

52400

Federal Probation
Vol. 41
No. 4
Dec. 1, 1977

the program have called and asked to be placed on the list.

Our program of work without pay by probationers has been well received by the public in this community. The local newspapers have editorialized in favor of it. One of the agencies, the Memphis Park Commission, that has been cooperating with our program is seeking to get still more probationers assigned to it for work by the city courts and state criminal courts,

which at the present do not have a comparable program. At the request of the Federal Judicial Center, the writer has described and explained our program in the past few months to probation officers at three regional seminars sponsored by the Center. Certainly there is plenty of public and charitable work to be done that is not being done in every city and town in America. We recommend this program to all courts throughout the land.

The Federal Government and Criminal Justice Research

BY DANIEL GLASER, PH.D.

Professor of Sociology, University of Southern California

HUNDREDS of millions of dollars per year—billions in the past decade—have been spent by the Federal Government for criminal justice research, defined broadly as including all development, demonstration, and evaluation of innovations, as well as surveys and analyses of offenses and current practices. Despite slim returns on some investments, these expenditures have produced many worthwhile additions to our knowledge on the dimensions and causes of crime and delinquency, and on the nature and effectiveness of police, court, and correctional programs and policies. Such more precise and valid information should slowly reduce criminological pontifications based exclusively on speculation, ideology, bias, or vested interest. However, much work remains, to separate the grain from the chaff in our harvest, and to learn what modes of cultivation may be still more fruitful.

The new administration in Washington has maintained the research programs it inherited, but is reported to be reviewing them to assess their yield and efficiency. This essay points out some principles that may be learned from recent Federal experience, and suggests functions and problems for the government in expanding criminological knowledge.

Varieties of Federal Roles in Research

The Federal Government has had almost every

conceivable degree of involvement in criminal justice research. At one extreme are the studies done only with its own employees and data (for example, assessments by Federal Bureau of Prisons research staff of programs in the Federal correctional system). At the other extreme are the projects done completely by outsiders who, although federally funded, receive no data and little direction from the government. There are many intermediate variations, but all may roughly fit three models, each with distinct advantages and disadvantages meriting our more thorough consideration.

(1) *Peer-Reviewed Government Financing of Nongovernment Research.*—In this procedure, the researchers' scientific peers evaluate requests for Federal funds. It is perhaps best exemplified in the work of the Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). The center receives grant applications from outside researchers and these proposals are assessed by a review board of about 10 established experts in research, mainly from university faculties in law, psychology, sociology, psychiatry, social work, and criminal justice. This board meets for several days, three times a year. All members serve staggered 2- to 4-year terms, and about one-third are replaced annually. Their vote of approval or disapproval and a synopsis of their discussion on each proposal, although only advisory to the

52406

Council of the Institute, are nevertheless highly influential.

Members of the review board for this NIMH center receive copies of all project proposals and two members present a detailed analysis on each that initiates their discussion. Sometimes they are joined by an outside consultant recruited to discuss an unusually specialized proposal. On every large request that passes this initial screening and on some of intermediate magnitude, a visit to the research site is made by one or two board members, usually with an NIMH staff person and often with an outside consultant as well. After a multiyear project has been funded, the NIMH staff reviews the research progress at least annually to decide on continued funding; it often visits the site and occasionally has the peer review board assess the progress reports and send one or more members to visit these ongoing projects.

There are peer review procedures in addition to those of NIMH and other U.S. Public Health Service institutes concerned with crime. In funding research on methods of facilitating employment of released offenders (such as vocational training for prisoners and unemployment insurance for parolees), the Office of Manpower and Research Development in the U.S. Department of Labor sends synopses of research proposals to individual outside experts and requests comments by mail, but sometimes brings together a panel to discuss a research proposal. The National Science Foundation has similar procedures for its social science grants that are relevant to crime. Usually these agencies do not notify the reviewers in advance that the documents will be mailed to them and do not remunerate the reviewers. NIMH provides per diem compensation to its reviewers and consultants, generally covering days spent in meetings but not the time spent in preparing for them. The National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, part of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), has ad hoc consultant panels on some problems and "technical assistance" contracts with outside firms to hire consultants to review documents, more often research reports than proposals, or to make site visits to research or training centers. These consultants are paid by the firm, at government rates, for time spent both in studying the documents and in preparing comments, as well as for travel time on site visits.

