

1976

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, 67 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 117 (1976)

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.

BOOK REVIEWS REVIEW ARTICLES

THE ONCE AND FUTURE PROMISE OF THE REHABILITATIVE IDEAL*

TERENCE P. THORNBERRY**

The rehabilitative ideal in correctional work has held sway in this country for the better part of the twentieth century. Spawned by the professionalism and positivism that dominated American social planning at the turn of the century it promised, through treatment, care, and counselling, to reduce recidivism and to turn one-time criminals into moral, skilled, and worthwhile citizens. One needed to be neither harsh nor punitive to reduce the menace of crime in the streets; what was required was a humanistic, caring, and objective approach based on the peculiar needs of the particular individual. This was a lofty ideal, indeed. But the question of the efficacy of the ideal was left largely unanswered for decades. Lerman's *Community Treatment and Social Control* and *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment* by Lipton, Martinson and Wilks go a long way toward eliminating that lacuna in our knowledge. They demonstrate clearly that the rehabilitative ideal in corrections has not been realized, and they raise serious questions about the form it will take in the future. The Lipton, Martinson and Wilks study indicates that a wide variety of approaches have failed, while Lerman demonstrates that even programs considered by many professionals to be among the "best" have not reached an acceptable level of success.

Lerman's study is a re-analysis and re-interpretation of earlier evaluations of two California Youth Authority (CYA) programs, the Community Treatment Project and the State Aid for Probation Services, designed to reduce that state's reliance on incarceration. While new data were not collected,

Lerman's secondary analysis suggests that substantially different conclusions about these projects are warranted.

The Community Treatment Project (CTP) is well known to professionals in this field as a model of innovative correctional experimentation. Its national reputation was enhanced by the positive evaluations it received during the late 1960's as being "highly effective in reducing recidivism rates," as being "acceptable to local community agencies" and as achieving these results at a "lower cost per capita" than the traditional CYA programs (p. 4). Surely a program with such credentials stands as strong proof of the effectiveness of the rehabilitative ideal. Such is not the case however, as Professor Lerman lucidly demonstrates. He takes issue with each of the above assertions, using the same data upon which they were based to arrive at opposite conclusions.

CTP was designed to provide a variety of treatment alternatives to delinquents in a community setting with a minimal use of detention and confinement. Yet as the project developed there was a significant shift towards the use of temporary detention. By 1968, 89 per cent of the experimental subjects had been temporarily detained and their rate of detention was almost twice that of the control subjects. Yet the "offenses" that lead to detention were often trivial: misbehavior, uncooperative attitude toward the program, truancy and trouble in home or foster home, were among the more common (p. 37). The rationale for the increased use of detention, which could be imposed by the parole agent without judicial or CYA Board review, was its utility as a treatment strategy. It was viewed as a useful and necessary treatment alternative in the agent's arsenal that would improve the likelihood of a successful outcome.

As Lerman points out, however, there is a distinction between social control techniques such as confinement, and treatment techniques that aim at effecting enduring change. To confuse the two and

*A review article of COMMUNITY TREATMENT AND SOCIAL CONTROL: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL POLICY. By Paul Lerman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975. Pp. 254. \$12.50, and THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT: A SURVEY OF TREATMENT EVALUATION STUDIES. By Douglas Lipton, Robert Martinson and Judith Wilks. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975. Pp. 735. \$37.50.

** University of Pennsylvania.

to justify the one in the name of the other only serves to obfuscate the issues. According to Lerman, what CTP was doing was providing far more social control than treatment to its charges. Comparing the length of time spent in detention with the amount of direct services received, Lerman indicates that social control outdistanced treatment by a ratio of 9.8 to 1. Although detention was justified in the name of treatment such as counselling or training, there is no evidence that the amount of treatment received while in detention was anything more than minimal (p. 47). At the outset then, Lerman raises serious questions about the ability of CTP to provide treatment in a community setting. Although CTP youths were, in total, incarcerated less than the control subjects, Lerman's point remains: the CTP youth spent more time in detention as a result of trivial offenses and discretionary decisions than in treatment.

But, given the form that CTP did take, how successful was it? The original research indicated that CTP was capable of reducing the recidivism rates of the experimental subjects as compared to the control group subjects. Again, Lerman takes issue with this claim. Starting with the position that recidivism statistics are a mixture of youth behavior and adult decisions (p. 59), he clearly demonstrates the distorting influence of the latter on the outcome measures. Using recidivism measures based on police, court and CYA Board data, Lerman can find no support for the contention the CTP reduced recidivism when data sources independent of the treatment project are used in the comparisons. The police and court data simply do not support the hypothesis that experimental subjects did better than the controls. Only when parole revocation rates are used as the outcome measure is the hypothesis supported. But this is the very measure most influenced by the agency sponsoring the research. It is here that the data can be most contaminated by the decision-makers' knowledge that the subject is an experimental or control group member. In essence, the only support for the position that CTP was successful comes from the methodologically weakest data.

Two other conclusions about CTP should be mentioned briefly. The first is that the program was not cost-effective as originally claimed. Because of a shift from short-term to long-term intensive supervision the project actually cost more than the control project of institutionalization and parole. Second, although temporary detention, a major innovation initiated by CTP, was shown to be ineffective, it was institutionalized in the state-wide CYA parole system by 1968.

In summary, Lerman's evaluation of CTP is generally quite negative. He concludes that "CTP did not have an impact on youth behavior that differed significantly from the impact of the control program" (p. 67). It provided more social control than treatment, was not cost-effective and did not produce a reduction in recidivism.

