

BOOK REVIEWS—cont.

are forced to set inmates goals of rehabilitation which can rarely if ever be realised. This pessimistic conclusion, which is developed in detail, should make this study required reading for all prison officers who see their function primarily in terms of rehabilitation of the offender.

In spite of these critical remarks this is an important study which would well repay the very serious effort necessary to comprehend its main contentions. It provides the theoretical rationale of our contemporary approach to prison work, establishing the connection between the older type of prison regime and the professionalisation of the criminal. It indicates the prime importance of understanding the phenomena of group activity if we are to connect certain types of behaviour of prisoners and guards with antecedent causes. The causal connections it establishes enables us to predict the outcome of particular regimes and to control social response. The best possible outcome of this book would be that some comparable group in this country might be encouraged to look at our prison system and correctional establishments in the same way and analyse them in terms of the same conceptual framework.

JOHN McLEISH.

PREDICTING DELINQUENCY AND CRIME

Sheldon & Eleanor Glueck
Harvard University Press (London &
Oxford University Press) 1959
pp.283. \$6.50.

WHATEVER VERBAL FORMULA we may like to resort to as our solution of the free will versus determinism

dilemma, there can be few who would deny what the authors of this book call "the reasonable predictability of human behaviour under given circumstances." Moreover, there seems no reason why we should exempt from this general statement such pieces of human behaviour that usually attract moral judgements. In other words, this predictability of human behaviour applies equally well to such actions as are customarily called good or bad. It may or may not be meaningful to say that a criminal has free will, but in any case there is no reason to doubt the predictability of his nefarious activities. And if anyone *does* doubt it then let him read this book. Herein is contained "an entire battery of predictive tables developed inductively out of the numerous Glueck researches." The underlying assumption of the book is simple but sound—that items which are found to separate the sheep from the goats at an acceptably high level of significance are capable of predicting sheepishness (or goatishness); and, furthermore, and this is really the "message" of the book, that this sort of knowledge is potentially of the highest social utility if only we could induce our administrators to use it. Evidence of such significant differences is given for a wide variety of treatments—e.g., Behaviour on Probation, Behaviour in Correctional Schools, Behaviour during Parole, Behaviour after End of Treatment, Behaviour of Civilian Delinquents in Armed Forces, and so on. There is also a chapter on the prediction of behaviour of female offenders, welcome because female delinquents are notoriously an under-studied group. Most interesting of all, in this reviewer's

BOOK REVIEWS—cont.

opinion, is a chapter on the identification of potential delinquents. Here the authors show that the techniques appropriate for predicting behaviour under various forms of correctional treatment are also appropriate for forecasting which boys are most likely to be delinquents. They are well placed to do so, since in their mammoth study, "Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency", they were able to discover a huge number of factors which discriminated between delinquent and non-delinquent boys. To what extent, however, this knowledge could be used as an instrument of social prevention is a question which will have to be discussed below.

Scientifically, it appears to this reviewer that the underlying significance of work such as the Gluecks' is that what they have achieved is an ordering of *experience*, a systematisation of empirical observations. This purely inductive achievement may look very modest by contrast with the elaborate deductive systems which characterise the history of the more "mature" sciences, but it is a notable step forward in the history of penal treatment, so much so that one cannot help wondering ruefully whether the authors may not still be several steps ahead of their time. The collection and ordering of observed data may represent an elementary stage of scientific investigation, but it is a stage; whereas to proceed on hunches, feelings, first principles, etc., is essentially *pre-scientific*. The information the Gluecks give us is of the kind: this offender, coming as he does within such and such a category, has a certain chance of succeeding (i.e., behav-

