

1973

Book Reviews

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Book Reviews, 63 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 407 (1972)

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

able in occurrence but whose victims are more prone to see the case through.⁵⁷

- 7) Rape, like homosexuality, falls into that category of lurid crime which is usually discussed in a circumspect manner and which may also arouse doubts as to the motives of the investigator.

⁵⁷ A paradox is evident here in that a Committee on Uniform Crime Reporting saw fit to include forcible rape as a Type 1 offense on the ground that these are the most likely to be reported to the police.

Many benefits could accrue from further inquiry about rape. A better understanding of the motivation to commit rape would probably result in fewer victims. The task of the police, courts and penal system in their investigation, prosecution and rehabilitation of the offender would also be made easier. Furthermore, legislatures would be able to work on more enlightened and less emotional bases. Finally, the adjustment of the rape victim to the social and psychological stress caused by rape would be facilitated.

THE JOURNAL OF CRIMINAL LAW, CRIMINOLOGY AND POLICE SCIENCE
Copyright © 1972 by Northwestern University School of Law

Vol. 63, No. 3
Printed in U.S.A.

BOOK REVIEWS

Edited by

Bernard Cohen

TOWARD A TYPOLOGY OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS: IMPLICATIONS FOR THERAPY AND PREVENTION. By Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1970. Pp. xvi, 203, \$8.75.

This reader was struck first by the fact that this slim volume begins with no less than three Forewords, each a testimonial to the Gluecks' work by a colleague of theirs on the Harvard University faculty. I suspect that this is a prior reaction to the sharp criticisms of their work which experience with previous publications has taught the authors to expect from some social scientists, including this reviewer. But, testimonials from prominent figures notwithstanding, the Gluecks' major opus comparing 500 delinquents with 500 non-delinquents, although a pioneering effort, was and continues to be riddled with conceptual and methodological faults, and those faults mar the present work which is based on that same study.

The authors address themselves here to an important problem in research on delinquency: the possibility that the concept itself is not usefully unitary.

"... [A] number of workers in the fields of delinquency and criminalism have been emphasizing the fact that to treat all antisocial deviates as a single class tends to blur distinctions which may be significant, not only in understanding etiology

but in carrying out varied therapeutic and preventive programs" (p. 1).

Were the Gluecks able to identify different types, at least partially distinctive as to the forces encouraging their delinquency and amenable to different kinds of treatment, they would indeed have made an important theoretical and practical contribution. The Gluecks claim to have "finally settled on what seems to us to be the most promising 'launching pad' for synthesizing such numerous individual and social influences into reasonably consistent, and essentially differentiative, types of juvenile offenders" (p. xi). This reviewer holds that even this modest claim is unfounded.

The Gluecks subjected the large store of information obtained on the 500 delinquent boys of their 1950 *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* to elaborate computer analyses in their search for types. Three brief chapters, covering 16 pages, and an appendix of 42 pages by a statistical consultant chronicle this effort. The authors and their consultant conclude finally that these analyses, while they may have yielded some interesting clues, make no significant advance toward a typology beyond the three-item prediction scale introduced in the 1950 report. So the "promising 'launching pad'" for a typology of delinquents is a three-fold classification of 500 delinquent boys based on ratings of (a) the supervision they received from

MARTIN GOLD

their mothers, (b) the discipline exerted by their mothers, and (c) the cohesiveness of their families: in group 1 are the 34 boys with scores less than 140; in group 2, the 113 with scores from 140 to 200; and in group 3, the 347 with scores of 200 or more.

Are these types? Are they the beginnings of a typology? According to the authors, "A typology ought to yield suggestive clues to therapeutic, prophylactic and preventive approaches and techniques" (p. 5). The Gluecks seem to offer two kinds of arguments that this three-fold classification is helpful in that direction, but it seems to me that these arguments are not compatible.

One argument implies that the classification system should be viewed, not really as differentiating *types*, but actually as identifying *degrees* of delinquency. The authors counsel that it directs clinicians, for reasons of economy, to concentrate "clinical and school preventive intervention . . . on children of Type 3 (with a high risk of delinquency) and of Type 2 (with a 50-50 chance)" (p. 93).

