate part is that it should not be necessary to
wait until women are marketing counterfeit record albums and stealing cars to fully realize the potential of explaining men's and women's crimes with the same theories. The point is that there are certainly qualitative and quantitative differences in the deviant behaviors between the sexes; but deviant behavior is deviant behavior.
II. BAD GIRLS, BAD SEEDS, OBSESSED AND OPPRESSED

In any discussion of deviant women and criminological theory it is essential to recognize two factors. As chapter one pointed out, women are arrested less frequently than men, and the distribution of their crimes is different than men's; i.e. they are generally less serious and less violent. These differences have some obvious social consequences. One is that fewer women are incarcerated than men; only about one in nine convictions is a woman, and one in thirty persons sentenced to prison is a woman. Moreover, these ratios have not changed much in the past two decades.¹ Three-quarters of the women in the nation's jails are serving time for minor crimes such as petty larceny and drug offenses.² Another result is that women are perceived as less "criminal" based on their traditionally insignificant deviant acts. This situation has infused biased perspectives into most of the theoretical literature regarding female deviance, not to mention its ramifications for criminal laws and cultural sanctions for women offenders. For example, judicial and correctional statistics may tell us more about the responses of a criminal justice system to female crime than they do about the crime itself. Furthermore, the laws and judicial and
correctional treatment of these women can reveal insights into roles and expectations for women in a society. One must consider whether their less severe crimes have made society and authorities less tolerant of their transgressions from norms or the law. On the other hand, law officials may be less eager to penalize women due to paternal, protective feelings or because their deviant behaviors are indeed less threatening.

The term "deviance" has several implications and meanings which are important to understand, especially if its connotations have been different for men and women. Therefore, some clarification of the term is in order. First of all, when a deviant act is committed, an act which "strays from a path or standard," three points of view must be considered: that of the actor and that of the group or system which has labeled such an act deviant. For this reason, "There is a certain relativity in the conception of conformity and deviance.... It is not possible to make a judgement of deviance without specific references to the system... to which it applies." The system may consist of anything from two people playing checkers, to a household, fraternity, business organization, or country. The rules, laws, or sanctions which the system sets up are usually created to maintain the organization, and a sense of trust between members, in order to carry on behavior efficiently. Problems arise when not
everyone agrees on the rules, the degree to which the rules should be followed, or when some are ignorant of the rules. Violations of the rules are labeled deviant; but if the rules are not universally agreed upon, or considered fair or adequate, the severity of the deviance is thrown into question.

Becker's term "outsiders" demonstrates this dual perspective. Supporters of the rules view the violators as outsiders. The transgressors may object to the validity of the standards and view the supporters as outsider. In the event that they are labeled deviant by the rest of society, the violators may view themselves as outsiders. They may still consider their behavior or beliefs strange or wrong whether or not they oppose the generally accepted standards.

This conceptualization of deviance as relative to group standards, is essential to understand female criminality. Yet, in as much as Emil Durkheim believed that deviation naturally occurs in social organization, deterring the need for laws as well as the possibility of disobeying them, deviance in women has been regarded as unnatural and out of character. This unfair distinction is magnified by the fact that the law and cultural norms have subjected women to a double standard for deviance. Sexual promiscuity has always been more detrimental for women than for men; no doubt because the latter cannot get pregnant. Prostitution is a
case point. Only recently has the law made any effort to apprehend male customers and these efforts have been intermittent at most. Of course, the setting of the crime makes it more difficult always to track down the client. Furthermore, the fact that prostitution is not even a criminal offense in most countries only increases the discriminatory nature of the law in this country; but that is a debate in itself.

Nevertheless, because women have statistically accounted for fewer, marginal and hard-to-detect crimes the theoretical attention given to their criminal behavior has been qualitatively insufficient and inadequate. Female criminals have been denied the elaborate considerations of environmental influences and socialization processes which are so extensively used for male deviance. Theories of feminine criminologist have been sexualized, psychologized or afflicted with sweeping generalizations. They have accounted for biological and individual differences, but ignored other important factors like status, culture, race, power, age or self esteem. Such factors have long been recognized as relevant to explaining male deviance, weaving their way into marvelous little criminological concepts like Robert Merton's social goals and means, conflict, subcultures, or differential association. Radical feminists blame the underdevelopment of women's criminological theories on the dominance of male criminologists. The
"underdevelopment" of women's participation in crime however is a more practical and fair excuse; especially since much of the deviant behavior for which many of the crimonological concepts were coined has not traditionally been performed by women. For example, "Delinquency in general is mostly male delinquency.... Stealing, 'other property offenses,' 'ornerness,' and 'hell raising' in general are primarily practices of the male." It is, therefore, helpful to consider what have been the most important aspects of crimonology theories, followed by a review of the theories that have been proposed for women. Such a juxtaposition will allow a clear comparison to be made between the less powerful theories used for women and the better theories used for men. Then, within the framework that deviant behavior is relative and that it always implies deviation from some standard, it can be demonstrated that a good, general, parsimonious crimonological theory can apply to either sex.

Theories of deviance vary the levels of phenomenon that they examine or emphasize; choosing among the biological, psychological, sociological and/or cultural levels. In the past, attempts at general, universal theories of crime have used evidence from only one level, creating a uni-causal level of explanation. Fortunately, theoretical evolution has shed light on the necessity for using a multi-variate or multi-level model for explaining most behavior. Now most
theories in varying degrees, refer to the actor, his personality structure, perspectives, values, goals, interests, temperament, needs, drives and something about the situation in which he acts. Be that as it may, it is advantageous to inspect briefly what phenomena each level examines.

Theories of biological causation state that criminal behavior is predominantly of organic origin, due to atavism: a biological reversion to an earlier stage of evolution. Consequently, criminal behavior is inevitable for someone born with such a characteristic. This level neglects the fact that human beings also think and live in societies which define certain acts as criminal in the first place.

Psychoanalytic theories focus on the internal motivation of the actor and the sources of these motivations. They look at the type of personality and try to see how the attitudes and characters of the parent, their early deprivations and frustrations might have contributed to their criminal personality. In Freudian terms, one example of such a theory is the Id versus the inhibitory forces theory: crime is an outcome of the inborn criminal drives of the Id. If the checking forces of the superego, or fear of punishment are too weak the drives overcome the super ego and crime may follow. Implicit in this sort of explanation are the social forces which develop the superego. Therefore, the processes of social-
ization, from the social structure and cultural background, can hardly be separated from a psychological level. A pure psychological focus might try to espouse that differences in the situation surrounding the deviant act are not important, instead one must consider the personality configuration of the deviant actor. But this focus automatically, albeit unintentionally, brings in the socio-cultural level because it attempts to explain past situations affecting the character. On the other hand, a psychological theory may state that there are basic, universal motivations present in everyone. Hence, anyone, given certain circumstances of temptation, opportunity or stress, would commit the same deviant act. However, this perspective denies the reality of past individual experiences. The psychological approaches today account for these interactive processes, both situational and those that develop over time; thus, an individual's socialization is usually considered.

A pure sociological explanation looks for patterns and distributions of deviant behavior. It attempts to correlate properties of the social system with the patterns of crime, and observe how the distributions vary among systems or change over time as a system changes. Such properties may be anything from demographic variables like fertility rates, to socio-economic variables such as religiosity, civic participation, or GNP. In sum, the shift to the socio-
logical level places the deviant action in the social system or structure (e.g. a city, organization, country, family, community), as opposed to being an event in the biography of an individual, executed by an individual.  

One of the benefits of using a sociological approach for examining female criminality is that it considers shifts in patterns and distributions of deviant behavior. It has already been shown that women's crimes are changing. The sociological method also considers changes in the social systems. Indeed, women's roles in many societies are undergoing transformations every year. These changes have ramifications for women, regarding their choice of crimes, and the social structure, regarding what it considers to be deviant for women. It is understandable that theories used to explain female deviance previously would not account for such changes since women's roles and their criminal behavior were fairly constant. However, much of the theorizing being done today appears to be overcompensating for prior theoretical neglect, placing less focus on the individual. The radical criminological and feminist literature are especially guilty of this overcompensation. The field is crying out for a neat balance, a synthesis. Theories for male deviance have come close to such a balance. They may not be perfect theories, but they are less extreme than most explanations offered for
female crime.

