

The application of criminological theory to a Japanese context: Power- control theory

Hiroshi Tsutomi¹

Laura Bui²

Mitsuaki Ueda³

David P. Farrington⁴

Abstract

The present study investigates the applicability of power-control theory in explaining the gender discrepancy in deviance and delinquency in Japan, a patriarchal society. Conceived by Hagan and his colleagues, power-control theory attempts to explain gender differences in criminality and suggests that occupational patriarchy is responsible for this gender discrepancy in crime. Within a Japanese context, the findings reveal that the gender difference in common delinquency is only significant within more patriarchal households and is non-significant in less patriarchal households. These results are more distinct than the previous results from a Canadian sample, meaning that power-control theory may be more applicable to more patriarchal societies like Japan than to more egalitarian societies like Canada.

Introduction

Criminological theories conceived in the West have been applied to Japan to better understand the extent of their applicability in a different context. Previous studies applying criminological theory to Japan have also recognized this importance. There was a comparative study by Tanioka and Glaser (1991) who employed Felson's (1986) web of informal crime control to Japan and the United States. The general theory of crime (self-control theory; Gottfredson and Hirschi 1990) was investigated in other comparative studies by Vazsonyi and Belliston (2007) and Kobayashi et al. (2010). Also, Fukushima, Sharp, and Kobayashi (2009) examined social bonding theory (Hirschi 1969) and found that Americans had stronger bonds to conventional society than Japanese.

What is important about these empirical tests of criminological theories within a Japanese context is that they inform criminological research on similarities and differences between Western and non-Western findings, and give evidence of whether these theories are applicable to

¹ Shizuoka University, Japan, tsutomi@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp

² University of Cambridge, UK, lb444@cam.ac.uk

³ Kyushu University, Japan, ueda.mitsuaki.669@m.kyushu-u.ac.jp

⁴ University of Cambridge, UK, dpf1@cam.ac.uk

non-Western societies. The present study continues the investigation of the empirical applicability of criminological theories to Japan. One theory that is most pertinent to Japan's current situation is power-control theory.

A Review of Power-Control Theory

Conceived by John Hagan and his colleagues, power-control theory attempts to explain gender differences in criminality. The question addressed is why do more males engage in deviance and common delinquency than females? (Hagan 1989; Hagan Gillis and Simpson 1985; 1990; Hagan Simpson and Gillis 1987). The theory is inspired by stratification and control theories, including Ralf Dahrendorf's (1959) notions of classes created from authority positions, and suggests that occupational patriarchy is responsible for this gender discrepancy in crime. In other words, the parent's job position contributes to the difference in criminality between males and females. Originally, the theory examined the employment position of the head of the household, primarily that of the father, to determine patriarchy. However, Hagan and his colleagues (1987) revised the initial theory to incorporate the workplace power dynamics of both fathers and mothers.

Patriarchy is found between the power dynamics reflected in mother and father work positions. The term "power" refers to the authority position in the workplace of either parent, and this corresponds to the positions of power and authority in the household. The term "authority" refers to whether the parent supervises employees or has employees working for him/her. For instance, an authority position in the workplace (or "position of power") refers to those who are (1) employers (those who work for themselves and have people who work for or get paid by them) and (2) managers (persons who do not work for themselves but supervise others). Those not in a position of authority are (1) employees (persons who do not work for themselves and do not supervise the work of others) and (2) unemployed (persons not working on a paid job, are retired, or are housewives; see Hagan et al. 1987; Singer and Levine 1988). Hence, a "more patriarchal" household occurs in one of the two scenarios: (1) the father is employed in a position of authority and the mother is either employed but without authority or is unemployed or (2) the father is employed but not in a position of authority and the mother is unemployed. However, Hagan and his colleagues considered the first scenario as the ideal type. A household was labeled as "less patriarchal" if (1) both parents were in employed positions of authority, (2) both parents were employed but not in positions of authority, or (3) both were unemployed. Essentially, patriarchy is determined by whether there is an imbalance of power between parents.

According to the theory, single-mother households are considered less patriarchal, and this has generated quite some controversy (see Leiber and Wacker 1997; Mack and Leiber 2005; Morash and Chesney-Lind 1991). Even Hagan and his colleagues (1990, 1035) remarked that their theory needed improvement in addressing female-headed households, "which have proved more complicated than we have expected".

Regarding deviance and delinquency, it was believed that, in more patriarchal households, female more so than male children were objects of parental control (Hagan et al. 1985). Further, it was mothers more so than fathers who were the instruments of that control. Females were socialized into more feminine roles, while males were socialized to take risks, recreating the power dynamics of that particular household. This in turn resulted in gender differences in risk taking and risk perception. These gender differences produced the gender discrepancy in criminality and deviance, since males had higher levels of risk taking, had lower levels of risk perception, and were more likely to engage in delinquent and deviant acts. Studies that have attempted to replicate Hagan and his collaborators' findings have produced mixed results (Avakame 1997; Bates, Bader and Mencken 2003; Blackwell 2000; Blackwell and Piquero 2005; Blackwell and Reed 2003; Blackwell, Sellers and Schlaupitz 2002; Hadjar et al. 2007; Hill and Atkinson 1988; Jensen and Thompson 1990; Leiber and Wacker 1997; Mack and

Leiber 2005; Mitchell 2009; Morash and Chesney-Lind 1991; Singer and Levine 1988; Uggen 2000).

The present study examines power-control theory and its applicability to the Japanese context. The purpose of this study is to investigate the extent to which this theory explains gender differences in deviance and delinquency in Japan, within the theory's known framework of patriarchy and risk taking. The theory is most relevant to Japan because its society has been and still is considered a patriarchal society.

