

6/11/19

THE FEMALE OFFENDER AND PUBLIC OPINION:
PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMES
AND RECOMMENDED DISPOSITIONS

by

Dretha M. Phillips
Lois DeFleur Nelson, Ph.D.
Gregory B. Walters

NCJRS
007 9 198
ACQUISITIONS

Revised version of paper presented at the American Society of Criminology meetings, Tucson, Arizona, November, 1976. The research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health training grant number MH08339.

72473

INTRODUCTION

Much of the writing and research in the field of criminology, particularly within the last decade, has been characterized by an emphasis on the subjective components believed to be inherent in the operation of the criminal justice system (see esp., Quinney, 1970; Henshel and Silverman, eds., 1975). Perceptions of, more than objective data on, crime waves, criminals, and appropriate legal sanctions, for example, are posited to have a considerable impact on the apprehension, adjudication, and reintegration into the community of criminal offenders (see, e.g., Conklin, 1975:15-49; McIntyre, 1975:188-94; Henshel and Silverman, eds., 1975:19). Such perceptions are held by, and influence the decisions of, those people -- such as legislators, police, attorneys, jurors, and judges -- who are situated at critical "decision-points" in the criminal justice system (Henshel and Silverman, eds., 1975:5). In addition, a number of researchers have assumed that not only do the general public and the legal decision-makers share similar perceptions, but that the formal processing of offenders is a reflection of public perceptions of crimes and criminals (see, e.g., Schur, 1971:51; Thielbar and Feldman, 1975:3; Doleshal, 1970:456; for a statement to the contrary, see Grindstaff, 1974).

One area of criminology which has relied heavily on the assumption of an influential link between public perceptions and the operation of the criminal justice system is that of female criminality. Renewed popular and professional interest in female crime and its ramifications has led to considerable research into the processing and treatment of offenders, particularly in comparison with the handling of male offenders. As will be demonstrated by the following discussion of the literature, nearly every author has noted differential processing of female offenders, and has offered the differing perceptions of female and of male offenders assumed to be held by the general public as explanations for the decisions of social control agents. However, there has

been no attempt to determine if the general public does, indeed, agree with and prefer such differential handling of female offenders. In fact, as Grindstaff notes:

In the absence of accurate documentation of public sentiment, . . . , we are forced to rely on the extent to which the state or a given official interprets the popular consensus . . . (1974:418).

The intent of the present paper, then, is to provide preliminary information on the supposed congruency of public opinion with official processing of female offenders. In particular, the data presented herein bear directly on the extent to which the public of the State of Washington differentiates on the basis of sex of the offender in the areas of perceived seriousness of specific crimes, recommended dispositions for, and social acceptance of, the convicted offender.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Particularly within the last few years, a number of researchers have noted that, of all the factors that may impinge on the operation of the criminal justice system, recognition of sex of the offender and perceptions of gender roles may have the greatest singular impact on judicial processing of offenders. As early as 1931, Lekkerkerker observed that "women offenders were often handled with 'noncriminal methods' and either granted probation, dismissed, or turned over to private agencies or supervision without any sort of formal conviction" (in Rasche, 1975:21). In 1967, Reckless and Kay reviewed various studies of female criminality and concluded that:

Victims or observers of female violators are unwilling to take action against the offender because she is a woman. Police are much less willing to make on-the-spot arrests of or 'book' and hold women for court action than men. Courts are also easy on women, because they are women (in Simon, 1975:10). [emphasis added]

Indeed, it appears that women offenders may need little further defense beyond the fact of womanhood. Female offenders drop out of the crime statistics at a disproportionately high rate at each stage of the criminal justice system. Simon summarized the situation by stating:

. . . although 1 in 6.5 arrests is a woman, and 1 in 9 convictions is a woman, only about 1 in 30 of those sentenced to prison is a woman (1975:87). (see also Fox, 1972:254)

In their research on felony sentencing, Lotz and Hewitt found that sex of the offender was the only "legally irrelevant factor" which had a direct effect on sentencing (n.d.:26). Their data indicated that "while 80 percent of women get a deferred sentence, less than half the men are so fortunate" (n.d.:23). Simon reports that criminal trial court judges who were interviewed readily admit treating women more leniently and more gently than men at the time of passing sentence (1975:88). Only a few of these judges stated that they were less likely to convict a woman; however, "they are more inclined to recommend probation rather than imprisonment; and . . . if they sentence a woman, it is usually for a shorter time than for a man" (1975:88; see also Reid, 1976:302). Further, Nagel and Weitzman found that female convicted offenders are given lighter sentences than their male counterparts (in Hoffman-Bustamante, 1975:120).