The second project that Lerman's study evaluates is the State Aid for Probation Services, more commonly referred to as Probation Subsidy. The aim of this project was to decrease commitments to CYA institutions† by allocating

state funds, normally used to incarcerate offenders and treat them while on parole, to the counties for development of adequate probation services. The theory is that this not only will reduce commitments, but it will also permit offenders to be treated in their home communities where chances for rehabilitation are increased. (quoted on p. 108)

The mechanism of the program was rather simple. A base rate of commitments to CYA institutions was established for each county; the county then received a subvention from the state when its actual number of commitments was lower than the number expected according to the base rate. Although the rate of subvention varied somewhat, it was approximately \$4,000 per year for each person "not sent" to the CYA.

Like CTP, the Probation Subsidy had been evaluated previously. While there is clear evidence that the number of *commitments* to CYA institutions declined during the subsidy years, that is not to say that *institutionalization* declined during these years. Indeed, according to a number of measures, there is evidence that under the subsidy program the experience of being institutionalized increased or remained the same when compared to the pre-subsidy years. At state institutions the number of commitments declined, but the length of time spent in confinement increased from 8 months in 1964 to 11.2 months in 1971. Although fewer youths were sent to CYA institutions, those who were sent remained for longer time periods. The CYA rationale for this change in policy was that the "new" population was "highly delinquent" and "more disturbed" than the old. But, Lerman indicates that the variables that distinguish the new and old populations are related to *lower* recidivism, thus challenging the state's rationale.

The second data set presented concerns the use of county detention. While variables such as police

† The project was also in effect for the Adult Authority, but since Lerman concentrates on the CYA we will do likewise.

arrests were relatively constant from the pre-subsidy to the post-subsidy periods, the number of delinquents admitted to local detention facilities increased dramatically. Lerman concludes:

The subsidy period is not associated with a decreased use of institutionalization at the local level. It appears that while fewer offenders are being committed to spend more time in institutions at a state level, more alleged offenders are being sent to local detention facilities for shorter institutional stays. (p. 151)

Finally, Lerman looks at the "institutional youth days" to estimate the net effect of the subsidy program. His conclusion is that the subsidy program did not decrease the number of days spent in confinement per year, but it did slow the rate of increase that had been experienced in the pre-subsidy period. Because of the secondary analysis it was necessary for Lerman to use estimates for some of his measures. When we eliminate the data which rely on such estimates a seven per cent decrease in "institutional youth days" occurs. It is difficult to assess whether Lerman's use of estimates or our elimination of them is more accurate; but even if the seven per cent figure is correct, it would not appear to be a tremendous decrease for a multimillion dollar project to produce over a five-year period. In general, one must conclude with Lerman that the reduction in commitments to CYA institutions had its costs in longer periods of confinement for those who were committed, and in a greater use of county detention facilities, with little or no net reduction in "institutional youth days."

The fiscal rationale for using state funds to subsidize county probation services was that the subsidy monies would come from money the state would save by not incarcerating as many inmates. As such, the state would not have to expend additional funds for the subsidies and might even save money through the project. A state study done in 1970 concluded that "the program had saved the state over \$50 million in operating expenses over a four-year period, even *after* making deductions for payments to the counties" (p. 157).

Lerman, however, concludes that not only did the Probation Subsidy not save the state money, but it actually required the state to spend additional funds. During fiscal 1969-1970, the state claimed to have saved \$4 million while Lerman indicates a *loss* of \$17 million. The reason for such a discrepancy is the accounting system used. In its formula, the state used the expected costs of operating the institution, while Lerman substitutes the actual costs of operating the institution. Since these costs increased sharply be-

cause of the extended length of stay and a lower ward/staff ratio, the savings claimed by the state simply did not exist. This is true even when the rate of inflation, as measured by the Consumer Price Index, is taken into account. To this non-accountant, Lerman's method seems more accurate and more realistic. In effect, the probation subsidies were being paid from general state revenues and not from the savings that the project was designed to accrue.

In relation to both CTP and Probation Subsidy, Lerman's conclusions are starkly negative. Both programs had attendant social costs in the increased use of temporary detention in county facilities which, in Lerman's framework, expanded social control but not treatment. CTP could not demonstrate success in terms of reduced recidivism and neither project was cost-efficient.

At the outset, Lerman questioned whether his findings could be generalized to apply to programs that existed in other states because "it is evident that two programs conducted in one state, cannot adequately represent all of the many variations of a community treatment strategy . . ." *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment* by Lipton, Martinson and Wilks should alleviate Lerman's anxieties since it surveys other similar projects with essentially the same results. *Correctional Treatment* is a sourcebook which brings together and synthesizes the results of published studies that have directly evaluated the effectiveness of treatment programs. It is a voluminous work that discusses, interprets and annotates the finding of this previous work and places the results in a systematic framework for easy reference. As such, it is impossible to review this book in the same detail that was devoted to Lerman's; there is simply too much material already summarized and distilled by the authors to allow this. Hence, we will deal with this work by concentrating on its methods and major conclusions.

The study was originally conducted for the New York Governor's Special Committee on Criminal Offenders in an effort to provide a systematic and detailed account of the relative effectiveness of different correctional strategies. Lipton *et al.* included in their survey reports which were published between 1945 and 1967 and which presented evidence to assess the success of treatment programs. The primary question they ask of these studies is: "What can be said of their effectiveness in changing the offender or in reducing recidivism?" (p. 3).

After an extensive bibliographical searching procedure in which well over 700 studies were considered and rejected, the authors included 231 studies in

their research. These studies met a set of criteria both substantive and methodological in nature that allows some credence to be placed in the validity of their findings. The 231 studies were then placed into two major groupings: those with no more than minimal research shortcomings, and those "with research shortcomings that place reservations on interpretation of findings" (p. 6).