The main advantage of the peer review model is in augmenting government specialists for assessing and monitoring research. This is done most thoroughly by NIMH and most economically by the Department of Labor and the National Science Foundation. In their procedures the initiative in developing proposals is with outside grant applicants, although officials of these government agencies do convey to the scientific community the kinds of research they would like to encourage. This communication is achieved through public speeches at professional meetings, through responses to informal inquiries by prospective grant applicants, and perhaps most effectively, by the types of research that are funded or rejected.

The procedures of these agencies spur creativity in design and elicit highly diverse grant applications. Some critics charge, however, that their grants are awarded disproportionately to the major universities and research institutes. This occurs to some extent, but probably because the recipient establishments stress research performance more rigorously in their recruitment and promotion of personnel, thus concentrating expertise in their staffs. Applications from less research-oriented organizations are also reviewed, however, and where the idea proposed is good but the research methods or the personnel unsophisticated, methodological guidance is often provided or consultants suggested by the agency staff or by peer reviewers.

(2) *Recruited Nongovernment Research on Government Projects.*—In the Federal role most developed during the past decade, with the growth of LEAA, the government publishes a "request for proposals" to recruit help in solving a specific problem. These "RFP's" in research have had extremely diverse objectives, notably designs for equipment (from protective armor for police to wrist radios for residents of high crime areas to use in summoning police), and description or evaluation of programs (for example, police handling of domestic disputes, halfway houses for prisoners, prosecution of career criminals). The great potential advantage of the RFP procedure for the public interest is that it quickly marshals much attention by researchers to the problems that a government agency considers important.

The main disadvantage of the RFP procedure to the public is that it encourages profiteering or at least, more stress on "grantsmanship" than

on workmanship—especially by the many research organizations created solely to apply for these contracts. Often the amount of money offered and the time required by the government reflects assessment by officials of the importance of solving a particular problem, rather than a realistic estimate of the requirements for its solution. Proposals tend to be accepted that promise most, and contract recipients feel pressured to communicate persuasively and on schedule, whether or not they have significant additions to knowledge to report. Although civil servants appraise all proposals and monitor the research that is funded, there is likely to be less expert assessment in this type of screening (even with technical assistance firms) than in the work by peer-review boards and agency staff at NIMH, described above. The NIMH procedures, of course, could also be used in assessing responses to RFP's.

(3) *Collaborative Government and Nongovernment Research on Government-Approved Projects.*—This approach is exemplified whenever the research staff of the Federal courts or prisons, in seeking aid for its research, hires consultants or contracts with an outside organization to complete a study in Federal facilities. The Bureau of Prisons launched its research program by procuring a grant for a university-based criminologist to evaluate its operations.¹ Among its innumerable other collaborative research projects was an experiment by an outside firm to determine whether token economies and programmed teaching would enhance the educational attainment and behavioral change of Federal juvenile offenders.² Such arrangements not only augment Federal staff, but also use data uniquely available to Federal agencies. The potential of such collaboration for the guidance of Federal, State and local criminal justice systems has hardly been tapped, however, because the unique statistical information in government records has not been appropriately compiled.

In the FBI computerized fingerprint and criminal history files, the Federal Government possesses the best available data for evaluation of recidivism reduction programs, and in the Social Security files it has information that can yield

precise assessment of employment assistance efforts with less threat to the privacy rights of research subjects than prevails with other research procedures, such as questionnaires and interviews. Like the fabled dog in the manger, however, the government neither uses these data for such purposes nor allows others to use them. This analogy is perhaps a slight exaggeration, since Federal agencies have made some use of these records in their evaluations and have occasionally provided information on recidivism or employment histories to outside researchers. Yet procuring such data for research has almost always been difficult, and usually impossible. Consequently, we have probably not achieved as much as one percent of the potential benefit from these Federal resources for the scientific guidance of criminal justice programs and policies. And, no information need be disseminated on any individual whose criminal or work record is used in compiling relevant statistics.