Daikokubashira: Patriarchy and Japan

The notion of *Daikokubashira* is pervasive in Japanese society and customs. This term refers to the central supporting pillar of a house, a metaphor for the man's role as the central support for his family (Hidaka 2011). The two reasons why Japan is patriarchal are (1) traditional gender roles are supported through general socialization processes where the majority of the Japanese have adapted these social values and (2) the division of home and work as distinct female and male domains encourages housewives and discourages life-time employment for females (Miller and Kanazawa 2000, 51; Mullins and Grothoff 2010).

Historically, this notion of *ie*, or the "traditional family" dated back to the Meiji period where this form of household, the patriarchal Confucian lineage family, was emphasized (White 2002, 45). In order to "preserve" Japanese culture from foreign and Western influences, this form of family was codified into law in 1898 (White 2002, 45). The *ie* system was abolished in 1947 and was replaced by a civil code which treated husband and wife as equals (Hidaka 2011). However, remnants of the *ie* system still linger in contemporary Japanese society through the social structure and the *koseki* system, which will be discussed in the next sections.

As Japan experienced rapid industrialization and urbanization, the division of labor between males and females was intensified, where work was considered the male domain and home was considered the female domain (Hidaka 2011). This division meant that husbands assumed the role of primary breadwinner while wives were viewed as primary caregivers in the domestic domain (Hidaka 2011; Kuzuno and Kan 2007; Mathews 2004; White 2002, 188). Hidaka (2011, 112) notes that the conventional aspiration during that period was

...male breadwinners who worked hard and were loyal to their companies, supporting the economic development of Japan and the well being of their families, with wives doing the housekeeping while bearing and raising children necessary for the reproduction of (patriarchal capitalist) society.

This patriarchal family structure continued to exist even beyond post-World War II and also has been considered part of the explanation for the low rates of Japanese criminality (Kuzuno and Kan 2007).

According to Miller and Kanazawa (2000, 40), low crime in Japan is made possible because of the patriarchal and male-dominated workplace. This creates social control mechanisms where males are dependent on their work in the forms of identity and social status. Because males are known to commit more crime and act in more socially destructive ways than females, the extensive system of the Japanese workplace helps to control crime.

Patriarchy in the Workplace

Patriarchy is unconcealed in the Japanese employment system. Because of the prominently male-dominated work environment, Japan is sometimes referred to as the *Oyaji* (dad or old man) society, referring to the post-war phenomenon of lifetime employment given to the majority of

salary men (Hirakawa 2011, 147). Take for instance, the prominently known “career track” positions in large corporations: although these positions comprise only a small percentage (20%) of the Japanese workforce (Mathews 2004; Sugimoto 2003, 94), *shushoku katsudo* (seeking career-track employment) is desirable because, if it is obtained, it guarantees Japanese males lifetime employment. Practically all men employed in these large corporations are given this position of *sararīman* (salaryman),¹ but options for full-time and permanent employment are difficult for women (Miller and Kanazawa 2000, 40).

In general, the Japanese employment system is arranged so that there are more opportunities for men to advance, while women who want to be employed full time find it difficult to obtain management positions and often find themselves working part-time (West 2011, 30). Women are also expected to leave their workplace after having a child, returning later to mainly part-time labor (Brinton 1993; Hertog 2011; Miller and Kanazawa 2000, 40; Sugimoto 2003, 155-156).

Patriarchy in the Home

The notion of the traditional and patriarchal family lineage is evident in present day Japan in the form of the *koseki* system (family register system; Sugimoto 2003, 148). The *koseki* system differs from other societies’ registration systems because it bundles a range of information about a family unit where usually the husband is listed as the head of the household, clearly provides information on any illegitimate children and divorces, and excludes those who do not fit into the standard patriarchal framework of the *koseki*’s idea of a family. As a result, this system works as a deterrent for women to divorce and preserves the patriarchal order (see Krogness 2011; Sugimoto 2003, 147-152).

Generally, the division of labor between husbands and wives is so distinct in Japan that on an international scale, if a woman were to spend 100 hours on household chores per year, the Japanese man would allocate 6 hours to household chores, while it is 54 hours for a Norwegian man, 52 for a Canadian man, 50 for an Australian and German, and 49 hours for an American man (Sugimoto 2003, 163). The division of labor is a prominent part of Japanese life, especially in families where highly educated mothers remain housewives, have children who feel immense pressure to conform, and where daughters are taught to behave decorously (Sugimoto 2003, 46).

The intention of the present study is not to use patriarchy as an explanation for Japan’s crime and delinquency, but rather to investigate the applicability of power-control theory in explaining the gender discrepancy in deviance and delinquency² in Japan, a patriarchal society.

Hypotheses

- (1) There will be a significant difference between males and females in delinquency across households.
- (2) This gender discrepancy in delinquency will be more pronounced in more patriarchal households.
- (3) The strength of this gender discrepancy will decrease as the theory’s posited factors (parental controls and risk taking) are included,
- (4) The relationship between low maternal control and delinquency will be higher in strength than the relationship between low paternal control and delinquency, and
- (5) The difference in the gender discrepancy in delinquency between more and less households will be salient after the inclusion of other factors.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations of the Japanese sample

| | Males (N=487) | Females (N=157) | Total (N=644) |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Age | | | |
| M= | 16.1 | 16.2 | 16.1 |
| SD = | 0.90 | 0.95 | 0.91 |
| Occupational patriarchy | | | |
| MP N= | 249 (73.9%) | 88 (26.1%) | 337 (100%) |
| LP N= | 238 (77.5%) | 69 (22.5%) | 307 (100%) |

MP=more patriarchal, LP=less patriarchal, M= mean, SD= standard deviation

Methodology

Data for the present study was collected in the spring of 2011 from students in two private high schools located in the Osaka prefecture area. For this study, only those who answered all of the items of the delinquency and responded that they had both a mother and father who both fit power-control theory's definition of occupational patriarchy were included in the analyses, resulting in an N of 644.³ The sample included 487 males and 157 females and the mean age was 16.1. The small fraction of females was because data collection was from predominantly male schools. The survey is comprised of questions on living arrangements, attitudes about shame and embarrassment, youths' relationships with their parents, schools, communities, and delinquent involvement.

