

## Article

---

"Self-Image and Delinquency: A Contribution to the Study of Female Criminality and Woman's Image"

Marie-Andrée Bertrand

*Acta Criminologica*, vol. 2, n° 1, 1969, p. 71-144.

Pour citer cet article, utiliser l'information suivante :

URI: <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/017007ar>

DOI: 10.7202/017007ar

Note : les règles d'écriture des références bibliographiques peuvent varier selon les différents domaines du savoir.

---

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter à l'URI <https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/>

---

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche. Érudit offre des services d'édition numérique de documents scientifiques depuis 1998.

Pour communiquer avec les responsables d'Érudit : [info@erudit.org](mailto:info@erudit.org)

**SELF-IMAGE AND DELINQUENCY**  
**A CONTRIBUTION TO THE STUDY**  
**OF FEMALE CRIMINALITY**  
**AND WOMAN'S IMAGE**

**Marie-Andrée Bertrand**

## CONTENTS

Introduction .....	73
Chapter one: Theoretical considerations on the « image », the « self », and the « agent-object » model of inquiry .....	76
Chapter two: Application of the agent-object model of inquiry .....	85
A. The preliminary phase .....	85
B. Codification of the answers .....	88
C. Hypotheses .....	90
D. Description of the population .....	94
Chapter three: Analysis of the variables .....	96
A. The Canadian population .....	97
B. The European population .....	117
Chapter four: Interpretation of the results of the inquiry .....	123
A. The Canadian population .....	124
B. The total population of juveniles, European and Canadian .....	129
Conclusion .....	136
References .....	137

## INTRODUCTION

It is an accepted fact among criminologists that there is a lower rate of delinquent and criminal behaviour among females than among males. There may be variations in time and space from 5 to 30% of the total volume, and we find the greater proportion of antisocial behaviour among young girls. Not only are women and young girls brought before law enforcement agencies less frequently than men and boys; if and when they are, they are dealt with differently.

Differential treatment does not necessarily imply lenience: treatment is often more severe depending upon the prestige of the social values jeopardized by the illegal behaviour of women and girls, or whether the female, by committing such crimes, strays far from her socially ascribed rôle. A study of some of the values placed in the safe-keeping of women by a given society is possible, in part, through an analysis of the special provisions, sanctions, exceptions and excuses for women in the criminal code.

In France, Belgium, Germany and Canada, the main social function required of women is « pattern maintenance », through the protection of family values, of the child, the infant and the unborn child, and through the special privileges granted the wife and mother. The double standard for men and women in France and Belgium regarding adultery, the attitude of Canada toward the prostitute and her client, are clear indications of the functions prescribed for women by society: those of fidelity and chastity.

Some criminal legislation does not consider women capable of committing certain crimes. The same legislation or others

contain a list of sections in which severe penalties are imposed on male aggressors where females are involved: women are considered helpless and innocent victims. The Canadian Criminal Code is especially fertile in both. The image of woman reflected through this « social representation » is one of criminal irresponsibility, helplessness and fear (under the domination of her husband), in many areas of behaviour.

*Social representations, we suggest, constitute the most effective regulators, and the best explanation for, the relatively constant rate of female criminality. Yet, collective representations and social consciousness are mere reinforcements of the already ascribed social rôles.*

The rôle theory is, in the end, the most complete explanation for the differential sex rate. While our culture condones and even expects a certain amount of acting out and aggressive behaviour in young boys, it is less tolerant of the foibles of young girls. Physical strength, shrewdness in business matters, for instance, are very compatible with our « ideal typus » of the « normal » adult male, while such attributes — oftentimes necessary for the performance of recurrent crimes — are not usually associated with femininity because society does not want women trained or practiced in such matters.

Hence, to a certain degree, it would be fair to say that the normal, conforming male is permitted, and will be prone to engage in, a certain amount of antisocial and illegal behaviour. The opposite is true for females: the more conforming and the more « normal », the less delinquent and misbehaving. Using the « looking-glass self » concept, we would say here that the male who commits an offence does not necessarily see himself, in the societal reactions (and depending upon the nature of his offence), as « abnormal » and « deviant », while with a very few exceptions society requires that women do. Eysenck's neuroticism scale, Christie's anxiety questionnaire and discrepancy between self rating and ideal ratings, and Taylor's manifest anxiety scale have always failed to show any relationships between delinquency and neuroticism in male groups.

To accept the generalization: « female delinquents are so far from fulfilling social expectations that they have to be *sick* » is too easy. Indeed, the degree of deviance from their explicit rôles is much greater for female delinquents than for males, and we must explain how a girl or a woman — without taking

the attributes of the opposite sex as von Hentig suggests — may perform delinquent acts. But in any case, rôle expectations being what they are concerning women, and labels, sanctions and penological implications being what we know them to be, the criminal woman and the delinquent girl, receiving their image from society, run the great risk of *becoming* really abnormal, i.e. to acquire a growing feeling of « incompetence » (Foote and Cottrell, 1955).

If we can rely to a great extent on collective representations, such as laws and the practices of law enforcement agencies, and on the rôle theory, to get more insight into the difficult problem of female criminality, sex rate, the kind of offences women are most ready to commit and the differential treatment female offenders will get on the part of law enforcement agencies as compared with men, we must also admit the limitations of such macrosociological tools. Penal codes, especially, are often obsolete in their representations; society manages to find ways of adjusting criminal legislation, not only to conditions nowadays, but also, according to the demands of pressure groups, for instance, by limiting « in practice » the application of some sections of the law or, on the contrary, by penalizing some misdemeanour to the maximum.

The study of jurisprudence comes closer to a « here and now » picture of social reactions to the criminal, his sex, his social class appurtenance, his crime, etc. However, collective representations, descriptions and ascriptions of rôles, studies in jurisprudence, granting that they furnish the major contribution to understanding the « whys » of criminality and the « hows » of law enforcement agencies are unable to provide major insight on « why » and « how » individual criminals commit their crimes. This we can find out only from the perpetrator himself.

Hence, in the following pages, we have tried to obtain the *subject's viewpoint* on himself, his perception of his potential in action, using a model of inquiry built on the assumption of a continuum between the stance of *agent-actor* and that of *object-spectator* (Korn, 1966), between *agens* and *patiens* (Erikson, 1964).

## CHAPTER ONE

# THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE « IMAGE », THE « SELF » AND THE « AGENT-OBJECT » MODEL OF INQUIRY

### 1. THE « IMAGE »

The image of which we are speaking lies behind the action of every individual. To recognize it, its shape, is the key to psychoanalytic understanding as well as to public opinion polling ...

But what determines the image ? It is built up as a result of all past experiences of the possessor of the image. Part of the image is the history of the image itself. At one stage, the image consists of little more than an undifferentiated blur and movement ... From the birth on, if not before, a constant stream of messages enter the organism from the senses. But we must distinguish between the image and the messages that reach it. The messages consist of informations that structure the experiences, which in turn alter the image. The meaning of a message is the change which it produces in the image (Boulding, 1966, p. 3-19, *passim*).

It can be said after Boulding that the image is our subjective knowledge, our knowledge of ourselves and of the world. It largely governs our behaviour, and we would agree with the author of *The Image* that « eiconics » (which may very well originate with George H. Mead, or perhaps even Freud) is a much needed science. The exploration of the image, conscious and unconscious, and the bringing back to consciousness of the latter is the task of the psychoanalyst. Social psychology has been eiconist almost from the start. It may be indeed that George H. Mead will have to be given credit for being the first eiconist. He has the concept of the image firmly in mind although he does not perceive, I think, the breadth and generality of the concept in the non-human « universe » (see

Boulding, 1966, p. 3-19, *passim*). Field theorists, like Kurt Lewin, clearly use the concept with all its dynamics. Economists and business administrators, along with Chester I. Barnard (1938) and Norbert Wiener (1961) have, somehow, bridged the « eiconism » of the psychoanalysts and of the social psychologists on the one hand, with that of the specialists of communications on the other. *The Functions of the Executive* and *Cybernetics* show us how far the concept of image can lead us: the executive is the centre of a control mechanism whereby through the feedback of information, divergencies from ideal values are corrected.

Behaviour, we say, depends largely on the image, because the latter shapes our identity. Identities require an « other », in and through a relationship with whom self's identity is actualized (Laing, 1962). In human societies at all levels, persons confirm one another in a practical way to some extent or other in their personal qualities, and a society may be termed human in the measure to which its members confirm one another (Buber, 1959).

## 2. THE « SELF »

We have mentioned the necessity of an « other » for the actualization of the self. But what is the self? According to George H. Mead (1913), the self cannot appear in consciousness as an « I ». It is always an object, i.e. a « Me ». But what is involved in the self being an object? An object involves a subject. « Stated in other words ... a Me is inconceivable without an I. » But again, an I is a presupposition, never a presentation of conscious experience, for « the moment it is presented, it has passed into the objective case, presuming, if you like, an I that observes but an I that can disclose himself only by ceasing to be the subject for whom the object Me exists » (p. 374).

In fact, the self appearing as I

... is the memory image of the self who acted toward himself and is the same self who acts toward other selves. On the other hand, the stuff that goes to make up the Me whom the I addresses and whom he observes is the experience which is induced by this action of the I. If the I speaks, the Me hears. If the I strikes, the Me feels the blow (p. 375).

The part that others play in the emergence and the shaping of the self is magnificently described in the following passage of a later work of George H. Mead (1934):



The individual experiences himself as such, not directly, but only indirectly, from the particular standpoints of other individual members of the same social group, or from the generalized standpoint of the social group as a whole to which he belongs. For he enters his own experience as a self or individual, not directly or immediately, not by becoming a subject to himself, but only in so far as he first becomes an object to himself ... and he [does so ...] only by taking the attitudes of other individuals toward himself within a social environment or context of experience and behaviour, in which both he and they are involved (p. 138).

Hence, « self-images » are necessarily « social images »:

The self, as that which can be an object to itself, is essentially a social structure, and it arises in social experiences. After a self has arisen, it in a certain sense, provides for itself its social experiences, and so we can conceive of an absolutely solitary self. But it is impossible to conceive of a self arising outside of social experiences ... (p. 140).

And that « social experience » goes as far as controlling the self thinking and acting:

It is in the form of the generalized other that the social process influences the behaviour of the individuals involved in it and carrying it on, i.e. that the community exercises control over the conduct of its individual members; for it is in this form that the social process or community enters as a determining factor into the individual's thinking (p. 155).

We owe to Cooley (1964) the concept of the « looking-glass self » which approximates as closely as possible the « reciprocity » of the process which goes on in the building up of self-images:

In a very large and interesting class of cases the social reference takes the form of a somewhat definite imagination of how one's self — that is any idea he approximates — appears in a particular mind and the kind of self feeling one has is determined by the attitude toward this attributed to that other mind. A social self of this sort might be called the reflected or looking-glass self:

« Each to other a looking-glass  
Reflects the other that doth pass ».

As we see our face, figure and dress in the glass and are interested in them because they are ours, and pleased or otherwise with according as they do or do not answer to what we would like them to be: so in imagination we perceive in another's mind some thought of our appearance, manners, aims, deeds, character, friends, and so on, and we are variously affected by it. A self idea of this sort seems to have three principal elements: the imagination

of our appearance and some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification (p. 183-184).

Cooley becomes critical about his comparison with the looking-glass and its limitations:

The comparison with a looking-glass hardly suggests the second element, the imagined judgment, which is quite essential. The thing that moves us to pride or shame is not the mere mechanical reflection of ourselves but an imputed sentiment, the imagined effect of this reflection on the other's mind. This is evident from the fact that the character and weight of that other, in whose mind we see ourselves, makes all the difference with our feeling. We are ashamed to seem evasive in the presence of a brave one, gross in the eyes of a refined one, and so on. We always imagine, and in imagining, share the judgments of the other mind (p. 184).

The individual, we have seen, enters his own experience not as a subject (to himself) but insofar as he becomes an object to himself and he does this, according to Mead, by taking the attitudes of others towards himself, as if someone else were responding to him. Discussing Mead's theory of the self and the genesis of the latter, Professor Korn (1966) summarizes it boldly: « How [does] the infant achieve its sense of self [?] How did [he] come to associate a certain body and its actions with the idea of *Me*? » (p. 73), and the answer takes us back to the image and the identity concepts: « Mead's answer is outrageously obvious: You come to know who you are by taking the attitude of someone *who knew who you were long before you did* » (p. 73). What are the « nuances », the differences between the self described by Mead (1934), the self circumscribed by Cooley (1964) and the sense of identity referred to by Erikson (1956)?

It has not escaped the reader that the term identity covers much of what has been called the self by a variety of workers be it in the form of a self-concept (G.H. Mead, 1931), of self-esteem (H.S. Sullivan, 1942), or in that of fluctuating self-experiences described by Schilder (1938), Federn (1914) and others ...

Hartmann has circumscribed this general area more clearly when in discussing the so-called libidinal cathexis of the ego in narcissism he comes to the conclusion that it is rather a self which is thus being cathected. He advocates a term « self-representation » as differentiated from « object representation ». This self-representation was, less systematically, anticipated by Freud in his occasional references, to the ego's « attitude toward the self » and to

fluctuating cathexes bestowed upon this self in labile states of « self-esteem ».

In this paper we are concerned with the genetic continuity of such self-representation — a continuity which must lastly be ascribed to the work of ego (Erikson, 1956, p. 73).

Hence, we suggest, the « I » and the « Me » which constitute the « self » are actualized through images. Self-images cultivated during all the childhood stages

... gradually prepare the sense of identity, beginning with that earliest mutual recognition of and by another face which the ethnologists have made us look for in our human beginnings. Their findings properly transposed into the human condition may throw new light on the identity-giving power of the eyes and the face which first recognize you (Erikson, 1964, p. 94).

Yet, as Erikson (1964) points out, « the eyes and the face which first recognize you (give you your first Anstehen) can also negate you, be at the origin of the dreaded estrangement, the « loss of face ». To be a person, identical to oneself, presupposes a basic trust in one's origins — and the courage to emerge from them » (p. 95). In our opinion this negative identity is part of a specific genesis of antisocial conduct.

Adelaïde Johnson and S.A. Szurek (1952) have shown how the child identifies spontaneously, not with the norms which his educators propose to him, but with the confidence or the distrust they subtly imply, while asking him to conform.

Following Erikson's and Johnson and Szurek's genetic trends, Mailloux and Lavallée (1962) speak of an identity leading to the « *sentiment d'une dévalorisation définitive* » (p. 108) in the delinquent as the major and focal dynamic source of antisocial behaviour.

*Bref, en insinuant à un enfant qu'il est un propre à rien, n'ayant d'inclinations et d'aptitudes que pour mal agir, alors même que l'image qu'il se fait de soi coïncide encore avec celle d'un agent dont toute la valeur dépend de son efficacité, on tue dans l'œuf un moi qui s'apprêtait à se forger une identité sociale et à fournir un apport unique au bien commun (p. 108).*

Mailloux and Lavallée's interpretation of Erikson's concept of « negative identity » seems to lean on the metaphysical distinction *l'être vs. l'agir*. That essentialist and moralistic view does not have much to do with the phenomenological stand taken by the author of our model of inquiry, Richard R. Korn (1966) — the agent: « *I am what I can do* » (p. 77-78). But we will try later on to interpret our data in the light of these two

schools of thought, showing how Mailloux and Lavallée on the one hand, Korn on the other, can both rely upon Erikson's epigenetic schema.

### 3. THE «AGENT-OBJECT» MODEL OF INQUIRY

Our main hypothesis is that women, in general, and in all male-dominated societies were subjected to a pattern of instrumentality (objectification, reification) to which they could adapt themselves by aiming at either end of a continuum (Ludovici, 1965) going from the « pleasure-giver » to the « mother-goddess », depending upon their degree of socialization, i.e. their relative capacity or incapacity to form positive identifications *and* to conform to socially acceptable patterns of womanhood. While, on the one hand, this pattern of « instrumentality » deprived them of the capacity to perceive themselves as « agents », and made of them ideal « objects » and victims, it also deprived society, caught in its own cultural cobweb, of the possibility of effectively sanctioning their antisocial and illegal actions: women's misdeeds can very well be instrumental, i.e. functional for male-dominated societies.

