

CRIME IS NOT JUST A MAN'S WORLD:
PERCEPTIONS OF FEMALE OFFENDERS THROUGH A FEMINIST LENS

by

Marianne Hudson

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Criminal Justice
Boise State University

May 2010

© 2010

Marianne Hudson

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE COLLEGE

DEFENSE COMMITTEE AND FINAL READING APPROVALS

of the thesis submitted by

Marianne Hudson

Thesis Title: Crime is Not Just a Man's World: Perceptions of Female Offenders
Through a Feminist Lens

Date of Final Oral Examination: 07 April 2010

The following individuals read and discussed the thesis submitted by student Marianne Hudson, and they also evaluated her presentation and response to questions during the final oral examination. They found that the student passed the final oral examination, and that the thesis was satisfactory for a master's degree and ready for any final modifications that they explicitly required.

Lisa Growette Bostaph, Ph.D. Chair, Supervisory Committee

Mary K. Stohr, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

Virginia Husting, Ph.D. Member, Supervisory Committee

The final reading approval of the thesis was granted by Lisa Growette Bostaph, Ph.D., Chair of the Supervisory Committee. The thesis was approved for the Graduate College by John R. Pelton, Ph.D., Dean of the Graduate College.

DEDICATION

To My Daughter, Sofia Marie Hudson for always loving her mother unconditionally.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with sincere gratefulness that I acknowledge the following people. I could not have accomplished this very important goal without their support, guidance, and encouragement.

To my wonderful committee members:

My chair, Dr. Lisa Growette Bostaph, for introducing me to feminist theories from a criminological standpoint and putting up with my procrastination, yet knowing when to put her foot down. Also for all of the time she spent with me on this thesis. Also for her help and guidance in other areas of my life and for the many opportunities she has granted to me.

Dr. Mary Stohr for her expertise in criminal justice and corrections, but most especially, for being my mentor and a “second mother” to me throughout the years.

Dr. Virginia Husting for her expertise in feminism from a sociological standpoint.

To my friends, colleagues, and family:

Dr. Andrew Giacomazzi for his unwavering faith and belief in my abilities as they unfolded and for the many opportunities he has given to me and still gives to this day.

My parents, R. Dennis and Mary Helen Hudson, for believing in and supporting me throughout my lifetime.

Dr. Bob Marsh for always supporting me and helping to provide me with opportunities and assistance when needed.

Dr. Tony Walsh for his consistent questioning of the validity of my thesis topic.

Dr. Craig Hemmens for unwittingly being the deciding factor for me choosing to go into criminal justice even before I started undergraduate studies.

My siblings for always being there when I needed them and for being wonderful role models.

The Grad Lab for being my second home for the majority of my master's career.

Jonathan Bolen for all of the intellectual discussions he had with me over the years, his input into my topic, and his help with statistics.

Nikki Gerhard for being a wonderful friend and for all of the all-nighters she endured with me in the Grad Lab.

All of the numerous other graduate students who started and finished their masters since I have been here, for their comments and jokes regarding my thesis topic, and my time at Boise State.

To the rest of the Professors and the Administrative staff in the Department for always being there when I had questions or needed someone with whom to chat.

Paul Venable for finding me late in life and unquestioningly supporting everything I do and love.

ABSTRACT

Using the scale on feminist views developed by Henley et al. (1998), this study adapted and created two survey instruments to measure views on feminism and female offenders: 1) the Societal Perspectives Scale, which measures a respondent's views of feminism; and 2) the Female Offender Perspectives Scale, which measures a respondent's views of female offenders. Using these survey instruments and convenience sampling, the current study examined college students' perceptions of feminism and female offenders. This study sought to investigate the following hypotheses: 1) the reliability of the survey instruments, especially the Female Offender Perspectives Scale; and 2) the predictive value of general feminist views on perceptions of female offenders. Using Cronbach's alpha, support was found for the first hypothesis indicating high overall reliability for the Female Offenders Perspectives Scale. Analysis of the multivariate OLS regression affirmed the second hypothesis and determined that the societal scale proved to be predictive of the female offender scale. These findings can provide a better understanding of female offenders and assist policy makers and professionals in creating new laws and making decisions that would affect female offenders in the system.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
LIST OF TABLES	x
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Feminism.....	5
Feminist Eras in the United States	7
Types of Feminism	8
Perceptions of Feminism.....	12
Female Offenders.....	15
Individual Characteristics	15
Situational Characteristics	16
Feminism and Criminology	21
Perception of Female Offenders	23
Perception of Feminism and Female Offenders.....	25
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS	28
Hypotheses	28
Data and Design.....	28
Sampling	29
Procedure	32
Instruments.....	34
Female Offender Perspectives Scale.....	34
Societal Perspectives Scale	34
Demographic and Control Variables	36
Demographic Variables	37
RESULTS	43
Femscores	43

Cronbach’s Alpha	43
Henley et al. (1998).....	44
Current Study	44
Correlations.....	46
Feminist Subscale Correlation Matrix	46
Demographic Variables Correlation Matrix	47
Validity	48
Multicollinearity	48
Multivariate OLS Regression	50
DISCUSSION.....	51
Hypotheses	52
Hypothesis #1.....	53
Hypothesis #2.....	54
Limitations and Future Research	55
Limitations	55
Future Research	57
CONCLUSIONS.....	59
REFERENCES	61
APPENDIX A.....	66
Major Findings of Previous Research	
APPENDIX B	72
Surveyed Classes, Times, and Locations	
APPENDIX C	74
Sample Survey Data Collection Form	
APPENDIX D.....	81
Data Analysis Tables	

LIST OF TABLES

Table D-1(a).	Societal Perspectives Scale Statements.....	82
Table D-1(b).	Female Offender Perspectives Scale Statements	82
Table D-2.	Demographic and Control Variables	83
Table D-2.	Demographic and Control Variables (cont.).....	84
Table D-3(a).	Cronbach's alpha-Societal Perspectives Scale.....	85
Table D-3(b).	Cronbach's alpha-Female Offender Perspectives Scale	85
Table D-4(a).	Feminist Subscale Correlation Matrix	86
Table D-4(b).	Demographic Correlation Matrix.....	87
Table D-4(b).	Demographic Correlation Matrix (cont.).....	88
Table D-5.	Multivariate OLS Regression	89

INTRODUCTION

The creation of ideas such as Sutherland's differential association theory (Sutherland, 1939) and the work of countless others have enabled social science researchers, practitioners, professors, and, more importantly, students specifically in the field of criminal justice to better understand and shape their views of offenders and why they commit crimes (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1998; Crump, 1987; Heidensohn, 1995; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). It has been argued by researchers that while most mainstream criminological theories largely have been male dominated, some of them may be explored as being gender neutral, such as Merton's anomie theory or Cohen's subcultural theory (Cohen, 1955; Crump, 1987; Merton, 1938; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). Other researchers argue that mainstream theories are inadequately explaining crime when it comes to women in the system (Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Flavin, 2001; Heidensohn, 1995; Simpson, 1989).

With regard to female offenders in the criminal justice system, there has been scant research done (Britton, 2000; Crump, 1987; Nagel & Johnson, 1994; Naffine, 1995; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). Female offenders have been described as invisible; based in part on their minimal numbers within the system (Britton, 2000; Heidensohn, 1995; Nagel & Johnson, 1994; Naffine, 1995; Pollock, Mullings, & Crouch, 2006; Simpson, 1989). It has also been argued in the past that it is not the lack of research done on female offenders, but the lack of quality in the research that has been done (Smart, 1977). When female offenders have been examined, most of the research has

focused on the sex specific reasons for their crimes, such as committing prostitution or embezzlement to feed their families or support drug habits (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Snider, 2003). The research that has been done has highlighted issues and characteristics that cannot or would not be generalized to include male offenders (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Snider, 2003).

Mainstream gender-neutral theories provide explanations as to why offenders in general commit crimes, so they tend to shape how people view offenders (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1998; Crump, 1987; Heidensohn, 1995). While feminist theories have not entered the mainstream of criminology, feminist ideals have found their place in society as the roles of women have changed. Feminist theory has created controversy, especially in the area of criminal justice, and it has yet to be fully accepted by a majority of researchers as a legitimate theory explaining female offending (Flavin, 2001). There are many basic views of feminism and each is specifically tailored to a certain view of where women are in society and how they got there (Heidensohn, 1995; Henley, Meng, O'Brien, McCarthy, & Sockloskie, 1998). While each of the mainstream criminological theories provides an explanation of offending in general, feminist criminological theories address their explanations specifically to female offending (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1998). Since feminist theories are relatively new and are not part of mainstream theories, how does a person's, namely a college students', potential view of feminism correlate with his or her views of female offenders, specifically? In the past, there has been some research conducted on the different views of feminism and on female offenders in general, but there is little research that correlates the two, especially

when examining the perceptions of college students (Henley et al., 1998; Murphy & Brown, 2000; Snelling, 1999).

This research involved the surveying of undergraduate college students enrolled in traditional criminal justice classes in a metropolitan university. They were asked to respond to a series of statements regarding how they viewed women in society and female offenders based on four feminist theories and one non-feminist theory. The four feminist theories addressed, as defined by Henley et al. (1998), were liberal, radical, socialist, and women of color/womanism. In addition, there was the option of a non-feminist viewpoint, conservatism. It was proposed that student responses to the statements about women in society would correlate to their views of female offenders. Control variables and demographic information was also assessed for each respondent.

Since prior research on female offending and feminist theories has raised many issues specific to women, any correlation found between beliefs in feminism and female offenders is important as it could assist in laying the groundwork for future research to better understand the female offender in a more gender specific way. This research has the potential to expose the need for scholars to address gendered explanations for female offending. In turn, this may enable criminal justice students and scholars to gain a better insight about the world of the female offender. This research could also lead politicians to understand and create more prudent laws that deal with women in the criminal justice system. More importantly, this research could put into perspective the gender gap, or the noticeably lower levels at which women commit crime than men (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996).

This research explored the literature that exists regarding feminism, including its history. It examined the four different types of feminist theories and one non-feminist theory, as defined by Henley et al. (1998), which were used in the current study. After discussion of the different theories, this research reviewed the literature regarding perceptions of feminism. It also addressed literature regarding female offenders, namely their individual and situational characteristics. Finally, this research combined the issues of feminism and criminology, discussed perceptions of female offenders and lastly, the perceptions of feminism and female offenders.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Feminism

Feminism has been viewed as a social movement, an outlook on gender in relation to society, and a guide on the direction needed for creating social change (Flavin, 2001; Simpson, 1989). Feminism ties not to one, but many explanations about the reasons for the inequalities and injustices that exist in society for women (Flavin, 2001; Simpson, 1989; Snider, 2003). While all feminist theories past and present agree that women experience inequities in society and women's interests are not being addressed in a sufficient manner, each varies in its explanation of the origin of such oppression (Flavin, 2001; Simpson, 1989).

The first known completed work of feminism was written in 1792 by Englishwoman Mary Wollstonecraft (Donovan, 2000; Holmstrom, 2003; Wollstonecraft, 1992). In her work, "she argued for equal opportunity for women based on a rational capacity common to both sexes" (Holmstrom, 2003, p. 39; Wollstonecraft, 1992). She also expressed an "[earnest] wish to see the distinction of sex confounded in society" (Wollstonecraft, 1992, p. 61). One of Wollstonecraft's most profound suggestions is that women who marry to rise in status were actually 'prostituting' themselves (Donovan, 2000; Wollstonecraft, 1992). She understood what society was like at that time and that women needed to be attractive and focused on their beauty in order to gain a husband who had the means to provide for them (Donovan, 2000; Wollstonecraft, 1992). Some of these women in turn were able to attract men wealthy enough to support them while they

cultivated their minds with some education and books, which were a definite luxury in those days (Donovan, 2000; Wollstonecraft, 1992). This was a farce and she sought to make other women see the wrongfulness of this behavior (Donovan, 2000; Wollstonecraft, 1992). She believed that “to their senses, are women made slaves, because it is by their sensibility that they obtain present power” (Wollstonecraft, 1792, p. 153, as cited in Donovan, 2000, p. 24). With that, she believed that women sold themselves to a man to gain not only his money, but in a way, his power and status (Donovan, 2000; Wollstonecraft, 1992). She truly believed that people were divided into two parts, reason and senses. Reason was used in the outside world and the senses were left to the private realm. Women were solely relegated to the private domain, unlike men, who had the advantage of being part of both domains. Wollstonecraft thought that women needed to be able to be a part of both reason and senses in order to advance their position (and their children’s) in the larger society. Wollstonecraft was just one of many women who, even in the eighteenth century, saw women as needing more rights than they had at the time and most importantly a voice (Donovan, 2000; Holmstrom, 2003; Wollstonecraft, 1992).

By the late twentieth century, feminism had changed dramatically from Wollstonecraft’s time because women had more rights, and better pay in the workplace (Donovan, 2000). There were also new feminist groups that took the place of the standard ones of old. There are, however, still similarities between Wollstonecraft’s views and feminist groups of today. In 1988, Carole Pateman argued that due to patriarchy in society, women were seen as the property of men for their sexual pleasure (as cited in

Donovan, 2000). Based on what she called a “sexual contract,” she argued that at that time there were still legal jurisdictions that did not allow for a wife or husband to file rape charges against their marriage partner (Pateman, 1988, as cited in Donovan, 2000). This had been found to be true as, according to Lyon (2004), the 1980s saw the number of states removing their marital rape exemption increase from nine to 42 and the District of Columbia. Lyon (2004) also reported that today there are only two states remaining that have not abolished their marital rape exemption laws, Kentucky and Oklahoma.