Sample Exclusions

The sample (N=644) was subsequently clustered into two groups: more and less patriarchal households. Just over half (N=249) of the males lived in a more patriarchal household while 238 males lived in a less patriarchal household. For females, 88 of them lived in a more patriarchal household while 69 of them lived in a less patriarchal household (see Table 1 for details of means and standard deviations). In total, 337 respondents lived in a more patriarchal household while 307 respondents lived in a less patriarchal household.

Two items asking respondents to circle which response best described their parents' employment position were used to determine which type of household the respondent belonged to. The items contained the following choices: self-employed with other people/ no one working for him/her, works for someone else and does/ does not supervise the work of anyone else, and retired or unemployed. Depending on the combination of the answers between mother and father authority positions, respondents were then categorized as belonging to a more or less patriarchal household. Table 2 shows how more and less patriarchal was determined. An option for "I do not have a mother/father" was also included in the original items, and also determined exclusion if chosen for either parent.

Because power-control theory does not specify how to classify mothers with higher positions of authority than fathers, exclusions were made for mothers who had positions of power (manager and employer positions) and who were with fathers who did not have such positions. Further, exclusions also had been made for fathers who were unemployed with mothers who were not unemployed. This is aligned with the original analyses of the theory (Hagan et al.1987). However, unlike the original analyses, the study included fathers who were self-employed with no authority and with mothers who were either employed, self-employed (with no authority) or unemployed. These made up 5.4% (N=35) of two-parent households and were labeled as "less patriarchal" households because of the lack of authority in both parents' positions.

Table 2. Items that determined whether respondent lived in a more or less patriarchal household (N=644)

| | <u>Father's position</u> | <u>Mother's position</u> |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| More patriarchal responses | | |
| N= 337 | employer | employer (np)/employee/unemployed |
| | manager | employer(np)/employee/unemployed |
| | employee | employer(np)/employee/unemployed |
| Less patriarchal responses | | |
| N=307 | employer | employer/manager |
| | employer (np) | employer (np)/ employee/ unemployed |
| | manager | employer/manager |
| | employee | employee |
| | unemployed | unemployed |

employer= self-employed with other people working for him/her

employer (np)= self-employed with no one working for him/her (no power)

manager= he/she works for someone else and does supervise the work of other people

employee= he/she works for someone else and does not supervise the work of other people

unemployed= he/ she is retired/unemployed/housewife

It should be noted that when frequencies were calculated to compare the responses of father occupational authority position and whether the respondent's father was currently living with them, unlike maternal questions, there was a discrepancy. After exclusion of those who had no fathers, 51 respondents of the sample size (N=644) disclosed that they were not currently living with their father. At first, this may be a cause for alarm since it seems to imply that their parents have separated and respondents were incorrectly answering the item, distorting the actual number of one and two parent households. But this is not the case because, in Japan, it is not uncommon for fathers to live somewhere else due to their work circumstances (see Sugimoto 2003, 102).

Measures

Outcome variable

Delinquency. Adhering to power-control theory, the 6-item measure of delinquency included only items of "common delinquency". Although some studies of the theory use measures of future offending (see Blackwell 2000; Tittle 1980; in order to be more aligned with the prospective nature of perceived sanctions), this study uses a retrospective measure.⁴ The main reason the delinquency measure is retrospective is because the survey includes measures meant to test a variety of theories and known correlates of delinquency and deviance. Further, factual questions about past offending are likely to yield more valid findings than hypothetical questions about future offending. Moreover, because of the survey's constraints (e.g., shortening the survey for the Japanese school boards), priority was given to the retrospective measure.

The delinquency measure assessed how many times in the past year a respondent had committed the following acts: drawn graffiti on buildings or other property (without owner's permission), took a bicycle/scooter/motorbike for a ride without the owner's permission, shoplifted, picked a fight, hurt someone in a fight, and took parents' money without permission ($\alpha = 0.82$). The items were coded as 0= none, 1=1 to 2 times, and 2= 3 or more times. These were then summed together and the mean of these scores were taken, forming each respondent's final delinquency score. The distribution of scores was skewed (skewness=1.51, SE=0.096; kurtosis=1.53, SE=0.19).

Transformations were conducted such as employing the logarithm and square root transformations, but they only slightly reduced the skewness. Transformations may alter the nature of the constructs and the consequence is that the researcher may no longer be addressing the same question since the original measure is now measuring something else. Further, transformations may make it difficult to convey findings to the public (Farrington and Loeber 2000). Because crime and delinquency measures are skewed variables by nature, and the interest is in replicating Hagan and his colleagues' research in a Japanese context, the delinquency measure was not transformed.

Explanatory variables

Being male. The item was a dichotomous variable, where males were coded 1 while females were coded 0.

Low maternal and paternal controls. Consistent with Hagan et al.'s (1987) original measures, these items assessed monitoring. Multicollinearity proved to be a problem in studies assessing both maternal and paternal monitoring separately, and this was also a problem in our dataset (see Blackwell 2000). Because paternal and maternal controls were highly correlated ($R = 0.6$) in this study, separate analyses for maternal and paternal controls were conducted.

Respondents were asked whether their parents knew where they were and who they were with when they were not home. Responses were coded on a Likert scale ranging from often (coded 1), sometimes (2), seldom (3) to never (coded 4). Reliability analyses yielded the following alphas: Maternal control $\alpha = 0.85$; Paternal control $\alpha = 0.81$.

High risk taking. The measure was composed of five items ($\alpha = 0.81$), asking respondents how frequently they participated in the following: shocking people just for the fun of it, doing what feels good regardless of the consequences, doing something dangerous because of a dare, doing risky/crazy things even if they are a little frightening or dangerous, and doing risky/crazy things just to see the effect on others. The scale ranged from "never" to "once a week". Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations of each variable.