ing himself, not recidivating, etc.) if he is given treatment X, and rather more chance if he is given treatment Y. Therefore it would be better to give him treatment Y. What is the scientific status of this information? The Gluecks' concluding words give the best answer " . . . it can be said, *on the basis of already existing evidence*, that the predictive approach opens up a promising path through the dense forest of guess work, hunch, and vague speculation concerning theories of criminal behaviour. It gives hope of the ultimate transformation of criminology into a discipline approaching scientific stature" (reviewer's *italics*). Evidence replaces hunch—that is the gist of the Gluecks' claim for their system, and in this respect their work represents a scientific breakthrough in the penological field. To say that we will send this nineteen-year-old lad to a reformatory because we know from *experience* that lads of this type—i.e., in this score class—have a less than one in three chance of maladaptation may not sound very spectacular, but it is far more scientific than saying that we will send him to borstal, put him on probation, fine him, or what have you, *because we have a feeling* (whether or not justified by objective evidence we have no idea) that borstal, etc., does lads like this good. If this seems like a labouring of the obvious the reader is recommended to look at the Gluecks' quotation on Page 5, of Gaudet's "The Sentencing Behaviour of the Judge"; no doubt it would not be difficult to find similar examples of sentencing practice in British courts.

The tone of the book is modest enough in its claims for the extent

BOOK REVIEWS—cont.

of the breakthrough which has been achieved, and it behoves us to be similarly realistic in assessing the practical usefulness of these predictive devices, even if we make a perhaps not very realistic assumption that the authorities can be persuaded to use them. Throughout, the authors stress the empirical, inductive, observational nature of their results, and although many interesting hypotheses could be framed, and tested, as to *why* certain factors are associated positively or negatively with success, the fact remains that all the Gluecks can tell us at the moment is *that* they are. We are thus in the position of knowing that a given offender will probably do well under a given form of treatment, without knowing—if the word may be permitted—the *dynamics* of the situation. Does this matter? In a sense no—if we know it will do this man good to go on parole we are justified in sending him on parole, even if we do not yet know why parole is good for him and not for the man in the next cell. And even if we never knew any more than what the Gluecks can at present tell us, the social utility of their predictive devices would be demonstrated. But quite clearly, in the long run, both theoretical sophistication and considerations of practical usefulness demand that we must go beyond this ordering of data stage. Although the Gluecks discourage the use of the word "cause", we must, sooner or later, start asking questions that look like "why" questions; from the point of view of scientific advance this is essential, since science is not content just to observe, it aims at establishing laws; so that we cannot rest

content with the knowledge that some people succeed and others fail, but if the analogy of other sciences is anything to go by, have to go on to a theoretical system capable of explaining such facts as success and failure. Quite apart from the scientific desirability of achieving this level of sophistication, its practical importance is obvious. It is better than nothing to know that certain kinds of treatment are effective with certain kinds of offender, but clearly the possibilities of modification and improvement of treatment are greatly enhanced once we know *why*, rather than *that*, the treatment works (or does not work).

A good deal of the value of the book, in this reviewer's opinion, lies in the high degree of psychological meaningfulness of many of the factors found to correlate with success in the various forms of correctional treatment. This gives good promise of leading on to the higher level scientific knowledge discussed above. Here are some of these factors: Economic Status of Childhood Home, Family Relationships, Conjugal Relations of Parents, Moral Standards of Home, Affection of Father for Offender, Age at Onset of Anti-social Behaviour, Member of Gang or Crowd. The mere listing of such factors is suggestive of the meaningfulness that might lie behind the observed correlations (a meaningfulness, incidentally, which might well have been brought out by a more statistically advanced handling of the data the Gluecks had to work with).

The greater part of the Gluecks' book is taken up with the problem of the treatment of already established offenders. But a more far-reaching aim is that of prevention.

BOOK REVIEWS—*cont.*

Because of this, the section of the book dealing with the identification of potential delinquents is significant. The Gluecks have been able to show that delinquents differ from non-delinquents in certain personality traits, and in certain "under the roof" environmental factors. These findings are rich in psychological suggestiveness; but apart from that, they are the basic data from which can be derived predictive devices to mark off the lads who are not yet delinquent but who show a good chance of becoming so. Arithmetically, it has been easy for the Gluecks to do this (their mathematics are very elementary compared with those of the Mannheim-Wilkins study); but what is most significant is the evidence they can quote for the validity of their Social Prediction Table. A very valuable chapter in this book is devoted to a summary of those studies in which the tables have been used on samples other than the one on which they were first constructed, thereby establishing the authors' point that what they have constructed is a genuine predictive device and not just an experience table. A particularly interesting feature is that the Social Prediction Table appears to work on samples very different (e.g., in ethnic distribution and cultural background) from the one from which the original data was derived.