Feminist Eras in the United States

First Wave

The first wave in 1848 began in Seneca Falls, New York, where feminists first met to discuss cultivating their rights as women (Harlan, 1998). Women, such as Susan B. Anthony, Sojourner Truth, and Lucy Mott, were among the first women to voice their opinions on the rights of women, which remain an integral part of feminism today. These women were among the first to ever speak out publicly and demand rights for themselves and all women. The first wave is said to have ended with the culmination of women’s right to vote in 1920 (Harlan, 1998).

Second Wave

This era started in the mid 1960’s and ended in the 1980’s (Harlan, 1998). The creation of feminist rights organizations was integral to the second wave of feminism. Many important organizations were created during this era such as the New Left political group. The reformers of this era sought to gain many victories for women in the form of equal pay, job and educational opportunities, and access to and the creation of support for

women who held both familial and occupational jobs. Two of the women who played important roles in this wave were Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem (Harlan, 1998).

Third Wave

This wave is thought to have arisen in the 1990's and continues today (Harlan, 1998). Third wave feminism seems to “consist of many of the daughters and sons of the second wave” (Harlan, 1998, p. 78). There are also many second wave feminists who are a part of this new wave of feminism. Many feminist issues raised in the second wave are still important to the third wave and are being examined to further the rights of women. Harlan (1998) claims that this wave is global and that women all over the world have taken part in furthering the feminist causes of today. The third wave has the advantage of social networking that is so critical to modern times. It also has avenues of expression that are more widespread than did the first two waves, with not only television and radio, but the internet as well. In the United States, the third wave has seen the addition of a multitude of other types of feminism, such as lesbian and multicultural (Harlan, 1998). Third wave feminists seek to bring many more women into their cause and to promote the involvement of women in integral roles in society through politics and business. They view today's women as strong, intelligent, brave, confident, and capable of doing anything they wish.

Types of Feminism

The following section provides definitions and brief histories of the four views of feminism discussed in this research: liberal, radical, socialist, and women of color/womanism (Henley et al., 1998).

Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminism is traced to the eighteenth century beginning with Mary Wollstonecraft (Belknap, 2001; Donovan, 2000; Gerson, 2002; Henley et al., 1998). She believed that women needed to have access to other areas of public life, such as employment in all the trades available to men (Donovan, 2000; Gerson, 2002). Developed during the Age of Enlightenment, liberal feminists were hoping to create equal rights for women (Donovan, 2000). Women during this era and for the next couple eras to come were considered to be the property of their fathers and then their husbands. It was believed that they had no ability for rational thought and were not even considered to be citizens in their own right (Donovan, 2000). According to Henley et al. (1998), liberal feminism is a belief, “[t]hat by virtue of reasoning capacity women and men are equal and essentially the same; a belief in civil rights, education, and equality of opportunity, assured by law, as the means to social change; and a belief in the limitation of government to a public sphere, reserving the rights of the individual to a private life not touched by the government.” (p. 320)

This type of feminism stems from liberal-bourgeois tradition and deals with the gender inequities of men and women in society and their appropriate roles in it (Simpson, 1989). Liberal feminists argue that it is not men and women specifically who make things unequal, but that the rules that have been put in place oppress women and they are in need of change for women to have opportunities for success (Belknap, 2001; Donovan, 2000; Gerson, 2002; Simpson, 1989).

Radical Feminism

Proponents of radical feminism argue that, “[t]he oppression of women is the fundamental oppression” and that it “[n]ames men as the oppressors of women, rather than capitalism, custom, or biology. Women are defined as a politically oppressed class” (Henley et al., 1998, p. 320). Dating back to the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, male aggression is noted to be central to this belief and women, being smaller, are easier to control, therefore giving men the chance they need to dominate. Biological distinctions are used to oppress women and the male role is considered to be superior to that of females (Eisenstein, 1999; Simpson, 1989). “These feminists believe [d] that women [were] exploited as both a sex and a class, and that women [were] consigned to reproduction and their natures tethered,” (Harlan, 1998, p. 75). This theory was developed by ex-“movement women”, women who had been a part of the civil rights movement and anti-war campaigns (Donovan, 2000). Created in part from a reaction to male participants of the group New Left, radical feminists sought to overcome the machismo within the traditional radical groups. They later came to believe that this patriarchal thought by men was the reason behind female oppression in society. Forged as a response to men’s reaction to feminist theories of the past, a new approach was born (Donovan, 2000).

Socialist Feminism

Socialist feminism suggests that women are equally oppressed by their class, gender and race (Henley et al., 1998). It sees capitalism as oppressing women, but also places women in a class that is considered lower than that of males (Ehrenreich, 2005;

Eisenstein, 1999; Holmstrom, 2003). This theory of feminism stems from Marxist thought and combines it with the association of class disparities. It also branches out to include class and patriarchal domination as a factor in life, art, music, and basically all areas of life. It was created to overcome the inadequacies of Marxist feminism, which just focuses on class within labor and the workplace in general (Ehrenreich, 2005; Eisenstein, 1999; Holmstrom, 2003). “Furthermore, it sees these issues as inseparable: sexism and class oppression and racism reinforce and feed on each other; they cannot be adequately understood separately” (Henley et al., 1998, p. 321).

Women of Color Feminism/Womanism

Finally, believers in the women of color feminism/womanism perspective argue that women of color are oppressed. Their main concern is that the feminist movement is primarily a White women’s movement and that the exclusion of women of color from this movement is what oppresses women of color. They do not, however, see men of color in the same light that White women do White men (Henley et al., 1998). Women of color feminists see “[m]en of color as oppressors but as brothers in oppression and consequently hold closer ties to men of color” (Henley et al., 1998, p.321). Women of this perspective should see the womanist position as “a definition of a specific political perspective, not as a description of the perspective of women by race or ethnicity” (Henley et al., 1998, p.321).

These types of feminism, as discussed by Henley et al. (1998), define what feminism is known as today. Using these definitions of feminism as content, this research will correlate college student perceptions of them with that of offenders.

Perceptions of Feminism

Feminists generally seek out equality for all women in all social areas (Harlan, 1998). Feminism today elicits different kinds of reactions from both sexes, who mostly view it as women hating men or a lesbian inspired propaganda. What these same people do not realize is that feminism is a belief that enters into their own minds at least once or twice in a lifetime, if not more (Harlan, 1998). It also has been found that both women and men try to detach themselves from the label of being a feminist due to the misconstrued beliefs that are held about what it means to be one (Harlan, 1998; Robison, 2002). That said, most people are more likely to be comfortable with the issues that feminism brings up, namely equality for women and other issues (Robison, 2002).

For example, Harlan (1998) discusses the outcome of a women's equality poll conducted in 1995 by the Feminist Majority¹. They found that "71 percent of women and 61 percent of men agreed" with equality for women (Feminist Majority, 1995, as cited in Harlan, 1998, p. 73). They also reported that only 51 percent of the female respondents identified themselves as being feminists (Feminist Majority, 1995, as cited in Harlan, 1998).

Yet Gallup polls conducted within the last 15 years have shown that only around "30% of Americans have identified themselves as feminists" (Robison, 2002, p. 2). Gallup responses on whether or not people believed themselves to be feminists rose slightly from 1991 to 1992, but then decreased slightly from 1992 to 2001 (Robison, 2002).

¹ It must be noted that it does not state how many people were in their total sample

Other research in this area, though highly limited, has shown that when it comes to perceptions of feminism, there are indeed many different definitions to which people can relate (Snelling, 1999). Using Q-sort methodology, Snelling (1999) used fifty items that related to feminist beliefs and asked 59 female respondents to rate each item. Not looking for a representative sample of the population, the researcher used snowball sampling to distribute the survey packets in order to gain a larger differential on the viewpoints of women. Though there were a total of 143 packages given out to women, less than a 50% response rate was achieved (N=59). Each of the women who did respond was paid \$10 or had a charitable donation made for them. The women who did respond ranged in age from 17 to 73 years and half of them were enrolled in some type of educational institution (Snelling, 1999). Ten feminist viewpoints were included in this study and in order to ensure that none was over-represented in the statements the researcher assigned five statements per view, for a total of 50 statements. Snelling (1999) followed up the packets with a request for an interview from nine of those women who indicated a strong preference for a particular view. Each of the respondents interviewed were asked to give their own definition of feminism, whether or not they thought of themselves as feminists, and whether or not the statements provided in the packet adequately described their personal beliefs of the feminist view with which they most identified. These women were paid an additional \$10 for their participation in the interviews (Snelling, 1999).

Snelling (1999) found that out of the ten given viewpoints, six were rated the highest. These six were “radical/lesbian/antiracist,” “liberal,” “humanist,” “conservative,”

“post feminist,” and one “non-labeled” view (Snelling, 1999, p. 263). While there were many respondents who did not fit into one particular viewpoint, Snelling (1999) maintained that this was a finding in itself in that feminist beliefs and viewpoints cannot always be viewed as singular and it is important to understand that there are many people who combine a number of different ideals into one. Future research was found to be the key to further exploring the perceptions of people and their understanding and beliefs about feminism (Snelling, 1999).

In their article, Henley et al. (1998) conducted two studies dealing with the measurement of feminist attitudes. Their first study (which they labeled Study 1) consisted of the creation of an instrument that could be used to measure such attitudes. In this study they created the Feminist Perspectives Scale. This scale was comprised of 306 items that indicated attitudes towards five feminist, and one non-feminist theory. They found that the majority of the items in the scale were significant when dealing with certain variables such as political label, and year in school of the respondent (Henley et al., 1998). However, upon examination of the intercorrelation of each of the feminist theory subscales, they did not obtain the results that they desired. The results of the analysis of this first study however, directed the researchers on how to construct the scale used in their second study (Henley et al., 1998). In their second study (named Study 2), Henley et al. (1998) created another scale using 60 of the items from their first study. In their study, they used factor analysis to determine which statements loaded the highest. Their scale was also determined to have fairly good reliability and validity (Henley et al., 1998).

Female Offenders

Research on female offenders has grown in the last several decades. The early research investigated the deviant side of women (Adler, 1975; Crites, 1978; Pollak, 1978). More recently, UCR data has shown comparable trends in male and female criminality. Some of this research has been compiled in a chart (See Appendix A).

Individual Characteristics

The typical female offender is a young, minority woman of low socio-economic status (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Gilbert, 2001; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Hedderman, 2004; Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Loucks, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). She is likely to be lacking education, although statistics show that female offenders tend to have more education than men (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Loucks, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). According to Greenfeld and Snell (1999), at least half of all women in all types of institutions within the system have at least completed their high school degree. The average offender is more likely than not to be a single mother (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Crites, 1976; Flavin, 2001; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Gilbert, 2001; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Loucks, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). She also usually lacks the necessary job skills to adequately take care of her family (Britton, 2000; Crites, 1976; Flavin, 2001; Gelsthorpe,

2004; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Loucks, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998).

The average female offender usually works a minimum wage job, if she has one, and is on welfare to help support her family, if she is a mother (Belknap, 2001; Crites, 1976; Flavin, 2001; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Loucks, 2004). They usually have a disrupted work history as well (Chesney-Lind, 1997).

Females are more likely to have been physically and sexually abused in their past than male offenders (Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Flavin, 2001; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Gilbert, 2001; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Hedderman, 2004; Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Loucks, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). This abuse not only includes their childhood, but their adult lives as well (Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Flavin, 2001; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Hedderman, 2004; Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Loucks, 2004; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). Often, they also suffer from low self-esteem and other emotional and psychological problems (Gelsthorpe, 2004; Loucks, 2004). They are more likely than men to be addicted to drugs and/or alcohol (Chesney-Lind, 1997; Gelsthorpe, 2004; Greenfeld & Snell, 1999; Hedderman, 2004; Loucks, 2004; Pollock, 2002). They are also more likely than men to have engaged in risky sexual behavior both as a juvenile and an adult (Pollock, 2002).

Situational Characteristics

Media portrayals exaggerate the extent of female crime (Burman, 2004). In reality, females historically have been underrepresented in criminal statistics, when

compared to males (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Burman, 2004; Chesney-Lind, 1995; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Flavin, 2001; Grana, 2002; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier, 2001; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998; Steffensmeier & Broidy, 2001). Daly (1998) found that the biggest gender gaps have been in the area of violent crimes and the smallest gap is in the area of property crimes. Research also has shown that males are more likely than females to be arrested for violent crimes (Daly, 1998; Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998; Steffensmeier & Broidy, 2001). In the instances when women do kill, they are more likely to kill someone known to them than men are (Koons-Witt & Schram, 2003; Pollock et al., 2006; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). Steffensmeier & Broidy (2001) found that females are more likely than males not to recidivate when it came to violent crimes.

The crimes that women are arrested and convicted for are mainly prostitution, larceny/theft, fraud, forgery, drug offenses, and other assaults (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1995; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Gilbert, 2001; Grana, 2002; Flavin, 2001; Kruttschnitt, 1992; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier, 2001; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998; Steffensmeier & Broidy, 2001). Steffensmeier and Allan (1998) and Burman (2004) found that, while both sexes were arrested for similar crimes, men offended at higher rates than females in all of the categories except prostitution. While women commit the majority of crimes on their own, there are the rest who commit crime in a diminished role (Belknap, 2001; Crites, 1978). This occurs when a woman takes on the follower role in a crime being committed,

and this is usually in the aid of a man, spouse, or intimate partner, who takes on the leader role in the crime being committed (Belknap, 2001; Daly, 1998). Women act alone 20-30% of the times that they commit crime (Belknap, 2001). The research shows that the issues and motivations behind the crimes they commit are different for females than for males (Belknap, 2001; Crites, 1978; Grana, 2002; Steffensmeier, 2001; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). According to Grana (2002) and Crites (1978), women tend to commit crime for two main reasons: men and money.