Plan of Analysis

First, ordinary least squares (OLS) regression analyses were performed, as in Hagan et al.'s original study but with two different tables representing maternal and paternal controls respectively. The purpose of these analyses was to assess the particular strength of each explanatory variable in predicting delinquency within the scope of power-control theory. Additionally, the regressions allow us to gauge the salience of gender within more and less patriarchal households. A Z-test, as suggested by Paternoster et al. (1998), for between group comparisons⁵ was included to determine whether there were significant gender differences between more and less patriarchal households in each of the tables.

Table 3 Means and standard deviations of study variables (N=644)

| | Males (N=487) | Females (N=157) |
|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| Low maternal control | | |
| M= | 2.15 | 1.75 |
| SD= | 0.86 | 0.73 |
| Min-max | 1-4 | |
| Low paternal control | | |
| M= | 2.61 | 2.48 |
| SD= | 0.88 | 0.81 |
| Min-max | 1-4 | |
| High risk taking | | |
| M= | 2.13 | 1.65 |
| SD= | 1.23 | 1.17 |
| Min-max | 0-5 | |
| Delinquency | | |
| M= | 0.39 | 0.24 |
| SD= | 0.50 | 0.43 |
| Min-max | 0-2 | |
| Occupational patriarchy | | |
| MP delinquency M and SD= | 0.38, 0.49 | 0.16, 0.34 |
| LP delinquency M and SD= | 0.40, 0.50 | 0.33, 0.50 |
| MP=more patriarchal, LP=less patriarchal, M= mean, SD= standard deviation | | |
| M= mean, SD= standard deviation | | |

Results

There will be a significant difference between males and females in delinquency across households

Table 3 reveals that males in more patriarchal households committed a similar average of delinquency as males in less patriarchal households (0.38, SD= 0.49 as opposed to 0.40, SD=0.50). For females, those living in a more patriarchal household committed on average less delinquency (0.16, SD= 0.34) than females living in less patriarchal households (0.33, SD= 0.50). A t-test for differences in delinquency between genders for the two types of households reveal that there is a significant difference between female and male delinquency in more patriarchal households ($t [335] = -3.78, p < 0.0001$); However, the difference between male and female delinquency in less patriarchal households was not significant.

Table 4. Regressions of self-reported delinquency within more and less patriarchal households with maternal controls

| <i>Explanatory variables</i> | More patriarchal (N=262) | | | | Less patriarchal (N=237) | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|
| | b | SE | β | p-value | b | SE | β | p-value |
| Equation 1 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.21 | .0001* | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 | .477 |
| R ² | 0.04 | | | | 0.002 | | | |
| Equation 2 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.16 | .004* | -0.02 | 0.07 | -0.01 | .82 |
| low maternal control | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.27 | .0001* | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.28 | .0001* |
| R ² | 0.11 | | | | 0.08 | | | |
| Equation 3 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.12 | .026* | -0.07 | 0.06 | -0.06 | .266 |
| low maternal control | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.22 | .0001* | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.19 | .0001* |
| high risk taking | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.26 | .0001* | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.45 | .0001* |
| R ² | 0.17 | | | | 0.26 | | | |

*denotes significance
 Note: Adjusted R² is reported

Table 5. Regressions of self-reported delinquency within more and less patriarchal households with paternal controls

| <i>Explanatory variables</i> | More patriarchal (N=248) | | | | Less patriarchal (N=223) | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|
| | b | SE | β | p-value | b | SE | β | p-value |
| Equation 1 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.23 | .0001* | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.02 | .76 |
| (intercept) | 0.16 | 0.05 | | | 0.37 | 0.07 | | |
| R ² | 0.05 | | | | -0.003 | | | |
| Equation 2 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.22 | .0001* | 0.004 | 0.07 | 0.003 | .96 |
| low paternal control | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.17 | .002* | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.16 | .008* |
| (intercept) | -0.09 | 0.10 | | | 0.16 | 0.10 | | |
| R ² | 0.08 | | | | 0.02 | | | |
| Equation 3 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.17 | .002* | -0.06 | 0.06 | -0.05 | .32 |
| low paternal control | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.11 | .048* | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.11 | .04* |
| high risk taking | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.28 | .0001* | 0.19 | 0.02 | 0.48 | .0001* |
| (intercept) | -0.18 | 0.09 | | | -0.09 | 0.09 | | |
| R ² | 0.14 | | | | 0.24 | | | |

*denotes significance
 Note: Adjusted R² is reported

This gender discrepancy in delinquency will be more pronounced in more patriarchal households.

The significant difference in delinquency between genders was only found within the more patriarchal households in both Tables 4 and 5, which represent maternal control (Table 4) and paternal control (Table 5). In both tables, being male was significantly associated with higher levels of delinquency than being female within more patriarchal households, even when other factors were controlled for. For instance, in Table 4, and in equation 1 within more patriarchal households, males significantly commit on average 0.23 more delinquent acts than females. Although the strength of the relationship between being male and delinquency was gradually reduced as other factors were included, it was consistently significant and remained so in the last model when all factors of power-control theory were featured (Table 4 $\beta=0.13$, $p<.05$; Table 5 $\beta=0.18$, $p<.01$).