Simple numbers on the incarcerated population of the United States provide further support for the allegation of differential sentencing of female and male convicted offenders.

The 1970 census data on inmates of institutions established that there were only 13,451 women in federal, state, and local jails and prisons, compared to 304,389 men. Over half of these women were in jails . . . while almost two-thirds of the men were in state and federal prisons (Rasche, 1975:10).

Women comprise somewhere between only three and five percent of the entire prison population in the United States (Rasche, 1975:10; Wheeler, 1975:84) -- a proportion which has not increased along with the reported increases in arrests and convictions of women.¹ Indeed, the "prison statistics . . . do not show a growing proportion of women being sentenced; rather a better case can be made for the opposite outcome"² (Simon, 1975:86).

There are a number of possible explanations for women being represented in such small numbers in the incarcerated population. The most often cited reason is male chivalry (see, e.g., Adler, 1975; Brodsky, ed., 1975; Hoffman-Bustamante, 1973; Klein, 1973; Millman, 1975; Schur, 1969; Simon, 1975; and Weis, 1976). Such chivalry stems from the general "attitude of protectiveness taken toward women in our society" (Schur, 1969:42), and begins with the male victim or observer of female crime being unwilling to report a woman³ and extends all the way through a predominantly male chain of law enforcement agents to judges who are in the position of exercising the most noticeable acts of chivalry.⁴

Another reason regularly offered for the low ratio of women to men in prisons is the belief in the sacredness of motherhood and the reluctance of judges to separate mother and child (Adler, 1975:210; Rasche, 1975:14). However, Brodsky has pointed out that somewhere between 60 and 80 percent of the women in prisons do have dependent children (1975:102).

A more plausible reason that proportionately fewer women than men are sentenced to prison may be the fact that female offenders are often viewed as less culpable than male offenders. There appears to be a "general belief that women are very conventional" (Millman, 1975:265), and that women, like children, are not capable of criminal intent (Cohen and Short, 1976:50). For example, when women get involved in crime, judges are likely to claim that "it's some man's fault, or she got in with the wrong people" (Wheeler, 1975:85; see also Adler, 1975:205; Millman, 1975:253; Simon, 1975:87). Generally, women offenders "have a good many more escape hatches and receive a good deal more forgiving" than do male offenders (Wheeler, 1975:85).

In addition, there is less fear of females who commit crimes than of males (Rasche, 1975:26; Wheeler, 1975:85). Female crime "has been viewed as essentially nondangerous to other persons -- socially offensive rather than actually dangerous" (Rasche, 1975:12). Indeed, the theme of the female offender as a pathetic, malleable creature has

dominated much of the writing on the subject (Heide, 1975:80; Simon, 1975:7). Rose Giallombardo noted that:

Women who commit criminal offenses tend to be regarded as erring and misguided creatures who need protection and help rather than as dangerous criminals from whom members of society should be protected (in Simon, 1975:7).

Coupled with the notion of the female offender as nondangerous is the assumption that female offenders are "more amenable and responsive to rehabilitation and reform" than male offenders (Adler, 1975:230). Consequently, "the community generally is less frightened of women offenders," and female offenders are less often rejected by family and friends than male offenders (Wheeler, 1975:85).

In attempting to explain the low numbers of incarcerated women as opposed to men, Wheeler speculated that "perhaps society is willing to deal in less punitive ways with women who have been introduced into the criminal justice system" (1975:84). From various research efforts, it certainly appears that judges are willing to deal less punitively with women and, if this is indeed in line with public sentiment, we would expect the general public to recommend lesser sentences for women than for men convicted of the same crime. In addition, in keeping with the rationale for such differential sentencing offered by writers on the subject, we would expect that the general public would perceive specific crimes committed by females as less serious than those committed by males, and that the public would be more willing to accept female offenders back into the community.

METHODOLOGY

Data for this paper were obtained through the course of a larger project in which considerably more information was collected regarding perceived differences between female and male offenders than was germane to this particular paper. Details of the sample, data collection, and questionnaire specific to this presentation are outlined below.

A stratified⁵ random sample of 743 households was drawn from telephone books for the State of Washington early in 1976. The survey techniques used to obtain the data made use of initial contact and follow-up procedures developed by Donald A. Dillman of Washington State University⁶ (see Dillman, et al., 1974). Out of the original 743 households in the sample, 91 could not be reached at the addresses obtained from the telephone books, and 68 refused to participate because of illness, death, or various other reasons. These cases were omitted from the sample. Of the 584 households remaining in the sample, completed questionnaires were returned by 78.25 percent (N = 457).