With regards to specific crimes that women commit, the research has shown that larceny and theft are common ones (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier, 2001; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). This usually involves minor property offenses and shoplifting (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier, 2001; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). According to Crites (1976), women are starting to commit more Part One, or Index crimes, as well. As such, robbery and burglary are also mentioned in the research (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998).

Shoplifting is another crime that seems to be gendered as well (Chesney-Lind, 1997). According to Chesney-Lind (1997), while men commit this crime as well, they seem to do so to gain from a big take or to prove their machismo by stealing things they do not necessarily need for the thrill. Women tend to commit this crime in order to obtain

the things that they need, or think they need, but cannot afford to have (Chesney-Lind, 1997).

White-collar crime was said to be another crime committed by women (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). When it comes to white-collar crime, however, there were major differences between men and women (Belknap, 2001; Daly, 1998; Steffensmeier, 2001). It has been found that women who have committed white-collar crimes were usually employed at a lower level than that of men at the time of the offense (Belknap, 2001; Daly, 1998). For example, women who embezzled from banks were usually employed as tellers or cashiers at the time of the incident, while men were usually employed in managerial or corporate jobs (Belknap, 2001; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Daly, 1998). As a result, men seemed to gain substantially more money in these offenses than did women (Belknap, 2001; Pollock, 2002). Women were found to work alone in most of these crimes, while men seemed to be part of a larger group (Belknap, 2001; Daly, 1998). The motivations for such crime are found to be mainly familial need based for the majority of women, while for men it was mainly for the big financial gain (Belknap, 2001; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Daly, 1998).

Drug use and dealing are other crimes for which women are frequently arrested and convicted (Belknap, 2001; Crites, 1976; Pollock, 2002). According to Chesney-Lind (1997), the War on Drugs has significantly impacted women. Belknap (2001) found that not all women who deal drugs are users themselves, but drug dealing gives them the best option for making money. Other findings by Pollock (2002) suggest that women who

commit crimes were likely doing so to buy more drugs to support a habit and that women were more likely than men to be under the influence of drugs at the time they committed an offense. Research has shown that women who used and dealt drugs were usually introduced to them by husbands or intimate partners (Belknap, 2001). Drug use and dealing can lead to prostitution among women (Belknap, 2001).

Prostitution is one of the few crimes considered by many in social science research to be gender-specific (Belknap, 2001; Daly, 1998). In most states, prostitution statutes have been written to be gender neutral, so as to apply to women and men equally, but statistics on arrests and convictions tell another story (Belknap, 2001). Women seem to be the over-whelming majority of arrests in this crime category (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1995; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Gilbert, 2001; Grana, 2002; Flavin, 2001; Kruttschnitt, 1992; Pollock, 2002; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier, 2001; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998; Steffensmeier & Broidy, 2001). Prostitution has been and seems like it will continue to be a “woman’s crime” (Belknap, 2001).

Another crime that is written to be gender neutral is that of non-lethal and lethal child abuse (Belknap, 2001). This crime includes neglect, cruelty, abandonment, and infanticide (Belknap, 2001). While it is applied equally to both men and women, there are definite social stigmas that attach to this type of crime (Belknap, 2001). It has been shown by the media that women accused of such crimes are subjected to more social shame and attention than are men (Belknap, 2001).

While keeping to small numbers as compared to men, homicide is another crime for which women are arrested and convicted (Belknap, 2001; Daly, 1998; Pollock, 2002; Steffensmeier, 2001). According to Belknap (2001), women constitute 10-20% of those convicted of homicide, but their numbers seem to be declining. Women are more likely to kill their spouses or intimate partners (Belknap, 2001; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Daly, 1998; Pollock, 2002). These women are more than likely to be victims of abuse by those they kill prior to the offense (Belknap, 2001; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Daly, 1998; Pollock, 2002). As such, women often claim self-defense as a justification for their crime (Belknap, 2001). Women are more likely to kill their victims within their home and with the use of a gun or other firearm (Belknap, 2001; Daly, 1998). Women have also been found to kill their victims to protect others within the home, such as children (Daly, 1998).

Feminism and Criminology

In the United States, feminism began its second wave in the 1960's and 1970's. As a consequence there was an increased interest in women's studies in the social sciences (Heidensohn, 1995). One important hypothesis that arose from this new wave of feminism was that the liberation of women led to their increase in crime (Heidensohn, 1995). In her book, *Sisters in Crime*, Freda Adler suggested that this hypothesis was supported and stated that the change in women's status had greatly increased their rate of criminality (Adler, 1975; Crump, 1987). She stated that women had now been freed to be as they would have been had these restrictions not been placed upon them in the first place (Adler, 1975). Her opinion was changed in a later article in which she recognized social differences as a possible cause for the increase (Crump, 1987). Both views,

however, have stemmed from ideas of female criminality that still exist with feminist theorists today (Belknap, 2001; Crump, 1987).

There is a continued belief that the term feminism is synonymous with women, while the term criminology is synonymous with men (Flavin, 2001). This false relationship has created a marginalization of feminist theories in relation to the criminal justice discipline (Flavin, 2001). This has led to an increased popularity in mainstream criminological theories to explain both male and female crime (Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Crump, 1987; Flavin, 2001; Heidensohn, 1995; Henderson & Pearl, 1997; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). Some of these researchers propose that, while mainstream theories have focused mainly on male offenders, there is still room for comparing women to these male dominated theories (Crump, 1987; Holsinger, 2000; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). For example, Crump (1987), while discarding most of the mainstream theories, pondered the applicability of labeling theory to female offending. Steffensmeier and Allan (1998) stated that the use of mainstream theories in understanding female offending could help when trying to view crime by women. They believed that using these mainstream theories could also help to understand the reasoning behind why female crime rates are much lower than rates for males. They used some examples of mainstream theories, such as anomie and conflict theories, and reasoned that female offenders tend to come from similar backgrounds as males and therefore can be subjected to the same constraints as men, giving them similar reasons to commit crimes. They found that both men and women could experience the same issues that relate to strain and differential association theory as well, thus causing them to think that, on its

face, a gendered approach may not be necessary in explaining female crime (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998).

Steffensmeier and Allan (1998) pointed out, however, that those mainstream theories could not explain the intricacies of female offending, such as the reason for consistently lower rates of female violent crime when compared to men. They also pointed out the differences in the offender motivation across gender in committing crimes. These are just some of the areas where mainstream theories do not adequately explain female criminality (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). There are many critiques of such theories and no suitable explanation using mainstream theories has been found for females and their criminality (Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1989; Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Flavin, 2001; Heidensohn, 1995; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). According to Daly (1998), gendered theories geared toward females, such as feminist theories, can help to more adequately relate to women's issues in crime and criminality.

Perception of Female Offenders

The perception of female offenders is another area that is also lacking in research and needs to be addressed (Murphy & Brown, 2000). In a study done by Murphy and Brown (2000), they surveyed men and women in different 'gendered' occupations to gauge their opinion on both male and female offenders. They chose three occupations, one of each to represent, "feminine (nursing), masculine (engineering) and neutral (radiography) oriented professions" (Murphy & Brown, 2000, p. 286). The researchers proposed that men who were in masculine occupations and who held masculine beliefs were going to be harsher on offenders than were women in feminine occupations who

held feminine beliefs (Murphy & Brown, 2000). Using a modified form of the Attitudes to Prisoner's scale created by Melvin, Gramling, and Gardener (1985, as cited in Murphy & Brown, 2000), the researchers changed the term "prisoner" to "offender." The instrument used was a 36 statement Likert scale that addressed attitudes toward "offenders". A higher score indicated the respondent's belief that offenders could change their behavior. The researchers also used the Bem Sex Role Inventory (1974, as cited in Murphy & Brown, 2000) that measured four main sex role stereotypes. Demographic information was also collected on each of the respondents as well (Murphy & Brown, 2000).

Murphy and Brown (2000) found that there was a statistically significant relationship between those respondents, regardless of their gender, who were in engineering occupations and corresponded to a belief about feminine sex roles. They indicated harsher attitudes toward female offenders than did any other combination of sex role and occupation. The researchers also found that the gender of respondents was not significantly related to their attitudes about male and female offenders. Their lack of other significant findings was attributed to the possibility of the Bem questionnaire not being able to discern between masculine and feminine sex roles. Murphy and Brown (2000) also suggested that their choice of occupations to compare might not have been the most representative of the three stereotypes they wanted to investigate. They indicated that more research was needed to further develop this issue (Murphy & Brown, 2000).

Perception of Feminism and Female Offenders

There appears to be no prior research examining the attitudes of college students when it comes to feminism and female offenders. However, there has been research done on criminal justice professionals in this area (Crites, 1978; Ochie & Ngege, 1996). In a survey done in 1974, judges and state attorneys were questioned about female offenders and agreed that women were not usually the masterminds behind most crimes. One attorney even said that women did not have what it took to plan a major crime because they could not look at it from the business aspect the way men could (Crites, 1978). Another study done in 1962 had the same conclusions as the studies that followed (Crites, 1978). This study showed that women were less likely to be incarcerated before trial than men. The researchers referred to this treatment afforded to women as a form of paternalism and as such, judges were more lenient with female offenders (Crites, 1978). Other reasons for the differential treatment of female offenders have been found to be that the majority of the time women are accessories to a major crime (Crites, 1978). A study in 1968 found that with robbery, this was true in 80% of the cases (Crites, 1978).

In another study done in Alabama, the researchers examined decisions by both male and female judges regarding sentencing of both male and female defendants (Crites, 1978). It was found that these judges held traditional beliefs about the role of women (Crites, 1978; Ochie & Ngege, 1996). These Alabama judges believed that women should hold traditional roles in the family and that men should make all the decisions. Crites (1978) argued that this may be due to a regional bias, but nonetheless shows that

there are some judges in this country who maintain traditional beliefs of the roles that women should play in connection to men.

In a recent study done in Oklahoma, researchers examined whether or not the state, leading in incarcerated female offenders per capita, had judges who held traditional beliefs of feminism and if they did, whether or not their beliefs contributed to their decisions concerning incarceration of the female offenders who came before them in court (Ochie & Ngenge, 1996). They sent out a survey to 234 judges across the state and had a return rate of 60 percent or 142 responses. They collected attitude information based on a Likert scale measurement and demographic information. There were 127 male judges and 15 female judges who responded. The researchers, while noting that there were a significantly lower number of females than males, still divided the answers by gender (Ochie & Ngenge, 1996).

Interestingly, they found that while almost all of the respondents followed liberal and Marxist feminist perspectives, they differed greatly by gender when faced with specific questions regarding gender issues (Ochie & Ngenge, 1996). For example, when asked whether or not they believed that women should seek out the same occupational opportunities as men competing for them, there was a drastic change in the responses. Just over half (58%) of the male judges agreed, and 80 percent of female judges agreed that women should seek out jobs in which they would have to compete with men. Twenty-five percent of judges chose undecided as their response to this statement (Ochie & Ngenge, 1996). When asked about their beliefs on the women's movement and

whether or not it played a large part in the evolution of female offending, the overall consensus was that it did not (Ochie & Ngenge, 1996).

Overall, the researchers found that judges in Oklahoma did not show a significant relationship between their beliefs about feminism and their ideas and decisions regarding female offenders (Ochie & Ngenge, 1996). They concluded that their decisions to incarcerate more female offenders in this state were not related to judicial bias against women. The researchers did point out that there was a significantly smaller number of female than male judges in this study; this raises some questions about the validity of this study (Ochie & Ngenge, 1996).

These studies address the notion that women have almost consistently been referred to as the weaker sex, in need of some guidance and comfort (Crites, 1978; Ochie & Ngenge, 1996). Freda Adler's (1975) contention that women are starting to behave more like men, or Otto Pollak's (1978) theory that women were conniving and deceiving, does not seem to coincide with the opinions and beliefs of those in control of the processing of female offenders (Crites, 1978). Adler's (1975) and Pollak's (1978) theories may continue to be overshadowed by the fact that their theories have yet to find support from empirical research (Crites, 1978; Ochie & Ngenge, 1996).

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Hypotheses

This study was conducted to test the reliability and validity of a new instrument, namely the Female Offender Perspectives Scale. Using this scale and the Feminist Perspectives Scale created by Henley et al. (1998), this research examined the perceptions of feminism held by undergraduate students enrolled in traditional criminal justice classes and how, if at all, this shaped their views of female offenders. It was hypothesized that if a person did indeed hold a particular view of feminism, or none at all, that his/her opinions about female offenders would correspond to that view. The following includes a description of the methodology used in this study.

Data and Design

The unit of analysis for this study was individuals because this research sought to identify correlations, if any existed, between the opinions of people regarding female offenders and feminism. In order to gauge such opinions, this research used a survey as its form of data collection. To more effectively measure the opinions of a large number of people, as was desirable in this study, survey research was chosen as a more feasible design over interviews or observations. This method helped to keep the focus of the respondents on the issues at hand, as the issues examined in this study could lead to thoughts and feelings that could inhibit the research (Babbie, 2010). For example, interviews could lead to the giving of personal opinions not beneficial to the research

(Babbie, 2010). The identity of respondents remained anonymous. This made it easier for the respondents to answer honestly, and increase validity of the study. Triangulation was not used, as there was no other data collection method that could best represent the information that was provided in the survey. Even so, other possible forms of data collection methods were considered. It was determined that secondary data analysis was out of the question in the current study as no prior research had been done on this specific topic.