Early theories of female criminality were unicausal, regarding women as behaving under biological laws and qualities inherent to their sex. A prime example is the work of Cesare Lombroso. In The Female Offender, he studied pictures of female offenders, measured craniums and counted moles and tattoos of imprisoned women in order to find consistent signs of degeneration or atavism; e.g. facial anomalies, thick dark hair, or a heavy lower jaw. But only a small proportion of female offenders and prostitutes met his criteria; they simply did not have enough signs of degeneration. Instead of looking for other "causes" for his subjects criminal behavior, Lombroso explained that women rarely develop atavisms because they are more primitive and less evolved than men. Therefore, they cannot develop the necessary physical or psychological characteristics to enable them to function more efficiently in their predetermined roles as deviant persons. Consequently, real, true, born female criminals were supposed to be scarce. Lombroso concluded that women are organically conservative, sedentary, and passive due to their lower position on the evolutionary scale. Their lower position in the social structure did not enter into the picture as affecting any of their deviant behaviors; but Lombroso probably would have believed that women's inferior social position was determined by their
primitive biological state. The lasting and most pervasive outcome of Lombroso's work was its assessment of the pre-determined nature of women: not to be criminal. Claiming that the born female criminal was a rare and pathological case gave her twice the stigma it held for men. Those that were criminal were deemed more masculine; Hence, they lacked maternal instincts, piety and physical weakness, characteristics which serve to repress criminal tendencies. "Masculine" female criminals, according to Lombroso, were also more insensitive to pain, making them cruel and unmerciful. He stated, "As a double exception, the criminal woman is consequently a monster." 9 Certainly Lombroso perpetrated the notion that it is deviant for a woman to be deviant. As reads the nursery rhyme, "... when she was good she was very, very good, but when she was bad she was horrid."

The next theoretical step for female criminality also produced a double stigma for female offenders. Criminality for women moved from being recognized as inconsistent with their biological constitution to being inconsistent with their social roles. Whereas "normal" women were expected to be unaggressive, virtuous, loving and caring, deviant, abnormal women were considered to be aggressive, malicious, and deceitful. Their crimes were still not perceived as deviations from male-imposed normative structures, or as an individual's manner of adapting, coping or reacting to her
society and delegated role obligations. Violating or surpassing her role expectations was almost as evil, if not moreso, than violating the law. This view was firmly put forth by theorists of the psychoanalytical school, influenced by Freud. They proposed that women committed crimes out of frustrations due to a sense of deficiency. The source of this frustration was always perceived as sexual in origin, and therefore, reflected the Lombrosian biological determinism. The work of W.I. Thomas exemplifies this perspective. In his work on delinquent girls, *The Unadjusted Girl*, published first in 1923, and later in 1967, he assumes females to be the passive opposite of the "naturally" active, and dynamic males. All human beings, he believed, have basic instinctual wishes which are tied to the nervous system, wishes for security, new experience, response and recognition. A person is capable of expressing these biological instincts through fear, anger, love, hate and the will to gain power or status. Women supposedly felt more intense love instincts and the desire to "feel response." Thus, women's need for excitement and desire for new experience was expected to be less intense than men's. Deviant women, however, need these feelings of need instead of traditional, passive maternal feelings; their needs and responses deviate from what culture and society has expected them to have. They turn to other modes of behavior to fulfill their wishes, namely promiscuity and pros-
For Thomas, the source of female criminality... was the breakdown of the traditional restraints on women who formerly would not have thought of working outside the home or marrying outside the ethnic or community group. A girl's or woman's value... is dependent upon how others perceive her... she is a symbol of purity... valuable only in as much as she pleases and enhances others... and object of adoration... not all women are able to live up to such an ideal of virgin purity and infinite tenderness. Such girls are amoral... This is... the beginning of their delinquency.

There is a positive side to Thomas' analysis of female deviance, however. It is the attention he gave to social norms. Indeed, he felt that social constraint on women's behavior was "better" for the more conservative, obedient sex. He did not question the validity of values or social-structural position of women in society, but emphasized the less disruptive traditional morality, and the detrimental effects of a less repressive, ambiguous morality. No doubt he felt that anomie in the area of sexual behavior would inundate society with nymphomaniacs.

Under Marxian influence, a few other theorists began to pay attention to women's economic and social position in discussions of female criminality. An example is the Dutchman William Bonger. He examined several of the issues that the researcher's of female offenders consider to be the most important. He considered the kinds of offenses they commit, why they commit those particular crimes, and how those crimes vary by region and nations, cultures and societies. Today
one would add why the variations in types and quantities of crimes occur over time. But women's roles were relatively static in Bonger's day. He concluded that women's criminality remains less common than men's; that they participate less in crimes which require strength or courage, and consequently commit fewer serious crimes. He also observed that women take a small part in sexual crimes ("for procuration is not a sexual crime but an economic one") and due to the nature of most sexual crimes, they cannot be committed by women, since women play a passive role in sexual activities. On a traditional level, Bonger noted that women at that time committed few economic crimes because if greed or poverty induced them to drop their nurturing cuties, they could turn to prostitution "Which generally yields greater and more returns than crime, and avoids the risks of prison (in Europe)". This idea is a sharp change from Lombrosos who claimed women committed few property crimes because they lacked "property sense."

Bonger's greatest achievement was his cross-cultural study of women's crime patterns. He concluded that when the figures vary noticeably in different countries, one may seek women's social position as a principal causal variable. He found that in England, where women's positions differ less from men's than they do in Italy, their crime rate was higher. The same result occurred in a comparison between Algeria and
Denmark-Scotland. By examining women's crimes in different parts of the same country Bonger found that women's crime rates were higher in countries which are the most urban and economically developed. Also, his research for England showed that women committed more offenses in the places where their social position most clearly approximated men's. The item Bonger failed to note was that a good deal of the female offenses in his data were traditional female crimes; e.g. abortion, infanticide, child abuse. However, in the more developed nations, property offenses for women were more frequent. Without question, Bonger was ahead of his time in his conceptualization of female criminality. He remarked how the law may treat women differently, since acquittal is much more common for women than for men. Yet, he did not note that their crimes were usually less severe. But his attention to women's place in societies is his most important contribution. This statement must not be ignored:

In looking the whole field over I see nothing to justify the opinion that the less criminal character of women indicates a higher morality, whether innate or acquired. The consequences of her manner of life, in so often as they are harmful to the formation of character, are probably counterbalanced by those which are favorable. Her smaller criminality is like the health of a hothouse plant; it is not due to innate qualities, but to the hothouse which protects it from harmful influences. If the life of women were like that of men, then criminality would hardly differ at all as to quantity, though perhaps somewhat as to quality.

Environmental influences on female crime and delinquency were raised later by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. In their
study, they scrutinized every aspect of five hundred female offenders in Massachusetts, from their childhood to post parole behavior. Using court records, school records, personal interviews, physical examination records, parole reports and arrest record as data, they concluded that environmental and biological conditions combined to make rehabilitation difficult for offenders and that they could pass such behaviors onto their children. They admitted that "...economic insufficiency and insecurity and industrial inefficiency on the part of certain classes of the population, together with the evils they bring in their train, are among the most potent conditioning factors in the careers of offenders" and that such socio-economic forces impede rehabilitation. However, the Gleucks observed, "In the long run a fundamental attack upon the problems of antisociality depends not only on the raising of the status of the economically underprivileged, but on the elimination or better control of the biologically handicapped. (e.g. compulsory sterilization)\textsuperscript{13} The Gleucks' perspective of biological determinism is blatant. They viewed their subjects as pathological beings "Burdened with feeble-mindedness, psychopathic personality and marked emotional instability..."\textsuperscript{14} They noted that many of the women had suffered from serious physical handicaps or ailments in childhood and adolescence, and that the majority had contracted venereal disease before they had turned twenty-
one.15 Yet in their efforts to create a better milieu for rehabilitation, which was the goal of their research, they recognized how the physical, educational, and economic disadvantages produced difficulties for these women to survive by "legitimate means." The women's competency as workers and students had generally been quite poor. Their employment patterns had been erratic, holding jobs mainly as domestics or factory hands. Their earnings were meager and about three-quarters had been "neglectful in their religious duties." Their marriages were generally unhappy, but moreover, the Gluecks noted that many of the husbands conducted criminal activities. This influence of companions is significant. The authors also write that "Throughout childhood and adolescence (the women were) ... endangered by companionships with the vicious and criminal with whom they frequented unwholesome places of recreation."16 No doubt, the Gluecks found that illicit sexual activity was the chief form of their subjects' adolescent and early-adult misbehavior; over half had been prostitutes and a third had born illegitimate children. (It is no surprise that among their suggestions for rehabilitation or prevention of female deviance, were good, proper marriages, and experiencing motherhood in a solid, wholesome manner.) Nevertheless, this attention to the women's peers and associates, as contributing to their delinquent activities, has important theoretical implications which have been largely neglected in the literature on female criminality. This em-
phasis, however, has been strong in discussions of male crime and delinquency. The Gluecks do not elaborate on this finding, but its ramifications will be discussed later.

