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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

SEX COMPOSITION AND FEMALE OFFENDING:
UNDER THE IMPACT OF THE ONE-CHILD POLICY

This dissertation explores the mechanisms of the increasing female crime in China from the effect of the one-child policy, which is treated herein as a natural experiment. Data reveal that the women’s share of documented crime dramatically increased after the mid-1990s when the first one-child generation reached the age of legal responsibility. This change reflects the interplay of the behavioral change and the net-widening effect.

The increasing criminality of the one-child generation is attributable to the gap between the equal gender expectations of the individual, which has been reshaped by the unique socialization practices under the influence of the policy, and a stubbornly unequal gender hierarchy in the society. As a result, the one-child-generation women who disproportionately suffer the resulting strains are more likely to become involved in property and occupational crime as the alternative means to fulfill their aspirations for economic success. Additionally, the effect of the policy affects not only the individual gender roles of the only children but also their peers who have siblings through the intermediary of a culture shift. Therefore, the policy has changed the behavior of a whole new generation through the process of socialization and the lag in the structural change.

The net-widening effect is another pathway of the unequal gender structure and ideologies to the increasing female crime. Moral panic associated with the emergence of diverse forms of female offenses lead to an inordinate degree of adverse attention focused upon the one-child-generation women by criminal justice professionals. The increased criminalization of sexuality brought an increasing number of the one-child-generation women into conflict with the law, usually for prostituting themselves for easy money to fulfill their material satisfaction. Consequently, the one-child-generation female offenders are perceived as “doubly deviant” from the law and from the socially prescribed ideology of gender and are, therefore, punished more harshly than before by the criminal justice system.

This dissertation not only explores an understudied country in criminological research but also seeks to apply the findings to a broad sphere to explain the increasing female crime that has been observed worldwide. It disentangles the theoretical controversy in explaining the increase in the share of crime committed by women in general by embedding the argument in a multidimensional gender role repertoire.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1. Introduction and Objectives

The sex ratio at birth, generally defined as the number of male births divided by the number of female births, is relatively stable for human beings over time and across space. Historically, consistent sex ratio imbalances have rarely been observed except for some crises, such as wars and epidemics. The rise in the ratios of belligerent countries during and after wars has been observed in France, England, and Wales during World Wars. A similar rise has also been acknowledged in the white population of the United States at the time of World War II (Chahnazarian, 1988). As far as the disease, the Hepatitis B virus (HBV) has been recognized as one possible cause to the high sex ratio\(^1\) because an HBV-infected mother is 1.5 times more likely to give birth to a male (Chahnazarian, Blumberg, & London, 1988). In addition to these reasons, a more striking imbalance in the sex ratio at birth has emerged since the wide technological application for fetal sex inspection, especially being coupled with the cultural preference for one sex over the other and lowered fertility rates. In turn, such an imbalance could constitute an alteration to social norms and values, and lead to behavior modifications. Previous research has widely explored its influence on the marriage market but neglected the other implications of the sex ratio imbalance in a broader and remoter social sphere.

This dissertation connects the increasing proportion of female crime in China with the imbalanced sex composition caused by the historically unique one-child policy. Specifically, the dissertation explores the mechanisms of gendered crime and consequently

\(^1\) The higher the ratio is, the higher the oversupply of males or undersupply of females there is in the society.
the gender gap in offending from an external policy force treated as a natural experiment. Its results show that women’s share of documented crime dramatically increased after the mid-1990s when the first one-child generation reached the age of legal responsibility. This change reflects an interplay of behavioral changes and the net widening. The increasing criminality of the one-child generation is attributable to the gap between similar gender expectations at the individual level, which has been reshaped by the unique socialization practices under the influence of the policy, and a stubbornly unequal gender hierarchy in the society. As a result, the one-child-generation women who disproportionately experience the resulting social strain are more likely to become involved in property and occupational crime as the alternative means to fulfill their aspirations for economic success. Additionally, the policy affects not only the individual gender roles of the only children but also their peers who have siblings through the intermediary of a culture shift. Therefore, the policy has changed the behavior of a whole generation through the process of socialization and the lag in the structural change. The net-widening effect, moreover, is also rooted in the unequal gender structure and traditional gender ideology. Moral panic associated with the emergence of diverse forms of female offenses led to an inordinate degree of adverse attention focused upon the one-child-generation women by criminal justice professionals. The increased criminalization of sexuality brought an increasing number of the one-child-generation women into conflict with the law, usually for prostituting themselves for easy money to fulfill their material satisfaction. Consequently, the one-child-generation female offenders are perceived as “doubly deviant” by the law and the socially prescribed ideology of gender and are, therefore, punished more harshly than before by the criminal justice system.
This dissertation not only explores an understudied country in criminological research but also applies the findings to a broad sphere to explain the increasing female crime that has been observed worldwide. It disentangles the theoretical controversy in explaining the increase in the share of crime committed by women in general by embedding the argument in a multidimensional gender role repertoire. The dissertation is organized around three objectives.

**Objective 1:** Identifying the relationship between the sex composition and the share of women’s offending, and the influence of the one-child policy on the relationship.

Demographic characteristics have always been used to explain variation in criminality. Specifically, measures of poverty, racial composition, region, income inequality, age distribution, and family disruption are well represented in most such studies. However, the gender composition of the population has not been researched as frequently, although gender is one of the most potent and substantial correlates of criminality (e.g., Smith & Visher, 1980; Steffensmeier & Cobb, 1981; Zimmerman & Messner, 2010; Messner & Sampson, 1991). One reason for this phenomenon is the relatively stable gender distribution of human beings, which limits the effects of variation in crime rates.

Guttentag and Secord (1983) proposed a dedicated framework to explain the relationship between the gender composition of a population and gender roles and norms in society. A society with more men than women (i.e., a higher sex ratio of the male population divided by female population) would tend to impose more constraints on women. When in shorter supply than, women are highly valued as marriageable partners, mothers, and homemakers (Angrist, 2002; Scott J. South & Messner, 1987). This is a result of the counteracting forces of dyadic power in interpersonal relationships and structural
power in societal gender separation (Guttentag & Secord, 1983). Although women’s dyadic power is likely to be enhanced in a society with an imbalanced sex ratio where women are relatively scarce, the overwhelming structural power owned by men limits the ways in which women’s potential dyadic power can be exercised. As a result, women in societies with higher sex ratios tend to marry at a younger age and, in cultural contexts, invest less in education and career development. It is more common for women to stay at home and work as full-time homemakers with constrained extrafamilial goals in such societies than it is in lower-sex-ratio societies. According to this theoretical paradigm, therefore, we expect to see more traditional gender norms and roles in societies with higher sex ratios and, therefore, less female criminality than is observed in societies with lower sex ratios.

This theory connects gender structure and gender roles at a macro level and has had considerable empirical support (Barber, 2001; Barber, 2000a; Messner & Sampson, 1991; Pedersen, 1991; Porter, 2007; South, 1988; Trent & South, 1989). Some research that has applied this theory to explaining criminality found a negative causal relationship between sex ratio and female crime (South & Messner, 1987) or a positive relationship for male crime (Barber, 2000b; Edlund, Li, Yi, & Zhang, 2013). However, this theory oversimplifies the endogeneity of the gender composition of society by setting it as the cause or at least as one crucial causal factor of gender norms. Gender composition as a demographic feature of a society is also a product of its cultural and social structures. Almost always, an imbalanced sex ratio is accompanied by some inherent culture and structure causing it. For example, a society with a sex ratio higher than normal would probably have a culture favoring sons and a structure empowering men (Becker & Posner, 2009; Das Gupta et al., 2003). The culture and structure of society are also the determinants of gender norms and
roles. Therefore, the relationship between the demographic sex ratios of a population and its gender norms as well its gendered behaviors is just like “two apples on one tree”—they are both outcomes of a society’s culture and structure. The direct relationship between the sex ratios and gender norms or gendered behaviors tends to be spurious unless we find causal logic supporting it or the “tree trunk” generating them both. However, since they are both products of culture and structure, it is hard to find the exogeneity of either.

Because those limitations veil the real relationship between the sex ratios and gendered crime, a clearer understanding of how imbalanced gender structure drive crime is needed to help us understand the underlying mechanism to criminality. China’s one-child policy provides such a window into the social effects of sex ratio imbalance and therefore the causal relationship between the sex ratio of a population and gendered criminality.

**Objective 2:** Evaluate the extent to which the one-child policy has changed the socialization practices across generations and the effect of the potential inter-generational differences on the gender gap in criminality.

The criminal world is an extremely masculine world. According to the statistics, up to 84% of crimes were committed by men, and 88% of prisoners were men worldwide (UNODC, 2015). Therefore, the gender gap in criminal offending is one of the most acknowledged phenomena in criminology (Britton, 2000; Leonard, 1982; Renzetti, 2013). The gender gap in offending is viewed as a product of biological and sociological differences between men and women. The former emphasizes the natural differences between genders, including physical and psychological aspects, whereas the latter regards socialization processes and practices as the critical factors explaining the gender gap. After
all, gender socialization is the first and most important socialization process that a person receives as soon as he or she is born. Almost all socialization institutions teach men and women to behave differently. These differences in socialization eventually create different gender roles and norms and, thereby, different gendered behaviors, including deviant ones. However, the causal mechanisms behind the relationship between the gender gap in offending and the socialization process are still controversial and obscure.

China’s one-child policy has externally changed the socialization practices on the new Chinese generations. Although girls are less valued than boys in China under the influence of cultural preference for sons, the imbalanced sex composition in favor of boys may benefit girls who survived because (a) the average parental treatment of girls improves because the ones who are not really wanted by their parents have been aborted, (b) there is more investment in the single child's education and human capital development, regardless of gender, in families with fewer children (Becker & Posner, 2009), and (c) for those families with only a girl, they put their hopes in her, since no family wants to give up their dream just because they only have a girl. In addition, extensive propaganda during the implementation of the one-child policy, designed to educate people that girls are as valuable and promising as boys, plays an important part in changing gender socialization and gender roles, although it has little effect in eradicating prenatal sex selection as expected. Therefore, the gender socialization process in China for the one-child generation is remarkably different from traditional practices. Women and men are treated more similarly by parents, teachers, relatives, and friends. The one-child-generation women are expected to be ambitious, competitive, and goal-oriented—just like their male peers. As a result, women are less relation-concerned or family-centered than before. Instead, similar
to men, they are achievement-oriented (Edlund et al., 2013). Consequently, economic success and status achievement is no longer solely a masculine goal. It is shared by both genders in the new generations in China.

Therefore, the one-child policy artificially changes the socialization of girls and boys and, therefore, it also affects the outcomes of socialization, such as the criminality of men and women. An exploration of the policy’s effects on socialization and deviance helps to clarify the etiological mechanisms of socialization facilitating crime.

**Objective 3:** Evaluate the influence of the one-child policy on the treatment of offenders by the criminal justice system and thereby affect the gender gap in crime.

Some criminologists have proposed that the convergence may not be due to actual changes in men’s and women’s criminality but is due to changes in crime control and punishment within the criminal justice system. In contrast to a behavior change hypothesis, then, these criminologists posit the net-widening hypothesis. The net-widening hypothesis suggests that women’s documented crime rates may be increased in two ways. First, societal attitudes toward women offenders change from being sympathetic to punitive, which leads to greater willingness by citizens to report women suspects, a higher probability that police will arrest them, and more severe punishment from the courts (Steffensmeier, 1980). Second, the increasing bureaucratization and routinization of the criminal justice system decreases individual discretion and leads to non-discriminatory standards and outcomes (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014; Feld, 2009).

If a change in crime is captured by documented official data, it is necessary to differentiate whether this change reflects a real change in behavior or is an artifact of the responses from enforcement authorities to clarify the influence path of the one-child policy.
1.2. Methodology

Addressing these objectives requires a combination of empirical research methodologies based on an integration of theories. This study uses a mixed-method approach to studying the effects of the one-child policy on the gender gap in crime in China and draws heavily from my fieldwork in China.

The quantitative research involves three kinds of methods. First, time-series analysis methods are employed to capture the general relationship between the sex ratios and female share of crime from the trends of these variables. I collected data from archived official records in China, from 1972 to 2014. The policy’s effect is measured by a proxy variable—the sex ratios of a cohort aged 0 to 4—to show its external force. The Student’s Test method is used for the inter-generational comparisons of socialization practices influenced by the policy. In addition to the generation category, I also compared gender differences to show the gender gap in socialization. I collected data from 2,006 responses to an online survey of Chinese adult citizens from 31 provinces of China as well as from Hong Kong and Taiwan. Following with the comparisons, I employed structural equation modeling (SEM) to evaluate the direct and indirect paths of socialization to criminality. Corresponding to the comparative categories by genders and over generations, I also estimated and compared four models.

The qualitative research in this dissertation focuses on the different treatment of female and male offenders by the Chinese criminal justice system and professionals. To examine the potential effect of the one-child policy, the analyses center around differentiation by genders (men and women) and over generations (pre-1980s and post-1980s, i.e., pre-one-child and one-child generations). Comparisons are made between these
two sets of groups to capture any inter-generational change in the gender gap in crime. I adopted interview methods for this study. The research participants were professionals in the criminal justice system in China.

1.3. Structure

The dissertation is structured as three papers. The findings of the first study set a backdrop for the other two studies. The second study explains the change found by the first study from a socialization perspective. The third study investigates the question from the perspective of justice system perceptions but additionally verifies the findings in the first and second papers (see Figure 1.1 for the theoretical framework).

The first paper, Chapter 2, pursues the first objective of identifying the relationship between the sex composition and the share of women’s offending under the influence of the one-child policy. It provides a quantitative examination on how the one-child policy influences the female offending in China. This article uses time-series analysis methods to trace the effects of that policy and the accompanying imbalanced sex ratios at birth on the percent of female offenders as of the one-child cohort reaching the age of criminal responsibility. It explores the relationship between sex composition and female crime at a macro level and provides a premise on the relationship between the artificial sex ratio imbalance and the gender roles for the following research. This paper has been submitted to The Sociological Quarterly for peer review.

Chapter 3, the second paper, addressing the second objective of the dissertation, compares the socialization practices between the one-child and pre-one-child generations and, thereby, evaluates the influence path of the socialization to criminality. It explains the change in the gender gap in crime from the behavioral perspective and ascribes the change
to the socialization process in family, school, peers, and workplace. The findings of this paper support those of the first study with an exploration of the causal pathways.

Chapter 4, the third paper, addresses all three objectives of the dissertation from the perspective of Chinese criminal justice professionals. It answers the trend in the gender gap in crime and, moreover, clarifies relative gender contribution to the change and explains what factors drive the change. Both changes in individual criminal behaviors and responses to those behaviors from the criminal justice system are examined with consideration of the effect of the one-child policy. This study not only supports the findings of the other two papers but explores the net-widening effect on the documented crime.

The fifth and last chapter concludes by summarizing the implications, limitations, and extensions for future research.
1.4. Figures

Figure 1.1. Dissertation theoretical framework.
Chapter 2. Sex Ratios and Female Crime

2.1. Introduction

Demographic characteristics have always been used to explain variation in criminal offending. Specifically, most of these studies represent measures of poverty, racial composition, region, income inequality, age structure, and family disruption. However, the gender composition of the population has not been commonly researched, although gender is one of the most potent and substantial correlates of delinquency (e.g., Messner & Sampson, 1991; Smith & Visher, 1980; Steffensmeier & Cobb, 1981; Zimmerman & Messner, 2010). One reason for this phenomenon is the relatively stable gender composition of human beings, which hinders its effect on variation in delinquency rates to be revealed. Fortunately, we can take advantage of a unique social experiment in China, which caused a significant shift in the gender composition and, thereby, gives us a “window” to explore its actual effect on crime.

Guttentag and Secord (1983) proposed a dedicated framework to explain the relationship between the gender composition of a population and gender roles and norms in society. A society with more men than women (i.e., a higher sex ratio) would tend to impose more traditional constraints on women. When in short supply, women are highly valued as marriageable partners and after that as mothers and homemakers (Angrist, 2002; South & Messner, 1987). This is a result of the counteracting forces of dyadic power in interpersonal relationships and structural power in societal relationships between genders (Guttentag & Secord, 1983). Although women’s dyadic power is likely to be enhanced in
a society with an imbalanced sex ratio where they are scarce, the overwhelming structural power owned by men limits the ways in which women’s potential dyadic power can be exercised. As a result, women in societies with higher sex ratios tend to marry at a younger age and, therefore, invest less in education and career development. It is more common for women to stay at home and work as full-time homemakers with constrained extrafamilial goals in those societies than in the lower-sex-ratio societies. According to this theoretical paradigm, therefore, we expect to see more traditional gender norms and roles in societies with higher sex ratios and, therefore, less female offending and vice versa.

This theory connects gender structure and gender roles at a macro level and has had considerable empirical support (Barber, 2001; Barber, 2000a; Messner & Sampson, 1991; Pedersen, 1991; Porter, 2007; South, 1988; Trent & South, 1989). Some research has applied this theory in explaining criminal offending and found a negative causal relationship between sex ratio and female crime (Anne Campbell et al., 2001; Scott J. South & Messner, 1987) or positive for male crime (Barber, 2000b; Edlund, Li, Yi, & Zhang, 2013). However, this theory oversimplifies the endogeneity of the gender composition by setting it as the cause or at least as one crucial causal factor of gender norms. Gender composition as a demographic feature of a society is also a product of its cultural and social structures. Usually, an imbalanced sex ratio is accompanied by some concomitant cultural and structural specific. For example, a society with a sex ratio higher than normal would probably have the culture favoring sons and the structure empowering men (Becker &

---

2 Calculating from developed countries’ statistics, the true sex ratio at birth without social and behavioral interference is around 106 males per 100 females, which is biologically stable (Johansson & Nygren, 1991). Therefore, a sex ratio at birth ranging from 105 to 107 is practically regarded as normal (Hesketh & Zhu, 2006; Hudson & Den Boer, 2002; Sen, 1990; Zeng et al., 1993).
Posner, 2009; Das Gupta et al., 2003). Meanwhile, the culture and structure of society are also the determinants of gender norms and roles. Therefore, the relationship between the demographic sex ratio of a population and gender norms as well as gendered behaviors is just like “two apples on one tree”—they are both outcomes of a society’s culture and structure. The direct relationship between the sex ratio and gender norms or gendered behaviors tends to be spurious unless we find causal logic supporting it or the “tree trunk” generating them both. However, since they are both products of culture and structure, it is hard to find exogeneity of either.

In this paper, I take advantage of a radical social experiment—the one-child policy in China—as a window into the social effects of sex ratio imbalance to assess the causal relationship between the sex ratio of a population and gendered offending. By setting the sex ratio as an exogenous variable, I aim to provide a counter-example from a society with an artificially imbalanced sex ratio to challenge the current theory.

2.2. China’s One-Child Policy

Designed by military scientists and announced on September 25, 1980, China implemented its one-child policy and has since regulated the birth and life of its people. The original and most important intention of this policy was to control the fertility rate and curb the then fast-growing population, thereby concentrating limited resources on enhancing population quality and eventually eliminating poverty in China. The content of the policy varied from province to province, but the basic guideline was similar. For the Han ethnic group (comprising over 90% of the Chinese population), every urban couple could only have one child regardless of its sex; every rural couple could have two children but only if the first
was a girl, or only one child if the first was a boy.\textsuperscript{3} This policy put fewer restrictions on minority ethnicities. To assist the process, contraception (including distributing free condoms and sterilization surgeries for either men or women) and abortion were widely used to achieve the goal of controlling fertility at such a low rate.

However, the one-child policy went against the cultural preference for sons. Chinese people valued boys more than girls because of the prevalent desire to raise sons to provide for one’s old age (Chen & Silverstein, 2000). Sons were perceived as the future of a family and the guarantees of their parents’ security in Chinese culture. In contrast, daughters were regarded as a debt or an economic burden since they were expected to join another family upon marriage, ceasing to take responsibility for care for their parents when they were ill or elderly (Hesketh & Xing, 2006).

As a response to this conflict between culture and policy, some practical methods were used to circumvent or reduce the policy’s influence on the traditional preference of a child’s sex. Among all such methods, prenatal sex selection was the most popular one. Especially after the introduction of ultrasound for prenatal inspection in the early of 1980s, fetal sex identification followed by gender-specific induced abortion was pervasive. According to a medical project covering eight provinces and cities in 1986, the sex ratios among 500 and 1,226 aborted sex-identifiable fetuses in rural and urban areas were 94.6

\textsuperscript{3} Some provinces (e.g., Jiangsu Province) had a stricter policy that even the rural couples could only have one child regardless of its sex. Some (Hainan, Yunnan, and Qinghai Provinces) had a looser one, in contrast, that one rural couple could have two children regardless of the sex of the first. Therefore, this policy has a more accurate name “1.5-child policy,” but that was rarely used because of its clunky wording.
and 96.8, respectively (Zeng et al., 1993). These ratios can be compared with the real sex ratio of living birth that year (107.68) as evidence of the impact of offspring sex selection on gender structure.

Along with a stunning drop in the fertility rate, the gender composition of the new Chinese generation eventually changed dramatically as a side effect of 35 years of the most radical and largest social experiment in history (see Figure 2.1). Hesketh and Zhu (2006) estimated that there were up to 34 to 41 million “missing females” in China by the end of 2000. This number is even higher according to Amartya Sen's (1990) estimate that there were 50 million “missing women” in China alone by the end of the 1980s. These staggering numbers of missing women eventually brought about 32 million surplus men than women among the one-child generation by 2005 (Zhu, Lu, & Hesketh, 2009) and a deficit of one million marriageable women in the first-marriage market per year after 2010 (Tuljapurkar, Li, & Feldman, 1995). Men occupied about 97% of all unmarried persons aged 28 to 49 in China (Hudson & Den Boer, 2002). Although the policy has been changed, its influence is lasting and striking in every aspect of the society.

A large proportion of unmarried young men in a society could be an unstable factor leading to conflicts, social disorders, and crimes. A substantial amount of literature links high delinquency rates with a large population of young, unmarried, and competitive men through psychological, biological, financial, and sociological processes (Barber, 2003;

---

4 The normal sex ratio for fetus is higher than 106, the normal ratio at birth, since male fetuses are more biologically susceptible to problems leading to miscarriage.
5 The average fertility rate in China dropped from over 6 births per woman in 1960s to less than 1.5 in and after the 1990s.
6 At the beginning of 2016, the one-child policy was officially and nationally updated to a new version widely called the “two-child policy,” that allows every couple to have two children unconditionally to help address the aging issue.
Cameron, Meng, & Zhang, 2016; Cheatwood & Block, 1990; Mesquida & Wiener, 1996; Wilson & Daly, 1985). Accordingly, most criminological forecasts predicted the male percentage of offending in mainland China would go up when numerous single men could not find wives (e.g., Den Boer & Hudson, 2004; Edlund, 2005; Edlund, Li, Yi, & Zhang, 2010, 2013, Hudson & Den Boer, 2002, 2004; Tuljapurkar, Li, & Feldman, 1995). In contrast, the female crime rate unexpectedly outpaced the male rate and had led to a substantial increase in the percent of female criminal offending (calculated as the number of female offenders/the total number of offenders) in recent decades (see Figure 2.2). This surprising outcome has raised questions regarding the relationship between the sex ratio and gendered patterns of offending.

