

Fall 1951

## Implication of the Glueck Methodology for Criminological Research

Donald R. Taft

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

Donald R. Taft, Implication of the Glueck Methodology for Criminological Research, 42 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 300 (1951-1952)

This Article 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.

# IMPLICATION OF THE GLUECK METHODOLOGY FOR CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH<sup>a</sup>

Donald R. Taft

The author is Professor of Sociology at the University of Illinois. The revised edition of his "*Criminology*" was recently published by the Macmillan Company.—  
EDITOR.

## INADEQUACIES OF MUCH PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The question, "why crime," is still incompletely answered. Important partial answers have usually resulted from the independent work of representatives of some half dozen different disciplines concerned with human behavior. Such research has utilized many different methods. Much of it has suffered from lack of adequate comparisons between delinquents and non-delinquents. Some of it, significant as pure research, has not presented and tested methods of using findings for the prevention of delinquency. Many studies have not investigated all kinds of crime. White-collar crime and potential white-collar criminals have been especially neglected. Until now no research has represented the cooperative effort of all types of specialists, utilized all pertinent methods, or presented identical data concerning delinquents and controls. Few studies have provided us with a predictive device usable in a preventive program.

## GENERAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LATEST GLUECK RESEARCH

*Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*, recently published by the Commonwealth Fund commendably supplies some of the above lacks. It probably could not supply them all. Perhaps none of us who, like the writer, emphasizes any one discipline, can adequately evaluate such a study. This article will attempt to use the publication of this important research to point the need for studies which will retain its many merits, and avoid a few of what seem to the writer to be its weaknesses.

Criminologists the world over await expectantly the publication of each succeeding research study from the pens of Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck. Their latest product, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*, will be received with even more than the usual interest because it adds important theoretical, practical and methodological contributions. A number of us criminologists will regret that they did not have previous access to this research if, like the present writer, they have recently

---

<sup>a</sup> Since this article was written a number of analyses of the Glueck research have appeared in this *Journal* (41:6). Though they are important, it does not appear that the general argument of the present article need be materially changed.—THE AUTHOR.

revised their texts. Whatever general criticisms such criminologists may have to offer, they will need to fit in the specific findings of *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* at appropriate places, especially in their chapters on the family. For this book is apt to be received as confirming tendencies to center attention excessively on early family situations as the locus of the "deeper" causes of delinquency. Actually the study finds non-family influences as well of great importance, but it retains much of phychiatric and psychoanalytical emphasis. It certainly does not prove the point that family tensions are the deepest causes of delinquency.

#### VALUE AND APPARENT LIMITATIONS OF PREVIOUS GLUECK RESEARCH

Most of the previous Glueck research studies have been primarily concerned to test the success of the treatment of juvenile or adult offenders. *Within the limits of their scope and of the approaches and methods they have used*, these earlier studies have been, in the writer's judgment, the most thorough, if not the most significant of all criminological research. Particularly notable has been Professor and Mrs. Glueck's persistence in restudying large numbers of cases over periods extending to fifteen years. Their books may have reflected some improvement in the behavior of delinquents as they have matured, but they have clearly proven the ineffectiveness of traditional treatment methods.

On the other hand, to the sociologically-minded criminologist the value of previous Glueck research has seemed to have been limited by its relative neglect of the influence of social relations outside of the home. Those earlier studies, it is true, gave information concerning church, school, recreational and especially home conditions. But they paid little attention to group membership, group patterning, social status, and social roles. They did not thoroughly and systematically investigate the culture values of the primary groups to which delinquents have belonged or from which they have been excluded, or those characterizing the general society. The Glueck research has generally evaluated the social life of delinquents as "good" or "bad" in terms of the standards of the larger community. It has rarely recorded ratings by the groups from which delinquents derive, aspire to derive, or fail to derive their social status. Some of us call these relatively neglected matters "sociological" as contrasted with merely social factors. The label is unimportant. The relatively neglected influences appear to be of great importance.