The other argument points out that all three categories are composed of seriously delinquent boys (for after all almost all were found in reformatories). But only Type 3 are delinquent clearly on account of familial factors. So the classification system directs clinicians faced with Types 1 and 2 to direct their diagnoses and treatment largely elsewhere than in the family. (These directives should be viewed cautiously in the context of the suspicion of this reviewer and others that the almost exclusive importance assigned by the Gluecks to familial factors in the generation of delinquency is not actually a discovery of what causes delinquent behavior, but rather their coming upon the criterion by which the juvenile justice system chose to put some apprehended delinquents in the reformatories where the Gluecks found them.)

The Gluecks conclude their work by suggesting: "Thus, it would seem advisable for the clinician to take two major relevant steps in considering the child involved: first, to determine the group to which he belongs in terms of his rearing; secondly, to determine which forces are involved in the youngster himself" (p. 79). They point to family life, school, and recreation as primary spheres of delinquency prevention and treatment.

This reviewer does not believe that this represents a major advance toward a typology of juvenile offenders.

Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan

EXPLAINING DELINQUENCY: CONSTRUCTION, TEST, AND REFORMULATION OF A SOCIOLOGICAL THEORY. By *LaMar T. Empey, Steven G. Lubeck*, with *Ronald L. LaPorte*. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1971. Pp. xv, 223. \$12.50.

This monograph presents a relatively straightforward theory of juvenile delinquency drawn from the sociological literature and then tests the theory in a sophisticated fashion. In doing so, the authors find that some of the relationships in that theory are not supported by the data and that others need substantial revision and restatement.

Before looking at the theory tested by Empey, Lubeck and LaPorte, a word must be said about the samples they use for testing the theory. In both Los Angeles and Utah, a sample of officially-labeled delinquents was combined with a sample of juveniles who had no official records of delinquency. In the last three chapters of the book, where the authors present a thoughtful discussion of directions for future research on delinquency, they distinguish between law-abiders, undetected law-violators and official delinquents. Since they do make this distinction, it is surprising that they do not fully take it into account in their own research design. They test the theory on two groups, each comprised of about three parts officially-labeled delinquents and one part some combination of law-abiders and undetected law-violators. It might have been better to test the theory on a cross-section of a particular age-cohort, using a measure of self-reported delinquencies as the dependent variable.

The theory tested by the authors is simply stated in terms of a sequence of cause-effect relationships. Lower class status reduces achievement, which in turn produces strain. Increased strain then leads to more identification with peers, and this in turn leads a youth into delinquency. It is not made clear exactly where in the delinquency literature the theory is stated in this form, but it does represent much current thinking about juvenile delinquency. It is also difficult to determine whether the theory is meant to explain delinquent behavior or officially-labeled delinquency. If it is the former, then reliance on only official records of delinquency creates obvious problems. If it is the

latter, it seems the model should include measures relating to the juvenile justice system, not just the background of the juvenile.

Path analysis and the gamma measure of association are used to test the theory. The results of the data analysis are presented in detail in Chapters 4 through 9. Though quite technical, these chapters are lucidly written. Good summaries are wisely presented at the beginning of each chapter so that those interested only in the substantive results will have them readily available.

The authors find that social class (operationalized only as prestige of father's occupation) has insignificant direct and indirect effects on other variables in the model and may be dropped from the model. Since class was construed in such a limited way in this study, one should be wary of eliminating this variable from future research. The authors do suggest that the absence of effects of class on achievement, strain, peer identification and delinquency may result from treating class in too global a manner. It may be necessary to look instead at the interaction of class with such variables as family structure and community structure to assess accurately the relationship of class to delinquency.

Integration into social institutions, particularly the school and the family (the latter not being part of the original model), is found to be a strong predictor of peer identification and delinquency. More specifically, measures of strain such as dropping out of school and disharmony in the family are related to peer identification and delinquency. The authors correctly acknowledge that the direction of these relationships is not always clear, e.g., dropping out of school may lead a juvenile into delinquency, but he may also be more apt to be labeled a delinquent if he is not attending school when brought before a juvenile court.