Sampling

This study sought to obtain the opinions of undergraduate students enrolled in traditional undergraduate criminal justice classes within a metropolitan university. An initial list of all available classes for the spring of 2008 was obtained, and before any sampling was done, there were certain sampling qualifications that had to be met. Those classes that did not meet these requirements were excluded from the sampling frame. First, only traditional classes were chosen. By traditional, it is meant that only those classes that were taught by an instructor in person for the full duration of the semester. Due to this requirement, internet-based courses were excluded from the sampling frame because this researcher sought to administer the survey in person to ensure that the respondents were able to understand the instructions for taking the survey and to exclude those who had already completed the survey in another class. All workshops and classes that did not run during the full course of the semester were also omitted due to timeline issues. Second, the chosen university at the time of the study had four satellite campuses. Two were in a nearby city approximately 45 minutes away from the main campus. One

was in the southern part of the immediate city, located within a small military base, and the final one was in a different city that was approximately two hours away. Due to transportation issues, all classes held on the final satellite campus were excluded from the sample. Third, there were classes that potentially had a mix of undergraduate and graduate students from a variety of disciplines, and if chosen, this survey would have been administered to those classes. If one of those classes had been chosen, each graduate student would have been asked not to participate. The main reason for the exclusion of graduate students was that the researcher was well known among the graduate criminal justice students and some pre-conceived opinions could have already been formed that would have biased their answers in the survey. Since it would have been inappropriate to only exclude criminal justice graduate students, all graduate students of any discipline were also excluded. In the end, none of those classes were chosen in the simple random sampling procedure that was performed.

After the classes that met the above mentioned criteria were excluded, 35 classes remained from the original list. Of those, a simple random sampling was done through the use of a random number table, and a list of ten classes in which to administer the survey was obtained. The random number table used in this study was generated by use of an internet-based random number generator (GraphPad Software, Inc., 2002 – 2005). This table was created with four columns and 50 rows of randomly generated numbers from 1-100. If the possibility of not being able to enter a classroom arose, another simple random sampling was done by use of the existing random number table previously generated. This issue did arise and, using the remaining 25 classes, a replacement was

selected. Such replacing occurred due to the fact that the researcher wanted to survey only one section of each class chosen. For example, in one instance, the random number table read 11 and the following number read ten. In this case, the chosen classes would have been two sections of the same class, CJ 103, Introduction to Law and Justice. Instead of having two sections, the next number was taken which read fourteen. This indicated a CJ 104 class, Introduction to Corrections, which brought up another issue. This researcher was the instructor in this class and in order to avoid any participant feeling coerced into taking the survey in any manner, this class was eliminated as well from the list. The random number process was repeated until all qualifications were satisfied and ten classes were chosen. A listing of the chosen final classes, the day(s) and times they were held, and their location are contained in Appendix B².

A total of 246 surveys were distributed in the ten different traditional criminal justice classes. Out of the 246 possible participants, 18 returned blank surveys, which constituted a refusal. Of these 18, one survey was handed back due to an accommodation issue. This respondent was deaf, could not understand the requirements, and felt more at ease not completing the survey. This left a possible sample size of 228 surveys. Of the remaining 228, ten were later omitted for non-response issues, leaving 218 total respondents (N=218). Those surveys that were omitted for non-response issues were done so only if the respondent failed to answer all of the statements in both sections and/or all of the demographics. According to Babbie (2010), a more than adequate response rate for

²The researcher recognized that there may be differences in the demographic and situational characteristics of those students who took night versus day classes. There was also recognition that the demographic and situational characteristics of students who took classes on other campus locations may be different as well. While not the focus of the current study, this issue warrants further research.

survey research is over seventy percent. The final response rate for this study was 88%, well over the percentage set by Babbie (2010).

Procedure

Each professor was notified by e-mail one week prior to the anticipated start date of the survey in order to seek permission to enter his or her classes. Upon approval from each professor, the surveys were administered in person. An undergraduate research assistant recruited by the researcher assisted in surveying all of the classes in the two-week period of time. Each professor was hand-delivered or e-mailed a copy of the survey and a letter in which they were introduced to the purpose of the survey, along with a request to not mention the nature of the survey to their students who would be asked to participate in the study. The undergraduate research assistant was used only to assist in surveying the chosen classes. Once in the classes, potential respondents were greeted, given a brief introduction and reason for the survey, and then asked to participate. In order to limit repeated surveys from people enrolled in more than one of the participating classes, the potential respondents were asked if they had previously completed the survey. If an individual indicated that they had previously taken the survey, they were asked to not complete it again. Respondents were also instructed to complete the survey sections in the order they were presented. Upon completion, the surveys were kept in a folder that corresponded with the class that was surveyed and stored in a locked cabinet per IRB rules³.

³ The current study's design and sampling procedures were submitted to the Internal Review Board and were approved under an expedited review procedure.

First, a statement of informed consent was provided to respondents, then a letter to the respondents stating the purpose for the study and thanking them for participating. Finally, the survey was given to respondents (See Appendix C). The survey contained three sections. Taken from The Feminist Perspectives Scale by Henley et al. (1998), Section I contained a series of 25 statements that addressed four feminist theories and one non-feminist theory examined in the current research about women in society (called the Societal Perspectives Scale). This section used a seven point Likert scale which ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree (Henley et al., 1998). There was also an undecided option placed in the middle (Henley et al., 1998). Respondents were asked to answer each statement by choosing the most appropriate response that reflected their beliefs or opinions. Using the same response scale, Section II connected the four feminist theories and one non-feminist theory from Henley et al. (1998) to views of female offending (called the Female Offenders Perspectives Scale) (see Appendix D). Finally, Section III contained forced choice and open ended demographic and control questions. Traditionally in surveys, this section was completed first in order to warm up the respondents to the survey process (Babbie, 2010). In the current study, it was completed last due to the final question of the section, which asked respondents if they considered themselves to be a feminist. As found in the literature, the word 'feminist' could be considered a 'loaded term' and it was not the intention of the researcher to bias the opinions of the respondents in any way (Robison, 2002).

Instruments

Female Offender Perspectives Scale

The dependent variable in this study was respondents' views of female offenders. Since no previous female offender instrument based on the perspectives examined by Henley et al. (1998) had been found to exist, five statements for each were constructed. Initially, these statements were designed to fit the parameters of each corresponding perspective, but were adjusted so that they did not also correspond too closely with any of the other statements. The 25 created statements were categorized by perspective, and simple random sampling, by use of a random number table, was performed to determine the ordering of the statements in this section of the survey (Blalock, 1979). In the female offender section, statements 1, 2, 12, 17, and 18 corresponded to liberal feminism; 16, 19, 20, 21, and 23 corresponded to radical feminism; 5, 6, 11, 13, and 22 corresponded to socialist feminism; and 3, 8, 15, 24, and 25 corresponded to women of color feminism/womanism. For the non-feminist perspective, statements 4, 7, 9, 10, and 14 corresponded. Table D-1(a) (Appendix D) offers one example of each of the perspectives and the preceding number corresponded to their location within the survey section.

Societal Perspectives Scale

One of the independent variables in this research was views of feminism. Section I of the survey consisted of statements taken from the Feminist Perspectives Scale (FPS) created by Henley et al. (1998). In their study, Henley et al. (1998) examined six different perspectives, one of those being non-feminist (Conservatism). As stated in their article, numerous steps to establish the reliability and validity of each statement were taken by

them in the two studies they performed (Henley et al., 1998). The omission of 'cultural feminism' in the current study brought the total to five perspectives and replicated 25 total statements (five from each perspective). In order to determine which statements were to be replicated in the current study, the highest loading statements in their factor analysis (as determined in study 2 of their article) were taken from Henley et al. (1998) and included in the Societal Perspectives Scale.

Similar to the Female Offender Perspectives Scale, the 25 chosen statements were categorized by feminist perspective. Since Henley et al. (1998) had already performed systematic random sampling on their items, the location of each statement in the Societal Perspectives Scale was placed in order by use of their assigned numbers. Table D-1(b) (See Appendix D) offers one example statement for each feminist perspective (Henley et al., 1998). The numbers preceding the statements were their location in the Societal Perspectives Scale, and the numbers in the brackets following the statements indicated their location in the Henley et al. (1998) study. For example, in Henley et al. (1998), the first statement (see Table D-1(b)) was listed as number five. Out of the 25 chosen for the Societal Perspectives Scale, the statement they had indicated as number five was the lowest taken from them, therefore in the current study, it is set as number one.

Femscore

The Femscore, adapted from Henley et al. (1998) contains a sum of all of the feminist perspective subscales. This was replicated in the current study and used to determine how a respondent scored on the feminist perspective statements on both the Female Offender Perspectives Scale and the Societal Perspectives Scale. Since this study

had two different scales, a respondent would receive two Femscores, a Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore, and a Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore.

Demographic and Control Variables

The demographic and control variables examined in this study were separated into two main categories: individual and situational characteristics. They were presented within the survey as forced multiple choice and open-ended questions. The effects of the individual and situational variables have been noted throughout past research (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). For example, a respondent's gender could influence their acceptance or rejection of feminist beliefs, and as such could affect the answers that they provide. While to some it was thought that feminism was only for women, it was hypothesized that men constituted a strikingly large proportion of those who held feminist beliefs. Political affiliation was controlled for as well due to the fact that certain party affiliations could make it more likely to believe in feminist ideals if not just support them. Religious affiliation also was an important aspect of this issue and the idea behind controlling for it was similar to the argument behind controlling for political affiliation. Even though this study included a survey of undergraduate students in traditional undergraduate criminal justice classes, many of the lower division classes were open to non-majors, as were some of the upper division classes. Since that was the case, the major course of study for the respondent was controlled for as well.

Demographic Variables

Table D-2 displays the individual characteristics of the respondents which included age, race/ethnicity, gender, marital status, and household income.

Age

As indicated in Table D-2, the mean age of respondents (N=209) was 25.18 years of age (SD=7.234). The ages of respondents ranged from 18 to 59 years of age. The majority of respondents (53%, n=111) were 19-23 years of age.

Race/Ethnicity

Survey participants were also asked to indicate their race/ethnicity (N=216). Of the 216 who responded (two declined to answer), 81.9% (n=177) indicated that were Caucasian/Non-Hispanic. Hispanics comprised 9.7% (n=21) of the survey population. Three people indicated that they were African American, three were American Indian, three were Asian American, and three were Multi-ethnic/racial (1.4% respectively, n=12). Finally, 2.8% of respondents indicated that they were Other (n=6).

Gender

Respondents were also asked to indicate their gender on the survey and this question was answered by all of the participants (N=218). Of the 218 participants, 55.5% (n=121) indicated that they were female and the remaining 45.5% (n=97) are male.

Marital Status

Marital status⁴ was also assessed in this survey. Participants were asked to indicate whether they were single (never married), divorced, widowed, or living with an intimate partner. Of the 214 respondents who answered, 61.7% (n=132) indicated that they were single (never married), 19.2% (n=41) indicated that they were married. There were 8.9% (n=19) respondents who indicated that they were divorced, while 10.3% (n=22) were living with an intimate partner.

Income

Income was assessed of respondents in two ways. Since the sample was comprised of college students, it was noted that some of the participants may be living under their families' income (parents and spouses), while some may have only their own income. With that in mind, income was divided into a contingency question based on the age of the respondent. Age was used as the contingency due to the fact that federal financial aid dependency is determined by age. Students who are 24 years of age or younger are placed as dependents under their parents' income, while those 25 years of age or older are placed as independent and are based on their own income. The only exceptions to this rule are those respondents who are married, wards of the state, or legally emancipated before the age of 24 years⁵. The first contingency question asked respondents to indicate their annual pre-tax family income. The second question asked them to indicate their own annual pre-tax income.

⁴ Of the total respondents, no one indicated that they were widowed, so this variable was excluded from Table D-2.

⁵ This research assumes that these traits do not comprise the majority.

Of the total respondents who responded to the family income question (N=127), 22.9% (n=27) indicated that their family income was less than \$15,000.00. The largest proportion of respondents, 23.7% (n=28), indicated that they made \$15,001.00 to \$30,000.00, while 22% (n=26) of respondents indicated that they made \$30,001 to \$60,000.00. Those who made \$60,001.00 to \$90,000.00 comprised 14.4% (n=17) respondents. Of the remaining respondents, 9.3% (n=11) indicated that they made \$90,001.00 to \$120,000.00, and 7.6% (n=9) stated that they made \$120,001.00 or more per year.

Of the total number of respondents who responded to the self income question (N=94), 14.9% (n=14) indicated that their annual income was less than \$15,000.00. Those who made \$15,001.00 to \$30,000.00 comprised of 30.9% (n=29) respondents. The largest proportion of respondents, 33% (n=31), indicated that they made \$30,001 to \$60,000.00, while 18.1% (n=17) of respondents indicated that they made \$60,001.00 to \$90,000.00. Of the remaining respondents 3.2% (n=3) indicated that they made \$90,001.00 or more per year.

Table D-2 also displays the situational characteristics which included four separate overall topics, education, political affiliations, religion, and feminist identification.