By comparing the subsequent criminal records of groups of offenders, we could much more adequately guide judicial and correctional policies. For example, followup statistics would be sought on groups of similar background but each receiving different penalties for a particular type of offense, groups that get the same penalties but after varying durations of courtroom delay, or groups that have diverse self-improvement opportunities while serving their sentences, or many other types of comparison groups. In a small-scale project, Gilbert McKee³ obtained postrelease Social Security payroll deduction data for groups of California ex-prisoners with diverse vocational training in prison. He demonstrated that their earnings increased in direct proportion to their prison hours in "general" types of training (e.g., auto repair, sheet metal, welding, machine shop) but had little relationship to the often more expensive specialized training (e.g., shoe repair, dry cleaning, masonry, refrigeration and air conditioning). The general training proved highly cost-effective while the others were not. Much more extensive and complexly designed research with this type of data is desirable to guide efficiently the huge spending for employment assistance to offenders, ex-offenders, and the chronically unemployed youth who have a high probability of becoming offenders.

One reason for not allowing government or outside researchers to trace the employment or

¹ Daniel Glaser, *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*, Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1961.

² Harold L. Cohen and J. Filipczak, *A New Learning Environment*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

³ Gilbert J. McKee, Jr., "A Cost-Benefit Analysis of Vocational Training in the California Prison System," Ph.D. dissertation in Economics, Claremont Graduate School, 1972 (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Xerox University Microfilms, No. 72-26,211).

criminal records of offenders (or of other persons as control groups) has been concern for the privacy of research subjects. But the alternative has been more intrusive and often less adequate procurement of information by interviews and questionnaires given the subjects in the community. It should be simple to arrange that government offices which now maintain files either on criminal records or on earnings, and whose employees use the files for administrative purposes, retain complete control and confidentiality of this information but provide statistical conclusions from it for research purposes. This could be done, for example, if researchers provide the records offices with lists of persons in various groups, each list designated only by a code number. The lists would actually be of groups to be statistically compared (e.g., released offenders of a given category with one sentence and those with another sentence, or with one type of assistance rather than another or none at all). The records office would then compile and release only the requested followup statistics for each list (e.g., average earnings, or percent reconvicted), not data on separate individuals.

Since the government would be collaborating in such use of official records for compiling statistics, it should exercise some control over the types of research undertaken. These should be well-designed studies on problems of concern to government agencies and to the general public. The results should be in the public domain, available to anyone interested in them. The need to balance concerns for efficiency with the public interest in growth of knowledge justifies having a supervisory board of government and outside experts to review applications for collections of statistics from official records, to monitor their utilization, and to ensure their full and accurate reporting. Appropriate budgets and possible charges or cost-sharing arrangements can be negotiated when the records and personnel of one government agency are used to compile statistics for another unit of government or for a nongovernment research organization.

Research Needs

The impact of the Federal Government on the expansion of criminological knowledge depends not just on the role it chooses, but on the prob-

lems it addresses. Awareness of research needs and of their importance requires some detachment from the deluge of daily decisions and pressures in most criminal justice agencies. To guide research effectively, one must identify the theoretical assumptions that underlie official policies, in addition to the deviations of practice from these policies that result from concern with immediate expediency. Furthermore, crime problems can only be well anticipated and the operation of criminal justice agencies understood, by knowing (1) the overall trends in society which impinge upon lawbreaking and on reactions to it, and (2) the established principles in the behavioral and social sciences from which criminological propositions may be derived. In summary, research guidance requires a view of the criminal justice forest in broad outline, rather than getting lost among the trees of separate offenses, offenders, and routine tasks.

Discussion of all these grounds for research is a larger undertaking,¹ but a few of its conclusions will be briefly presented here to illustrate the variety of potential functions for the three Federal roles in research discussed above.

(1) *Experiments in Reducing Age Segregation.*—The concentration of juveniles and youths among arrestees for robbery, burglary and other serious crime is one of the most striking trends of the past few decades. This development reflects a larger change in society: As a result of the prolongation of schooling and the reduction of family businesses and household chores, more youths have little close contact and rapport with adults and hence, they more readily develop very distinct subcultures. This is dramatically evident in the contrasts between age groups in tastes for particular types of apparel, hair style and music, as well as by polls showing that most 18- to 30-year-olds have used drugs that only five percent of people over 50 have tried.