2.3. Theory and Literature

2.3.1. Sex Ratio, Cohort Size, & Gendered Delinquency

Guttentag and Secord (1983) explored the relationship between sex ratios and sex roles historically and internationally and proposed a power-matrix paradigm for explaining the relationship between the sex ratios and gender roles. There are two types of power in the society; one is the micro-dyadic power attached to interpersonal relationships, and the other is the macro-structural power that is related to the social hierarchy of genders. Compared to the latter, dyadic power is more flexible according to the relative dependence between two parties. Therefore, one gender gains the dyadic power when it is in relative undersupply. However, the implementation of the dyadic power must be subject to the structural power. Societies with higher sex ratios have more traditional social norms with respect to female roles because the structural power owned by males is strengthened by the patriarchal structure. Under these circumstances, women are highly valued as homemakers.
and mothers (Angrist, 2002; Scott J. South & Messner, 1987) and, so, tend to marry at a younger age and have fewer career aspirations than their counterparts in low-sex-ratio societies. As such, girls and women tend to stay at home, work as full-time homemakers, and invest less in education and career development with constrained extrafamilial goals, although they may have a subjective sense that they are powerful in the relationship and be able to require a substantial economic investment from wooers or partners, such as a “quasi-wage” or intra-marriage transfers of income (Grossbard, 1984), or a lifetime commitment to the marriage as an economic and reproductive union (Guttentag & Secord, 1983; South & Messner, 1987). Moreover, chastity is often prized in high-sex-ratio societies, with women usually controlled strictly by their fathers before marriage or by their husbands after marriage (Guttentag & Secord, 1983). In contrast, women in low-sex-ratio societies are relatively free from traditional role constraints, although they may have less dyadic power in hand. Since the benefits of marriage are relatively low, women aspire for more economic and political independence and pursue career success on a par with men. Because of their success in extrafamilial activities and advantage in numbers, women can ask for more structural power as a remedy for the lack of the dyadic power.

Building on this theory, South and Messner (1987, 2000) posited a negative association between the sex ratio of the population and female involvement in criminal offending. Because women are likely to be constrained more in traditional gender roles in a society with a high sex ratio, their activities primarily center around family and domestic issues. Therefore, they have less ability and opportunity to commit crimes (Adler, 1975; Simon, 1975). Conversely, women in the lower-sex-ratio societies tend to be more delinquent due to more extrafamilial activities providing them with opportunities to
become involved in crime. Using the female share of property crime as the dependent variable and the sex ratio for ages 15 to 49 as the key explanatory variable, this hypothesis was supported by a cross-national empirical study covering 60 countries (South & Messner, 1987). Campbell, Muncer, and Bibel (2001) linked the sex ratio with female violent crimes to an evolutionary perspective. In their model, a low sex ratio in a region tends to strain male partner resources, which is likely to induce more female crime, especially intra-female assaults, for competing for male partners and future paternity and paternal investment (Buss, 1994). This proposition has also been applied to explain increasing black female crime in the United States. Due to race-specific mass incarceration and the increasing economic marginality of black men, women in the black community have to face the shortage of suitable male partners who are expected to hold a higher socioeconomic status than themselves (Becker & Posner, 2009). The regional low sex ratio leads to a significant increase in the proportion of female-headed households and female crimes (Taylor, Chatters, Tucker, & Lewis, 1990).

O’Brien (1991) studied the effect of the sex ratio on rapes testing the thesis of Guttentag and Secord (1983) and found a negative relationship between the two. In other words, rape incidents are less likely in societies with higher sex ratios and more likely when the sex ratios are lower. O'Brien ascribed this association to the degree of men’s protection over women and women’s extrafamilial activities producing opportunities for perpetrators. Moreover, in a low-sex-ratio society, rape can be seen as a response to the threat to men posed by women engaging in nontraditional gender roles and a restoration of the challenged structural power (O'Brien, 1991).
Studies directly exploring the effect of the sex ratio on overall crime rates have mixed results. Barber (2000) found a negative association between the sex ratio and violent crime through the mediating effect of lower sex ratios inducing more family conflict (Guttentag & Secord, 1983), which would, in turn, lead to a higher level of delinquency. However, most research suggests a positive association between the sex ratios and crimes (Dreze & Khera, 2000; Edlund et al., 2013; Messner & Sampson, 1991; Oldenburg, 1992). A society with more men, especially the young and unmarried, is likely to have more conflicts and delinquency due to more motivated offenders, fiercer competition for a wife, and less social control from marriage (Edlund et al., 2013). Messner and Sampson (1991) ascribed this inconsistent or “null” effect of the sex ratio to the countervailing direct and indirect effects and argued that the negative indirect effect suppressed the positive direct effect of sex ratios on criminal offending via family disruption. However, these empirical studies did not disaggregate the crime rate by the sex of the offenders, so they were relatively ineffective in explaining the effect of sex composition on gender roles or gendered offending. In other words, it is hard to say which sex contributes more to the marginal change in the crime without considering sex-specific offending rates.

Sex ratios affect gender roles and behaviors through the “marriage squeeze” (Caldwell, Reddy, & Caldwell, 1983; Hvistendahl, 2011; Trent & South, 2011). In a high-sex-ratio society, there is likely to be a marriage squeeze for men, which means they would face a shortage of suitable female marriage partners; on the contrary, the marriage squeeze is experienced by women when marriageable men are undersupplied. Moreover, birth rates and corresponding cohort sizes may catalyze or buffer the marriage squeeze effect of imbalanced sex ratios on gender roles and the gender gap in offending (Guttentag & Secord,
Because a traditional age gap exists between spouses, such that men are on average older than women, the influence of the sex ratio imbalance is mediated by the corresponding age cohort size. In a society with a surplus of men but a deficit in women, an expanding cohort size weakens the marriage squeeze effect of the sex ratio imbalance, and a shrinking cohort size intensifies the effect. Conversely, in a society with a surplus of women but a deficit in men, an expanding cohort size intensifies the effect of the sex ratio imbalance, and a shrinking cohort size weakens the effect. Research about the relationship between the sex ratio and cohort size has focused on the causal effect of a shrinking cohort size on the sex ratio imbalance (Das Gupta & Li, 1999; Hvistendahl, 2011), but rarely has studied the mediating effect of cohort size on the marriage squeeze pressure caused by the imbalanced sex ratio.

2.3.2. Economic Development & Gendered Delinquency

Economic development has effects on gender roles and gendered offending in different ways. Straightforwardly, the economic situation contemporarily influences the occupational opportunities faced by men and women. In addition, the economic development may also have an effect on gendered socialization through its influence on the relative positions between parents and, thereby, the gender norms and roles of offspring. The latter reflects an inter-generational effect of the economic development on gendered offending, whereas, the former can be categorized as an intra-generational effect correspondingly, which is confined within the contemporary generation.

2.3.2.1 Intra-generational Effect

The process of economic development plays a role in influencing the levels of criminal activities of both genders. Along with economic development, there is more property
available to be stolen (Nettler, 1982) and more extrafamilial activities available for both genders to participate in, especially for women who are traditionally constrained by domestic responsibilities (Shelley, 1981). As women become less comfortable with traditional gender roles and more ambitious about social roles outside of the home, they would strive to behave more like men in a variety of ways, including delinquent behaviors, thereby increasing the female involvement in criminal activities (Adler, 1975). Moreover, along with more participation in business and economic affairs, women enjoy more opportunities, including educational, occupational, and criminal ones, due to the liberation from traditional gender roles (Simon, 1975). The emancipation theory generated a significant amount of research about the relationship between equality and the gender gap in offending (e.g., Chamlin & Cochran, 1997; Engelhardt, Rocheteau, & Rupert, 2008; Hunnicutt & Broidy, 2004; Messner & Golden, 1992; Ruppanner, 2010; Steffensmeier & Streifel, 1992). The results regarding the relationship between gender equality and gendered offending rates have been mixed, in part because of the variety of ways that gender equality has been operationalized. Emancipation theory focuses on the “bright side” of economic development by connecting it with gender role liberation and predicts a positive association between the economic development and female involvement in the crime.

2.3.2.2 Inter-generational Effect

Hagan (1990) and Hagan, Simpson, and Gillis (1987) proposed power-control theory in explaining the inter-generational influence of gender power dynamics on the delinquency of man and women. Wives have much less power than their husbands in patriarchal families in which husbands are employed in an authority position while wives work as full-
time homemakers; correspondingly, daughters enjoy much less freedom than their brothers in the same family. The former imbalance explains the latter one, whereas the latter imbalance explains the reason why girls traditionally commit less crime than boys because (a) the gender division in domestic work imposes more social control on daughters and (b) the resulting attitudes toward risk make daughters more risk-averse. Therefore, patriarchal families tend to reproduce daughters to focus their futures around domestic labor and consumption following the model of their mothers, whereas they reproduce sons to prepare for participation in direct production following the model of their fathers (Hagan et al., 1987; McCarthy, Hagan, & Woodward, 1999). However, with more women joining the labor force, more women are increasing their power at home. This results in the formation of more egalitarian families, in which the consumption and production spheres are undivided by gender. Having relatively equal power at home results in the similar treatment of sons and daughters. Boys are encouraged to reject the traditional masculine gender norm supporting risk-taking activities and delinquency, whereas girls are encouraged to be independent and ambitious. Therefore, the gender gap in delinquency is narrower in the egalitarian families than it is in the patriarchal families because of the decrease in male offending and the increase in female offending (Hagan et al., 1987; McCarthy et al., 1999). Therefore, family pattern, either patriarchal or egalitarian type, can reproduce itself from generation to generation and keep the gender inequality or equality relatively stable.

changes in the workplace, which brings about more control over resources and power outside and at home. This change increases women’s chances to exercise their power in family relations. Consequently, child-rearing practices for sons and daughters are also transformed (McCarthy et al., 1999; Morash & Chesney-Lind, 1991). As egalitarian families become more common and prevalent, daughters become freer and less constrained, thereby increasing preference for risk among women, thus reducing gender difference in delinquency in the society (Blackwell & Piquero, 2005; McCarthy et al., 1999). Empirical tests of power-control theory suggested that gendered delinquency changes depending on the level of patriarchy and corresponding control at home.

Furthermore, the power dynamics between parents may also influence the offspring sex ratio. Cultural son preference is rooted in a functionalist perspective that men are better able to provide their parents with economic security than women since their higher capacity in wage earning. As such, if women make more or as much as money as their male counterparts, their parents should adjust the pro-male bias and balance back their preference of offspring sex (Hudson & Den Boer, 2002; Zeng et al., 1993). Therefore, if the power dynamics are balanced between a couple, the son preference should be weakened, which correspondingly leads the sex ratio to be balanced. Another link between sex ratio and economic development is evidenced by the positive association between parents’ education and occupation and offspring sex ratio (Banister, 2004; Gu & Roy, 1995; Zeng et al., 1993). Education increases the awareness of potential technological options for offspring sex selection, whereas good occupations make those options affordable (Hvistendahl, 2011).
These theories connect the sex ratio, economic development, and gendered delinquency from different perspectives, but all three have rarely been tested in the same analysis. Moreover, the stable and endogenous nature of gender composition limits the explanatory power of the sex ratio on gendered roles and behaviors in previous research. This study aims to address these gaps in the literature based on an experiment that changed the population sex ratio dramatically in a short time and provide a counter-example from a rarely researched society with substantively different culture from the “mainstream” Western countries to challenge the current theory.

2.4. Research Questions and Hypotheses

This study aims to identify the means by which the sex ratio and economic development influence gendered offending and to test if Guttentag and Secord’s (1983) thesis holds when the sex ratio imbalance is artificially and exogenously caused or (at least) strengthened by a policy. As such, there are three primary questions I seek to address with the present study.

First, in discussing the primary effect of the exogenous shock caused by the one-child policy, I need to ask whether and to what extent the shock changed the relationship between the sex ratios and gendered offending. If the gendered behaviors are influenced by sex ratios as predicted by Guttentag and Secord (1983), the shock is supposed to be irrelevant to this causal relationship. In contrast, if the relationship is changeable to the exogenous shock, there should be a mechanism underlying the relationship that was impacted by the shock. To answer this question, this study adopts the policy as the structural breaker to check if the effect of the sex ratios of the marriageable population on the gendered offending has changed after years of policy enactment.
**Hypothesis 1:** The effect of the sex ratio of the marriageable population on the gendered offending is expected to be structurally broken by the one-child policy after a generation of its enactment.

By controlling for the effect of the shock via its proxy variable, the second objective of this study is to assess the real effect of sex ratio on gendered offending. On the one hand, I believe there is a relationship between the sex ratio and gendered offending as most research has assumed to be the case; on the other hand, I suspect this relationship is only the appearance of an underlying causality in the culture and structure leading to concurrent changes in the sex ratio and gendered offending. The effect of sex ratio on gendered offending may not be same as predicted after controlling the exogenous influence, which means the policy has changed the underlying factor and, therefore, the relationship could not keep up. As such, this study proposes the second hypothesis.

**Hypothesis 2:** After controlling for the exogenous shock from the one-child policy, the effect of the sex ratios of the marriageable population on the gendered offending is expected to be non-negative and, thereby, different from the prediction of Guttentag and Secord (1983).

Last, this study also tests the relationships between the economic development and the gendered offending from intra- and inter-generational perspectives. According to the literature, the third hypothesis tested in this study is as follows.

**Hypothesis 3:** Economy is expected to be positively related to the percent of female offending contemporaneously based on emancipation theory, and positively related to the one-generation-lagged percent of female offending based on power-control theory.
2.5. Data and Methods

2.5.1. Data

I adopted the percentage of female offenders from 1972 to 2014 as the dependent variable to show the trend in gendered offending. However, because gendered offending data in China were not always available, I constructed a proxy measure, combining two relevant variables in time series to make up the missing values in certain years. There are two official databases in China reporting the gendered offending rates but in different measures. One is the *China Statistics Yearbooks* reporting the annual number of prison inmates and female inmates; the other is the *Chinese Yearbooks of the Court of Justice* reporting the female share of convicts. Nevertheless, the availability of the time-series data for each variable separately was too low for our study as it involved tests of one policy’s accumulative effect on structural and behavioral changes across generations. The official data for the female share of inmates are only available from 2003 to 2012, whereas the data for the female share of convicts is only available from 1994 to 2007 (c.f. Lin, 2012). Other secondary data sources for the female share of inmates include the Department of Correction in China for data from 1972 to 1985 (c.f. Tong, 1995), the Supreme Court in China from 1986 to 1992 (c.f. Tong, 1995), and a BBC news report for the variable in 2014 (Hatton, 2015). Therefore, the time-series from 1992 to 2002 are missing for the female share of inmates, which is supplemented by the female share of convicts. Although the dependent variable is hybrid, the time-series trends of these two types of gendered offending rates are highly consistent (see Figure 2.3). To capture the influence of the data source change on the results, I generated a dummy variable controlling the data source effect in the following regressions. The dependent variable is calculated as [the number of
female offenders/the total number of offenders*(1+ the sex ratio of the population)]. This method ensures the dependent variable is controlled for gender composition and, therefore, reflects the female percentage of recorded offenders in the population filtering out noise from sex ratios.

The independent variables were obtained from publicly available data from national agencies, including population censuses (1964, 1982, 1990, 2000, 2005, 2010), the *Chinese Population & Employment Statistics Yearbooks* (named as the *Chinese Population Statistics Yearbook* before 2000; 1987-2015), and the *China Statistics Yearbooks* (2000-2015). There are three variables related to our research questions. To test *Hypothesis 1* and 2, this study specifies the marriageable cohort as population aging from 15 to 49 because this cohort is the primary population experiencing marriage squeeze that is influenced by the sex ratio imbalance according to Guttentag and Secord's (1983) thesis (South & Trent, 1988; South, 1988). Two variables are derived from this cohort: sex ratio and cohort size variation. The former is calculated as the ratio of male population per 100 female population in the cohort, and the latter calculated as (cohort size at year t / cohort size at year t-1). Therefore, if the rate is higher than 1, the cohort size is expanding; if less than 1, the cohort size is shrinking. To answer the second question, I used the sex ratios of the cohort aged 0 to 4 as the proxy variable to reflect the policy effect. Rather than the sex ratio at birth, I chose the sex ratio of a larger cohort because I want to include not only the influence of the prenatal sex selections but also postnatal sex selections against females in our model so to manifest the influences of the one-child policy more comprehensively.

---

7 Most postnatal sex selections happen before age three, such as infanticide, neglect, or mistreatment of girls, in cities as well as rural areas (Banister, 2004).
I expect to see a higher sex ratio of young children in years when the one-child policy was implemented more strictly.

Based on theoretical predictions about the relationship between economic development and gendered offending, I adopted GDP per capita and its 27-year lagged\(^8\) form as another two independent variables. Higher GDP per capita indicates higher economic development, and, therefore, there should be more occupational and extrafamilial activities in the economy available for females, with which the percent of female offenders is expected to be higher. The variable at the same period controls for the intra-generational effect of economic development on gendered offending; whereas the lagged variable controls for the inter-generational effect.

I adopted the linear interpolation method for missing values for all variables.\(^9\) According to the t-statistics of the augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test, all variables except the marriageable cohort size variation are non-stationary at level but stationary at their first difference. Therefore, I included their first difference forms in our models (See Table 2.1 and 2.2 for descriptive data statistics and zero-order correlations).

### 2.5.2. Methods

Although the time for the one-child policy announcement is known, its effect on the structure is not apparent because the exact time for implementation was different from province to province and the effect would be manifested after certain years of accumulation.

---

\(^8\) According to census statistics, the average childbearing age in China was ranging from 26.43 in 1985 to 26.88 in 2015 (World Data Atlas); therefore, I adopted 27 as the number of years indicating the generation gap.

\(^9\) There are three missing values in the dependent variable (1993, 2002, and 2013) and five missing values in each independent variable related to sex ratios or cohort size (1981, 1983-1986).
To test *Hypothesis 1*, therefore, we adopted the Chow test (Chow, 1960) to detect any possible structural break changing the effect of sex ratio of the marriageable cohort on female offending during the period from 1973 to 2014.

The time of breakpoint is meaningful to our model specification, from which we can determine the number of lagged years for the proxy variable of the policy (sex ratio of cohort aged 0 to 4). Building on the structural breakpoint, we used time-series and robust OLS methods to test our model to see whether and how much the policy changed the effects of sex ratio and cohort size on the gendered offending as well as the degree to which the economic development can explain the percent of female offending.

**2.6. Results**

Tables 2.3 and 2.4 show the results of the Chow breakpoint test, from which we can identify that year 1997 is a structural breakpoint for the effect of sex ratio on gendered offending. Before 1997, the effect of sex ratio on the percent of female offenders is consistent with Guttentag and Secord’s (1983) thesis, although it is not statistically significant; however, the coefficient signal was changed to be significantly positive by the policy after 17 years of its performance. After 1997, every 0.01-unit increase in the sex ratio would bring about 8.25% increase in the female percentage of offenders, which is contrary to the theoretical prediction. Therefore, the exogenous policy shock structurally changed the relationship between the sex ratio and gendered offending, which supports *Hypothesis 1*. Moreover, the dummy variable is not significant in the breakpoint test, which means the break is caused by the policy rather than the data source change.
According to the Chinese criminal law, the age for full penal responsibility is sixteen;\(^{10}\) therefore, the structural breakpoint has its practical meaning. It reflects that the change in gender composition caused by the policy had a lagged effect on gendered offending through socialization and that the effect showed up when the influenced generation reached the age of legal responsibility.

Table 2.5 shows the results of the specified model guided by Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3.\(^{11}\) The effect of the policy is manifested by the coefficient of the proxy variable in model 3, which is positively related to the percent of female offenders. In other words, the offspring selection against girls would bring in more female offenders after the generation grew up. Different from the theoretical predictions (Guttentag & Secord, 1983; South & Messner, 1987), the sex ratio of the marriageable cohort has no significant effect on the percentage of female offenders although the coefficient signal conforms to the expected relationship (model 3). However, the marriageable population variation has a positive effect on the percent of female offenders, and the counteracting effect of these two is also significant. Therefore, the relationship between sex ratio and gendered offending does not stand. Moreover, differences between model 2 and model 3 manifest the effect of the proxy variable on the sex ratio and size variation of the marriageable cohort. The coefficients of the three variables related to sex ratio and cohort size are more salient in model 3 than those in model 2, which means the real effects of these variables are

---

\(^{10}\) From the first version (1979) through the latest version (2015), the Chinese criminal law has consistently defined the age of 16 as the age for full penal responsibility, age 14 to 16 as the age for relative penal responsibility for only index offenses, and age less than 14 no responsibility.

\(^{11}\) The autoregressiveness of the dependent variable was checked, and there was no AR or MA process found in the first difference form. Variance-inflation factors were all below 2.5 without the interaction; so, I was not concerned about multicollinearity.
counteracted by the effect of the policy to some extent. Therefore, the inclusion of the policy effect is necessary to show the net effects of sex ratio and cohort size variation on gendered offending. Moreover, there is no structural breakpoint found in the specified model, which means the proxy variable has explained the effect of the policy.

With regard to the economic development, the lagged variable for the inter-generational effect of economic development is significantly positive; however, the variable for the intra-generational effect of the economic development is not significant nor consistent with theoretical predictions. Therefore, the results support power-control theory, but not emancipation theory. The power dynamics between parents influence the gender roles of their offspring, which shows a profound influence of socialization on gendered offending. Therefore, *Hypothesis 3* gets partial support.

Model 4 includes the dummy variable controlling for the data source. The coefficient of the dummy variable is not significant; moreover, the differences between model 3 and model 4 are not salient either on the statistical significances or the coefficients, which means the data source change does not influence the results. Therefore, the results are not an artifact of the different data sources.

These results prove to be robust to the replacement of other variables reflecting the economic development and marriageable cohort in the robustness tests.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\) To check the model robustness, I firstly replaced the GDP per capita and its 27-year lagged form with the ratio of tertiary industry to GDP and its 27-year lagged form correspondingly. I expect the new variables better reflect the job opportunities available for women than simple GDP per capita because the tertiary industry is relatively less labor-demanding and pro-male-biased in nature comparing to the primary and secondary industries (Becker & Posner, 2009). Therefore, women are expected to have more occupational and extrafamilial activities in an economy with a higher ratio of tertiary industry contributing to GDP. Building on this replacement, I then narrowed the
2.7. Discussion

This study sought to challenge Guttentag and Secord’s (1983) theory in consideration of China’s purely exogenous shock to the sex ratio and its effect on gendered delinquency. This artificially imbalanced sex ratio is expected to have a distinctive effect and mechanism on gender roles and norms from those of naturally imbalanced sex ratios because of the gender socialization process. Rather than a natural derivation from culture and structure, the socialization practices experienced by the one-child generation in China changed dramatically because of the policy and, thereby, led to the changes in the relationship between the sex ratio and female offending. Therefore, we suspect the underlying factor influencing both sex ratio and gendered offending is the process of gender socialization.

The results provide support for this argument with manifestation as to when and how the exogenous shock took effect. After 17 years of enactment, the lagged effect of the one-child policy appeared when the first one-child generation grew up to the age of criminal responsibility. The artificially and exogenously imbalanced sex ratio produced more female offending outpacing male offending, which is an unexpected outcome. Combined with the positive inter-generational effect of economic development on the percentage of female offending, we speculate this is because of the unique socialization process accompanying the sex ratio imbalance. The propaganda designed for educating people that girls are as valuable and promising as boys in the process of implementing the one-child policy did not eradicate prenatal sex selection as expected, but played a part in marriageable cohort age range to 20 to 49, considering the legal age for marriage in China is 20 and 22 for women and men respectively. The significances and signals of all independent variables keep the same, so our model is robust. Results are available upon request.
changing gender socialization (Das Gupta et al., 2003). Every family put its hopes on the only child, girl or boy, and treated them more similarly. No family wanted to give up its dream just because they only had a girl. This socialization process was remarkably different from the traditional practices, such that girls were raised to be ambitious, competitive, and goal-oriented just like their male counterparts. As a result, Chinese women are less relation-concerned than before, but similarly as men, are more achievement-oriented (Edlund et al., 2013). This unique gender socialization process is distinctively accompanied with and caused by the artificial sex ratio imbalance and low fertility rate. As a result, economic success is no longer solely a masculine goal. It is shared by both genders in the new generation in China. In contrast with this equality goal, however, the distribution of the means to achieve it is still unequal in a patriarchal society with structural power dominated by men. Compared with men, women have much fewer opportunities, especially legitimate ones to fulfill their goals. According to the Global Gender Gap Report 2016, the gender gap in earned income in China was 1: 0.676 although the gender parity has improved significantly during the past decades. To conquer this strain (Merton, 1938) faced specifically by young females in China, illegal means to success became an alternative option for some.