Table 4. Regressions of self-reported delinquency within more and less patriarchal households with maternal controls

| <i>Explanatory variables</i> | More patriarchal (N=262) | | | | Less patriarchal (N=237) | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|
| | b | SE | β | p-value | b | SE | β | p-value |
| Equation 1 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.23 | 0.06 | 0.21 | .0001* | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.04 | .477 |
| R ² | 0.04 | | | | 0.002 | | | |
| Equation 2 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.17 | 0.06 | 0.16 | .004* | -0.02 | 0.07 | -0.01 | .82 |
| low maternal control | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.27 | .0001* | 0.16 | 0.03 | 0.28 | .0001* |
| R ² | 0.11 | | | | 0.08 | | | |
| Equation 3 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.13 | 0.06 | 0.12 | .026* | -0.07 | 0.06 | -0.06 | .266 |
| low maternal control | 0.12 | 0.03 | 0.22 | .0001* | 0.11 | 0.03 | 0.19 | .0001* |
| high risk taking | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.26 | .0001* | 0.17 | 0.02 | 0.45 | .0001* |
| R ² | 0.17 | | | | 0.26 | | | |

*denotes significance
Note: Adjusted R² is reported

Table 5. Regressions of self-reported delinquency within more and less patriarchal households with paternal controls

| <i>Explanatory variables</i> | More patriarchal (N=248) | | | | Less patriarchal (N=223) | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|----------------|
| | b | SE | β | p-value | b | SE | β | p-value |
| Equation 1 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.25 | 0.06 | 0.23 | .0001* | 0.02 | 0.07 | 0.02 | .76 |
| (intercept) | 0.16 | 0.05 | | | 0.37 | 0.07 | | |
| R ² | 0.05 | | | | -0.003 | | | |
| Equation 2 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.24 | 0.06 | 0.22 | .0001* | 0.004 | 0.07 | 0.003 | .96 |
| low paternal control | 0.10 | 0.03 | 0.17 | .002* | 0.09 | 0.03 | 0.16 | .008* |
| (intercept) | -0.09 | 0.10 | | | 0.16 | 0.10 | | |
| R ² | 0.08 | | | | 0.02 | | | |
| Equation 3 | | | | | | | | |
| male | 0.18 | 0.06 | 0.17 | .002* | -0.06 | 0.06 | -0.05 | .32 |
| low paternal control | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.11 | .048* | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.11 | .04* |
| high risk taking | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.28 | .0001* | 0.19 | 0.02 | 0.48 | .0001* |
| (intercept) | -0.18 | 0.09 | | | -0.09 | 0.09 | | |
| R ² | 0.14 | | | | 0.24 | | | |

*denotes significance
Note: Adjusted R² is reported

Within the less patriarchal households for both tables, however, being male had no significant relation to delinquency even in the first equation. Gender was not important in less patriarchal households, which supports the prediction of power-control theory that in less patriarchal households, males and females will take risks equally, which will result in less of a discrepancy in delinquent involvement between the genders. But because there was not even a significant finding for being male with less patriarchal households, these particular results are more distinct than Hagan et al.'s original findings.

The strength of this gender discrepancy will decrease as the theory's posited factors (parental controls and risk taking) are included.

The gradual decrease in strength and significance in the gender discrepancy in delinquency is observed across both tables and across households when other factors are included. In more patriarchal households, the relationship between being male and delinquent involvement was significant, but it reduced in strength and significance as each factor of power-control theory was added into the model. For instance, in Table 5, for more patriarchal households, males commit 0.25 more delinquent acts than females ($\beta=0.23$) and when all factors are included (equation 3), males commit on average 0.18 more delinquent acts than females ($\beta=0.17$).

The relationship between low maternal control and delinquency will be higher in strength than the relationship between low paternal control and delinquency.

Although this is not a direct comparison, the strengths of low maternal control in Table 4 in each equation are higher in value than those of low paternal control in Table 5. A test for between-group differences between the initial values of low maternal ($b=0.16$, $SE=0.03$) and paternal ($b=0.10$, $SE=0.03$) controls, and the final values of both controls revealed that this difference was not significant (initial and final $Z=1.41$, $p>.05$; one-tailed). In less patriarchal households, low maternal control also had a high value in its relationship strength to delinquency with a β -value of $.28$ ($p<.001$) which decreased to a β -value of $.17$ ($p<.01$) when risk taking was included into the model. This is in contrast to low paternal control in the less patriarchal households where its initial relational strength to delinquency in equation 2 is lower in value ($\beta=.16$, $p<.01$) and decreases to a barely significant ($p=0.048$) β -value of $.07$. A test for between-group differences reveals that the initial parental control values in less patriarchal households were non-significant ($Z=1.649$) and even when risk taking was included ($Z=1.18$).

The difference in the gender discrepancy in delinquency between households will be salient even with the inclusion of other factors.

Table 6 presents the results of the z-test for between group comparisons of parameter values as proposed by Paternoster et al. (1998). There are significant differences between the males and females reared in more patriarchal households compared to the ones who are reared in less patriarchal households. The z-values demonstrate that these gender differences between households exist, with the more significant gender differences between households found in the model with low paternal control (all values above 2.00 and $p<.01$). This could mean that low paternal control is not a salient factor in increasing high risk taking and delinquency, and is weaker in its relational strength to delinquency than it is for being male.

The z-test provides clear evidence that the gender difference in delinquency from a more patriarchal household is significantly different than the gender difference in delinquency found in a less patriarchal household. The z-test was one-tailed because there was a proposed direction: that the gender difference in delinquency from a more patriarchal household would be more than that from a less patriarchal household. In examining these findings, power-control theory's main argument that distinct gender differences exist between more and less patriarchal households is saliently supported.

Discussion

Summarizing the results, we have found (1) there are indeed significant gender differences in delinquency within more patriarchal households, (2) as low parental controls and high risk taking are included into the model, the gender difference in delinquency reduces in its strength in both households and (3) when observing each model, low maternal control is a stronger but not a more salient relation to delinquency compared to the that of low paternal control, and (4) the gender difference in delinquency in more patriarchal households is significantly different from that of less patriarchal households. Further elaborations of the findings will be by hypothesis: Hypothesis 1, that there would be a significant gender difference in delinquency

Table 6. Z-test comparison of parameter values for gender between households

| <u>Equations</u> | <u>Table 4 (N=499)</u> | <u>Table 5 (N=471)</u> |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 1.95* | 2.49** |
| 2 | 2.06* | 2.56** |
| 3 | 2.36** | 2.83** |

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001; one-tailed test, critical value +1.65

Note: Table 4 represents the previous table with maternal control, whereas Table 5 represents paternal control. The equations column represents each model within each table. The z-scores shown are the results comparing more and less patriarchal households.

found across households, was only partially supported. This significant gender difference was only applicable for more patriarchal households, which revealed consistent significance between male and female delinquency. In less patriarchal households, the findings for the difference between male and female delinquency were the exact opposite of the more patriarchal household findings: the gender difference was consistently non-significant.