The first important work to use women's roles in society to explain their criminal behavior was *The Criminality of Women* by Otto Pollak, published in 1950. More specifically, he used their role to explain their access to criminal means. Unlike earlier theorists who believed women's criminal activity to be substantially less than men's, Pollak claimed that women have just as much access, as many opportunities as men, but these opportunities are of a different nature. Their crimes take place under conditions which make them more difficult to detect. Since their crimes are concomittants of traditional female roles, such as teacher, secretary, domestic, clerk nurse, or housewife, they may be effectively covered for low visibility and typical female crimes such as shoplifting, forgery, petty theft, assault on lovers and children, blackmail, prostitution, or fraud. He termed this concept the "masked" character of female criminality. Pollak's downfall was that he still argued that the nature of women's crimes is rooted in their biological characteristics and qualities inherent to their sex. He claimed that women are socialized to be deceitful; evident by everything from coquettish flirting to concealing menstruation, pregnancy, and even faking orgasms. They infuse this sinister, deceitful
quality into their criminal activities. Essentially, Pollak believed that if women's hidden crimes came out of the closet, they would equal or surpass men's.

Fortunately, Pollak considered some other variables. For instance, he found that women were more likely to commit crimes if they were between twenty-five and thirty years old, married, and in a traditional female occupation, like a domestic worker. But, an issue of more relevance today is Pollak's emphasis on the relationship between women's increasing social equality to rising crime rates. His examples were data collected during both World Wars.

During World War I, he found that female crime rates rose significantly in Germany, Austria, and the Netherlands. In England, a noticeable increase occurred in property offenses during the second World War, as well as increases in violent and serious sex offenses, probably due to the great numbers of foreign soldiers stationed in that country. Sex crimes and petty offenses accounted for the majority of female offenses increases during World War II in the United States. Women's crimes against property rose only from twenty-nine percent to thirty per cent between 1940 and 1944, whereas the rise for their sex offenses was eighty-eight per cent. The consideration that sex crimes such as prostitution were not outlawed in many European countries, and only police regulated, may account for the disparity between the rates in wartime
American and European nations. It should also be emphasized that major crackdowns on prostitution were placed in effect in this country during wartime to "protect the boys." Thus, wartime crime statistics for American women are not the best evidence for anyone trying to deduce correlation between women's greater participation in the work force and rising criminality. As men went into the military, many women launched into the task of employment on top of heading households. If these new roles created financial burdens, and their crime increases were due largely to crimes against property, some significant parallel may exist between the wartime increases and the increase in the United States and other Western countries in the past fifteen years. Yet, one must not ignore Bonger's point that procuration, and prostitution can be economic crimes. It is widely agreed that since the decline of the brothel and organized prostitution, much of this activity is done, on a part-time basis, by housewives, secretaries, waitresses, etc., seeking extra income not out of any fulfillment of affective needs or alleviation of sexual deprivation. That a woman's husband is at war, and she needs some money, is an equally valid argument to explain an act of shoplifting or forgery, as well as intercourse for monetary compensation.

A theme that pervades any theorizing about women's crimes, from Lombroso, to Pollak's Freudian-influenced arguments, is the desire to correlate biological or psychological character-
istics with crimes of individuals. Socio-economic arguments, however, are equally guilty of overemphasizing a single perspective. Indeed women's roles in society both constrain and induce much of their criminal acts, but too much emphasis on economic explanations to understand female offense patterns is equally as biased. Klein's statement below is a typical example of the arguments offered in today's literature.

...writers see criminality as the result of individual characteristics that are only peripherally affected by economic, social and political forces... characteristics are of a physiological or psychological nature... which is universal, rather than existing within a specific historical framework...

Many explanations of what are obviously economically motivated offenses, such as prostitution and shoplifting are explained in sexual terms. The writers ignore the problems of poor and Third World women... who in fact constitute a good percentage of women caught up in the criminal justice system. These women have real economic needs which are not being met, and in many cases engage in illegal activities as a viable economic alternative...

Writers ignore problems of sexism, racism and class... Concern is adjustment to the individual woman to society, not social change.20