After controlling the policy influence, the effects of the sex ratio and size variation of the marriageable population are not completely consistent with the theoretical predictions (South & Messner, 1987). An expanding marriageable cohort relieves the pressure of a marriage squeeze where females would be less constrained to the traditional roles by the structural power owned by males and could be involved in more extrafamilial activities, including illegal ones. Conversely, a shrinking marriageable cohort boosts the
marriage squeeze pressure, so females were more constrained and less in pursuit of goals out of the home. However, the sex ratio of the marriageable cohort is not significant in our results, although it plays a counteracting role to the effect of cohort size change on gendered offending.

Finally, the inter-generational effect of economic development plays a part in determining the percentage of female offending in the offspring generation. A higher position held by mothers or a more balanced power structure between parents is influential to the socialization of more neutral gender roles of offspring. However, the intra-generational effect of economic development is not consistent with theoretical expectation. This may be due to the countervailing effects produced by more criminal opportunities with occupations available for females and less economic temptation to commit crime with a legal and stable income.

2.8. Conclusion

The one-child policy not only controlled the Chinese population but also changed the social structure dramatically. It increased the percent of female offending after the first one-child generation grew up. Moreover, its effect on the percent of female offending was intensified over time along with more single children growing up and further changes happening within the social structure. The one-child policy structurally broke and increased the percentage of female offending in China after 1997. By influencing the sex ratio of a very young generation, the one-child policy unexpectedly contributed to gender role convergence in China as one of its side-effects. In turn, the policy enhanced the percentage of female offenders because there tends to be more similarity between gender roles in the
one-child generations and more structural strains specifically experienced by young females in China.

Cross-national offending data from self-reports or arrest data from official records are not available for many countries, particularly broken down by gender and/or offense type (Stamatel, 2006). That kind of detailed data would be ideal to better understand the gendered dynamics of the criminal offending outside of Western nations. Nonetheless, a non-mainstream country study is meaningful because it uniquely explores the relationship between demography and gendered behaviors within a less-researched culture with an experimental social break. The findings unveiled the factor that undergirds a relationship between the sex ratio and gendered patterns of offending that has been ignored in most research based on Western samples. This is inspirational not only to the country that was studied but also to criminological research on this topic.
### 2.9. Tables and Figures

#### Table 2.1. Descriptive Statistics for All Continuous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Obs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta ) percent of female offenders</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta ) sex ratio of cohort aging 0 to 4</td>
<td>2.71e-3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta ) sex ratio of marriageable population</td>
<td>-2.47e-4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change of marriageable population</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta ) GDP per capita</td>
<td>804.03</td>
<td>1345.65</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>5527</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta ) 27-yr-lagged GDP per capita</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td>57.95</td>
<td>-33</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2.2. Zero-order Correlations Between Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ( \Delta ) percent of female offenders</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ( \Delta ) 17-yr-lagged sex ratio of cohort aging 0 to 4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ( \Delta ) sex ratio of marriageable population</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. change of marriageable population</td>
<td>0.37**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.62***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. ( \Delta ) GDP per capita</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ( \Delta ) 27-yr-lagged GDP per capita</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.74***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p<0.1; \) ** \( p<0.05; \) *** \( p<0.01 \)

#### Table 2.3. Chow Breakpoint Tests (F-statistics) on the Percent of Female Offenders (First Difference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Breakpoint</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta ) sex ratio of marriageable population</td>
<td>6.90***</td>
<td>5.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dummy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p<0.1; \) ** \( p<0.05; \) *** \( p<0.01 \)
Table 2.4. Structural Break on Sex Ratio Effect (Standard Errors) on the Percent of Female Offenders (First Difference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time span</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ sex ratio of marriageable population</td>
<td>-6.15 (4.16)</td>
<td>8.25** (3.57)</td>
<td>2.32 (2.89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Table 2.5. Regression Coefficients (Robust Standard Errors) for the Percent of Female Offenders (First Difference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected relationship</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δ 17-yrs lagged sex ratio 0-4</td>
<td>1.53** (0.72)</td>
<td>1.44* (0.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ sex ratio of marriageable cohort</td>
<td>-2.15 (3.68)</td>
<td>-3.24 (4.12)</td>
<td>-3.22 (4.25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variation of marriageable cohort size</td>
<td>3.98e-3** (1.70e-3)</td>
<td>4.33e-3** (1.68e-3)</td>
<td>4.06e-3** (1.77e-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ sex ratio * change of marriageable population</td>
<td>-0.11** (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.12** (0.05)</td>
<td>-0.11** (0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ GDP per capita</td>
<td>-6.32e-6 (2.88e-5)</td>
<td>-1.52e-5 (3.14e-5)</td>
<td>-1.64e-5 (3.11e-5)</td>
<td>-1.60e-5 (3.16e-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ 27-yrs lagged GDP per capita</td>
<td>1.80e-3* (9.53e-4)</td>
<td>2.17** (9.39e-4)</td>
<td>2.22** (9.62e-4)</td>
<td>2.26e-3** (9.81e-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dummy</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Figure 2.2. The Percent of Female Offenders in China (1972-2014). Note: The percent of female offenders equals the percentage of female prison inmates from 1972 to 1992 and from 2003 to 2014 and equals the percentage of female convicts from 1994 to 2001. Data source: the Department of Correction in China (1981-1985), the Supreme Court in China (1986-1992), the Chinese Yearbooks of Court of Justice (1994-2001), the China Statistics Yearbooks (2003-2012), and a BBC news report (Hatton, 2015).
Figure 2.3. Data Sources for the Percent of Female Offenders in China. Note: The percent of female offenders equals the percent of female inmates from 1972 to 1992 and from 2003 to 2014 and equals the percent of female convicts from 1994 to 2001. Therefore, 1992 and 2003 are two change points of the data source.
Chapter 3. How Does the One-child Policy Influence Gendered Deviance in China?

3.1. Introduction

Gender is one of the strongest predictors of delinquent and deviant behaviors across space and over time. Men are inarguably more involved in crime than women (Agnew, 2009; Vaske, Boisvert, & Wright, 2015). As a result, the gender gap in deviance is prominent. However, scholars have debated since the 1970s, after the proposition of emancipation theory (Adler, 1975; Simon, 1975), whether the gender gap has changed and, if there has been the change, what has contributed to this change. Since the 1970s, the convergence of the gender gap in deviance and crime has been observed worldwide (Carrington, 2006; Estrada, Backman, & Nilsson, 2016; Heimer, Johnson, Lang, Rengifo, & Stemen, 2012; Lauritsen, Heimer, & Lynch, 2009; Savolainen et al., 2017), yet the causes of the change are still controversial. Etiological research on the gender convergence in crime has been based on the gender role convergence from the emancipatory perspective (Adler, 1975; Simon, 1975), the economic marginalization perspective (Heimer, 2000; Steffensmeier, 1978, 1980), and the civilizing perspective (Goodkind, Wallace, Shook, Bachman, & O’Malley, 2009; Haynie & Armstrong, 2006). One problem shared by the previous research, however, is the oversimplification of gender roles. Most research, either the theory explaining the increase in women’s offending or the theory explaining the decrease in men’s offending, has operationalized gender role change as a result of the alteration in women’s labor force participation and ignored the multidimensional aspects of gender roles in other domains, such as family, school, and interpersonal relationships (Giordano & Cernkovich, 1979). Moreover, femininity and masculinity are set as the ends of the gender role continuum, in which femininity deters the delinquency and masculinity facilitates the
delinquency. The convergence, therefore, is a result of the masculinization of women, or femininization of men, or the neutralization of gender roles in general.

Another limitation to this line of research is the endogeneity embedded in the affected variables and the possible spuriousness of the correlations between them. The overwhelming majority of empirical research has been based on observations from advanced Western countries where the social order is relatively stable in the contemporary era. Even the emancipation theorists who set their focus on the effects of the women’s liberation movement cannot clarify whether the movement has also been an outcome of the change in other fundamental cultural and social structure and, therefore, the relationship between the movement and the increase in women’s crime might be illusory (Giordano, 1978; Smart, 1979). Similarly, the other two theories, one based on the gender-specific structural change that occurred in the labor market and the other based on the cultural change of gender ideologies, also cannot avoid the same question: What is the initiative of the change?

To subdue these two problems in research, the current study (a) employs Giordano and Cernkovich's (1979) multidimensional gender-role frameworks to reflect the gendered pathology of deviance comprehensively and (b) applies this framework to a rarely researched country with a unique natural experiment on a massive population. China’s one-child policy provides an experimental setting to explore the underlying mechanism of gendered delinquency. The findings of the current study present the ways in which the policy has transformed the gendered pathways to deviance with an integrated theoretical model.
3.2. The Context of the Current Study

Designed by Chinese military scientists and announced on September 25, 1980, the one-child policy was implemented and has since regulated the birth and life of one in five people in the world. For the Han ethnic group (comprising over 90% of the Chinese population), every urban couple could only have one child regardless of its sex; every rural couple could have two children only if the first was a girl, or only one child if the first was a boy. However, the one-child policy went against the cultural preference for sons. Chinese people valued boys more than girls because of the prevalent desire to “raise sons to provide for one’s old age.” (Chen & Silverstein, 2000). As a result, offspring sex selection was pervasive as a method to circumvent the conflict between the policy and the culture. To reduce its occurrence, the nationwide propaganda promoted gender equality, and the value of women crusaded to change the attitudes toward gender at a macro level. Although the propaganda did not eradicate the cultural preference for sons, it played a part in the offspring socialization practices with the effect of the low fertility rate directly produced by the policy.

Although girls are less valued than boys in China under the influence of Confucianism, the imbalanced sex composition in favor of boys may benefit girls who survived because (a) the average parental treatment of girls improves because the ones who were not really wanted by their parents had been aborted (Sen, 1990), (b) there is more investment in the single child’s education and human capital development, regardless

---

13 Some provinces had a stricter policy that even the rural couples could only have one child regardless of its sex, such as Jiangsu Province. Some had a looser one, in contrast, that one rural couple could have two children regardless of the sex of the first one, such as Hannan, Yunnan, and Qinghai Provinces.
whether the child is a girl or a boy, in families with fewer children (Becker & Posner, 2009), and (c) for those families with only a girl, families pin hopes on her, since no family wants to give up their dream just because they only have a girl. This new socialization trend accompanied with economic reform and marketization incubates the materialism and money fetishism in China among the young generations (Bao & Hass, 2009; Bao, Hass, & Tao, 2017). As a result, the gender role ideologies have been shifted to a more balanced repertoire that accommodates economic roles in place of family responsibilities for both women and men.

Therefore, the gender socialization process in China for the one-child generations is remarkably different from traditional practices (Bao et al., 2017; Curran & Cook, 1993). Women and men are treated more similarly by parents, teachers, relatives, and friends. The one-child-generation women are expected to be ambitious, competitive, and goal-oriented just like their male peers. As a result, women are less family-centered than before and are, instead, similar to men in their achievement orientation (Edlund et al., 2013). Consequently, economic success and status achievement are no longer solely masculine goals but are shared by both genders among the new generations in China. The unique socialization of the one-child generations is an outcome of a natural experiment imposing an external force on a nation’s demographic structure, which is impossible to find in other nations even in those with naturally imbalanced gender structure.

3.3. Gendered Pathways to Deviance

Before the rise of feminist criminological theories, the development of theories of deviance and delinquency primarily concerned male behaviors. Women were treated as an unimportant subset that was compatible with or neglected by the “masculine” theories
because of the marginal position of women in the criminal world. Feminist criminology, however, has brought gender on the agenda and treats gender as a crucial structure to deviance and delinquency, rather than a demographic category, and accordingly modifies the traditional criminogenic pathology with gendered pathways to criminal offending. Moreover, such study has advocated a gender-centered introspection of the traditional theories and, therefore, adds a new dimension to reactivate the vitality of those frequently researched theories. This study absorbs the idea of feminist criminology and tests the explanatory power of variables extracted from three established criminological theories to assess how the one-child policy has affected the pathways to deviance for both women and men.

3.3.1. Multidimensional Gender Roles

Gender has always been simplified as a binary identity in most criminological research and treated as an add-on (or a control) variable. Correspondingly, gender roles have also been perceived as a unidimensional concept and simply connected with the delinquency change. One criminogenic interpretation of the traditionally greater involvement of men in delinquency argues that there is simply a correlation between traditional masculine behavior and deviant behavior; traditional feminine behavior is perceived as the antithesis of deviance and criminality (Messerschmidt, 2000; Shover, Norland, & Thornton, 1979). In the vein of this theory, gender roles are viewed as behavioral expectations that people hold for themselves, expectations about such matters as appropriate conduct or plans for the future (Shover et al., 1979). Therefore, the link between gender roles and criminal involvement is straightforward and direct.
Following such an assumption, changes in gender roles have been connected to changes in the gendered deviance. Adler explains the narrowing gender gap by claiming that women imitate more masculine than before (Adler, 1975). In the vein of emancipation theory, many studies have perceived masculinized women or reduced femininity as the reason responsible for the change in the gender gap (e.g., Applin & Messner, 2015; Savolainen et al., 2017).

Feminist researchers insist that we should elaborate gender in the model and acknowledge the multidimensional complex of gender from how it is shaped to how it influences other social factors. Relying on this perspective, this study proposes a gender-centered analytic framework based on Giordano and Cernkovich's (1979) model and, accordingly absorbs explanatory variables from current criminological theories to evaluate the influence of the one-child policy on gendered crime in China. Giordano and Cernkovich conceived a multidimensional gender role framework to explain the complexity of gender and its cultural and structural influence on individuals’ behaviors. This framework has been adopted and extended to understand the relationship between gender and crime from a feminist criminological perspective (e.g., Heimer & De Coster, 1999; Savolainen et al., 2017). Also deriving from this model, the current study adds another structural dimension to the societal-level gender role repertoire as the settings of specific behaviors of actors. Correspondingly, three assumptions are made about the concept of gender roles, each of which has important implications for understanding the relationship between such variables and delinquent activities: (a) The concept “gender roles” can be layered as a general social level and a specific individual level; (b) in each layer, gender roles can be decomposed into attitudes toward gender and actual action corresponding to gender; and
(c) concrete gender roles are also related to the specific domains of the actor’s role repertoire. Table 3.1 presents these conceptual distinctions schematically. Gender roles are a set of concepts composed of the general and individual attitudes toward gender, gender structure, and personal gendered behavior within a variety of social institutions. Moreover, the attitude and actual structure or behavior do not always match each other. The generalized individual gender roles reflect the societal-level gender roles, but individual traits may fluctuate widely from those of the societal level. Moreover, the individual-level gender roles are a result of socialization under the influence of the societal-level gender roles.

This system of gender roles is relatively stable and reproducible by itself. However, this system is also dynamic and changeable. A substantial change in either individuals’ gender role expectations or behaviors will initiate the change in societal-level gender roles, which, in turn, produces more individual-level change and then ripples out.

Guided by this multidimensional gender role framework, the current study abstracts variables from three most researched criminogenic theories and categorizes them according to their possible influence on specific dimensions of the gender role repertoire.

3.3.2. Gendered Decomposition of Criminological Theories

3.3.2.1. Control theories

Delinquency, according to control theories, requires no particular skills. It is frequently the easiest or most expedient way for individuals to satisfy their needs and desires. What requires explanation is the conformity. Control theorists argue that people conform because of the controls to which they are subjected (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Hirschi, 1969; Kornhauser, 1978; Sampson & Laub, 1995). Therefore, control theories emphasize the
mechanism of socialization on the offending behaviors. These controls can be categorized into three types: (a) external control or social control (Hirschi, 1969), (b) stake in conformity (Briar & Piliavin, 1965; Toby, 1957), and (c) internal control or self-control (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). In addition, power-control theory is another strand that specifies the relationship between family control and offspring offending from an inter-generational perspective.

External control largely manifests as the fear of sanctions from others for delinquent behaviors. The “others” include family, friends, school officials, employers, colleagues, neighbors, and police. External control can be enhanced if the others set clear rules forbidding delinquency and related behaviors, monitor the individual’s behavior, and consistently sanction rule violators in a meaningful manner (Robert Agnew, 2009; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Stake in conformity can be found in some individuals who are less likely to engage in delinquency because they have a lot to lose through delinquent behaviors. In particular, they have strong emotional bonds with conventional others, like family and friends, that may be jeopardized by delinquency (Sampson & Laub, 1995). Investment in conventional activities, such as getting an education, can increase the stake in conformity. For example, adolescents who are doing well in school, devoting more time to homework, and anticipating obtaining a good education and job are less likely to engage in delinquency because it might jeopardize their accomplishments and life plans (Giordano, Cernkovich, & Rudolph, 2002; Smith & Paternoster, 1987). Another restraint against delinquency is individuals’ abilities and beliefs inhibiting themselves from responding to temptations and provocations with delinquency, which is defined as internal control or self-control. Some individuals have been taught to condemn delinquency and, therefore, are
less likely to engage in delinquency as a result. Therefore, self-control is partly a result of absorption of the external control and, therefore, internalization into individuals’ traits (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990).

Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) explained why men have higher rates of offending than women by arguing that men are subject to fewer controls than are women. Men are less strictly supervised by parents and less strongly tied to the household than women; moreover, men are less likely to be sanctioned by family, peers, and others for aggressive and deviant behaviors than women. Compared with women, men are less likely to condemn crime and more likely to internalize pro-criminal definitions (Burton, Cullen, Evans, & Dunaway, 1994; Warr & Stafford, 1993). Moreover, committing crime, to some extent, is a way to demonstrate masculinity (Messerschmidt, 1993, 2000). These gender-specific differences in crime participation are products of different socialization experiences of women and men that result in the gender stratification of controls (Lagrange & Silverman, 1999). “Parents tend to socialize children to accept society’s values and thereby develop their conscience” (Kempf, 1993, p. 145). However, social values and beliefs are different across genders. Correspondingly, women are socialized differently from their male counterparts since their day of birth and are expected to be more submissive than men in patriarchal societies. Besides its impact on internal control, the family also functions fundamentally in shaping the stratification of external control. Women tend to be more closely monitored and controlled from their childhood through adulthood than their male counterparts (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996), which limits opportunities for involvement in delinquency through family socialization (Lagrange & Silverman, 1999). These gender-specific differences survive in other institutions of socialization including school,
workplace, and friends. Experiencing a distinctively higher amount of controls, women are, therefore, much less likely to be involved in crime than their male counterparts. Empirical findings substantially support control theories with two additional extensions. First, the interpersonal differences in controls are determined primarily as early as in childhood from family socialization. Better parenting is associated with higher control levels among children and thereby less offending committed by them after they grow up (Rebellon & Anskat, 2018; Rebellon, Straus, & Medeiros, 2008). Second, control level experienced by individuals not only explains the variation in criminal offending, but also works well with other analogous deviant behaviors, such as smoking, fighting, speeding driving, excessive drinking, and gambling (Pratt & Cullen, 2000; Rebellon & Waldman, 2003; Widom, 2014). These behaviors are very similar to criminal offending in the way that they can also achieve immediate gratification in an expedient way (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990).

In addition to traditional control theories, Hagan, Simpson, and Gillis (1987) proposed power-control theory to explain the inter-generational influence of gender power dynamics on offspring’s delinquency. Wives have much less power than their husbands in patriarchal families in which husbands are employed in an authority position while wives work as full-time homemakers; correspondingly, daughters enjoy much less freedom than their brothers in this type of family. The former imbalance explains the latter; whereas the latter imbalance explains the reason why girls traditionally commit less crime than boys: (a) the gender division of domestic work imposes more social control on daughters, and (b) the resulting attitude toward risk makes daughters more risk-averse. Therefore, patriarchal families tend to reproduce daughters socially to focus their futures around domestic labor and consumption following the model of their mothers, while reproducing sons to prepare
for participation in direct production following the model of their fathers (Hagan et al., 1987; McCarthy et al., 1999).

However, with women joining the labor force, the family power structure has been rebalancing. This change results in the formation of more egalitarian families, in which the consumption and production spheres are undivided by gender. Relatively equal power between parents leads to the similar treatment of sons and daughters. Boys are encouraged to reject the traditional masculine gender norms supporting risk-taking activities and delinquency, and girls are encouraged to be independent and ambitious. Therefore, the gender gap in delinquency is narrower in egalitarian families than in patriarchal families because of the expected decrease in men’s offending and increase in women’s offending (Hagan et al., 1987; McCarthy et al., 1999). Family structure, either patriarchal or egalitarian, can reproduce itself from generation to generation and keep gender inequality or equality relatively stable.

Most empirical research on power-control theory has provided at least moderate support for the argument (Blackwell & Piquero, 2005; Grasmick, Hagan, Blackwell, & Arneklev, 1996; Hagan, 1990; Jensen, 1993; Leiber & Wacker, 1997; McCarthy et al., 1999; Morash & Chesney-Lind, 1991). Women experience the change in the workplace, which brings about more control over resources and power outside and at home. This change increases women’s chance to exercise their power in family relations. Consequently, child-rearing practices for sons and daughters are also transformed (McCarthy et al., 1999; Morash & Chesney-Lind, 1991). As egalitarian families become more common and prevalent, daughters become freer and less constrained, thereby reducing the gender difference of delinquency (Blackwell & Piquero, 2005; McCarthy et al., 1999). Empirical
tests of power-control theory suggest that the gender gap in offending is correlated to the level of patriarchy and corresponding control at home.

Gender has been embedded into control theories, which has theoretically explained the substantial gender gap in delinquency and deviance within their analytic paradigms, respectively. However, the pivotal variables are independently studied, and sometimes researchers would find contradictory or competitive explanations. For example, in the egalitarian families where mothers spend less time on supervising children, the external control experienced by either boys or girls tends to be less intense than in the traditional patriarchal families. The lessened family control should increase offspring’s deviance level, which should derive a contradictory prediction on boys’ delinquency. This concurrence of several explanatory variables hides and mixes the real effect of each variable on deviance. Therefore, an integrated model including those competing variables is crucial for differentiating and comparing effects between them. Corresponding to the multidimensional gender role repertoire, we extract four factors from control theories influencing gendered deviance: (a) external control that is affected by the societal gender ideologies, such as family control, (b) stake in conformity that is shaped by the individual behaviors, such as school performance, (c) internal control related to the individual-level gender expectations, such as legal conscience, and (d) parents’ power dynamics experienced in the original family, which corresponds to the societal-level gender structure.

3.3.2.2. Anomie/strain theory

Different from control theory, strain theory explains why people offend. Emile Durkheim (1897/1951) ascribed crime and deviance to the imbalance between the norms or values that are previously held and the ones that are newly evolving. Durkheim called this
imbalance anomie, which gestated people’s criminality in searching for a more stable environment. Building on Durkheim’s anomie theory, Robert Merton (1938) developed a more specific theory for explaining the origin of crime. He refined the imbalance that Durkheim focused on, theorizing it to be the mismatch between socially accepted goals and the means to achieve those goals, which may produce frustration and other negative feelings. People may deal with strain through delinquency so that their goals can be fulfilled, or they just turn to delinquency to as an outlet for negative feelings. Messner and Rosenfeld (1997) applied this theory in explaining why the United States suffers higher crime rates than other nations. They ascribed the root to the prevalence of “the American dream” overemphasizing economic success but with limited means to fulfill this dream, especially for the underclass. Meanwhile, there is also an institutional anomie intensifying the mismatch under the societal emphasis on economic success. Or, in other words, the economy dominates over other social institutions, such as family and school, that should otherwise produce constraints over individuals’ deviant behaviors. Therefore, those who lack legal means to achieve those cultural goals and necessary social control from institutions would be likely to turn to illegal means to fulfill the goals. This theory is successful in explaining the extremely high property crime rate among the underclass. Therefore, anomie/strain theory successfully connects individual experience with the institutional structure to explain motivations for delinquency, regardless of gender.

