

Consider the following three brief scenarios and associated research questions. Each suggests a different approach and use of criminological research:

A relationship between viewing violence on television and the perpetration of violence in the real world has been advanced by a number of theorists. Is true that individuals who watch inordinate amounts of violence on television stand a greater chance of actually engaging in violent criminal activities? To test this hypothesis researchers develop a study plan to investigate the relationship between television watching and crimes.

Crime in the city based on official police statistics is at an all time high and citizens are concerned. The Crime Prevention Unit of the police department feels that grassroots programs such as Neighborhood Watch can help reduce crime in given neighborhoods. An all out campaign is instituted to organize Neighborhood Watch Programs throughout the city. Personnel in the Crime Prevention Unit wish to evaluate neighborhoods with and without Neighborhood Watches to see if the programs are effective in reducing crimes.

A number of patrons at a shopping center have reported being armed robbed in the parking lot during evening hours. Several of these victims have decided to sue the corporation, which owns the shopping center for damages. The victims lawsuit is based on the argument that there has been a long history of crimes, and the owners should have foreseen that future crimes were likely to occur based on past crime trends, and thus provided reasonable and adequate security for shoppers. A criminologist is retained by counsel for the crime victims to aid in the determination of foresee ability of criminal acts and the relative dangerousness of the area.

Each illustration above suggests different types of problems, methods, audiences, and forms of presentation of crime research. The first example represents a test of a theory of imitation or modeling of violent behavior. A criminologist who is interested in the effects of media on criminal behavior might design a study to test this theory. As part of the role of academic criminology the results of the study would be published permitting other criminologists to check (or replicate) and to critique or seek further clarification of such research. This type of research is called **pure research**; it is oriented toward the discovery of knowledge and relationships of causality. The findings of the study may or may not have direct applications or policy implications.

The second example deals with a very practical problem. Some individuals in a police department believe that a neighborhood crime prevention program can aid the police in reducing crime in targeted neighborhoods. The results of their research may determine whether

or not Neighborhood Watch Programs will be instituted throughout the city, and whether funding will be continued. A criminologist may be employed to conduct the evaluation research for the police department or an in-house justice practitioner may be assigned the task of assessing the success of the program.

The third example involves a situation where a criminologist's research regarding past criminal activity in a shopping center parking lot will be used as legal evidence in a court case seeking damages for crime victims. In this case the criminologists will have to review crime statistics and police incidence reports as well as uncover other sources of information in an effort to determine the "dangerousness" of the area and the "foresee ability" of future crimes. The victim's ability to recover damages may depend on the quality and persuasiveness of the criminologist's report and testimony.

The last two cases are illustrations of **applied research**. Applied research is directly used to guide policy as in the example where a neighborhood watch program is being considered or decision making as in the instance of a third party liability law suit.

Each of the examples is unique with respect to the orientation and method of presentation (e.g., journal article aimed at other criminologists, outcomes evaluation or report prepared for a review committee, and court or deposition testimony). Even though each type of research has unique features, there are some common elements, i.e., **scientific research methods** are employed for the collection and analysis of data. Academic criminologists, as well as justice practitioners in law enforcement, the judiciary, and corrections depend on scientific methods and concrete data to reach conclusions regarding crime, its elimination, control or treatment.

In the first chapter, we *defined criminology as an interdisciplinary field, which relies heavily on the scientific method to study crime phenomena, including the patterns of crime and victimization, etiology of crime, social responses to crime, and crime control*. This chapter provides the nuts and bolts of how to conduct research in criminology and criminal justice. We discuss the general makeup of theories and how criminological theories guide research. Steps

in the traditional scientific method are reviewed. In addition, evaluation strategies are explored with a consideration of the goals and objectives of justice agencies, programs and policies. Since billions of dollars are spent each year on programs to control crime, periodic evaluation and accountability has become necessary. Indeed evaluation of programs and policies are increasingly required; budget allocations and grants are often contingent upon certain outcomes.

Crime research frequently involves ethical dilemmas for the criminologist. The results of criminological research do not exist as neutral bodies of information; results whether in the form of statistics or evaluation studies affect budget, personnel, and programmatic decisions as well as political philosophies, crime policies, crime control and/or treatment programs. Both the ethical and political ramifications of crime research are reviewed in this chapter. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the resources for the study of crime. The information resources on crime are vast and exist on all levels. We shall review some of the major indexes, abstracts, journals and organizations including national and international bodies, which sponsor crime research, and the dissemination of crime related information.