It follows that to reduce juvenile crime's fundamental sources it is desirable to increase the involvement of youngsters with older persons in work, recreation, and studies. Carefully monitored experiments are needed to determine whether delinquency and crime can be reduced by fostering collaboration of parents and senior citizens with youth in school activities during and after class hours or days, by subsidizing youth employment with adults, and by sponsoring hobbies and recreation that integrate a wide age spectrum.

(2) *Expanding Legitimate Achievement Op-*

¹ Partly attempted in Daniel Glaser, *Structure of Criminal Justice Planning*, DHEW Publication No. (ADM) 7-100, Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1975, *Glaser, Crime in Our Changing Society*, New York: Praeger, forthcoming.

portunities for Those Maladjusted in School.—For young people who are humiliated in the classroom, delinquency is often an alternative opportunity for achieving a sense of eminence. Therefore, unhappy experiences in school programs result in students not participating in approved learning activities and often committing crimes.⁵ Indeed, "those who commit offenses usually become more law-abiding if they drop out of school." This problem is growing, because the span of school attendance required for most youth before they can obtain full-time employment has steadily increased. Experimental research is needed to measure the delinquency-reducing effects of changes in the school's organization. One such change is to provide competition, with significant rewards for learning achievement not for individuals but for large groups of students, each of which includes a cross-section. Then the high-achievers help the less-successful ones within each group, for improvement by any raises the total group's score. Other changes would mix adult types of work with education, perhaps permitting early dropout from the regular school system, but creating special part-time schooling. These are but a few of the many kinds of experiments that should be undertaken to determine if they reduce crime by youth maladjusted in school.

(3) *Alternative Drug Policies.*—Our efforts to rely primarily on the criminal justice system to control the use of mood and behavior-altering substances have been consistently unsuccessful, if viewed in even slightly long-run perspective. These efforts included 14 years of the Prohibition Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and during the 1950's and 1960's, repeatedly raising penalties against opiates and marihuana, as well as massive expenditures to try to cut off foreign sources of these substances. No set of penalties demonstrably affected rates of use, but they alienated many people who today see others legally permitted to abuse substances—such as alcohol, tranquilizers and many other psychoactive drugs—which are at least as disabling as the illegal drugs. Government efforts to cut off some of the sources of illegal drugs only expanded the

profits, hence the flow, from the many alternative sources.

Just as we are finally learning that the public health and education systems are more effective than most criminal justice methods of coping with public drunkenness, we should conduct experimental research with alternative approaches to drug abuse. For heroin addiction this might include experimenting with Goldstein's "STEPS" program for a supervised transition from heroin to morphine to methadone, LAAM, opiate antagonists and ultimately, abstinence, but supervised maintenance at any intermediate stage if necessary.⁷ For marihuana it is mostly a matter of carefully assessing effects of the various changes in State legislation, changes that are now continually occurring. Evaluation of these alternatives should encompass not only their impact on substance abuse, but also their effects on property crime rates and on police and court workloads.

(4) *Measuring the Consequences of Reallocations of Discretion in Penalties.*—Early American legislatures fixed penalties for each offense by statute, leaving little discretion to the courts. Gradually, in the 19th century, judges gained power to specify the duration and conditions of confinement, and later—especially in the 20th century—to grant probation. Parole boards were established mainly in the present century, with authority to alter the term of confinement after it began. Presumably this division of penalty control among legislatures, judges and parole boards provided a system of checks and balances, so that errors and deviations by one agency could be corrected by the other.

Actually, the division was often unequal. Many states gave much discretion to the parole board and little to judges, while other states and the Federal system gave most options to the judges. Recently, in a reversal of history, parole power has been greatly curtailed or eliminated in three states and similar action is expected elsewhere.⁸ But it was pointed out long ago that (1) the discretion of the prosecutor in determining what offense to charge and what charges or recommendations to alter in exchange for a plea of guilty is largely unchecked, and (2) this plea bargaining process greatly diminishes achievement of legislative intent in other penalty-fixing arrangements.⁹

In addition to the foregoing, a recent development in Wisconsin, Michigan, Maryland and

⁵ Travis Hirschi, *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969; LaMar T. Empey and Steven G. Lubek, *Education and Delinquency*. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1971.

⁶ Delbert S. Elliott and Harwin L. Voss, *Delinquency and Dropout*. Lexington, Mass.: Heath, 1974.