Broidy and Agnew (1997) extended general strain theory to explain the gender difference in crime. Women are traditionally perceived to have much less strain than their male counterparts because of the different requirements of gender roles. Traditionally, women are perceived to be insulated from the pressures of public life, especially the
pressure of economic success and high-class status (Applin & Messner, 2015). The ideal image of women is often “sugar and spice,” and women’s roles are assumed to be less demanding than men’s, which is assumed to produce less strain and therefore less delinquency (Naffin, 1985). Moreover, differences in the types of strain experienced exist between genders, which mediate the influence of strain on behavior and emotions reacting to it (Moon & Morash, 2017). Compared to men, women tend to suffer strain more from relational conflict than their male counterparts, who tend to suffer strain from struggling in pursuing monetary success and extrinsic achievement (Broidy & Agnew, 1997). Moreover, gender discrimination is another distinct source of strain for women (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992). The connecting mechanism from strain to deviance is also different between genders. More concern with relational issues causes women to be constrained more by various social controls from family, friends, and colleagues and to have more social supports as well, all of which reduce the possibility of delinquency, especially serious and aggressive offenses. On the contrary, men always have fewer social controls over their aggressive behaviors (Broidy & Agnew, 1997). Therefore, the different amount and type of strain experienced by men and women, various emotional reactions to strain, and distinctive conditioning factors between strain and responding behaviors explain the gender gap in deviance.

Corresponding to the multidimensional gender role repertoire, strain theory explains the gap between the individual gender ideology and its actual performance as affected by the societal-level gender structure. To include strain theory into the integrative model, three sets of variables are extracted: (a) the family hope burdened by different genders, which is a part of the societal-level ideologies of gender, (b) the life goals of either
genders, such as the aspiration for monetary success, as a reflection of the individual gender expectations, and (c) the generalized gender structure facilitating the fulfillment of the life goals for women and men.

3.3.2.3. Learning Theory of Deviance

Peer influence is another correlate of deviance that has frequently been used to explain the gender difference of deviance (Jensen & Akers, 2017). During interaction with intimate personal groups, definitions favorable or unfavorable to delinquency are learned with the assimilation of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes toward whether viewing legal codes as rules to be observed or broken (Matsueda, 1982; Sutherland, 1947). This differential association effect has been widely found in the interactions of peers with friends, which has been developed to explain the gender-specific effect of peers on criminal involvement (Alarid, Burton, & Cullen, 2000; Covington, 1985).

As one gender-oriented derivation of learning theory, Giordano and her colleagues affirmed that girls would be more deviant and delinquent with a mixed-gender peer group, while boys would be so when they were typically accompanied by same-gender companions (Giordano, 2009; Giordano & Cernkovich, 1979; Giordano et al., 2002). These mixed-gender peer groups play a role in taking the learning channel into effect, from which women can learn about and carry out delinquent activities with the maximum opportunity to interact with men and masculinity. As a result, women’s delinquency and deviance are “group influenced in a way that is similar to the pattern of male delinquency.” (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1979, p. 474).

In contrast, men are less aggressive when they are around women, which has been supported by the civilizing perspective (Lauritsen & Heimer, 2008). The increasing
presence of women is expected to be associated with a civilizing process restraining men’s
deviance to some extent. In this way, women act as men’s “moral guardians” or at least as
some form of informal control over men’s delinquent and criminal behaviors (Lauritsen et
al., 2009; Rosenfeld, 2000).

Both gender-specific contentions are derivations of learning theory and are consistent. By setting men as the origin of deviance learning but women as the other side,
interaction with men increases the involvement in crime and occurrence of deviance, while
interaction with women decreases these in contrast. Therefore, the gendered perception of
cross-sex friendship connects the gender roles and learning theory of deviance (Cernkovich
& Giordano, 1979), which reflects the individual-level gender ideologies corresponding to
the gender role framework. To include the peers’ effect on deviance, our model also
integrates this variable.

3.3.3. Reformulate Gendered Pathways to Deviance

Most criminological research treats the criminogenic factors and deviance flatly without
differentiating the structural positions held by explanatory variables. However, every social
and cultural factor does not exist independently, because they are intricately related to other
factors and, thereby, compose a complex effect influencing people’s decision, including
the decision of criminal involvement. To reflect our society more accurately, therefore, we
must distinguish the effects of each variable on deviance as well as on other potentially
relevant variables. Guided by the multidimensional gender role assumptions, this study
reformulates the extracted variables from the three theories and configures a framework
explaining the gendered pathways to deviance (see Figure 3.1).
All variables are categorized into three groups according to their initiative features and onset stage. The first category corresponds to the societal-level ideologies of gender, including family control, family hope, parents’ interaction dynamics, interaction with family members, peer interaction, and school life, which represents the socialization processes within three primary institutions: family, peers, and schools. The second category, reflecting the individual-level gender role repertoire, includes self-control, life goal, and gender role perceptions, which reflect cognitive traits. The last category of variables corresponds to the societal-level structure of gender roles and mainly reflects the gendered means of fulfilling the individual expectations. Compared to the third category, the cognitive traits are more individual and likely to fluctuate from person to person. However, they are affected by the societal settings of gender ideologies that are beyond the individual’s control and classified as socialization practices. Moreover, the effects of socialization practices are intermediated by individuals’ cognitive traits; in other words, individuals, even though having grown to maturity in similar environments, make different decisions on criminal engagement. In this process, personal cognition plays as a receptor and translator of external forces to behavior (Giordano et al., 2002). Those three categories of variables influence the deviance (individual behavior) directly and indirectly. Therefore, we assume that the layered gender role repertoire affects gendered deviance and, correspondingly, that the alteration occurring in the former also drives the latter to change.

Following the socialization change, a sequence of shifts would happen in the gender role repertoire, conductive from the individual layer to the societal layer, and then to the individual layer again. As a result, this substantial change of gender role repertoire influences people’s behaviors in the other realms, including in deviance and delinquency.
3.4. Hypotheses

The present study examines the effect of the one-child policy on gendered pathways to deviance by comparing the differences between generations before and after the enactment of the one-child policy with an integrated model. It also explores the change in multidimensional gender roles and its effect on deviance. Considering the possible unique socialization process experienced by the one-child generations, we expect to see:

*Hypothesis 1a:* Gender socialization in family, school, and peers is significantly different between the one-child and pre-one-child generations.

*Hypothesis 2a:* The gender socialization differences transform the one-child generation people’s cognitive traits from their older counterparts.

*Hypothesis 3a:* The socialization, cognitive traits, and gender structure variables influence subsequent deviant behavior, but the pathways are different between genders and generations.

Hypotheses 1a and 2a are tested by the differences in specific measurements between the one-child and pre-one-child generations. Whereas, a series of path-equation regressions is adopted for the test of hypothesis 3a, from which the gendered pathways to deviance and their inter-generational dynamics are revealed.

3.5. Methods

3.5.1. Sample

The sample included 2,006 adult Chinese citizens (ages 18 and above) who were recruited online. The reason for employing adult subjects rather than adolescents, as much research has disproportionately done (e.g., Agnew & Brezina, 1997; Hoffmann & Su, 1997; Jennings, Piquero, Gover, & Perez, 2009; Kaufman, 2009; Moon & Morash, 2017), is out of fidelity
to the original version of strain theory, which focuses on financial goals (Merton, 1938). Adolescent subjects may be a good choice when considering sampling convenience but are only feasible for the analysis of educational strain, which is insufficient to capture the direct motive driving delinquency even if there is a positive connection between those two kinds of strain.

The geographic distribution of the respondents was wide, covering 31 Chinese provinces and municipalities as well as Hong Kong, Taiwan (97.1%), and some foreign countries (25 respondents were residing out of China), as identified by the respondents’ IP addresses. The age and gender distributions are highly representative for the one-child-policy-oriented study. There were 908 respondents born after 1980, the year for the announcement of the policy, and 1,098 born before that year. Women were the majority (63.5%) of the respondents across generations (see Table 2).

3.5.2. Data Collection

The survey with 46 multi- and single-choice questions and seven self-rating scales (see appendix for the survey instrument) was carried out in the summer of 2017 in China. The questionnaire was designed at the Wenjuanxing Survey Service Website (www.wjx.cn) and then posted and distributed on the WeChat platform (the most popular social networking software in China, akin to Facebook) to recruit respondents. The intent of the research was briefly introduced in the advertisement for the survey. The respondents who finished the survey with “good quality” (taking more than 180 seconds to finish) would get ¥1 Chinese Yuan (approximates $0.16 US dollar) cash reward, which was also clarified in the introduction of the survey as an incentive. The survey was anonymous, which meant there was no identifiable information collected. Because of the voluntary nature of the
online survey, participation per se represented consent. Moreover, the respondents were free to end the survey at any time in the process, and all information would be dropped by the survey system automatically.

3.5.3. Measures and Comparisons

To reveal the gendered influence of the one-child policy, all respondents were categorized into four groups according to their ages (born before or after 1980) and genders (female or male). They were one-child-generation men (OCG men), one-child-generation women (OCG women), pre-one-child-generation men (POCG men) and pre-one-child-generation women (POCG women). Answers were compared between generations and genders with the Student’s Test method to capture the inter-generational and gender differences (see Table 3.3). Control theories are measured by sibling care, parents’ power dynamics, family hope, parents’ control, legal conscience, and school performance. Learning theory is measured by peer effect. Strain theory is measured by life goal and societal gender structures in terms of means to success. In addition, individual ideologies of gender are also included as cognitive traits. I reformulated those variables according to the path framework in Figure 3.1, including (a) the socialization from family, school, and peers, (b) personal cognitive variables such as individual attitudes toward gender roles, life goal, and conscience, and (c) gender differences experienced in multiple institutions as the gender structure at the generalized level (see Table 3 for the descriptive and comparative statistics). The latter two directly affected deviance; whereas the socialization factors were expected to influence the deviance directly and indirectly intermediated by the cognitive traits. Among these variables, the measurement of family hope and definitions of masculinity/femininity were measured by multiple-item scales. Inclusion in a scale
required items to reach a minimum loading of 0.5 in the rotated matrix of the factor analysis (Bao et al., 2017). Moreover, the Cronbach’s alpha for each scale had to be higher than 0.7 to ensure the internal consistency and measurement reliability statistically.

3.5.3.1. Socialization process

Sibling care is measured by two questions. One concerns the number of siblings, and the other is about the time spent in caring for their siblings for the participants who were not single children. The responsibility of taking care of siblings cultivates the conventional bonding within the family and the orientation toward personal relations; thus, it is expected to decrease the deviance (Hirschi, 1969). Combining the responses, the sibling care variable is binary (1: need to care; 0: no need). The inter-generational difference is significant in that there was a higher proportion of older-generation people responsible for their siblings’ care when they were young (mean = 0.55) than the OCG counterparts (mean = 0.39). However, this responsibility has been skewed to women over time. More young women shouldered the responsibility of sibling care than their male counterparts (mean = 0.41 for women and 0.34 for men). In contrast, fewer POCG women had to take the responsibility than did their male counterparts (mean = 0.52 for women and 0.59 for men). This gender-specific change might be a direct reflection of the policy’s intervention. Families that had the “luck” of having a boy as the first child would stop childbearing and comply with the policy; however, families without such “luck” would not be satisfied with the single child and would tend to have a larger family, in which the first child turned to be the elder sister and likely the babysitter of her younger sibling(s). As a result, the one-child generations have been largely freed from the sibling-care responsibility, though this change is not equal between genders.
The parents’ power dynamic is measured by parents’ relative position at home. Respondents were asked who had the final say at their homes (1 = mother, 2 = mother for the major things and father for the less important, 3 = the same, 4 = father for the major things and mother for the less important, 5 = father). Therefore, the higher the number is, the more patriarchal the family was in which the respondent grew up. The mean is 3.24 (SD = 1.34). This variable is not different between generations nor genders.

Family hope combines the scales for father’s and mother’s hope (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes for either) and, therefore, ranges from 0 to 4. A higher score in family hope means the respondent burdened more by parents with the family dream\(^\text{14}\). The mean is 2.84 (SD = 1.47), and Cronbach’s alpha is 0.81. The gender difference is significant, where men (mean = 3.00) were burdened with more family hope than women (mean = 2.75). Moreover, the gender gap has shrunk (the gender difference is 0.31 for the POCG with p < 0.01, whereas the difference is 0.23 for the OCG with p < 0.01).

Family control is captured by the question whether the respondent would receive sanctions from the family if they were deviant or intractable when they were young (1=no, 2=not always, 3=yes). The mean is 2.38 (SD = 0.73) and increases across generations. Compared to the older-generation counterparts (mean = 2.35), the OCG people (mean = 2.42) generally received more sanction from the family against their defiant behaviors

\(^{14}\) Under the influence of Confucianism, individual attainment in China is not a personal issue, however, it is shared by the family or even the clan. Specifically, success, in Chinese context, means not only personal achievement but also bringing glory on one’s ancestors and the families who share the same ancestors (guanzong yaozu). Therefore, Chinese respondents might understand family hope as the expectation of their family pinned on them optimistic for their recognizable attainments and prosperity, which has been acknowledged as a significant factor influential to parenting practices (Huang & Gove, 2015).
Moreover, there is no significant gender difference among the young generations. In contrast, older-generation males were subject to more disciplinary control than were their female counterparts.

*Cross-gender friendship* measures the learning effects on deviant behaviors (Giordano, 2009; Lei, Simons, Simons, & Edmond, 2014). The variable is measured by the response to the question “is friend’s gender a concern when you are making friends?” (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes.) The mean is 0.75 (SD = 0.92). Compared to men, women were concerned more about their friend’s gender in general (mean = 0.80 for women, and 0.66 for men, with $t = 3.32$ and $p < 0.01$); however, this gender difference only existed among the POC generations, which reflected a more permissive trend in making friends for Chinese young women.

*School effect* is captured by the measure of the self-reported school performance (1 = bad, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, and 5 = good). The mean is 3.56 (SD = 1.09). There is no significant difference between generations nor genders.

In sum, either boys or girls of the one-child generations have been more at the center of the family (Bao et al., 2017). They have been freed from sibling care responsibility and pinned with more hope and control from the family because of their parents’ low fertility rate. However, the inter-generational change is not the same between genders. On the one hand, the gender gap has been narrowing in terms of socialization. Women have received relatively more family hope and control and been more open to making male friends than they were before. On the other hand, however, some family chores, such as sibling care, is skewed to women’s shoulders. Overall speaking, our results support hypothesis 1. The
socialization practices have been significantly changed over generations because of the one-child policy; moreover, the change has been gender-specific.

3.5.3.2. Cognitive Traits

*Legal conscience* reflects the level of self-control and the internalization of the external controls. This variable is captured by the responses to the question whether the respondent agreed on unconditional compliance with laws and regulations (1 = no; 2 = yes for most except the unpunishable; 3 = yes for most except the unreasonable; and 4 = yes). The mean is 3.32 (SD = 0.81) with no difference between genders nor generations.

*Masculinity and femininity* reflect the result of gender socialization on individual gender roles. They are measured in two ways: first, as the interaction between the definition and the self-rating scale by men and women, respectively and second, as the comparison between the respondents’ same-gender parent and themselves. Both definitions are gauged with 16 items, similar to those in previous studies (e.g., Kaufman & Taniguchi, 2006; Lei et al., 2014). Masculinity was defined by male respondents based on a multi-response question, including being independent, enterprising, aggressive, physically strong, emotionally repressed, controlling, pleasure seeking, economically successful, muscular, sporty, tough, adventurous, sagacious, powerful, assertive, and knowledgeable. Based on the constructed definition, the male respondents were asked to rate their masculine level from 1 (not masculine at all) to 10 (very masculine). Correspondingly, femininity was defined by female respondents with options including being elegant, affectionate, delicate, sociable, submissive, family-centered, dependent, chaste, kind-hearted, quiet, cautious, sensitive, considerate, cultured, neat, and pure. After constructing the femininity definition, the respondents were asked to rate their feminine score from 1 (not feminine at all) to 10.
(very feminine). Therefore, the scales of masculinity and femininity range from 0 to 160 and are positively related to persons’ perceptions of their gender roles. Both definitions’ internal reliability is high (Cronbach’s alpha is 0.78 for masculinity and 0.79 for femininity). Moreover, the self-rated femininity significantly decreases over time (mean = 7.05 for the POC generation, and 6.24 for the OC), but there is no significant inter-generational change among men. Correspondingly, the interaction is significantly higher for the OCG females than for their older counterparts but are not different between male groups. Another measurement is the parent-child comparison of masculinity and femininity (1 = I am more masculine/feminine, 2 = the same, 3 = my father/mother is more masculine/feminine). The mean is 1.99 (SD = 0.80) for the masculine difference and 1.95 (SD = 0.80) for the feminine difference, which means both genders regard their parents as being more masculine or feminine, and this perception is consistent across generations.

Life goal is composed of two parts. One is the economic-oriented definition of success, and the other is the aspiration to achieve economic success. The respondents were asked to construct their definition of success from ten diverse items—being economically abundant, politically powerful, reputable, popular, knowledgeable, healthy, to having many friends, a happy family, outstanding children, and making the world a better place. Compared to the older generations, who had a diverse spectrum of success definition, more of the OCG people, both women and men, disproportionately defined success as economic abundance (1 = yes, no = 0; mean = 0.49 for the POC generations and 0.66 for the OC; see also Dutton, 2005; Shen, 2015). Moreover, the gender difference has shrunk across generations (no difference among the new generations but a significant gap among the older generations with 0.52 and 0.46 for men and women, respectively). This pattern is
consistent with the trend of aspiration for economic success (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes). A higher proportion of the OCG people rated high in their desire to achieve success economically than their older counterparts (mean = 1.59 for the older generations, and 1.74 for the younger, with t = 4.91 and p < 0.01). In particular, a higher proportion of the single children among the new generations defined success economically (0.75 versus 0.62 with p < 0.01) and aspiring for economic success (1.81 versus 1.70 with p < 0.01) than their peers who had siblings.

In sum, a higher proportion of the OCG people defined success as monetary abundance and aspired for such a success than the older generations. Moreover, femininity reduced over time, but masculinity saw no change. Therefore, these findings support hypothesis 2. The individual gender role expectations are different across generations.

3.5.3.3. Gender Structure

Gender structures are measured in four ways as the gender differences experienced by the respondents in family, school, workplace, and from the general income level to reflect the societal level of gender structure.

*Family inequality* is measured by the responses to the question about whether their parents told or implied that “It is harder for women to succeed than for men” (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes). The mean is 0.63 (SD = 0.82). The gender difference was less emphasized by the parents of the OCG people than for their older counterparts (mean = 0.68 for the POC generations, and 0.56 for the young ones, with t = 3.40 and p < 0.01). Compared to women’s parents (mean = 0.60), men’s parents (mean = 0.68) were more likely to transfer the chauvinist message to their sons to promote the sons’ confidence in
their gender (t = 1.94 and p < 0.05). Moreover, this difference was from the gender gap among the older generations, which was not noted among the one-child generations.

*School inequality* is measured similarly to family inequality, except the gender discriminatory message senders were changed to teachers (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes). The mean is 0.57 (SD = 0.79). Gender discrimination has been strengthened over generations. A significantly higher proportion of young women (mean = 0.61) experienced such discrimination at schools than did their male counterparts (mean = 0.50) and older counterparts (mean = 0.54).

*Job inequality* is captured by the promotion prospect for women and men. Respondents were asked to predict the outcome of a scenario in which “a man and a woman are working in the same company at the same position. One day, the boss has a mind to promote one of them. Who do you think is more likely to get this promotion (1 = the woman, 2 = the same, 3 = the man)?” The mean is 2.22 (SD = 0.78). Fewer young women agreed with the man getting the opportunity than did their male counterparts (mean = 2.18 for women and 2.31 for men, with p < 0.02). However, the gender gap was reversed for the POC generations, among whom more women predicted the man as the lucky person than their male counterparts (mean =2.28 for women and 2.13 for men, with p < 0.01).

*Income inequality* is measured by the perception of who had a higher income on average (1 = women, 2 = the same, 3 = men). The mean is 2.46 (SD = 0.73), which means more people regarded men as the winner of income. The unequal perception has been reinforced over generations. More OCG people believed men’s average income is higher than women’s than did POCG people. Like job inequality, however, younger generation
women were more optimistic than their older counterparts in the gender equality of earning, which reflects the dynamics of individual expectation of gender roles.

In general, regardless of the equalized socialization practices and individual gender role perceptions, the societal gender structure turns out to be even more unequal than before, especially in school and in the general income level. Compared to other socialization agents, the family has less gender discrimination among the one-child generations, and, correspondingly, women who have been socialized with such equality expect similarly equal treatment in other societal institutions. However, those institutions keep or even strengthened gender disparity, and fail the expectation of the OCG women.

3.5.3.4. Deviance

*Deviance* is measured by a self-rated scale of respondents’ deviant levels regarding deviant behaviors (from 1, not deviant at all, to 10, very deviant). Examples were offered, including smoking or drinking before 18, fighting at school or on the street, getting something by force, shoplifting, deliberately damaging private or public property, and disobeying the authorities (Bao et al., 2017). The mean is 4.59 (SD = 2.44). The gender gap in deviance is significant across generations. On average, men are more deviant than women. The reason why deviance was used as the dependent variable rather than more serious criminal behaviors is in consideration of the data quality. There are two concerns if we explicitly collect information on delinquency: (a) the reliability and validity may be impaired considering the respondents’ willingness to reveal their criminal activities (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000) and (b) the data tend to be highly skewed with an inflation of zero considering the general low crime rates in China (Curran & Cook, 1993). As an alternative, the measure of deviant behavior, which is milder than criminal offending, avoids these problems to a
large extent; and more importantly, they are analogous to crime in the nature of fulfilling instant gratification and therefore widely used as the sound prediction for criminal involvement in research (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990; Perrone, Sullivan, Pratt, & Margaryan, 2004; Widom, 2014).

3.6. Results

3.6.1. Bivariate Correlations

Table 3.4a and 3.4b present Pearson correlations for men’s and women’s groups of respondents, respectively. Deviance has significant correlations with cognitive traits and moderate correlations with structural inequalities. Moreover, the connections between cognition and socialization variables are salient, which reflects the effect of socialization on deviance via its intermediary effect on shaping cognitive traits. These associations are consistent with both theoretical propositions and empirical findings based on Western samples (e.g., Burton, Cullen, Alarid, & Dunaway, 1998; Lauritsen et al., 2009; Lei et al., 2014). Comparing the Table 4a and 4b, all structural variables have a consistent correlation with deviance between genders, which is also true for the cognition-related variables except for masculine/feminine ones. However, some socialization-related variables have a reversed effect on women’s and men’s deviance, such as parents’ power dynamics and cross-sex friendship.

Three demographic control variables are measured with the single-choice questions. In addition to the gender and age variables, childhood residence was also collected and coded as 0 = non-country and 1 = country, with 60 - and 40 - percent distributions, respectively. From the IP addresses, the overwhelming responses were from industrial or economically advanced cities. However, the information revealed by the IP address is
vague at the city level and impossible to capture more residential details after childhood. Combining with the fact of massive rural-to-urban migration in China during past decades (Lo, Cheng, Bohm, & Zhong, 2018; Solinger, 1999) and the relatively inconvenient infrastructural condition in rural areas, there is a high probability that the Internet-based survey respondents who spent childhood in the countryside have moved out after they grew up.

3.6.2. Path Model - General

Structural equation modeling (SEM) is employed to evaluate direct and indirect effect paths between variables in the model, which integrated elements of socialization, cognition, and inequality. Collinearity diagnostics did not show multicollinearity problems between parenting variables, with all the VIF values under 1.3. The result for the general model with all responses without differentiation over gender nor generation is shown in Table 3.5. Socialization is operationalized by six variables ranging from the realm of family, school to peers. Cognitive traits reflect through two variables, and gender structure includes four variables. The influences of these three parts on deviance are estimated with the intermediary effects of socialization on cognitive traits. Three demographic variables were used as controls to exclude possible artifacts of group differences on the measures.