## DISTINCTIVENESS AND METHODS OF UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

*Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* is unlike former Glueck studies in that it is primarily concerned with the *explanation* of delinquency. We have here an eight-year study of approximately 500 institutionalized delinquent boys compared with an equal number of "non-delinquent" school children from similar census tracts (somewhat questionably called neighborhoods) in or near Boston. Equal care in the investigation of this control group is one of the study's most important and commendable characteristics. Hence we shall consider below the adequacy of that control group and of the findings concerning "non-delinquents". The delinquents and the "non-delinquents" were matched as to age, residence in a census tract of high delinquency, intelligence, and ethnic group. This matching process, valuable for some purposes, had the serious defect of ruling out from the statistical comparisons the possible influence of the following general factors: Lack of attention to ethnic groups may possibly account for failure to find culture conflict of great significance for delinquency. Lack of attention to neighborhood differences tended to rule out all sorts of significant sociological factors. The possible seriousness of this ruling out process is in part, at least, recognized by the Gluecks. The study shows every evidence of great care in the use of the several methods employed, in securing cooperation and rapport, in tirelessly and objectively seeking facts. Interviews at home and in school, physical measurements with the Sheldon classifications as their object, medical examinations, intelligence and achievement tests, Rorschach techniques and psychiatric interviews were all included. The data were treated statistically rather than through case analyses.

### SOME FINDINGS OF THE SURVEY

It is natural that many of the contrasts found between delinquents and "non-delinquents" confirmed the findings of previous research by many scholars. We hardly need mention these except those which the Gluecks have used as bases for predicting what types of children are headed toward delinquency. It is significant that delinquents were found to change residence more often than non-delinquents. This fact has sometimes been neglected in neighborhood research. It is not surprising that the Gluecks discovered delinquents to be lacking in self-respect. This rather obvious fact suggests, however, the need to show how group membership and group status determine whether chil-

dren shall have such self-respect or lack it. The harmful effect of too severe physical punishment by fathers, of laxity of discipline by mothers, and of inconsistency in discipline by both parents stands out. Though this effect has long been known, it is well to have it confirmed.

With respect to bodily constitution the more or less distinctive characteristics of delinquents included the masculine physical type, early lag and later spurt in physical growth suggesting possibly the Gluecks' theory of maturation presented in their earlier research; laterality in body build, homogeneity of physique, and mesomorphic or muscular constitution. The present writer is hardly competent to pass upon the validity of the use of Sheldon techniques and classifications. It may be noted, however, that these seem to have been accepted without question in this research, whereas they have been seriously challenged both by sociologists and some psychologists.<sup>1</sup>

### RORSCHACH FINDINGS

Nor can we comment expertly upon the use of Rorschach tests together with psychiatric interviews to reveal a large number of contrasts in character and personality. Some social scientists as well as psychologists have found these tests useful in skilled hands and valid as a prognostic device; others point to low validity scores in their research studies. This is said to be the largest group of delinquents and controls to whom Rorschach techniques have been applied, but unless the writer is misinformed some other studies have not brought out similar contrasts to the same degree. Moreover the validity of Rorschach test results even for studies of mental disorder has been questioned. Interpretation of the Rorschach findings depends also, as

---

1. After writing the first draft of this article the writer had the advantage of receiving comments upon it from Professor Sheldon Glueck who was kind enough to read the article as written at that time. A number of generally slight changes have been made in the light of Professor Glueck's criticisms, the most important of which was a lesser emphasis upon what had seemed to me the inadequacies of the control group of "non-delinquents".

With reference to the use of the Sheldon and Rorschach techniques, Professor Glueck properly chides me with failure to explain the basis of my questioning of the validity of these methods and failure to name the critics. I leave the brief comment unchanged, because as indicated I am no specialist in these matters. But there is no question as to the fact that pertinent criticisms of both techniques have been made by eminent authorities. At the last meeting of the *American Sociological Society* the late Professor E. H. Sutherland, with his wonted thoroughness, gave the Sheldon contribution to criminology a terrific going over. An eminent psychologist who himself makes great use of Rorschach techniques permits me to conclude that their use is, to say the least, highly controversial. Another equally eminent psychologist tells me that the Sheldon and Rorschach techniques have both been demonstrated to be invalid. These opinions do not permit the present writer to accept the validity of either the techniques or criticisms of them. They do permit him to assert that their uncritical use is highly questionable. Local psychologists have expressed the view that on such methodological grounds the Glueck research, otherwise so significant, is being subjected to severe criticism from many psychologists.