One interesting aspect of this book is that at various points the authors note that different relationships hold in the two areas they studied, Los Angeles and Utah. For example, they find that family disharmony is a stronger predictor of peer identification and delinquency in Los Angeles than in Utah, possibly because the impersonality of life in the city makes the family more important in preventing delinquency in that setting. The authors' suggestion that delinquency should be studied empirically in different social contexts is worth pursuing.

A series of alternative formulations of the theory are considered and tested. The authors say that one must consider the possibility of two-way cause-effect links, e.g., peer identification may cause delinquency, but being labeled delinquent may then produce increased identification with peers. The asymmetry of relationships suggested in the original theory seems to have oversimplified reality. Explaining delinquent behavior is clearly more complex than many theorists have assumed.

The authors of this study do a nice job of extracting a theoretical explanation of delinquency from the literature, testing it in a detailed fashion, considering and testing revisions of the theory, and offering suggestions for future research. Any responsible work on the causes of delinquency in the future will have to take into account the results of this study, and make comparable efforts to test theory with the same care exercised by the authors of this book.

JOHN E. CONKLIN

Tufts University

THE POLICE AND THE PUBLIC, (*Albert J. Reiss, Jr.*)

New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971. Pp. xv, 228. \$7.95.

The past decade has witnessed an astonishing proliferation in what might be called "police literature" . . . much of it poor to mediocre, some of it useful if undistinguished. Among the many titles newly available may be found a very limited number of challenging, insightful and provocative contributions, analyzing, examining, and evaluating the American approach to law enforcement by utilizing the concepts and methodologies of sociology, political science, history and philosophy. Exemplars of this excellence might well include Jerome Skolnick's *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society*¹, George E. Berkley's *The Democratic Policeman*², James Q. Wilson's *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities*³, J. P. Martin and Gail Wilson's *The Police: A Study in Manpower*⁴ and Egon Bittner's *The Functions of the Police in Modern Society*⁵, and perhaps some half-dozen additional titles. To this latter grouping must now be added Albert J. Reiss' *The Police and the Public*.

Albert Reiss, a Yale University sociologist, was one of the many experts retained by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice . . . his particular responsi-

bility was to select, train and supervise a crew of observers (12 observers in each of three cities, selected equally from the fields of law, law enforcement and social science) which in the summer of 1966 spent approximately seven weeks riding eight-hour tours with police motor patrol units in Boston, Chicago and Washington, D. C. recording each incident in which the patrol unit became involved. Reiss had done previous observation tours himself and had supervised such observations conducted by graduate students in Detroit and Chicago from about 1963 through 1966. His report to the Commission, emphasizing a high incidence of observed police misconduct, proved controversial and little of his findings are included in either *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*⁸ or *Task Force Report: The Police*.⁷

In *The Police and the Public*, Reiss has rescued the unused data, supplemented it with observations and discussions with police officials in many other American cities (and at least one city in Canada), and produced four essays, each in itself a major contribution to the public's understanding of the realities rather than the myths of American policing; but the four taken together add up to considerably more than the sum of the parts. Here we have a contribution to police ethics more honest than Kooken's⁸ and a revelation of police self-perceptions and police rationalizations more sharply delineated than either Niederhoffer's⁹ or Westley's¹⁰ researches in these areas. Especially clear, forceful and informative is the third essay, "Police Manners and Morals," and more particularly the sub-section of that essay entitled, "Subcultures and Misconduct." Curiously, Reiss fails to address himself either here or in other essays to the socio-psychological factors which perhaps underpin much of the defective structure (e.g., the ultra-masculine self-image; socio-religious origins of police-sex attitudes,¹¹ and the authoritarian yet defensive self-righteousness so frequently pervading the writings of police authors)¹².

Reiss and his observers identify many areas of police administrative, managerial, operational and organizational deficiency—most of which have been previously pointed out by August Vollmer, Bruce Smith, O. W. Wilson and the directors of scores of municipal police surveys. More importantly Reiss calls into question some of the time-worn if unhallowed rationalizations for police misconduct (e.g., that corruption, brutality, acceptance of gifts and favors, and other violations are atypical behavior patterns; that police exercise no discretion

in enforcing the law; or that police misconduct involves only a small and perhaps not too deserving segment of the population) and describes what is fast becoming an alienated police sub-culture (or perhaps counter-culture) with its own mores, folkways and politicized organizations, at war with the society it is sworn to protect (although he does not indeed state so explicitly). Certainly he provides much evidence that the police officer's "moral commitment" to the system of criminal justice administration is diminishing if not entirely lost (although recent histories of municipal policing in 19th century America suggest that perhaps this phenomenon is not entirely new)¹³.