This classification procedure would be stronger and more useful if the authors had presented more detailed information on how the criteria were applied to the studies. For example, we are not told if the studies were rated blindly, or how the research team resolved internal disagreements. Since Lipton *et al.* rightly emphasize the studies that are methodologically strongest in reaching their substantive conclusions, this classification scheme should have been described in more detail.

The studies were grouped according to the type of treatment imposed and the type of outcome measured, with the intersections of these two variables forming the organizing principle of the text. The treatment strategies that were surveyed included probation, imprisonment, parole, casework and individual counselling, skill development, individual psychotherapy, group methods, milieu therapy, partial physical custody, medical methods, and leisure time activities. The outcome measures or dependent variables are: recidivism, institutional adjustment, vocational adjustment, educational achievement, drug and alcohol readdiction, personality and attitude change, and community adjustment. In Part I the chapters are organized according to outcome measures so that one can first see the effect of each of the treatment strategies in reducing recidivism, then their effect on improving institutional adjustment and so forth. Parts II and III are summary sections, Part II using the same organizing theme as Part I, while Part III groups the studies according to treatment strategy. Thus, if one is interested in seeing the relative effect of different types of treatment in reducing recidivism, the material is available in one format, while if one is interested in analyzing the ability of a treatment strategy (*e.g.*, imprisonment) to effect a variety of outcomes, the material is available in that format as well. Although somewhat redundant, this procedure is useful for a source document such as this to present its information in an accessible format.

The result of this work by Lipton *et al.* is a sourcebook with unusually detailed information about the state of the art in correctional research. It provides useful summaries about the validity and

utility of previous evaluations, as well as information about the types of clients served by the project, a description of the treatment provided, the type and adequacy of the research design used in the evaluation, and so forth. There is no doubt that this book will be of value to policy makers, politicians, planners, researchers, teachers, administrators, and others.

But its value to others notwithstanding, its message is simple and distressing. Regardless of the time, money and energy expended in the projects described by Lipton *et al.*, one simply cannot conclude that there is one strategy or set of strategies that have been effective in reducing recidivism or improving any of the other outcome measures dealt with in this book. "This study uncovered no treatment that holds promise of easily and effectively impacting upon the recidivism of all offenders" (p. 560). Lerman's conclusion based on his case studies is essentially repeated on a national level by Lipton *et al.*

This, of course, is not to say that absolutely nothing works. There is evidence that in certain situations some types of treatments can have a positive effect on some types of offenders. The reader should particularly examine the material on length of sentence (pp. 81 *et seq.*), on the quality of parole supervision (pp. 113 *et seq.*), and on amenability to treatment (pp. 208 *et seq.*), to mention a few. There is some hope for the future, but frankly it is not very great. For those who read this work there are indications of fruitful directions to be taken in the future, but they are not many and they certainly are not guaranteed to succeed. What Lipton *et al.* have done is to demonstrate how little we know and how much remains to be done. Take, for example, the fact that the extensive search undertaken to create the bibliography for this project uncovered only 231 studies, produced over a twenty-two-year period, which met the criteria for inclusion. This is only an average of 10.5 per year, even though the criteria were not extremely rigid and studies with "some research shortcomings" were included. It is little wonder that current correctional planning is so ill-informed by sound research findings.

Thus far we have been relatively uncritical of the two books under review. Both works are methodologically sound, carefully designed and informative. Specific criticisms could have been made, for example, on Lerman's reluctance to use significance tests, but such criticisms pale to insignificance when confronted with the weight of the evidence presented by the authors of both books. What they tell us, in essence, is that there is little or no support for the

rehabilitative ideal in actual practice, that with a few exceptions nothing works. Is this conclusion justified? I think it is for it is built on strong ground indeed. Given this finding, what do these books have to say about the future of this ideal? Unfortunately, in our view, Lipton *et al.* have said very little. There is no systematic statement in their work about the types of strategies that should be abandoned, the ones that should be strengthened and implemented, a priority listing of future research topics, or a discussion of the format that such action and research programs should take. They do present occasional suggestions for program changes and future research, but these suggestions tend to be quite specific and tied to the particular topic they are discussing. The problem with this approach is that within any topic there are bound to be suggestions that can be made for modifying the programs and for improving the research strategies to measure the effect of these improvements. But this does not allow us to focus on the most important changes, it does not indicate which approaches hold the greatest promise, nor does it delineate the crucial experimental problems to which future research should turn. In sum, it does not provide a list of priorities, a blue-print for future work, based on the experience and knowledge of the past. This is indeed unfortunate, for the amount of material that these three authors have digested is admirable and makes them uniquely qualified to render prescriptions for the future. In the last two pages they list a number of suggestions for improving the adequacy of correctional treatment and research; however, these suggestions do not do justice to the complexity of the problem and only serve as an outline of what should have been an entire section of the book.

Lerman, however, is less reticent about addressing the future and suggests that the future of corrections be typified by a "strategy of search." Such a strategy would not abandon what we have called the rehabilitative ideal but it would place such an ideal in the posture of a working hypothesis, first to be tested and scrutinized, and then to be accepted or rejected on the basis of empirical evidence. The "strategy of search" has three basic assumptions: (1) current efforts are *ineffective* until proven otherwise; (2) new programs must actually *cost less* than regular institutional and parole programs; and (3) the costs for those regular programs must be *frozen* at a pre-determined base-year per-capita level (p. 195). While the concept of a "strategy of search" is a sound one, Lerman's presentation of it raises a number of problems. The most problematic is Lerman's assumption that a

fiscal ceiling must be placed on all special programs. This seems to be an arbitrary criterion that is clearly inflexible. Yet, the linchpin of a "strategy of search" should be flexibility, *i.e.*, flexibility to experiment with new ideas and approaches without having to give up a fruitful line of exploration because it costs 10 per cent more than the baseline figure. We agree with Lerman that fiscal responsibility and accountability should be demanded in a "strategy of search," but this can be accomplished by means other than fixed ceilings.