is recognized in this study, upon the soundness of the psychoanalytical theory which formed the basis of the analyses. Here, too, the specialist assumed certain traits as characteristic of delinquents and then, after blind analysis of Rorschach responses by both delinquent and non-delinquents, found that he was not infrequently right. The more important of these Rorschach findings included: (1) Delinquents were assumed and then discovered to have less fear of authority and dependence upon it than "non-delinquents" and to identify less with parents and other persons in positions of authority. (2) Delinquents were assumed, and then discovered to be, more unstable and impulsive in their behavior. (3) Delinquents were assumed, and then discovered to be, more aggressive and destructive. The logical relationship of these characteristics to delinquency is so obvious that a cynic might add that delinquents might be assumed to be law-breakers and then proven to be such by elaborate Rorschach devices! Speaking more seriously, it should surely be determined whether school counseling personnel or even selected teachers, might not achieve as accurate prediction through more or less common-sense and interview analysis, as is achieved by the complex Rorschach techniques. Such specialists might even improve on the results of the latter because they might have had longer association with pupils and more time at their disposal. Moreover Rorschach results in this Glueck study were by no means perfect. Of 496 delinquent boys 27.7 per cent could not be conclusively classified by the specialists. If one were to add to these the 23 cases of delinquent boys classified as "non-delinquents", one could say that the Rorschach method was able to distinguish delinquents in about two-thirds of cases. (Computed from *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquents*, p. 217).

#### RESULTS OF PSYCHIATRIC INTERVIEWS

Like the results obtained by using other techniques, the major findings of the psychiatrist were generally what one would expect. Delinquents were found to be temperamentally different from "non-delinquents". They were less adequate and more emotionally unstable. They were energetic, aggressive, impulsive, adventurous, and stubborn. Delinquents again were more inclined to indulge their immediate appetites and more desirous to acquire material things. Apart from queries mentioned below as to the adequacy of the control group, this last quality is the only finding which the writer seriously doubts. It is indeed difficult to see how these delinquents could have been more

materialistic than are white collar criminals, or our captains of industry or our labor union members. The psychiatrist also found the delinquents to be less conventional, conscientious, realistic, self-critical and more self-centered than were "non-delinquents". Both groups showed evidence of emotional conflicts, but the sources of conflict of delinquents and their opposites were found to differ. To such conflicts delinquents tended to react extroversively, "non-delinquents" through introversion. There is little reason to question most of these findings, other than to say that they were of necessity arrived at through subjective evaluations, however skilled. Moreover so far as labels of personality traits like those mentioned above are concerned, these in themselves of course tell us nothing as to causes unless we know how the labels were acquired. The traits are thus superficial findings symptomatic of deeper causes. It tells us little to know that delinquents are aggressive, impulsive or stubborn more often than non-delinquents. It tells us a lot if we can show through what types of social relationships delinquents acquire such traits, some of which relationships are almost synonymous with delinquency. Seeking such deeper causes we may conceivably discover the Oedipus complex of the psychoanalyst. We may sometimes find simpler and more overt emotionally toned relations in the family, though these often are found to express forces external to the family. Sociology has shown that such traits are very frequently to be traced to unusual social relations outside the home, or, for a particular child, to the implications of cultural values we all share. Finally the acceptance of these and other findings is subject to the query as to the control group and control group findings discussed in the following paragraph.

#### IS THE CONTROL GROUP SUITABLE?

The Gluecks took great pains in the selection of their control group of "non-delinquents". They will agree that its adequacy and the reliability of the findings concerning its members are questions crucial to the significance of their scholarly study. It may be that the criticisms we are about to make are open to question, but there is no doubt as to the importance of the questions raised. Such a control group must be representative of "non-delinquents" in the census tracts studied. Our first query is whether the families of "non-delinquents" who were willing to cooperate were truly representatives of the families of "non-delinquents" generally who resided in the same areas. Doubt on this point has led us to put the term "non-delinquent" in quotes. However, in a letter to the writer, Professor Glueck has indicated that only

