

Michigan Law Review

Volume 79 | Issue 4

1981

The Inauguration of Criminology Annuals

David F. Greenberg
New York University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr>



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

Recommended Citation

David F. Greenberg, *The Inauguration of Criminology Annuals*, 79 MICH. L. REV. 894 (1981).
Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol79/iss4/36>

This Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Michigan Law Review at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

THE INAUGURATION OF CRIMINOLOGY ANNUALS

*David F. Greenberg**

CRIME AND JUSTICE: AN ANNUAL REVIEW OF RESEARCH, Vol. 1. Edited by *Norval Morris* and *Michael Tonry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1979. Pp. ix, 348. \$14.

CRIMINOLOGY REVIEW YEARBOOK, Vol. 2. Edited by *Egon Bittner* and *Sheldon L. Messinger*. Beverly Hills, Cal.: Sage Publications. 1980. Pp. 733. \$35.

Stimulated by massive doses of federal funding for criminological research and growing public preoccupation with crime, publications concerning crime rapidly multiplied over the past decade. There are now more than a hundred periodicals devoted exclusively to crime and criminal justice, and books on these subjects are being published in ever-increasing numbers. Understandably, criminologists and criminal justice practitioners have a hard time keeping abreast of the literature.

As the crime literature has grown, it has become increasingly difficult to locate. Now that scholars affiliated with a wide range of disciplines have begun to study crime, articles are appearing in a correspondingly wide range of journals, including some in fields that until recently have had little to say about crime (*e.g.* economics). And the poor quality of so much that is written discourages those who would make the effort to read it.

To a limited extent, abstracting journals (such as *Criminal Justice Abstracts*) and the recently established National Criminal Justice Reference Service of the National Institute of Justice help scholars by providing brief summaries of new publications. But these sources occasionally miss important material in non-criminological journals. Moreover, they do not assess the quality of the publications they list, nor do they summarize new developments in a format suitable for the non-specialist.

Annual series have long helped scholars in other disciplines keep up with their fields. The inauguration of *two* such series relating to

* Associate Professor of Sociology, New York University. B.S. 1962, M.S. 1963, Ph.D. 1969, University of Chicago. — Ed.

crime, each with distinguished editors, promises similar assistance to criminologists who find themselves overburdened by the proliferation of research and policy analyses. The two series nicely complement each other, since *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* publishes review essays commissioned by the editors, while the *Criminology Review Yearbook* reprints recently published articles and portions of books.

Together, the scope of the eight essays in *Crime and Justice* is quite wide. Four papers describe crime patterns or discuss the causes of crime. These include John Baldwin's review of ecological and areal studies of crime in Great Britain and the United States, Franklin Zimring's analysis of trends in American youth violence, Daniel Glaser's outline of crime causation theory, and David Farrington's resumé of longitudinal research on crime and delinquency. The remaining four papers deal with various aspects of the criminal justice system: James Jacobs discusses recent thinking about race relations in prison; Rubén Rumbaut and Egon Bittner describe American studies of police patrol; David Bayley provides an overview of comparative and historical research on the police in Western Europe and North America; and Malcolm Klein analyzes the impediments to the diversion and deinstitutionalization of juvenile offenders from the juvenile justice system and the reformatory. At least in this maiden issue, the editors exclude material on the criminal law.

At their best, the expositions conveniently summarize discrete bodies of literature, orient readers to critical issues, and provide references for further reading. On the other hand, most are rather bland. This may be due to the choice of authors and audience. In an introduction, the editors tell us that they asked "leading scholars" to prepare papers. By selecting established figures, the editors may have biased the essays toward the conventional wisdom, and away from iconoclastic perspectives.