Education

The first question asked of the respondents was to indicate the number of the class in which they were taking the survey (N=218). Of the respondents who answered, 51.8% (n=113) were in a one or two hundred level class, recoded as lower division. The other

48.2% respondents (n=105) were in a three or four hundred level class, which was recoded as upper division.

Since this information was not necessarily indicative of where they were at in their college career, the survey also asked them to indicate the number of credits they had completed as of the beginning of the current semester (N=217). This was recoded to show the ranking of freshman (0-25 credits), sophomore (26-57 credits), junior (58-89 credits), and senior (90 or more credits). Of the respondents who answered, 21.2% were freshmen (n=46), 14.7% sophomores (n=32), 21.2% juniors (n=46), and 42.9% were seniors (n=93).

Finally, respondents were also asked for their declared major (N=217). This was recoded into the College where that major was located. For example, at this university, criminal justice majors are part of the College of Social Sciences and Public Affairs. It was found that 5.5% of these respondents were from the Arts and Sciences (n=12), 5.5% were from Business and Economics (n=12), 1.4% were from Engineering (n=3), 1.8% were from Health Sciences (n=4), 0.9% were from Applied Technology (n=2), and 82.5% were from Social Sciences and Public Affairs (n=179). Of the Social Science and Public Affairs respondents, 145 indicated that they were obtaining a Bachelors or Associates degree in criminal justice (66.8% and 81%, respectively). There were also 2.3% of respondents who indicated that they had not declared a major at that time (n=5).

Political Affiliation

Respondents were first asked whether they, in general, considered themselves to be liberal, moderate, or conservative on most political issues (N=212). Of these

respondents, 31.1% said that they took a liberal stance on most issues (n=66), 43.4% said they leaned toward a moderate viewpoint (n=92), and 25.5% indicated conservatism (n=54).

Next, respondents were asked to indicate whether they considered themselves to be a Democrat, Republican, or Independent (N=211). The largest proportion of respondents, 38.4% (n=81), indicated that they were Republicans. Of the remaining 130 participants, 34.1% (n=72) were Democrats, while 27.5% (n=58) indicated they were Independent.

Finally, respondents were asked to indicate whether they held strong, moderate, or weak support for their party or stance on issues (N=212). The majority of respondents, 65.6% (n=139), indicated that they had moderate support for the party or issues in which they believed. Strong support was shown by 22.6% (n=48) respondents, while 11.8% (n=25) indicated weak support.

Religion

This variable was addressed as a contingency question. The first part asked survey respondents if they were a member of a church or had a religious affiliation (N=213). Of the respondents who answered this question, 53.5% (n=114) indicated 'no', while 46.5% (n=99) chose 'yes'. Respondents answering 'yes' to the affiliation question were then asked to indicate on average how many times a month they attended services (N=100). The mean number of services attended was 2.72 (SD=2.132). The number of services attended per month ranged from 0 to 12. The largest proportion of respondents, 41% (n=41), indicated that they attended four services on average, per month.

Feminist Identification

The final question asked of survey respondents was whether or not they considered themselves to be a feminist (N=212). The overwhelming majority of the respondents, 76.9% (n=163), said that they did not consider themselves to be a feminist. Only 23.1% respondents (n=49) said they did consider themselves to be a feminist.

RESULTS

Femscores

In order to determine whether or not the societal instrument had an influence on the offender instrument, an independent variable labeled Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore and a dependent variable labeled Female Offender Perspectives Scale, replicated from the Henley et al. (1998), were used in the current study. In Henley et al. (1998), this score was created by summing the scores from each of their respondent's answers to the Likert scale statements used in their survey. This total score was comprised only of the feminist theory statements used in their survey, so their conservative statement scores were excluded (Henley et al., 1998). In the current research study, the Femscore variables were replicated using the respondent's answers to the Societal Perspectives Scale and Female Offender Perspectives Scale sections of the survey. The conservative score was excluded in the current study as well.

Cronbach's Alpha

In order to test for internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate reliability. Cronbach's alpha "measures how well a set of items (or variables) measures a single unidimensional latent construct" (UCLA, n.d., para. 1). In respect to the current study, Cronbach's alpha measures how well each of the five chosen (or designed) statements measure the subscale they fall under, such as each of the five statements created for the liberal feminist subscale of the Female Offender Perspectives Scale.

Cronbach's alpha ranges from zero to one, and ".70 or higher is considered 'acceptable' in most social science research situations" (UCLA, n.d., para. 11).

Henley et al. (1998)

The societal instrument items taken from Henley et al. (1998) were tested for reliability in their study. In their study, Henley et al. (1998) created six subscale categories based on social views: five feminist (liberal, radical, socialist, cultural, and women of color) and one non-feminist view (conservative). These societal items were measured in three sample categories: a student sample, a nonstudent sample, and a combined sample (Henley et al., 1998). Since the current study focused on the opinions of college students, the comparison group taken from the Henley et al. (1998) study was that of the student sample. The Cronbach's alpha scores for their student sample feminist subscales were: .62 for liberal, .86 for radical, .79 for socialist, .73 for cultural, and .75 for women of color. The non-feminist conservative view scored at .77 (Henley et al., 1998)⁶.

Current Study

The items chosen for the Societal Perspectives Scale were those that Henley et al. (1998) indicated in their study to have loaded the highest in their factor analysis. The items in the Female Offender Perspectives Scale were modeled after those societal items. The current study sought to establish reliability for this new instrument, the Female Offender Perspectives Scale.

⁶ Since the Henley et al. (1998) study used more feminist perspectives than the current study; the total Cronbach's alpha was omitted.

Using Cronbach's alpha, the current study assessed the reliability of both the Societal Perspectives Scale and the Female Offender Perspectives Scale. Taking into account all of the different perspectives, feminist and non-feminist, Cronbach's alpha scores were run individually by feminist perspective. Table D-3(a) shows the Cronbach's alpha for the Societal Perspectives Scale.

As indicated, the alphas for all of the individual perspectives in the current study, with the exception of Liberal Feminism ($\alpha=.558$), suggested high reliability in this scale. In addition, the Societal Femscore ($\alpha=.889$) indicated very high reliability. While the individual scores were low, the total ($\alpha=.813$) Societal Perspectives Scale Cronbach's alpha revealed that the shortened version of the societal instruments taken from Henley et al. (1998) has higher reliability. This denoted that the full scale used by Henley et al. (1998) may not be required in order to have high reliability.

Table D-3(b) shows the Cronbach's alpha for the Female Offender Perspectives Scale. While the table illustrates that the individual perspectives are not high in reliability on their own, the Female Offender Perspectives Femscore ($\alpha=.779$) suggests the opposite. This finding indicated that the comparison of the predictive value using the Female Offender Perspectives Femscore would have high reliability.

Cronbach's alpha was also run for the Female Offender and Societal Perspectives Scales combined ($\alpha=.878$ and $\alpha=.879$ -standardized). This suggested that the reliability of both of the scales combined was within acceptable limits.

Correlations

Feminist Subscale Correlation Matrix

A correlation matrix was created using all of the individual feminist subscales and the Femscores from both the Societal Perspectives Scales and Female Offender Perspectives Scales (See Table D-4(a)). These correlations were conducted to determine whether the individual feminist subscales and Femscores were related to each other, and if so, if that relationship was significant (see Table D-4(a)).

All of the feminist subscales in the Societal Perspectives Scale had a significant relationship with one another at the .01 or .05 level, with the exception of the Conservative-Woman of Color/Womanism ($r = -.044$) and Conservative-Societal Perspectives Femscore correlations ($r = .102$). Strong correlations in this scale were found in the Woman of Color/Womanism-Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore ($r = .748$), Radical-Socialist ($r = .738$) and Liberal-Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore correlations ($r = .634$). The strongest relationships were found in the Radical-Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore ($r = .883$), and Socialist-Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore correlations ($r = .866$).

All of the correlations within the Female Offender Perspectives Scale feminist subscales and the inclusion of the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore were significant at either the .01 or .05 level. A strong correlation was found with the Liberal-Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore correlation ($r = .782$), the Radical-Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore correlation ($r = .620$), and the Woman of Color/Womanism-Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore correlation ($r = .728$).

The strongest relationship was found in the Socialist-Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore correlation ($r=.812$). As indicated in Table D-4(a), even though the conservative perspective in the Female Offender Perspectives Scale was a non-feminist view point and should have had an inverse relationship with the all of the feminist subscales, the correlations indicated a positive relationship.

Table D-4(a) also included the correlation between the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore and Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore ($r=.600$). Since the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore and the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore were the sum of each of the subscales for the two instruments, it was assumed that they would indeed be measuring the same thing, feminist view points.

Demographic Variables Correlation Matrix

In order to determine what demographic variables to use in the multivariate regression, a correlation matrix was generated including the dependant variable, Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore (See Table D-4(b)). From this matrix, only four of the independent variables indicated a statistical significance at the .05 or .01 levels. These variables were family income (under 25), race (recoded), whether a person was a liberal, moderate, or conservative⁷, and the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore.

⁷ In order to determine which political variables to use, two initial regressions were run: one using whether or not a person was liberal, moderate or conservative and the other using the democratic and republican variables. The multivariate regression produced large standard errors for each of the two variables that exceeded the slope of the regression. The large standard errors resulted from skewed distributions of the race and political measures.

Validity

In order to assess validity in their study, Henley et al. (1998) used convergent and discriminate validity measures. By examining the subscale correlations between each other, along with the demographic variables they determined that the conservative subscale negatively correlating with the feminist subscales was “suggestive evidence of validity” (Henley et al., 1998, p. 326).

Using their methods, the current study found that the validity of the Societal Perspectives Scale subscales suggested evidence as well, because the conservative subscale of the Societal Perspectives Scale was found to have a negative relationship with the feminist subscales. However, when examining the conservative subscale in the Offender Perspectives Scale with the corresponding feminist subscales, the relationship was found to be positive, thus causing concern for validity in the Offender Perspectives Scale.

Multicollinearity

The strong relationships shown in Table D-4(a) suggest that some of the feminist subscales within the Societal and Female Offender Perspectives Scales exhibited multicollinearity issues. The Societal Perspectives Scale correlations demonstrated a severe multicollinearity issue between the Liberal and Socialist feminist subscales. This multicollinearity issue also was observed in the Female Offender Perspectives Scale between the Liberal and Socialist feminist subscales, but at a lower level than in the Societal Perspectives Scale correlations. This implied that in both the Societal and Female Offender Perspectives Scales, to differing degrees, the Liberal and Socialist

statements could have been measuring the same concept. Though adjustments were not made to address this issue, it was assumed that in this case, a failure to adequately distinguish between the Liberal and Socialist feminist subscales occurred.

There was also a demonstration of severe multicollinearity between the Societal Perspectives Scales Femscore and each of the feminist subscales. Due to the fact that the Societal Perspectives Scales Femscore was a combination of the scores from the feminist subscales, this finding was expected. Since it was expected, the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore remained in the analysis.

In Table D-4(b), a slight problem with multicollinearity was found in the correlations of the variables that were used to measure political views and support. This issue was addressed in the Multivariate OLS Regression (Table D-5) by eliminating the use of whether a person was democratic or republican. It was decided that using whether a person was liberal, moderate, or conservative better measured their political viewpoints⁸. By collapsing viewpoints of political views, this issue could be addressed in the regression analysis (see Table D-5).

Table D-4(b) also denoted a multicollinearity issue with self identification as a feminist and the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore variable. Since this study examined the effects that a person's Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore has on their Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore, self identification as a feminist was not used in the regression.

⁸ This was decided due to the thought that being a liberal, moderate, or conservative was a better measure of how a person feels about and identifies themselves with various issues and ideals, than if they viewed themselves as a republican or democrat.

Multivariate OLS Regression

Table D-5 displays the results of the multivariate OLS regression using the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore as the dependant variable with the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore and the most statistically significant demographic variables as indicated by the second correlation matrix (Table D-4(b)). This regression model was found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) and the model explained 36.7% of the variance in the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore ($R^2 = .367$). Of the four independent variables used in the model, only the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore was found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$). For every one point a respondent scored on the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore, they scored .428 points on their Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore (see Table D-5).

DISCUSSION

Research into the area of female offenders has sought to enable criminal justice professionals to better understand issues such as the prevalence of female offending and theoretical explanations as to why women commit crime (Chesney-Lind, 1989; Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 1998; Crump, 1987; Heidensohn, 1995; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). Over time, these theories have grown from purely male centered theories to those that involve research about women, as well as men (Crump, 1987; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998). Research on women however has indicated that they are an invisible group, this being due mainly to their minimal representation in the system (Britton, 2000; Heidensohn, 1995; Nagel & Johnson, 1994; Naffine, 1995; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989). Some research has indicated that gender neutral theories are adequate enough to address female offending (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Smart, 1977). This does not fully encapsulate women in the system as there are many crimes that are labeled as 'sex specific' (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Snider, 2003).

Feminist theories have existed since the late 18th century (Donovan, 2000; Holmstrom, 2003). In her work, Wollstonecraft argued for the equality of women and a change in their status quo (Donovan, 2000; Holmstrom, 2003). Since her time, the idea of feminism has evolved to include many subsections of feminisms, and each has had its place in the history of women (Belknap, 2001; Donovan, 2000; Ehrenreich, 2005; Eisenstein, 1999; Gerson, 2002; Harlan, 1998; Henley et al., 1998; Holmstrom, 2003;

Simpson, 1989). Overall, feminists in general still argue for the equality of women and their male counterparts, but it is within the various sub-types of feminism that women (and men) differ about how they believe equality can be achieved.