Following hypothesis 1's findings, the second hypothesis, that the gender difference in delinquency will be more pronounced in more patriarchal households than in less patriarchal households is supported by the findings. As previously mentioned, this gender discrepancy was only significant in more patriarchal households, while in less patriarchal households, this gender difference was non-significant. These are interesting findings because Hagan and his colleagues' original study (1987) found that this difference existed for both more and less patriarchal households in his Canadian sample (N=463).⁶ The chapter's findings are aligned with the original power-control theory findings, but these findings suggest that the theory is more applicable in a Japanese context.

In the Japanese context, the findings reveal that the gender difference in common delinquency are only significant within more patriarchal households and are non-significant in less patriarchal households. These results are more distinct than the results from the Canadian sample, meaning that power-control theory may be a more applicable theory to more patriarchal societies like Japan than to more egalitarian societies such as Canada and The United States. The present findings clearly distinguish the gender difference in delinquency between more and less patriarchal households. Further, compared to Hagan et al.'s original 1987 study, the impact of gender did not disappear entirely. This effect retained significance throughout each equation in more patriarchal households. Research applying power-control theory to different patriarchal societies, like South Korea, may generate similar distinctive results.

A prior study that looked at the implications of power-control theory is Kobayashi, Sharp and Grasmick's (2008) comparative study between Japanese and American university students. Inspired by their review of low risk taking in Japanese society, they theorized that compared to Americans, the Japanese would exhibit significantly lower rates of deviance. Their claims were validated, but, their measures did not fully consider power-control theory despite the theory being the main thrust of their paper; although they found that Japanese males self-reported a higher prevalence of deviance than females, the gender difference in deviance was smaller for the Japanese than for the Americans. Additionally, Kobayashi and her collaborators (2008) did not even test for patriarchy, risk taking and parental controls in their study, merely examining deviance and gender. Thus, this chapter was the first to incorporate all known items of power-control theory to fully examine its applicability in a Japanese context.

The strength of this gender difference in delinquency, however, decreased as each of the proposed mechanisms of power-control theory (parental control and risk taking) were included into the model. This supports hypothesis 3 and the power-control theoretical framework. Hagan et

al. (1987) posited that a discrepancy in the gender-crime relationship exists because mediating factors of parental controls and risk taking are responsible for the differences in delinquency between males and females, particularly within more patriarchal households. This proposal assumes that when these factors of power-control theory are included, the effect of gender should weaken and disappear once the full model of power-control theory is constructed. In other words, the phenomenon of the gender difference in delinquency is the difference in parental socialisation between boys and girls. The more patriarchal Japanese households demonstrate this phenomenon.

Again, the salience of gender was not found within any of the models belonging to less patriarchal households, meaning that there was not a gender difference in delinquency for these households to start. Though the strength of the non-significant gender difference did decrease as each mechanism of power-control theory was inserted into the framework, the non-significance of this gender difference for less patriarchal households, suggest that just by living in a less patriarchal household, there is no significant difference in the level delinquent acts between females and males. This is because in less patriarchal households, females commit on average a higher amount of delinquency (Mean= 0.33) than females in more patriarchal households (Mean=0.16). Across households, males on average, commit approximately the same amount of delinquency (more patriarchal Mean= 0.38; less patriarchal Mean=0.40). This means that the difference in delinquency between males and females occurs because females on average commit more delinquency living in less patriarchal households. Lastly, although power-control mechanisms are related to delinquency, it seems that these mechanisms such as parental control and risk taking act more as reducers of overall delinquency and not as the reducers of the gender difference in delinquency. But it seems that merely living in a less patriarchal household means that there will be an initial non-significant difference in male and female delinquency.

The relationship between low maternal control and delinquency had consistent higher strengths in this study than the relationship between low paternal control and delinquency. However, a quick test of between group differences (Clogg, Petvoka and Haritou 1995) in equation 1 between low maternal and paternal control showed that these controls were not significantly different from each other. However, the betas (β) show that low paternal control has weak strength in its relation to delinquency compared to low maternal control. This is unlike low maternal control, which was consistently significant and a strong factor, even when risk taking was accounted for across households.

The influence of maternal control seems stronger than paternal control within a Japanese context, which is also aligned with Hagan et al's belief that mothers, more so than fathers, are the main agents of socialization for their children, especially their daughters. Evidence of maternal control being more significant than paternal control is also relevant to Japanese society. Specifically within Japan, the responsibility of this child socialization usually rests also on the mother (Katsuura-Cook 1991; Kawanishi 2004). The mother-child relationship is an essential component for Japanese socialization. *Amae* or indulgence refers to this relationship, explained as one's long-term mental dependency on one's mother (Doi 1994). Maternal socialization is responsible for cementing the foundations for future mutual reliance on others and intimate relationships through this indulgence between mother and child (Kawai 1976; Sakurai 2004). Thus, this possible interpretation could explain why low maternal control was a salient factor for the decrease in delinquency despite the addition of high risk taking. However, no significant differences were found between these two parental controls meaning that the influence of maternal socialization may not be more important than paternal socialization in its relation to risk taking and delinquency.

Lastly, similar to results that support hypothesis 1 and 2, the results of the between groups Z-test further support the existence of the gender discrepancy in delinquency within more patriarchal households, and the lack of such a difference in the less patriarchal households, upholding Hypothesis 5. Unlike Hagan et al.'s previous findings, our results reveal that, even when accounting for all of the theory's variables, the gender difference in delinquency between

households is salient, especially when accounting for low paternal control. This means that the difference between male and female delinquency in more patriarchal households is significantly different from the difference between male and female delinquency in less patriarchal households. Specifically, there is more of a significant gender difference in delinquency in more patriarchal households than there are in less patriarchal households.