Since the focus of this research is the perceived differences between female and male convicted offenders, two versions of the questionnaire were constructed; one in which all the offenders were female and one in which all offenders were male. Both versions of the questionnaire contained four vignettes describing, very briefly, four hypothetical cases of illegal behavior. The two versions of the questionnaire differed only in the sex of the offender described in the vignettes. The only information given to describe the offender, besides gender, was that the hypothetical individual was: 1) 25 years old, 2) Caucasian, 3) employed, 4) convicted of that particular offense, and 5) a first offender. This information was the same for all crimes.

The four crimes described in the vignettes were chosen because they represent a range of seriousness in terms of legal penalties and because they are theoretically interesting. Specifically, the offenses were: 1) petit larceny (shoplifting) -- historically, a predominantly female crime; 2) embezzlement -- one of the crimes for which women are being arrested more often; 3) selling marijuana⁷ -- historically, a predominantly male crime since females are recognized as users, but not pushers, of controlled substances; and 4) second-degree murder -- one of the crimes for which women are being convicted more often.

The necessary information on public perceptions regarding the seriousness of specific crimes committed by a female or by a male was obtained by asking respondents "How serious do you believe this crime is?" and providing response categories of "1) not at all serious; 2) somewhat serious; 3) fairly serious; 4) serious; and 5) very serious."

The recommended disposition of each offender was obtained through asking, "If you were in a position to decide, what sentence or disposition would you recommend in this case?" Response categories provided were "1) no penalty; 2) fine of around \$100 without jail or probation; 3) probation and supervision by probation officer; 4) jail term of less than 1 year; 5) prison sentence of 1 to 5 years; 6) prison sentence of 5 to 10 years; and 7) prison sentence of over 10 years."

The degree of social acceptance or tolerance of the convicted offender was obtained by asking respondents, "Knowing that (name of hypothetical offender) has been convicted of (particular offense), how close a relationship would you be willing to have with (either her or him)?" The responses provided were those used by Simmons (1969): "1) might marry or accept as close relative; 2) might have as a close friend; 3) would accept as a next door neighbor; 4) would accept in my school, church, and so on; 5) would accept in my community, but would have no contact; 6) would accept as a resident of my country, but not my community; and 7) would not accept at all, even as a resident of my country."

Based on previous research and using the above response categories, we would expect that the general public of the State of Washington would respond as follows: 1) crimes committed by males would be rated as "serious" or "very serious" considerably more often than the same crimes committed by females; 2) convicted males would be given recommended dispositions of a prison sentence much more often than female convicted offenders; and 3) preponderantly more female than male convicted offenders would be judged as acceptable social contacts.

FINDINGS

Overall, our analyses of the data yielded only four instances of statistically significant differences ($p \leq .05$) between the perceptions of female and of male convicted offenders. Such a finding is important, as well as surprising, in itself. However, setting levels of statistical significance aside, our data produced some interesting perceptual directions which will be discussed in some detail below. These directions were consistent and obvious when controlling for respondent characteristics such as gender and educational level, even though the significance levels obtained were even lower than those in the two-by-two tables. For this reason, and also because of space limitations, the findings presented herein will be confined to those analyses which involved only the specific crime, sex of the offender, and the three areas of public perception.

Before proceeding to the exposition of the findings, it should be noted that we are fairly confident that these results represent legitimate public perceptions and are not mere statistical artifacts. We make this claim on the basis of the research design, which employed random assignment to groups (the two groups being female offender and male offender), in addition to being a double-blind situation (the respondents had no way of knowing that sex of the offender was a variable). In addition, our confidence in the findings reported herein is bolstered by the fact that the trends held across all manipulations of respondent characteristics.

As a step toward simplification and coherence, the following discussion of the results of the data analyses is divided into the pertinent sections of perceived seriousness of crimes, recommended dispositions of offenders, and the social acceptance of offenders. In each instance, we tested for perceived differences regarding female and male convicted offenders by comparing the proportion of females placed in any given response category to the proportion of males in that category.

Perceived Seriousness

As can be seen from Tables 1 through 4, there were no statistically significant differences between respondents' ratings of seriousness of crimes committed by females and of those committed by males. Contrary to our expectations, in all four

Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 about here

crime categories, the majority of the respondents rated both crimes committed by females and by males as "serious" and/or "very serious."