five or six families of "non-delinquents" refused to cooperate. That was surely an achievement. It does not, however, fully dispel doubt as to different degrees of cooperation as between the members of the matched pairs. If, in any research, even a few refuse to cooperate, or cooperate inadequately because of undetected delinquency or other criminologically significant "skeletons" in their closets, the representativeness of the control group is brought seriously into question, by the selective factor thus introduced. If such a defect was present it no doubt was inevitable but non the less serious. This difficulty is one of the reasons for hoping for an approximation to current study of significant events in the lives of thousands of school children, as these events occur, rather than attempts to reproduce them in case histories gathered later in life.<sup>2</sup> Such a "current-recording" method has its own peculiar difficulties but would avoid the ones under discussion, since all children could be studied routinely. Such a current-recording method is somewhat remotely approximated in a few of our schools.

A related question seems to us of much greater importance. Let us assume that a truly representative control group was secured. Let us assume, also, that the investigators and specialists employed were the most skilled obtainable with regard to gaining rapport. Were they as successful in uncovering the family skeletons of cooperating families of "non-delinquents," as they and others before them had been in uncovering the discreditable general behavior and specific acts in the lives of the institutionalized delinquents? The present writer seriously doubts it. How was cooperation of the families and friends of non-delinquents secured? Apparently by telling them their sons and friends were the "good" boys who were to serve as contrasts with the "bad" delinquents. The Gluecks tell us much of the techniques used in securing this cooperation. It is their own account which gives us pause in accepting the findings as complete with respect to the very type of facts which are the most crucial. Lack of full frankness could not affect the discovery of a "non-delinquent's" Sheldon somatotype, nor probably his scores on aptitude tests. But might it not conceal exploitation of fellows, mental disease, undignified quarrels between husbands and wives, and scores of other intimate occurrences of which you and I are a bit ashamed and which we therefore try to conceal? It is not suggested that the investigators failed to uncover large numbers of such uncomplimentary characteristics. It is suggested that they probably missed many more of them in the families of "non-delinquents" than

---

2. Cf. DONALD R. TAFT, *CRIMINOLOGY* (revised edition), New York, The Macmillan Company, 1950, p. 53.



of delinquents. It is true that families of "non-delinquents" were perhaps more willing to talk than those of delinquents, but the latter had been studied because of actual discovered delinquency and had an obligation to submit to study. Moreover, a family skeleton which brings blushes to the cheeks of the good citizen, is often eagerly displayed as an "excuse" for the crimes of the apprehended son. If these two criticisms are sound, they are not criticisms of the work of these two leading scholars. They are defects inherent in the basic problems of securing proper control groups, and securing as adequate facts from them as from deviants.

### THE PREDICTIVE DEVICE

If such defects did not exist, or could be avoided, and if more sociological data could be obtained, studies like *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* could form the basis for a predictive device such as the interesting one which the Gluecks present. That device is one of their real contributions. On the ground that it might be applied as early as the age of six, the device does not utilize findings as to later group experiences which may have been of many different sorts. A very high relationship was found between gang life and delinquency and of course many other types of social relationships might have been studied with exhaustive care. The finding concerning the influence of the gang was not used for prediction. Using other factors with respect to which great contrasts had been found between delinquents and "non-delinquents," weighted failure scores were computed with respect to information gained from three sources: the social investigation with only family data utilized, factors revealed by Rorschach tests, and factors revealed through the single psychiatric interview given each child. Since these factors represent major contrasts between delinquents and "non-delinquents" they may be listed as follows:

#### 1. *Social background:*

- a. Overstrict or erratic discipline of boy by father (although 25 percent of those exposed to such discipline were "non-delinquent").
- b. Unsuitable supervision by mother
- c. Indifferent or hostile father—lacking in affection
- d. Indifferent or hostile mother
- e. Family lacking cohesion

Five degrees of the above factors are combined, but the general idea is expressed when only two degrees are distinguished. When the weighted failure score is under 250 an 84 percent chance of non-

delinquency is found as against only 20.9 percent when scores are over 250.

## 2. *Rorschach test*

- a. Marked social assertion (see study for definition)
- b. Defiance marked
- c. Suspicion marked
- d. Destructiveness marked
- e. Emotional lability or impulsiveness

When these factors are combined and rated in terms of weighted failure score, those scoring under 255 have chances of "non-delinquency" of 71.1 percent against 18.4 percent for those with scores over 255.