The authors, we are told, were asked to write not for their peers, but for scholars of crime and justice who are not specialists on the given topic and for the "mythical intelligent layman" (p. x). It is certainly true that specialists are unlikely to learn anything from essays on topics within their expertise, but it is also true that criminologists who are not specialists will find much that is already familiar. Few of the topics are treated in a manner that is new, controversial or surprising. This leaves the authors with the task of reviewing matters already thoroughly studied and widely discussed in texts and journal articles. For example, Rumbaut and Bittner's article on changing conceptions of the police role details the evolution of the

sociology of the police in the 1950s and 1960s; the field studies on which it draws have become part of the common lore of criminology, and are unlikely to be new to anyone in the discipline. Virtually every undergraduate textbook summarizes this material. The major exceptions — the papers that do contain something new — are those by Zimring and by Klein. Although Zimring does not explain his findings, his description of trends in youth violence during the 1970s (which concludes that there is no strong evidence of youth violence having increased substantially in the decade) is likely to force a revision of scholarly as well as lay conceptions. Klein's paper nicely conceptualizes the process of establishing diversion programs, and pinpoints the stages where implementation can be expected to encounter obstacles.

The editorial process, in which paid outsiders reviewed draft manuscripts, may explain why most of the essays are thorough, systematic, and balanced in judgment. These qualities are not found to the same degree in all the essays, however. Although the role of the police in carrying out political repression received a great deal of attention in writings on the police in the 1960s and 1970s, Rumbaut and Bittner scarcely mention it in passing; it is as if they did not know how to handle the issue. David Farrington's review of longitudinal studies is incomplete; but more important, it fails to address such important topics as hazard function methods for analyzing experimental studies. Farrington also fails to discuss the technical questions that arise in analyzing non-experimental longitudinal data, and to explain what they offer for purposes of causal analysis that cannot be provided by cross-sectional data. Daniel Glaser's treatment of crime causation theory is superficial (perhaps necessarily, given space limitations, though it wastes space describing miscellaneous rehabilitation programs and their outcomes without explaining their relevance to crime causation theory). Glaser concentrates on the social psychology of individual offenders, paying little attention to work on crimes committed by organizations (businesses, labor unions, governments), or to theories about structural sources of crime. James Jacobs's otherwise informative discussion of race relations in American prisons ignores women prisoners and prisons in other countries. In failing to mention that prisoners at Attica achieved a high degree of unity across racial lines during the rebellion, and that prisoners unions have had inter-racial leadership, Jacobs's unvarying portrait of racial conflict may overlook the possibilities for overcoming racial divisions in the future. John Irwin's treatment of the same issues, which suggests that high levels of

conflict between prisoners are due in part to repression of inter-racial prisoners movements by prison authorities, paints a more nuanced picture.¹

Of the forty articles in *Criminology Review Yearbook*, all but four are reprinted from books or journals (including a good many periodicals that criminologists do not regularly see). The selection was not limited to writings appearing only in the year before publication, though all of them are recent, the earliest having been published in 1975.

Most collections of this type lack coherence; however good the individual articles, they do not add up to a book. Although this problem is not entirely absent here, it is mitigated by the exceptionally lucid introductory material prepared by the editors, and by the thematic grouping of articles. Instead of trying to reprint all the good pieces they could find, regardless of topic, the editors have chosen a limited number of topics for each yearbook, and have selected only articles that bear on these topics. This practice provides a minimal degree of unity to the collection, even though the essays grouped together under a single heading are sometimes quite diverse.

The broad categories of this volume, the second in the series, are psychological approaches in criminology, white-collar crime, violence, ecological analysis of crime, and victimization. The first volume, which appeared in 1979, dealt with economic perspectives on crime, crime in historical perspective, discretion in the criminal justice system, organizational criminology, delinquency theory, and the prevention, treatment and control of crime. Each yearbook also contains a commissioned review of crime statistics, and beginning in this volume, a section of "Controversies and Continuities," in which readers comment on articles in earlier volumes.

The title of the yearbook notwithstanding, several of the articles (e.g. *Securities-Related Crimes* by August Bequai, *The Use of Civil Liability to Aid Crime Victims* by Ruben Castillo *et al.*, *Victim Provocation: The Battered Wife and Legal Definition of Self Defense* by Nancy Wolfe, *Crime Control as Energy Policy* by Steven Balkin, and *Risk and Responsibility* by David Bazelon), cannot be considered criminology, if that term is taken to mean the scientific study of crime. These pieces delineate developments in law and the administration of justice without analyzing them scientifically. Nonetheless, criminologists may find the expositions useful as background information in their work.