A growing need for gender specific theories in criminal justice came about in the late twentieth century with the rise of works based on feminist theories (Adler, 1975; Crump, 1987; Heidensohn, 1995). Feminist theories lead to female specific explanations for women's place in society and specifically into research about women offenders (Belknap, 2001; Crump, 1987; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998).

While feminist research in the area of women offenders has significantly increased over time, perceptions of female offenders and feminist theories are another area in which research is lacking (Crites, 1978; Murphy & Brown, 2000; Ochie & Ngenge, 1996). Within the literature there have been studies which examined both males and females in gendered occupations and judges in the criminal justice system on their perceptions of the societal role of women (Crites, 1978; Murphy & Brown, 2000; Ochie & Ngenge, 1996). As to the current research topic, no studies have been found that discuss perceptions of feminist theories and views of female offenders in the general population or among criminal justice professionals.

Hypotheses

The current research examined two main hypotheses: first, whether the creation of a new scale (Female Offenders Perspectives Scale) to examine a respondent's view of female offenders based on four feminist and one non-feminist theory would yield high reliability and validity. Second, the current study sought to examine whether or not the

replicated version of the Henley et al. (1998) societal scale survey (see Appendix D, Section I) predicted the newly created offender scale (Female Offender Perspectives Scale) (see Appendix D, Section II), thus predicting whether or not a person held societal feminist beliefs and if those beliefs predicted their perceptions of female offenders.

Hypothesis #1

In their study, Henley et al. (1998) ran a Cronbach's alpha on their scale in order to determine the reliability of their statements. Since the current study replicated only a small portion of the statements from the Henley et al. (1998) study, a Cronbach's alpha was replicated for the current Societal Perspectives Scale. In comparison to the Cronbach's alpha for Henley et al.'s (1998) scale, the Cronbach's alpha of the Societal Perspectives Scale in the current study indicated similar scores for each individual perspective that was replicated⁹.

In addition, Cronbach's alpha was performed for the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore. This 'feminist score' indicated high reliability. A similar Femscore was created by Henley et al. (1998); however, their study included one other feminist theory in their calculation. Since the current Societal Perspectives Scale does not include all of the original theories, there can be no comparison of the results for this Cronbach's alpha. The results of the Cronbach's alpha for the Societal Perspectives Scale provided evidence that it was a reliable basis for the Female Offender Perspectives Scale since the latter was modeled after the former. Cronbach's alpha was also analyzed for the Female Offender

⁹ The feminist perspective, *Cultural Feminism* was omitted in the current study.

Perspectives Scale by individual feminist subscale and the Female Offender Perspectives Femscore.

Individually, the feminist subscales in the Female Offender Perspectives Scale each manifested a low Cronbach's alpha score (as indicated in Table D-3(b)). On the contrary, the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore demonstrated an adequate and more reliable score. Since each of the Female Offender Perspectives Scale items were modeled after the Societal Perspectives Scale statements, this indicated that there may have been some issues in the creation of the new scale's items. Overall, the results from the current study indicated that the Societal Perspectives Scale and the Female Offender Perspectives Scale are good beginning tools to measure whether or not a person holds feminist beliefs, and if so, how they view female offenders.

Hypothesis #2

Table D-4(b) indicated that those who identified themselves as feminists would score higher on the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore. While not completely contrary to the existing literature, this study found that variables listed in the literature as having some importance to perspectives on feminism, female offenders, and both combined, were not as predictive. Such variables included income, race, and political beliefs (Belknap, 2001; Britton, 2000; Chesney-Lind, 1997; Crites, 1976; Daly, 1998; Flavin, 2001; Henley et al. 1998; Murphy & Brown, 2000; Pollock et al., 2006; Simpson, 1989; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1998).

The Multivariate OLS regression found that an increase in an individual's Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore significantly predicted an increase in their Female

Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore as well. This finding is in support of the current study's hypothesis that the Societal Perspectives Scale scores found in this study predict the Female Offender Perspectives Scale results shown by respondents.

Limitations and Future Research

Limitations

One of the limitations of this research involved the omission of one of the feminist theories used by Henley et al. (1998) in their study. The elimination of cultural feminism was due to the fact that this theory was too close to aspects of the other subscales being used. This could have resulted in issues of multicollinearity between cultural feminism and those theories that share its components.

Another limitation to this study was the sample. By surveying undergraduate students in traditional undergraduate criminal justice classes, these findings cannot be generalized to any larger population, such as to all college students or the general public. There also could be some problems regarding the time that the survey was administered, the week prior to Dead Week¹⁰ and Dead Week itself. Surveying during this time frame could have affected the number of possible respondents. Smaller sample sizes have the potential to reduce both the internal and external validity of a study's findings.

The low Cronbach's alpha for the liberal feminist subscale in the Societal Perspectives Scale and in the Offender Perspectives Scale subscales were also a limitation to this study. This could possibly have been due to the fact that there were only

¹⁰ Dead Week is the name assigned to the week prior to final examinations. During this week, no tests or major projects are to be due in classes. It has frequently been known as a week that students do not come to class, in order to use the time to study or other reasons.

five indicators for each perspective in this scale. However, upon review of the high scores in the individual Societal Perspectives Scale items, it was likely that the survey statements created in the Offender Perspectives Scale may not have adequately measured the views of female offenders based on the various theories of feminism, and thus indicated a possible validity issue. Another reason could be that according to the research, liberal feminism is traced back as being part of Wollstonecraft's time and could be considered the first feminist view, thereby being the one that all of the rest of the feminist ideals branched from. That being said, it would make sense that the Cronbach's Alpha would be low as the liberal feminist items could each legitimately measure one of the other feminist views addressed in the current study.

The positive relationship in the Female Offender Perspectives Scale's conservative subscale correlations brought to light another limitation to this study. This problem indicated that the conservative subscale correlated in the wrong direction with the feminist subscales. Statement ambiguity may be at fault in this case and the need for rewritten statements may be in order for future research. Since the Female Offender Perspectives Scale statements were adapted from the Societal Perspective Scale statements, no factor analysis was run. Therefore the author is unable to identify which statements were ambiguous.

Table D-4(a) indicated that the Societal Perspectives Scale conservative subscale had a negative relationship with the Societal Perspectives Scale feminist subscales. This was expected. On the contrary, Table D-4(a) also showed that the Female Offender Perspectives Scale conservative subscale had a positive relationship with the Female

Offender Perspectives Scale feminist subscales. This brings up issues with validity and the creation of the Female Offender Perspectives Scale statements because, if the conservative subscale did indeed measure those beliefs, the correlations with the Female Offender Perspectives Scale feminist subscales should have been negative. They were all low, but were positive nonetheless.

As indicated by Table D-4(a), multicollinearity issues were demonstrated between some of the individual Societal Perspectives Scale feminist subscales or Female Offender Perspectives Scale feminist subscales or both perspectives. Since the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore used as the independent variable was the sum of the feminist subscales for each respondent, the multivariate OLS regression (Table D-5) which was statistically significant, could present with some issues. There is no way to determine how much the multicollinearity affected the Betas in the regressions and, thus, the strength of its predictive relationship with the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore. This issue could be due to a low sample size in the current study or failure to differentiate the statements across the feminist subscales.

The skewed distribution revealed in the multivariate regression (Table D-5) also places a limitation on this study. This affected the standard errors of the race and political variables causing them to exceed the slope. This is likely to have been caused by the low sample size in this study and/or the demographic composition of the geographic area.

Future Research

Since the issue of feminist theories and their influence on female offending is an under-researched area, this study seeks to open doors for future studies of this kind. This

study was just the start of future research that is needed in order to understand the role, if any, that feminist theories play in the decision-making of criminal justice policymakers and professionals regarding women and female offending.

Future studies that seek to replicate the current study should address the multicollinearity issues shown in the correlation matrix. The reliability and validity issues should be taken into account and addressed as well. Further replication of this survey in future studies with increased sample sizes would help to address the issues found in this study with each of the scales. Future studies should focus on the issue of differentiating between the various feminist subscale theories and running a factor analysis on each of the subscales and the items they contain. The overlap of tenets across these subscales is such that, without clear means of differentiating measures, multicollinearity will continue to be an issue.

Finally, another area for future research should further examine the effects that demographic and control variables individually have on the views of feminism and female offenders. Such a study would require a larger sample size than the present study included. Studies on the effects that religion or politics play on the ideals of feminism and female offenders are an interesting area that is not commonly researched in the criminal justice field.

CONCLUSIONS

Using statements taken from the Henley et al. (1998) study, this research replicated statements used in their second study. These statements were combined in the current study to create a new scale labeled the ‘Societal Perspectives Scale’. Further, the current study introduces a new scale, the “Female Offender Perspectives Scale”, which was created based on the societal items taken from the Henley et al. (1998) study. Using these two scales, this study sought to answer two main questions: 1) whether or not the introduction of the Female Offender Perspectives Scale would yield high reliability; and 2) whether or not the Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore (see Appendix C, Section I) would predict the Female Offender Perspectives Scale Femscore (see Appendix C, Section II).

This study found first that the Female Offender Perspectives Scale demonstrated high reliability overall. Notably, however, the individual feminist subscales reliability scores were not as high. Second, and most importantly, with the limitations and issues facing the current study in mind, it was determined using multivariate regression that how a person scored on the Societal Perspectives Scale was a good predictor of how a respondent would score on the Female Offender Perspectives Scale. These findings support the main hypothesis of this study that if a person holds feminist beliefs or viewpoints about women in society, they will also view female offenders in the same light.

These and future findings could bring about a better understanding of how policymakers and professionals view female offenders and whether or not those views influence their decision-making in terms of the prosecution, sentencing, and rehabilitation of female offenders. It is believed that with the realization of how a person in a position of power views a female offender can better enable that person to help or hinder women in the criminal justice system. Female offenders are indeed different from their male counterparts in many respects and a better understanding of perceptions about them can address possible discrepancies in how female offending is addressed in the criminal justice system. It is no longer just a 'man's world' and as such, women offenders need to be treated based on their most basic difference with males...the fact that they are women.

REFERENCES

- Adler, F. (1975). *Sisters in crime: The rise of the new female criminal*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Babbie, E. (2010). *The practice of social research*, 12th edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Belknap, J. (2001). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime, and justice*, 2nd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Blalock, H. M. (1979). *Social statistics*, Revised 2nd edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Britton, D. M. (2000). Feminism in criminology: Engendering the outlaw. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 571, 57-76.
- Burman, M. (2004). Breaking the mould: Patterns of female offending. In G. McIvor (Ed.), *Women who offend* (pp.39-65). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1989). Girls' crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35(1), 5-29.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1995). Women and crime: The female offender. In N. Naffine (Ed.), *Gender, Crime and Feminism* (pp. 3-21). England: Dartmouth Publishing Company Limited.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1997). *The female offender: Girls, women, and crime*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Chesney-Lind, M. & Shelden, R. G. (1998). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice*, Second Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Cohen, A. K. (1955). *Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Crites, L. (Ed.). (1976). *The female offender*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Crites, L. (1978). Women in the criminal court. In W. Hepperle & L.Crites (Eds.), *Women in the courts* (pp. 160-175). Williamsburg, VA: National Center for State Courts.
- Crump, A. (1987). Women and crime-A contemporary controversy. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 31, 31-40.

- Daly, K. (1998). Gender, crime and criminology. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *The handbook of crime and punishment*. (pp. 85-108). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Daly, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (1988). Feminism and criminology. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(4), 497-538.
- Donovan, J. (2000). *Feminist theory: The intellectual traditions*. New York, NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- Ehrenreich, B. (2005). What is socialist feminism? *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine*, 57(3), 70-77.
- Eisenstein, Z. (1999). Constructing a theory of capitalist patriarchy and socialist feminism. *Critical Sociology*, 25(2/3), 196-217.
- Flavin, J. (2001). Feminism for the mainstream criminologist: An invitation. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29, 271-285.
- Gelsthorpe, L. (2004). Female offending: A theoretical overview. In G. McIvor (Ed.), *Women who offend* (pp.13-37). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Gerson, G. (2002). Liberal feminism: Individuality and oppositions in Wollstonecraft and Mill. *Political Studies*, 50, 794-810.
- Gilbert, E. (2001). Women, race, and criminal justice processing. In C. Renzetti & L. Goodstein (Eds.), *Women, crime and criminal justice: Original feminist readings* (pp. 222-228). Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Co.
- Grana, S. (2002). *Women and (in)justice: The criminal and civil effects of the common law on women's lives*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- GraphPad Software, Inc. (2002 – 2005). *QuickCalcs Online Calculator for Scientists*. Retrieved April 22, 2008 from the world wide web: <http://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/randomn1.cfm>.
- Greenfeld, L. A., & Snell, T. L. (1999). *Women offenders*. Bureau of Justice Statistics: Special Report. U.S. Department of Justice, December.
- Harlan, J. (1998). *Feminism: A reference handbook*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Hedderman, C. (2004). The criminogenic needs of women offenders. In G. McIvor (Ed.), *Women who offend* (pp. 227-244). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Heidensohn, F. M. (1995). *Women and crime: The life of the female offender*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

- Henderson, J. H., & Pearl, N. R. (1997). Feminist theory and alienation: Explaining female crime. *Caribbean Journal of Criminology and Social Psychology*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Henley, N. M., Meng, K., O'Brien, D., McCarthy, W. J., & Sockloskie, R. J. (1998). Developing a scale to measure the diversity of feminist attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 22, 317-348.
- Holmstrom, N. (2003). The socialist feminist project. *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine*, 54(10), 38.
- Holsinger, K. (2000). Feminist perspectives on female offending: Examining real girls' lives. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 12(1), 23-51.
- Koons-Witt, B. A. & Schram, P. J. (2003). The prevalence and nature of violent offending by females. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31, 361-371.
- Kruttschnitt, C. (1992). "Female crimes" or legal labels: Are statistics about women offenders representative of their crimes?. In I. L. Moyer (Ed.), *The Changing Roles of Women in the Criminal Justice System: Offenders, Victims & Professionals* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Loucks, N. (2004). Women in prison. In G. McIvor (Ed.), *Women who offend* (pp.142-158). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lyon, M. R. (2004). No means no? Withdrawal of consent during intercourse and the continuing evolution of the definition of rape. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 95(1), 277-314.
- Merton, R. K. (1938). *Social structure and anomie*. New York: Irvington
- Murphy, E., & Brown, J. (2000). Exploring gender role identity, value orientation of occupation and sex of respondent in influencing attitudes towards male and female offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 5(2), 285-290.
- Naffine, N. (1995). *Gender, crime and feminism*. England: Dartmouth Publishing Company Limited.
- Nagel, I. H., & Johnson, B. L. (1994). The role of gender in a structured sentencing system: Equal treatment, policy choices, and the sentencing of female offenders under the United States sentencing guidelines. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 85(1), 181-221.
- Ochie, C. O., & Ngenge, T. T. (1996). Judicial attitudes on feminist ideas and female felons: The impact on female crime patterns. *Journal of the Oklahoma Criminal Justice Research Consortium*, 3, 135-145.