If the characteristics of a "strategy of search" are developed, some of these means will become clearer, as will the nature of the strategy itself. The first characteristic we propose is the introduction of inflexibility *within* treatment programs. As long as programs are allowed to change and adopt new policies while in progress, the results of evaluative research will be equivocal and meaningless. Such a posture is antithetical to a "strategy of search," which is dependent upon clear-cut research findings to provide its internal dynamics. We agree with, and would even strengthen, Lerman's suggestion that a more active role be taken by the funding agency to ensure that stated aims and techniques of the project are actually carried out. This should protect the human rights of the subjects, as Lerman suggests (p. 98), and in addition it should contribute to the clarity of the experimental situation and serve as a deterrent to unanticipated cost increases. Each of these objectives is in line with the "strategy of search."

The objection, of course, is that this will tie the hands of the treatment agents and prevent needed adjustments and modifications. My response is that such adjustments should be made in subsequent experiments which will form the fabric of the "strategy of search." What is needed is flexibility between projects, not flexibility within projects. Thus, the answer to the question, "What works?," will come at the end of a series of experiments where each one builds on the results of the one before it, rather than at the end of one large project that has become institutionalized long before data on its effectiveness is available.

Two other characteristics of the "strategy of search" can be mentioned in closing this essay. The first concerns a re-direction of the ego-involvement of treatment agents. Lerman points out that "the responses of CTP researchers and agents yield evidence of the difficulty in accepting the null hypothesis that their program was indeed ineffective" (p. 96). A partial explanation for this observation lies in the misdirected ego-involvement of treatment

agents to a particular project or technique rather than to the more abstract notion of a "strategy of search." If we emphasize Lerman's first assumption that everything is ineffective until proven otherwise, the ego-involvement could be re-directed towards achieving a solution to crime rather than demonstrating that this or that solution is the best one. Such a change would go hand-in-glove with an emphasis on between-project flexibility and within-project inflexibility, and would allow a fuller development of the experimental spirit necessitated by such a strategy.

Lastly, the "strategy of search" should be militantly opposed to the institutionalization of any program that has not proven effective. This element of the strategy requires that the evaluative research seek to uncover unanticipated consequences of projects, *i.e.*, routinization of temporary detention in the CYA parole office, as well as the effect of the project on other elements of the criminal justice system. If this is not done the different parts of the system can easily work at cross-purposes, as the probation subsidy project demonstrated, and thereby mute the positive effect that each of the individual programs might have.

In sum, the "strategy of search" suggests that the rehabilitative ideal continue to be used in correctional treatment, not as an answer to the problem but as a set of testable hypotheses that may or may not provide a solution. To test these hypotheses the quality of the research endeavor will have to improve significantly. As Lipton *et al.* conclude:

It is not just more research that is needed. An entirely different grade of research will have to become standard before hard conclusions can be reached about the worth of traditional methods or of treatment programs now being introduced into the field of corrections. (p. 627)

If these hard conclusions are not reached it will be "business as usual," but, as both of these books have demonstrated, business as usual is very unprofitable.

PRISONS INSIDE-OUT: ALTERNATIVES IN CORRECTIONAL REFORM. By *Benedict S. Alper*. Cambridge: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1974. Pp. xxi, 211. \$5.95.

This book is based on a series of lectures the author delivered in 1973 at the United Nations Asia and Far East Institute on Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in Tokyo, Japan. The material focuses primarily on the juvenile and adult correctional system and practice in the United States,

and is interspersed with accounts of how some European, Asian and Far East countries deal with their crime problems. The central concern of the author is to build a case against the incarceration of the majority of alleged and convicted offenders and in favor of the use of alternatives to traditional practices at all points of the criminal justice system. He emphasizes that community programs for the mentally disturbed, the retarded, the criminals and delinquents, in short, all types of societal deviants, have existed for centuries and are as varied as the cultures which brought them forth. The invention of the penitentiary in the United States some 200 years ago interrupted these time-honored practices and the author argues for their return.

Today, there is a special need to argue the merits of community corrections. Criminal justice in general, and corrections in particular, are in turmoil. Jails and penitentiaries in many states are overcrowded. Some are overflowing. At a time when some states are turning to accommodating inmates in tent cities and others explore the possibility of using one-time Navy vessels as floating prisons, criminal justice administrators and the public at large need to be convinced that it is in their ultimate interest to reverse this dismal but all too prevalent trend, and to look with urgency for innovative and alternative approaches. This book falls short of that mark. The discursive prose in which the twelve chapters are written offers a brief view of traditional correctional practice, discusses existing local and state correctional programs and enumerates a variety of alternative programs. But there is no discernible theoretical framework or guiding rationale, an element which would have greatly enhanced the impact of the book. The volume's lone theoretical discussion comes in chapter nine when five models of treatment of convicted offenders are presented, mainly in the form of direct quotations from the report of a task force on delinquency delivered in Massachusetts in 1972. No attempt is made to interrelate this material with the rest of the text. Nor will the reader find the detailed analysis of the recent proliferation of alternatives to traditional institutions promised on the jacket of the book. Instead, there is an eclectic smattering of a wide variety of facts and figures which leave the reader inundated, but unenlightened.