Klein's observations are correct and justified as this paper has demonstrated. However, one must be wary of making sweeping generalizations when deducing individual motives from statistics, and committing the ecological fallacy. It does not matter if the motives are the result of sexual or economic deprivation. If a correlation exists between women entering the mainstream of society and committing more offenses, then one must keep in mind it is only a correlation. Therefore, anyone who uses only statistics to verify a hypotheses such
as Simon's is overlooking many cultural and psychological variables. Other attempts to do so have usually utilized prison populations, which are not from a random sample. For example, of the 1,325 women serving sentences in federal institutions, the typical offender is Black, 31-years-old, single, with the responsibility for two children, has not completed high school and is usually head of her household. There is evidence that these women face the same economic pressures that have been associated with male criminal behavior in the past. They lack job skills, making it difficult for them to maintain adequate financial resources. Over 20 per cent are serving sentences for economically-related crimes such as theft, larceny, fraud, embezzlement or forgery. Another 25 per cent are serving time for drug charges, although the majority have histories of drug abuse. Fifteen per cent of the women have been convicted for violent crimes: assault, kidnapping, homicide, and robbery. These facts overwhelmingly support claims similar to Klein's. Moreover, the offense patterns for these women has remained fairly constant for the past fifty years, a point that is not evident from the arrest rate data. The reasons probably lies in part in the criminal justice system, and its treatment of certain types of women. This brings up the issue of the chivalry factor which was long ago implicated by Lombroso, and lates by Pollak. The argument is that the protective attitudes
held by the legal system makes officials reluctant to arrest or sentence women. Judges, police, and legislators have been accused of identifying women in court or at the scene of a crime with their mothers, wives, or sisters; subsequently treating them more benevolently than they would men in a similar situation. Some judges have admitted that they try to avoid aggravating the problem of motherless children. Nevertheless, many argue that the existence of a "chivalrous" justice system is a myth since most of the statements concerning chivalry and the criminality of women have been made with little if any empirical evidence to support them. Only descriptive and anecdotal data support the chivalry theory.²² For instance, Simon interviewed several judges and state attorneys to find out what kinds of women they dealt with the most in court and whether they were ever tempted to treat them more leniently than men. The officials said that the defendants were often black, lower-class, poorly educated and had several children. The women were most often charged with shoplifting, other thefts, drug use, and "crimes of passion" that involved killing a husband or "the other woman."²³ The state attorneys and judges emphasized that the women were usually accomplices in crimes committed with a companion, getting involved through a husband or boyfriend. So far this evidence is consistent with that given by other researchers. But as for chivalry, the officials confessed
that they do try to treat women more gently, and are more inclined to recommend probation rather than imprisonment. When they pass down a sentence it is usually for a shorter time than if the crime had been committed by a man. But, how does chivalrous behavior of officials operate at the current level? A somewhat more systematic assessment of the prevalence of chivalry has been comparing self-reported delinquency with actual police records. Self-report data is a fairly recent phenomenon in criminological research. Local samples are used and the subjects are most often institutionalized, and/or juveniles. Several have indicated that the ratio of male to female delinquent offenses is much smaller than offense ratios derived from official statistics. Still, the large differences between male and female offenses remain. Hindelang and others have shown, however, that despite these differences, the patterns of involvement are much more similar between the sexes for juvenile offenses than previously expected. Martin Gould's work in Flint, Michigan, revealed that running away, incorrigibility, and fornication, accounted for only 8 per cent of the delinquency reported by girls. Apparently if juvenile courts sampled juvenile delinquency randomly they would continue to find fewer delinquent girls than boys, but girls would be charged with roughly the same kinds of offenses. Yet, girls are usually apprehended for running away from home, incorrigibility, waywardness, truancy, sexual delinquency,
being in need of supervision, and ungovernability. Only one fifth of boys are arrested for such conduct, according to the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. Boys were primarily charged with larceny, burglary, car theft, or other adult offenses. The discrepancy between such official data and the self-report studies is curious. Further arrest and self-report comparisons were conducted by Monahan. He found that officers tend to release a larger proportion of girls apprehended for law violations than boys and that police were more likely to arrest a girl for a sexual offense. Chesney-Lind found that in Honolulu, 70 per cent of the girls and 31 per cent of the boys were charged with juvenile offenses, while 34 per cent of the girls and 22 per cent of the boys arrested for these offenses were referred to courts. This evidence suggests that chivalry is not dead; at least not for young female delinquents. Police appear to have a paternalistic mindset which says that girls should be treated chivalrously, and released unless they need protection (probably for preventing pregnancy). In a way, boys are suffering from reverse discrimination, if the self-report data is valid. But does this situation generalize for older women, who are the crux of the recent arguments over female deviance? Unfortunately, little evidence has been collected for this and one can only observe the populations of correctional institutions. If
chivalry is still practiced in the judicial system, then being female is no criterion. The nature of the majority of women who become incarcerated would only point to Klein’s claim that the system is racist, classist, if it is at all sexist. The argument that officials are not being as kind to women now that they are demanding equality in all spheres, thus, they are arresting more women for crimes and boosting the female arrest rate, does not hold water when one examines the women behind bars. Not only has the female prison population remained relatively stable, and the women inhabiting these institutions possess the socially dis-advantaged characteristics but the profiles on incarcerated women do not reveal that they are comprised of women with a strong feminist consciousness. A national study of women’s correctional programs investigated this aspect of female offenders. They found that most of the women were under thirty, 50 per cent were Black, and whites and Indians whose educational levels generally represented their state-wide medians, had received more schooling than the Black and Hispanic prisoners. Moreover, 60 per cent had been married at least once with 10 per cent actually living with their husbands prior to incarceration; seventy-three per cent had borne children though only 56 per cent had cared for them before going to jail. Many of the women believed women are just as "good" as men, but a surprising number believed that a man’s opinion as to whether
or not his wife should work should be a deciding factor in her decision to work. A big surprise was that whether or not a woman worked hard had no bearing on the type of crime she committed. Therefore, the link between increased participation in the labor force and women's rise in criminal activities is not supported by institutional information. Any chivalry or judicial prejudice that may occur between the scene of the arrest and the sentence to prison, therefore, is, and probably will continue to impede the formation of deductions of individual economic motives from the arrest statistics. Patterns of correlations are the only "hard" evidence one can cite; and the fact that they have been significant and have generated massive reconstructions of theories of female deviance makes them all the more worthwhile.
III. UNISEX THEORIES OF CRIME: WHERE ARE THEY AND WHY?

It is apparent that the single most significant factor which has shaped female crime is social role. In lieu of this fact, arguments over whether women are naturally more, less or equally moral than men become groundless. It is reasonable to assert that they are subject to differential treatment by the judicial system, or are hiding their criminality, but these are all speculations that are difficult to investigate. Using women's roles to explain their position in the socio-economic structure is a more direct, causal framework. This leads to treating social factors like poverty, unequal distribution of wealth and differential opportunity structures as aggravations to, or causes of personal maladjustment. In turn, delinquent behavior, per se, may be viewed as meaningful, rational behavior under certain conditions. Role theory also explains the different socialization processes women undergo, which is reflected in the type of offenses they commit and the nature of their participation. Their crimes seem to bring lesser returns and when performed in conjunction with someone else, their role is usually auxiliary to men. Much attention has been paid to factors involved in socialization and how these factors may contribute or restrain deviant behavior. Because
the elements of the process have differed for each sex, as well as the resulting crimes, the following opinion has frequently been put forth:

...female criminality is a separate and distinct order of criminal behavior in which cultural factors relating to sex roles in our society are of critical importance. Those who study the etiology of criminal behavior should be prepared to find that most of the current theories of crime causation are inappropriate when applied to female offenders.

Female criminality usually exists in a different setting, with a different tool or accomplice, if any, or a different sort of victim. These facts are well documented. Although the socialization processes encouraging occur under different conditions, with different conditioners, some of those processes may be of a similar nature for both sexes. It may be helpful to ask the question in reverse. Instead of asking how the processes leading to female criminality may differ from men's, thus, requiring different theories (which is not acknowledged as true anyway), one may ask is the proportion of women who do not ostensibly deviate greater than the proportion of men who do not turn to criminal conduct? Chances are any theories developed today for such an inquiry would be applied to either sex. But no theories have directly and specifically challenged this question to any extent in the past. Researchers agree more and more that similar motivational factors prompt men and women to commit a crime, though it may not be the same crime. Conversely, many people, regardless of sex,
do not pursue deviant actions or follow through on deviant impulses due to similar commitments to conventional norms and institutions, and similar internal prohibitions. Members of either sex may also find themselves in social positions which place conflicting demands on them such that the individual turns to an illegitimate way of solving the problems with which he/she is confronted. Men and women may also find themselves in positions which provide them with the option of using illegitimate means. This concept can clarify questions about varying crime rates not only among sex troup, but within the groups according to ethnicity, religion, age and other social divisions. Thus, the distribution of criminal behavior depends on the existence of internal prohibitions and on the feasibility and internal acceptance of employing illegitimate means, not on one's sex. Subculture theory, theories of differential association and differential opportunity use these variables in their explanations of crime. The creators of these theories have implied that these explanations are applicable to both sexes; but it has usually been with an enormous emphasis on the different nature of female criminality. Therefore, such theories have not been considered as applicable to women's deviant behavior as they are to men's. This attitude can easily lead one to assume that women's crimes are better explained by other concepts, and, and consequently, other theories. The implication is not only er-
raneous, but it is contradictory. (A theory is a set of con-
cepts.) As of today, someone has yet to resolve this contra-
diction enthusiastically and clearly. The following is a mere
reck at "arresting" this inconsistency.

First, a distinction in the type of deviant behavior one
may participate in needs to be made. This concerns the soc-
ialization process as it contributes to deviant behavior, ver-
sus the occurrence of nonconforming act which may appear
necessary or expedient to a person who under most circum-
stances is law-abiding. For instance, despite the incon-
testable utility and convenience of violating rules, many
people comply with them. Apparently more women do so than
men. On the other hand, a few people insist on carrying on
their affairs in certain disturbing ways despite rules to the
contrary. Men constitute a greater proportion of these
people than women. The sex differences here may be related
to a difference in deviant behaviors which Robert Merton has
termes aberrant and nonconforming behavior. The former
occurs primarily out of self-interest; rules are violated
but the violator does not dispute the need for such rules,
nor does he try to change them. He/she may be pursuing very
worthy interests (feeding his/her children, trying to attain
valued social goals, e.g. getting the money to buy a decent
home, keeping up with the Jones', or getting an education).
The nonconformist aims to change the norms he is denying even
if he/she sees their value. In contrast, Merton's "rebel," deviates because he/she thinks the rules are unjust. In the case where a group develops its own set of rules and norms to live by, and goals to attain, rejecting, but not challenging those of the established society or culture, individuals may retreat, or break off and form a subculture. The subculture may either keep to itself or disrupt the establishment for kicks; not necessarily with any attempt to change it.