Let us accept for the moment my evaluation of *The Police and the Public* as an outstanding contribution to the new police literature . . . a far more important question rises: Who is reading this new literature? I am not at all certain that it is the police; not even those many thousands of police who are attending community colleges, are enrolled in baccalaureate programs or who have been accepted as candidates for graduate degrees. Analysis of footnotes and bibliographies in both published and unpublished materials, checks of library catalogues in institutions having police science curricula, and conversations with both faculty and students in such programs discloses little acquaintance with many of the more important contributions of the past fifteen years . . . and an attitude toward both books and authors so hostile that one is astonished to learn that the detractor has not even read the volume he has just demolished with the label, "anti-police." Some months ago while lecturing on "Seminal Works in Police Literature" at a major university having a well-established and highly-rated police curriculum, I was dumbfounded to learn via hand-poll that in a class of some forty specially selected middle-management level police officers, many of them intelligent, articulate, and professionally-oriented, scarcely ten percent had read even one of the volumes mentioned elsewhere in this review.

Albert Reiss' *The Police and the Public* is too important, too perceptive, too timely to gather dust on a library shelf; far too relevant to the true professionalization of the police to be reserved for graduate students in sociology and political science. It is a study of the police, for the police. Their response, not only to the author and the book, but to the very basic aspects of law enforcement as a profession and its role, and its practi-

tioners' conception of their role, which he, perhaps traumatically, exposes for further study and dialogue, will measure more exactly the parameters of their dedication to police professionalism than will hours of self-serving rhetoric or continued vilification of those observers and scholars who have directed their attention to this important area of governmental administration and who have exposed its deficiencies and abuses . . . that they may be corrected or eliminated.

DONAL E. J. MACNAMARA

John Jay College of Criminal Justice
City University of New York

REFERENCES

1. Skolnick, Jerome, *Justice Without Trial: Law Enforcement in Democratic Society*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1967.
2. Berkley, George E., *The Democratic Policeman*, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969.
3. Wilson, James Q., *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1968.
4. Martin, J. P. and Gail Wilson, *The Police: A Study in Manpower*, Heinemann, London, 1969.
5. Bittner, Egon, *The Functions of the Police in Modern Society*, NIMH Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, Washington, D. C., 1970.
6. —, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1967.
7. —, *Task Force Report: The Police*, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1967.
8. Kooen, Don, *Ethics in Police Service*, Charles C. Thomas, Springfield, Ill., 1957.
9. Niederhoffer, Arthur, *Behind the Shield: The Police in Urban Society*, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1967.
10. Westley, William A., *The Police: A Sociological Study of Law, Custom and Morality*, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1951.
11. MacNamara, Donal E. J., "Police and Sex", *Sexual Behavior*, Vol. 1, No. 4 (July 1971), pp. 24-32.
12. Klein, Herbert T., *The Police: Damned if They Do—Damned if They Don't*, Crown Publishers, New York 1968; and Radano, Gene, *Walking The Beat: A New York Policeman Tells What Its Like on His Side of the Law*, World Publishing Company, Cleveland, 1968.
13. Lane, Roger, *Policing The City*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1967 and Richardson, James F. *The New York Police: Colonial Times to 1901*, Oxford University Press, 1971.

PRISON TREATMENT AND PAROLE SURVIVAL: AN EMPIRICAL ASSESSMENT. By Gene Kassebaum, David A. Ward and Daniel M. Wilner. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971. Pp. v, 380. \$9.95.

Professors Kassebaum, Ward and Wilner, funded by the National Institute of Mental Health,

have made a significant contribution to correctional literature with *Prison Treatment and Parole Survival*. The volume describes a prison treatment program of group counseling and provides a sophisticated evaluation of effects of participation in the program on attitudes and behavior of men in prison and on their chances for completing parole successfully after release to the community. The significance of the volume is not limited to the reported findings, but extends to broader issues of research and evaluation of correctional programs and demonstrates unequivocally the continuing need for assessment of correctional programs.