It seems that although there were violations of assumptions with the continuous variables (e.g., the delinquency measure), they were not too much of a problem because not presented in this paper (due to space limitations), when dichotomizing these measures and analyzing them with logistic regression, both findings from continuous and dichotomized measures were consistent with each other.⁷ For instance, Odds ratios (ORs) for Table 4 reveal that in more patriarchal households, being male had a significantly strong odds of committing more delinquency than females (OR= 3.32, CI= 1.52- 7.24) with each OR value being more than 2 and then decreasing in strength once other posited factors were included (OR=2.56, CI=1.05-6.27). In less patriarchal households however, being male did not have significant or strong odds of committing more delinquency than females (OR= 1.41, CI=0.75-2.67). When other factors were included, this value was an OR=1.05 (CI=0.47-2.35).

Limitations

The limitations to this particular study of the applicability of power-control theory to Japan are a small female sample size, no control variables and non-linearity. The low sample size for females relative to males may have distorted or exaggerated the results (e.g., robust strength of the gender difference in delinquency in more patriarchal households may be because of the low female sample size). Therefore, focus should be on effect size measures (e.g., β), instead of statistical significance. However, the findings were found to be consistent with power-control theory, known criminological relationships, and the previous chapters' findings (e.g., the salience of the relationship between low maternal control and delinquency).

The second limitation is the lack of control variables. Although our findings provide strong support for the applicability of power-control theory, this could also be interpreted as a lack of factors that would better explain away the gender difference in delinquency. Because parental controls and risk taking were unable to dissipate the effect of gender in more patriarchal households, it may be that other factors such as parental attachment or harsh discipline may be more relevant to a Japanese context. In other words, power-control theory is not the only explanation for Japanese crime because it is unable to account for other, stronger prospective explanations of Japanese delinquency. A future study is needed to address this facet of the research.

Conclusion

The present findings show evidence that power-control theory is valid in Japan and also point to evidence of the prominence of maternal control and risk taking within more and less patriarchal households. In order to generalize criminological theories, it is vital to test them in contexts and societies where the theory was originally not conceived. Doing so contributes to understanding the cultural and social limits of a theory in explaining crime.

Endnotes

¹ This term refers to company workers or civil servants who receive a monthly salary.

² “Deviance and delinquency” will henceforth be referred to as only “delinquency”.

³ The sample is supposed to be N=645 but because one did not disclose his/her gender, it is N=644.

⁴ The rationalization for using a future measure of offending is because of the causal order problem related to assessing current perception threats with self-reports of past offending. Perceptions of threats are not stable over time and change depending on the respondents’ experiences with certain criminal behavior.

⁵ Based on Clogg, Petvoka, and Haritou (1995), this formula is suggested for use in between group comparisons of regression coefficients. The equation is believed to be better in detecting significant differences between groups because it does not produce a negative biased estimate (meaning that it does not produce error estimates that are too small which inflate the Z-score, encouraging type 1 and type 3 errors) of the true standard deviation of the sampling distribution of coefficient differences (Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle & Piquero, 1998). This formula is $Z = (b_1 - b_2) / \sqrt{SEb_1^2 + SEb_2^2}$.

⁶ Hagan and his colleagues (1985) collected data in the Toronto metropolitan area in 1979. The sample consisted of students and their parents from seven high schools. The survey was administered to groups of students, and the questions were read aloud by an investigator from the study while the students self-filled in the questionnaire. The students’ parents were subsequently contacted by phone for employment details. But in the 1987 study where the current power-control theory was conceived, these parents were again contacted for a follow-up where employment information on both their spouses and themselves were obtained.

⁷ However, ORs for being male in the paternal control model reveals discrepancies where the strength increases when paternal control is added, but then decreases again once risk taking is included into the model for both more and less patriarchal households.