*Yet, we hypothesize, while « normal women », (conforming to the societal norms) in return for their submissive acceptance of their socially ascribed instrumentality, experience a sort of limited regency over a domain carefully delineated by men, antisocial, delinquent females, much more than their masculine peers, will be objectified by their subgroups and by society as a whole, and their self-image will tend to be that of « things », « accidents », « toys », « instruments » used and misused, at will. Even if they sometimes and for a short while feel like powerful instigators of some acts, they are always deprived of its authorship.*

To test such assumption, we decided to use a model of inquiry devised by Korn (1966) in his book to be published: *Psychopathology as Experience and Action*, by way of a questionnaire (see *supra*, p. 85). Although it had been designed for the testing of progress in the recovery of mentally-ill persons, this model suited our purposes for two main reasons: 1) It permitted a direct, free, projective type of expression on personal and other crucial issues. 2) It met our need for measuring specifically the perception of our subjects as « instruments », as objects, as victims to whom things happen, as compared with agents having some power over events and persons.

On the level of reported experience, the distinction between these two polarities of self-orientation may be expressed in terms of the following (global) phenomenological formulae:

Object-Spectator: « All I can do is observe what happens to me ».

Agent-Actor: « I can affect what happens to me by doing something about it » (Korn, 1966).

A dichotomy close to that structured by Korn had been devised earlier by Erickson (1964).

*Agens* is the opposite of *patiens* and we will use this opposition here in order to give additional meaning to such terms as « passive » and « active », and to free them from such connotations as aggressive and submissive, male and female. *Patiens*, then, would denote a state of being exposed from within or from without to superior forces which cannot be overcome without prolonged patience or energetic and redeeming help; while *agens* connotes an inner state of being unbroken in initiative and of acting in the service of a cause which sanctions this initiative. You will see immediately that the stage of *agens* is what all clients, or patients, in groups or alone are groping for and need our help to achieve. But it is also clear that we are not speaking of a condition of overt activity, but of an inner state which we conceptualize as active tension in the ego (p. 87).

The « agent » and the « spectator » described by Korn have much in common with Erikson's *agens* and *patiens*. Yet, methodologically, the former are easier to put into operation.

Korn (1966) underlines two characteristics of the self experience (which can arise in one or more of three modes: sensation, image, concepts): its components appear to have a reciprocal relationship, but they also appear to be highly variable in their reciprocal dimensions. An expansion in the dimension of one implies a contraction in the other.

Under strong emotional stress the person may be forced into a spectator rôle with respect to his own thoughts, feelings and actions. Under severe stress I cannot control my feelings: they happen, they emerge, they suddenly become part of the universe I have no agency over; they are no longer within the circle of my « I » (p. 77).

The « I which reacts to the self arises through the taking of the attitudes of others » (Mead, 1934, p. 174) while the « *Me* arises [originally] as a reflection of the orientations of others to me » (Korn, 1966, p. 75). Although Korn describes a certain contraction of the « I » as a painful sense of being appraised

by others and a feeling of helplessness ending in mechanical conformity to the bad expectations of others (p. 78) and hence implies that such an expansion of the « Me » produces the feeling of being reduced to passive objects or spectators; and although he clearly describes such a contraction-expansion (contraction of the « I », expansion of the « Me ») as pathological, he also says: « the extent to which one can act as an agent in his own fate is realistically determined by the ratio of the totality of *what he can do* in the face of the totality of *what can be done to him* » (p. 78). He adds that besides reality factors, the extent of what we can do is determined by our sense of adequacy as agents (p. 79). This is where his idea of the mediation of experiences through the modality of concepts and especially through a system of self-concept finds its place: « *what I feel I am and how I see myself is mediated by what I know I am* » (p. 79).

Social culture of course controls, through the rearing of the child, the reciprocal dimensions of the self-as-agent — the I — and the self-as-object — the Me — (p. 80), and later on in this work, when comparing the self-perception of adolescents from different cultures, we will be in a position to confirm to some extent the cultural differences in the reciprocal dimensions of the « I » and the « Me ». If one experiences to the utmost the expansion of the me-as-object, he comes to believe that everything happening around him is *personally* significant, i.e. is happening to him. As Korn points out: « The ideas of reference manifested by the paranoid schizophrenic fulfill this prediction » (p. 84). If the opposite happens, if the I expands to the utmost

... I become an active part of everything that is happening. In the one situation the external environment closes in and presses the active self to virtual extinction ... In the other case, the I-as-Agent actively intrudes itself in an ecstatic transcendence of the boundaries and becomes one-with-the object (p. 84).

Yet, in the state of self-transcendence, an aspect of self-consciousness is lost « but it is the Me which is lost, not the I » (p. 85). Hence, while the agent or the self is oriented predominantly as an I can *do*, the spectator or the « Me-oriented » self can only watch. Yet, if we interpret correctly Korn's conceptualizations of his model, unless the self as a whole remains able to organize smoothly, with suppleness, the inter-exchange

between its two modalities and to alter its relative dimensions according to reality situations, self-consciousness, in some way, can be lost. The self as agent *can*. The self as object not only is confined to watch because *he can't* — resorting to indifference, withholding, not venturing — but he may also be compelled to act because *he must*, in which case he uses, imposes and acts out. « I can't because of something that has happened or will happen to me » or « I must or *else* something worse will happen ». Having now summarized the major theoretical considerations on which rests the agent-object model of inquiry, let us now proceed to the description of the experimentation.

## CHAPTER TWO

# APPLICATION OF THE AGENT-OBJECT MODEL OF INQUIRY

### A. THE PRELIMINARY PHASE

It was felt that a pre-experimentation would be useful in order to acculturate the instrument, check on the wording, decide upon the method of administration (individual, small or large groups, written, oral), be able to predict the major resistances, especially with criminals and delinquents, and when feasible, overcome such obstacles by proper preparation and attitudes. The content analysis would also give some indication as to the appropriateness of the questionnaire for our purposes. The questions were the following:

- 1 (a) What has been, according to you, the most important step or most important decision you have taken in the last three years ?
  - (b) Why did you do it ?
- 2(a) Which man or which woman has done the most harm to humanity in the last twenty years ?
  - (b) What did he or she do ?
  - (c) Why did he or she do it ?
- 3(a) Which man or which woman has done the most good to humanity or has been its greatest benefactor, in the last twenty years ?
  - (b) What did he or she do ?
  - (c) Why did he or she do it ?

The preliminary inquiry was done in three major steps. The first consisted of individual or small group interviews with parents of delinquents, probation officers, directors of penal institutions and of reeducation centres, university professors and teachers and directors of colleges for boys and girls. It was



at this stage that an objection was raised by the people working with delinquents and criminals regarding questions 2 and 3 which they considered too academic for the state of knowledge of their teenagers or adult criminals.

#### MODIFICATION OF THE ORIGINAL FORM

At the pre-experimentation level, we noticed that group A, made up of non-delinquent girls, responded eagerly to question 1, but that the interest dropped with question 2. There was no verbal protest but four of the girls left that question unanswered, and two of them did the same with question 3.

Group B, made up of delinquent girls, protested vehemently when coming to question 2. Some threw away their questionnaire. One of the girls said that she did not know the names of persons who would have done great harm to humanity, or if she did she would not know how to spell these names, or exactly what these people had done. However, some of the girls (three or four) were already working on the question. But finally, one of those who had discarded the questionnaire after page 1 said: « If you would ask me who has done the most harm to me, that I could answer ! ». The majority of the girls agreed with that remark, and one of them asked: « Can we answer that, in place ? ». The inquirer agreed, provided that those who wanted to answer the original questions 2 and 3 would do so.

Group B needed more than half an hour to finish with the questionnaire. All along, interactions were going on, between the girls and the experimenter, and among the girls. Some testees needed help to phrase their answer. Others wanted to know if the authorities of the institution would see their test. Others wondered if they could mention names, when they were writing about persons who had harmed them, etc.

The original questionnaire was also applied to boys. More than half of the non-delinquents answered quickly to questions 2 and 3, but the remaining ones resisted giving any one name, pleading ignorance, if not of the name itself, at least of the actual deeds of the person and his alleged reasons for his action. We then reported what had been suggested by the girls and all the boys decided to answer, either impersonally (original form) or personally (« who has done the most harm to me ? ») or both. With the delinquents, we proposed at once the modified question 2 and question 3 in the presentation of

the test and let them choose between the two types of questions. Twelve out of fifteen boys decided to write on their personal « enemies » and ten on their personal benefactors.

From then on, we used the following formulation for questions 2 and 3:

2(a) Which man or which woman has done the most harm to humanity in the last twenty years ?

or Which man or which woman has done *you* the most harm ?

(b) What did he or she do ?

(c) Why did he or she do it ?

3(a) Which man or which woman has done the most good to humanity or has been its greatest benefactor in the last twenty years ?

or Which man or which woman has done *you* the most good or has been your greatest benefactor ?

(b) What did he or she do ?

(c) Why did he or she do it ?

We also devised a sheet of « social notes » that was to serve many purposes. We wanted to keep track of the following variables: age, sex, marital status, schooling and « institutionalization » versus socialization, which we tried to find out by simple questions on the integrity of the family, whether living together or apart, early placements and displacements, etc.

#### SOME CONCLUSIONS

##### ARISING FROM THE PRE-EXPERIMENTATION

The content analysis brought the following conclusion: the test was revealing, i.e. elicited answers which permitted a categorization according to the agent-object model of inquiry; moreover, the general trends toward one or toward the other end of the continuum exhibited by the short answers to the « whys » proved to be consistent with the overall attitudes of the testees. In fact, we saw all but three of the girls of group A and group B in private interviews, at their request, and in a very open type of relationship and verbalization, checked our scores. It was also possible with the permission of the delinquent boys and the delinquent girls to discuss their answers with their *rééducateurs*.

Not only did we find out that the material elicited by the test was valid, consistent and pertinent, but in many cases the *éducateurs* mentioned that their girls or boys had revealed more of themselves through the answers to our three questions

than they had shown up in some three or four weeks of life at the reception centres. Except for one case (a delinquent girl) the subjects had been thorough and open.

Differences between boys and girls, between delinquents and non-delinquents could be detected on the basis of the « agent-object » model of inquiry. The analysis of the *modus operandi* led us to establish the following procedures:

1) Questions 2 and 3 (impersonal original form) could and should be doubled by personal ones as suggested by the delinquent girls.

2) The questionnaire could be administered to small groups.

3) Interactions between the testees and the experimenter seemed favourable to a more open type of answering. It helped overcome resistances.

4) Additional support and motivation could be provided for delinquents who mistrust themselves regarding their degree of knowledge and their adequacy when facing any type of « exams ».

5) The protocol (the formal presentation of the test) should be very simple and *adapted* to the age, educational background and degree of socialization of the testees.

## B. CODIFICATION OF THE ANSWERS

The answers given to the « whys » in our questionnaire are the key to our coding. We decided to score:

1) « A » (agent): answers whose authors clearly saw themselves as able to affect things that were happening to them (question 1 [see Korn, 1966, p. 71-93]), and who saw the malefactors (question 2) and the benefactors (question 3) as free persons, « unbroken in initiative » (Erikson, 1964, p. 87), aiming decidedly toward certain goals of their own.

2) « O » (object): answers whose authors implied that things were happening to them (question 1 [see Korn, 1966, p. 71-93]), and who perceived malefactors (question 2) and benefactors (question 3) as « being exposed from within or from without to superior forces » (Erikson, 1964, p. 87). Authors of that type of answer tended to rely upon circumstances to act for themselves (question 1) and to explain the conduct of authors (questions 2 and 3) in terms of their sickness, irrepressible impulses or as commanded by their rôle.

3) « AO » and « OA »: while some 70% of the answers

belonged to the clear-cut categories mentioned above, there remained some 20 to 25% which could be interpreted in either way because their authors gave more than one reason (for instance, some testees indicated in answer to question 1 that they had taken a major step first because they felt it was in correspondence with their aspirations, goals, aptitudes, tastes, and secondly because of favourable circumstances). At the pre-experimentation stage and during the first part of the experimentation itself, we took care to score these ambivalent answers « AO » and « OA ». Yet, further on, when coming to a final code for the computer, with the help of four « judges » we decided to reduce that subcategory to the two first ones, for three main reasons: a) The categorization in « A » and « O » is indicative of trends or orientations rather than crystallized states. b) A careful analysis of the ambivalent answers more often than not showed a preponderance toward one pole of the dichotomy. Some « whys » were loaded with adverbs, while others were formulated as accessory motives. c) When two reasons of seemingly equal importance were given we took care, at the pre-experimentation phase and during the first part of the experimentation, to check in private interviews with their authors what they really meant and whether some movement toward one or the other end of the continuum could be detected. In a very few cases, we obeyed the rule that the first reason given was the most spontaneous, the preponderant, and the second, an afterthought.

4) « *No decision ever taken* », « *no reason* », « *no one* » or « *nobody* »: some 2 to 3% of the answered questionnaires raised problems of interpretation other than those posed by ambivalence. To question 1 it occurred, though very seldom, that respondents in the space provided for explaining why a major decision had been taken wrote: « *no special reason* ». That was the case mainly within our delinquent and criminal population. « *No decision ever taken* » is to be found very seldom in our questionnaires, some 0.5%, among younger respondents. A greater proportion of testees said « *no one* » or « *nobody* » in answer to question 2 and question 3. The latter (« *no one has ever done any good to humanity and/or to me* ») is to be found mainly among criminals and delinquents as we will see later.

5) « *No answer* »: absence of answer to question 1, question 2 and question 3, pages left blank, names given without

any special deed mentioned or further on without any reason at question 2 and question 3, were scored « no answer ». Interesting differences will show up under that heading when we put these absences of answers in correlation with variables such as ethnic origin, sex, age, etc. In certain ethnic groups, particularly the German, the « blanks » left at question 2 and the overt rejection of that question render statistical inferences difficult and are certainly significant.

### C. HYPOTHESES

Our main hypotheses previous to the application of the agent-object model of inquiry were the following:

#### 1. CONCERNING THE SEX

We expected men to answer the questionnaire in a significantly different way than women. It has been assumed earlier in this work that western societies are male-dominated (Ludovici, 1965). This is the kind of gross assertion that does not take care of tenuous, but real cultural differences within a hypothetical occidental « unit », nor does it account for the special way sweeping changes and great transformations affect, and differently so, particular societies and their female subgroup.

Yet, according to Morris Zelditch (1955, p. 307-352), there would be certain more or less universal differences between the masculine and feminine rôles. Starting from a theoretical distinction established by Talcott Parsons and from observations made in fifty-six societies, Zelditch finds that the husband seems more apt to play an instrumental rôle, to act as the leader in the economic field and to exercise the final authority, especially in matters of discipline and education concerning the children, while the rôle of the mother would be more one of expression tending to the resolution of conflicts, the expression of feelings, the giving of support.

#### 2. DELINQUENTS VS. NON-DELINQUENTS

Following Matza's hypothesis on the « mood of fatalism » — « ... the negation of the sense of active mastery over one's environment » (1964, p. 189) which culminates in the feeling of being « pushed around », a feeling which characterizes the delinquent — we nevertheless are aware of the fact that when experiencing desperation, delinquents wish to undo such an unpleasant and undesired state of being. « They seek, in other

words, to restore the mood of humanism in which the self is experienced as a cause — the state in which man himself makes things happen ... » (1964, p. 189), and that can be accomplished, ironically enough, by committing an infraction.

Clearly, infractions do not exhaust the acts that may dramatically restore the humanistic mood. [But] whatever other risks are entailed, the risk of deepening the fatalistic mood is absent in infraction. Delinquents may succeed in committing a theft or burglary by getting away with it, or they may fail and be apprehended, but in either case they have demonstrably made things happen (1964, p. 190).

Hence, for Matza, the delinquent is sometimes *drifting*, sometimes *acting*. The fatalism, the despair described by Matza, is also one of the main themes of Mailloux and Lavallée (1962) in their study of the genesis and meaning of antisocial conduct. Speaking of the loss of self-esteem which results from the confusion instilled in the delinquent by the parents who do not distinguish between a « wrong act » and « being wicked », the authors add that that loss of self-esteem « *se traduit] bientôt par une attitude de désespoir* » (p. 108). We expected delinquents and criminals to express, in answer to our questionnaire, a lesser capacity (than the non-delinquents of their age) to perceive themselves as agents.