Initiated in California correctional institutions in 1944, group counseling is, according to correctional officials, "an effort to use the small group method to constructively increase the positive impact of correctional employees on inmates and parolees. It is an effort to develop more healthy communication and relationships within the prison. It is focused on conscious reality problems and feelings—past, present and future." Group counseling "attempts to reduce institutional tensions and incidents, encourage participation in correctional programs, and increase parole success." That these lofty goals are not uniformly shared by inmates is documented by a segment from an escaped prisoner's poem:

The object of this meeting is as far as I can see.
Is to squeel on each other.

The biggest fink goes free.

Disparities in perceptions aside, the hypotheses tested in the research were three in number:

Participation in treatment (group counseling) results in lessened endorsement of the inmate code.

Inmates who participate in the group counseling program receive fewer prison disciplinary reports.

Parolees who participate in the prison group counseling program have lower recidivism rates than controls.

How these hypotheses stood up against hard data may be examined concurrently with a description of the volume. Chapter I is a concise and clear statement of the concept of treatment in an institution and the problems encountered by correctional agencies in their social control role. Chapter II, an orientation to the locus of the research, the California Men's Colony-East, is a portrait of the physical plant, inmates, staff, services and programs. Included is an examination of the concept of "troublemaking" in prison and a review of

the institutional "justice system." Chapter III outlines the research design, including operational definitions of group counseling, the program ingredients necessary to influence group members' behavior in a positive fashion, the measures used to evaluate treatment outcome, the composition of the treatment and control groups, and the plan for implementing the research design. Chapter IV details a special training program established for group counselors. Chapter V summarizes the inmate view of group counseling, one part of which is the "game" represented by group counseling wherein participation in the program may not help, but failure to participate may seriously reduce official estimates of parole potential.

Chapter VI focuses upon the inmate code, the classification literature from Clemmer through Schrag and Sykes and Matza, attempts to classify inmates according to previously published schemes, and furnishes data testing the first hypothesis. The authors "*conclude that group counseling did not alter the endorsement of inmate norms, and correspondingly that to the extent that postrelease criminality is supported by continued endorsement of these values, group counseling in prison does not affect this source of parole violation.*"

Chapter VII, emphasizing social control aspects, describes the background of parole services in California. Chapter VIII provides data relating to the second (treatment exposure and behavior in prison) and third hypotheses (parole outcome). "*The differences on any given type (of prison violation)—person, inmate property, staff, or administration—from one treatment category to another, amount to only a few percentage points . . . the value of chi square did not reach significance.*" As to parole outcome by the year of return to prison or the seriousness of revocation . . . "*all versions tell essentially the same story: treatment and controls do not have significantly different outcomes. . . . Post-*

release outcome was not significantly different irrespective of exposure to any type of group counseling program or stability of leadership In short, parole performance as measured by specific criteria was no different for the participants in group counseling than it was for non-participants There were no differences in parole outcome by treatment status measured at 6, 12, 24 and 36 months after release."

Chapter IX explores factors related to parole survival and provides technical notes on the methods of analysis. Chapter X is a critical examination of "why group counseling does not reduce parole violation" and should be mandatory reading for correctional administrators and practitioners. Segments of this concluding chapter include a revised view of the prison community, with subsections on the prison as a closed social system, the Department of Corrections as an inclusive system and the inmate code as a reaction to the pains of imprisonment, and implications of negative findings from evaluation of correctional treatments for administrators and treatment professionals and for the disciplines of sociology and penology.

While the complete evaluation of a specific treatment program is itself noteworthy, the text contains implications for correctional and other justice administrators, not the least of which is the critical need for assessment of programmatic activities. Because of its detailed description of a correctional institution and its sociological summaries and insights, the volume should prove useful in both the academic and in-service classroom. Well-organized, well-written and thoroughly documented statistically and methodologically, *Prison Treatment and Parole Survival* will be satisfying and thought-provoking for those interested in corrections.

ROBERT M. CARTER
University of Southern California