There are other problems. The book presents an unduly optimistic view regarding the prospects of decriminalization, diversion of offenders from the criminal justice system, de-institutionalization or the supposed reversion to earlier, community-based ways of dealing with the offender. Unfortunately, the trend

is in the other direction. The volume uncritically offers statistics on recidivism and short but glowing reports of program descriptions, variously disseminated by project personnel or U.S. and foreign governmental agencies which are notoriously incorrect, often self-serving and principally designed to justify yet another year's funding.

The most rewarding parts of the book come toward the end. Chapter 10 is devoted to the Massachusetts experiment with de-institutionalization of the state's juvenile training schools. The account contains interesting information on the rationale behind this innovative approach, details on the restructuring of youth services in the state and outlines the main components of the new program, *i.e.*, alternatives to incarceration, group homes and the purchase of services from the private sector. But the presentation is overly optimistic in its discussion of recidivism, and does not reflect the administrative turmoil left in the wake of such radical change. In addition, it fails to convey the continuing problems that plague the Massachusetts system, and the fact that the experiment may yet fail because of law enforcement and judicial disenchantment with the relative ineffectiveness of alternative options.

By far, the most interesting part of the book deals with the correctional practices of foreign countries. While the material is not adequate to convey a comprehensive view of any single foreign correctional system, it does whet the reader's appetite for more knowledge. There are good discussions of the British Borstal system, the Shinko Maritime School operated by the Japanese Ministry of Justice, the OHI work camp training school in Japan (which trains young delinquents in the art of shipbuilding) and the British hostel system. In addition, the origin and the history of project Outward Bound in Great Britain, as well as its American derivatives are examined. Equally informative are the accounts of American innovations such as the Florida Ocean Science Institute program (which teaches young delinquents oceanography, navigation, deep-sea diving, seamanship, marine biology and motor boat maintenance) and the McCoy Air Force Base experiment (which brings to bear on the problems of delinquent youngsters the resources of an entire air base).

Finally, the intended reader of this book is the professional who is actively involved in developing a penal system that is both beneficial to the community and rehabilitative for the offender. It is doubtful whether the eclectic selection of the material and the absence of depth in the discussion will do much to enlighten the reasonably knowledgeable professional

audience. Those wishing to gain knowledge about comparative correctional practices in foreign lands will be equally dissatisfied. As such, only the lay reader desirous of some knowledge about correctional practices will be served.

EDITH ELISABETH FLYNN

Northeastern University

CORRECTIONAL ADMINISTRATION: THE MANAGEMENT OF INSTITUTIONS, PROBATION AND PAROLE.

By *Alan R. Coffey*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975. Pp. ix, 249. \$11.95.

The underlying theme of this book centers upon the distinction the author wishes to draw between the practice and the management of corrections. In the process of crystallizing this distinction the book offers the reader an analysis of various managerial philosophies that might well be usefully applied in the correctional setting. The managerial concepts focused upon are: systems analysis, theory X-theory Y, management by objectives, the managerial grid, organizational development and participatory management. One of the problems inherent in Coffey's approach is determining how detailed one should be in explaining the applicability of these managerial approaches to the field of corrections. In addition, the author is vulnerable to criticism in terms of whether or not a strategy for implementation has been presented. On both counts this book could have contributed more specifics. As it is, much of the discussion of managerial approaches borders on the superficial.

On the other hand, the author's presentation of material is quite effective in offering the criminal justice student, as well as the practitioner, an inventory of alternative managerial strategies for organizing a correctional agency. If one views this text as a vehicle designed to motivate the student and practitioner to gain knowledge in greater detail at a later time about other managerial approaches, then this book has indeed made a contribution to our literature.

The book has some unique strengths and weaknesses. To critique the weak points constructively, one should call the following items to the reader's attention. First, the sections devoted to policy and research were consistently shallow. Second, the chapter on community-based corrections did not discuss a theoretical base for this movement. Although, perhaps, one should not fault the author for this since it is characteristic of almost all of the literature on community-based corrections, with the

exception of Norval Morris' *The Future of Imprisonment*.

Another particularly disturbing aspect of this publication is that the references made to improving the correctional system are made as though this was the ultimate end in and of itself. In essence, one of the pitfalls that accompanies a managerial orientation, such as the author has utilized, is the overly simple assumption that the *only* defect with the correctional system is its managerial obsolescence. In short, provide a more competent managerial base and the system's problems will be ameliorated. This is not so. An example is necessary, and a good one is provided by the author's coverage of parole and his belief that managerial sophistication will improve the system in this most abysmal area. Unfortunately, when one tries to improve the administrative and managerial behaviors that constitute the parole system one is, in effect, buying into the model, or legitimizing it. Coffey no doubt sees weaknesses here and is quite committed to assist in the elimination of these weaknesses. The problem, however, is that all too frequently situations such as these entail a pre-supposition that the parole system is, in fact, a viable and effective model save for its managerial obsolescence. This is an assumption which should be carefully rethought because managerial streamlining of systems, like the parole system, will have little effect on the fundamental philosophical beliefs underpinning the almost total capriciousness of the present model. In short, alternative managerial styles and approaches are a feeble palliative to a system which is premised on a multitude of structural defects, not the least of which is the complete absence of a "due process."