Yet, we were doubtful as to the undifferentiated applicability of such an assumption to delinquents of all age groups and to female delinquents. a) Among detected delinquents a sense of failure and incapacity to act and do something about themselves and others even in way of infractions can very well be ingrained by consecutive arrests, imprisonments, etc., by which society responds to the delinquent's attempt to do something. In other words, we hypothesize that the aging criminal develops a sense of impotence. b) Female delinquents, and especially adult women, would be the most « object-like » part of our population.

While the woman who stands at the positive end of the continuum, the non-delinquent, the « mother-goddess » can very well be, and as a matter of fact is, « objectified » in many respects, we hypothesize that she nevertheless at some point becomes conscious of the power granted to her by the fact that she serves explicit, overt functions of society, such as procreating, child-rearing, housekeeping, family relations, etc. She creates for herself realms, areas of power (the budget for instance) additional or complementary to the traditional ones

and easy to conquer over a husband who is so often absent from the family life.

But the same does not apply to the woman who stands at the other end of the continuum or towards it, the « pleasure-giver ». She is serving *latent, implicit* functions of society and whatever real power she may gain and exercise in her rôle, *it will not and cannot be recognized overtly*, or else society has to render those goals explicit, and has to reward the rôle-players, e.g. legalize prostitution, abortion, etc. Hence, in addition to the instrumentality to which the normal woman is subjected in a male-dominated society, the delinquent female, we hypothesize, will see herself as an object twice or three times as often as the normal man. In fact, she is an object, an instrument, a thing, in most of the offences in which she takes part (in prostitution for the client, the souteneur, etc., in burglaries and thefts where her indiscretions are needed and where she plays rôles behind the desk, in major crimes where she is used to furnish alibies to the main authors, etc.). Even her real active rôle will be denied by the lesser severity of the sentence given to her as against the one a male offender would get.

*Hence, we hypothesize, we will find a great number of « objects » among adult female criminals and a self-perception as victims. The tendency to see oneself as a victim, which is characteristic of the criminal and the young delinquent, and to make someone or anyone the scapegoat, could find a way of expressing itself in answer to questions 2 and 3. We had hypothesized that criminals and delinquents could see the malefactor as an actor.*

### 3. CONCERNING THE AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

*... tout se passe comme si, plus qu'un âge de la vie, la jeunesse était un phénomène de classe, une enfance indéument prolongée, un sursis d'irresponsabilité ... (Sartre, 1949, p. 135).*

The therapeutic and functional approaches have often tended to assimilate juvenile delinquency and teenage culture. Our approach is radically different.

*Dans les sociétés traditionnelles, l'éducation des adolescents était assez simple: il s'agissait de les préparer aux rôles qu'ils devaient occuper plus tard; ces rôles de mari, de mère, d'agriculteur ne variaient pas beaucoup avec les générations. Or, dans nos sociétés contemporaines, ces rôles sont sans cesse redéfinis (Rioux, 1966, p. 15).*

Teenagers know that their adult life will differ from that of their parents. They keep away from adults.

*Un des indices les plus sûrs de rupture entre générations dont plusieurs observateurs font état, c'est justement l'absence relative de rébellion contre les parents. Les jeunes sont beaucoup plus portés à se retirer dans le monde qu'ils se sont créé plutôt que de combattre des parents auxquels ils savent dès maintenant qu'ils ne ressembleront pas* (Rioux, 1966, p. 15).

Today, adults try to look young, to think as teenagers, to be young. The post-industrial society may very well need the characteristics of the teenagers for its adults and that would explain partially what Rioux calls *néoténie*. Juvenile characteristics such as spontaneity, pliability and readiness seem much more functional for present-day society than the traditional attributes of adulthood: stability, if not rigidity. In Quebec especially, the polarization between young and adult people assumes a fundamental importance because the other major polarizations — between peasants and city dwellers, *bourgeois* and *prolétaires* — are very dim.

Indeed, in the type of society that mankind is entering, « *quels sont les groupes qui nous apparaissent comme les plus dynamiques, quels sont les groupes qui incarnent les conflits les plus profonds de la société, quels sont les groupes qui, par leur action, vont faire changer la société et qui ont déjà commencé de la faire changer?* » (Rioux, 1966, p. 13). With Marcel Rioux we assume that the intergenerational conflict has replaced that which formerly opposed peasant to urban people, *bourgeois* to *prolétaires*. C.W. Mills had also come to think that youth perhaps constituted and replaced the class phenomenon of the first stages of industrial society.

*Il est bien évident, d'après les analyses de Wright Mills lui-même, que partout dans le tiers monde, les jeunes ont joué et continuent de jouer un rôle de premier plan dans les mouvements de libération nationale et dans les révolutions sociales. Là, comme dans les sociétés développées, la jeunesse semble constituer l'élément le plus actif de contestation et de revendication* (Rioux, 1966, p. 16).

Coming back to our « agent-object » model, we had hypothesized that young people in general would tend to see themselves more often than the adults of the same category (non-delinquents with non-delinquents, delinquents with delinquents, girls as against women, boys as against men and within the same cultural boundaries) as *agents*, as « unbroken



in initiative » (Erikson, 1964, p. 87). In summary: girls and boys would resemble their cultural, sexual and non-delinquent or delinquent peers, but would elicit answers showing a significantly greater capacity to see themselves as agents than older respondents.

#### D. DESCRIPTION OF THE POPULATION

One thousand one hundred and sixteen persons (1 116) were submitted to the test questionnaire (see *infra*, p. 85, 87), between August and December, 1966, in their own language, French, English, Flemish and German. The distribution of our population is provided in Table 1.

TABLE 1  
Distribution of the population

Subjects	Ethnic origin	Sex		Age		Delinquency	
		Male	Female	Adult	Juvenile	Delinquent	Non-delinquent
Canadians	711	411	300	261	450	471	240
Belgians	227	124	103	—	227	107	120
French	123	63	60	—	123	65	58
Germans	55	31	24	—	55	—	55
Total		<u>629</u>	<u>487</u>	<u>261</u>	<u>855</u>	<u>643</u>	<u>473</u>
Grand total	1 116	1 116		1 116		1 116	

#### DELINQUENTS IN INSTITUTION

The self-perception of delinquents in institution could very well be a reflection of the culture of the institution, depending on the length of the stay and depending also on the strength of the reeducational process and its impact on the inmate. Hence, in addition to delinquents serving sentences, we tested newly incarcerated ones. That was possible in Canada and in France, but only with juveniles. For legal and administrative reasons, governors of prisons would not let us have access to *prévenus* (accused).

#### THE CONTROL GROUPS

We did not think that a rigid matching procedure applied to our study with regard to the selection of the control groups.

After having paired the ages and the socio-economic variables with those found in the criminal and delinquent groups, we were still left with a number of possibilities for choice. We decided to test a category of people who, in recent studies, are called « judges » of delinquents and criminals (Szabo *et al.*, 1964, p. 81).

To match the French-Canadian adult criminals, we went to a School of Social Welfare where an undergraduate course in public assistance and probation, at the technical level, is taught at night and in which week-end courses are given to people already working in those fields. The educational background may be minimal (11th grade) and the adults belong to the upper lower class, with the exception of a small group of lower middle class, married women coming back to work. These « judges » range from 22 to 55 years of age. Their school is called: *École d'aide sociale de Montréal*.

To match the population of French-Canadian young delinquents, we selected groups of students in education in the *École normale* of a very small town in the northern part of the Province. (The majority of the delinquents in institutions come from outside the region of Montreal.) The school is called: *École normale Monseigneur-Labrie* and is located in Hauterive, Co. Saguenay, Quebec.

The English-speaking non-delinquent Canadians were all taken from the same milieu: Sir George William's University, which receives students of the lower middle class and upper middle class. Adults and juveniles are students in psychology and education, the first following night courses and coming from all professions and trades, the second being full-time undergraduate students. Sir George William's was picked as a last possibility for experimentation after we had made many unsuccessful attempts at getting into schools equivalent to those chosen for the French Canadians.

The educational background of the English-speaking control groups is somewhat higher than that of the French-speaking ones, but that reflects the reality situation, between French and English Canada.

## CHAPTER THREE

# ANALYSIS OF THE VARIABLES

The computer of the University of Montreal (Fortran language) was fed with 1 116 cards representing each of the subjects tested before the end of December, 1966. It was programmed to give a symmetrical matrix of interassociation. The variables were the following: ethnic origin, sex, age, delinquency, education, socialization, « institution » and marital status, playing on the basic dichotomy: agent vs. object, the keys to which were the answers to questions 1, 2 and 3 of the test. The program was to elicit significant  $\chi^2$  and coefficients of contingency between the variables.

## THE VARIABLES

*Ethnic origin:* The testees belonged to the following groups: French Canadians, Anglo-Canadians; French-speaking and Flemish-speaking Belgians; French (from France); and Germans.

*Sex:* Male and female.

*Age:* Our subjects were divided into two categories with regard to their age: juvenile (under 18) and adult (18 and over).

*Delinquency:* Our population is made up of delinquents vs. non-delinquents. The former have been arrested, tried and sentenced. Among the Canadian juvenile delinquents, a sample is made of arrested youngsters awaiting their trial. The non-delinquents have no official record.

*Education:* Our testees are distributed in three main cat-

egories according to the number of years they had completed in school. Those having: primary education (0-7 inclusively), secondary (7-13 inclusively) and university (13 and over).

*Socialization*: The sheet of social notes provided us with informative material based on the testee's perception regarding his own socialization. The criterion was the following: if the subject said that he had lived throughout his early childhood (0-7) in what he considered a complete and intact family, we rated him « socialized ». Through his perception, we tried to evaluate the family integrity. Early placements and displacements, the death or separation of the parents, were weighed according to the time at which they occurred, plus the subject's own perception of their importance.

« *Institution* »: That variable was considered only in relation with our group of juvenile delinquents. We wanted to oppose a category of testees having spent some time in rehabilitation centres to persons newly arrested and awaiting their trial.

*Marital status*: A first attempt at distributing the population according to its marital status was made of the following categories: single, married, divorced, separated, widower and common law. But many tables showing figures too small to lead to inference, we re-grouped in the following way: 1) single, widowers, divorced (when not remarried); 2) married, divorced and remarried; 3) separated and common law.

## RESULTS OF THE INQUIRY

Our results will be commented on in two sections. The first one will deal with our Canadian population because some of the variables play in that group only, namely: age, marital status and « institution ». The European population will be analyzed in the second section.

### A. THE CANADIAN POPULATION

How similar are our experiments and controls? French-Canadian and Anglo-Canadian subjects? Men and women? Adults and juveniles? Table 2 will show these similitudes and differences through the analysis of the degree of significance of the variables, one being held constant at a time.

TABLE 2  
Picture of the Canadian population under study

Constant	Variables	Level of significance ( $\chi^2$ )	Direction
ethnic origin	sex	non significant	Anglo-Canadians more socialized
	age	non significant	
	delinquency	non significant	more Anglo-Canadians among people in institution, proportionately
	socialization	0.02 <sup>a</sup>	
	institution	0.01	
sex	age	0.01	more adults among men
	delinquency	0.01	more delinquents among women
	socialization	non significant	
	institution	non significant	
age	delinquency	0.01	more delinquents among juveniles
	socialization	non significant	implicit — variable playing only in the case of juveniles
	institution		
	marital status		implicit
education	ethnic origin	0.01	more primary, but more university people among Anglo-Canadians — 2/3rds of the French Canadians: secondary
	sex	0.01	more females among university subjects
	age	0.01	implicit
	delinquency	0.01	no primary among non-delinquents — no university among delinquents
	socialization	0.001	non-socialized: no university education
marital status	sex	0.01	more married men — more single women
	delinquency	0.01	more single and separated among delinquents
	age	0.001	implicit

<sup>a</sup> The percentages are always > the degree of significance stated.

TABLE 3

Percentages of agents, objects, no answer and no one  
in the Canadian population

	Agents	Objects	No answer	No one
question 1	49 <sup>a</sup>	48	3	—
question 2	40	44	14	2
question 3	64	23	11	2

<sup>a</sup> Rounded up percentages.

As we can see in Table 3, our population is nearly evenly distributed between agents and objects in question 1. In question 2 (person who has done the most harm to humanity or to you), testees have a tendency to consider the malefactor more as one object, driven by inner or outer forces. It is in question 2 that respondents feel less at ease, resist most. As we will see later, question 2 could be considered as an independent variable because of the high degree of significance of differences between the variables. Question 3 loads our results with « agents ». Testees project easily a sense of agency into the benefactors, impersonal or personal. The object-like were seen as imprisoned in their rôles, duties, functions (« must »).

In Table 4, we see that « delinquency » discriminates on all three questions and so do « education » and « institution ». Yet, the  $\chi^2$  for « age » and « ethnic origin » are heavier. « Delinquency » does not operate constantly throughout the test. Non-delinquents answer more as agents to question 1, while delinquents project themselves as agents on questions 2 and 3. « Education » also works differently according to the question. Testees with secondary education show more agency in questions 1 and 2; the less educated are the more agent in question 3. « Institution » is the only variable which discriminates in the same direction at all three questions. People awaiting their trial in reception centres are always more agent than those in rehabilitation centres. Yet, as mentioned above, that variable applies only to a subcategory of testees: delinquents and juveniles.

#### 1. ETHNIC ORIGIN AS A CONSTANT

Table 5 demonstrates that, in question 1, when ethnic origin is taken as a constant, four variables show significance

TABLE 4

Degree of significance of the variables at each question  
in the Canadian population

	Discriminating variables	Level of significance	More agent <sup>a</sup>
question 1	ethnic origin	> 0.05 <sup>b</sup>	French-Canadian
	delinquency	0.01	non-delinquent
	education	0.01	secondary and university
	institution	0.01	juvenile in reception centre
question 2	ethnic origin	0.01	French-Canadian
	age	0.01	juvenile
	delinquency	0.01	delinquent
	education	0.05	secondary
	institution	0.01	juvenile in reception centre
question 3	age	0.01	juvenile
	delinquency	0.01	delinquent
	education	0.02	primary
	socialization	0.02	non-socialized
	institution	0.02	juvenile in reception centre

<sup>a</sup> Further on, « plus A » will indicate a trend in the direction of agency (more agent).

<sup>b</sup> The percentages indicated throughout this chapter are always > the degree of significance stated. Hence, one should read > 0.05, except when the opposite is stated: < 0.05.

with regard to the French-Canadian population: delinquency, education, institution and marital status, but are insignificant in relation to the Anglo-Canadians, while, on the contrary, sex is highly discriminating with the Anglo-Canadians.

In question 2, delinquency and institution do not discriminate with the Anglo-Canadians, while they do with the French Canadians. Yet, the opposite is true for education. Age is less discriminating for the Anglo-Canadians than for the French Canadians.

The same applies to question 3, with regard to education. Age and delinquency, again, are less significant for the Anglo-Canadians than for the French Canadians. Institution would be more significant for the former, but 25% of the English-speaking young delinquents in institution did not answer that question, which invalidates that difference.

TABLE 5  
Ethnic origin as a constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance		A — O <sup>a</sup> direction
<i>question 1</i>			
sex	2 <sup>b</sup>	0.01	M <sup>c</sup> 51% <sup>d</sup> 43% F 27% 67%
delinquency	1	0.05	non-delinquent plus A
education	1	0.10	plus educated plus A
institution	1	0.01	reception centre plus A
marital status	1	0.05	single plus A
<i>question 2</i>			
age	1	0.01	juvenile plus A
	2	0.10	juvenile plus A
delinquency	1	0.02	delinquent plus A
education	2	0.02	plus educated plus O
institution	1	0.02	reception centre plus A
<i>question 3</i>			
age	1	0.01	juvenile plus A
	2	0.05	juvenile plus A
delinquency	1	0.01	delinquent plus A
	2	0.10	delinquent plus A
education	2	0.02	less educated plus A
socialization	1	0.05	less socialized plus A
institution	1	0.10	reception centre plus A
	2	0.05	reception centre plus A

<sup>a</sup> A = agent; O = object.

<sup>b</sup> 1 = French-Canadian; 2 = Anglo-Canadian.

<sup>c</sup> M = male; F = female.

<sup>d</sup> Rounded up percentages.