The results in Table 3.5 show that cognitive variables are highly related to deviance. In general, high conscience is a good predictor of low deviance level; whereas the aspiration for economic success increases deviance. These two variables are results of socialization. Except for the sibling care responsibility, all other five variables have significantly positive effects on one or both cognition variables. Among all socialization institutions, family plays the most important role in shaping self-control and life goal
through the external control, hope anchoring, and power structure between parents. Nevertheless, the direct effects of family socialization are largely diminished after controlling its indirect effects on deviance. In contrast, the effect of school socialization is salient on deviance, either in the direct or indirect way. The acceptance of cross-gender friends only connects to the self-control but does not affect the other two response variables. Structural gender inequality contributes to the increase in deviance through discrimination in family and school. Among the control variables, gender has the only direct effect on deviance that men have a higher deviance level than women on average. However, generation and rural residence during childhood connect to the shaping of cognition and therefore indirectly influence deviance. The one-child generations are more eager for economic success than their older counterparts. Growing up in rural areas plays a role in reducing success aspiration and self-control, which can be ascribed to the unequal distribution of education resources and loosened parent-to-children relationships due to the massive labor force migrations from rural to urban areas.

After including all the variables into the model, the effect of generation is not significant, which means the inter-generational difference has been explained. Although the direct pathway model to deviance is significant, its $R^2$ is relatively low. This may be because the aggregate data not fit this designated path model well. Therefore, a gendered and generational disaggregation is necessary to explore the pathways to deviance.

### 3.6.3. Path Model – Gendered and Generational

Whether current criminogenic explanations are universal and gender-neutral has been in debate for a long time (Mears, Ploeger, & Warr, 1998; Smith & Paternoster, 1987). Moreover, in line with the gender-specific effects of the one-child policy, we disentangle
the data over gender and generation so to capture the policy’s influence on the inter-
generational trend of the gender gap in deviance. Categorized by gender and generation,
therefore, four sets of path models are estimated separately representing each group. 
Facilitated by the specification in gender, two gender role measures are additionally 
included as cognitive variables. Corresponding to the data specification, gender and 
generation are removed from the control variables. The complete results of the grouped 
path analyses are presented in Table 3.6a, 3.6b, 3.6c, and 3.6d. To make it easy to read and 
compare, Figure 3.2 only contains the paths that are statistically significant (at 90% 
confidence level), while controlling for the effect of childhood residence variable. Table 
3.7 decomposes the direct and indirect effects of each variable on deviance and compares 
the differences between groups.

The results show salient differences between generations and genders in the 
etiological paths to deviance. Among the socialization variables, patriarchal family, family 
control and school performance are the only three variables influential on deviance for all 
groups with consistent effects. A more patriarchal family, where the mother has a lower 
position than the father, decreases the deviance level of its daughters but increases that of 
sons on the contrary. This finding supports power-control theory. In addition to the gender-
specific direct effect, girls from a more patriarchal family have a higher level of self-control, 
which deters deviant behaviors; whereas, boys tend to have a higher level of masculinity, 
which promotes the sense of toughness and eventually, deviance, indirectly. Family control 
plays a role in reducing deviance for four groups through the indirect paths. For male 
groups, family control significantly promotes the self-control level and therefore reduces 
the level of deviance. In contrast, family control reduces the deviance level of POCG
women by increasing their sense of femininity. Moreover, both mechanisms can be found among the OCG women, whose experience of strict family control increases their femininity (comparing to the level of their mother) and legal conscience. School performance has a strong effect on deviance prevention. Except for the POCG women whose school performance decreasing their deviance via the increase in femininity, good school performance directly reduces the deviance for the other three groups. This finding is consistent with the conformity stake hypothesis that deviance is more “costly” for the better school performers. The exclusiveness of same-gender friend network shows the gender-specific effects on deviance. Women’s deviance is likely to be higher if they are willing to make friends with men, which is consistent across generations. However, the effect is reversed for the OCG men’s deviance. The deviance of a man of the younger generation is higher if he tends to make friends with only men and correspondingly lower if with women. This finding supports learning theory including the mixed-gender association effect on women’s deviance (Giordano & Cernkovich, 1979) and the civilizing effect on men’s (Lauritsen et al., 2009). Being burdened with family hope has no effect on the POCG women but plays a part in affecting the OCG women’s and all generation men’s deviance via indirect paths. For the younger generation people, family hope increases conscience and therefore reduces the deviance level. The family hope placed on young women particularly increases their aspiration for economic success, so it has an extra positive effect on their deviance, which however is buffered by the effect of increased conscience. For the POCG men, the family hope enhances not only the conscience but also their masculinity. After counteracting, the deviance level of this group is positively related to the family hope. The responsibility of sibling care, although has been decreased
strikingly as a benefit to the OCG people, has no significant effect on their deviance. The only influenced group is the POCG men, whose deviance would be increased by the sibling care responsibility.

Among the cognition variables, the parent-child difference in femininity or masculinity is the only factor significantly affecting the deviance for all four groups. Consistent with the predictions that masculinity encourages toughness and aggression while femininity to the opposite (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Lei et al., 2014; Messerschmidt, 1993), decreased femininity promotes the deviance of younger women, but decreased masculinity reduces the deviance of men in contrast. Therefore, the opposite changes in individual gender ideologies narrow the gender gap in deviance that men tend to be less defiant but women more defiant. Another measure of gender roles, self-rated femininity/masculinity, is significant for the POCG women and both male groups. Consistent with the finding in the inter-generational changes of gender roles, a lower score of femininity or a higher score of masculinity increases the deviance level for women and men, respectively. Conscience consistently decreases deviance among the OCG women and both male groups, which supports self-control theory (Burton et al., 1998; Gibbs et al., 1998; Perrone et al., 2004). In particular, only the OCG women’s deviance is specifically increased by the aspiration for economic success. If a young Chinese woman yearns for being economically successful as her life goal, her deviance level is likely to be higher than her counterparts who have no such a goal.

With regard to the gender structure, inequality variables only influence women’s deviance across generations, which is sensible for the gender inequalities are experienced disproportionally by women in a patriarchal society. If a POCG woman experiences gender
discrimination at family, she is likely to be more deviant than the ones who are protected from such experience by parents. Whereas for the OCG women, the income inequality plays a more important role in increasing their deviance level. These findings empirically support strain theory with the positive effect of the success aspiration on deviance. The young women bearing with the dream to be monetary successful will find themselves in short of legitimate means of fulfilling their dream when they enter the patriarchal society with stratified gender structure. Even if they have a paid job, they are still more likely to confront the disadvantages of the “double shift” (H. Zhang, 2014a) and less chance to promotion than their male counterparts (Applin & Messner, 2015), which exposed them further to the anomic pressures associated with the economically successful goal.

Growing up in rural areas is positively related to deviance as a control variable for all groups except for the OCG men. It increases deviance via the indirect paths by decreasing the legal conscience. Also, living in the countryside decreases the success aspiration for the younger generation women and femininity for the older-generation women, respectively. The former plays a role in reducing deviance, but that is too weak to offset the positive effect of the decreased conscience.

Compared to the aggregate model (Table 3.5), the regression $R^2$ has been enhanced in each model, especially for male groups. The lowest $R^2$ is for the POCG female group, which means their deviance relates more to other variables not included in our model. The $R^2$ for the OCG female model is higher and between that of their older and male counterparts. Therefore, the model fits the pathways to deviance better for men and OCG women.
The findings for the one-child generations, either women or men, are stable after being tested with data disaggregated by single or non-single children status, although the success-inequality strain effects are more significant among the only-children group. The perception of income inequality has a positive effect on OCG women’s deviance including the only children and the ones who have siblings, but not on their male counterparts’. For the single male children, more skewed income distribution toward men, in contrast, decreases their deviance level because they can succeed through legitimate channels in a more patriarchal society. Thus, the one-child policy has changed not only the socialization for the only children and therefore their gender roles and gendered pathways to deviance, but also the other people who belong to the very special generations. This effect process functions through the mutual influences between the layered gender role repertoire. The only children, as the ones directly influenced by the policy, initially change the generalized attitudes toward gender, which in turn affects the individual-level gender ideologies of more peer children in society. Despite the difference of the definition of success and aspiration between single and non-single children, we can expect the difference will gradually fade out when the policy effect ripples out over time.

### 3.7. Discussion

The pathways to deviance are distinctive for every group representing each combination of the gender and the generation. Compared to the POCG groups’, some influential variables are replaced or added in the pathways to the one-child generations’ deviance. Most explanatory factors are the same between the groups of men, except for the stronger peers’ and weaker family interaction’s effects on the deviance of the OCG men than on that of their older counterparts. For groups of women, the inter-generational differences are more
salient. The pathways to the OCG women’s deviance reflect the features of both deviant pathways for their older counterparts and male counterparts. Or in other words, the OCG women are in the middle between the POCG women and the OCG men in terms of the pathways to deviance. Similar with men, family hope and legal conscience are affecting Chinese younger-generation women’s deviance that are not significant in the older-generation women’s pathways. Moreover, school performance, which only has an indirect effect on the POCG women’s deviance, plays a role in decreasing deviance directly in men’s and OCG women’s pathways. Like the POCG women’s model, moreover, the younger-generation women’s deviance is also deterred by the patriarchal family structure and the same-gender friendship. In addition to the generational differences, the distinctions between genders are also prominent. Compared to men, women are subjected to the gender inequality embedded in the social structure, which increases their deviance across generations. For the POCG women, gender discrimination from family is substantial in promoting their deviance level. However, for the OCG women’s deviance, income inequality between genders pushes deviance up, especially when they have the aspiration for economic success. This finding is consistent with strain theory. Although the younger generation women have been socialized more equally with their male counterparts at home by their parents, they are still suffering from the gender discrimination and inequality in other social institutions. Because of such a lag in the attitude toward gender roles and actual gender structure in society, Chinese younger-generation women are subjected to the specific strain between their newly instilled dream and the relentless reality that the gender structure is still hierarchical, and therefore the opportunities to fulfill their life goal are unequal and meager.
In addition to testing the applicability of these theories, we also examine the relative explanatory power of variations derived from them. For all four groups, control theories get the most support, especially social control and stake in conformity theories. Learning theory is also functional in the pathways to deviance for all respondents except for the POCG men. Whereas, strain theory only explains the deviant pathways for the OCG women because of the faster change in gender ideologies than that in structure, which has been externally driven by the demographic policy.

Another extensive finding is in line with learning theory. For the OCG men’s group, the same-gender friendship network demonstrates a positive connection with high masculinity and thereby a high level of deviance. However, the effect is reversed for women’s deviance that is increased by the opposite-gender friendship. Despite the reversed direction in the gendered pathways, the effect of cross-gender friendship is consistent on deviance. Male friends play as an aggressive model in peer interaction and a socialization agent for definitions and motives favorable to delinquency. Moreover, such a peer effect on male and female deviance can be enlarged by the imbalanced sex ratios among the one-child generations. It is easier for women making friends with men than before, but harder for men making friends with women when we take the huge deficit of women among the one-child generations into consideration, which was caused by the conflict between the policy and cultural son preference. Thus, the increase in women’s deviance may be partially a consequence of increased involvement in mixed-gender peer groups.

As a result, the gender gap in deviance that was rated higher than five has been narrowed from 4.7% for the pre-one-child generations to 3.9% for the one-child generations (calculated as 50% - [women’s ratio/ women’s + men’s ratios] *100%).

Moreover, the convergence is primarily a result of the increase in women’s deviance. There are few differences between male groups inter-generationally. Therefore, unique socialization practices experienced by the one-child generations updated the individual attitudes toward gender roles, which has equalized the life goal of the younger generation people between men and women. Nevertheless, the hierarchical gender structure is stubborn and untouched, which limits women’s means to achieve their life goal and therefore creates the strain specifically faced by Chinese young women.

3.8. Conclusion and Implication

The one-child policy had been strictly enacted for over 35 years and affected the birth and life of one-fifth people in the world. As a result, it has reshaped a society’s culture and social structure externally and therefore provides an extraordinary chance to explore the underlying mechanisms and effect paths to gendered delinquency. Contrary to the prevalent predictions, however, the imbalanced sex ratios and scarce of women do not endow women more value, at least no more value as workers or producers. The gender gap in deviance narrows, but is not because of the increase in gender equality as numerous research indicates (Lauritsen & Heimer, 2008; Lauritsen et al., 2009).

In general, two mechanisms function in narrowing the gender gap in deviance. First, women are less feminine than before; meanwhile, masculinity also decreases inter-generationally, which caused a convergence in the gender difference of deviance. However, this change is different from the “masculinization” of women or “feminization” of men because the pathways to deviance continue being distinctive between genders. If it is a simple neutralization of gender roles or shortening of the gender continuum, the gender differences in other realms should also fade, and the deviant pathways should be
“degendered.” However, the findings still indicate strong differences between genders in almost all domains, which, in return, support the multidimensionality of gender role repertoire. The other mechanism to the converged gender gap in deviance is the equalization lag of the societal gender structure to gender ideologies happened in gender role repertoire. The one-child policy drives the socialization, especially family socialization of gender, to be changed and therefore alters the definition of what is normative femininity but maintains the existing societal gender structure (Seidman, 2010). Even as stereotypes are modified, however, the cultural shift may still leave structural inequalities in place (Applin & Messner, 2015). This mismatch produces the gender-specific strain for Chinese young women, especially those who have been instilled in gender equality and pinned with the family dream by their parents. Therefore, the new generation women have been less “immune from the criminogenic institutional forces” (Applin & Messner, 2015) but turned to be as likely as their male counterparts to exhibit support for the values associated with economic achievement (Steven F. Messner & Rosenfeld, 1994). Eventually, the deviance functions as an outlet and a reaction after their dream is struck by the unequal means in society.

Although this study is based on Chinese data, the findings are revelatory to the criminogenic research in general. The change in socialization practice was a side outcome of the demographic policy curbing the population growth, but the transformation has been experienced by all people belonging to the one-child generations, regardless if they are the only children or not.

Emancipation theory connects the liberated gender roles with the increase in women’s crime, which has been widely criticized from the mismatch between the
explained subjects – the women who have been liberated are not the ones who are brought into the justice system (Giordano & Cernkovich, 1979; Renzetti, 2013). The latter, in contrast, are always found in the underclass, who are far from being liberated but trapped deep with financial burdens by the economic marginalization (Holtfreter, Reisig, & Morash, 2004; Reckdenwald & Parker, 2008; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1995).

However, the liberated women and the underclass women do not live in a vacuum. In fact, they share the same world and dramatically influence each other. When the middle- and upper-class women enjoy liberation and go out of home to compete with men in school and workplace, the other groups of women are also influenced. They may not be directly influenced by the liberalization, but indirectly through the changed societal gender roles. For example, the liberated life of the middle-class women is advertised as the standard and normal style in the modern time by mass media. Influenced by such ideologies, other groups of women are also desiring for such a liberated life, even if they have not been emancipated in real. Bearing with such a dream but having to face the crude reality that they are marginalized in the society, and therefore the means to fulfill their dream is bleak. They, as a result, are subjected to the strain produced by the structural inequality not only inter-gender but also intra-gender. Mismatched by the societal structure from their ideologies of gender roles, those groups of women are more likely to involve in delinquency to alternatively fulfill their dream or simply avoid the frustrating feelings. Therefore, emancipation and economic marginalization theories tell us the same story within a dynamic system of gender roles. Some groups of women have achieved numeric gains in society as the result of emancipation and therefore influenced the societal attitudes toward gender, which in turn incubates the equalized individual ideologies in a broad scope.
but does not change the unequal structure fundamentally. This equalization lag happening in the gender role repertoire leads to the strain and therefore an increase in delinquency for the ones experiencing the mismatch most. Therefore, there is still a long way to go to reach the real equality of gender for the whole society.
3.9. Tables and Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Societal</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalized Attitudes toward Gender in Society</td>
<td>Specific Expectation within an actor’s frame of reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>The desirability of gendered familial behavior (e.g., Women should be family-centered)</td>
<td>Actor’s familial goals (e.g., Whether and when to marry and how many children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>The desirability of gendered behavior at school (e.g., girls should be good at humanities while boys at sciences)</td>
<td>The equal/unequal treatment of genders by teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers</td>
<td>The desirability of relationship with gendered peers (e.g., a woman should be with women)</td>
<td>The friendship network structure (e.g., the proportion of cross-sex friends)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and income</td>
<td>The gendered desirability of work (e.g., a woman should work and earn income)</td>
<td>The general gender structure at the workplace (e.g., women occupy low-paid jobs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is modified based on Giordano and Cernkovich’s (1979) work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-one-child generations</th>
<th>One-child generations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>2,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>Inter-generational Change = the OC(^a) – the POC(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>Deviance</td>
<td>4.59 (2.44)</td>
<td>-0.04 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>Sibling Care Responsibility (0 = no, 1 = yes)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.50)</td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parents’ Power Dynamic (1 = matriarchal, 2 = mild matriarchal, 3 = egalitarian, 4 = mild patriarchal, 5 = patriarchal)</td>
<td>3.24 (1.34)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Hope (0 – 4: the bigger the number, the more hope expressed)</td>
<td>2.84 (1.47)</td>
<td>0.05 (0.71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Control (1 = no, 2 = not always, 3 = yes)</td>
<td>2.38 (0.73)</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-gender Friends’ Effect (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.92)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Performance (1 = bad, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, 5 = good)</td>
<td>3.56 (1.09)</td>
<td>0.01 (0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>Legal Conscience (1 = no, 2 = except for the unpunishable, 3 = except for the unreasonable, 4 = yes)</td>
<td>3.32 (0.81)</td>
<td>-3.74e-3 (0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Masculinity/Femininity (0 – 160: the bigger the number, the more masculine/feminine)</td>
<td>28.86 (24.70)</td>
<td>-0.57 (0.43)/-9.53*** (4.90)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 (Continued) Comparisons over Generations and Genders (T-test Statistics with Unequal Variances)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (Std. Dev.)</th>
<th>Inter-generational Change = the OC(^a) – the POC(^b)</th>
<th>Gender Difference = Women - Men</th>
<th>Gender Gap among the POC = Women - Men</th>
<th>Gender Gap among the OC = Women – Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>Parent-child difference of Masculinity/Femininity (1 = I am more masculine/feminine, 2 = the same, 3 = my parent is more masculine/feminine)</td>
<td>1.99 (0.80)/ 1.95 (0.80)</td>
<td>-0.07 (1.11)/ 0.03 (0.62)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Success Definition (0 = no, 1 = yes)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.18*** (8.13)</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.06(^*)</td>
<td>-0.03 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Success Aspiration (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes)</td>
<td>1.66 (0.69)</td>
<td>0.15*** (4.91)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07(^*) (1.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Gender Discrimination (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.82)</td>
<td>-0.12*** (3.40)</td>
<td>-0.07(^*)</td>
<td>-0.09(^*)</td>
<td>-0.01 (0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Gender Discrimination (0 = no, 1 = somewhat, 2 = yes)</td>
<td>0.57 (0.79)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.53)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.10(^*) (1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workplace Gender Discrimination (1 = women easier being promoted, 2 = the same, 3 = men easier being promoted)</td>
<td>2.22 (0.78)</td>
<td>-2.15e-3 (0.06)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.15*** (3.23)</td>
<td>-0.13** (2.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Income Gender Inequality (1 = women have higher income, 2 = the same, 3 = men have higher income)</td>
<td>2.46 (0.73)</td>
<td>0.06(^*) (1.83)</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.22*** (4.62)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(p<0.1; \; **p<0.05; \; ***p<0.01\) (two-tailed test); \(^a\) OC = One-child Generation; \(^b\) POC = Pre-one-child Generation
Table 3.4a. Correlation Matrix for the Study Variables (Men, n = 732)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Deviance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sibling</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Patriarchal</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hope</td>
<td>4.30e-3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Control</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Friends</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. School</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cons.</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fem.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Fem. Dif.</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Asp.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Fam. Dis.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sch. Dis.</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Job Dis.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Inc. Ine.</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.1; **p < 0.05; ***p < 0.01
Table 3.4b. Correlation Matrix for the Study Variables (Women, n = 1,274)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.Deviance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.Sibling</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.Patriarchal</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.Hope</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.Control</td>
<td>-0.07***</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.15***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.Friends</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.School</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.Cons.</td>
<td>-0.12***</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.15***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.Fem.</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>4.50e-3</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.Fem. Dif.</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
<td>-0.18***</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>-0.15***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.Asp.</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.Fam. Dis.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.10***</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
<td>-0.05*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.Sch. Dis.</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.Job Dis.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.07**</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.15***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.10***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.Inc. Ine.</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.12***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>-0.08***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Table 3.5. Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Path Model (n=2,006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory Variables</th>
<th>Response Variables</th>
<th>7. Legal Conscience</th>
<th>8. Success Aspiration</th>
<th>Deviance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sibling Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriarchal Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>-0.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09***</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>-0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Same-sex Friend Exclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>-3.33e-4</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>-0.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legal Conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Success Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Family Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Job Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Income Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Gender-Woman</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Generation-One Child</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Childhood Rural Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.16***</td>
<td>-0.08**</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Table 3.6a. Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Path Model (Pre-one-child Generation Women, n=638)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sibling Care</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriarchal Family</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.12***</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17***</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Same-sex Friend Exclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10***</td>
<td>0.06**</td>
<td>0.19**</td>
<td>-0.06**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legal Conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Success Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Femininity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Decreased Fem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Job Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Income Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Childhood Rural Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
<td>-0.14***</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$p<0.1; ~**p<0.05; ~***p<0.01$
### Table 3.6b. Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Path Model (One-child Generation Women, n=636)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sibling Care</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriarchal Family</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Hope</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.06***</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Control</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.13***</td>
<td>-3.37e-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Same-sex Friend Exclusiveness</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Performance</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legal Conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Success Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Femininity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Decreased Fem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Job Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Income Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Childhood Rural Residence</td>
<td>-0.21***</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sibling Care</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.67***</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriarchal Family</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Hope</td>
<td>0.14***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.40***</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Control</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>0.15***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>3.19e-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Same-sex Friend Exclusiveness</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Performance</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.97e-3</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legal Conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Success Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Decreased Mas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Job Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Income Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Childhood Rural Residence</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>-4.59e-4</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Table 3.6d. Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Path Model (One-child Generation Men, n=272)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Socialization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sibling Care</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriarchal Family</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08**</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Hope</td>
<td>0.09**</td>
<td>0.07***</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Control</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Same-sex Friend Exclusiveness</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.09***</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School Performance</td>
<td>0.11***</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.25**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive Traits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legal Conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.54***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Success Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Masculinity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Decreased Mas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Job Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Income Inequality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Childhood Rural Residence</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.13***</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01
Table 3.7. Effect Decomposition for the Path Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NOC Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>OC Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>NOC Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>OC Men</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>Indirect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Socialization</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sibling</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
<td>-0.40e-3**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Patriarchal</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.17**</td>
<td>-0.32***</td>
<td>-0.40e-3**</td>
<td>-0.32**</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hope</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>-0.01**</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>0.08***</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>-0.12**</td>
<td>-0.12***</td>
<td>-0.12***</td>
<td>-0.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Friend</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.25**</td>
<td>-0.23**</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. School</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.02**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>-0.01*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>-0.21**</td>
<td>-0.37***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cognitive Traits</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Cons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
<td>-0.43***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Aspiration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td>0.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Fem./Mas.</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td>-0.17***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dec. Fem./Mas.</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65***</td>
<td>-0.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gender Structure</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Family Dis.</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. School Dis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Job Dis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Inc. Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Control</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.05**</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
<td>0.03**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01; Only significant effects are displayed. The rest is represented in Table 3.6a, 3.6b, 3.6c, and 3.6d.
Figure 3.1. Theoretical Re-composition of the Gendered Pathways to Deviance
Figure 3.2. Grouped Structural Equation Models Detecting Influence Paths to Deviance. Note: Only paths significant are displayed. The rest is represented in Table 3.6a, 3.6b, 3.6c, and 3.6d. Childhood residence is controlled but not presented here.
Chapter 4. Who Is Like Whom: A Qualitative Research on the Convergence of the Gender Gap in Offending Among the One-child Generations in China

4.1. Introduction

The trend toward the convergence of the gender gap in offending has been widely acknowledged and quantitatively researched worldwide (Estrada, Backman, & Nilsson, 2016a, 2016b; Lauritsen, Heimer, & Lynch, 2009; Savolainen et al., 2017; Schwartz, 2013a; Schwartz, Steffensmeier, Zhong, & Ackerman, 2009). The difference in men’s and women’s offending has been shrinking as indicated by official measures of crime. Quantitative research verifies this change as well but has failed both to clarify who contributes most to the convergence—men or women—and to explain what factors drive the convergence. Moreover, most research, limited by the accessibility of the quantitative data, has been disproportionally based on the “mainstream” sample (i.e., data from Western countries, particularly the United States; Schwartz, 2013b). However, considerable endogeneity and complexity exist in the association between the patriarchal social order and other theoretically salient macrosocial characteristics because of their relatively stable social structure in the contemporary era (Savolainen et al., 2017). For example, one of the most frequent critiques on emancipation theory is that women’s liberation is an outcome of changes in other fundamental culture and social structure. Thus, the assumed relationship between emancipation and the increase in women’s offending may be spurious. Consequently, the stability in social structure makes it difficult to detect the real causal relationship between variables due to the endogeneity of the variations in those variables.