This qualitative difference in deviant behavior helps to distinguish the difference in the nature of male and female criminality. The different aims of aberrant and nonconforming behavior lead to different styles of deviance. For instance, women rarely commit their offenses in the company of other females. Young girls do not tend to form gangs. Whatever little evidence exists on female gangs shows that they are usually dependent on, and began in relation to a boys' gang. Their membership has a greater turnover rate and they tend to disband if their brother gang disperses. The girls' roles in the gang are often that of observers of the thefts and assaults that the boys commit. Frequently, the presence of girls often prevents or postpones boys' delinquent activities.

Consequently, the different styles of male and female deviance, and their relation to criminology theories must be
seen in the context of the kind of behaviors the theories have described. Most of the interest in male deviance has been directed towards those who embrace deviance as a way of life, committing offenses over an extended period of time. Moreover, the subjects frequently commit these offenses in the company of, under the influence of, or to gain respect in the eyes of others. This involves analysis of the process of socialization, which permits one to attend to the mechanisms that can lead to a sustained, or even erratic development of deviant motives and interests. Many of the investigations into this area concentrate on how an individual avoids alliances with criminal contacts, ideas and opportunities; or conversely, how an individual avoids the impact of conventional society and commitments. The converse statement applies more to women. Indeed, their criminal contacts have been uncommon in the past when compared to men's; but if one can still hypothesize about their deviant behavior using their exposure to criminal frameworks as a variable, one is explaining their conduct with the same concept used for male deviance.

The statements of a few criminological theories will now be given, and then the phenomena which has been used to test them will be described. Although the concrete phenomenon may differ for the sexes, the concepts being used to describe their deviant behavior can be the same. Hence, the
same theories can, and should be used to explain their criminal activity. The time has come for "uni-sex" theories of crime and delinquency.

The concept of differential opportunity structures connects the theory of anomie, which recognizes differentials in access to legitimate means, and differentials in access to illegitimate means. It views the individual not simply in relation to one or the other system of means, but in relation to both the legitimate and illegitimate systems. Anomie theory focuses on the conflict between culturally prescribed goals and the social structure which bars many from access to legitimate means. It points to economic inequality, e.g. the economic inferiority of women, and the widespread teaching of competition for wealth. For example, the poverty of the lower classes often prevents them from using legitimate means such as education, to acquire valued goods, thereby providing no alternative but to engage in illegitimate activities. The point to be made is that in the past girls have been more closely scrutinized in their social activities than boys. They have been taught domestic values and skills and basically stayed closer to home and to their families. Their access to legitimate means, such as education has been greatly enhanced, yet their access to high prestige occupations has not. This situation prevents them from taking part in big business crimes as well as possibly increasing their motivations to commit their petty crimes, out of need or feelings
of relative deprivation. Perhaps this condition accounts in part for the fact that a higher general standard of living, better distribution of wealth in an economically developed country, the opening up of paths to higher education and economic opportunities, has little or no effect on reducing or constraining criminal activity.  

Edwin Sutherland's theory of differential association also focuses on socialization patterns and involvement with deviant values and activities. This theory asserts that criminal behavior is learned in "...contacts with criminal patterns. The contacts must be sufficiently greater than contacts with anti-criminal patterns. Whenever, and only if they are, do they bring about an excess of definitions favorable... to violation of law." Whenever the excess of definitions appears, crime follows. Sutherland has written:

... no other trait has as great statistical importance as does sex in differentiating criminals when researchers learn that criminal is male.... but it can be considered that maleness is not significant in the causation of crime itself, but only as it indicates social position, supervision, and other social relations.... boys and girls live in the same homes, in equal poverty and with equally ignorant parents, and have the same neighborhoods which are equally lacking in facilities for organized recreation. These conditions of the social environment cannot be considered as causes of delinquency. The significant difference is in the social positions of the girls and women as compared with the boys and men, and the difference in social positions either determines the frequency and intensity of the delinquency and anti-delinquency patterns which impinge upon them or determines the frequency of opportunities for crimes which are available to them. Prob-
bably the most important difference is that girls are supervised more carefully and behave in accordance with anti-criminal behavior patterns taught to them with greater care and consistency than in the case of boys.10

Essentially, Sutherland concludes that physical and physiological conditions are significant in crime causation only to the extent that they affect social interaction. His theory has been criticized for not being applicable to all types of crimes and offenders. It mainly explains juvenile delinquency and the process leading to crime as a career or way of life. For example, it has been argued that differential association is not a useful theory for understanding violators of financial trust, naive check forgers, white collar crimes, perpetrators of individual and personal crimes committed out of self-interest, adventitious and/or accidental crimes, to occasional or incidental and situational offenders, murderers, nonprofessional shoplifters and non-career type criminals and commiters of crimes of passion.11 A bell should ring at this point because the nature of several of these crimes has already been shown to be characteristic of the majority of females crimes. Moreover, the biggest areas of increase in female arrests are accountable by crimes possessing the above characteristics. These crimes are of an independent, utilitarian, sporadic nature, related to an aberrant behavior pattern. But to say that the concept of differential association does not encompass them in its
explanation is to use a narrow definition of the term criminal contacts, or conditions "favorable to" and "unfavorable to" the violation of the law. These contacts do not necessarily have to be other criminals or delinquents who may serve as role models for identification, or the reference groups to which one aspires. Exposure to a value that is not so virtuous under some circumstances is just as effective a contact as exposure to the neighborhood bullies. For example, a woman might be raised to value the lives of her children more than her reputation as a chaste woman, or even an honest employee. As a result, when the cupboard is bare, her conscience may be more pacified if she takes to soliciting for a few "tricks," or embezzling a few dollars at work, than if she lets her children go to bed hungry, or puts off buying them new coats for another year. On the other hand, her religious education in her formative years may have built tremendous internal prohibitions in her, forbidding her to participate in licentious behavior or violations of any of the Ten Commandments, regardless of the type of motivations for deviant behavior.

In essence, one may distinguish contacts with criminal persons and contacts with criminal ideas; or, to put it another way, contacts with non- or anti- criminal persons and non- or anti- criminal ideas. Traditionally, women have experienced more of the latter than the former. Therefore,
Sutherland's theory explains the way women engage in deviant behavior. One's earlier associations do indeed affect the kinds of associations or behavior one prefers later. As the socialization of women today exposes them to more experiences, people and ideas away from the domestic conventional sphere, the mode of decision making involving the commission of a criminal act may be changing. Concomittant with changing roles, we have seen how their opportunities to commit more public crimes have increased. Likewise, it can be hypothesized that women's receptivity to unconventional or nonconforming ideas and people is increasing, too, as their new roles foster greater exposure to such contacts; and perhaps detract from exposure to conforming values and commitments.

A couple of not-so-recent studies have unintentionally provided evidence for the application of Sutherland's theory to girls. A study by Raymond Sletto\(^{12}\) showed the significance of sibling position in delinquency. He found that delinquency ratios were higher for girls whose siblings were all brothers than for girls whose siblings were all sisters. Boys with only sisters did not display lower delinquency. Sletto concluded that nonconformity to cultural standards may be more frequent among children who play certain roles in intra-family interaction, depending on seniority position and the sex distribution of the siblings. Since boys are
typically in dominant positions, their acquisition of expected masculine traits will be less influenced by sisters. Girls, however, with brothers, may place greater value on their dominant brothers' opinions and subsequently absorb traits which are in the behavior pattern traditionally characteristic of boys; i.e. actions which are more aggressive, independent, disrespectful, etc. In sum, the siblings, serve as contacts which can affect the degree to which a boy or girl learn or value delinquent conduct.¹³

Ruth Morris explored a theory to explain the relationship between sex role and delinquency.¹⁴ Her theory postulates that the greater rate of delinquency among boys is due to differences between the sexes in role objectives. For example, she asserted that boys steal or destroy property because they are mainly concerned with the status-type goals of power, prestige, and wealth. Girls are taught to be concerned with "relational" goals which accounts for their delinquency in illicit sexual relationships. Of course, the double standard of morality exists in this study, too. Nevertheless, brothers and sisters can come from the same home, neighborhood and similar social and psychological environments, yet their sex role, Morris claims, define their success goals which are culturally valued for them. They are exposed to different ideas of how they should behave. Legitimate means are more accessible for females than males for reaching
their respective culturally defined goals. Illegitimate means of reaching their culturally defined goals are more readily available to bys. This point can account for the different quantity of delinquencies between the sexes, as we have already seen; and this accessibility to means is related to differential exposure to criminal contacts and ideas.