Resistance to question 2 is high in both ethnic groups:

	no answer (%)	no one (%)
1	13.41	1.58
2	15.69	2.94

In both cases, the non-delinquents are less prone to answer « nobody » than the delinquents are. Resistance to question 2, when considered in relation to education, is to be found at its maximum in both ethnic groups with the university people.



Resistance to question 3 is stated as follows:

	no answer (%)	no one (%)
1	10.26	2.17
2	11.76	2.94

Delinquents are more prone than non-delinquents to answer « no one » to the question: « Who has done the most good to humanity or to you ? ». As a matter of fact, among French Canadians, no non-delinquent answers that way, while 3.33% of the delinquents do. As for the Anglo-Canadians, the difference between delinquents and non-delinquents is also interesting (3.55% vs. 1.59%).

## 2. SEX AS A CONSTANT

As provided in Table 6, in question 1, when « sex » is kept constant, we find interesting differences between women of different ethnic origin, between female delinquent and non-delinquent and between women of different educational backgrounds. As for men, the younger are more agent, and so are the non-delinquent and the more educated. Yet, the Anglo-Canadian men do not differ significantly from French Canadians as is the case for women. Institution plays constantly as usual, in the sense of « object », both for men and women. But the marital status discriminates among men only. In question 2, six variables have a high significance for women and four for men. In three cases out of those four, the level of significance is lower for the latter. In question 3, four variables discriminate when women are considered: age, delinquency, socialization and institution. Four variables also play for men and boys: age, delinquency, education and institution, but the last only at the 0.30 level.

## 3. AGE AS A CONSTANT

When « age » is studied closely, it becomes obvious that the subcategory « juvenile » is much more prone to differentiation under the influence of intervening variables than the subcategory « adults » (see Table 7). In question 1, « juveniles » show differences on four variables out of six, when adults do so only with regard to « delinquency » and « socialization ». In question 2, the variables: ethnic origin, education and institution show significant differences for « juveniles ». None of these intervenes significantly for adults. In question 3, four variables are significant for juveniles; none of these for adults.

**TABLE 6**  
Sex as a constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance	A — O direction
<i>question 1</i>		
ethnic origin	F 0.01	1 55% <sup>a</sup> 41%
		2 27% 67%
age	M 0.05	juvenile plus A
delinquency	F 0.05	non-delinquent plus A
	M 0.10	non-delinquent plus A
education	F 0.01	secondary plus A <sup>b</sup>
	M 0.10	university plus A <sup>c</sup>
institution	F 0.05	reception centre plus A
	M 0.01	reception centre plus A
marital status	M 0.05	single plus A
<i>question 2</i>		
ethnic origin	F 0.05	1 46% 42%
		2 28% 57%
	M 0.10	1 45% 38%
		2 31% 47%
age	F 0.01	juvenile plus A
	M 0.01	juvenile plus A
delinquency	F 0.01	delinquent plus A
education	F 0.05	plus educated less A
	M 0.10	secondary plus A
socialization	F 0.05	non-socialized plus A
institution	F 0.01	reception centre plus A
	M 0.10	reception centre plus A
<i>question 3</i>		
age	F 0.01	juvenile plus A
	M 0.01	juvenile plus A
delinquency	F 0.01	delinquent plus A
	M 0.01	delinquent plus A
education	M 0.10	less educated plus A
socialization	F 0.10	non-socialized plus A
institution	F 0.01	reception centre plus A
	M 0.30	reception centre plus A

<sup>a</sup> Rounded up percentages.

<sup>b</sup> Agent: primary 29%, secondary 55% and university 46%.

<sup>c</sup> Agent: primary 49%, secondary 49% and university 59%.

TABLE 7

Age as a constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance		A - O direction
<i>question 1</i>			
ethnic origin	J <sup>a</sup>	0.02	French-Canadian plus A
sex	J	0.10	male plus A
delinquency	Ad.	0.01	non-delinquent plus A
education	J	0.02	plus educated plus A
socialization	Ad.	0.02	socialized plus A
institution	J	0.01	reception centre plus A
	Ad.	excluded	
<i>question 2</i>			
ethnic origin	J	0.01	French-Canadian plus A
education	J	0.05	secondary plus A
	Ad.	0.05	secondary plus A
institution	J	0.01	reception centre plus A
	Ad.	excluded	
<i>question 3</i>			
ethnic origin	J	0.05	French-Canadian plus A
delinquency	J	0.01	delinquent plus A
education	J	0.10	secondary plus A
socialization	J	0.10	non-socialized plus A

<sup>a</sup> J = juveniles; Ad. = adults.

#### 4. DELINQUENCY AS A CONSTANT

Table 8 permits one to observe that delinquency comes out as a very significant entity compared to non-delinquency. Out of twelve discriminating variables (three questions together), seven are significant in the case of delinquents only, as against two which are significant for both delinquents and non-delinquents. Moreover, « age » discriminates less (0.05 level) among non-delinquents than among delinquents (0.01).

#### 5. INSTITUTION AS A CONSTANT

The heading « institution » groups delinquents and criminals only, as explained before. The part of our Canadian

TABLE 8  
Delinquency as a constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance		A - O direction
<i>question 1</i>			
age	D <sup>a</sup>	0.10	juvenile plus A
education	D	0.05	secondary plus A
institution	D ND	0.01 excluded	reception centre plus A
<i>question 2</i>			
ethnic origin	D	0.02	French-Canadian plus A
sex	D	0.01	male plus A
age	D ND	0.01 0.05	juvenile plus A <sup>b</sup> juvenile plus A <sup>c</sup>
institution	D ND	0.01 excluded	reception centre plus A
<i>question 3</i>			
age	D ND	0.01 0.05	juvenile plus A juvenile plus A
institution	D ND	0.02 excluded	reception centre plus A
marital status	D	0.05	single plus A

<sup>a</sup> D = delinquent; ND = non-delinquent.

<sup>b</sup> Question 2:

	A	—	O
Ad.	30.65		50.00
J	49.28		40.63

<sup>c</sup> Question 2:

	A	—	O
Ad.	29.93		40.15
J	30.81		46.60

population which is composed of arrested criminals and delinquents is distributed as follows:

institution	adult	124
	juvenile	201
reception centre	total	325
	juvenile	146
	grand total	471

Hence the variable « delinquency » is implied in « institution » and « reception centre ». The variables « age » and « marital

status » are excluded from the population of reception centres, entirely made up of subjects under 18. Since we are now focusing on the specific object of our study, delinquency and criminality, the picture obtained under « institution » is worth being analyzed more carefully. We get a picture of that group in Table 9, keeping constant the factor institution.

TABLE 9  
Institution as a constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance	A ~ O direction
<i>question 1</i>		
age	I <sup>a</sup> 0.10	juvenile plus A
education	I 0.10	secondary plus A
<i>question 2</i>		
ethnic origin	RC 0.01	French-Canadian plus A
sex	I 0.01	female plus O
age	I 0.01	juvenile plus A
education	I 0.05	secondary plus A
socialization	RC 0.05	non-socialized plus A
<i>question 3</i>		
ethnic origin	RC 0.05	French-Canadian plus A
age	I 0.01	juvenile plus A
marital status	I 0.10	single plus A

\* I = institution; RC = reception centre.

The general make-up, in terms of *agent* and *object*, is the following (question 1):

A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)
40.31	56.00	3.69

Although there is a significant difference (0.10) between adults and juveniles in institution, the object predominance applies to both age categories:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)
adult	35.48	58.06	6.45
juvenile	43.28	54.73	1.99

That is not the case with juvenile delinquents in reception centres:

A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)
54.79	34.93	10.27

The variables: sex, ethnic origin, socialization, marital status, do not intervene significantly either in regard to people in institution, or to those in reception centres, in question 1.

In question 2, ethnic origin discriminates among youngsters in reception centres and sex is a highly significant variable for people in institution:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)
male	39.81	43.13	15.17
female	34.21	63.16	1.75

Yet the proportion of delinquent men and boys who have left question 2 unanswered, contrasting very much with the low incidence of such a resistance in women and girls, makes us wonder if the difference should not be « weighed ». In fact, the percentage of agents for both sexes is similar. Figures related to « ethnic origin », a significantly discriminating variable for the population in reception centres as well, have to be interpreted with some caution: the percentages are the following:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
French Canadian	63.56	25.42	9.32	1.69
Anglo-Canadian	39.29	35.71	17.86	7.14
total	58.90	27.40	10.96	2.74

But it can hardly be hypothesized that « no answer » or « no one » would be distributed evenly between agents and objects. On the contrary, oftentimes the formulation itself of the rejection reflects the author's incapacity to impute a responsibility to a malefactor — and even if it did not, the differences between the two groups would still remain highly significant.

« Age » also discriminates, in question 2, for people in institution. The pattern is the same as for question 1:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
adult	30.65	50.00	16.13	3.23
juvenile	42.29	50.25	6.97	.50
total	37.85	50.15	10.46	1.54

The delinquents in institution clearly tend to be more object-like, in question 2, as well as in question 1. That is not at all the pattern for delinquents in reception centres, as shown below:

A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
58.90	27.40	10.96	2.74

In question 3, the general pattern, both for delinquents in institution and those in reception centres is one of *agency*:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
total/institution	65.54	21.23	8.92	4.31
total/reception centre	77.40	10.96	10.27	1.37

But very significant differences appear between older and younger delinquents in institution:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
adult	50.00	30.65	14.52	4.84
juvenile	75.12	15.42	5.47	3.98

Juveniles are more agent, and less than half as often object. « No answer » can hardly go in either direction. The great majority of our delinquent population having chosen to answer the « personal » question (who has done *you* the most good), blank sheets may be interpreted as meaning: « I cannot figure (or remember) anyone doing any good to me », or even « No one in his right mind would do me any good », as some of our delinquents said; both types of answers belonging clearly to the « he can't » or object-like category.

In short, delinquents in institution give an « object » picture in questions 1 and 2, while our total population is evenly distributed between agents and objects in those two questions. The older criminals in institution always present a comparatively less agent picture in all three questions, whereas the image given by the younger ones in institution is much closer to an even distribution between agents and objects, and the pattern of « agency » observed in question 3 is to be attributed to the influence of *juveniles* as shown above.

#### 6. ETHNIC ORIGIN AND SEX HELD CONSTANT

Keeping constant two of our factors as we do in Table 10, we now get the following picture: a) Whereas « juveniles » in general behave more as agents in our population, French-Canadian adult females outnumber the juveniles for their « agent » self-image. b) Anglo-Canadian females as a whole are more object-like than our general population tends to be

TABLE 10  
Ethnic origin and sex held constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance	A — O direction
<i>question 1</i>		
age	1 M 0.01	juvenile plus A
	1 F 0.10	adult plus A
delinquency	2 F 0.05	non-delinquent plus A
education	1 M 0.02	university plus A
	2 F 0.05	less educated 80% O
institution	1 M 0.01	reception centre plus A
	1 F 0.02	institution plus A
	2 F 0.01	reception centre plus A
marital status	1 M 0.01	single plus A
<i>question 2</i>		
age	1 M 0.01	juvenile plus A
	1 F 0.05	juvenile plus A
	2 M 0.02	juvenile plus A
delinquency	1 F 0.01	delinquent plus A
	2 F 0.10	delinquent plus A <sup>a</sup>
education	2 M 0.10	less educated plus A <sup>b</sup>
	2 F 0.10	less educated plus A <sup>b</sup>
institution	1 M 0.05	reception centre plus A
	1 F 0.01	reception centre plus A
	2 F 0.01	reception centre plus A <sup>c</sup>
<i>question 3</i>		
age	1 M 0.01	juvenile plus A
	1 F 0.01	juvenile plus A
	2 M 0.01	juvenile plus A
	2 F 0.01	juvenile plus A
delinquency	1 M 0.01	delinquent plus A
	1 F 0.01	delinquent plus A
education	2 M 0.05	less educated plus A
socialization	1 F 0.01	non-socialized plus A
institution	1 F 0.02	reception centre plus A

<sup>a</sup> Non-delinquent: 24.24% « no answer ».

<sup>b</sup> Anglo-Canadian men and women at university level: 30% « no answer ».

<sup>c</sup> Anglo-Canadian females in institution: 33% « no answer ».

in question 1. Yet, the picture becomes alarming when we come to analyze it with regard to delinquency:



*Anglo-Canadian females (question 1)*

	A (%)	O (%)
delinquent	18.64	75.58
non-delinquent	42.42	54.55

c) Institution, up to now, has had an « object » connotation. For the first time, we have a subgroup: French-Canadian females (delinquent) which is more agent in institution than in reception centres. The influence of « age » analyzed above is clear, here. d) The influence of the age factor at question 2 becomes clearer. So does that of institution. e) Delinquency is a factor of « agency » for the *females* of both ethnic groups in question 2. f) The effect of age is obviously constant in question 3. g) Delinquency appears again as a factor of « agency » in question 3, and this time for both sexes among French Canadians. h) Education connotes « agency » in question 1, but the less educated subjects are more agent in questions 2 and 3, where Anglo-Canadians are concerned.

## 7. ETHNIC ORIGIN AND AGE HELD CONSTANT

Table 11 takes us one step further in our cluster analysis.

In question 1: a) When ethnic origin and age, combined, are put in relation with sex, it becomes clear that French-Canadian adult females behave in a unique way. b) The influence of « delinquency » as a discriminating variable is limited to one out of four possible groups: the French-Canadian adults. c) The same applies to education which intervenes as a significant factor only in the case of French-Canadian juveniles. d) Juveniles in institutions show a constant tendency toward « object » whereas those in reception centres go in the direction of « agent ».

In question 2: a) The object-like picture of the French-Canadian adult delinquents is increased (see b, in question 1). b) Education differs significantly according to the ethnic group — but somehow the resistance of university people to question 2 invalidates the results, although the fact is very symptomatic in itself.

In question 3: a) A significant difference to be noted: between French-Canadian juveniles, delinquent vs. non-delinquent, the former being much more agent. b) Education as a discriminating variable is limited to French-Canadian juveniles. c) The same applies to socialization.

TABLE 11  
Ethnic origin and age held constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance	A — O direction
<i>question 1</i>		
sex	1 Ad. 0.01	female plus A
	2 Ad. 0.05	male plus A
	2 J 0.05	male plus A
delinquency	1 Ad. 0.01	non-delinquent plus A
education	1 J 0.10	plus educated plus A
socialization	2 Ad. 0.05	non-socialized 83% O
institution	1 J 0.01	reception centre plus A
	2 J 0.10	reception centre plus A
marital status	1 Ad. 0.10	single plus A
<i>question 2</i>		
delinquency	1 Ad. 0.10	delinquent plus O <sup>a</sup>
education	1 Ad. 0.05	less educated plus O
	2 J 0.10	secondary plus A <sup>b</sup> less educated plus A <sup>c</sup>
institution	1 J 0.01	secondary « top » O reception centre plus A
<i>question 3</i>		
delinquency	1 J 0.01	delinquent plus A
education	1 J 0.10	less educated plus A
socialization	1 J 0.02	non-socialized plus A

<sup>a</sup> 30.34% « no answer » among non-delinquents, as against 16.04% among delinquents.

<sup>b</sup> 33.33% « no answer » among university; 6.67% « no one » among university.

<sup>c</sup> 36.36% « no answer » among university.

#### 8. ETHNIC ORIGIN AND DELINQUENCY HELD CONSTANT

At the light of the results summarized in Table 12, the play of the « sex » variable becomes more definite.

In question 1, sex discriminates only in relation to Anglo-Canadian delinquents. That is to say: the self-image (in terms of agent and object) of French-Canadian delinquents is much alike for males and females. The same goes for French-Canadian and Anglo-Canadian non-delinquents. However, the combination of sex, delinquency and ethnicity is interesting. At this stage of our analysis, our findings show that French-Canadian

TABLE 12  
Ethnic origin and delinquency held constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance		A — O direction
<i>question 1</i>			
sex	2 D	0.01	female much plus O
age	1 D	0.01	juvenile plus A
education	1 D	0.10	secondary plus A
institution	1 D	0.01	reception centre plus A
	2 D	0.20	reception centre plus A
marital status	1 D	0.10	single plus A
<i>question 2</i>			
sex	1 D	0.01	female plus A <sup>a</sup>
age	1 D	0.01	juvenile plus A <sup>b</sup>
	1 ND	0.01	juvenile plus A <sup>c</sup>
	2 D	0.10	juvenile plus A (72% of the adults O)
education	1 D	0.10	secondary plus A
institution	2 D	0.10	reception centre plus A
	1 D	0.01	reception centre plus A
<i>question 3</i>			
sex	2 ND	0.20	male plus A
age	1 D	0.01	juvenile plus A
	1 ND	0.01	juvenile plus A
	2 D	0.20	juvenile plus A
education	2 D	0.20	primary plus A
institution	1 D	0.10	reception centre plus A
	2 D	0.05	reception centre plus A
marital status	1 D	0.05	single plus A
	1 ND	0.10	married plus A

<sup>a</sup> But 13% of the men as against 3% of the women left the question unanswered.