As might be expected, second-degree murder was rated as the most serious of all crimes included ($\bar{X} = 4.81$) and petit larceny as the least serious ($\bar{X} = 3.52$). Such a finding is consistent with previous research on public evaluations of the seriousness of crimes by Rossi, et al. (1974) and Thomas, et al. (1976). However, contrary to the seriousness ranking obtained by Rossi, et al. (1974:228-29; Thomas, et al., 1976, did not include the same specific crimes), our sample rated embezzlement as more serious than selling marijuana ($\bar{X} = 4.25$ compared to $\bar{X} = 3.89$). Such a difference in the rank-ordering of these two crimes could be a result of the specific years in which the studies were undertaken. The data used by Rossi, et al. was gathered in 1972, while our data was obtained in 1975; within that time-span, there has been increasingly greater emphasis on curtailing corporate, white-collar crime and less on victimless crime, vis-a-vis such events as Watergate and the efforts at reforming marijuana laws. While this is certainly not the only explanation, it is one which is readily identified and understood.

What is more interesting and less easily explained in terms of the present paper is that, although the differences were slight, crimes committed by females were rated as more serious than the same crimes by males; in every crime category, except selling marijuana. Specifically, petit larceny when committed by females was

given a mean seriousness rating of 3.59, when committed by males a mean seriousness of 3.44 (see Table 1); embezzlement committed by females received a mean seriousness rating of 4.27, by males a mean of 4.22 (see Table 2); and second-degree murder committed by females had a mean seriousness rating of 4.85, when committed by males a mean seriousness rating of 4.75 (see Table 4). As can be seen, the greatest difference between the mean seriousness ratings of crimes committed by females and by males was for the crime which was rated as least serious, petit larceny.

Such a finding, i.e., that crimes (except for selling marijuana) committed by females are judged by the general public to be more serious than those crimes committed by males, runs contrary to our expectations and to the previous literature in this area. What may be operating here is the notion that, although it may take more blatant violations for a woman to be judged as a serious offender, once she has been convicted of an offense -- as was the case in each vignette -- the crime is viewed as more serious than the male crime and the stigmatization is harsher (see Rosenbaum, 1975, for a discussion of the ramifications of women "falling" from conventional behavior). Obviously, this is an area which merits specific and rigid research efforts.

Recommended Dispositions

It will be recalled that previous research indicated that male convicted offenders should receive recommendations of prison sentences considerably more often and for longer periods than female convicted offenders. However, this was demonstrated in only two of the four offenses: embezzlement and selling marijuana (see Table 6 and 7). In addition, the only crime for which the differences between the recommended sentences for female convicted offenders and for male

Tables 5, 6, 7, 8 about here

convicted offenders was statistically significant was selling marijuana ($p < .0279$). Male convicted offenders were given recommended sentences of "prison sentence of over 10 years" in twice as great a proportion as were female convicted offenders (14.2 percent of the males compared to 7.1 percent of the females).⁸

Apart from significance levels, public recommendations appear to run contrary to the literature on sentencing. With the exception of selling marijuana, in every crime category, over half of those offenders receiving recommended dispositions of a prison term were women. Specifically, for petit larceny, 13 out of 20 sentenced to prison by the public were women (see Table 5); for embezzlement, 125 out of 242 were women (see Table 6); and for second-degree murder, 195 out of 350 given recommended dispositions of a prison sentence were women (see Table 8). In addition, in two of these crime categories, a higher percentage of females than males received recommended dispositions of a prison sentence. For the crime of petit larceny, 5.4 percent of the women received prison term recommendations compared to 3.6 percent of the men (see Table 5), and for second-degree murder, 95.6 percent of the women were given recommended dispositions of a prison sentence compared to 88.5 percent of the men (see Table 8).

Such mixed findings are difficult to explain. For the crimes rated as least serious and as most serious, petit larceny and second-degree murder, more females than males received recommended dispositions of prison sentences; yet, for those crimes rated in the middle, the reverse was true. It appears that public sentiment toward sentencing of female and of male convicted offenders operates differentially across crime categories. However, we have no theoretical nor empirical framework, as yet, to guide any interpretation of this anomaly.

Social Acceptance

We anticipated that female convicted offenders would be accepted as close social contacts by the public much more often than would male convicted offenders. Our data suggests that this is, indeed, the case. The only crime for which differences between the specified acceptance of female convicted offenders and of male convicted offenders was not statistically significant was second-degree murder ($p < .1787$). Even in this instance, however, three times as many females as males were given

Tables 9, 10, 11 and 12 about here

responses of "might marry or accept as a close relative" (3.3 percent of the females compared to 1.0 percent of the males), and over twice as many females as males were given responses of "might have as a close friend" (7.5 percent of the females compared to 3.6 percent of the males).