- Pollak, O. (1978). *The criminality of women*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pollock, J. (2002). *Women, prison, & crime* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Pollock, J. M., Mullings, J. L., & Crouch, B. M. (2006). Violent Women: Findings from the Texas Women Inmates Study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(4), 485-502.
- Robison, J. (2002) Feminism—What's in a name? Retrieved October 6, 2006 from the world wide web: <http://brain.gallup.com/content/default.aspx?ci=6715>.
- Simon, R. J., & Landis, J. (1991). *The crimes women commit the punishments they receive*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Simpson, S. S. (1989). Feminist Theory, Crime, and Justice. *Criminology*, 27(4), 605-631.
- Smart, C. (1977). *Women, crime and criminology: A feminist critique*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Snelling, S. J. (1999). Women's perspectives on feminism: A q-methodological study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 247-266.
- Snider, L. (2003). Constituting the punishable woman: Atavistic man incarcerates postmodern woman. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43(2), 354-378.
- Steffensmeier, D. J. (2001). Female crime trends, 1960-1995. In C. Renzetti & L. Goodstein (Eds.), *Women, crime and criminal justice: Original feminist readings* (pp. 191-211). Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Co.
- Steffensmeier, D. J., & Allan, E. A. (1996). Gender and crime: Toward a gendered theory of female offending. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 459-487.
- Steffensmeier, D. & Allan, E. (1998). The nature of female offending: Patterns and explanation. In R. T. Zaplin (Eds.), *Female offenders: critical perspectives and effective interventions* (5-29). Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen Publisher, Inc.
- Steffensmeier, D. J., & Broidy, L. (2001). Explaining female offending. In C. Renzetti & L. Goodstein (Eds.), *Women, crime and criminal justice: Original feminist readings* (pp. 111-132). Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Co.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1939). *Principles of criminology* (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Co.

UCLA: Academic Technology Services, Statistical Consulting Group. (n.d.). Statistical Computing, SPSS, FAQ, *What does Cronbach's alpha mean?*. Retrieved March 30, 2010 from the world wide web:

<http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/spss/faq/alpha.html>.

Wollstonecraft, M. (1992). *A vindication of the rights of woman*. New York: Everyman's Library.

APPENDIX A

Major Findings of Previous Research

Major Findings of Previous Research

Author(s)	Article Year	Data Covers- Year(s)	Major Findings
Belknap	2001	1998	<p>Total Crimes women constituted 21.8%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Total Index crimes women constituted 25.6% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Violent Index Crimes women constituted 16.8% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Murder & Non-negligent manslaughter- 11.2% ● Property Crime Index women constituted 28.9% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larceny-theft- 34.7% ● Selected Non-Index offenses for women <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other Assaults- 22.4% ○ Drug Abuse Violations- 17.5% ○ Prostitution and commercialized vice- 57.8%
Chesney-Lind	1997	1985-1994 Changes in arrest patterns during specified years	<p>Total Arrests for women went up 36.4%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Total Index Crimes rose 25.2% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Violent Crimes rose 89.9% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Murder & Non-negligent manslaughter fell 4.2% ● Property Crimes rose 16.1% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larceny-theft rose 14.1% ● Selected Non-Index Crimes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other Assaults rose 126.2% ○ Forgery & counterfeiting rose 41.6% ○ Embezzlement rose 40.8% ○ Drug Abuse Violations rose 100.1% ○ Prostitution and commercialized vice decreased 24.9% ○ Offenses against family and children rose 264.6%
Crites	1976	1960-1974 Changes in arrest patterns during specified years Comparison of most frequent offenses arrested for in years 1960 and 1974	<p>Total Arrests for women increased 6.2%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Total Index Crimes rose 8.8% ● Total Violent Index crimes rose 0.6% ● Total Property Index Crimes rose 11.9% ● Most frequent arrests for females in 1960 were (in rank order) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drunkenness ○ Disorderly Conduct ○ Larceny-theft ○ Prostitution ○ Other Assaults ○ Liquor Laws ● Most frequent arrests for females in 1974 were (in rank order) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larceny-theft ○ Disorderly conduct ○ Drunkenness ○ Narcotic Drug Laws ○ Prostitution ○ Other Assaults

Author(s)	Article Year	Data Covers- Year(s)	Major Findings
Greenfield & Snell	1999	1998 Variety of statistics about female offenders	<p>In 1998, the total arrest percentage for women was 22%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 14% of violent offenders were women based on self reports by victims between 1993-1997 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 53% of violent female offenders committed the act alone <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 40% committed the act with another female offender ▪ About 8% committed the act with a male offender ○ More than half of violent female offenders were said to be white <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Just over a third were said to be black ▪ Approximately 1 in 10 were said to be from an "other" race category ● In 1998, murder rates were the lowest since 1976 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Murder victims of females were more likely to be an acquaintance or a spouse ○ Over half of female murderers use a firearm, but they are more than likely to use a knife than are males ● In 1998, total violent offense arrests for women were 17% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Murder was 11% ○ Robbery was 10% ○ Aggravated Assault was 20% ● Property offense arrests were 29% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Burglary was 13% ○ Larceny was 35% ● Drug offense arrests were 18% ● DUI offense arrests were 16%

Author(s)	Article Year	Data Covers- Year(s)	Major Findings
Simon & Landis	1991	<p>1963-1987 Changes in arrest patterns and comparison during specified years</p> <p>Comparison of most frequent offenses arrested for in years 1972, 1980 and 1987</p>	<p>Total arrest rate for women from 1963-1987 increased 6.3%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Violent crimes increased by .8% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Criminal homicide decreased 3% ○ Aggravated Assault decreased .7% ● Property crimes increased by 12.4% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Robbery increased 3.2% ○ Burglary increased by 4.6% ○ Larceny increased 12.1% ○ Fraud increased 24.5% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only noted from 1964-1987 ○ Forgery increased 16.8% ○ Embezzlement increased 20.8% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only noted from 1964-1987 ● Drug crimes increased .7% overall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From 1963-1971 they increased 2.1%, but from 1971-1987 they decreased 1.4% ● Prostitution decreased 2.1% ● Crimes against the family increased 8.3% ● Most frequent crimes arrested for in 1972 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larceny-theft ○ Drunkenness ○ Disorderly conduct ○ Drug offenses ○ other assaults ○ DUI ○ Prostitution ○ Embezzlement and Fraud ○ Liquor violations ○ Aggravated assault ● Most frequent crimes arrested for in 1980 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larceny-theft ○ DUI ○ Disorderly conduct ○ Fraud ○ Drunkenness ○ Drug offenses ○ Liquor violations ○ Other assaults ○ Prostitution and other vice ○ Aggravated assault ● Most frequent crimes arrested for in 1987 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larceny-theft ○ DUI ○ Fraud ○ Drug offenses ○ Disorderly conduct ○ Other assaults ○ Liquor violations ○ Drunkenness ○ Prostitution and other vice ○ Aggravated assault

Author(s)	Article Year	Data Covers- Year(s)	Major Findings
Steffensmeier	2001	1960-1995 Changes in arrest patterns during specified years with a look at 1980 when indicated	<p>From 1960 to 1995, total arrest rate for all offenses by women rose 8.6%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Total Index crimes increased 12.5% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Violent crimes increased 3.5% overall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From 1960-1980 they decreased .5%, but then increased 4% from 1980-1995 ○ Homicide crimes decreased 8% ○ Aggravated Assault crimes increased 2.2% overall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ From 1960-1980 they decreased 1.9%, but from 1980-1995 they increased 4.1% ● Simple Assault increased 8.1% ● Total property crimes increased 15.4% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Larceny-theft crimes increased 15.4 % ○ Fraud crimes rose 23.8% ○ Forgery crimes rose 18.5% ○ Embezzlement was only noted from 1980-1995, but during that time it rose 15.3% ● Drug offenses increased 1.3% overall <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ From 1960-1980 they decreased 1.6%, but from 1980-1995 they increased 2.9% ● Prostitution offenses decreased 11.5% ● Crimes against family increased 10.9%

APPENDIX B

Surveyed Classes, Times, and Locations

Surveyed Classes, Times, and Locations

CLASS NUMBER (SECTION) NAME	DAYS & TIMES	CAMPUS LOCATION (ROOM #)	# STUDENTS (# SURVEYS COMPLETED)
CJ 101(001) Introduction to Criminal Justice	T 6:00 p.m.	Main (ILC 303)	26 (1)
CJ 102(001) Introduction to Policing	Tu/Th 10:40 a.m.	Main (LA 106)	55 (55)
CJ 103(003) Introduction to Law & Justice	Tu/Th 1:40 p.m.	Main (E110)	40 (38)
CJ 301(5550) Administration of Justice	W 6:00 p.m.	Gowen (B500 R170)	24 (19)
CJ 315(5550) Theories of Crime	Tu/Th 1:40 p.m.	Main (ILC 303)	28 (14)
CJ 376(5550) Law of Arrest, Search & Seizure	Th 6:00 p.m.	Gowen (B578 R403)	24 (12)
CJ 425(001) Research Methods	M 6:00 p.m.	Main (MP312)	20 (15)
CJ 426(001) Statistics	W 6:00 p.m.	Main (MP308)	26 (26)
CJ 461(001) Contemporary Issues in American Policing	Tu/Th 10:40 a.m.	Main (E106)	14 (14)
CJ 498(002) Senior Seminar	Tu/Th 12:15 p.m.	Main (B302)	9 (9)

TOTAL STUDENTS	266
(TOTAL SURVEYS)	228
Nonresponsive (Taken Out)	<u>-10</u>
FINAL TOTAL SURVEYS	218

APPENDIX C

Sample Survey Data Collection Form

Sample Survey Data Collection Form

Section I: Societal Perspectives Scale*

Please read the following statements and place the number, which best represents your response in the space provided before each one.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Undecided	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

- _____ 1. Whether one chooses a traditional or alternative family form should be a matter of personal choice.
- _____ 2. People should define their marriage and family roles in ways that make them feel most comfortable
- _____ 3. Women of color have less legal and social service protection from being battered than White women have.
- _____ 4. A man's first responsibility is to obtain economic success, while his wife should care for the family's needs.
- _____ 5. Using "man" to mean both men and women is one of many ways sexist language destroys women's existence.
- _____ 6. Sex role stereotypes are only one symptom of the larger system of patriarchal power, which is the true source of women's subordination.
- _____ 7. Homosexuals need to be rehabilitated into normal members of society.
- _____ 8. The workplace is organized around men's physical, economic, and sexual oppression of women.
- _____ 9. Women of color are oppressed by White standards of beauty.
- _____ 10. Making women economically dependent on men is capitalism's subtle way of encouraging heterosexual relationships.
- _____ 11. Homosexuality is not a moral issue, but rather a question of liberty and freedom of expression.
- _____ 12. Being put on a pedestal, which White women have protested, is a luxury that women of color have not had.
- _____ 13. Men use abortion laws and reproductive technology to control women's lives.

* Henley et al., 1998

- _____14. Men prevent women from becoming political leaders through their control of economic and political institution
- _____15. It is a man's right and duty to maintain order in his family by whatever means necessary.
- _____16. The way to eliminate prostitution is to make women economically equal to men.
- _____17. Capitalism hinders a poor woman's chance to obtain adequate prenatal medical care or an abortion.
- _____18. Women should try to influence legislation in order to gain the right to make their own decisions and choices.
- _____19. In rape programs and workshops, not enough attention has been given to the special needs of women of color.
- _____20. It is the capitalist system which forces women to be responsible for childcare.
- _____21. Women should not be assertive like men because men are the natural leaders on earth.
- _____22. Discrimination in the workplace is worse for women of color than for all men and White women.
- _____23. Capitalism forces most women to wear feminine clothes to keep a job.
- _____24. Heterosexuality is the only natural sexual preference.
- _____25. Men need to be liberated from oppressive sex role stereotypes as much as women do.