Nye explored the different controls exercised over girls by their parents. Specifically, he observed families where mothers were employed. The families were different sizes, residential locations, socio-economic status, educational level of the mother and sex of the adolescent. His findings showed that in families where mothers were employed there was a greater frequency of delinquent behavior among the children. Further analyses revealed more significant relationships for this variable for girls than for boys. Nye attributed the greater delinquency of children with working mothers to "an obvious and probably inevitable loss of supervision" over the children; a loss of control anticipating more frequent delinquent behavior. Girls have usually been subject to more restrictive discipline by parents which limits the peer group activities of girls (and hence, their "contacts") more than they do boys. Girls have also relied on the family, especially their mothers, more than boys, for internalizing standards and learning models for behavior. Granted, some of the control by extra-familial institutions such as the church, school, law-enforcement agencies, and peer
groups, affect both sexes. Yet, the proportions of control exercised by the family is greater for girls than for boys, and the role of the parents, therefore, has been more significant for girls. Employment of mothers may cause girls to aspire and identify with new role models, goals, values, and consequently change their patterns of contacts. Thus, it can be hypothesized that as women enter the labor force in greater numbers, their daughters' crime rate may increase as well as their own.

Before concluding this section on the relevance of applying theories of crime and delinquency to both sexes, one more area of criminology theory will be evaluated for its pertinence to female deviance. This is the area of "delinquent subcultures." Cloward and Ohlin applied this concept to studying delinquent gangs which "are typically found among adolescent males in lower-class areas of large urban centers." They basically examined three types of these subcultures: (1) criminal subcultures in which members devote their activities to extortion, theft and other illegal ways of obtaining income; (2) conflict subcultures, which employ violence as a way of winning status; and (3) retreatist subcultures, which stress the consumption of drugs. But it has already been shown that this sort of "group" delinquency does not apply to most of female deviant behavior. Another major researcher in this area is Albert K. Cohen,
author of *Delinquent Boys*. He devotes a few pages in the book to sex differences in delinquent behavior, noting that such behaviors are usually considered male territory. Although his discussion of why this is the case is quite paternalistic and condescending (he writes, "It is no accident that 'boys collect stamps, girls collect boys.'"), his explanation is valid. Basically, he has tried to argue that one reason for the lower female crime rate is that women may have their own brand of subculture which approves or disapproves of conduct in ways that are fundamentally different from their male counterparts. Their ideals, values, goals and solutions to their perceived problems are entirely their own. Thus, "...the kind of delinquent subculture is not appropriate to the problems of adjustment and the social expectations of the female role."  

Cohen also stresses that sexual delinquency is the most common for girls, constituting "...one type of meaningful response to the most characteristic, most central and most ego-involved problems of the female role: the establishment of satisfactory relationships with the opposite sex." Although this is a narrow view of causes and manifestations of female delinquency, which should come as no surprise, it still employs the concept of a subculture, and all the elements it entails: beliefs, values, codes, tastes, knowledge, prejudices, and goals, to explain the existence,
or more appropriate, the lack of existence of female delinquency. Girls and women may not congregate in "gangs" but they may frequent and share their ideas in different settings: the home, secretaries' lounge, church groups, or National Organization of Women's meetings. These different contexts might promote acquisition of certain patterns of deviant or non-deviant attitudes and behavior. Certainly, as women's roles change in society, the nature of their "subcultures" will change. If particular values and conduct generated by this change is of a traditionally conforming nature, their deviant behavior may expand in quality and quantity. This type of explanation is quite plausible in this day and age.

Now that it has been demonstrated that the same factors, concepts and theories are applicable to both male and female deviance, at least in the case of American culture, one may wonder how far this conclusion can be generalized. Since the ultimate aim of criminology theories has been to be useful in any culture at any time, i.e. be universal, these sets of concepts should be suitable for explaining female criminality anywhere and anytime, or at least come as close to this ideal as possible. What has been the status of female criminality in some other cultures, and how do they compare with the American situation? The next chapter will examine this issue in a few other nations for which data has been made available, and show how the arguments and concepts constructed so far fit the features of female criminality cross-culturally.
Since the controversy over female criminality emerged in the United States a few years ago, the attention has focused primarily on the relationship between women's social positions in this country and the female offense rate. Earlier researchers such as Bonger, Pollak, and Sutherland, noted this connection in other nations as well. This issue was raised at the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in 1976. It was noted that among the more significant changes in the dimensions and forms of criminality have been recent changes in female criminality in various countries.¹

... available evidence indicated that in a number of nonsocialist developed countries the female crime rate had increased much faster than the male crime rate during the past decade, and changed police practices alone could not account for this. However, the opposite phenomenon had occurred in other countries under similar conditions. There seemed to be agreement that participation of women in the development of their countries was not a crimogenic factor. In some countries, on the other hand, and increase in female crime rates could perhaps be attributed to lack of opportunities to participate fully in socio-economic life.²

This evidence prompted the Congress to consider it necessary to perform studies examining the interrelations of the degrees to which women are integrated into the economic life in various nations and the extent of female criminality in these nations. But the mention of "the opposite
phenomenon" occurring "under similar conditions" suggests that other factors besides socio-economic ones may be at work in nations where the proportion of women active in the work force are at similar levels. For this reason, the nature of the cross-cultural examination in this chapter will focus primarily on countries at similar levels of economic development. By controlling for this factor one may gain more insight into the impact that cultural and traditional attitudes towards, and expectations for women has on their criminal behavior. This focus also eliminates some of the problems which arise in comparing countries at different stages of technical and political development. Differences in the economic and legal stability of countries create problems associated with heightened expectations of citizens, and inadequate physical, organizational and financial resources in different degrees. Changes in values and many social institutions occur simultaneously with these developments. For instance, increases in urbanization are related to decreases in the role of the family as a major socializing agent, while other institutions replace this function. Changes in values involve less acceptance of inferior status and the lower degrees of power and prestige associated with it. Inadequate economic bases for employment and rising standards of living can incite definite patterns of deviance. In general, property crimes, and not crimes against the person,
are more directly related to economic development. Crimes which can be expected to increase with modernization include theft, armed robbery, auto theft, corruption in business and government, vandalism, check forgery, embezzlement, and the theft and misuse of credit cards. On the other hand, one can expect a decrease in homicide rates, the use of children in crime and illegal beggary, cattle thefts, village disputes, and looting over food shortages. Since prostitution in less developed countries and cities is related to a sexual imbalance in the cities, limited employment opportunities for women and their low status, it tends to decrease as a nation industrializes and provides more employment opportunities for women. Evidence in the United States supports this claim.

Another problem which must be considered when comparing crime rates of countries at different stages of development is the reliability of the crime statistics. They may reflect changes in law enforcement, definitions of crime categories, or methods of recording. These are in turn affected by public concern about certain types of criminality. Thus, one can question whether the characteristics of the offenders are really representative of those actually committing the crimes. Any margin of unreported crime raises the possibility that even small changes in the way crimes reported by the public to police or classified and recorded
by police could have significant effects on the trends of reported crime. Consequently, the data of countries experiencing rapid developmental changes can be less reliable in terms of comparability over time.

For purposes of studying women's criminality, differences in economic development are generally associated with differences in status of women. Viewed in an evolutionary framework, the more advanced the country, in terms of technical and economic criteria, the greater the participation of women in the public sphere. This is measured in terms of political power and labor force participation, which includes paid jobs; not unpaid farm labor and housekeeping, since these are activities conducted in a more or less "private" sphere. Urbanization tends not only to draw women out of the home, but to increase their educational opportunities. Essentially, the more modern the nation is, the more financial obligations women will have. An increase in material aspirations may also be expected. Therefore, women's crimes in more highly developed countries can be expected to be the same as those previously mentioned for industrialized regions. Their property crimes should tend to increase, while their violent crimes, and prostitution activities should tend to decrease. It has already been shown how women's offenses follow this pattern in the United States, although their crimes are still not as numerous or as serious as men's.
But their social status is neither comparable to men's in terms of their occupational status and attitudes held towards themselves and society at large. Evidence collected for other industrialized, western nations shows that the percentage of women involved in crime is generally higher for these countries than the less economically developed nations in Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean. Moreover, the types of offenses women commit in these countries are consistent with the hypothesis that as they enter the labor force, their crime rates for larceny/theft and fraud/embezzlement increase also.