On the other side of the ledger, the author should be commended for the unique manner in which participatory management is suggested as a means to interface with staff and provide staff feedback, and for the comments on talent threshold. Particularly valuable was the author's observation on career promotions in the corrections system. He quite accurately makes the assessment that "managers are promoted not for managerial talent, but for job talent, and there is a difference." It then properly follows that "the promotion to managerial position fails to create managerial talent." In other words, the importance attached to an experiential base within our correctional system puts into perspective the importance that is also attached to a managerial or behavioral science base.

Perhaps one of the more compelling statements in this text was the author's observation that offenders

are being committed to a correctional process rather than to a specific prison. While this has been taken out of the context in which it was used, I have done so because of the overpowering subtlety and the implications that are inherent within the term "correctional process."

Finally, it is incumbent upon the reviewer to point out that the term "cultural deprivation" was used, again no fault being attributable to the author. This was a fashionable term for some time. However, in terms of accuracy and social justice, one would be well advised to think in terms of culture differentiation, not deprivation.

In conclusion, despite the fact that this text has not introduced much original material, it has performed a most valuable function in acquainting criminal justice personnel with another field of literature. Coffey's approach is to stimulate interest in these allied areas, and he does this well. For this reason, his text may well be considered quite useful for supplementary reading.

THOMAS A. JOHNSON

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO DRUG TREATMENT. By Freda Adler, Arthur D. Moffett, Frederic B. Glaser, John C. Ball, and Diana Horvitz. Philadelphia: Dorrance and Company Publishers, 1974. Pp. vii, 328. \$10.00.

Between May 1971 and May 1972 the authors conducted an analysis of the drug treatment facilities in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This book is their report presenting their analysis, analytic techniques, observations and conclusions. As a report, it can be approached successfully by the reader on either of two levels. In its simplest form, the book can be used as a documentation of the background and status of the drug treatment programs in Pennsylvania as they appeared by May 1972. Readers who are associated either with the funding or delivery of drug treatment services cannot help but gain a broadened point of view by reading the detailed attitudes and experiences of professionals involved in other modalities of treatment. On a theoretical level, planners and analysts, both in academia and in the field, will be impressed by the potential benefits derived from the coordination and feedback of information between practitioners of various treatment modalities. The authors advocate this systematic interconnection of the different types of treatment which will result in a "systems approach" to drug treatment.

The benefits associated with a systems approach will come from reduced competition between treat-

ment modalities for patients, the assignment of patients to the most suitable treatment facility and, perhaps most importantly, a systematic methodology for the planning, measurement and evaluation of the performance of treatment facilities.

The study team examined seventy-seven drug treatment facilities throughout the Commonwealth, with the objective of trying to find out what was "wrong" with the system as it existed then. Again and again they found the problems were systemic rather than personal. Treatment facilities tended to coalesce around a *modality* rather than a set of explicit *goals* to be achieved through the execution of a documented plan. The process of planning in any diverse area such as drug abuse treatment will produce diverse treatment modalities, which the authors expect. They do, however, point out the difference between diversity and chaos. Chaos is what they found, but effective program control, which is what is needed, can only be brought about by effective planning. The presentation of methods by which this can be achieved is one of the important aspects of their work. The authors' approaches and conclusion are presented in a logical, coherent and unemotional framework within which the critic can respond. This represents step one in the process of effective planning.

STEVEN LEWIS

Data Architects, Inc.
Waltham, Massachusetts

CRIME PREVENTION AND SOCIAL CONTROL. Edited by Ronald L. Akers and Edward Sagarin. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974. Pp. viii, 165. \$12.50.

This volume, the fourth in an American Society of Criminology series, is composed of a selection of papers presented at the Second Inter-American Congress of Criminology held in Caracas, Venezuela in 1972. The editors, Ronald Akers and Edward Sagarin, have divided the fourteen papers into three sections: Crime Prevention and Deterrence, the Police, and Criminal Justice and the Courts.

Several of these papers have important contributions to make to the burgeoning field of criminology. Himelhoch's article, "A Psychosocial Model for the Reduction of Lower-Class Youth Crime," helps integrate the psychological and social factors in delinquency causation. In the reviewer's opinion, Himelhoch's model merits attention in juvenile delinquency courses. The papers by Cousineau, Bowers, Grupp and Henshel are noteworthy because they examine the deterrent effect of legal penalties

and highlight the theoretical and methodological issues involved in deterrence. Roebuck and Barker's contribution, "A Typology of Police Corruption," is the most significant article to date on police corruption, considerably advancing the case study methods of ex-officers' confessionals about criminal activities.

The major weaknesses of this volume rest in the wide variation in quality of the papers and in the "half-finished" nature of too many of the selections. The editors should have required the authors to make further revisions, and then applied a heavy editorial hand to the submitted papers. If this had been done, many of the stylistic and conceptual problems would have been resolved.

Nevertheless, this book is strongly recommended to a criminological audience. It is a good research document, and demonstrates the high quality of papers presented at the annual meetings of the American Society of Criminology.

CLEMENS BARTOLLAS

Sangamon State University

CRITIQUE OF LEGAL ORDER: CRIME CONTROL IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY. By Richard Quinney. Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 1974. Pp. v, 206. \$4.95.

In *Critique of Legal Order*, Quinney attempts to get criminologists to re-examine their basic theoretical assumptions. To do so, he outlines basic assumptions and implications of three modes of criminological thought: positivism, social constructionism and phenomenologism. After a careful, brief review of each, he introduces a fourth, Marxism, which he adheres to throughout the book.