In contrast to highly developed countries, some nations are still in transitional stages of economic modernization. Therefore, they may experience tremendous changes in
their culture and social structure within a short time brought about by external social forces. Studies of possible variations caused by some unusual external force are valuable in uncovering the relationships between variables and contribute to our understanding of the underlying mechanisms of those relationships. China’s one-child policy is the source of one of those external forces, which has reshaped the culture and social structure of a nation within 35 years. This policy, then, provides us with scholarly leverage for exploring the change in the gender gap in offending and the causes of that change from the perspective of a natural experiment. Moreover, China has rarely been studied, even though one-fifth of the world’s population lives there. A study of crime in China, therefore, offers a unique opportunity to test current criminological theories regarding the gender gap in offending.

It is widely recognized that China’s one-child policy has dramatically imbalanced the gender composition of the Chinese population (Hesketh & Zhu, 2006; Hudson & Den Boer, 2002; Zhu, Lu, & Hesketh, 2009). The gender composition imbalance, moreover, has been affecting every aspect of the culture and social structure of Chinese society. As a result, it has profoundly influenced gender norms and gendered behaviors, including criminal activities (Barber, 2000b; Campbell et al., 2001; Edlund et al., 2013; Guttentag & Secord, 1983; South & Messner, 1987, 2000). Statistics indicated that the share of crime contributed by women has doubled within 20 years in China since the first one-child generation reached the age of criminal responsibility (see Figure 4.1). This change has contributed to the convergence of the gender gap in offending, which is consistent with the global trend. However, the policy adds an extra dimension to China’s case that enables us

---

15 The one-child policy was announced on Sep.25, 1980 and had been since strictly implemented until the end of 2015. It has been changed to a more relaxed version, namely the two-child policy since the beginning of 2016.
to probe the causes of the convergence by controlling the endogeneity in the variations of
social variables through an exogenous experiment.

4.2. Literature Review

4.2.1. Convergence

Although the narrowing of the gender gap in offending has been observed across countries
(Carrington, 2006; Estrada et al., 2016b; Heimer et al., 2012; Heimer et al., 2009; Lauritsen
et al., 2009; Savolainen et al., 2017; Schwartz et al., 2009; Steffensmeier et al., 2005, 2006),
the pattern of the trend is still controversial: Does it reflect a change in men’s behavior
over time or is it due to a change in women’s behavior? Influenced by the works of Adler
(1975) and Simon (1975), most research assumes male behavior as the “norm” in the
criminal world and female behavior as the “mimic,” thus hypothesizing that the
convergence is a result of increases in women’s involvement in crime. Moreover, this
female-to-male pattern has been supported by a significant body of empirical studies,
especially those based on data from the United States (e.g., Heimer et al., 2012; Schwartz
et al., 2009; Steffensmeier et al., 2005, 2006) and other highly developed nations (e.g.,
Carrington, 2006; Estrada et al., 2016b, 2017; Schwartz, 2013b). The opposite pattern,
however, has been supported by research in Sweden, where Estrada and colleagues found
the convergence due to decreases in men’s offending (Estrada et al., 2016a, 2017).

In addition to the longitudinal studies, most cross-national research also confirms a
narrowing gender gap in offending that is caused by increased offending by women
(Hunnicutt & Broidy, 2004; Schwartz, 2013a). Using a larger sample of countries, recent
research has indicated a mix of both patterns, i.e., increased women’s offending and
decreased men’s offending, contributing simultaneously to the narrowing of the gap
(Savolainen et al., 2017). However, in both single country and cross-national research, the data are drawn primarily from Western and economically advanced nations. Therefore, the generality of the converging pattern is limited by this consideration.

### 4.2.2. Causes of Convergence

Some criminologists have proposed that the convergence may not be due to actual changes in men’s and/or women’s criminality but is due to changes in crime control and punishment within the criminal justice system. In contrast to a behavior change hypothesis, then, these criminologists posit the net-widening hypothesis. Of course, it is possible that convergence of official crime rates reflects both changes in individual criminal behaviors and responses to those behaviors from the criminal justice system; that is, official crime rates reflect the interplay of these two effects.

The behavior change hypothesis assumes that the change in the gender gap reflects the real propensities to offending. Emancipation theory originally specified the behavioral and predisposing changes. Enhanced freedom and equality between genders (Adler, 1975) and augmented opportunities to commit crime brought about by women’s increasing engagement in extrafamilial activities (Simon, 1975) promoted criminal involvement by women. This hypothesis sees greater gender equality as “masculinizing” women’s behavior, which results in an increase in women’s motivations for offending (Levin & Fox, 2001). In addition, “conflict between what is supposed to be possible and what is actually available for women” (Schwartz, 2013b, p. 791) may cause strain and frustration, which may provoke criminal responses (Agnew, 1992; Rosenfeld, 1989; Schwartz, 2013b).

Economic marginalization theory refutes the liberation hypothesis; in contrast, it ascribes the increasing women’s offending to their worsening economic position in society
and the “feminization” of poverty (Steffensmeier, Emilie Allan, & Cathy Streifel, 1989). Gains in gender equality do not necessarily translate into economic independence or parity of women (Hartnagel & Mizanuddin, 1986; Hunnicutt & Broidy, 2004; Renzetti, 2013). While the women’s movement may have allowed some upper- or middle-class women to make inroads into formerly men’s professions, most women have become increasingly economically marginalized. They are more likely to be unemployed or, if employed, they are more likely to be in less secure, lower paid, less or unskilled part-time jobs in which career prospects are minimal (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014; Holtfreter, Reisig, & Morash, 2004). Consequently, the economic pressures lead women to be more involved in crime, especially non-violent, petty, property offending (Steffensmeier, 1978).

The net-widening hypothesis is also rooted in emancipation theory but as a derivation of the original theory, which centers on the reactions of citizens and criminal justice system professionals toward the alleged “liberated” women and new gender roles and norms. This hypothesis emphasizes changes in the treatment of women involved in crime. It postulates that the convergence of the gender gap in offending was brought about by harsher treatment and stricter punishment of women offenders, rather than by actual behavioral change on the part of women (Merlo & Pollock, 2015). Moreover, another gender-specific, net-widening effect relates to changes in consumption patterns and development of technology. More women are involved in crime due to the shifting market consumption patterns (e.g., more self-help markets and heavier credit card usage) that enable certain kinds of property crimes. Moreover, advanced technologies (e.g., surveillance cameras) have been applied prevalently in preventing consumer crimes that are mainly perpetrated by women (Scott J. South & Messner, 1987). The net-widening
hypothesis suggests that women’s documented crime rates may be increased in two ways: (a) societal attitudes toward women offenders change from being sympathetic to punitive, which leads to more willingness of citizens to report women suspects, a higher probability that police will arrest them, and more severe judgment from courts (Steffensmeier, 1980) and (b) the increasing bureaucratization and routinization of the criminal justice system decreases individual discretion and leads to non-discriminatory standards and outcomes (Chesney-Lind & Shelden, 2014; Feld, 2009; Hagan, 1977).

Compared to the behavior change hypothesis, the net-widening effect has received a greater amount of empirical support (e.g., Chesney-Lind & Paramore, 2001; Estrada, 2006; Estrada et al., 2016b; Schwartz, Steffensmeier, & Feldmeyer, 2009; Steffensmeier et al., 2005; Witterbrood & Junger, 2002). By employing diverse operationalizations of net-widening indicators and comparisons between official crime rates and self-reported crime or victim-survey data, the convergence of the gender gap in offending is argued to be largely an artifact of changes in social control by net-widening theorists. The criminalization of less serious forms of deviant behaviors brings more women into the criminal justice system because women’s offending is more likely than that of men to be petty and minor (Steffensmeier & Allan, 1996). Although the “War on Drugs” since the 1980s “has translated into a war on women” (Chesney-Lind, 1991, p. 57) and is more likely to bring women into justice system than before, women still play a marginal role in drug organizations and are likely to receive lesser sentences for a much smaller amount of drugs (Sokoloff, 2005) or just for possession of drugs rather than trafficking in them (Chesney-Lind, 1991). Compared to more stringent enforcement of serious offenses, one might expect more latitude or discretion by the criminal justice system professionals for the less
serious offenses, if such discretion is legally permissible (Schwartz, 2013b; Steffensmeier et al., 2005, 2006)

Existing empirical research into this topic is disproportionately quantitative and varies significantly in sample selection and variable operationalization, which lowers the reliability of the results (Schwartz, 2013b; Schwartz, Steffensmeier, & Feldmeyer, 2009). Moreover, the quantitative methodology may be inappropriate for testing the behavior change hypothesis because the behavioral change is latent and, therefore, not easily detected by quantified variables. In addition, there has been no single study that answers both questions about who is converging to whom and what is causing the convergence. Another shortcoming of the existing research is that the possible endogeneity of variations of diverse social variables may blur and impede the discovery of the causal relationship and underlying mechanism. Finally, both single-country and cross-national research has been based on data from a limited number of advanced Western countries; thus, the results are relatively circumscribed.

4.3. Current Study
To overcome some of the limitations of quantitative research for understanding the convergence of the gender gap in crime, this study adopts qualitative methods to explore changes in the gender gap in offending and to explore potential reasons for such changes from the perspective of criminal justice professionals. Moreover, an understudied country, China, is the site of data collection. Besides being one of the world’s most populous countries, China’s one-child policy provides a unique “window” for exploring various causes of the convergence in the gender gap in offending. Different from the Western experience, China saw no explicit women’s movement in the 1960s; nor was it influenced
by the Western movement because of its closed regime at that time. However, the one-child policy, although not directly on gender order, sharply changed the structure of the Chinese population. Therefore, such a different country sample provides a unique way to explore the mechanism by filtering the influence of the emancipation movement that has been argued about for decades.

To examine the potential effect of the one-child policy, the analyses here center around differentiation by gender and by generation (pre-1980s and post-1980s, i.e., pre-one-child and one-child generations). Comparisons are made between these two sets of groups to capture any inter-generational change in the gender gap in offending.

4.4. Method

4.4.1. Qualitative Approach

I use the interview method for this study. The research participants were professionals in the criminal justice system in China who were recruited through personal networks rather than a formal institutional channel to alleviate any pressure from the system they might feel and to encourage them to express their honest opinions. Most interviews were conducted in casual settings. Some interviews were conducted through WeChat (a popular message and social networking platform in China), in which the researcher did not meet the interviewee in person, but rather conducted the interview through audio and typed messages. To increase rapport and put the participants at ease, the interviews were conducted in the style of a casual chat (Warren & Karner, 2010).

4.4.2. Participants

Fifteen professionals currently working in the Chinese criminal justice system participated in the interviews. Participants were recruited using snowball sampling methods. The
researcher began with her personal network, contacting persons who were criminal justice professionals or who might have friends or relatives working in the system. After each interview, the interviewee was asked to introduce the researcher to colleagues or friends who worked in the system, and whom they thought would be interested in and appropriate for this research. Recruitment continued until 15 interviews were completed, which was the number approved by the university’s institutional review board.

The participants represented a wide range of professions in the Chinese criminal justice system, including one professor at a police college, several police officers, prosecutors, court clerks, judges, and one sheriff (see Table 4.1). Nine of the 15 interviewees were men. Eight of the 15 were born before 1980, the year the one-child policy was announced, while seven were born after 1980 and belonged to the one-child generation (OCG for short, correspondingly POCG as the acronym of pre-one-child generation). Five of them had less than five years of experience in the justice system, but four had more than 20 years of experience in the system. Among the 15, the shortest tenure was 2.5 years, and the longest was 36 years.

4.4.3. Data Collection

Interviews were conducted between June and August 2017 in China. Twelve interviewees were professionals in the criminal justice system in a capital city of an eastern coastal industrial province. Three interviewees were criminal justice professionals in another city in the same province. The economy of this province played a pilot role in the process of economic reform and opening up in China, which incubated a commerce-oriented environment and massive private and small enterprises. Correspondingly, the per-capita income of this region was relatively high in China, and therefore, attracted an immense
amount of migrating population from the rural areas of China. The duration of interviews depended on the conversation location and environment. The in-person interviews lasted approximately 1-1.5 hours; those conducted via WeChat were approximately 15-30 minutes long.

Prior to each interview, the researcher introduced herself and this study to the interviewee including the aim of the research (academic research on women’s crime in China) and the sample question of the interview (“What is the trend of women’s offending?”). Based on the potential participants’ initial understanding of the purpose and content of the interview, they decided whether to participate in the research. If individuals consented to participate, the researcher then asked them to decide when and where they would like the interview to take place. As a result, most interviews were conducted at locations that were private and convenient for the interviewees, such as a restaurant, teahouse, coffee shop, or the interviewee’s home. Some interviews were conducted via the WeChat Message system. The criminal justice professionals identified the evenings or weekends as the most convenient times for the interview. Most in-person interviews were conducted while the researcher was dining with the interviewees, which was defined as a casual environment for personal conversation in Chinese culture (Shen, 2015). Because the interviews occurred in a casual and informal setting, most participants who attended in person refused to allow the use of a recording device after being asked for permission to

---

16 The rural-to-urban migrants are an outcome of the persistence of China’s Hukou (a household registration) system, adopted since 1958, and the inequality in regional resource distributions (Lo, Cheng, Bohm, & Zhong, 2016). Attracted by the greater amount of occupational opportunity in cities, over 260 million (Chinese National Census, 2010) rural people migrated to urban areas for better lives (Jordan, Ren, & Falkingham, 2014). Restricted by the Hukou status, however, they are unable to enjoy same welfare benefits nor be recognized as urban citizens.
do so by the researcher; nor was it appropriate in this context for the interviewer to take
notes. In addition, many participants mentioned political sensitivity as a concern. Five
explicitly refused permission to use a voice recorder for the interview because of their
worries that the record would be used as evidence detrimental to their career. Only one
participant agreed to record the interview. However, the responses of that participant
seemed to reflect hesitation (perhaps holding back); for example, she gave “unsure” or “no
feeling” to questions regarding trend changes but went no further when the interviewer
asked for examples supporting her conclusion than to offer the passive response, “I have
never done statistics.” Except for the one recorded interview, all transcripts were generated
by the researcher right after the interviews when her memory was freshest. The transcripts
were word-processed and simultaneously translated into English after all interviews were
completed in 2017.

The researcher began the interview with questions regarding the interviewee’s
demographic information—age, occupation, and years of experience with the justice
system. The interviewee’s gender was determined by interviewer observation. After that,
the interviewer asked the questions following the guide. During each in-person interview,
the interviewer used pause and probe techniques with verbal and nonverbal responses to
the participant. During each WeChat interview, the interviewer adjusted and supplemented
questions according to the participant’s responses.

4.4.4. Interview Questions

A semi-structured interview guide was developed. Questions focused on both
interviewees’ perception of the trend in the gender gap in offending and on the treatment
of men and women offenders. About the gender gap in offending, two main questions were asked to stimulate discussion:

1. Do you think women’s share of crime has changed in the post-1980s’ generation compared to the pre-1980s’ generation?

2. Have any differences emerged in criminal offending patterns between generations?

The first question sought to gauge the interviewee’s perception of the change in the share of crime committed by women, whereas the second question was intended to determine if interviewees perceived a change in crime patterns across generations.

Two major questions also set the stage for the discussion of differences in the treatment of male and female offenders:

1. Is there any difference in the treatment of men and women suspects or offenders in the criminal justice system? For example, are women more likely than men to get a lenient sentence?

2. Do you treat men and women who are involved in crime differently in your work?

The first question was intended to gauge the participants’ perception of whether the criminal justice system treats male and female offenders differently, while the second was intended to measure the professionals’ sense of their own differential treatment of male and female offenders.

Guided by these four primary questions, additional questions were asked during the interview depending on the responses, identity, and status of the interviewees to probe for additional and more specific information.
4.4.5. Data Analysis

Data were imported into NVivo12 (QSR International Pty Ltd., 2018). Using an interpretive method, the researcher read, identified, and categorized units of meaning or text units. Themes emerged after reflection on these categories. Guided by the four primary questions, three themes emerged from the interviews: (a) the convergence of the gender gap in offending, (b) the net-widening effect on the convergence, and (c) the socialization effect on the convergence. The first two themes were explicitly revealed by the responses to the guide questions, whereas the third theme emerged during the interviews. New codes were added, and definitions of codes were revised as the analysis process continued. An iterative process was followed as the researcher returned to the data to make certain the interpretation as represented by categories and themes was consistent with the data.

4.5. Results

Three themes emerged from the data (see Figure 4.2). The first theme centers on the convergence between men’s and women’s crime in the one-child generations compared to their older counterparts. This theme has two sub-themes corresponding to the first two interview questions: (a) changes in terms of the crime rate, and (b) changes in crime patterns. The second theme relating to the treatment of male and female offenders by the criminal justice system has three sub-themes: (a) systematic treatment, (b) the professionals’ individual treatment, and (c) the inter-generational transformation in leniency. A final theme emerged around the roles of socialization, success aspiration, and gender inequality experienced by offenders and the effect of these factors on behavioral change. To protect the participants, all specific information (e.g., the name of the employer or the name of a relevant place) was coded and anonymized.
4.5.1. Theme 1: Convergence of the Gender Gap in Offending

Most professionals stated that the gender gap in offending has been narrowing across generations in China. The convergence is reflected in two ways: as an increase in the share of crime committed by women and as a similarity in men’s and women’s offending patterns.

4.5.1.1. Crime Rate

Twelve professionals (80.0%) stated they felt men’s crime was growing, but women’s crime was growing faster, which contributed to an increase in women’s share of criminal offending. Two interviewees (13.3%) differentiated the types of crime and stated there was no change in violent crime, but that there was a sharp increase in property and occupational crime perpetrated by women. Another participant (6.7%). whose interview was audio-recorded, said she “never made statistics and had no feeling about the change.” This participant was also the one who had the least experience (2.5 years) in the criminal justice system (see Table 4.2).

The conclusion that the share of crime committed by men and women was converging was based on the observation that there were more young women involved in crime now compared to those of the pre-1980s generations. One professional with rich experience in prison guard training gave some numerical examples.

The female crime rates have increased a lot. The rates are very high nowadays. Although the general crime rates have been increasing, the women’s part grows more rapidly. Look, there is another women’s prison newly built (in our region). Why? [That is] just because the number of women inmates was over the maximum capacity of the old one … [answering the supplemental question about the capacities of both facilities] The old one is at C [a district name]. It was designed to accommodate 2,000 inmates, but in fact, contained 4,000. However, it was still not enough, so another one has been built. [I am] not sure about its capacity; however, it must be above 4,000. (Respondent A)
The convergence is significant but may be sensitive to the type of offenses. Two male professionals noted that the convergence happened inconsistently across offenses. There was no obvious change for violent crimes, but they observed significant increases in property and occupational crimes.

It depends on types of crime. There is little change that happened in violent crimes. Compared to men, women only occupy a tiny share in all (violent) criminal cases. However, women’s share in crime has increased a lot in property crimes, especially the occupational crimes in which the women’s share has been on par with men’s and close to 50 percent. The occupational crimes were not common in women’s crime in the past, mainly because female heads were rare at that time. (Respondent B)

Respondent L noted, “I have no particular feeling of the ascent, maybe only a little….There is no change in violent crime, but the proportion of women offending has been increasing in property-, drug- and job-related crimes.”

Because the inherent difference in physical strength between genders is constant across generations, violent crime is still a male-dominated arena in a country with strict gun control. However, changes have appeared in other crimes that demand less physical power by the offender. Some professionals ascribed these changes to emancipatory gender roles: women now have more occupational options and extrafamilial activities than in the past, which affords them more opportunities to engage in some traditionally male-dominated offenses, such as corruption, embezzlement, drug trafficking, and other property crimes.

4.5.1.2. Crime Pattern

Consistent with the convergence of the gender gap in crime rates, most professionals noted that the patterns and forms of crime committed by men and women are also converging (see Table 4.3). Nevertheless, four professionals believed that major
differences in men’s and women’s crime patterns continue to exist and are significant across generations. Two OCG professionals noted that the similar trend in new types of crime was the drive for the convergence.

Eight professionals noted there was a convergence in the crime pattern between genders and that changes in women’s offending were the causes of the convergence. Women were converging toward men in terms of offending types and tactics. Many professionals mentioned the diverse types of crime committed by young women, but they observed that occupational and drug offenses were those in which women’s offending had become most similar to that of men. One professional (Respondent E) connected this phenomenon with women’s emancipation in recent generations, nevertheless he also indicated there was still a difference in terms of severity because of the gender difference in extrafamilial activities and physical characteristics:

Women’s crime has been increasing in some types, such as embezzlement and larceny. The primary cause, in my opinion, probably is the expanding range of women’s occupations….(answering the supplemental question about the severity compared to men’s crime) That is still a bit different. For example, the amount of money involved in larceny perpetrated by men is on average higher than that by women. Women are common to see in petty theft. Moreover, there are usually more techniques or strengths involved in men’s crime. Women, because of their lack of technical skills or physical strength, can only steal some easy things. Therefore, the sums involved in their cases are less. Women’s preys are always those things that are easy to steal, or they have opportunities to encounter in their work or daily life. (Respondent E)

This view is consistent with research findings based on quantitative studies in the United States (Archer, 2000; O’Brien, 1999; Steffensmeier, 1980; Steffensmeier, Steffensmeier, & Rosenthal, 1979). Regardless of the increase in women’s offending, the consequences and dangerousness caused by their criminal behavior are still not as serious
as those of men. Therefore, even if the convergence has happened in terms of crime rate and pattern, the severity is typically still significantly different between men and women.

Despite that the convergence in the gender gap in the crime rate and crime patterns was noted by most professionals, crime was still viewed as a traditionally masculine symbol in Chinese culture. Some professionals believed the increase in women’s offending was a result of the masculinization of gender roles. Respondent M and Respondent F opined, “I would say women converge toward men. Women’s offending is becoming increasingly masculine, including the offense types or the offending methods” and “The crime types and tactics are converging, indeed. You can find women criminals commit almost every crime type that was traditionally committed by men,” respectively.

Those professionals believed that crime was a way of showing masculinity; correspondingly, they equalized women who committed traditionally male-dominated crime to men, because the women were believed to be doing something “exclusively” reserved to men, thereby breaking the traditional ideology of femininity.