In her first attempt to support this hypothesis, Simon examined arrest rates, using data from the International Police Organization, for about twenty-five countries from the early part of the 1960's to 1970. She investigated which societies women committed a greater proportion of violent crimes, towards property and people, and in which societies women were committing less serious property and white collar-type crimes. Among her conclusions were the following (1) There is little relationship (as measured by female arrest rates for all crimes combined or for specific offense categories) of female crime and the level of economic development; (2) no increase in female arrest rates occurred between 1963 and 1970; (3) countries with high female arrest rates for any type of financial crime had high rates for other
types of white-collar crimes; (4) countries with highest female arrest rates for fraud and minor larceny were primarily countries where a large proportion of the women were employed outside the home in commercial occupations; and (5) no relationship exists between countries with high female arrest rates for violent offenses and those that had high female arrest rates for property or financial offenses.4 A few years later, she still claimed that no consistent pattern in overall crime rates or for most of the specific crime categories could be determined, except for acts of larceny, which showed an upward trend in the more industrialized and commercial countries.5 Certainly, her findings, albeit the inconsistencies, still support her hypothesis. But her inconsistent findings regarding the relationship between violent crimes and property offenses is suspicious considering the previous deductions made about women's statuses and degrees of modernization. There are several factors which could interfere with her work. They are the inevitable difficulties inherent in any cross-cultural examination of crime. Bowker studied thirty countries, using Interpol data and found some consistent patterns. The countries he chose had to have reported sex-specific crime rates for at least two years, that were a minimum of a decade apart. He also selected three definite categories for analysis; murder, excluding manslaughter and abortion, including infanticide
and attempted murder, major larceny (robbery burglary, etc.), and total criminal offenses. Murder represented his violent crime variable, major larceny his index for "professional" commitment to a criminal career, and one which includes offenses in which the use of violence is instrumental in masculine stereotype sex-role terms, instead of expressive as in female stereotypic terms. Total crime constituted his category for analysis as the best measure of female property crime available from the data. Bowker cross-tabulated proportionate female crime for the countries with three independent variables; degree of male-female economic equality, degree of male-female social/educational equality, and state of national and socioeconomic development. The first two variables can be considered measures of the status of women in their respective societies. This also indicates the location of their role behaviors and expectations on a continuum from domestic to public/occupational.

Bowker found that murder was inversely related to socioeconomic development and social/educational equality index, and directly related to the economic equality index. This finding may be a better explanation for the inconsistent patterns Simon observed. Within modernized cultures, the degree of social/educational equality may be low while that of cross-sex economic equality may be high. The opposite situation also exists in many societies, including the United
States. Consequently, modernization can benefit both men and women in the economic sphere, and narrow the social and educational gaps between the sexes; but because the former is more profitable for men than women, the differential between the sexes can increase rather than decrease. Hence, one would expect an increase in property crime for women in societies similar to the United States. However, Bowker's information did not lead him to this conclusion.

The proportion for female major larceny was not related to his three independent variables; but he blames this on insufficient data. The finding may also be attributable to the fact that women generally participate more in minor larceny than major larceny. His last finding may compensate for this discrepancy. State of economic development was strongly associated with total proportionate female crime.

In sum, it appears difficult to make any strong conclusions about female crime rates cross-culturally. Aside from the enormous methodological problems, the plurality of political and cultural groups which exist in many highly developed nations provide additional variable to consider. For instance, intra-group conflict can be a source of crime. Moreover subgroups have standards, expectations, and socialization practices of their own. Therefore, choosing relatively homogeneous units for study allows one to control for more variables. Since this paper has concentrated on the cultural
and societal influences on women's roles, and how these affect their criminal behavior, these variables rather than exclusively economic ones, will be presented now in relatively economic homogeneous contexts. The remaining discussion will, therefore, compare the patterns and trends of female criminal behavior in England-Wales and Japan with those in the United States. A final note will be made on some research done by Safilios-Rothschild in Greece concerning socio-cultural changes which have occurred in Greece, and how they have affected the commission of "honor crimes."

In general, the situation for women in Great Britain is similar to that in the United States. There has been no significant increase in the proportion of women committing violent offenses. The number of females committing property offenses, has steadily increased each year; however not drastic explosion of thefts or fraud are discernable from the statistics. Britain is indeed comparable to the United States in terms of urbanization and industry, but this evidence points to the fact that one needs to look further than economic development to explain women's crimes. The question to ask, then, is what is the social status of women in Great Britain today, and has it changed in recent years? What opportunities, educational and occupational, do they have, and what are the attitudes of others, and themselves, towards women?
Educational levels for British women are somewhat lower than those for British men. Ministry policy suggests that fewer provisions be made for teaching science in girls' and mixed schools than in boys' schools. Seventy-two per cent of the university students are male, and British medical schools restrict female enrollment to about 15 per cent. About half of the state schools and all private schools are sex segregated, and subject matter in all schools usually reinforces traditional sex role training. At the minimum school leaving age of sixteen, more girls than boys leave school and enter the labor force. In fact, a study by the Labour party made the following charge.

The conditioning of girls to accept low academic achievement and to settle for domesticity as a "career" appears to have been effective. This conditioning is often reinforced by the ignorance of girls, their parents, and their teachers of the career opportunities that are in fact open to them... Girls are also discouraged from their studies because of prejudice against their capability. As a result their own ambitions are often geared to marriage without much thought for anything beyond.

As in the United States, inflation and economic necessity have compelled many British women to work. But their economic status is also not equal to men's. Twenty per cent of the heads of households are women. However, their average paycheck, even when number of hours is taken into account, is about half of the men's. Their occupations require less training, skill and responsibility, and carry
less prestige.

On the political scene, British women are active voters and interested in political issues, but they play a minor role in elected positions. Nor does the government seem to be actively concerned with sex discrimination in women's careers and social development. However, in a way this lack of interest reflects the attitudes of the population at large, including women. Surveys have indicated that the majority of British women do not feel that they are receiving a raw deal. Tradition and custom appear to affect the social system and government. The cultural support needed in order for women to achieve equality does not exist in Great Britain, and a large part of this may be attributable to the fact that the women do not feel that they are particularly disadvantaged. Hence, any groups which make up the women's liberation movement are not well organized, nor especially interested in achieving political change.

The gist of this discussion is that Great Britain appears to be comparable to the United States in terms of economic development, and as our mother country, is culturally compatible in many ways. However, British women are not experiencing the rapid role transformations that American women have been subject to in the past fifteen years. One may, therefore, hypothesize that they feel less relatively deprived, and do not usually aspire to goals beyond their
acceptable means. Since such aspirations have been seen to correspond with notable increases in crime rates, one may use this explanation to understand their uneventful pattern of crime in recent history. They do not appear to become frustrated with their domestic duties, so their unimpressive change in violence (since they usually involve relations) is comprehensible. They also do not seem to feel cheated out of material goods, nor have any new financial responsibilities. (Most of the women working are married.)

English women have not experienced any sharp changes in their status, and the evidence shows their crime rates correspond as similarly unchanged.