References

- Avakame, Edem F. 1997. Modeling the patriarchal factor in juvenile delinquency: Is there room for peers, church, and television? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24(4): 477-494.
- Bates, Kristin, Christopher Bader and Carson F. Mencken. 2003. Family structure, power-control theory, and deviance: Extending power-control theory to include alternate family forms. *Western Criminology Review*, 4(3): 170-190.
- Blackwell, Brenda S. 2000. Perceived sanction threats, gender, and crime: A test and elaboration of power-control theory. *Criminology*, 38(2): 439-488.
- Blackwell, Brenda S. and Alex Piquero .2005. On the relationships between gender, power control, self-control, and crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(1): 1-17.
- Blackwell, Brenda S. and Mark D. Reed. 2003. Power- control as a between- and within-family model : Reconsidering the unit of analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32(5): 385-39.
- Blackwell, Brenda S., Christine S. Sellers and Sheila M. Schlaupitz. 2002. A power-control theory of vulnerability to crime and adolescent role exits— revisited. *Canadian Review of Sociology*. 39(2): 199-218.
- Brinton, Mary C. 1993. *Women and the economic miracle: Gender and work in postwar Japan*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Clogg, Clifford C., Eva E. Petkova and Tzuwei Cheng. 1995. Reply to Allison: More on comparing regression coefficients. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 100(5): 1305-1312.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf. 1959. *Class and class conflict in industrial society*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Doi, Takeo. 1994. *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Farrington, David P. and Rolf Loeber. 2000. Some benefits of dichotomization in psychiatric and criminological research. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 10(2): 100–122.
- Felson, Marcus. 1986. Linking criminal choices, routine activities, informal control, and criminal outcomes. In *The reasoning criminal* edited by B. Derek Cornish and Ronald V. Clarke, 119-128. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Fukushima, Miyuki, Susan F. Sharp and Emiko Kobayashi. 2009. Bond to society, collectivism, and conformity: A comparative study of Japanese and American college students. *Deviant Behavior*, 30(5): 434-466.
- Gottfredson, Michael and Travis Hirschi. 1990. *A General theory of crime*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hadjar, Andreas, Dirk Baier, Klaus Boehnke and John Hagan. 2007. Juvenile delinquency and gender revisited: The family and power-control theory reconceived. *European Journal of Criminology*, 4(1): 33-58.
- Hagan, John. 1989. *Structural criminology*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Hagan, John, A.R. Gillis and John Simpson. 1985. The class structure of gender and delinquency: Toward a power-control theory of common delinquent behavior. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(6): 1151-1178.
- Hagan, John, A.R. Gillis and John Simpson. 1990. Clarifying and extending power-control theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(4): 1024-1037.
- Hagan, John, John Simpson and A.R. Gillis. 1987. Class in the household: A power-control theory of gender and delinquency. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(4): 788-816.
- Hertog, Ekaterina. 2011. “I did not know how to tell my parents, so I thought I would have to have an abortion”: Experience of unmarried mothers in Japan. In *Home and family in Japan: Continuity and transformation* edited by Richard Ronald and Allison Alexy, 91-111. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Hidaka, Tomoko. 2011. Masculinity and the family system: The ideology of the ‘salaryman’ across three generations. In *Home and family in Japan: Continuity and transformation* edited by Richard Ronald and Allison Alexy, 112-130. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Hill, Gary D. and Maxine P. Atkinson. 1988. Gender, familial control, and delinquency. *Criminology*, 26(1): 127-147.
- Hiragawa, Hiroko. 2011. The dignified woman who loves to be ‘loveable’. In *Manners and mischief: Gender, power, and etiquette in Japan* edited by Jan Bardsley and Lauren Miller, 136-155. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, Travis. 1969. *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Jensen, Gary F. and Kevin Thompson. 1990. What’s class got to do with it? A further examination of power-control theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(4): 1009-1023.
- Katsuura-Cook, Noriko. 1991. *Nihon no kosodate, America no kosodate* [Child Rearing in Japan and in the United States]. Tokyo, Japan: Science-sha.
- Kawai, Mikio. 2004. Anzen shinwa hokai no paradokkusu [The paradox of the collapse of Japan’s safety myth]. Tokyo, Japan: Iwanami Shoten.
- Kawanishi, Yuko. 2004. Japanese youth: The other half of the crisis? *Asian Affairs* 35(1): 22-32.
- Kobayashi, Emiko, Susan Sharp and Harold Grasmick. 2008. Gender and deviance: A comparison of college students in Japan and the United States. *Deviant Behavior*, 29(5): 413-439.
- Kobayashi, Emiko, Alexander T. Vazsonyi, Pan Chen and Susan F. Sharp. 2010. A culturally nuanced test of Gottfredson and Hirschi’s general theory: Dimensionality and generalizability in Japan and the United States. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 20(2): 112-131.

- Krogness, Karl J. 2011. The ideal, the deficient, and the illogical family: An initial typology of administrative household units. In *Home and family in Japan: Continuity and transformation* edited by Richard Ronald and Allison Alexy, 65-90. London, U.K.: Routledge.
- Kuzuno, Hiroyuki and Ueda Kan. "Crime in Japan and its relation to transnational organized crime." International Conference on Organised Crime Groups and Organized Crimes. Shandong University Law School. Jinana China, Nov. 17-19, 2007.
- Leiber, Michael and Mary Ellen Ellyson Wacker. 1997. A theoretical and empirical assessment of power-control theory and single-mother families. *Youth & Society*, 28(3): 317-350.
- Mack, Kristin and Michael Leiber. 2005. Race, gender, single-mother households, and delinquency: A further test of power-control theory. *Youth & Society*, 37(2): 115-144.
- Mathews, Gordon .2004. Seeking a career, finding a job: How young people enter and resist the Japanese world of work. In *Japan's changing generations: Are young people creating a new society?* Edited by Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 121-136. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Miller, Alan S. and Satoshi Kanazawa. 2000. *Order by Accident: The origins and consequences of conformity in contemporary Japan*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mitchell, Jessica N. 2009. *Power-control theory: An examination of private and public patriarchy*. Retrieved from Scholar Commons @ USF database. (UMI no. 2108).
- Morash, Merry and Meda Chesney-Lind. 1991. A reformulation and partial test of the power-control theory of delinquency. *Justice Quarterly*, 8(3). 347-377.
- Mullins, Christopher W. and Garrett Grothoff. 2010. Gendered imprisonment in Japan: An examination of imprisonment for stimulant drug offenses. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 34(2): 367-382.
- Paternoster, Raymond, Robert Brame, Paul Mazerolle and Alex Piquero. 1998. Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*, 36(4): 859-866.
- Sakurai, Tetsuo. 2004. The generation gap in Japanese society since the 1960s. In *Japan's changing generations: Are young people creating a new society?* Edited by Gordon Mathews and Bruce White, 15-30. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Singer, Simon I. and Murray Levine. 1988. Power-control theory, gender and delinquency: a partial replication with additional evidence on the effects of peers. *Criminology*, 26(4): 627-647.
- Sugimoto, Yoshio. 2003. *An Introduction to Japanese Society (2nd ed.)*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanioka, Ichiro and Daniel Glaser. 1991. School uniforms, routine activities and the social control of delinquency in Japan. *Youth & Society*, 23(1): 50-75.
- Tittle, Charles. (1980). *Sanctions and social deviance: The question of deterrence*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Uggen, Christopher. 2000. Class, gender, and arrest: An intergenerational analysis of workplace power and control. *Criminology*, 38(3), 835-862.
- Vazsonyi, Alexander T. and Lara M. Belliston. 2007. The family -> low self-control -> deviance: A cross-cultural and cross-national test of self-control theory. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(4): 505-530.
- West, Mark. 2011. *Lovesick Japan: Sex, marriage, romance, and law*. New York, NY: Cornell University Press.
- White, Merry I. 2002. *Perfectly Japanese: Making families in an era of upheaval*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.