1. J. IRWIN, PRISONS IN TURMOIL (1980).

The range of academic disciplines and disciplinary viewpoints represented in the yearbook is exceptionally wide. In addition to the expected articles by sociologists, psychologists and lawyers, the yearbook includes studies by economists (*e.g.*, Mario Rizzo's analysis of the effect of crime on residential rents and property values) and historians (*e.g.*, Eric Monkkonen's review of methodological problems in studying crime and criminality in nineteenth century America). Although for some decades most criminologists have looked askance at biological explanations of crime, Sarnoff Mednick's *A Biosocial Theory of the Learning of Law-Abiding Behavior* draws on physiological studies of the learning process to speculate about the role of innate biological factors in crime causation. Unlike earlier biological theorizing, this effort does not contrast biological explanations of crime and psychological or social explanations; instead it attempts to integrate them. This reviewer finds Mednick's speculation implausible; it is difficult to see how they would account for the major dimensions of variation in criminal activity (sex, age, class, and race). But the evidence is not yet in, and some evidence for a biological element in causation may turn up. This element, of course, need not be innate: physiology can be influenced by environmental factors.

A couple of the articles are a bit technical (*i.e.*, *Residential Burglary and Urban Form* by Patricia and Paul Brantingham, and *The Clearance Rate as a Measure of Criminal Justice System Effectiveness* by Philip Cook), demonstrating that the editors of this volume, unlike the editors of *Crime and Justice*, are willing to address their colleagues. But the bulk of the papers, including those that report empirical research, are technically undemanding.

A collection of this sort must be judged by what it omits as well as what it includes. I have conducted no systematic search for articles that should have been included but were not; however, the wide range of sources from which the selections have been drawn and the diversity of disciplines and perspectives represented on the panel of associate editors make it unlikely that any very significant article has been overlooked. One reviewer has complained that important topics were neglected,² but the editors acknowledge this. Rather than attempting to cover every topic each year, they decided — wisely in my opinion — to be selective. There will be room for other topics in future years.

The selections in the yearbook are uneven in quality, as seems

2. Alper, *Current Issues in Crime and Punishment*, 44 FED. PROBATION 92 (1980).

inevitable in a collection of this size. John Monahan and Stephanie Splane's commissioned overview of psychological approaches to criminal behavior provides a valuable introduction for more sociologically oriented criminologists, though its neglect of psychoanalytical perspectives on crime is curious. Both Jack Katz (*The Social Movement Against White-Collar Crime*) and Michael Britnall (*Federal Influence and Urban Policy Entrepreneurship in the Local Prosecution of Economic Crime*) analyze the role of professional interests and ideologies in shifting prosecutorial resources toward white-collar crime. These important essays offer a historical dimension that is missing from most sociological work on prosecutors' offices. In another noteworthy contribution, Charles Silberman draws on Erving Goffman's analyses of face-to-face interactions to develop a phenomenology of the fear of crime. W. Michael Reisman's *Operational Codes and Bribery* introduces a typology of bribes and sketches the normative codes that govern each type.

Two papers present original and pioneering analysis of victimization. In *Toward a Theory of Personal Criminal Victimization*, Michael Hindelang, Michael Gottfredson, and James Garofalo associate different life routines with different social-structural positions. These routines influence patterns of vulnerability and of association with those involved in crime. These patterns explain many of the group differences found in rates of victimization. Though the reasoning may seem common-sensical, it explores a new direction for criminological theory. While criminologists have invested a great deal of effort in explaining group differences in rates of participation in crime, they have invested almost none in explaining group differences in rates of victimization. *Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach* by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson carries the line of reasoning in the Hindelang, Gottfredson, and Garofalo paper one step further to argue that rising crime rates in the past two decades have been caused not by changing characteristics of the criminal population, but by changes in lifestyle that make certain kinds of crime easier to carry out. For example, as the proportion of women working at paid jobs increases, homes are more likely to be vacant during the day, and consequently they can be burglarized more easily. And as women enter the paid labor force they become more vulnerable to rape than when they remained home.