Section II: Female Offender Perspectives Scale

Please read the following statements and place the number, which best represents your response in the space provided before each one.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Undecided	Slightly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Strongly Agree

- _____1. When a woman is named as a co-conspirator with a man, he is obviously considered the "brains" of the operation.
- _____2. Mothers in prison need to seek legislative help in gaining more parental rights while incarcerated.
- _____3. Female offenders of color have a lower education level than White female offenders.

- _____4. Females are innately deceitful; therefore it is logical that they would commit crime.
- _____5. Females only resort to prostitution because they cannot succeed economically as well as men.
- _____6. Due to a capitalist society, single mothers are faced with being the sole support for their children and should not be incarcerated away from them.
- _____7. Women commit crime because we have abandoned the traditional family structure.
- _____8. Female offenders of color tend to recidivate faster than men or White women.
- _____9. Women commit crimes because they are too emotional.
- _____10. Female offenders should only be given sewing, cooking and cleaning jobs while in prison.
- _____11. A woman is more likely to commit a crime if she is poor and a member of a minority group.
- _____12. Female prostitutes should be able to sell their bodies as they see fit.
- _____13. Poor women tend to commit more crime than poor men.
- _____14. Female criminals show a sense of assertiveness that is contradictory to how women should act.
- _____15. Women of color tend to be incarcerated for drug crimes at a higher rate than White women.
- _____16. The only way for male correctional officers to keep a female inmate in line is to use force and subordination tactics.
- _____17. Women lack the same educational opportunities as men, which contributes to their commission of crime.
- _____18. Governmental agencies make it difficult for female convicts to survive outside of prison.
- _____19. We do not need research on female offenders because research on males offenders can apply to both men and women.
- _____20. When a woman cannot economically rely on a man for support, she has to turn to a life of crime.
- _____21. Incarcerated female offenders have limited job-training opportunities due to the male dominated administration of prisons.
- _____22. Capitalism makes it difficult for a female offender to succeed in life after prison.

- _____23. Female offenders in prison should conform to any wishes of the male correctional officers.
- _____24. Women of color are largely over represented in female offender populations.
- _____25. A high number of domestic violence victims who kill their abusers are women of color.

Section III: Demographic Information

In this section, please answer the following questions about yourself by either circling the correct response, or writing your response in the provided spot.

- 1) Number of credits you have completed as of January 22, 2008?
 - a. 0-25
 - b. 26-57
 - c. 58-89
 - d. 90 or more
- 2) What is the class number of the course you are in right now? _____
- 3) What is your major? _____
- 4) What is your age? _____

(IF YOU ARE **UNDER** 25, SKIP TO QUESTION 4a; IF YOU ARE **OVER** 25, SKIP TO QUESTION 4b)

- 4a) Which of the following categories does your annual pre-tax family household income fall into?
 - a. Less than \$15,000
 - b. \$15,001-30,000
 - c. \$30,001-60,000
 - d. \$60,001-90,000
 - e. \$90,001-120,000
 - f. \$120,001-above
- 4b) Which of the following categories does your annual pre-tax household income fall into?
 - g. Less than \$15,000
 - h. \$15,001-30,000
 - i. \$30,001-60,000
 - j. \$60,001-90,000
 - k. \$90,001-120,000

1. \$120,001-above
- 5) Which race or ethnicity do you identify yourself with the most?
 - a. African American
 - b. American Indian
 - c. Asian American
 - d. Hispanic
 - e. Multi-ethnic/racial
 - f. Non-Hispanic white
 - g. Other
- 6) What is your gender?
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
- 7) In general, do you consider yourself to be Liberal, Moderate, or Conservative on most political issues?
 - a. Liberal
 - b. Moderate
 - c. Conservative
- 8) In general, do you consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican or Independent?
 - a. Democrat
 - b. Republican
 - c. Independent
- 9) If you do consider yourself to be a Democrat, Republican, or Independent, is your support strong, moderate or weak for that perspective?
 - a. Strong
 - b. Moderate
 - c. Weak
- 10) What is your marital status?
 - a. Single (Never Married)
 - b. Married
 - c. Divorced
 - d. Widowed
 - e. Living with an intimate partner
- 11) Are you a member of a church or religious affiliation?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No

12) If yes, on average how many times a month do you attend services? _____

13) Do you consider yourself to be a feminist?

- a. Yes
- b. No

APPENDIX D

Data Analysis Tables

Table D-1(a). Societal Perspectives Scale Statements

Societal Perspectives Scale Statements	
Liberal Feminism	(17) Women lack the same educational opportunities as men, which contributes to their commission of crime.
Radical Feminism	(20) When a woman cannot economically rely on a man for support, she has to turn to a life of crime.
Socialist Feminism	(11) A woman is more likely to commit crime if she is poor and a member of a minority group.
Women of Color Feminism/Womanism	(24) Women of color are largely over represented in female offender populations.
Conservative	(4) Females are innately deceitful; therefore it is logical that they would commit crime.

Table D-1(b). Female Offender Perspectives Scale Statements

Female Offender Perspectives Scale Statements	
Liberal Feminism	(1) Whether one chooses a traditional or alternative family form should be a matter of personal choice. [5]
Radical Feminism	(5) Using "man" to mean both men and women is one of many ways sexist language destroys women's existence. [15]
Socialist Feminism	(9) Making women economically dependent on men is capitalism's subtle way of encouraging heterosexual relationships. [20]
Women of Color Feminism/Womanism	(3) Women of color have less legal and social service protection from being battered than White women have. [12]
Conservative	(4) A man's first responsibility is to gain economic success, while his wife should care for the family's needs. [13]

Table D-2. Demographic and Control Variables

Demographic and Control Variables				
Variable	# of Students	Mean	SD	Percent
Class Number (N=218)				
Lower Division	155			71.1
Upper Division	63			28.9
Number of Credits Completed (N=217)				
Freshman (0-25)	46			21.2
Sophomore (26-57)	32			14.7
Junior (58-89)	46			21.2
Senior (90 or More)	93			42.9
College of Major (N=217)				
Arts & Sciences	12			5.5
Business	12			5.5
Engineering	3			1.4
Health Sciences	4			1.8
Applied Technology	2			.9
Social Sciences & Public Affairs	179			82.5
Criminal Justice	145			
Undeclared	5			2.3
Age (N=209)		25.18	7.234	
Family Income (Under 25) (N=118)				
Less than \$15,000	27			22.9
\$15,001-30,000	28			23.7
\$30,001-60,000	26			22.0
\$60,001-90,000	17			14.4
\$90,001-120,000	11			9.3
\$120,001 and above	9			7.6
Self Income (Over 25) (N=94)				
Less than \$15,000	14			14.9
\$15,001-30,000	29			30.9
\$30,001-60,000	31			33.0
\$60,001-90,000	17			18.1
\$90,001-120,000	1			1.1
\$120,001 and above	2			2.1
Race/Ethnicity (N=216)				
African American	3			1.4
American Indian	3			1.4
Asian American	3			1.4
Caucasian/Non-Hispanic	177			81.9
Hispanic	21			9.7
Multi-Ethnic/Racial	3			1.4
Other	6			2.8

Table D-2. Demographic and Control Variables (cont.)

Demographic and Control Variables (cont.)				
Variable	# of Students	Mean	SD	Percent
Gender (N=218)				
Female	121			55.5
Male	97			44.5
Liberal, Moderate or Conservative (N=212)				
Liberal	66			31.1
Moderate	92			43.4
Conservative	54			25.5
Democrat, Republican or Independent (N=211)				
Democrat	72			34.1
Republican	81			38.4
Independent	58			27.5
Support-Strong, Moderate or Weak (N=212)				
Strong	48			22.6
Moderate	139			65.6
Weak	25			11.8
Marital Status (N=214)				
Single (Never Married)	132			61.7
Married	41			19.2
Divorced	19			8.9
Living with an Intimate Partner	22			10.3
Religious Affiliation (N=213)				
No	114			53.5
Yes	99			46.5
Number of attended services-Monthly (N=100)		2.72	2.132	
Self Identification of Feminist (N=212)				
No	163			76.9
Yes	49			23.1

Table D-3(a). Cronbach's alpha-Societal Perspectives Scale

Cronbach's alpha-Societal Perspectives Scale (N=218)				
	Standardized	Alpha	Mean	SD
Conservative	.710	.709	13.63	6.804
Liberal	.572	.558	26.36	5.381
Radical	.834	.833	15.72	7.496
Socialist	.802	.801	15.89	7.127
Woman of Color/Womanism	.779	.776	17.80	6.691
Societal Perspectives Femscore	.887	.889	75.77	21.207
Total Societal	.819	.813	74.04	17.536

Table D-3(b). Cronbach's alpha-Female Offender Perspectives Scale

Cronbach's alpha-Female Offender Perspectives Scale (N=218)				
	Standardized	Alpha	Mean	SD
Conservative	.618	.611	12.06	5.011
Liberal	.529	.495	15.92	5.710
Radical	.517	.478	10.73	4.319
Socialist	.533	.534	15.37	5.286
Woman of Color/Womanism	.658	.656	19.95	5.039
Female Offender Perspectives Femscore	.782	.779	61.98	15.105
Total Offender	.802	.797	163.44	34.136

Table D-4(a). Feminist Subscale Correlation Matrix

Feminist Subscale Correlation Matrix											
	Female Offender Femscore	Societal-Conservative	Societal-Liberal	Societal-Radical	Societal-Socialist	Societal-Woman of Color/Womanism	Female Offender-Conservative	Female Offender-Liberal	Female Offender-Radical	Female Offender-Socialist	Female Offender-Woman of Color/Womanism
Societal Femscore	.600**	-.296**	.634**	.883**	.866**	.748**	.024	.582**	.215**	.545**	.384**
Female Offender Femscore		.102	.212**	.501**	.573**	.559**	.358**	.782**	.620**	.812**	.728**
Societal-Conservative			-.473**	-.312**	-.154*	-.044	.535**	-.071	.309**	.037	.084
Societal- Liberal				.476**	.378**	.269**	-.215**	.275**	-.088	.214**	.176**
Societal- Radical					.738**	.510**	-.025	.499**	.208**	.457**	.278**
Societal- Socialist						.547**	.132*	.535**	.287**	.559**	.280**
Societal- Woman of Color/Womanism							.138*	.493**	.213**	.447**	.466**
Female Offender-Conservative								.120*	.419**	.310**	.254**
Female Offender-Liberal									.328**	.513**	.391**
Female Offender-Radical										.358**	.255**
Female Offender-Socialist											.497**
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).											

Table D-4(b). Demographic Correlation Matrix

Demographic Correlation Matrix									
	Female Offender Femscore	Societal Femscore	Class #	# of Credits Completed	Major	Students Age	Family Income-Under 25	Self Income-Over 25	Race
Societal Femscore									
Class #	.057								
# of Credits Completed	-.044		.479*						
Major	.102		.451*	.307**					
Students Age	.015		.110	.317**	.140*				
Family Income-Under 25	-.196*		-.163	-.180	-.017	-.095			
Self Income-Over 25	.073		.069	-.124	-.004	.137	. ^a		
Race	.161*		.064	.036	.031	-.009	-.167	-.116	
Gender	.008		-.020	.029	-.121	.060	-.045	-.058	-.056
Liberal, Moderate, or Conservative	-.183**		.028	.028	.111	-.007	.198*	.133	-.198**
Politics-Democrat	.157*		.071	.071	.014	.063	-.061	-.150	.213**
Politics-Republican	.208**		-.042	-.042	.037	-.043	-.054	.059	-.156*
Political Support-Weak, Moderate, or Strong	-.006		.102	.102	.118	.131	-.070	.046	.107
Marital Status	-.128		.141	.141	.115	.306**	-.023	.437**	.049
Religious Affiliation	-.125		.004	.004	.072	-.076	.058	.038	.056
# of Attended Services-Monthly	-.010		.103	.103	.187	.098	-.089	-.052	.083
Self Identification of Feminist	.241**		.066	.066	.059	.069	-.085	.011	.066
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed). ^a . Correlation cannot be computed because at least one variable is a constant.									

Table D-4(b). Demographic Correlation Matrix (cont.)

Demographic Correlation Matrix (cont.)								
	Gender	Liberal, Moderate, or Conservative	Politics-Democrat	Politics-Republican	Political Support-Weak, Moderate, or Strong	Marital Status	Religious Affiliation	# of Attended Services-Monthly
Societal Femscore								
Class #								
# of Credits Completed								
Major								
Students Age								
Family Income-Under 25								
Self Income-Over 25								
Race								
Gender								
Liberal, Moderate, or Conservative	-.195**							
Politics-Democrat	.035	-.505**						
Politics-Republican	-.062	.529**	-.568**					
Political Support-Weak, Moderate, or Strong	-.108	-.031	.121	-.021				
Marital Status	-.062	.084	-.057	.038	.098			
Religious Affiliation	-.007	.348**	-.196**	.332**	.055	.107		
# of Attended Services-Monthly	-.126	.138	-.122	.064	.020	.194	.082	
Self Identification of Feminist	.219**	-.161*	.164*	-.165*	.078	-.069	-.125	-.073
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed). *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).								

Table D-5. Multivariate OLS Regression

Multivariate OLS Regression		
Variables	B (s.e.)	Beta
Family Income (Under 25)	-.799 (.719)	-.088
Recoded Race	-.798 (3.872)	-.016
Liberal, Moderate, or Conservative	.828 (1.535)	.046
Societal Perspectives Scale Femscore	.428* (.061)	.605
Constant	31.414	
Model F	15.824	
Model R ²	.367	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).