Males convicted of petit larceny were given responses of "would not accept at all, even as a resident of my country" and of "would accept as a resident of my country, but not my community" in twice the proportions of females convicted of the same offense (3.0 percent and 4.0 percent of the males compared to 1.2 percent and 2.0 percent of the females). In addition, twice the proportion of females as males convicted of petit larceny were given responses at the other end of the spectrum, i.e., "might marry or accept as a close relative" (24.4 percent of the females compared to 10.4 percent of the males).

In the case of offenders convicted of embezzlement, four times the proportion of females as males received responses of "might marry or accept as a close relative" (12.2 percent of the females compared to 3.0 percent of the males). In addition, 46.0 percent of the males convicted of embezzlement as opposed to 34.9 percent of the females convicted of the same offense were given responses which provided for no contact with the offender.

Females convicted of selling marijuana were given responses of 'might marry or accept as a close relative' nearly three times as often as males convicted of selling marijuana (15.0 percent of the females compared to 5.5 percent of the males).

As outlined above, the underlying pattern of our findings regarding public sentiment toward acceptance of female convicted offenders as close social contacts was in keeping with the previous research and speculation in this area.

DISCUSSION

Research in the area of female criminality has consistently produced evidence of differential processing of female offenders. Indeed, with virtually no exceptions, actual sentencing patterns have demonstrated that female offenders are sentenced to prison less often than are male offenders. The usual rationale offered for such differential processing is that judges and social control agents are acting in accord with public sentiment. It has been assumed that the general public, and consequently law enforcement officials, view crimes committed by females as less serious, less deserving of incarceration, and less threatening than crimes committed by males. For the most part, our data do not support such assumptions.

In terms of public evaluation of the seriousness of crimes committed by females and by males, our data run directly contrary to the literature. Admittedly, the differences were slight and not statistically significant; yet it was apparent that the public evaluates crimes committed by females as consistently more serious than the same crimes committed by males.

This being the case, though contrary to previous research, it would follow that the public would recommend prison terms for the females more often than for the males. This was true to some degree; however, public sentiment on sentencing recommendations was not consistent across crimes. Again, it should be emphasized that the differences were slight and statistically significant only for the crime of selling marijuana; yet,

for every other crime category, over half of those offenders receiving a recommended disposition of a prison term from the public were women. In addition, for the crimes of petit larceny and second-degree murder, a higher percentage of females than of males were given prison terms by the general public. This suggests that the public does not differentiate entirely on the basis of sex of the offender.

Though our respondents rated female crimes as more serious than male crimes and recommended incarceration for females at least as often as (if not more so) for males, they still indicated close social acceptance of female offenders -- with the exception of second-degree murderers -- significantly more often than of male offenders.

What emerges from the data is that actual sentencing of females in the past is not congruent with public recommendations at this point in time. Subsequent research may indicate, however, that current sentencing practices do reflect current public sentiment. Indeed, our data could serve as a possible baseline for further research on this point.

This incongruence between judicial processing and public recommendations may also be a result of judges interpreting public sentiment regarding the "threat potential" of female and of male offenders. It was apparent from our data that, regardless of the perceived seriousness of the crime or the recommended disposition of the offender, female offenders were much more readily accepted as possible social contacts by the public. Perhaps judges evaluate this perceived lack of a potential threat to the community in processing females.

In addition, as with any public survey, it must be remembered that our respondents could recommend dispositions and indicate social acceptance without having to deal with the consequences of such evaluations. At the present time, we have no way of knowing whether their decisions would be more or less in accord with judges' decisions in an actual sentencing situation.

All of this is not to lessen the legitimacy of our findings; as stated earlier, we are confident that our findings are representative of public sentiment toward

female and male offenders. However, the connection between public sentiment and judicial processing remains unclear. What is needed is a theoretical scheme for establishing empirically what this connection is and the process through which it operates. It is proposed that the data presented in this paper will be useful in providing the groundwork for further research in the area of public perceptions and judicial processing.