## 3. *Factors derived from psychiatric interviews*

- a. Adventurous
- b. Extroverted in action
- c. Suggestible
- d. Stubborn
- e. Emotionally unstable (not to be confused with lability or impulsiveness of reactions)

When with respect to the above factors weighted failure scores are under 245 the chances of "non-delinquency" per 100 are 78.4 percent as against 17.2 percent when scores are over 250.

Comparing results when each of these three bases was used it was found that when a five-class classification was utilized there was fairly often a divergence of one class as among the three. When but two classes were utilized social and Rorschach bases placed 65.1 percent in the same predictive class; social and psychiatric 67.9 percent and psychiatric and Rorschach 69.8 percent. In explanation of this somewhat discouraging result, the Gluecks quite properly comment: ". . . prophetic infallibility is beyond the reach of social scientists . . . there are anywhere from one and a half to three chances in ten that those placed in the group of potential non-delinquents are really potential delinquents." It follows that the use of any two sources gives only 65 percent to 70 percent accuracy. All three of these sources place the boy in his proper predictive category in 49 percent of the cases; two of the three in 86.8 percent. In 2.4 percent all three tables incorrectly identify delinquents as "non-delinquents" while in an additional 10.8 percent two of the three do so; making a total of 13.2 percent in which two or all three of the tables place the boy in the wrong predictive category. Such considerations limit the value of the predictive device but do not wholly discredit it.

## WERE DELINQUENTS AND CONTROLS EXPOSED TO IDENTICAL NEIGHBORHOOD CONDITIONS

A minor point concerns the use of census tracts as neighborhoods. The geographical definition of delinquency areas is very difficult. There is no assurance that census tracts will be true neighborhoods. In addition the Gluecks were obliged to patch out some of their neighborhoods, apparently in terms of physical nearness to undesirable situations, rather than in terms of actual association.<sup>3</sup> Of a total of 156 census tracts in Boston, no less than 92 were called suitable because they had delinquency rates of more than ten per thousand. To these 17 others were added by personal inspection, making a total of 109, or 69.9 percent of those in the city. The present writer does not know how this proportion would compare with that implied in the Shaw-McKay or similar studies, but to call seven-tenths of Boston an area of high delinquency seems excessive. Like the term "slum," the term "delinquency area" is relative and subjective. When so large a proportion of any city is included, does a study really investigate the effects of "the slum" on delinquency? The significance of this point becomes clear when one refers to a recent popular article concerning the Chicago Area Project in which one neighborhood in Chicago is reported as having a delinquency rate forty times that of the average for the city as a whole! And yet a neighborhood is not a geographical but a sociological term. It is properly delimited in terms of social relations, not of physical distance. Social relations causing delinquency may indeed be statistically more prevalent in one census tract than in another. But such tracts do not coincide with the limits of such social relations. That is, indeed, a weakness inherent in all ecological studies. Physical nearness to hangouts or other "causes of delinquency" do not show exposure to these causes except that they were "handy by." Research like that of the Shaw-McKay type also gives us rates by geographical or census areas, but unlike the Glueck research it enables us to see that criminalistic contagion is not a matter of mere physical nearness but of association. It is precisely because the Gluecks do not tell us about such social relationships that we cannot accept the view that they paired off delinquents and non-delinquents as having been exposed to identical neighborhood influences. They were paired off with reference to physical proximity not with reference to exposure

3. Cf. *UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY*, p. 31. Professor Sheldon Glueck writes that there is no question but that delinquents and "non-delinquents" came from similar neighborhoods. Our doubt on this point grows out of the fact already mentioned, that mere physical nearness to conditions rated deleterious was the test of exposure to a bad neighborhood.

to the same type of neighborhood influences. We are not told what their associations were, to what groups they belonged, how far they achieved or failed to achieve status in different types of groups etc. This lack is the more glaring because the significance of such social relations has been demonstrated by many criminologists. Thus the Gluecks, unwittingly no doubt, make themselves appear to disregard research findings by such men as the late E. H. Sutherland, Clifford Shaw and Henry D. McKay to mention but a few. When the Gluecks show that large numbers of properly distinguished delinquents and "non-delinquents" have experienced identical social relationships their emphasis upon family association and personality type will have been partly justified. We say "partly," because even such never-to-be achieved findings would still leave unanswered the question of the sources of family tensions and of personality deviations.