Mario Rizzo's essay takes an innovative approach to estimating the cost of crime. Instead of attaching arbitrary dollar values to crimes, he allows the public at large to do so. He does this by exam-

ining the effect of crime rates on residential rents and home property values in Chicago neighborhoods, controlling statistically for other variables that one might expect to influence these rents and values. If the average rents in a neighborhood are lower when crime rates are exceptionally high, all other things being equal, one can infer that landlords and property-owners are losing money because of crime.³

An essay by Leonard Berkowitz on criminal violence (arguing that it stems from uncontrolled rage, rather than a desire to gain the approval of observers), together with comments by Hans Toch and Lynn Curtis, continues the debate as to the value of subcultural explanations of violence. Dwight Smith's essay, *Organized Crime and Entrepreneurship*, extends the reconceptualization of organized crime that has been developing for some time in criminology. Rather than seeing "the Mafia" as a unique type of organization staffed by distinctive types of people (Sicilian-Americans), the new approach emphasizes similarity in both motive and organizational structure to other types of entrepreneurial activity. There may be differences between lawful and illegal organized entrepreneurship, but Smith argues that at best they are differences of degree, not kind. In an essay on *Community, Environment, and Violent Crime*, Richard Block produces evidence from a study of violent crime rates in Chicago neighborhoods indicating that crime rates are likely to be especially high in those neighborhoods where extremes of high and low income are found in close proximity. This finding is consistent with sociological theories of crime that emphasize relative deprivation as a cause. Unfortunately, Block lacks the data on individuals that would permit him to nail down this interpretation of his findings.

Regrettably, the papers in *Criminology Review Yearbook* are not written at a uniformly high level. For example, a paper by Minoru Masuda and his collaborators (*Life Events and Prisoners*) is methodologically quite weak. It contrasts mean scores of male prison inmates and a white middle class control group on a forty-item scale of retrospectively reported stressful life events before and during imprisonment. It is hardly surprising that the authors found differences in the mean scores. Although they make no attempt to explain these differences, the scale is constructed in such a way that differences

3. There is a certain pro-landlord bias in Rizzo's analysis that may be worth noting. If landlords are receiving less rent in high crime areas, tenants are also paying less. To them, living in a high crime neighborhood carries some side benefits. If rising crime rates mean that sellers of property receive less for their homes, they also mean that those who do not sell pay lower property taxes, and that purchasers can buy homes more cheaply. What is a cost to some may be a gain to others.

were bound to occur. As a measure of stress, the scale is of doubtful validity. On its face, the scale is not unidimensional; it measures several conceptual variables, including such items as going on a vacation, signing a mortgage, enduring the death of a spouse, and being fired from a job. The scale also includes an indicator of criminal activity and jail time. Because the scale includes what is to be explained (crime) and its consequences (jail time) as part of the explanatory category, its usefulness in explaining crime and imprisonment is unclear. Although the authors could have computed a correlation between the life event scale score and imprisonment by weighting the prison sample according to its size relative to the population of nonprisoners, they did not do so. Using their figures, I estimate the correlation to be quite small. Since other researchers have found the relationship between stressful life events and other kinds of behavior and conditions (*e.g.*, suicide attempts, heart attacks) to be weak, this is not very surprising. Those who do research on such matters have gone far beyond the limited conceptual framework of this study by trying to specify the conditions under which potentially stressful events have given consequences. This study makes no attempt to do that, perhaps because the data were collected seven years before the extremely circumscribed analysis was published in 1978.