NOTES

1. The increase in arrest rates may be largely attributed to an increase in arrests for larceny, fraud, forgery, and embezzlement, while the increase in conviction rates "has been due solely to the higher conviction rates for violent offenses" (Simon, 1975:86).
2. Contrary to this, however, Rasche states that "more females are being brought into court and sentenced to prison terms than was true previously" (1975:14); also, Brodsky has recently found indications of "equal lenience toward women and men" (1975:101).
3. Gefland, et al. report, however, that males were twice as likely as females to report female shoplifters (1973:281).
4. Klein has argued against such notions of chivalry toward female offenders by positing that those women who are most likely to come into contact with the criminal justice system -- Third World women or women who have been defined as hippies or political rebels -- are those women who have traditionally been deemed undeserving of such chivalrous treatment (1973:14, 23).
5. Telephone listings were designated as covering either rural or urban locales, and the number of listings in each book was then tabulated. The number of households drawn from each book was then determined by the proportion of the total population represented by that particular book. This was done to avoid over-sampling those telephone books which cover only a small proportion of the population, and to insure proportional sampling of those telephone books which cover a large part of the population of Washington.
6. Specifically, in February, a postcard describing the general purpose of the project was mailed to each household, and one week later each household received a rather lengthy questionnaire. Another postcard, thanking those who had returned the questionnaire and reminding those who had not to do so, was mailed to each household within the next two weeks. Those who had not responded within three-and-a-half weeks of the initial contact received a reminder letter with a replacement questionnaire and, if they still failed to respond, a certified letter with a final questionnaire.
7. Selling marijuana instead of a harder substance such as heroin was chosen because pretests indicated that there was a greater range of offender descriptions and sentencing recommendations for selling marijuana. Selling heroin was consistently rated in the extreme negative categories.
8. Interestingly, though selling marijuana was rated as less serious than embezzlement, proportionately more offenders convicted of selling marijuana were given recommended prison sentences of over 10 years (see Tables 6 and 7).

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMES COMMITTED
BY FEMALES AND BY MALES BY CRIME

TABLE 1

	Petit Larceny	
	Female offender	Male offender
not at all serious--1	2.4%(6)	2.9%(6)
somewhat serious--2	12.9 (32)	19.1(39)
fairly serious--3	25.8 (64)	26.5(54)
serious--4	41.1 (102)	33.8(69)
very serious--5	17.7 (44)	17.6(36)
	$\bar{x} = 3.59$	$\bar{x} = 3.44$
chi-square = 4.465; p < .3467 $\bar{X} = 3.52$		

TABLE 2

	Embezzlement	
	Female offender	Male Offender
not at all serious--1	1.6%(4)	0.5%(1)
somewhat serious--2	2.4 (6)	2.9 (6)
fairly serious--3	11.4 (28)	11.7 (24)
serious--4	36.3 (89)	43.4 (89)
very serious--5	48.2 (118)	41.5 (85)
	$\bar{x} = 4.27$	$\bar{x} = 4.22$
chi-square = 3.948; p < .4131 $\bar{X} = 4.25$		

PERCEIVED SERIOUSNESS OF CRIMES COMMITTED
BY FEMALES AND BY MALES BY CRIME

TABLE 3

	Selling Marijuana	
	Female offender	Male offender
not at all serious--1	4.5%(11)	6.8%(14)
somewhat serious--2	13.8 (34)	7.8 (16)
fairly serious---3	10.1 (25)	14.6 (30)
serious--4	32.0 (79)	30.7 (63)
very serious--5	39.7 (98)	40.0 (82)
	$\bar{x} = 3.887$	$\bar{x} = 3.893$
chi-square = 6.675; p < .1541 $\bar{X} = 3.889$		

TABLE 4

	Second-Degree Murder	
	Female offender	Male offender
not at all serious	0.4%(1)	1.0%(2)
somewhat serious--2	.4 (1)	1.0 (2)
fairly serious---3	.8 (2)	.5 (1)
serious--4	10.7 (26)	16.7 (33)
very serious--5	87.7 (214)	80.8 (160)
	$\bar{x} = 4.85$	$\bar{x} = 4.75$
chi-square = 4.893; p < .2985 $\bar{X} = 4.81$		

RECOMMENDED DISPOSITIONS OF FEMALE AND
OF MALE CONVICTED OFFENDERS BY CRIME

TABLE 5

	Petit Larceny	
	Female offender	Male offender
no penalty	0.0%()	2.6%(5)
fine of around \$100 without jail or probation	32.1 (76)	28.2 (55)
probation and super- vision by probation officer	48.9 (116)	48.2 (94)
jail term of less than 1 year	13.5 (32)	17.5 (34)
prison sentence 1 to 5 years	4.6 (11)	2.6 (5)
prison sentence of 5 to 10 years	.4 (1)	.5 (1)
prison sentence of over 10 years	.4 (1)	.5 (1)