Not only in those traditional offenses but the convergence also emerges in new types of crime along with the technological development. Professionals indicated that Internet-based crime is an emerging domain contributing to the narrowing of the gender gap.

Per Respondent H, “In my opinion, there is some difference (between generations), but not (women) converging to men in offending. The whole criminal world is turning from the traditional ‘offline’ to the newly emerging ‘online’ field, such as gambling. Another trend is more women involved in drug-related crime. According to Respondent I,

The share of the new types of crime in women’s offending is increasing to some extent, especially the internet fraud and pyramid schemes. For those offenders, men
and women are converging in the means of crime commission and culpability. I believe that is because the division of labor is elaborate in those new types of offenses. Moreover, they are not the violent crime and are demanding more in intelligence capital input, therefore more similar for both men and women physically. (Respondent I)

Compared to the traditional offenses, these new types of crime fit women’s characteristics better, which the professionals perceived to be a reason for the narrowing of the gender gap in offending. Some professionals, however, believed there was no significant change in the gendered pattern of offending across generations. For women’s crime, the non-violent offenses were still the dominant types because of either the physical insufficiency or “high morality” of women. Per Respondent B,

I do not think (there is any change). Men commit much more violent crimes than women, and women’s share of violent crime is always meager. After all, violent crimes are demanding force and strength. The most common types of women’s crime are fraud, larceny, prostitution, and drug-related offenses. Even some women who are involved in some violent crimes, such as robbery, are mainly aiding and abetting. It is rare to see a mix of property and personal offense types in women’s offending. It is either property or personal crime, because of (women’s) moral value. It is rare to see a mixture of both, like killing or hurting someone for money or other extremely vicious cases (perpetrated by women). While (for women), the most common reason for the personal crime is emotional disputes. (Respondent B)

The marginal position held by women in serious and violent crimes was also observed in the quantitative research based on the Western nations’ data (Schwartz, 2013a), although the reason has rarely been revealed in previous research. The Chinese professionals attributed the difference to feminine characteristics, both physical and psychological, which restrict women’s participation in violent offending. Moreover, consistent with the findings from Western nations, women’s violent crime typically happens in intimate and private settings (Archer, 2000) and involves personal relationships. From this view, the rate and type of violent crime committed by women are different from
that of men; men commit more violent crimes that result in more injuries, and they commit these crimes against strangers as well as people they know (Campbell, 1993; Miller, 2001; Miller, 2005).

This view of the gender difference in seriousness also extends to non-violent crimes. Women are more likely to be involved in property-related crime, especially the petty offenses, which is responsible for the marginal increase in women’s offending. Respondent K proposed, “There is an increase in women’s share of offending. However, there is no particular change in the crime pattern or form. The property infringement still dominates women's crime.” Respondent J believed,

Differences between the men’s and women’s crime continue to exist, although the women’s offending is catching up in terms of crime rates. Women’s and men’s crime have distinctive characteristics, respectively. Women are increasing as the offenders in some types of crime, such as larceny, drug abuse, and traffic accidents. (Respondent J)

A professional summarized the observations of women’s crime patterns from the perspective of prisoners, in which violent offenses were the primary type of offending. Respondent A proposed,

Violent crimes are the primary (in prison). Because most property crimes are petty offenses, the imprisonment term is short. If the remaining term is shorter than one year after deducting the time spent in the detention house, the inmates will not be transferred to prison. After the Penal Correction (VIII) (2011), if (the remaining term is) shorter than three months, the inmates will not be transferred and stay in the detention house for the remaining sentence. Therefore, only the inmates who have long imprisonment term will be transferred to prison. Consequently, the violent crime is the primary offense type (in prison). Also, one-third of the women inmates are for drug-related crimes. In general, (they) take the drug at first, then commit drug trafficking. However, they all are at the bottom (of the drug trafficking chain). None of them have had connections with the higher levels. They even don’t know the persons who are at the higher levels. Only one alleged “big sister” among the inmates I contacted in recent decades is the exception. Her partner was the boss (of drug trafficking), who could be said: “a foxy rabbit with three burrows.” He had many crack dens all over the country. Eventually, her partner was sentenced to death, and she got a suspended death sentence. Later, her sentence abated to life.
imprisonment and then to fixed-term imprisonment. When I saw her, she has served for over ten years. Also, there are many criminals of fraud, especially in XX Province (where we are). However, fraudsters are not very common among the young generations because it (committing fraud) needs experience after all. The next most common crime is accommodating prostitution. (Respondent A)

Even within the field of violent and other serious offenses, which would result in long-term imprisonment for the offenders, the inferior position held by women was still remarkable and consistent, as this interviewee’s comments indicate. The only high-level drug criminal known by this professional was the partner of and dependent on a real male boss. Most women drug dealers were at the bottom of the trafficking chain with little, if any, connection to the important roles in the business. Because they played primarily as the “retailer” of the drug trade, they were highly vulnerable to being detected and arrested. Therefore, if there is a net-widening tendency of the criminal justice system, women’s arrests may increase without any corresponding change in offending behaviors simply because there is a great share of women in the pool of offenders who could be easily targeted and arrested (Blumstein & Wallman, 2000; Steffensmeier et al., 2005).

The minor-offense pattern of female offenders is consistent with the findings of other research (e.g., Shen, 2015; Steffensmeier, 1983). Even being charged for serious crimes, women are more likely to play a minor role in the process, such as compliances (Giordano et al., 2002; Leonard, 1982). The gender stratification in the criminal world mirrors that in the whole society in China. Even the women offenders, who were perceived as masculine by professionals, are still largely dominated by men and observe the patriarchal gender order consistent with the socially prescribed ideologies.
4.5.2. Theme 2: Net-widening Effect on Convergence

Most interviewed professionals noted that the system’s and their own individual treatment of men and women offenders is unbiased (see Table 4.4), except for some special situations regulated by law, such as pregnancy and lactation. However, many of them also mentioned that women offenders’ penitent attitude and their victimization experiences that would also be considered for leniency. Nevertheless, there is a trend of diminishing lenient conditions for the one-child generation of women offenders.

4.5.2.1. System Treatment

Most professionals mentioned the tenet that “all people are equal before the law.” One professional also described the structure of the Chinese criminal justice system designed to ensure the unbiased treatment of all offenders. The antagonistic roles played by the court and the prosecutor reduce the possibility of discretion in judgment and sentencing. He gave an example to illustrate the power balance in the Chinese system:

The relationship between the courts and the prosecutors is antagonistic to balance the power of each other, which is the foundation of Chinese judicatory system. Therefore, even if the court sympathizes with this woman, the prosecutor is responsible for supervising (whether the law is indiscriminately carried out and the sentence is reasonable). In contrast, if the prosecutor sympathizes with someone, then the court has the responsibility for supervising (the process and decision). (For example,) There was a case detected by me years ago: a woman poured concentrated sulfuric acid caused another person’s severe injury, but the trial court only sentenced her to four-year imprisonment considering her prior experience of victimization. This was a very light sentence for a case with serious injuries. The prosecutor, however, filed a protest against this sentence afterward, which eventually pressured the court to change the sentence to ten-year imprisonment…(Moreover,) the court would form a collegiate bench for each case before 2017, which was composed of seven members. The verdict would not be submitted or valid unless four of the seven agreed. Therefore, the outcome was unlikely to mix with personal emotions. However, judges are in charge of simple cases independently after 2017, so the personal feelings may affect the result after that. (Respondent B)

Regardless of such a mechanism to avoid biased treatment, however, the law
regulates some specific situations in which women can get lenient treatment for humanitarian considerations during sentencing and imprisonment, including pregnancy and lactation. In addition, some “soft” conditions would also influence the judgment and sentencing as well, including the attitude of contrition, the reason for the crime, and subjective culpability. The law also considers those conditions but gives more latitude of discretion for professionals rendering judgment. According to Respondent A,

A lot of women criminals are for retaliatory crimes. Therefore, the judges will consider their specific victimization and lighten penalty as appropriate. Besides, women, in general, have a better attitude to a guilty plea, which is also considered in the sentence and detention.

Per Respondent G,

[We] will consider whether to give her lenient sentencing for some extenuating circumstances... such as the former experience of victimization, the coercion experienced during the criminal commission, and the fact whether she surrendered on her own.

In contrast, male offenders are much less likely to be afforded extenuating conditions. Respondent G observed, “[M]en are usually the principal offenders in most serious cases, whereas women are often accomplices or coerced accomplices. Moreover, women’s social status determines that they experience more victimization than men.”

Therefore, there are several “hard” (pregnancy and lactation) and “soft” conditions according to Chinese Law that will possibly give female offenders some leniency relative to their male counterparts. Nevertheless, lenient treatment of female offenders by the individual professionals interviewed for this study appears less likely.

4.5.2.2. Individual Treatment

Most professionals (80.0%) stated that they were blind about gender or other demographic characteristics of offenders in their work. They would only be in line with
the law and do the job with impassive professionalism. Only three interviewees mentioned the slight difference in their treatment of men and women offenders. Their reasons were very similar to the extenuating circumstances regulated by law, but with some personal sympathy toward those women who were involved in crime involuntarily.

Thus, Respondent I proffered, “I treat women more genial with the consideration of their emotional sensitivity and the fact that many of them have had some experiences of victimization more or less before their crimes. Some of them were forced to become involved in crime.” Respondent J similarly responded, “I usually treat men harsher than women, because it is believed that male criminals are mostly subjectively intentional malice, while women (criminals) are often the victims of being coerced or incited.”

Beliefs in gender differences are persistent. Compared to men, women are perceived as emotional, passive, and relational, which have been alleged as the reasons that deter women from committing crime or serious crime (Miller & Mullins, 2006). Even if women catch up to men in terms of crime share, the perceived differences between men and women offenders are still prominent.

Regardless of these chivalrous statements about women offenders, most interviewed professionals declared they were only doing their job and treated everyone the same. As stated by the net-widening hypothesis, in addition to the willingness of police and the courts to arrest and punish women offenders, the bureaucratization and routinization of the Chinese criminal justice system may also play a role in decreasing personal discretion in processing.

4.5.2.3. Inter-generational transformation

It is worth noting that the extenuating circumstances mentioned by many
professionals and implying disproportionate consideration for women offenders have been declining among the post-1980s generations. The most remarkable change has been in the attitudes of young women involved in crime. Two professionals gave examples from their observations of prison inmates and suspects, respectively.

Nowadays many young girls who have been convicted have bad attitudes when they are serving their sentence, which can be said very resistant. Well, she is always penitent and refuses to change no matter how you communicate with or educate her; she even does not regret at all. However, the previous generation inmates, without being educated much, regretted very much once they entered in (the prison). (Respondent A)

The former women criminal suspects had a better attitude of confession (than those today). Generally speaking, they would confess their offending during interrogation actively, which is very different from the new-generation girl offenders. Nowadays, those young women suspects are very resistant and uneasy to surrender, even with a variety of strategies (used for the interrogation). I remember that when I started working, I met a girl who was involved in a robbery case. In fact, she was just an accomplice and did not participate in the looting. The principal criminals were her boyfriend and their friends. She was only standing beside and looking around. However, despite that, the accomplice was also a criminal. From the moment she was arrested, she was very regretful and scared. She was trembling and crying all the time until swollen her eyes. Eventually, she got a not heavy sentence taking consideration of her small role in the criminal process, good attitude of pleading guilty and meritorious contribution by reporting the facts of other offenders. In contrast, there are more shrewd girls today. They declare that “they have the right to keep silent” or “they will only say when their lawyers come” as soon as they enter (the interrogation room), which they learned from some Hong Kong and foreign films or TV series. Some young girls even threaten us by asserting their connections with some powerful people who will protect them. (Respondent N)

The change in the attitude among the younger generation reduces the possibility that leniency regulated by law will be applied to their cases. Moreover, it may also lower the level of sympathy that criminal justice professionals feel toward them. Their uncompromising and antagonistic manner may play a role in reducing the chivalrous treatment of women offenders among the one-child generations.

Another change is the decrease in the victimization or coercion experienced by
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younger-generation female offenders. However, the motives for their offending are seen by the professionals as more like those of men and less pardonable than was seen in the past for female offending, on average. Respondent I offered, “[The victimization was] more common among the pre-80s generations. The post-80s are still very young after all so many offenses are out of impulsivity, and [therefore the motivations are] relatively similar between men and women.”

One professional summarized both changes in attitude and motivation based on his observations of women’s offending at different times, implying that those changes would influence punishment and possible leniency of the treatment by the criminal justice system.

Women offending [in the past] was not as usual as it today. On the one hand, many [women] offenders were the victims of previous violent crimes. The victimization experience would be taken into consideration while sentencing and result in a lenient treatment if possible. On the other hand, [I] have to say that the women offenders or suspects in the previous time had better attitudes than the new generation. They would confess or surrender their criminal facts actively and truthfully, which would also be considered for the leniency. (Respondent L)

The lenient treatment of female offenders is a responsive outcome of traditional Chinese gender roles, which regard women as being vulnerable and obedient. This stereotype is also applicable to women offenders. Perceived by the interviewed professionals, female suspects “should” be nonresistant and female criminals “should” be repentant as the “right” way to behave and, subsequently, to earn the sympathy and leniency that may be awarded. If they fail the socially prescribed roles, such as being “bad in attitude” or unrepentant, they are punishable pursuant to the male model. Moreover, women offenders who break the stereotype are subject to a backlash and tend to be punished more harshly because of their being “doubly deviant” (Lloyd, 1995). They are blamed for jeopardizing the social safety and, simultaneously, for challenging the
traditional moral code of femininity (Shen, 2015). Consequently, the increasingly punitive response to female offenders among the new generation is in line with “equality with a vengeance” (Chesney-Lind & Pollock, 2006). Compared to the pre-1980s generation, therefore, we can expect an increase in the harsh treatment of female offenders among the one-child generations, who are more likely to break with traditional “womanhood” (Chesney-Lind, 1991). The responses from the criminal justice system thus contribute, at least in part, to the narrowing of the gender gap in offending.

4.5.3. Theme 3: Socialization and Criminality

Some professionals expressed opinions on why the gender gap in offending was narrowing among the one-child generations. The reasons can be divided into four categories: (a) the socialization of the younger generation of women; (b) the strain caused by the gap between economic aspiration and the means to fulfill the aspiration that was specifically experienced by Chinese young women; (c) a permissive change that has occurred in gender norms; and (d) the loosening social control structure in modern times.

A professional connected the unique process of socialization with the strain experienced by young Chinese women together as a reason why there had been such a sharp increase in women’s offending in contemporary China. Her observation is based on her experience with women prison inmates.

[It is] very common [to see the single child in women criminals]. Most of them were taken care of by their grandparents and lived in their hometowns when their parents migrated to urban areas for work….Their grandparents were unable to restrain their behaviors when they grew up. Moreover, most of them made a poor performance at school, so they had to continue their education in some vocational schools in urban or suburban areas. These were not regular high schools, so their education background was not good, which hindered their career development, especially many of them dreamed of high-status and highly paid jobs. Moreover, those vocational schools had an atmosphere in which students did not study but
cliquing, brawling and fighting every day. Influenced by such an environment, those girls could commit any crime you can imagine. (Respondent A)

The city-centered economic development style in China spawns a huge flow of migrants to provide cheap labor in urban areas; however, constrained by the hukou (household registration system), their statuses are impossible to change to align with their migration. As a result, those rural-urban migrants cannot be registered into the welfare system in their residential areas where they make striking contributions. Among the variety of social benefits affiliated with the welfare system, children’s education is one of them, which limits the possibility of taking their children with them to the place where they work. For the higher incomes in those industrial cities, they have to leave their children at home in villages with their grandparents or other relatives; hence, these children are called the “left-behind” children (Chang, Dong, & MacPhail, 2011; Wen & Lin, 2012; Ye, Murray, & Wang, 2010). The left-behind experience influences girls more profoundly. On the one hand, girls are traditionally more controlled and supervised than boys, which is believed to be the reason for their higher rates of conformity (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992). Therefore, the loosened family control should have a greater effect on their behavior than on their male counterparts (Lagrange & Silverman, 1999; Savolainen et al., 2017; Schwartz, 2013a). In other words, the inter-generational change that happened in men’s socialization was not as significant as that in women’s socialization. On the other hand, the patriarchal nature of Chinese society structurally limits women’s legitimate opportunities to pursue success on par with men.

The low fertility rates as a direct result of the one-child policy, together with propaganda promoting gender equality that accompanied the implementation of the policy, changed traditional socialization practices, especially for girls. Parents placed their hopes
on their only child regardless of the child’s gender and, accordingly, treated boys and girls more similarly than ever before. Compounded with the influence of economic marketization in China, monetary abundance is emphasized and uni-defined as the symbol of success by the society (Dutton, 2005; Shen, 2015). Girls were also infused with the dream of being as successful and as independent as boys. This change in the gender socialization practices has not only influenced the single children, but also their peers who had siblings. Therefore, the gender roles and norms of the whole one-child generations have been changed. Such a unique socialization process, which is remarkably different from traditional practices, has created new generations of Chinese women who are more likely to be ambitious, competitive, and goal-oriented than were their older counterparts (Edlund et al., 2013). However, they are also more likely to experience strain than their male counterparts upon realizing the inequality of means to fulfill their goals when they are out in the society (Merton, 1938). A nationwide survey shows that sex discrimination is common in Chinese job markets with 86.6 percent of female college-graduate respondents having experienced it and 95 percent of all female respondents acknowledging the pressure of “double shift” (Xinhua News, 2016; H. Zhang, 2014b). Female migrants, moreover, are even more vulnerable to the involvement of crime because of extra exploitation of their labor (Harvey, 2005) and marginalization of their social position in an economy-driven society (Bakken, 2005), which results in greater strain.

The change, either in the way of social control or in the way of strain, would positively contribute to criminal offending among the one-child generations, especially for women (Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Hirschi, 1969; Steven F. Messner & Rosenfeld, 1994; Sampson & Laub, 1995). Therefore, we can expect women’s criminal offending to catch
up to men’s and, therefore, create the convergence in the gender gap of offending. Consistent with this mechanism, one professional illuminated another situation for young women offenders by focusing on the strain resulting from their goals or dreams of material success and their realistic chances of fulfilling the goal on their own.

Along with the “Beat the Tigers” [anti-corruption] campaign going, many women have also been charged with corruption and bribery as men do. Some of them were government officials themselves, but some were wives or mistresses of male governors and accomplices of those occupational crimes. Generally speaking, [for the second situation,] most of them were mistresses. They were not government employees but used their sexuality to hook the ones who were holding power and sold the “guanxi” [personal connection] to persons who needed it. [They], in this situation, are convicted of the accessories. Most of them were young women pursuing material enjoyment and vanity satisfaction. However, they might have a bleak prospect on the job market and didn’t want to toil. (Respondent B)

The strain between the life goal of economic success and the ways to realize the goal is demonstrated in Respondent B’s statement and is believed to drive some women to take advantage of their sexuality as a shortcut in fulfilling the goal. The shortcut is not illegal per se; however, it is criminalized with an emphasis on the sexualization of women in general. Therefore, the professional was of the opinion that women have a greater tendency to derive status from male partners without expending too much effort (see also Hall, 2013), which echoes the traditional sexist perception toward women by many of the Chinese professionals interviewed. Combined with the expected “womanhood” from female offenders by the professionals, the culturally ingrained sexism is vivid. Although these perceptions came from legal professionals, they reflect the unequal societal-level expectations on gender roles in China and specific constraints imposed on Chinese women.

However, challenges against the traditional gender roles have emerged in the new generations under the influence of economic and social changes. A professional analyzed the increase in women’s crime from an emancipatory perspective:
From a social perspective, women have more and more job options and opportunities. They are as active as men in every field, including the criminal world. From the perspective of gender perception, we no longer think that women are weak, but that women are equal to men, including women themselves. [Asking the female interviewer], do you think that your ability is the same as that of men? [Do you think that] you can do the same as men? …[After getting the positive response from the interviewer, he continued], Right! Another aspect [of the new perception] is there are more tolerance and freedom rendered to women by the present society. There are no longer the shackles of the former “three obedience and four virtues.”17 Women’s thoughts and behaviors are more open and permissive than before. (Respondent J)

This statement connects the behaviors of women with the perception of gender. Consistent with both hypotheses of emancipation theory, the behavioral change and net-widening effect are simultaneously influencing the gender gap in offending. More specifically, the emancipation in women’s activities has resulted in a perception of gender equality. Another professional confirmed such a change in the gender norms and perceptions from a more extreme example, prostitution.

[T]he perception of prostitution has also changed. The girls who were arrested for prostitution in the past all felt embarrassed and asked us to keep them confidential. The girls nowadays seem to be quite indifferent. They plan to make some money by prostitution in the urban areas for several years and then return to their hometowns where there will be no one knowing their story and what they have done. With this idea, there are few moral constraints. The effect of the sole legal sanctions is not enough [to restrict prostitution]. (Respondent N)

One side effect caused by the one-child policy is the prevalence of offspring sex selection against girls,18 because of the conflict between the policy and the son-preference

---

17 It is the Confucian ideology of women that has profoundly influenced Chinese gender norms and roles for thousands of years. “Three obedience” means the obedience of a woman to her father before marriage, to her husband after marriage, and to her son when she is widowed. “Four virtues” means high morality, propriety in speech, charming appearance, and competence in housework. A Chinese woman would be traditionally perceived good only if she could meet this quantified standard.

18 Hesketh and Zhu (2006) estimated that there were up to 34 to 41 million “missing females” in China by the end of 2000. This number is even higher according to Amartya
culture, and eventually a dramatic sex composition imbalance of the young generations. As estimated, there were about 32 million “surplus” men among the one-child generations by 2005 (Zhu et al., 2009) and a deficit of 1 million marriageable women in the first-marriage market per year after 2010 (Tuljapurkar et al., 1995). Men occupied 97 percent of the all unmarried population aged 28 to 49 in China (Hudson & Den Boer, 2002). Derived from the sex ratio imbalance in the marriageable cohort, the demand for prostitution soars. At the same time, the more sexually permissive gender norms and higher population mobility than ever before promoted the supply-end to cater to the huge demand. As a result, prostitution has become the fastest growing type of female crime (Chan, 2006).

As this statement illustrates, in addition to more permissive attitudes toward prostitution, the rural-to-urban migrating status was another reason for an increase in the offense. The loosened social network accompanying the migrant flows anonymized this group of people. Therefore, the high population mobility has brought about another side effect—lessened social control (Wang & Shi, 2018). This structural change reduces the moral scruples of the migrants and also increases the difficulty of preventing recidivism.

Female suspects were not as common as nowadays when I just worked as a policeman 36 years ago. There are many migrants [in our city] currently. Many suspects are migrants, and it is difficult to manage them. Female recidivists and habitual criminals are also more common than before, especially for the prostitution. [It is frequent to see] some women caught in another place just days after their release. The primary reason is the loosened social management system. In the past, the migration flow was not so significant [as today], and most criminals were locals. Therefore, just a call to their employers or communities, they would be tightly supervised and less likely to recidivate. Particularly for women, in addition to the physical supervision, they were also subjected to the pressure from public opinion. Now those constraints are gone. (Respondent O)

Sen’s (1990) estimate that there were 50 million “missing women” in China alone by the end of the 1980s.
Because of the difficulty of constraining recidivism rooted in the structural and cultural changes, the criminal justice system would respond with harsher punishment for the new-generation offenders, especially women, who are the primary group affected by the inter-generational changes. Therefore, socialization not only has played an important role in the convergence of the gender gap in offending, but it also influenced perceptions and treatment of women offenders by criminal justice professionals.

4.6. Discussion

This study empirically confirms (a) the converging trend of the gender gap in offending in China, (b) the convergence as an outcome of the rising women’s offending, and supports (c) both net-widening and behavioral change effects on the convergence, and (d) the connection between the two causal effects (see Figure 4.3).