<sup>b</sup> But 16% of the adults as against 7% of the juveniles left the question unanswered.

<sup>c</sup> But 30% of the adults as against 9% of the juveniles left the question unanswered.

delinquents on the whole are less agent-like than non-delinquents, but not dissimilar within the sex category (see Table 13). Whereas a real difference is to be observed between male

and female delinquents, in the Anglo-Canadian population (see Table 14).

TABLE 13  
French Canadians

Sex	A (%)	O (%)	No answer (%)
<i>delinquents</i>			
male	45.84	48.62	5.50
female	51.79	42.86	5.36
total	47.88	46.67	5.45
<i>non-delinquents</i>			
male	54.32	44.44	1.23
female	59.38	38.54	2.03
total	57.06	41.24	1.69

TABLE 14  
Anglo-Canadians

Sex	A (%)	O (%)	No answer (%)
<i>delinquents</i>			
male	51.22	42.68	6.10
female	18.64	74.58	6.78
total	37.59	56.03	6.38
<i>non-delinquents</i>			
male	53.33	46.67	—
female	42.42	54.55	3.03
total	47.62	50.79	1.59

In question 2: a) The overall picture of our French-Canadian delinquent population is one of « agency »:

A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
49.09	39.39	10.00	1.52

Whereas, that of our non-delinquent is more evenly distributed:

A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
38.42	40.11	19.77	1.69

But these two pictures differ widely from those offered by the Anglo-Canadian population:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
delinquent	33.33	51.77	12.06	2.84
non-delinquent	22.22	50.79	23.81	3.17

However, the trend is the same, in both ethnic groups, i.e. non-delinquents are more objects, in question 2. Yet the pattern is the same as in question 1: Anglo-Canadians tend to project themselves more as objects than French Canadians. b) The « age » variable discriminates in three groups out of four. « Institution », as usual, discriminates in all possible cases.

In question 3: a) Sex is significant only within the Anglo-Canadian non-delinquent group. As a matter of fact, the overall picture of our population on question 3 is one of striking « agency ». The only group which makes exception to that rule is the one made of Anglo-Canadian female delinquents. b) Age acts in three possible cases out of four.

#### 9. THE CLUSTER, ETHNIC ORIGIN, SEX AND AGE HELD CONSTANT

When ethnic origin, sex and age are combined as in Table 15, we obtain the following picture:

In question 1: a) The sense of « agency » of delinquents does not differ significantly from that of non-delinquents in five out of eight possible groups. Clearly, where the French-Canadian population is concerned, youth is closely associated with agency. As for the Anglo-Canadians, we begin to see that delinquent girls present a very special picture. The same will apply to French-Canadian criminal women. b) A correct statement of our findings at this point, with regard to education associated to a sense of agency as expressed in question 1, would be the following: primary education in all cases goes with an object-like perception of oneself. c) « Institution » up to now had been associated with « object » vs. « reception centre » with « agent ». The image given here is much more complex. We will specify it later.

In question 2: a) The association of delinquency with a sense of agency projected into the malefactor is clear with regard to the French-Canadian female juveniles:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
delinquent	57.30	39.33	3.37	—
non-delinquent	42.11	42.11	12.98	3.57

b) As usual, education differs according to the ethnic group. c) Socialization works similarly and negatively for French-Canadian adults and juveniles. d) « Reception centre » as usual is associated with agency.

TABLE 15  
The cluster, ethnic origin, sex and age held constant

Discriminating variables	Level of significance	A - O direction
<i>question 1</i>		
delinquency	1 M Ad. 0.10	non-delinquent plus A
	1 F Ad. 0.01	non-delinquent plus A
	2 F J 0.01	non-delinquent plus A
education	1 M J 0.01	university plus A
	1 F Ad. 0.01	university plus A
	2 M Ad. 0.05	secondary plus A
	2 F J 0.01	university plus A <sup>a</sup>
institution	1 M J 0.01	reception centre plus A
	1 F J 0.05	<i>institution plus A</i>
	2 M J 0.05	<i>institution plus A</i>
	2 F J 0.01	reception centre plus A
marital status	1 M Ad. 0.10	single plus A
<i>question 2</i>		
delinquency	1 F J 0.05	delinquent plus A
education	1 M Ad. 0.05	secondary more balanced
	1 F Ad. 0.10	primary plus O
	2 M J 0.02	secondary more balanced
socialization	1 M Ad. 0.05	primary plus O <sup>b</sup>
	1 F J 0.05	secondary plus O
	1 M Ad. 0.05	socialized plus O
institution	1 F J 0.05	non-socialized plus A
	1 M J 0.10	reception centre plus A
	1 F J 0.02	reception centre plus A
	2 F J 0.01	reception centre plus A
<i>question 3</i>		
delinquency	1 M J 0.01	delinquent plus A
	1 F Ad. 0.01	non-delinquent less O
	1 F J 0.01	delinquent plus A
	2 M Ad. 0.10	non-delinquent plus A
education	1 F J 0.10	less educated plus A
socialization	1 F J 0.01	non-socialized plus A

<sup>a</sup> 33% of the Anglo-Canadians with primary education left the question unanswered.

<sup>b</sup> Only 11 subjects among the primary.

In question 3: a) The variable « delinquency » does not discriminate in the same direction according to ethnic origin. It is positively associated with « agency » (or negatively with a projection of the benefactor as an object) by the French Canadians. But that is not the case with the Anglo-Canadians. Among them, « delinquency » does not discriminate in three cases out of four and is negatively associated with a sense of agency where Anglo-Canadian male adults are concerned. b)

TABLE 16  
The cluster, ethnic origin, sex, age and delinquency  
held constant

Discriminating variables		Level of significance		A — O direction
<i>question 1</i>				
institution	1 M J	D	0.01	reception centre plus A
	1 F J	D	0.05	institution plus A
	2 F J	D	0.01	reception centre plus A
education	1 M J	D	0.01	secondary plus O
	1 M J	ND	0.01	university plus A
	1 F Ad.	ND	0.10	university all A
	2 F J	D	0.05	primary plus A
socialization	2 M Ad.	D	< 0.05	non-socialized plus O
<i>question 2</i>				
education	1 M Ad.	D	0.05	primary less A
socialization	1 F J	D	0.10	non-socialized plus A
institution	1 M J	D	0.05	reception centre plus A
	1 F J	D	0.02	reception centre plus A
marital status	1 F Ad.	ND	0.05	married plus O
<i>question 3</i>				
institution	2 M J	D	0.05	institution plus A
marital status	1 M Ad.	ND	0.05	married plus A <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> But 28% of the singles did not answer.

« Education » is again more specific. It is among French-Canadian female juveniles that it discriminates only. That variable is negatively associated with a sense of agency. c) « Socialization » works the same way and for the same group.

#### 10. THE CLUSTER, ETHNIC ORIGIN, SEX, AGE AND DELINQUENCY HELD CONSTANT

If we combined, as in Table 16, the variables ethnic origin, sex, age and delinquency, we obtained the following picture:

In question 1, it is interesting to note that French-Canadian delinquent girls in institution are more « agent » than those in reception centre while the variable institution was, up to now, associated with an object perception of oneself. The same is true for Anglo-Canadian boys. Also, in question 1, we see that education goes along with a sense of « agency »

where the *non-delinquents* are concerned but the *opposite* is true for delinquents.

In question 2, non-socialized French-Canadian delinquent girls project, more than their socialized peers, a sense of « agency » into the malefactor, personal or impersonal.

In question 3, we see again the Anglo-Canadian delinquent boys in institution reacting more than those in reception centre as « agent », which is exceptional, if we consider the general movement of our population in reception centre in the direction of agency.

## B. THE EUROPEAN POPULATION

The European population is made up of 405 subjects, including 123 French, 117 French-speaking Belgians, 110 Flemish-speaking Belgians and 55 Germans. The distribution according to the dichotomy « agent-object » is provided in Table 17. According to their sex, our testees include 218 males and 187 females. We have 172 delinquents and 233 non-delin-

TABLE 17  
Percentages of agents, objects, no answer and no one  
in the European population

	Agents	Objects	No answer	No one
question 1	57.78	33.09	9.14	—
question 2	35.06	33.83	29.63	1.48
question 3	53.83	27.16	17.78	1.23

quents, but we must subtract the 55 Germans from the 233 non-delinquents because, finally, we did not receive the tests from the German delinquent population. Hence, we have 172 delinquents (French and Belgians) and 168 non-delinquents (French and Belgians). Education is considered « primary », « secondary » and « university » according to the number of years completed in school and we used the same criteria as in Canada — primary: 32.43%, secondary: 58.04% and university: 9.54%. According to the criteria defined previously, 83.08% or 334 testees see themselves as « socialized », 16.92% or 68 as non-socialized and 3 make no specification. In Europe, we had no access to newly arrested delinquents. Some of our



subjects in France were in a *Centre d'observation* but the stay in such institutions may last for many months. Our European population is entirely made up of juveniles and of single people. Hence the variables age, marital status and institution will not play.

#### 1. THE EUROPEAN POPULATION *PER SE*

a) When ethnic origin is kept constant, we see that the population is well balanced between males and females, socialized and non-socialized, delinquents and non-delinquents (subtracting the Germans who have no delinquent peers). However, Flemish-speaking Belgian and German subjects belong mostly to the secondary and university level of education while French boys and girls and French-speaking Belgians are equally distributed between primary and secondary students.

b) If the population is viewed from the angle of sex, we see significant differences between the level of education of boys (34% primary, 45% secondary and 17% university) and girls (74% secondary).

TABLE 18  
Percentages of agents, objects, no answer and no one  
in the ethnic groups of the European population

Ethnic groups	Agents	Objects	No answer	No one
<i>question 1</i> ( $\chi^2$ : 34.837 — df: 6) > 0.01				
French	39 <sup>a</sup>	73	17	
Belgians:				
French-speaking	73	23	4	
Flemish-speaking	61	34	5	
Germans	62	31	7	
<i>question 2</i> ( $\chi^2$ : 25.196 — df: 9) > 0.01				
French	41	29	28	2
Belgians:				
French-speaking	41	32	25	2
Flemish-speaking	25	47	26	2
Germans	31	20	49	0
<i>question 3</i> ( $\chi^2$ : non significant)				
French	51	24	22	3
Belgians:				
French-speaking	60	24	15	1
Flemish-speaking	53	30	16	1
Germans	49	35	16	—

<sup>a</sup> Rounded up percentages.

c) From the delinquency standpoint, socialization is strongly associated with non-delinquency:

	socialized	non-socialized
delinquent	69%	31%
non-delinquent	94%	6%

The ethnic groups within our European population are distributed as summarized in Table 18, according to the model of inquiry.

#### *Some comments*

On question 1, Belgians and Germans gave a picture of « agency », while French boys and girls were « object-like », and by far, offered the strongest resistance to the test. On question 2, 49% of Germans refused to give any answer (naming a malefactor). In Canada, in France and in Belgium, the identified malefactors were oftentimes German people: (v.g. Hitler, Eichmann). The question was considered « silly » by German students and openly rejected. On question 3, for every ethnic group, the number of respondents who projected « agency » into the benefactor outweigh that of the testees who saw him as an object. Yet, 21% of the French boys and girls refused to answer.

## 2. THE EUROPEAN COMBINED WITH THE CANADIAN (JUVENILE) POPULATION

a) On « ethnic origin », Table 19 elicits the following results:

In question 1: 1) There is no significant difference between boys and girls (when delinquents and non-delinquents are put together) in 5 out of 6 of our ethnic groups. Anglo-Canadian boys are strikingly more agent than their feminine peers. 2) When socialization is a discriminating variable, it plays in the direction of agency.

In question 3: 1) Delinquency discriminates above the 0.05 level in 3 groups: in Canada (English and French) and with the French-speaking Belgians, it favours a projection of agency into the benefactor. The opposite is true in France. 2) Again in France we see that socialized testees project a sense of agency into the benefactor as they did with the malefactor, whereas the opposite is true in French Canada.

b) If the variable « sex » is isolated, other tables, not to be submitted in here, also show that:

In question 1: 1) Ethnic origin is highly discriminating

TABLE 19  
The European combined with the  
Canadian (juvenile) population

Discriminating variables	Level of significance	A — O direction
<i>question 1</i>		
ethnic origin*	0.01	French Canadians give a balanced picture: 1                    A                    O 54%                41% Belgians (French-speaking and Flemish-speaking) and Germans are plus A 4, 5 and 6        A 60 to 70% French (from France) and Anglo-Canadians are on the O side 2 and 3            A                    O 40%                60%
sex	0.05	male plus A
delinquency	0.01	non-delinquent plus A
education	0.02	more educated plus A
<i>question 2</i>		
ethnic origin	0.001	French Canadians plus A; Flemish-speaking Belgians plus O
sex	0.05	M            A            O            No answer    No one 42%        37%        21% F            41%        40%        17%        2%
delinquency	0.01	delinquent plus A non-delinquent much more resistant
education	0.05	secondary plus O
<i>question 3</i>		
ethnic origin	0.01	see above for Europeans at question 3 French Canadians and Anglo-Canadians more A than Europeans 1            A            O            No answer 74%        19%        5% 2            65%        20%        12%
delinquency	0.01	delinquent plus A
education	0.20	more educated plus O
socialization	0.30	non-socialized plus O

\* 1 = French Canadians; 2 = Anglo-Canadians; 3 = French; 4 = French-speaking Belgians; 5 = Flemish-speaking Belgians; 6 = Germans.

among boys but more highly among girls. Cultural differences seem accentuated with regard to females. 2) Delinquency does not discriminate among *boys*. It is highly significant with regard to girls, non-delinquents being clearly more agent. 3) Education plays somewhat differently for boys and girls.

In question 2: 1) The resistance of the non-delinquents among Europeans to name any malefactor or to try to imagine his motivation is very high. 2) Lack of socialization is clearly associated with the perception of the malefactor as an agent.

In question 3: Delinquency goes along with the projection of a sense of agency into the benefactor for both sexes; so does lack of socialization for girls.

c) When « delinquency » is held constant:

In question 1: 1) French-speaking Belgians, delinquent or not, are the most « agent » of our population, while delinquent Anglo-Canadians and non-delinquent French (from France) people are significantly more object. 2) When delinquents and non-delinquents are taken together, the only ethnic group where boys are significantly more on the object side is the Anglo-Canadian. Now with delinquency kept constant, maleness is clearly associated with agency. 3) More education goes with agency for delinquents. It has no bearing on non-delinquents.

In question 2: 1) Among delinquents, females project a sense of agency into the malefactor, more than boys do. 2) Lack of education is associated with a projection of agency for *non-delinquents*.

In question 3: Delinquency is a very important variable where France is concerned:

	A (%)	O (%)	no answer (%)	no one (%)
D	36.92	30.77	30.77	1.54
ND	67.24	17.24	12.07	3.45

But the resistance of the delinquents to name a hero might invalidate the statistical results.

d) If we isolate the cluster « ethnic origin and sex » as a constant, we get the following results:

In question 1: It was said earlier that non-delinquents tended to see themselves more as agent than delinquents on question 1. Two important exceptions to that generalization are the following: 1) French-Canadian delinquent *girls* are more agent than their non-delinquent peers. 2) French *boys* when

delinquent are significantly more agent than if non-delinquent. Among *Anglo-Canadian delinquent girls* and *French delinquent girls* some 20 to 27% are on the agent side.

In question 2: 1) Delinquency goes with a projection of agency into the malefactor for French Canadians only. 2) The refusal of non-socialized French boys to name any malefactor or assess him any motivation is amazing (66%).

In question 3: 1) 26% of the delinquents, in France, refuse or are unable to name any benefactor. 2) Delinquency is associated with the projection of agency into the benefactor for two ethnic groups: the French Canadians and the French-speaking Belgians.