chi-square = 8.983; p < .1745

TABLE 6

	Embezzlement	
	Female offender	Male offender
no penalty	1.3%(3)	3.1%(6)
fine of around \$100 without jail or probation	.8 (2)	1.5 (3)
probation and super- vision by probation officer	25.0 (59)	17.4 (34)
jail term of less than 1 year	19.9 (47)	17.9 (35)
prison sentence of 1 to 5 years	39.8 (94)	48.7 (95)
prison sentence of 5 to 10 years	10.2 (24)	7.2 (14)
prison sentence of over 10 years	3.0 (7)	4.1 (8)

chi-square = 8.557; p < .2001

RECOMMENDED DISPOSITIONS OF FEMALE AND
OF MALE CONVICTED OFFENDERS BY CRIME

TABLE 7

	Selling Marijuana	
	Female offenders	Male offender
no penalty	3.4% (8)	6.1% (12)
fine of around \$100 without jail or probation	4.3 (15)	5.6 (11)
probation and super- vision by probation officer	21.4 (51)	15.7 (31)
jail term of less than one year	23.5 (56)	15.7 (31)
prison sentence of 1 to 5 years	24.8 (59)	31.3 (62)
prison sentence of 5 to 10 years	13.4 (32)	11.6 (23)
prison sentence of over 10 years	7.1 (17)	14.1 (28)

chi-square = 14.163; $p < .0279$

TABLE 8

	Second-Degree Murder	
	Female offender	Male offender
no penalty	1.5% (3)	4.6% (8)
fine of around \$100 without jail or probation	.0 ()	1.1 (2)
probation and super- vision by probation officer	2.0 (4)	4.6 (8)
jail term of less than 1 year	1.0 (2)	1.1 (2)
prison sentence of 1 to 5 years	12.7 (26)	13.1 (23)
prison sentence of 5 to 10 years	27.0 (55)	22.3 (39)
prison sentence of over 10 years	55.9 (114)	53.1 (93)

chi-square = 8.474; $p < .2054$

SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF FEMALE AND
OF MALE CONVICTED OFFENDERS BY CRIME

TABLE 9.

	Petit Larceny	
	Female Offender	Male Offender
might marry or accept as a close relative	24.4% (60)	10.4% (21)
might have as a close friend	16.3 (40)	18.8 (38)
would accept as a next-door neighbor	12.2 (30)	15.8 (32)
would accept in my school, church, and so on	29.7 (73)	28.7 (58)
would accept in my community, but would have no contact	14.2 (35)	19.3 (39)
would accept as resident of my country, but not my community	2.0 (5)	4.0 (8)
would not accept at all, even as a resident of my country	1.2 (3)	3.0 (6)

chi-square = 18.375; p < .0054

SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF FEMALE AND
OF MALE CONVICTED OFFENDERS BY CRIME

TABLE 10.

	Embezzlement	
	Female Offender	Male Offender
might marry or accept as a close relative	12.2% (29)	3.0% (6)
might have as a close friend	13.4 (32)	9.0 (18)
would accept as a next-door neighbor	16.0 (38)	16.5 (33)
would accept in my school, church and so on	23.5 (56)	25.5 (51)
would accept in my community, but would have no contact	22.7 (54)	33.0 (66)
would accept as resident of my country, but not my community	7.6 (18)	8.0 (16)
would not accept at all, even as a resident of my country	4.6 (11)	5.0 (10)

chi-square = 17.822; p < .0067

SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF FEMALE AND
OF MALE CONVICTED OFFENDERS BY CRIME

TABLE 11.

Selling Marijuana

	Female Offender		Male Offender	
might marry or accept as a close relative	15.0%	(36)	5.5%	(11)
might have as a close friend	9.2	(22)	8.0	(16)
would accept as a next-door neighbor	7.9	(19)	12.6	(25)
would accept in my school, church, and so on	17.5	(42)	15.6	(31)
would accept in my community, but would have no contact	28.3	(68)	26.1	(52)
would accept as resident of my country, but not my community	10.0	(24)	17.6	(35)
would not accept at all, even as a resident of my country	12.1	(29)	14.6	(29)

chi-square = 17.226; p < .0085

SOCIAL ACCEPTANCE OF FEMALE AND
OF MALE CONVICTED OFFENDERS BY CRIME

TABLE 12.