⁷ Avram Goldstein, "Heroin Addiction: Sequential Treatment Employing Pharmacologic Supports," *Archives of General Psychiatry*, March 1966.

⁸ M. C. Neethorcutt, "Parole Legislation," *FEDERAL PROBATION*, March 1967.

⁹ David E. Olson and Frank J. Remington, "Sentencing Structure: Its Effect Upon System for the Administration of Criminal Justice," *Law and Contemporary Problems*, Summer 1958.

several other states is contract parole, whereby shortly after an inmate begins serving sentence an agreement is negotiated specifying the date when parole will begin. The date is contingent on the inmate's meeting various conditions stated in an individual contract, such as earning a high school diploma or a trade-training certificate, avoiding major disciplinary infractions, and perhaps participating in a specified number of hours of psychotherapy.¹⁰ Other innovations, in a few states, include arrangements for inmates to work at salaried jobs from which they must complete restitution to the victims of their offenses before they are eligible for parole. Also, the composition and procedures of parole boards are quite diverse. In Wisconsin and Michigan the board members have civil service tenure, whereas in other states they are highly political; in some states they hold extensive hearings with the inmates and in others little or none.

All of these and other variations in the determination of penalties merit evaluation. One standard with which to assess them is their effect on the predictability of penalties: Do they increase or decrease the extent to which punishments depend upon the actual crime and the criminal's prior offense record (not simply upon the plea-bargained official description of the offense and the offender)? Another standard is whether any of these variations have any effect on recidivism rates, or on postrelease employment, for various types of offenders.

(5) *Assessing the Impact of Correctional Services.*—American correctional institutions have had a large variety of programs that they justified as preparing prisoners for more law-abiding lives. Until the Depression, these programs consisted mainly of hard work that made or saved money for the state. This practice still prevails in several Southern prisons that operate large plantations, but in most of the country it was drastically reduced after 1933, when business and labor lobbies combined to get laws enacted (they are still in effect) that ban interstate shipment of prison-made goods. After World War II the

emphasis shifted to structured programs for inmate talk, mostly to each other and occasionally to staff, with the talk usually called "counseling" or "psychotherapy," regardless of its style or content. These programs were supplemented by education and vocational training programs of extremely diverse quality.

There has been much effort to assess the effects of these programs on recidivism rates. The findings from most of the more rigorous assessments were negative, and those which indicated some crime reduction seemed to be so randomly distributed as to inspire the conclusion that "nothing works."¹¹ Yet analysis from the perspectives of social science theory suggests that when programs markedly improve the noncriminal experiences, resources or relationships of certain types of offenders, they are likely to reduce recidivism for these types.¹² To assess correctional services soundly we need more research that (1) measures the actual change in experience, knowledge or social bonds that these services provide; (2) relates these changes to a theory on particular types of offender; and (3) rigorously assesses the correlation of these services with change in recidivism and in employment for such offenders.

Conclusion

Three Federal roles in criminal justice research were delineated, and their contrasting functions were illustrated by a far from exhaustive list of research needs. If the Federal Government wishes to accelerate attention to any of these types of need or others, it can do so promptly by publishing Requests for Proposals on them, promising sufficient funds to achieve the objectives of plans that are accepted. Rigorously high quality research will be more probable if a good peer review and monitoring program is maintained for all federally funded studies. New research possibilities will be most readily brought to official attention with a peer-reviewed grants program for nongovernment research. Finally, research on the crime-reducing effects and on some other consequences of many criminal justice policies or correctional services can become much more adequate, protective of privacy rights and efficient if done collaboratively by government and nongovernment agencies with data from Federal record systems.

¹⁰ Steve Gettiner, "Parole Contracts: A New Way Out," *Corrections*, October, 1975; Leon Leiber and William Parker, "Mutual Agreement With Vouchers," *American Journal of Correction*, January-February 1975; Gloria Stevenson, "MAP to Parole," *Menpower*, April 1975.

¹¹ Robert Martinson, "What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform," *The Public Interest*, Spring 1974.

¹² Daniel Glaser, "Achieving Better Quality: A Half-Century's Progress in Correctional Research," *Federal Probation*, September 1975; Glaser, "Concern With Theory in Correctional Evaluation Research," *Crime and Delinquency*, April 1977.

END