## CHAPTER FOUR

# INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE INQUIRY

The meaning held by the testees as opposed to the meaning held by the observing scientist (Korn, 1966) was searched throughout our inquiry. Our first question was meant to elicit conscious, immediate perception of the motivation of the self in an important stance of one's life: the taking of a major decision. Motivation, notes Korn, can be either « reactive » or « proactive ». The first is initiated by the confronting external circumstances, the second comes spontaneously from within. Bales and Murray (see Korn, 1966) offer an articulate description of the proactive type of action:

As a rule, a proaction is not merely homeostatic in the sense that it serves to restore the organism to a previously enjoyed equilibrium or state of well-being ...

The integrates of serials ... and intended proactions directed toward distal goals constitute a large portion of the ego system ...

Moreover, Husserl and Schütz (see Korn, 1966) provide a solid philosophical ground for the distinction when the latter points out the equivocity of the term « motive » and distinguishes between the « in-order-to » motives and the « because ». Korn (1966) comments:

Patients who failed to progress in our groups were notorious for their tendency to offer « because » motives as opposed to « in-order-to » motives ... like historians, they walked through the present facing in a backward direction ... *The essence of the stance of Spectator-Object* is the renunciation of any belief in the efficacy of in-order-to motives in favor of self-fulfilling fatalism which insists that the future is already ordained by the past.

Questions 2 and 3 — the naming of a person who has

harmed/or done much good to humanity, the recalling of his deeds and his perceived motivations — were aimed at opening to the respondent a possibility to project himself into « villains » and « heroes », malefactors and benefactors, personal and/or impersonal. The respondents then either project their capacity to influence things around them or their incapacity, hence supposing that those villains and heroes were merely led, compelled to do what they had done, either because of external circumstances or because of their past.

## A. THE CANADIAN POPULATION

### 1. EDUCATION, SOCIALIZATION AND THE SENSE OF AGENCY

On question 1, we obtain, through a conscious, well spelled and oftentimes well learned « motivation » of the taking of the most important decision, the following picture of the agents: non-delinquent, educated, socialized, if delinquent, not yet « objectified » by incarceration, and belonging to an ethnic minority. Youth is also associated with agency on question 1 when variables are combined.

On question 2, it is easy to understand that delinquents are more prone than non-delinquents to perceive a sense of agency in a malefactor. Psychoanalysts may call that mere projection, rationalization; it may also be a means to release guilt by making a scapegoat of someone else. In many cases, though, especially for delinquents, the malefactor was a personal enemy really « meaning » what he had done and powerfully able to harm the delinquent. Young people were more prone to see « agents » in these « villains » than older people. University people were the most resistant to name anyone and to assess any direct responsibility and agency to a malefactor.

The interpretation of answers to question 3 sets problems. We still see that our younger population perceives more power, more influence in the heroes (and again delinquents in reception centres more than those in institutions) and the less educated, the delinquent, the non-socialized respondents are also more prone to see the hero, the benefactor as an *existing, acting, influencing* being because *he can* and *he wants* to do what he does; yet non-delinquents, educated, socialized testees see him as imprisoned in his rôle. A heavy « sense of constraint » loads the answers of college and university people speaking of

Kennedy, John XXIII, Schweitzer, Churchill, Salk, Pasteur, etc.

Out of three major generalizations, one has to do with age: getting older, obviously, impairs the sense of agency. Rehabilitation centres and penal institutions lessen the perception of oneself as able to influence what happens to him. Resistance to naming any « malefactor » and « benefactor », personal or impersonal, is relatively high with the Canadian population, although half as high as with the European. It has to be interpreted differently according to the stage of resistance. Some respondents wrote a name and left blank the spaces for mentioning his deeds and his motivation. Others mentioned the deeds but did not go so far as « taking the rôle of the other » and imagining his « why ». Some resisted in the first place by stating clearly: « no one has ever done any harm to me » or « I cannot conceive of anyone who has really, by himself or alone, harmed humanity ». « I can see ideologies, groups, etc. »: that is mostly the case with university people.

Two interpretations may be put forward to explain the differences in the characteristics of the population which projects itself as « agent » on question 1 vs. questions 2 and 3.

a) To be able to project a sense of agency into a « villain » (malefactor) or a « hero » (benefactor) the respondents must be relatively less acculturated, acculturation and socialization having the effect of giving a certain preponderance to the rôle over the person, to the function over the individual. In a way, what we are saying is that a well learned, educated, socialized person seldom thinks of a « hero » or a « villain » as acting completely on his own. Rôle apprenticeship may lessen the capacity to imagine a « great » man as *really personally* able to act and influence, if not out of obligation and duty.

b) Of course, the other interpretation which does not preclude the first is that the less one is educated, and the less socialized, the more delinquent and the more prone he will be to give in to the myths surrounding « villains » and « heroes ». The demystification process would accompany a certain sophistication of the mind (« education ») and of the mores (acculturation and socialization). Yet, that last interpretation does not seem to differentiate clearly between what we would call the Olympus Gods (or let us say the « stars » and the « super stars ») who are admired for what they are and what they possess and the heroes praised for what they do.

The « heroes » and the « villains » who were picked by



our respondents in answer to our question were « *doers* », *actors*, *authors*.

## 2. DETAILED ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

### a) *Ethnic origin*

French Canadians, on the whole, are more « agent » than Anglo-Canadians. Yet, when men are considered alone, Anglo-Canadian males are more on the « agent side » than our general population. Anglo-Canadian females delinquent and non-delinquent outweigh the balance on the « object side ».

The fact of being non-delinquent, and if delinquent, of being in a state of arrest rather than incarceration, and the fact of being single are associated with a sense of « agency » with regard to French Canadians only. Hence, Anglo-Canadians, be they delinquents or non-delinquents, in institution or in reception centre, married or single, do not differ among themselves, according to our model of inquiry, on question 1.

On question 2, higher education, which has been said to be associated with a projection of « object », works that way for Anglo-Canadians only. Delinquency is associated with « agency » for French Canadians only — and so are reception centres vs. institutions.

Yet, on question 3, delinquency and reception centre are definitely associated with agency for both ethnic groups while education discriminates for Anglo-Canadians only, and socialization, for French Canadians.

### b) *Sex*

If Anglo-Canadian males are agent-like and more so than our total configuration on question 1, French-Canadian females win the « agent » competition, while Anglo-Canadian women and girls are outstandingly on the object side. Hence, when speaking of ethnic origin (French-Canadian) as associated with agency, one has to take into consideration the *sex* differences: *Anglo-Canadian males do not differ significantly from French-Canadian males on question 1.*

However, on question 2, the object-like picture of the Anglo-Canadians is extended to males (see Table 6). Another interesting correction to our generalization has to be made here concerning « delinquency » associated with « agency » on question 2: it discriminates among females only.

The same is true for lack of socialization on question 3.

c) *Age*

Under that heading, it becomes interesting to consider on what items our subgroups do not differ from one another. On question 1, we see that *adults* are similar, be they French Canadians or Anglo-Canadians, men or women, more or less educated. *Youngsters* are comparable, be they delinquent or not, socialized or not. Boys lean toward agency more than girls and French Canadians more than Anglo-Canadians.

On question 2, *adults* again do not differ according to their ethnic origin. *Sex* plays no rôle; neither does *socialization* when juveniles and adults are considered separately.

On question 3, *adults* react similarly to the test be they *French-Canadian* or *Anglo-Canadian*, *delinquent* or *not*, *more* or *less* *educated*, *socialized* or *not*. *Sex* has no significance, either for adults or for juveniles.

d) *Delinquency*

The clearest generalization which comes out from the analysis of our population under that variable is that non-delinquents do not differ at all among themselves on question 1, be they men or women, French Canadians or Anglo-Canadians, more or less educated, single or married, older or younger, *while delinquents do*. As said earlier, we observe at this point: 1) A real difference between male and female delinquents in the Anglo-Canadian population. 2) A tendency for the Anglo-Canadian non-delinquent population to see itself less in terms of agent than the French-Canadian non-delinquent one. 3) A general tendency on the part of the Anglo-Canadian population to perceive itself more in terms of object than is the case with the French-Canadian group.

e) *Institution*

The conclusions drawn from the analysis of the factor have been mentioned at length.

f) *Ethnic origin and sex*

On question 1, « age » does not differentiate at all for the Anglo-Canadians, either for males or for females. That variable becomes more and more specifically relevant with the French-Canadian population in which *boys* are more agent than *men*, but *adult females* perceive themselves in the stance of decision-taking as more able to influence what happens to them than *young girls* do. At this level of analysis, we see that on question 1 the delinquents who perceive themselves significantly less as

agent than their non-delinquent peers, are the Anglo-Canadian females.

On question 2, « age » is very influential. Juveniles project themselves as agent more easily than their adult ethnic and sexual peers. Delinquency is especially associated with agency in the case of females and *more education* discriminates (in the object direction) for Anglo-Canadians.

On question 3, *juveniles* of both sexes and both ethnic groups show a strong and universal tendency toward believing that their heroes are self-determined and not driven (agent). However, we begin to see that if French-Canadian *delinquents* project a sense of agency into their heroes more so than their non-delinquent peers, that is not the case for Anglo-Canadians.

Lack of *education* and of *socialization*, as two significantly more influential sources of projection of a sense of agency into the benefactor, discriminate now in two subgroups: Anglo-Canadian males and French-Canadian females.

g) *Ethnic origin, sex and « institution »*

We are dealing here with delinquents only. Within that subgroup, *age* is a very influential factor of agency on every question including question 1 where in the total configuration that variable (age) did not appear as discriminating. We see that within our delinquent population it has direct relevance. That is especially the case within the French-Canadian group and more so than for the Anglo-Canadians.

h) *Ethnic origin, sex and age*

We had said in a first gross indifferenced view of our discriminating variables that age did not play on question 1. We see now that it does in relation with the French-Canadian population and that *non-delinquency combined with youth for that ethnic group is not associated with agency*. In short, non-delinquency is associated with agency where the French Canadians are concerned only for adult males and females. As for the Anglo-Canadian delinquent girls, they are definitely object-like, and that will be discussed later.

i) *Ethnic origin, sex and delinquency*

It was seen under « ethnic origin, sex and institution », that among delinquents and within that subcategory, juveniles were more agent (which applied especially to French Canadians); we see now that the influence of youth is obvious among non-delinquents and the clash of generation in the

French-Canadian population becomes clear. Let us elaborate on that:

French-Canadian male delinquents: juveniles plus A;

French-Canadian female delinquents: juveniles plus A;

French-Canadian male non-delinquents: juveniles plus A;

French-Canadian female non-delinquents: adults plus A.

Hence, it becomes a real conclusion that the factors *male* and *juvenile*, combined with the factor *French-Canadian* give a picture of agency.

j) *Ethnic origin, sex, age and delinquency*

French-Canadian delinquent girls perceive themselves in a peculiar way when compared to the general trends of our findings up to now. We begin to see that French-Canadian female teenagers in rehabilitation centres not only do not differ significantly from the non-delinquent girls of the same ethnic group, but that those in institutions are, exceptionally, more agent than those in reception centres. It is our hypothesis that because of cultural and especially of moral and religious values which are hurt by the « immoral sexual conduct » of the French-Canadian girls (which conduct is responsible for the majority of the commitments to rehabilitation centres for Catholic and French-speaking females in the Province of Quebec), we do have in these centres a very special population which is neither really delinquent nor object-like (Bertrand, 1965). But it may also be that we have measured the « culture » of the institutions (*Maison Sainte-Agnès, Centre Berthelet*) more than the self-perception of the French-Canadian delinquent girls.

## B. THE TOTAL POPULATION OF JUVENILES, EUROPEAN AND CANADIAN

### 1. MASCULINITY, NON-DELINQUENCY AND « AGENCY »

A first glance at this global result would seem to indicate that the kind of contradiction that we have already seen within our Canadian population — for instance the fact that education and socialization were factors of agency on question 1 while less education and absence of socialization were often associated with the projection of a sense of agency into the heroes and the villains — is confirmed on a cross-cultural level. Our data may be interpreted as a stronger argument to the effect that, somehow, education and in many cases socialization lessen the capacity of the testee to perceive great men, heroes and villains, or

personal benefactors and malefactors as *actors* while the same variables play significantly in favour of the perception of oneself as an agent on question 1 for our six ethnic groups.

Two of our hypotheses seem to be substantiated at this level: *masculinity is more often associated with the perception of oneself as agent-actor than is femininity; non-delinquency works the same way as opposed to delinquency.* Yet things are not that simple.

a) If French-Canadian juveniles project easily a sense of agency into heroes and villains when the testees are delinquent, less educated and non-socialized, the very opposite is true about French boys and girls: education, socialization and non-delinquency go along with projections of agency for that ethnic group, especially into the hero.

b) If in this global result we see that masculinity is associated with the perception of oneself as agent more so than femininity on question 1, that is not always the case on questions 2 and 3 and, moreover, the only ethnic group where sex clearly differentiates in favour of boys is the Anglo-Canadian one, when delinquents and non-delinquents are taken together.

c) If it is true that on the whole, when all ethnic groups are considered together, delinquent boys are more agent than delinquent girls, and non-delinquent boys again more agent than non-delinquent girls on question 1, we see, when ethnic origin and delinquency are kept constant, that it is especially the case for three subgroups (out of eleven possible ones): French-Canadian non-delinquents, Anglo-Canadian delinquents and French delinquents. In the other groups, we often see a trend in the same direction, but not a clear difference.

d) On question 2, delinquent girls in three ethnic groups out of five are more prone than delinquent boys to assess the quality of actor to the malefactor. Those are the French Canadians, the French and the French-speaking Belgians.

## 2. NON-DELINQUENCY, SOCIALIZATION, EDUCATION AND « AGENCY »

We have mentioned earlier a clear opposition between the characteristics of the French-Canadian delinquent who projects agency into the malefactor and the benefactor and the French non-delinquent respondent. With caution, that opposition must be extended to our whole Canadian population on the one part as against our European group on the other. What we are saying is that the conflict between education and socialization

on the one part and the projection of a sense of agency in the heroes and villains on the other is clear in our French-Canadian population and less so but existing however in the Anglo-Canadian one. But with the exception of some subgroups, Europeans on the whole follow the pattern of French boys and girls: education and socialization favour not only a self-perception as agent but projection of agency. So does non-delinquency.

Yet two observations deserve attention and explanations concerning the European population: a) a much greater resistance to give any answer, even on question 1; b) an even greater resistance of less educated and less socialized people to project themselves on questions 2 and 3.

### 3. SELF-IMAGE, NEGATIVE IDENTITY AND DELINQUENCY

From E.H. Erikson (1956) and his followers A.M. Johnson and S.A. Szurek (1952), we have adopted the concept of « negative identification » as part of the genesis of antisocial conduct: the child identifies spontaneously not with the norms his educators propose to him but with the confidence or the distrust they show him while asking him to conform. Parents who formulate an order or request adding to it the threat of punishment suggest to the child that he *will* do wrong: they prepare him to act in accordance with their negative expectations.

We have quoted Mailloux and Lavallée's (1962) metaphysical interpretation of that psychoanalytic and psychosocial view of the early possible sources of delinquency and we have noted at one point the contradictions between Mailloux and Lavallée's and Korn's conception of what we would call: the fundamental *value* of *man*. In our opinion, Mailloux and Lavallée (1962) say that a man is far from being only what he does. It is an awful reduction to call a child a stealer because he has stolen (i.e. he has acted as a stealer). The confusion between « being » and « doing » is at the very origin of the depressive feelings — and here we freely interpret — which depressive feelings the delinquent fights by his acting out.

*Au lieu de [...] réprimander [les enfants] pour s'être laissés aller à poser un acte mauvais, il paraît] tellement plus simple de les amener à prendre le mal en horreur en les accusant d'être des méchants ou des voleurs [...] un tel procédé devrait être regardé comme abominable. [...] utilisé à un moment où l'enfant est encore incapable de dissocier son moi de son agir et d'apercevoir que sa dignité d'être humain transcende inaltérablement les errements momen-*

*tanés de sa conduite, il joue un rôle plus néfaste encore* (Mailloux and Lavallée, 1962, p. 108).