	Second-Degree Murder	
	Female Offender	Male Offender
might marry or accept as a close relative	3.3% (8)	1.0% (2)
might have as a close friend	7.5 (18)	3.6 (7)
would accept as a next-door neighbor	7.9 (18)	5.2 (10)
would accept in my school, church, and so on	16.3 (39)	15.5 (30)
would accept in my community, but would have no contact	31.0 (74)	31.6 (61)
would accept as resident of my country, but not my community	17.2 (41)	22.3 (43)
would not accept at all, even as a resident of my country	16.7 (40)	20.7 (40)

chi-square = 8.909; p < .1787

REFERENCES

- Adler, Freda
1975 Sisters in Crime. The Rise of the New Female Criminal. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Brodsky, Annette M., ed.
1975 The Female Offender. Sage Contemporary Social Issues 19. Beverly Hills: Sage Publication, Inc.
- Brodsky, Annette M.
1975 "Planning for the female offender." Pp. 100-108 in Annette M. Brodsky, ed., The Female Offender. Sage Contemporary Social Issues 19. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cohen, Albert K. and James F. Short
1976 "Crime and juvenile delinquency." Pp. 49-100 in Robert K. Merton and Robert Nisbet (eds.), Contemporary Social Problems, Fourth Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Conking, John E.
1975 The Impact of Crime. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Dillman, Donald A., et al.
1974 "Increasing mail questionnaire response: a four state comparison." Paper presented at Rural Sociological Society Meetings, August.
- Doleschal, Eugene
1970 "Public opinion and correctional reform." Crime and Delinquency Literature (August):456-476.
- Fox, Vernon
1972 Introduction to Corrections. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gefland, Donna M., et al.
1973 "Who reports shoplifters? A field-experimental study." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 25 (2):276-285.
- Grindstaff, Carl F.
1974 "Public attitudes and court dispositions: A comparative analysis." Sociology and Social Research 58 (July):417-426.
- Heide, Wilma Scott
1975 "Feminism and the 'fallen woman.'" Pp. 77-81 in Annette M. Brodsky (eds.) The Female Offender. Sage Contemporary Social Issues 19. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Henshel, Richard L. and Robert A. Silverman, eds.
1975 Perception in Criminology. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hoffman-Bustamante, Dale
1973 "The nature of female criminality." Issues in Criminology 8 (2):117-136.

- Klein, Dorie
1973 "The etiology of female crime: a review of the literature."
Issues in Criminology 8 (2):3-30.
- Lotz, Roy and John D. Hewitt
Forth- "The influence of legally irrelevant factors on felony
coming sentencing." Sociological Inquiry.
- McIntyre, Jennie
1975 "Public attitudes toward crime and law enforcement." Pp. 185-203
in Henshel and Silverman (eds.) Perception in Criminology. New
York: Columbia University Press.
- Millman, Marcia
1975 "She did it all for love: a feminist view of the sociology of
deviance." Pp. 251-279 in Millman and Kanter (eds.) Another
Voice. Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science.
Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.
- Quinney, Richard
1970 The Social Reality of Crime. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Rasche, Christine E.
1975 "The female offender as an object of criminological research."
Pp. 9-28 in Annette M. Brodsky (ed.) The Female Offender. Sage
Contemporary Social Issues 19. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications,
Inc.
- Reid, Sue Titus, J.D., Ph.D.
1976 Crime and Criminology. Hillsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press.
- Rosenbaum, Marcia
1975 "Sex roles among deviants: the woman addict." Paper presented at
the American Sociological Association Meetings, San Francisco.
- Rossi, Peter H., et al.
1974 "The seriousness of crimes: normative structure and individual
differences." American Sociological Review 39 (April):224-237.
- Schur, Edwin M.
1969 Our Criminal Society. The Social and Legal Sources of Crime in
America. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

1971 Labeling Deviant Behavior. Its Sociological Implications. New
York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Simmons, J. L.
1969 Deviants. Berkeley: The Glendessary Press.
- Simon, Rita James, Ph.D.
1975 The Contemporary Woman and Crime. Crime and Delinquency Issues:
A Monograph Series, written under contract number HSM-42-73-247(SM)
from the National Institute of Mental Health.

Thielbar, Gerald W. and Saul D. Feldman

1975 "Images of deviants and their behavior: stereotypes and social context." Unpublished.

Thomas, Charles W., et al.

1976 "Public opinion on criminal law and legal sanctions: an examination of two conceptual models." The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 67 (1):110-116.

Weis, Joseph G.

1976 "Liberation and crime: the invention of the new female criminal." Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Meetings, March 27, San Diego, California.

Wheeler, Martha

1975 "The current status of women in prisons." Pp. 82-88 in Annette M. Brodsky (ed.) The Female Offender. Sage Contemporary Social Issues 19. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

END