#### APPARENT RELATIVE NEGLECT OF GROUP RELATIONS OUTSIDE THE HOME

It is not to be understood that the Gluecks wholly neglected non-family social relations or influences on delinquency traditionally more stressed by sociologists than by psychiatrists. *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* certainly strives for objectivity. It seeks social as well as psychological data. It does not claim any greater significance for factors revealed through personality analysis than for factors discovered through social investigation. Actually the gang was found to be one of the most important criminogenic correlates. One of the three bases utilized for the prediction of future delinquency comes from the social investigation, though all of its six factors, with the possible exception of family cohesion, pertains solely to parent-child relations. On the other hand no sociologist of distinction (unless possibly among the social investigators) was included among the chief specialists employed. There is little evidence that the social investigations included much about group relations. Study of these was made by a psychiatrist, not a sociologist, and he had time for but one interview with each of the thousand children. Moreover, he had plenty else to investigate closer to his traditional area of interest. Since it is contemplated that the predictive device may be used when the child enters school, it is natural that family relations make up an extremely large part of the factors used since at that time normal children have been exposed chiefly to family influences. Yet even children six years of age have had some extra-family contacts and presumably "predelinquent" children dispro-

portionately. Moreover it is not necessary to make predictions quite so early, and it is surely unwise to do so if the doing means leaving important influences out of consideration in the prediction. It may be argued that to the extent that the prediction device predicts, its basis is unimportant. But in the first place as we have seen, and as the Gluecks recognize, the accuracy of its predictions is not as great as is desirable. In the second place it may be queried whether even the degree of prediction indicated is real. Let us assume for the sake of argument that matters of group membership, group patterning, social status, social roles, gang association, values in the local or general culture, etc. *are* genuinely important for the causation of delinquency. There surely is abundant evidence that they are. Let us further assume that such cultural and relational influences are among the important sources of the emotional conflicts, intra-family relations, personality defects and other factors which the Rorschach and psychiatric techniques uncover or which are found through social investigation of the family milieu. Let us recognize, in other words that, important as are emotional tensions, there frequently underlie them social processes some of which originate outside the home, and that the values taught in the home have an ultimately external origin. It is arguable that conflicts between group standards of sex behavior produce more personal tensions today than does conflict with the superego. Let us recognize, in other words that the importance of the family is in no small degree as a channel through which deeper forces reach the child. It is all important to deal with these deeper sources, partly because unless they are dealt with, it is extremely difficult to reduce significantly the emotional causes of delinquency in the home. It is admitted that all this has not yet been fully established through the use of control group studies such as this fine Glueck research exemplifies. But it is clear that all this has been pretty well established by some of our best sociological research. If, then, the importance of these matters is recognized, how does that importance affect the validity of the Glueck predictive device? The children the Gluecks studied were investigated years after they had had their "six-year-old" experiences. If for example certain tensions significant for delinquency really grow out of gang associations at the age of 8-16, then Rorschach tests and psychiatric interviews will not discover them at the age of six. Thus children in need of attention will not be discovered thereby. Similarly it may well be that the Glueck research and the psychiatric approach generally, overemphasize the importance of traits observable at age six. No doubt the significance of temperamental characteristics at that

age is relative to later gang and other social relations. If so, children will be singled out for special attention who, because they will have favorable later social relations, do not need it. Of course it all depends upon what the nature of the treatment will be. Maybe it will be good for all children. But if it involves any sense of being more socially dangerous than other children it will be unfortunate.

#### SOCIAL RELATIONS IN LATER CHILDHOOD

In this connection it should be noted that while the beginnings of delinquency are of great significance, they are hardly more significant than are later delinquencies. This is because some degree of delinquency at an early age is almost universal among children. It is latter association, including the way in which these beginnings of delinquency are dealt with, which determines whether such early beginnings are continued into a life of crime.