Once the Marxian ideology is introduced, Quinney develops a "critical philosophy" toward explaining the contemporary legal order by advancing a theory of crime control. Its basic outline is:

1. American society is based on an advanced capitalist economy.
2. The state is organized to serve the interests of the dominant economic class.
3. Criminal law is an instrument of the state and ruling class to maintain and perpetuate the existing social and economic order.
4. Crime control in capitalist society is accomplished through a variety of institutions and agencies established and administered by a government elite.
5. The contradictions of advanced capitalism . . . require that the subordinate classes remain oppressed.
6. Only with the collapse of capitalist society and the

creation of a new society . . . will there be a solution to the crime problem. (p. 16)

After setting the stage, Quinney supplies numerous examples of how existing social order perpetuates traditional reasoning concerning the legal order. Chapter two begins with a forceful presentation of various types of research projects supported by the federal government. From this, the message is clear. Each funded project has the same implicit objective, which is "the control and manipulation of human beings, accomplished by those who rule and those who benefit from this rule" (p. 50).

The core of the book is chapters three, four and five. Here, Quinney attempts to open the criminologist's eyes to "official reality." To do so, Quinney presents a well developed argument of law as an "arm of the ruling class." He concludes the book with a chapter entitled "Toward a Socialist Society." This is his weakest performance. The chapter rehashes the book's theme and leaves the reader at a loss as to the "next step." Essentially, Quinney has created a dilemma: the flaws of the existing structure have been pointed out while no provision is made for a feasible solution to overcome them. The book becomes merely a "tool" for academicians and not an instrument for practitioners of social change.

Throughout the book Quinney argues a "cultural determinism" approach by suggesting that as criminologists we are taught what, when, where, why and how to reason. Thus, for Quinney, all efforts of "crime control" are aimed at ridding society of "deviants." Of course, the alternative is to place our energies into changing the social order so that eventually extensive efforts toward "crime control" would be unnecessary. Again, Quinney fails to provide any concrete recommendations for the needed change.

In conclusion, Quinney's book, *Critique of Legal Order*, should be read by all criminologists. He does succeed in presenting the Marxian framework well, and it is an "eye-opening" account of crime control in America. This book is valuable at both graduate and undergraduate levels, especially to instructors ascribing to a conflict/labelling orientation.

ROBERT M. REGOLI

Indiana State University

sentencing. Gaylin adds to this growing literature an usually well-written book which basically rejects the empirical approach, and instead relies upon data gathered and interpreted by the author using a psychoanalytic approach. While admitting that statistical studies can demonstrate sentence disparities, Gaylin claims that such studies fail to deal with the meaning or process of such disparities. He attempts, through non-directive interviews, to demonstrate that in even the most fair-minded of individuals, their values, their life styles, their background, their current life experiences, in other words, their biases, are necessary and inevitable intrusions into the process of discretion. While the total number of judges interviewed is not stated, Gaylin focuses primarily on four judges picked for their outstanding and varied backgrounds.

Sentencing is a very subjective process and the judges are perhaps the last to realize or recognize that their own biases are violating notions of fairness and consistency. Gaylin defines disparity as simply the violation of "fairness" and "consistency" in the relationship between the punishment and the seriousness of the crime. Departures from fairness and consistency are, according to Gaylin, often the result of the ill-defined and vague intentions of a society which is confused about its own attitudes about crime and punishment. But bias itself is not disparity: biases may be directed against racial, ethnic, class or political groups, or it may be the principled, philosophical orientations concerning the nature of punishment and rehabilitation which are held by judges. This last, the bias of principle, is, according to Gaylin, the most subtle and ultimately irrational bias affecting the sentencing system. As Gaylin perceives the process, "discretion is built into the sentencing procedure to allow each judge to exploit his perception of crime, criminal and circumstance. . . ." Discretion is inevitable, and apparently it breeds disparities in sentence.

This book, while interesting in its insight and valuable for the comments of the judges, is not without serious shortcomings. First, the psychoanalytic approach is not sufficient to uncover the full range of independent, and more importantly, intervening variables in the process of sentencing. Second, it is unclear at times to whom the statements should be attributed: Gaylin, or one of the judges being interviewed. Third, with the development of the book we are led to expect something more in the way of recommendations. The five policy suggestions at the end of the book are not particularly novel, radical or innovative. Finally, while Gaylin admits that re-

PARTIAL JUSTICE: A STUDY OF BIAS IN SENTENCING.
By Willard Gaylin. New York: Vintage Books,
1974. Pp. ix, 244. \$2.95.

Within the past few years dozens of studies have been published which examine bias in judicial

duced discretion at one end of the system (sentencing increases discretion at the other end (police and prosecutor discretion), the final recommendations do not consider the implications of this more complex and interrelated picture of effects on sentencing.

Even with these weaknesses, this is a well-written book. Unlike most empirical marks, it makes clear at the start exactly how disparity is to be defined. Finally, it adds valuable insights to the many statistical studies that document the existence, if not the full nature, of bias in sentencing.

JOHN D. HEWITT

Valparaiso University

SISTERS IN CRIME. By *Freda Adler*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975. Pp. i, 287. \$9.95.

Sisters in Crime discusses the changing patterns of female crime in the United States. It is one of the few books devoted to this topic. Indeed, in the next few years, it will probably be referred to as a pioneer work since we should soon be seeing many books and monographs devoted to this topic. The main message in Professor Adler's work is that more women are involved in more types of criminal activities than ever before, and that, at least for the next few years, this pattern will continue. The crime rate for adult and juvenile women is rising faster than it is for men in all crimes except murder and aggravated assault. This is especially true for property and white collar offenses. As Ms. Adler notes, "liberated female criminals, like their male counterparts are chiefly interested in improving their financial circumstances and only secondarily in committing violence." However, her findings run counter to the mass media accounts and popular impressions that, notwithstanding the Lynette Frommes and Emily Harrises, women in large numbers are not involved in crimes of violence.