In our opinion, Korn (1966) says: « A man is what [he feels] he can do. » « Situations defined as real are real in their consequences », W.I. Thomas says in his theorem (quoted in Merton, 1953, p. 169). And that is especially true of situations defined by parents for their children: as a child, I will strongly believe that what I can do about situations is what others (i.e. my parents) believe I can. As Korn (1966) says, the « self » and the « situation » seem incapable of assessment without reference to each other.

Yet, the concept of negative identity, especially Mailloux and Lavallée's interpretation of the « negative identification », seems to leave out the nonetheless frequent parents' feeling that their child is *powerful*, may act, destroy, create, annoy, etc. Power is here taken in Bertrand Russell's acceptation of the term: the capacity to produce intended effects, which connotes « competence » in Foote and Cottrell's terminology (1955). When parents suspect a suddenly abnormally « quiet » child of « preparing something » they do suppose that he is powerful and powerfully able to disturb them. That feeling permeates and it may be part of the « negative expectations », but it may also transcend them. Is there not a great difference between thinking of a child who will spend his afternoon alone in the house: « He's just wasting his time » (or of a teenager looking for a job: « I know my son: he won't get anything ») and, on the contrary, *fearing* the half-expected effects of the initiative and action of a child: « Somehow, he will *manage to do something* that will disturb me. »

The basic mistrust Erikson speaks of changes itself into fear in the second instance. Needless to say, the supposed « wrong » that the parents can expect in return for their mistrust or/and fear may be wrong only for them (see Métraux, 1964; Wolfenstein, 1964). The child will soon discover that his parents' subjective morality has to be respected if he does not want a spanking, but it has little to do with morality « outside ».

Parents can project — when they distrust a child — a strong feeling of inadequacy or their own wish for outstanding, anti-conformist, attention-getting *actions* (which they often perform with a smile of complicity). In the last case, we hypothesize that the child gathers and filters a feeling of *being powerfully able to act and do something*, in a certain sense a feeling of com-

*petence*. That feeling of power is defeated later on, again and again, by the « socializing agents ».

Working on Foote and Cottrel's subcategory of interpersonal competence: health, intelligence, empathy, autonomy, judgment, creativity, Rothstein (1961) devised sixty favourable attributes or characteristics. Delinquents were inferior to non-delinquents in seventeen items only, seven having to do with « judgment » but only one with « autonomy », one with « empathy » and two with « creativity ». That would seem to confirm our previous conclusion on the lack of correlation between neuroticism and delinquency (in boys).

Having submitted populations of delinquents from five different cultural backgrounds to a test questionnaire we found that delinquent boys are never significantly less agent than their non-delinquent ethnic peers. Our results stand in flagrant contradiction with Matza's assumption:

Those who have been granted the potentiality for freedom through the loosening of social controls but who lack the position, capacity or inclinations to *become agents in their own behalf* I call drifters and it is in this category that I place the *juvenile delinquents* [our emphasis] (1964, p. 29).

Yet Matza hesitates — and rightly so — to give in to such a normative conception: « Freedom is self-control. *If* so, the delinquent has clearly not achieved that state [emphasis added] » (p. 29).

Moralistic as well as metaphysical considerations are not enlightening in any attempt to understand « here and now », or to see from the subject's viewpoint how he feels about himself, what he considers valuable and not, desirable and not, what he himself feels capable of doing. It is so easy to decide for others, according to a so-called objective measure which is a mere projection of our own, that they are sick, disturbed, powerless, impotent. However, from the very opinion of the subjects themselves, many of our delinquent girls (the Anglo-Canadians, the French-speaking Belgians and the French) and the majority of our criminal women (in Canada) *see themselves as defeated in action*. They also project the image of victims in the hands of powerful aggressors.

On the psychogenetic level, we assume: a) That many delinquent girls have interjected a strong feeling of being *able to seduce*. That came about, in many cases, through their relationship with their father. In other cases, these girls identified



themselves with the unconscious or half-conscious powerfully repressed sexual wishes of their mother (Bertrand and Carrière, 1965). The delinquent girls' « precocious sexuality » is learned, as is any human behaviour. b) That other girls have been challenged, questioned, rendered doubtful about this capacity to seduce and they will try, again and again, to make sure that they can, using techniques that are self-defeating.

But on the psychosocial and sociological levels, because delinquent girls stand in discontinuity with the rôles ascribed to women, they have to be made objects. By discontinuity, we mean here that a woman in order to perceive herself as agent outside the home must set herself in opposition to a male-dominated world. This form of opposition is dictated, somehow, by the « musts » preestablished by society with regard to women, i.e. the prevalent values of family life, motherhood, fidelity and chastity. Yet by so doing a) the delinquent girl and the criminal woman often surrender to an aggressor; b) they lose control over the effects of their action; c) they are being constrained by society to see themselves as exploited objects. In some cases, a wrongdoer, by her very actions against the societal norms, has destroyed her main source of value. The second point refers to Alain Touraine's concept of *action* (1955): the will to create but also the will to exercise control over the produced effect. The third point is taken from Cooley's conception of the self as a reflection of the look of others.

From the point of view of penology, our observations concerning some of the institutions for delinquent girls and most of the jails and prisons for women lead us to think that these institutions belong to a world of false representation. Maximum security prisons for women and so-called reeducation centres for the very ill teenagers are a sad farce. Female offenders in jails respond to the description that Korn (1966) gives of mental illness:

- a) a persisting cycle of self-defeating security operations and their disastrously reinforcing real consequences,
- b) founded upon a fixed prophecy of interpersonal incompetence
- c) confirmed by the individual's experience in the world he constructs out of the relation between his orientation of the Self-as-incompetent to the manifold of events he experiences as his unique autobiographical situation.

*Yet, we still have in our population of delinquents two groups of creative, « unbroken in initiative » youngsters, whose « com-*

*petence » surpasses that of their non-delinquent cultural peers: French-Canadian delinquent girls and French delinquent boys. « Agents » are often made social failures and « objects » social successes, through our need for conformity.*

## CONCLUSION

Before starting our experimentation, we had formulated three major hypotheses: *women, delinquents* and *adults* would show a tendency to perceive themselves more as « objects », compelled in action, more as victims, persons to whom things happen, than would *men, non-delinquents* and *young people*. Women, delinquents and adults would also tend to project a lesser sense of agency into their chosen benefactors and malefactors.

With a few exceptions, our hypotheses were confirmed by the data. Hence, if we dispose our population along a continuum, 1) youth, 2) masculinity, 3) non-criminality are closely associated with a sense of agency. The cluster: adulthood, femininity and criminality is, on the contrary, very closely associated with a perception and a projection of the self as object. Standing midway are the juvenile delinquents and the non-criminal adults (males).

In a follow-up study already undertaken on the same topic — comparative female criminality and a study of woman's image in different societies —, we hope to be able to refine and improve our model of inquiry and to render the results more significant through cluster analysis.

## REFERENCES

- BARNARD, C.I. (1938): *The Functions of the Executive*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- BERTRAND, M.-A. (1965): « Quelques aspects culturels de la délinquance des adolescentes à Montréal », *Fourth Research Conference on Delinquency and Criminology*, Montreal, Quebec Society of Criminology and Pinel Institute, p. 209-224.
- (1967): « The Myth of Sexual Equality before the Law », *Fifth Research Conference on Delinquency and Criminality*, Montreal, Centre de Psychologie et de Pédagogie, p. 129-161.
- and A. CARRIÈRE (1965): *Interventions psycho-sociologiques auprès de parents de délinquants*, lecture presented at the V<sup>e</sup> Congrès international de criminologie (Montreal).
- BOULDING, K. (1966): *The Image*, 4th ed., Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, « Ann Arbor Paperbacks ».
- BUBER, M. (1959): *la Vie en dialogue*, Paris, Aubier-Montaigne.
- COOLEY, C.H. (1964): *The Self, Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York, Schocken Edition.
- ERIKSON, E.H. (1956): « The Problem of Identity », *Journal of the American Psychiatric Association*, 4: 56-121.
- (1960): « The Problem of Ego-Identity », in: M. Stein et al. (eds.), *Identity and Anxiety*, Glencoe (Ill.), Free Press, p. 37-87.
- (1964): *Insight and Responsibility*, New York, W.W. Norton.
- FOOTE, N.N. and L.S. COTTRELL, Jr. (1955): *Identity and Interpersonal Competence*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- JOHNSON, A.M. and S.A. SZUREK (1952): « The Genesis of Antisocial Acting out in Children and Adults », *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, 21: 321-343.
- KLAPP, O.E. (1962): *Heroes, Villains and Fools*, Englewood Cliffs (N.J.), Prentice Hall.
- KORN, R.R. (1966): *Psychopathology as Experience and Action*, Berkeley, University of California. Copyright pending: Random House (New York).
- LAING, R.D. (1962): *The Self and Others*, Chicago, Quadrangle Books.
- LUDOVICI, L.J. (1965): *The Final Inequality*, New York, W.W. Norton.

- MAILLOUX, N. and C. LAVALLÉE (1962): « Genèse et signification de la conduite antisociale », *la Revue canadienne de criminologie*, 4: 103-111.
- MATZA, D. (1964): *Delinquency and Drift*, New York, John Wiley and Sons.
- MEAD, G.H. (1913): « The Social Self », *The Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods*, December-January.
- (1934): *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- MEAD, M. and M. WOLFENSTEIN (eds.), (1964): *Childhood in Contemporary Cultures*, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, « Phoenix Books ».
- MERTON, R.K. (1953): *Éléments de méthode sociologique*, Paris, Plon.
- MÉTRAUX, R. (1964): « The Consequences of Wrongdoing: An Analysis of Story Completions by German Children », in: M. Mead and M. Wolfenstein (eds.), *Childhood in Contemporary Cultures*, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, « Phoenix Books », p. 306-323.
- RIOUX, M. (1966): « La jeunesse dans le monde contemporain et dans le Québec », *Prospectives*, 2: 11-20.
- ROTHSTEIN, E. (1961): *An Analysis of Status Image as Perception Variables between Delinquent Boys and Non-Delinquent Boys*, Thesis, Chicago, University of Chicago.
- SARTE, J.-P. (1949): *Situations III*, Paris, Gallimard.
- SZABO, D. (1960): *Crimes et villes*, Paris, Cujas.
- , F. GOYER and D. GAGNÉ (1964): « Valeurs morales et délinquance juvénile: résultats d'une enquête pilote », *l'Année sociologique*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 3: 75-110.
- TOURNAINE, A. (1955): *Sociologie de l'action*, Paris, Seuil.
- WIENER, N. (1961): *Cybernetics*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, M.I.T. Press.
- WOLFENSTEIN, M. (1964): « Some Variants in Moral Training of Children », in: M. Mead and M. Wolfenstein (eds.), *Childhood in Contemporary Cultures*, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, « Phoenix Books », p. 349-368.
- ZELDITCH, M., Jr. (1955): « Rôle Differentiation in the Nuclear Family: A Comparative Study », in: T. Parsons and R.R. Bales (eds.), *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*, New York, Free Press, p. 307-352.
- (1964): « Family, Marriage and Kinship », in: R.E.L. Faris (ed.), *Handbook of Modern Sociology*, Chicago, Rand McNally, p. 680-733.

## ABSTRACTS

### IMAGE DE SOI ET CRIMINALITÉ

Cet article représente la seconde partie d'une étude en deux tranches du phénomène de la délinquance et de la criminalité féminines au Canada, aux États-Unis, en France et en Belgique, intitulée: *Self-Image and Social Representations of Female Offenders*, du même auteur.

La première partie s'attache à la valeur de « représentation sociale » de la criminalité. On y étudie le volume relatif de la criminalité des femmes, la nature spécifique des délits et crimes qu'elles commettent et pour lesquels elles sont arrêtées et inculpées, le traitement qu'on leur fait subir, comparé aux dispositions prises à l'endroit des criminels de sexe masculin trouvés coupables

des mêmes méfaits, les dispositions particulières des codes criminels qui, en plusieurs cas, prévoient des délits limités aux femmes mais aussi les excluent comme auteurs possibles de plusieurs crimes. Ce sont là des indices des rôles assignés aux femmes dans une société donnée.

Les représentations sociales ainsi analysées nous ont suggéré que non seulement les lois et les sanctions prévues, mais aussi le choix des pénalités imposées au moment du prononcé de la sentence offrent la meilleure explication de ce taux comparativement très bas et relativement constant de la criminalité féminine à travers le monde. Ces représentations sociales sont des renforcements de rôles précédemment prescrits à la femme. Ainsi, la théorie du rôle (*role theory*) nous semble la meilleure base d'explication de cet écart entre la criminalité masculine et la criminalité féminine.

La seconde partie, dont le présent article est tiré, résume une recherche empirique qui a duré près d'une année (août 1966, juin 1967).

#### *Instrument*

Pour mesurer la perception de soi, nous avons utilisé un questionnaire bref et direct composé essentiellement de quatre parties. La première partie fait appel, chez le répondant, à des données conscientes, en l'amenant à décrire la décision la plus importante qu'il juge avoir prise au cours des quelques dernières années et les motifs qui ont inspiré cette décision. La deuxième et la troisième parties réfèrent à du matériel psychologique (intra-psychique) préconscient ou inconscient, par mode de projection, c'est-à-dire que le répondant choisit de nommer les « grandes figures » de bienfaiteur (personnel ou non personnel) et de malfaiteur, résume les « grands gestes » qu'il leur attribue et donne sa perception de leur motivation. La dernière partie est constituée par une fiche bio-socio-psycho-éducationnelle ou petite histoire de cas en résumé.

*Rationnel de l'instrument:* cet instrument d'analyse est basé sur une polarité bien décrite dans l'œuvre du psychologue et psychanalyste Erikson (1964). Il s'agit d'un continuum allant de la notion d'*agent* à celle de *patient*: « *agens vs patiens* ». Cette polarité est reprise dans les travaux de R.R. Korn (1966) dans les termes suivants: « agent-acteur vs object-spectateur ».

Quelle est la signification précise des catégories ainsi nommées? L'*agent* est, pour Erikson et pour Korn, celui qui se perçoit comme capable d'influencer le monde, les événements, les personnes. Il a une prise sur sa vie. Il ne se sent pas « brisé » dans ses élans (« *unbroken in initiative* »). L'*objet* est celui à qui les choses arrivent (« *to whom things happen* »), celui qui se sent poussé par des forces, internes ou externes, à poser des gestes qui lui paraissent inévitables.

*Hypothèses:* nous avons choisi cet instrument à cause de nos deux grandes hypothèses de départ, l'une étant la condition sociale faite à la femme dans les sociétés dominées par l'homme (condition d'instrument, d'objet), l'autre étant la position sociale de la femme criminelle et de la jeune fille délinquante dans les sociétés structurées, position déterminée par les codes pénaux et par l'organisation répressive, mais aussi par la culture qui privilégie certaines valeurs et fait de la femme leur gardienne (position d'instrument mais aussi de victime). La condition sociale de la femme normale et la position sociale de la femme criminelle sont des « miroirs » (« *looking-glass self* »), selon la théorie de G.H. Mead, « miroirs » dans lesquels la femme normale et la délinquante trouvent une image d'elles-mêmes.

#### *Résultats*

Nos résultats peuvent se résumer comme suit: *Première hypothèse:* « Les femmes adultes normales d'une société donnée se perçoivent moins que les hommes de la même couche socio-économique et du même groupe d'âge, comme des agents. » Cette hypothèse ne s'est pas vérifiée en ce qui touche les Canadiennes françaises. La différence entre hommes et femmes n'est pas significative dans ce groupe. Notre hypothèse s'est vérifiée chez les Canadiens anglais mais à un niveau de signification peu élevé ( $\chi^2:0.20$ ). *Seconde hypothèse:* « Les femmes adultes criminelles se perçoivent plus comme des

objets et des victimes que les non criminelles d'une part et que les hommes criminels d'autre part. » Cette hypothèse s'est vérifiée statistiquement et la différence est très significative dans le premier cas (0.01) et un peu moins dans le second (0.10).

Il ressort que si la femme non délinquante, suivant le test « agent-objet », ne se perçoit pas de façon sensiblement différente de l'homme non délinquant, par contre la femme criminelle, elle, se perçoit nettement comme un objet-spectateur, comme une victime, plus que l'homme criminel et beaucoup plus que la femme non délinquante.