#### POTENTIAL WHITE COLLAR CRIMINALS AND EFFECT OF GENERAL CULTURE

One last point. Since the publication of the late E. H. Sutherland's *White Collar Crime*, no important criminological research can afford to disregard the implications of that basically important study. But what, it may be asked, has the study of predelinquent children aged six to sixteen got to do with the problem of white collar crime? It has surely been unusual to consider this problem at that level when we are thinking of potential thieves, burglars, robbers and rapists. But so far as property crimes are concerned, white collar crime is our most dangerous crime, as the late Professor Sutherland and others have shown. It deprives us of vastly more property than the burglars and robbers do. If so it is vastly important to discover the *potential white collar criminals*. They need definition. Presumably, however, they will be children over-eager to take advantage of their opportunities to exploit their fellowmen. Presumably such children are rather numerous. Presumably they will be found to be at least as large a proportion of the dwellers on the avenue as of the dwellers in our slums. These budding exploiters could not be discovered by the techniques employed in *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency*. They have not been either sought or discovered by any other criminological research of which the writer is aware. Had the Gluecks sought these young exploiters, the writer ventures a guess as to what the result would have been. The significance for the total crime problem of unusual personality traits, unusual

family experiences and tensions, and of the unusual generally would have been shown to be far less evident. Budding exploiters seem to be following patterns all-too-"normal" in our society. Do not their "pre-white-collar-crimes" express values in our general culture fairly directly? Do not burglaries and robberies in large degree express those same values, but far more indirectly? Do not family milieu and family tensions, slum associations, etc., determine, not so much crime or not-crime, as the form which exploitation, stimulated by our culture, shall take?<sup>4</sup> We are speaking, of course, of delinquency against property and pre-delinquency, rather than of delinquency against the person; although the latter is sometimes committed in connection with delinquency against property and sometimes, though not always, has similar causes. Like all criminological research to date, the Glueck research fails fully to explain delinquency because it fails (1) to explain the beginnings of white collar crime tendencies in children, and (2) to show how the prevalence of white collar crime in society helps explain the genesis of "no-collar-crime." This failure also tends toward an exaggeration of the personal abnormality of criminals generally.

#### NEED FOR MORE COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH

*Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* constitutes a very important contribution to the understanding of delinquency. But it is not enough, as the Gluecks themselves recognize in their concluding chapter. Years ago the present writer rather timidly and not very publicly expressed the hope that Clifford Shaw and Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck—or others of like persuasion—might engage together in genuinely cooperative research. If and when such research is set up and adequately financed, it seems that results even more significant than those which we owe to *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* may be anticipated.

In sum, does not Dr. and Mrs. Glueck's scholarly contribution to criminology suggest the need for still more scholarly, still more cooperative and comprehensive, and still better-controlled research? Criminology is not a branch of any single discipline. It is properly an integration of at least half a dozen disciplines. That integration must be applied to the analysis, treatment and prevention of a very arbitrarily defined type of behavior. That behavior is designated as crime by legislatures and other authorities. Crime so defined does not comprehend all of our most dangerous behavior. The still too illogical organization of our universities, and the partial separation of our

---

4. Cf the author's *CRIMINOLOGY*, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

varied types of practitioners, has manufactured specialists who study, teach and practice in considerable isolation from one another. Each gains over-confidence in his specialty and that over-confidence is too seldom challenged by tests of his hypotheses and predilections in the same frame of reference as that of other specialists. Research even more than teaching and practice should require these specialists to work together. The Gluecks included a number of such specialists on their staff, but apparently not all of them. They seem not to have been in complete balance nor was there full participation of all *in the interpretation as well as the gathering of data*. Without such participation neither the Gluecks nor the Tafts are fully competent to integrate and evaluate criminological research findings.