The inter-generational change, either in crime share or in crime pattern, confirms a trend of close resemblance between genders. Believed by most professionals, this convergence reflects women’s greater participation in offending, especially in non-violent crime. Women’s shares of property, drug, and job-related offenses outpace those of men and, therefore, have contributed to a narrowing of the gender gap. Nevertheless, gender roles in the criminal world are still distinct. Compared to men, women offenders play an inferior and marginal role in criminal enterprises, which places them in a vulnerable position for being caught. Also, women’s offending is more likely to be petty and minor in consequences compared with that of men, which leaves a large latitude of discretion in criminal justice processing.

Because of the gendered characteristics of criminal offending, the justice system and professionals also play a part in narrowing the gender gap in offending. The law has
created some “hard” extenuating circumstances exclusively applicable to women, such as pregnancy and lactation, and some “soft conditions” disproportionately enjoyed by women, such as good attitude and victimization experience. Both categories are eligible for lenient consideration in Chinese legal settings. Therefore, women offenders are systematically chivalrously treated in China. However, this gender-specific leniency has been fading away, along with the vanishing of the “soft conditions,” especially for the one-child-generation women offenders. Moral panics associated with the emergence of diverse forms of female offending lead to an inordinate degree of adverse attention focused upon the one-child-generation women by criminal justice professionals. Defiance against the traditional ideology of women places the young female offenders in the form of “social double jeopardy” and causes them to suffer repugnant treatment by professionals. As a result, professionals’ belief in the growing resemblance of women’s and men’s criminal motives and the perceived attitude of resistance by women offenders both contribute to a convergence in the treatment of men and women offenders by both the system and individual professionals.

Another contributor to the convergence of the gendered offending gap is the real change in the criminal behavior of younger generation women. As one unintended outcome produced by the one-child policy, there have been more women brought into the criminal justice system under the influence of the unique socialization practices of the special generation. The one-child policy has provoked a gender-neutral approach to socialization in the family but has failed to promote gender equality simultaneously in other social institutions, such as the work world. The inconsistency in the equalization pace has created strain between aspirations and the means to fulfill those aspirations, specifically for women.
Moreover, the rural-to-urban migration generated by the interplay of regional inequalities and marketization in China has loosened social control imposed on the migrants and their children as well. Consequently, gender roles and norms have become more permissive. These shifts in socialization are gender-neutral but have gender-specific effects on behavioral change, especially on the criminal behavior of women.

Finally, changes in the socialization process have not only influenced behavior but have also broken down gender stereotypes that might portray women as pitiful, dependent, and in need of care. To some extent, therefore, these changes also influence the perceptions and treatment of female offenders by the criminal justice system. Women offenders, who are against the traditional gender norms, are more likely to be punished more harshly than their submissive counterparts because they have threatened not only social safety but also the cultural ideology of gender. From this perspective, the change in socialization brought about by the one-child policy, directly and indirectly, narrows the gender gap in offending.

### 4.7. Conclusion

This study was limited by the small sample size as well as by the use of a convenience sampling method. If we could have more diverse participants, such as justice professionals from rural areas, the discovery would be more profound. For example, in addition to the inflowing migrants’ influence on women’s crime in cities, the effect of the outflowing migrants from the countryside could also be explored, which would increase the comprehension of causes of the gap convergence from a comparative perspective. Moreover, the interview method also limited the study, especially for a topic that was politically sensitive and related to professional integrity. Other qualitative methods, such as ethnographic methods that involve direct observations, might have yielded deeper
findings.

Despite these limitations, this study makes an important contribution to knowledge about the gender convergence in crime in a rarely researched, but socially and economically important country. Moreover, the results also promote the understanding of the causal effects of the convergence, which have been widely debated for some time. A narrowing gender gap is confirmed both by the crime rate and by the crime pattern. Nevertheless, the gender order is still significant, both in the criminal world and the society. Gender equality has been enhanced to some extent in China by the one-child policy, but China is still far from achieving gender parity. The increase in women’s offending could be seen less as a manifestation of gender emancipation and more as a responsive vengeance from the stubborn hierarchical structure against the progressive cultural shift in gender ideology.
### 4.8. Tables and Figures

#### Table 4.1. Interviewee Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Gender &amp; Generation</th>
<th>POCG Men</th>
<th>POCG Women</th>
<th>OCG Men</th>
<th>OCG Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4.2. Statements about the convergence of the gender gap in the crime rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Gender &amp; Generation</th>
<th>POCG Men</th>
<th>POCG Women</th>
<th>OCG Men</th>
<th>OCG Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing women’s share of crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12 (80.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on crime type</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4.3. Statements about the convergence of gender gap in crime pattern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Gender &amp; Generation</th>
<th>POCG Men</th>
<th>POCG Women</th>
<th>OCG Men</th>
<th>OCG Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women converging to men</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar on the new crime</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (26.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 4.4. Statements about the treatment of men and women offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Unbiased</th>
<th>Lenient toward Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>8 (53.3%)</td>
<td>7 (46.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>12 (80.0%)</td>
<td>3 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2. The structural map of themes and subthemes.
Figure 4.3. The Causes of the gendered offending convergence and their relationships.
Chapter 5. Conclusion

Profoundly influenced by Confucian values, Chinese people endorse the relational hierarchy (Y. B. Zhang, Lin, Nonaka, & Beom, 2005). Gender is the very realm manifesting the strict hierarchical relation between men and women, which has ingrained the patriarchal gender orders in every Chinese social institution and also shaped traditional gender ideologies in China. The Confucian perspective emphasizes the differences between genders and justifies them by its metaphysical and normative account (Wang, 2011). Although Confucianism had been criticized during the Cultural Revolution and diluted in the modern era, its influences are still alive in every cell of Chinese culture and social structure.

This dissertation explored the etiological mechanisms of the increasing proportion of female crime in China and eventually anchors on structural gender inequality as its essential cause. The results show that the women’s crime is converging to men’s in China, which has narrowed the gender gap in crime in China after the first one-child generation reached the age of legal responsibility. The one-child policy has changed the socialization practices on the new generations with gender-equalizing propaganda and low fertility rate. As a result, the gender role repertoire has changed both at the individual and societal levels.

From the individual gender role perspective, discrimination has diminished in the family because of the low fertility rate imposed by the policy. Consequently, the individual gender expectation, especially that of one-child generation women, has become more egalitarian. Young Chinese women are more likely to aspire for economic success on par with men than their older counterparts. In contrast, the one-child policy keeps the gender inequality and gender order intact in other social institutions. Chinese society is still a
patriarchal society where the prescribed social ideology constrains women; moreover, driven by the imbalanced sex ratios of the population, the degree of patriarchy has been strengthened with women are more valued as marital partners and after that as mothers and homemakers but less as employees or productive workers. Accompanied by this change, gender inequality and women’s discrimination are exacerbated in the work world. This imbalance in the progressiveness of gender equality creates strain for the younger generation of women from the mismatch between their life goals and the means to fulfill such goals in reality.

Another factor influencing crime in the new generations is social control experienced by both genders driven by the economic reform in China. The massive rural-to-urban migration generated by the interplay of regional inequality and marketization in China has loosened social control imposed on the migrants and their children as well. Compared to men, this change has a more prominent influence on women, who used to be closely monitored by and bonded with parents reducing their exposure to definitions favorable to deviance. Loosened social networks anonymize migrants and result in decreasing moral constraints. The loosened control combined with the extra strain produced by the labor exploitation and social marinization of migrants leads to a sharp increase in crime among migrants, particularly female migrants. Moreover, increased exposure to male peers, because of the extremely imbalanced sex ratios among the one-child generations, drives women to absorb the pro-deviance definitions and therefore increases their propensity for crime than before. In contrast, the sex ratio imbalance limits younger men’s chance to group with women, which also increases the one-child-generation men’s deviance. This change brought about by the one-child policy has influenced not only
the only children but also their peers who have siblings; therefore, the policy reshaped the individual gender role repertoire in the whole one-child generations. As a result, both genders’ crime is growing, but women’s is growing faster, which narrows the gender gap in crime.

From the perspective of societal gender role ideologies, the gender difference in crime commission is consistent across generations, which are hard to be changed by the policy. Gender hierarchy is stubborn in most social institutions regardless of the changing socialization practice in the family. The permissive transformation in gender norms, moreover, brings about “vengeful” criminalization of female sexuality by criminal justice professionals who largely represent the societal perception of gender standard. This gender order keeps the stereotype of genders, in which women are expected to be passive, submissive, and vulnerable. If they fail such an expectation, social punishment will be imposed, or chivalrous treatment will be revoked. When the ideology failure happens in female offenders, harsher treatment is conceivable due to their “double deviance” from the law and the prescribed social ideologies of women. Because of the ingrained gender order, gender differences do not diminish but are still vivid in every field in China. Even in the perceived “masculine” criminal world, women still play a marginal (e.g., petty non-violent offenses) and inferior (e.g., accomplices in serious offenses) role dominated by men, and have a gendered pathway to deviance, which mirrors the gender stratification in the whole society in China. Therefore, the progressive imbalance in gender equality reflects that the gender roles are multidimensional.

Therefore, the increase in the female share of crime and thereby the convergence in the gender gap is an outcome reflecting the behavioral change and the responses of the
criminal justice system to that change. The obstinate gender inequality disappoints the “emancipated” individual gender prospects and as a result, leads to the increase in female crime.

5.1. Implications for Strain Theory

The findings of this dissertation strongly support Merton’s strain theory (1938) and imply the applications of his typology of deviance in explaining the influence of sex composition on female crime. The case study is based on a sample with artificially imbalanced sex ratios driven by policy. The exogenous force has emancipated the gender ideologies of individuals and infused the equalized life goals into the one-child-generation women. However, the force keeps the gender hierarchy untouched in most social agents, which determines that the institutional means of fulfilling those goals are unequal or even inaccessible for women when compared with men. This goal-means mismatch fits one type of deviance categorized by Merton including the acceptance of the cultural goals but the rejection of the legitimate means of attaining those goals. As a result, illegal channels turns out to be attractive as an innovative way to fulfill the goal. Therefore, the one-child policy, which has changed the socialization practices and, thereby, the cultural goals of women, has initiated the mismatch and eventually triggered the increase in female offending.

As a comparison, countries with naturally imbalanced high sex ratios are typically low in female crime rates (Scott J. South & Messner, 1987), because women, in those countries, are repressed by the traditional gender ideologies (Guttentag & Secord, 1983). Specifically, women are valued more as marriageable partners and, thereafter, as homemakers and mothers but less as workers and employees in the high-sex-ratio societies. Without any external force, the process of socialization will reproduce culture and social
structure through the generations. Therefore, natural sex ratio imbalance will not have the same force as does its artificial counterpart. It will not create the mismatch between the goals and the means. As a result, women in those countries are more likely to have the cultural goals of being home-stay mothers and around family, which are compatible with the means provided by the social institutions. This type of deviance (or non-deviance) fits the conformity category that involves the acceptance of both the cultural goals and means of attaining those goals.

As a derivation, a way to curb the increasing female crime in the society with artificially imbalanced sex ratios, according to Merton’s typology, should be equalizing the institutional means for women to fulfill their already-emancipated life goals. Once the goal-means mismatch disappears, the strain, and thereby, the crime rates will reduce correspondingly. Thus, the real gender parity in both cultural ideologies and social structures can adjust the deviant innovation back to conformity.

5.2. Implications for Feminist Criminology

This dissertation has important implications for explaining the increase in female crime at a global level. The trend of convergence of the gender gap in crime has been widely acknowledged and observed worldwide (e.g., Estrada, Backman, & Nilsson, 2016; Heimer, Lauritsen, & Lynch, 2009; Savolainen et al., 2017). However, the cause of the trend has been controversial for decades due to the theoretical debate around whether it is because of the enhanced gender equality or worsened economic position of women, which are seen as opposite and rivalry.

Using a policy experiment, this dissertation illustrates that the two theories are not contradictory; in contrast, they explain the causal effects of the transformation in gender
role repertoire on the increasing female crime at different levels. Emancipation theory connects the liberated gender roles with the increase in women’s crime, which has been widely criticized from the mismatch between the explained subjects— the women who have been liberated are not the ones who are brought into the justice system (Giordano & Cernkovich, 1979; Renzetti, 2013). The latter, in contrast, are always found in the underclass, who are far from being liberated but trapped deep with financial burdens by the economic marginalization (Holtfreter, Reisig, & Morash, 2004; Reckdenwald & Parker, 2008; Steffensmeier & Allan, 1995).

However, the liberated women and the underclass women do not live in a vacuum. In fact, they share the same world and dramatically influence each other. When the middle- and upper-class women enjoy liberation and go out of home to compete with men in school and workplace, the other groups of women are also influenced. They may not be directly liberalized, but indirectly influenced by the changed societal gender roles. For example, the liberated life of the middle-class women is advertised as the standard and normal style in the modern time by mass media. Influenced by such ideologies, other groups of women are also desiring for such a liberated life, even if they have not been emancipated in real. Bearing with such a dream but having to face the crude reality where the means to fulfill their dream is bleak, they, as a result, are subjected to the strain produced by the structural inequality not only inter-genders but also intra-gender. Mismatched by the social structure from their ideologies of gender roles, those groups of women are more likely to become involved in delinquency to fulfill their dream alternatively or to avoid the frustrating feelings. Therefore, emancipation and economic marginalization theories tell us the same story within a dynamic system of gender roles. Some groups of women have achieved
numeric gains in society as the result of emancipation and therefore influenced the societal attitudes toward gender, which in turn incubates the equalized individual ideologies in a broad scope but does not change the unequal structure fundamentally. This equalization lag happened in the gender role repertoire leads to the strain and therefore an increase in delinquency for the ones experiencing the mismatch most. Therefore, there is still a long way to go to reach the real equality of gender for the whole society, and when that day comes, we can expect a drop in crime for both genders.

5.3. Limitations and Future Research

This dissertation is a starting point for research on China’s one-child policy and gendered crime and therefore has a number of limitations. This section reviews some limitations and points to future research for an enhancement. First, inaccessibility to disaggregate crime rates over crime types and lack of victimization data have impeded the macro-level quantitative research to reveal which categories of crime contribute most in the increasing women’s crime. An enhancement in data quality in future studies, therefore, is expected to illustrate further the underlying factor beneath the relationship between the sex ratio and gendered patterns of offending that has been ignored in most research based on Western samples.

Convenience sample for survey data might bias the findings because the respondents were the ones who could and would participate in such an Internet survey. This sampling method filtered out many kinds of respondents, such as rural residents who were restrained in internet access, and undereducated or aged people who were unfamiliar with the online content. Under such an influence, therefore, the results might only show a
partial image of Chinese people’s perceptions on gender, success, and deviance, especially when we take the enormous rural-urban disparity in China into consideration.

Moreover, political sensitivity largely restricts both research methods and sample size. Other qualitative methods, such as ethnographic methods that involve direct observations might have yielded more in-depth findings. Snowball sampling method, although convenient, might also bias the scope of the sample and therefore, the research findings. The sampled participants, because of this method, were highly homogeneous in terms of their work and resident contexts. All of them were from urban areas with massive inflows of migrants from rural areas. If I could have more diverse participants, such as justice professionals from rural areas, the discovery would be more profound. For example, in addition to the inflow migrants’ influence on women’s crime in cities, the effect of the outflow migrants in the countryside could also be explored, which would increase the comprehension of causes to the gap convergence from a comparative perspective. Also, the results would be more revealing if I could include criminal convicts in the research and compare their socialization, gender role definition and reasons for offending with the non-criminal sample.
Appendix: Survey Instrument

A Survey on Gender Ideologies and Deviance

You are being invited to take part in a research study on the effects of the one-child policy on the gender ideologies, gender structure, and gendered deviance. If you take part in this study, you will be one of about 2,000 respondents to do so. There are 52 Questions relate to your experience of gender differences in family, school, workplace, and from the interaction with peers, and one question asks for your self-rated score of deviance. Neither your privacy nor personal identity will be collected. This is a 100% anonymous survey, even to the researcher. If you decide to take the survey, you still have the right to end it at any time during the process. Your response, therefore, will be not collected nor stored before clicking the submission button. You will get CNY ¥ 1 of cash reward after submitting a high-quality response truly reflecting your opinions.

The person in charge of this study is Ting Wang, a Ph.D. candidate of the Department of Sociology, University of Kentucky. Before you decide whether to accept this invitation to take part in the study, please ask any questions that might come to mind. Later, if you have questions about the study, you can contact the investigator, Ting Wang, at 13738002786 or her advisor Dr. Janet Stamatel at +1-859-388-4027. If you have any questions about your rights as a research volunteer, contact the staff in the Office of Research Integrity at the University of Kentucky at +1-859-257-9428 or toll-free at +1-866-400-9428 with the Protocol No. 17-0288-X4B.

If you agree to take the survey, please click the link below.

Survey Questions

General Question
1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
2. What is your age?
   a. 18-26
   b. 27-36
   c. 37-46
   d. 47-56
   e. 57-66
   f. 67-76
   g. 77-86
   h. 87-96
   i. 97+
3. Where did you spend most time when you were before the age of 18.
   a. Rural areas
   b. Suburban areas
   c. Urban areas
4. How many siblings do you have?
   a. 0
b. 1
c. 2
d. 3
e. 4
f. 5
g. 6
h. 7
i. 8
j. 9+

5. Do you need to take care of your younger siblings if you have any?
   a. Yes, I do
   b. Yes, but not much
   c. No, I don't
   d. I have no sibling

6. Do you think childcare of your siblings diminishes your benefit and chances for success?
   a. Yes, I do think so
   b. Yes, but only a little
   c. No, but sometimes it is annoying
   d. No, I don't think so
   e. I have no sibling

7. How would you define masculinity? (multiple choices and male respondents only)
   a. Independent
   b. enterprising
   c. Aggressive
   d. Physically strong
   e. Emotionally repressed
   f. Controlling
   g. Pleasure seeking
   h. Economically successful
   i. Muscular
   j. Sporty
   k. Tough
   l. Adventurous
   m. Sagacious
   n. Powerful
   o. Assertive
   p. Knowledgeable

8. How would you define femininity? (multiple choices and male respondents only)
   a. Elegant
   b. Affectionate
   c. Delicate
   d. Sociable
   e. Submissive
   f. Family-centered
   g. Dependent
h. Chaste
i. Kind-hearted
j. Quiet
k. Cautious
l. Sensitive
m. Considerate
n. Cultured
o. Neat
p. Pure

9. (Question only for male respondents) What score of masculinity do you grade yourself? (1 - not masculine at all; 10 - very masculine)

10. (Question only for female respondents) What score of femininity do you grade yourself? (1 - not feminine at all; 10 - very feminine)

11. Where did you mainly learn about masculinity/femininity?
   a. Parents
   b. Siblings
   c. Relatives
   d. Peers
   e. Teachers
   f. Others ________

12. Do you think there is a significant difference between males and females?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too much
   c. No

13. What score of deviant do you grade yourself? You can think deviance as disobey orders from parents/teachers/other authorities, such as smoking or drinking before age 18, fighting at school or on the street, getting something by force, shoplifting, deliberately damaging public or private property. (1 - not deviant at all; 10 - very deviant) ______

14. Would you get punishment from family if you disobey rules?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not always
   c. No

15. Do you agree that “laws and rules should be observed”?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes for most, except those unreasonable ones
   c. Yes for most, except those unexecuted ones
   d. No

16. Do you agree that wives should do more housework than husbands?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too much
   b. No

17. Do you agree that husbands should earn more than wives?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too much
   c. No
18. Imagine such an image: a very successful person is speaking on an international economic forum and sharing experience to the audience. Who is the person in your image, a male or a female?
   a. A female
   b. A male
   c. The person in my image has no gender

19. How do you define success?
   a. To be economically abundant
   b. To be politically powerful
   c. To be reputable
   d. To be popular
   e. To be knowledgeable
   f. To be healthy
   g. To have many friends
   h. To have a happy family
   i. To have outstanding children
   j. To make the world a better place

20. Do you think you are a person aspiring to economic success?
   a. No
   b. To some extent, yes
   c. Yes

Impact from the Original Family
21. Who does housework in your original family?
   a. Mother
   b. They share housework, but my mother does more.
   c. They equally share most housework.
   d. They share housework, but my father does more
   e. Father

22. Who is the main bread earner in your original family?
   a. Mother
   b. They earn similarly, but my mother earns more.
   c. They are the same.
   d. They earn similarly, but my father earns more.
   e. Father

23. Whose job is better based on the type and position in your original family?
   a. Mother’s
   b. They are similar, but my mother’s is better
   c. They are the same
   d. They are similar, but my father’s is better
   e. Father’s

24. Who made the decision in your original family?
   a. Mother
   b. Mother on major things, whereas father on minor things.
   c. They are equally powerful.
   d. Mother on minor things, whereas father on major things.
   b. Father
25. Whom did you spend the most time with?
   a. Mother
   b. Equally with either
   c. Father
   d. other __________

26. Did your mother hold a high expectation on you?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too much
   c. No

27. Did your father hold a high expectation on you?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too much
   c. No

28. Did your parents invest a lot in you?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too much
   c. No

29. Did your parents tell or imply that “women are harder to succeed” or “men are easier to succeed”?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too often
   c. No

30. (Question only for male respondent) Do you think you are more masculine than your father?
   a. I am more masculine
   b. The same
   c. My father is more masculine

31. (Question only for female respondent) Do you think you are more feminine than your mother?
   a. I am more feminine.
   b. The same
   c. My mother is more feminine.

**Impact from Peers**

32. How many best friends do you have? _______

33. Among your best friends, how many are of the opposite sex? ______

34. Do you share your problem or concern with your friends?
   a. Yes
   b. No

35. Do you think people of the opposite sex are averagely smarter than you?
   c. Yes
   d. Yes, but not too much
   e. No

36. Do you think people of the opposite sex are averagely more successful than you?
   f. Yes
   g. Yes, but not too much
   h. No
37. Do you think gender matters when you are looking for friends?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too much
   c. No
38. (Question only for male respondents) Compared to your friends, do you think you are more masculine than them on average?
   a. I am more masculine.
   b. We are the same.
   c. My friends are more masculine on average.
39. (Question only for female respondents) Compared to your friends, do you think you are more feminine than them on average?
   a. I am more feminine.
   b. We are the same.
   c. My friends are more feminine on average.

**Impact from School**
40. How was your school performance?
   a. Bad
   b. Below average
   c. Average
   d. Above average
   e. Good
41. Whom do you think is better in school performance?
   a. Girls
   b. They are the same
   c. Boys
42. Who are more favored by teachers in school?
   a. Girls
   b. They are the same
   c. Boys
43. Generally, who is smarter from your observation?
   a. Girls
   b. They are the same
   c. Boys
44. Did your teachers tell or imply that “women are harder to succeed” or “men are easier to succeed”?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but not too often
   b. No

**Impact from Workplace**
45. Averagely, whose wage do you think is higher?
   a. Women’s
   b. They are the same
   c. Men’s
46. Averagely, whom do you think have better jobs/positions?
   a. Women
   b. They are the same
47. A man and a woman have the same position in a company. One day, there is a promotion opportunity for them, whom do you think will be more likely to get the opportunity?
   a. The woman
   b. They are the same
   c. The man

48. Whom do you think are more competent in the job?
   a. Women
   b. They are the same
   c. Men

**Gender Opinion**

49. Do you think having a son is crucial to keeping up appearance and status in your community?
   a. Yes
   b. Yes, but daughter is also good.
   c. No, but having a son is better than having a daughter.
   d. No

50. How many kids do you think is best for your family regardless of any policy or economic concern? _________

51. Considering the economic burden, how many kids do you think is best for your family? _________

52. If you have a daughter, will you teach her to be family-oriented or career-oriented?
   a. Family-oriented
   b. Career-oriented
   c. Family-oriented but career is also important
   d. Career-oriented but family is also important
   e. Neither

53. If you have a son, will you teach him to be family-oriented or career-oriented?
   a. Family-oriented
   b. Career-oriented
   c. Family-oriented but career is also important
   d. Career-oriented but family is also important
   e. Neither
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