In Japan, the crime rates for both men and women since World War II, have provided curious observations for Western criminologists and social control experts. The reason is that despite the rapid industrialization which has occurred, the crime rates have dramatically declined, while the opposite has occurred in the West. Any rise in the female crime rate must be measured against a falling male crime rate. The effect has been to cause a rise in the ratio of female to male offenders from 7.6 in 1947, to 13.6 in 1972. In 1978, the figure stood at nineteen. Calculating for the rate of female offenders per 1,000 female population, the rate rose from 1.3 in 1946, to 1.9 in the early fifties, fell to 0.9 by the end of the decade, rose
again to 1.6 by 1969, fell again to 1.1 by 1972, and is now again on the upturn, reaching 1.5 in 1978. The pattern of female crime has not changed much since the country industrialized and opened up many education and occupational fields for women. In fact, it is comparable to the pattern which existed before the war. Murder, theft, infanticide, arson, participation in suicide, and negligence causing death or injury, constitute their areas of highest concentration. Both men's and women's property crimes have been increasing; thefts constitute the majority of non-traffic Penal Code offenses in Japan. But as far as white collar offenses like fraud/embezzlement and forgery and counterfeiting are concerned, there has been no large increase in the arrest rate for women; actually there is some evidence of a slight downward trend.  

The general rate for violent offenses has not displayed any notable changes either. However, there has been an indication that infanticide is on the increase. One explanation has been that since Japanese women have more freedom, participate in the labor force, and are marrying later, a newly born child can be embarrassing or interfere with a women's lifestyle. Considering the changes which have taken place in the status and role activities for Japanese women, this proposal is plausible. The role of housewife has not declined in importance for urban women, but the value of
Japanese women in the labor force has increased. Consequently, living up to ideal expectations of both roles might be very taxing for Japanese women. The majority of women employees are married, and one out of four housewives has a job. But social conditions in Japan have not developed to where women can work and care for their families simultaneously. Since 1947, Japanese women have been granted equal opportunity in education, but the majority of graduates at all levels of higher education follow typical "female" careers in service jobs, as teachers, clerical workers or medical technicians. The employment patterns of women have not diverged much from before the war, in spite if advances in their legal and educational status. One-third of all employed women are office workers and 28 per cent are factory workers. Fourteen percent of working women are service industry workers, of which they constitute 50 per cent of all employees, and where the difference in wages between men and women is the greatest. Aside form the absolute numerical increases of working women, and a rise in the employment rate of mature and married women, the patterns of employment for Japanese women have changed very little. This situation is no different than that of American women. They both occupy lower paying and lower status jobs, and discrimination in employment is a problem. The majority of Japanese women still do not go beyond high school. Most
of their access to political influence is through loosely organized organizations; their representation in the government remains small. Furthermore, their interests have primarily concerned fighting unfair employment policies, such as forced retirement at marriage and childbirth. Thus, the majority of Japanese women, married or single, still hold the role of wife and mother as traditionally sound. More women are contributing to the nation's economic growth, pursuing the dual role pattern, than ever before. They are exercising their new legal rights to transmit property, vote and hold office, and to divorce. However, much of the traditional attitudes regarding femininity have resisted change, and women have been slow to incorporate their new financial independence into individual value structures. This acceptance of their subordinate status is perhaps why their extra role obligations has not greatly affected their deviant behavior. It is worth mentioning, though, that the suicide rates for Japanese women are among the highest for women in the world, which may only emphasize their passive, perhaps self-blaming perceptions of their dilemmas. Then again, it is not safe to impute such individual, psychological motives from the statistics. The item worth noting is that despite legal and economic advances which Japanese women have enjoyed since the war, their overall crime rate has not jumped in a manner that would persuade the public to
fear that women are becoming more evil.

A number of cultural factors can be cited for possibly preventing criminality for both men and women in Japan. First, racial and ethnic minority tension and discrimination is not a problem in a country predominantly composed of one race. Secondly, the rising educational and economic levels have provided much security for citizens. Finally, social control, informally through the family and formally through religion, school and community, have traditionally been highly valued and effective in Japan. The importance of such socialization processes needs no further emphasis.

Before leaving the issue of the impact of culture and roles on women's crime rates, it is worth looking at a special crime in one more country. This is the phenomenon of the "honor crime" which has long been a part of the Greek culture, and is slowly deteriorating as the traditional values are affected by modernization.

Love of honor, or philotimo, is a prevalent value in traditional Mediterranean cultures. It is connected with the concept of shame, which is a concern for reputation, both as sentiments and as public recognition of that sentiment. Shame is, therefore, one's sensitivity to the pressure of public opinion, and is honorable to possess. However, the honor of a man and of a woman imply different modes of conduct. A woman is dishonored if her sexual purity is contam-
inated, or if she behaves like a man; an implication of sexual freedom. A man's honor depends on acting in the appropriate masculine manner, and on the maintenance of the honor of his wife or any female relatives.

Traditional values prescribe different actions for restoring honor for each sex. It is usually the case that men in the family are responsible for restoring the family honor, for which killing has been acceptable and socially expected behavior. For example, killing a man who has intercourse with one's wife, or daughter after promising marriage and backing out, would make a murder condonable. However, since World War II, social changes have occurred in Greece which have weakened the strength of traditional morals and family values, as well as the justification of honor crimes. Although Greece is primarily an agricultural state, it has gradually urbanized and has come to include an educated, urban, middle class. These changes have brought with them Western norms and morals, creating a clear division between the educated, urban classes, and the rural and urban working classes who remain traditionally oriented. The effect on the value of honor has been threatening since such moral changes entail greater sexual freedom and opportunity choices for women. The defense of committing an honor crime, a crime which the offender claims his motive to be an insult or molestation of his personal or family
honor\textsuperscript{14} has thus declined in acceptable validity. Several observations indicate this trend. First, young men are less likely to commit these crimes than older men, and the majority of men held unskilled occupations or were unemployed. Rural offenses involve more family wide collaborations and are always committed by men, perhaps with some women as accomplices. Dishonored rural women either take no action and are then killed by their father, brother or other male, or they commit suicide.\textsuperscript{15} Urban women, on the other hand, will undertake violent acts in defense of their honor if they choose to maintain their purity. If they choose freedom, which is happening more and more with the educated, middle class women, there is no problem. In sum, the closer one adheres to the traditional Greek values, the greater the probability he or she may commit an honor crime if dishonoring events are forced upon him/her. The less one adheres to these values, the less probable it is that he/she will commit an honor crime even in the presence of these events. One may take these findings one step further and suggest that one has a greater chance of becoming the victim of an honor crime if he/she has dishonored a traditional man or woman.

As far as changes in the laws are concerned, offenders still have a reasonable chance of avoiding a sentence if they can have a reasonable chance of avoiding a sentence
if they can prove that their motive was indeed honorable. Nevertheless, one may predict that as more women choose independence, and view marriage as an alternative, the status of the honor crime will decline. There is already a trend to judge women by their educational achievements and general personality, and less on their dowry; which has been a major determinant of women's basically weak positions in Greece. But the impact that the Greek value of honor has had on the pattern of homicide is undeniable. In all fairness, we can only now begin to call this behavior a crime due to its widespread acceptability and endorsement in the Greek culture. If deviance is relative, this is a superb example.
EPILOGUE

One of the consequences of social change is that social consensus on certain rules thins out. Since deviance depends as much on the existence of a rule as on the occurrence of an act, it may be created or destroyed by changes in rules or norms. Perhaps more than those for anyone else, the social rules for women have shifted drastically. Their new role behaviors and expectations have broadened the scope of legitimate and approved behaviors as well as illegitimate and disapproved behaviors in which they may participate. Nevertheless, they have a long way to go in both areas before they can claim to be "equal" to men.

Feminist writers blame both women's small participation in crime as well as any increases which occur, on the oppression of women by men. But if equality in the public sphere connotes more activity in the criminal world, is the goal worth fighting for? Does society need twice as many criminals and juvenile delinquents making life miserable for the rest of the people who are content, or have no pressing need to break the law? Certainly not. On the contrary, men should start looking at women and observing the content and quality of their roles. We need to be positive and take those aspects of women's lives which have allowed them to be less
criminal, or prevented them from turning to such behavior. This perspective can enable us to begin including men in many of the socialization procedures which have been applied to women in the past. Indeed, this is a step toward androgynous roles; but it means producing honest, happy human beings, and a more equal and democratic way of life for both sexes, so who can declare it unjust or wrong?

The consequences of this would be to remove the relative character of deviance for the sexes, in terms of law and illegitimate and legitimate opportunities. This ideal seems so distant now given the present status of women in the social and criminal world, but it tries to guarantee the prevention of an Alice Capone, or the resurrection of her brother.
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