It will be well to say a word about the practical usefulness of the S.P.T. (its theoretical value is self-evident). Clearly, the Gluecks see it as an instrument of therapeutic intervention, to head off lads who are going towards delinquency. Potentially, no doubt, it is, but what is the *actual* situation?

Regretfully, that we are woefully ignorant about how to treat delinquency, and, therefore, of how to prevent it. The unfortunate Cambridge-Somerville study—which the Gluecks' actually claim as an example of their success in *predicting* delinquency—is the most eloquent testimony of this. Thus, we may know which lads are most likely to offend, we may even have a good idea—thanks largely to the Gluecks' own work—of *what* causes lads to offend, but we have to admit that it is *not* self-evident from this knowledge what ought to be done either to cure or to prevent. To say, as the Gluecks do, that a lad's chances of offending are reduced if we can persuade his parents to be more efficient disciplinarians is no doubt true, but does not get us very far. We already knew that delinquents come from bad homes, in which poor discipline is one of the unsatisfactory features; but the kind of discipline which parents impose is presumably a function of *their* personalities, the product of as complex a network of factors as is the child's delinquency, and probably as difficult to modify. We always live in hopes, of course, that preventive and curative measures will be discovered, but it is a *non sequitur* to assume that knowledge of these measures flows self-evidently from knowledge of who will get the disease; except, of course, in a very general sense, e.g., that increase of family cohesiveness will decrease the chances of delinquency—but the existence of S.P.T. adds nothing to what little we already know about how to increase family cohesiveness. In short, it is this reviewer's opinion that the practical value of S.P.T. is rather less than that of the authors' correc-

BOOK REVIEWS—cont.

tional treatment predictors (but, of course, situations can well arise where it will be important to know who is most likely to offend, even if no preventive measures are immediately apparent).

Despite this one lapse into near-mechanical thinking, the Gluecks' claim that they have made an important scientific breakthrough is well justified. Moreover, their book is very readable, generously provided with appendices (in one of which occurs a very useful alphabetical list of operational definitions of predictive factors); the text is liberally illustrated with tables—these, although they do not save the lazy man the trouble of reading the text (which is almost true of the tables in "Unravelling Juvenile Delinquency") are admirable as summaries of the main findings. This work, together with the Mannheim-Wilkins study, with which it obviously invites comparison, could provide the basis for a penal practice which would be empirical rather than speculative.

BERNARD MARCUS.

PENAL PRACTICE IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

A Critical Examination of the White Paper Policy

C. H. Rolph and others

Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency. 1960. pp.45. 3s. 6d.

THIS "CRITICAL EXAMINATION" of the White Paper is an attractively printed and easily handled little publication costing you 3s. 6d. and it might be appropriate in attempting to review it to say something about book reviews generally, as this

booklet is a form of review in itself. Some readers of the PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL have claimed there were too many book reviews in the first issue; others said book reviews were the best part. So it might be correct to assume that people in this Service are interested in book reviews and that they are concerned with the quality and quantity of this particular part of the Journal.

Many people believe that it is an easy job to review a book. "What nicer" they ask, "than to sit down with a new book, a free copy at that, read it and then say something about it". They think reviewing falls into two classes, gentle pleasantly written appreciations, or acid smart criticisms. However it is not the policy of the Journal to publish gentle, purring, cosy comments, nor to produce sharp, uncomfortable denunciations; but we hope we will not merely write dull stuff. We aim to tell you about books which you might like to buy or borrow and then read, about others you may never want to buy or borrow (much less read) but about whose existence you would not wish to be ignorant, and even about books you may have treasured and re-read for a variety of reasons. In particular, we want to inform you about books which are relevant to our work.

Ignoring reviewers who seem to make a living by taking in each other's literary washing and concentrating upon what readers seem to want from reviewers, one cannot but agree that the sub-title "critical examination" is a good indication of what most people want. They want to have books examined, and reported upon, by people on whose critical judgments they can rely.