Other essays also left this reviewer unsatisfied. John Conrad presents a quick summary of what is known about violent street crime. His treatment of subcultural explanations of violence is ambiguous, and fails to cite the relevant empirical studies. His assertion that there is no evidence regarding the deterrence of violent crime is inaccurate; there is evidence, but criminologists are uncertain how to interpret it. The claim that there are no predictably effective therapies is not entirely true: a Danish study found that castration lowered the recidivism rate of rapists.⁴

Two articles deal with how research subjects indicated they would respond to hypothetical situations. John Carroll asked juvenile and adult prisoners and students whether they would commit lucrative crimes with penalties of varying severities and risks; Peter Scharf and his co-authors asked police officers whether they would use potentially lethal force in a variety of situations. Yet what people say they would do hypothetically is not necessarily what they would do in real life. Neither of these studies measures actual behavior.

4. See D. LIPTON, R. MARTINSON & J. WILKS, *THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CORRECTIONAL TREATMENT* 290-91 (1975); Stürup, *The Treatment of Sexual Offenders*, 1960 *BULLETIN DE LA SOCIÉTÉ INTERNATIONALE DE CRIMINOLOGIE* 320.

Ted Gurr's essay on the history of violent crime in Europe and America is marred by sloppiness and inattention to questions of fact. His assertion that Central and East European socialist societies are plagued by a "rising tide of disorder" (p. 422) in the form of conventional, individualistic crime is not supported by his sources; his statement that these societies "have not published sufficient statistical information to determine the trends" is quite wrong. Published crime statistics from Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland and Yugoslavia show no evidence of upward trends in crime rates.⁵ Gurr's attribution of rising crime rates in the West to "aggressive hedonism, which is . . . a belief that almost any means are justified in the pursuit of personal satisfactions" (p. 428) is glib and unsubstantiated by empirical evidence. Gurr does not explicate the origins of this hypothesized "ethic" in his essay.

Almost a dozen papers were of the sort one sees so much of the time in the journals. They address some small questions with adequate competence, but without contributing any major conceptual breakthrough or surprising empirical finding. Where a body of literature is reviewed, it is reviewed superficially and uncritically.⁶ How one feels about including articles of this kind in a yearbook largely depends on how important one thinks an article should be to merit inclusion. If only major breakthroughs are considered important enough to merit reprinting, few if any of these articles would qualify. I would not have regretted their deletion, but that is a personal view. While thorough coverage may be a virtue in a yearbook, it presumably means higher prices, and that is a drawback. However one feels about that tradeoff, though, the usefulness of *Criminology Review*

5. See, e.g., Redo, *Crime Trends and Crime Prevention Strategies in Eastern Europe*, WORKING PAPERS FOR THE SIXTH UNITED NATIONS CONGRESS ON THE PREVENTION OF CRIME AND THE TREATMENT OF OFFENDERS (1980); and Greenberg, *Penal Sanctions in Poland: A Test of Alternative Models*, SOC. PROB., forthcoming in December 1980.

6. I would place in this category David Farrington's *Experiments on Deviance with Special Reference to Dishonesty*, Joan McCord's *Some Child-Rearing Antecedents of Criminal Behavior in Adult Men*, Jack D. Edinger's *Cross-Validation of the Megargee MMPI Typology for Prisoners*, the American Psychological Association's *Report of the Task Force on the Role of Psychology in the Criminal Justice System* (dealing with problems of ethical conflict facing psychologists whose work relates to the criminal justice system), Jonathan Sheldon and George Zweibel's *Historical Development of Consumer Fraud Law*, Marshall Clinard and Peter Yeager's *Corporate Crime: Issues in Research*, Ted Gurr's *On the History of Violent Crime in Europe and America*, Dane Archer and Rosemary Gartner's *Homicide in 110 Nations: The Developments of the Comparative Crime Data File*, Leon Sheleff's *The Criminal Triad* (reviewing the literature on bystanders who intervene to stop a crime), William F. McDonald's *The Role of the Victim in America*, and Susan Silverman and William Doerner's *The Effect of Victim Compensation Programs upon Conviction Rates*.

Yearbook and the value of having its important articles available between a single set of covers is unquestionable. The yearbook and the *Crime and Justice* annual will both prove valuable to those who wish to keep informed about recent scholarly thinking about crime.