Sisters in Crime can be divided into roughly four parts. The first two chapters review the changing patterns of women's roles and the changing literature about women's propensities. They also discuss the biological, cultural and psychological differences between men and women, and assess their implications for women's participation in deviant as well as conformist activities. The next five chapters describe various types of deviant activities with special emphasis on prostitution and drugs. There are two chapters that try to assess the relationship between race, sex and crime, and between class, sex and crime. These are the two weakest chapters, perhaps because there is so little data available to substanti-

ate the expectations or the theories that the author wishes to promulgate. The last two chapters discuss how women are treated and are likely to be treated in the future by the courts, and the types of commitment they receive. One major change that Professor Adler anticipates is that women will receive more equal treatment at the hands of the courts. On the whole, relatively little time is devoted to considering the legal implications of the changing pattern in women's criminal behavior.

Professor Adler writes clearly and lucidly, and intersperses her observations and statistics with long quotes from interviews she has had with women offenders. These "first person" accounts provide depth and balance to the more abstract and impersonal discussion of the forces that influence women's participation in crime.

RITA JAMES SIMON

University of Illinois

A TIME TO DIE. By *Tom Wicker*. New York: Quadrangle Press and The New York Times Book Co., 1975. Pp. ix, 322. \$10.00.

Wicker renders a dramatic and compassionate account of the events between September 9, 1971 when inmates rioted, captured fifty hostages, and took over Attica prison, and September 13, 1971 when the administration regained control by force of arms. In the final assault ten hostages and twenty-nine inmates were killed by corrections officers and state troopers; five hostages, eighty-five inmates and one trooper were wounded.

The inmates formed a negotiating team and presented five demands, including transportation to a non-imperialistic country, and a list of persons to be invited as observers of the negotiations, Wicker among them. Protracted negotiations ensued in which a number of outsiders, including observers who politicized the inmates, became partisan negotiators for the inmates. Idiotically, television cameras and reporters were also permitted within the rioting area. Negotiations, however, were doomed to failure because of unrealistic inmate demands such as complete amnesty. This was rejected since one guard had been killed in the uprising. In addition the administration and observers, including Wicker, initially misread the situation. Given the penal system within the criminal justice system of New York, negotiations should have been conducted exclusively by inmates and other members of the system—including Governor Rockefeller. *From the beginning to the bitter end, the inmates could have been subdued by unarmed state personnel since the*

prisoners had no firearms. The final slaughter was unnecessary, brutal, unlawful and punishable.

Wicker's portrayal is marred by his implicit assumption that the rioters were political prisoners, though they were serving time for traditional crimes. The riot offered Wicker a vehicle to express his "genteel Southern liberalism," to write an autobiography à la Thomas Wolfe, and to submit a polemic on race relations, criminology, ethics and the human condition—unfortunately, all sophomoric. These interpretations supposedly enabled him to fathom the events at Attica within the framework of American racism. The rendition in the third person might have worked had he been a knowledgeable, "true" liberal or radical. Contrariwise, Wicker unmasks himself as a capitalistic individualist ("people could change any society, but no society could change people"), a pious protestant who believes that good, honest, decent, sweet people can make things right regardless of the system, a romanticist who relies on his gut feelings about people and things removed from their social contexts, and an "expert" on race relations who stipulates ridiculously that racism in America stems exclusively from a symbolic fear of blackness, the color of evil and death. Moreover, Wicker's generalizations are flawed by his preoccupation with race rather than with the class system in the United States. This book demonstrates to criminologists how not to handle a riot, and discloses the misinterpretations of a well-meaning, self-searching but naive newspaper writer.

JULIAN B. ROEBUCK

Mississippi State University

PRISONERS OF SOCIETY: ATTITUDES AND AFTER CARE. By *Martin Davies*. London and Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1974. Pp. xii, 204. \$15.50.

In this slim, concisely written volume author Davies describes and analyzes the probation and after-care system in Great Britain. He presents forthrightly the fact that the borstal training program, set up by the Government's Home Office to rehabilitate and promote the welfare of young of-

fenders, is now facing a serious dilemma. Since those committing less violent and less severe offenses are increasingly placed on probation and parole and in what we in the United States call community corrections, those now committed to the Borstal system are the most hardened delinquents who are least responsive to the training and rehabilitation programs.

A number of topical areas are covered in this book. The reality of after-care is discussed through an examination of the extensive and well-systematized English follow-up program. The section on before-release contains a composite portrait of today's prisoners and a lucid account of prison welfare services, and well-developed case histories are used to illustrate the chapter on release-on-license. A part of the book is devoted to the homeless offender and all the other possibilities on the accommodations continuum; this demonstrates the more developed spectrum of alternatives that exists in Britain than in our country. Employment, in prison and on release, is examined as well as the prisoner's view, through autobiographies, of the prison experience and its aftermath. The difficulties of the penal decision-making process, especially the situation where there is no alternative but imprisonment, receive careful coverage. Davies' writing has the merit of great specificity and clarity; for example, he discusses after-care supervision by the probation worker in terms of

immediate contact on release; intensive help with environmental problems . . . ; the offer of personal support through office interviews and rare home visits . . . ; diminishing frequency of contact during the period under supervision . . . ; administrative records will be kept; and reports will be made to central agencies regarding progress.

This reviewer recommends the book highly for those interested in the English penal system and for what its philosophy and accomplishment can contribute to correctional, probation and parole policy and practice in the United States.

FLORENCE KASLOW, PH.D.
Hahnemann Medical College Philadelphia