#### NEED FOR EMPLOYING SPECIALISTS IN ALL PERTINENT DISCIPLINES

Types of specialists studying crime are legion. Rightly or wrongly geneticists still wonder about "genes of crime." Geographers find the weather in some degree criminogenic. Economists can tell us more about the effect upon crime of unemployment, child labor, systems of free enterprise and socialism, than can non-specialists. Physiologists disagree among themselves and with the rest of us as to the role of physique or endocrine balance. Some anthropologists have not completely divorced themselves from Lombroso's influence, but they are not in full agreement. Psychologists still give intelligence and character tests and what have you. In the social branch of their science they make important contributions to the study of crime not always distinguishable from those of the sociologist. They have their Rorschach and their anti-Rorschach wings. Sociologists are often far too arbitrary in insisting that crime is a cultural product or is solely a matter of group patterning, social status and other aspects of social relations. Psychiatrists have come a long way since the pioneer days of William Healy especially in their belated discovery of the group. Psychoanalysts tell us correctly that much behavior has sources of which the individual is unconscious. They insist their findings be interpreted in terms of not fully tested hypotheses concerning Oedipus complexes and what not. They interject a jargon incomprehensible to the layman. Some of them appear to wish to keep it incomprehensible. They thrive on the divinity that doth hedge the not-understood—the charisma. Case workers vary somewhat in their training. In the field of behavior problems they are far too often merely neurotic "psychiatric social workers." Some bask slavishly in the radiance of Freud's real greatness,



or the lesser radiance of their particular hero—their master mind. Some case workers seem often not to know the implications for their profession of the work of Shaw and McKay. They do not seem to glimpse the meaning of Sutherland's analysis of white collar crime for their own relations with delinquents. Their task is not to change American culture, but they do not appear to realize how its values reach their unadjusted children.

#### SIMILAR NEED IN PROGRAMS OF TEACHING, TREATMENT AND PREVENTION

At the level of teaching, criminology seems most often to be located in a Department of Sociology and to be sociologically oriented, and that is too bad. At the level of community work sociologically trained leaders are properly called in, but they should be in company with other specialists. At the level of treatment, the psychiatrist and his often hypnotized followers are frequently hailed as uniquely the "specialists in bad boys." Psychiatrists are indispensable, but there is of course no logical reason why men with their particular training should direct our clinics or other treatment or preventive programs. At least it appears that we should get together and there is no more appropriate place of meeting than in a cooperative research task.

#### OTHER CRITERIA OF SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH

Criminological research needs very carefully selected control groups. In the writer's judgment the Glueck research, commendable for seeking such a group, did not provide an adequate one. Even with still greater care it seems that all criminological research must forever be subject to the suspicion that we shall know less about the uncaught than about the caught delinquent, and far less about the so-called "non-criminal" than about the criminal. We shall to that extent always tend to exaggerate the difference between the delinquent's personality and experience, and that of the "non-delinquent." In this connection it seems that some students dismiss too readily the view that crime is largely a product of values in a culture shared by most of us. They argue that were this the case we should all be criminals. Such critics should study research evidence—not yet fully developed—from those who hold crime thus to be largely a problem of the normal. The current wrangle between those who hold white collar crime to be real crime and those who deny this, seems peculiarly unfortunate. It has obscured the significance for

criminology of what is perhaps the most important research to date in this field—that of the late Edwin H. Sutherland.

It is not contended that the “current-recording” type of research mentioned earlier can be set up in a wholly satisfactory form. It would seem that effort to approximate such day-by-day gathering of information might be rewarding. Various types of cooperative research of a different sort could be extremely worth while. Might not such research have among others, the following characteristics?

1. Consideration of all pertinent disciplines, checking findings of each one against the findings of the others. It does not necessarily follow that every discipline mentioned above—such for example as geography—need be included.
2. Participation of all types of specialists in the interpretation as well as the gathering of data.
3. The use of all pertinent methods, checking their results against each other.
4. Effort, even more careful than that of the Gluecks, to get full data about a control group of “non-delinquents.”
5. Search for social processes underlying personality traits and emotional tensions.
6. Consideration of influences making for delinquency at different stages in the development of delinquent careers, so that predictive devices may be shown to be free from errors due to the time at which they are applied.
7. Adequate criteria for the geographical delimitation of neighborhoods, and for their definition in terms both of delinquency rates and carefully determined types of social relationships.
8. Consideration of adult crime as well as of juvenile delinquency, so that relationship between the two may be revealed.
9. Separate consideration of different types of crime or delinquency.
10. Inclusion of special consideration of white-collar crime, racketeering, and non-criminal exploitation both among adults and in the form of “pre-white-collar crime”, “pre-racketeering”, and “pre-exploitation.”
11. Careful study of attitudes of delinquents toward “dangerous” values in the general culture, and of the influence of these values upon them.

More than most criminological research, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* has some of these characteristics. Clearly no research to date has exemplified them all.