## IMAGEN DE SÍ Y CRIMINALIDAD

Este artículo constituye la segunda parte de un estudio dividido en dos partes del fenómeno de la delincuencia y de la criminalidad femenina en Canadá, Estados Unidos, Francia y Bélgica, titulado *Self-Image and Social Representations of Female Offenders*, del mismo autor.

La primera parte está dedicada a la importancia de la « representación social » de la criminalidad y estudia el volumen relativo de la criminalidad de las mujeres, la naturaleza específica de los delitos y crímenes que cometen y por los que son arrestadas e inculpadas, el tratamiento que se les impone, comparado a las disposiciones tomadas para con los criminales de sexo masculino culpables de las mismas infracciones. Asimismo examina las disposiciones particulares de los códigos penales que en muchos casos previenen delitos particulares para las mujeres, pero también las excluyen como autores posibles de varios crímenes. Todo lo cual son índices de los roles asignados a las mujeres en una sociedad dada.

Las representaciones sociales analizadas nos han sugerido que las leyes y las sanciones previstas, así como la elección de penalidades impuestas en el momento del pronunciamiento de la sentencia, son los reguladores más eficaces y la mejor explicación del tanto por ciento comparativamente muy bajo y relativamente constante de la criminalidad femenina en el mundo. Estas representaciones sociales y la conciencia social no son más que refuerzos de los roles prescritos precedentemente a la mujer. De este modo, la teoría del rol (*role theory*) es la mejor explicación de esta diferencia entre la criminalidad masculina y la femenina.

La segunda parte del estudio, de la cual se ha sacado este artículo, resume una investigación empírica que ha durado casi un año (agosto 1966, junio 1967).

### *Instrumento*

Para medir la percepción de sí mismo, hemos utilizado un cuestionario breve y directo compuesto esencialmente de cuatro partes. La primera parte intenta obtener de la persona cuestionada datos conscientes, induciéndole a expresar la decisión más importante que a su parecer ha tomado a lo largo de los últimos años, así como los motivos que inspiraron tal decisión. La segunda y la tercera parte recurren a material psicológico (intra-psíquico) pre-consciente o inconsciente, mediante un sistema de proyección; es decir, que la persona interrogada escoge nombrar las « grandes figuras » de bienhechor (personal o no personal) y de malhechor, resume las « grandes acciones » que les atribuye y da la percepción de su motivación. La última parte está constituida por una ficha bio-socio-psico-educacional o resumen de pequeña historia de caso.

*Racional del instrumento:* este instrumento de análisis está basado sobre una polaridad bien descrita en la obra del psicólogo y psicanalista Erikson (1964). Se trata de un continuum que va de la noción de *agente* a la de *paciente* (agente contra paciente). Esta polaridad está recogida en los trabajos de R.R. Korn (1966) en los términos siguientes: « agente-actor contra objeto-espectador ».

¿Cual es la significación precisa de las categorías mencionadas? El *agente* es para Erikson y para Korn quien se cree capaz de influenciar el

mundo, los acontecimientos y las personas, quien tiene un poder sobre su vida, quien no se siente « roto » en sus impulsos (« *unbroken in initiative* »). El objeto es aquel a quien las cosas suceden (« *to whom things happen* »), quien se siente impelido por fuerzas, internas o externas, a hacer acciones que le parecen inevitables.

*Hipótesis:* hemos escogido este instrumento debido a nuestras dos grandes hipótesis de partida, una sobre la condición social acordada a la mujer en las sociedades de dominación masculina (condición de instrumento, de objeto), la otra sobre la posición social de la mujer criminal y de la chica delincuente en las sociedades organizadas, posición determinada por los códigos penales y por la organización represiva, así como por la cultura que privilegia ciertos valores y hace de la mujer su guardiana (posición de instrumento, pero también de víctima). La condición social de la mujer normal y la posición social de la mujer criminal son, según nosotros, « espejos » (« *looking-glass self* »), conformemente a la teoría de G.H. Mead, « espejos » en los cuales la mujer normal y la delincuente encuentran su propia imagen.

### Resultados

Pueden resumirse de la manera siguiente: *Primera hipótesis:* « Las mujeres adultas normales de una determinada sociedad se perciben menos que los hombres de la misma capa socio-económica y del mismo grupo de edad como agentes. » Esta hipótesis no se ha verificado por lo que se refiere a las Canadienses francesas. En este grupo, la diferencia entre hombres y mujeres no es significativa. Nuestra hipótesis se ha verificado en las Canadienses inglesas, pero a un nivel de significación poco elevado ( $\chi^2$ : 0.20). *Segunda hipótesis:* « Las mujeres adultas criminales se perciben más como objetos y víctimas que las no-criminales de una parte y que los hombres criminales de otra. » Esta hipótesis se ha verificado estadísticamente: la diferencia es muy significativa en el primer caso (0.01) y un poco menos en el segundo (0.10).

De la segunda parte de este estudio — la imagen de sí de la mujer criminal y la de grupos de mujeres no-delinquentes a título de control — resulta que si la mujer no-delincente, siguiendo el test « agente-objeto », no se percibe de modo sensiblemente diferente del hombre no-delincente, por el contrario la mujer criminal se percibe netamente como un objeto-espectador, como una víctima, más que el hombre criminal y mucho más que la mujer no-delincente.

## SELBSTBILD UND KRIMINALITÄT

Dieser Artikel stellt die zweite Hälfte einer Studie desselben Verfassers dar, die die weibliche Delinquenz und Kriminalität in Kanada, in den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika, in Frankreich und in Belgien behandelt, und die den Titel: *Self-Image and Social Representations of Female Offenders* (Self-Image und soziale Vorstellungen bei weiblichen Delinquenten) trägt.

Der erste Teil widmet sich der Bewertung der sozialen Vorstellung der Kriminalität. Es wird hier der geringe Umfang der weiblichen Kriminalität studiert, sowie die Eigenart der Vergehen und Verbrechen, die von Frauen begangen werden, und für die sie festgenommen und beschuldigt worden sind; weiterhin ihre Behandlung, verglichen mit derjenigen männlicher Verbrecher, die für dieselben Delikte schuldig befunden worden sind; die besonderen Vorschriften der Strafgesetzbücher, die in verschiedenen Fällen Delikte vorsehen, die nur von Frauen begangen werden können, auf der anderen Seite aber auch Frauen als Täter verschiedener Verbrechen ausschließen. Das sind alles Anzeichen von Rollen, die den Frauen in der Gesellschaft zugewiesen sind.

Die Analyse dieser sozialen Vorstellungen erlaubt uns anzunehmen, dass sowohl die vorgesehenen Gesetze und Strafen, als auch die Wahl der Strafarten im Augenblick der Urteilsfällung die wirksamsten Regler und die beste Erklärung für den vergleichsmässig sehr niederen und relativ bes-



tändigen Beitrag der weiblichen Kriminalität in der ganzen Welt sind. Diese sozialen Vorstellungen und das soziale Gewissen sind nur Erscheinungen der Rollen, die seit jeher der Frau zugeschrieben sind. Daher erscheint uns die Theorie der Rollen (*rôle theory*) die beste Erklärung für diese Kluft zwischen weiblicher und männlicher Kriminalität.

Der zweite Teil, aus dem der vorliegende Artikel einen Auszug bildet, fasst eine empirische Forschung zusammen, der fast ein Jahr gewidmet wurde (August 1966 bis Juni 1967).

#### *Instrumentarium*

Um die Wahrnehmung des « Ich » zu messen, haben wir einen kurzen und knappen Fragebogen benutzt, der aus vier Hauptteilen bestand. Im ersten Teil wurde vom Befragten verlangt, dass er die wichtigste Entscheidung nannte, die er (in den letzten Jahren) glaubte getroffen zu haben und die Motive, die ihn zu dieser Entscheidung geführt haben. Der zweite und dritte Teil bezog sich auf psychologisches (intrapyschisches) Material, das mittels Projektion im Vorbewusstsein oder im Unterbewusstsein gefunden wird. Der Befragte wählte zwei « grosse Figuren », nämlich jene des (persönlichen oder unpersönlichen) Wohltäters und jene des Missetäters. Ferner beschrieb er die « grossen Taten », die er ihnen zuschrieb und ebenfalls, wie er ihre Motivation wahrnahm. Der letzte Teil ist ein bio-psycho-pädagogisches Register; d.h. eine kurzgefasste Beschreibung der Fälle.

*Natur des Instrumentariums:* Dieses Mittel der Analyse beruht auf einer Polarität, die in dem Werk des Psychologen und Psychoanalytikers Erikson (1964) beschrieben ist. Es handelt sich um eine stetige Wechselbeziehung, die vom Begriff des *Agenten* zu dem des *Patienten* geht: « *agens vs patiens* ». Diese Polarität wird in den Arbeiten von R.R. Korn (1966) mit den Begriffen: « Agent-Handelnder vs. Objekt-Zuschauer » wieder aufgenommen.

Was ist die Bedeutung dieser so genannten Kategorien? Für Erikson und Korn ist *Agent* derjenige, der sich als jemanden begreift, der fähig ist, die Welt, Ereignisse und Personen zu beeinflussen. Er beherrscht das Leben und fühlt sich in seinen Bewegungen nicht gehemmt (« *unbroken in initiative* »). Das *Objekt* ist derjenige, « dem die Dinge geschehen » (« *to whom things happen* »), der sich durch innere oder äussere Kräfte gedrängt fühlt, in einer Art und Weise zu handeln, die ihm unausweichlich erscheint.

*Hypothesen:* Wir haben dieses Instrumentarium wegen der beiden grossen Ausgangshypothesen gewählt: die der sozialen Lage der Frau in einer dominant männlichen Gesellschaft (Voraussetzung des Instruments und der Objektwahl) und die soziale Lage der kriminellen Frau und der jugendlichen Delinquenten (ebenfalls weiblichen Geschlechts) in geordneten Gesellschaften; eine Situation, die von den Strafgesetzbüchern und der Verbrechenverhütung, aber auch von der Kultur festgesetzt wird, die einige Werte höher schätzt als andere, und die aus der Frau ihre eigene Wärterin macht (Lage des Instruments, aber auch des Opfers. Die soziale Lage der normalen Frau und die soziale Stellung der weiblichen Delinquentin sind — unserer Meinung nach — « Spiegel » (« *looking-glass self* »), nach der Theorie von G. H. Mead, in denen die normale Frau und die Delinquentin ihr Ebenbild findet.

#### *Ergebnisse*

Sie lassen sich folgendermassen zusammenfassen: *Erste Hypothese:* « Die erwachsenen, normalen Frauen einer Gesellschaft sehen sich selbst weniger als die Männer dergleichen gesellschaftlichen Schicht und Altersgruppe, als Agenten. » Diese Hypothese hat sich bei der Französisch-Kanadierin als nicht zutreffend erwiesen. Der Unterschied zwischen Mann und Frau ist in dieser Gruppe nicht bedeutsam. Dieselbe Hypothese hat sich bei der Englisch-Kanadierin in unbedeutendem Masse bewährt ( $\chi^2$ : 0.20). *Zweite Hypothese:* « Die erwachsenen weiblichen Delinquenten sehen sich selbst mehr als Objekt und Opfer als die nichtkriminellen Frauen auf der einen Seite, und als die Männer, die ebenfalls kriminell sind, auf der anderen Seite. » Diese Hypothese ist statistisch bewiesen worden; der Unterschied

ist im ersten Fall sehr erheblich (0.01) und um ein wenig geringer im zweiten (0.10).

Aus der zweiten Hälfte der Studie erscheint deutlich das Eigenbild der kriminellen Frau und der nicht-kriminellen Frau (aus einer Zeugengruppe): Wenn die nicht-kriminelle Frau sich nicht wesentlich anders als der nicht-kriminelle Mann sieht, so sieht sich dagegen die kriminelle Frau, mehr als der männliche Täter und wesentlich mehr als die nicht-kriminelle Frau, deutlich als Objekt-Zuschauerin und Opfer.

## ПРАВОНАРУШЕНИЕ В ЗЕРКАЛЕ ЛИЧНОГО "Я"

Это вторая часть труда "Правонарушение в зеркале личного "я" и его социальные представители женского пола" того же автора.

В первой части говорится о макро-социологических видах женской преступности. Анализ относительного объема преступности женщин, специфическая природа преступлений, за которые женщины преследуются судебным порядком, разная трактовка женщин-преступниц по сравнению с мужчинами, виновными в подобных же преступлениях, и специальные положения по отношению к женщинам в уголовных кодексах, — все это рассматривается и как "социальные факты", и как "коллективные факты" (Дуркгейм), т. е. указатели роли женщины в данных обществах.

Таким образом, анализ социального распределения указывает, что не только законы и санкции, заранее предвиденные, но также и выбор наказания во время вынесения приговора, регулировали бы наиболее эффективно и давали бы наилучшее объяснение сравнительно низкого и относительно постоянного коэффициента преступности женщин во всем мире. Эти социальные распределения преступлений и общественная совесть только усиливают роль, приписываемую женщине. Следовательно, теория роли (*rôle theory*) дает наилучшее объяснение, почему среди женщин преступность — более редкое явление, чем среди мужчин. Наша культура принимает, закрывает глаза или даже ожидает определенное число антисоциальных актов среди несовершеннолетних юношей, тогда как проступки девушек гораздо менее терпимы.

Вторая часть, из которой взята эта статья, принадлежит области психосоциологии. Это резюме эмпирического исследования, которое проводилось с августа месяца 1966 г. по февраль 1967 г. в Канаде, Бельгии и Франции.

## ИНСТРУМЕНТ

Для измерения автоперцепции была использована короткая анкета из четырех различных частей. Первая часть предназначена для выявления области сознания, где ответчик указывает решение, которое он считает важнейшим в течение 3 или 4 последних лет своей жизни, и причины, которые по его мнению привели его к такому решению.

Вторая и третья часть анкеты относится к не осознанному и подсознательному материалу путем проектирования "я" в "героях" или "злодеях", каковые соответствуют представлению их как величайших героев добродетели или злодеев всего человечества или самого себя лично. Кто этот герой или злодей, и что он сделал, однако не так важно, чем причина, по которой он именно так поступил. Последняя часть инструмента — это краткая автобиография, состоящая из обычных био-психо-социальных и воспитательных данных.

**Рационально-разумное:** Это орудие анализа основывается на bipolarности, хорошо описанной в трудах психолога и психоаналиста Эриссона, особенно в *Insight and Responsibility* (1964). Термины ссылки — "*agens vs patiens*".

Эта полярность расширена и обработана Р. Р. Корном (1966). Новая модель является *continuum* от позиции Агент-Деятель к позиции Объект-Наблюдатель (*agent-actor vs. object-spectator*).

Какое же определенное значение придается этим терминам? **Agens** или **agent** у Эриксона, как и у Корна — это тот, кто осознает себя как имеющий способность действовать, влиять на лица и предметы. Он чувствует непрерывность своей инициативы (**unbroken in initiative**). "Пациент" (**patients**) или "объект" (**object**) является лицом, с которым происходят события, которое чувствует себя побуждаемым, принуждаемым "внутренними и внешними силами".

Это орудие было выбрано для проверки двух основных гипотез: одна о самовосприятии (**self-perception**) женщин и девушек в обществах под господством мужского пола и другая — о представлении самой себя своего "я" женщиной-преступницей и молодой девушкой-преступницей.

Наша первая гипотеза о самовосприятии женщин и девушек непроступниц в данных обществах по сравнению с мужчинами и юношами, не подтвердилась нашими данными, за исключением одной данной группы (Канадцы английского происхождения).

Наша вторая гипотеза: женщины и девушки преступницы имеют склонность представлять себя "объектами" (**objects**) больше, чем преступники мужчины, и больше, чем непроступный элемент — была подтверждена статистически в значительной степени.

#### MARIE-ANDRÉE BERTRAND

*M.A. (criminologie), Université de Montréal (1963).*

*Doctorat en criminologie, Université de Californie (1967).*

*Travail clinique auprès des adolescents délinquants à Montréal et direction de la formation du personnel employé auprès des jeunes délinquants, Province de Québec (1955-1959).*

*Travail de recherche en cours sur la criminalité féminine comparée en Hongrie, Pologne, France, Belgique, Canada, Haïti et Venezuela (subvention du Conseil des Arts du Canada, 1967).*

*Professeur-assistant au Département de criminologie, Université de Montréal (1967).*