RESEARCH IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Everyone has an opinion about crime, especially its causes and possible solutions. "Average" citizens are quick to make judgements about crime and criminal justice, usually with very few facts to substantiate their views. They often rely on common sense, rather than empirical data for support. Take, for example, the following statements about crime:

- (1) Most crimes measured as taking place in the United States are of a violent nature and these are rising by leaps and bounds.
- (2) The larger the city, the greater the likelihood that its residents will be the victims of crime.
- (3) Women are more likely than men to be the victims of crime.
- (4) The victims of crime seldom know or recognize their offenders.

- (5) The typical person who commits a crime is either unemployed or on welfare.

Each of these statements is false, or represents commonsense myths about crime.

Objectivity vs. Subjectivity

The statements above are based on more subjective or selective information, which frequently lead to erroneous conclusions. Based on more objective data collected by the National Crime Survey (NCS) and the National Prisoner Statistics Program (NPS), certain mitigating factors must be brought to bear so that each statement is more accurate (see Chapter 3). Compare this list with the list above:

- (1) Of the NCS-measured offenses, the vast majority are against property only and do not involve personal violence or threat.
- (2) The size of a city alone does not determine crime rates; crime rates vary greatly throughout a city.
- (3) For most personal crimes, men are victimized at higher rates than women
- (4) One's chance of being injured and ending up in a hospital are somewhat greater if the assailant is not a stranger.
- (5) Based on what is known about imprisoned criminals, most persons who engage in crime have jobs and very few are welfare-dependent.

Although it is probably impossible to generate completely objective or unbiased statements regarding crime, criminologists strive to collect unbiased data and derive subsequent conclusions from the analysis of such data. Part of the problem is that scientists are human, and therefore also commit errors. Some of the common errors that are found in the examination of crime phenomena are:

Inaccurate Observation. Several people viewing the same event will often report the incident quite differently. For example, black and white bystanders may see a skirmish between black youths and white police officers differently. Black observers may be more attuned to comments and behaviors by the police, which suggest possible racial discrimination or bias. White observers, on the other hand, may simply see stereotypes of young street toughs in conflict with the police. Reconstructing the facts and differentiating

between facts and appearances often challenge criminologists who are committed to presenting unbiased data.

Overgeneralization. There is a real tendency for people to look for patterns in things and incidents. We often seek a conclusion based on very few observations. For example, if we interview several citizens about fear of crime, and their responses are similar, we may assume that all citizens feel the same way. Criminologists seek to avoid overgeneralization by employing different research techniques such as random sampling of populations, adding control groups, and replication - repeating a study to see if the same results can be obtained.

Selective Observation. Once we conclude that a particular pattern exists, there is a tendency to pay attention only to those events, which fit the pattern, and to ignore those that deviate. We may interview a number of rape victims who were raped in public places after dark. Our conclusion might be that rape is a victim precipitated crime because women should not be in public places alone after dark. We selectively ignore other rapes, which occur in homes, and office buildings where victims do not place themselves at risk. We must make sure that selective observation and interpretations are avoided.

Stereotypical Information. By virtue of being residents of a heterogeneous culture, we are all exposed to stereotypes, or exaggerated beliefs associated with some particular category of individuals. Italian Americans, for example, who come into conflict with the law, may be linked with organized crime or the Mafia. Relatively few Italians, in reality, are associated with the Mafia or are involved in criminal activities. Distinguishing myths from realities is an important function of criminologists whose goal is to clarify misconceptions and to facilitate a better understanding of the problem.

Ego Involvement in Understanding. Individuals often get intimately involved in the situations that they study. Several studies have shown that even criminologists fall prey to this weakness. Some criminologists who have studied the police have gone native and become police officers themselves and sometimes act very defensive of the police. Similarly, individuals who study prisoners may become sympathetic to the extent that they fail to realize the gravity of the crimes that were committed by some inmates regarding them more as victims of society. The scientific method is a method to help researchers avoid the pitfalls of personal or institutional bias.

The Scientific Method

The scientific method is comprised of rules governing the defining, collecting, description or explanation of observations or data (See Figure 7.1). The method provides an orderly and logical way of testing criminological theories or solving specific problems. Steps in the scientific method are: **(1) Statement of Problem; (2) Review of Literature; (3) Formation of Hypothesis (es); (4) Collection of Data; (5) Analysis of Data and (6) Conclusions and Interpretation of Results.**

Statement of Problem

The first step in the process is to clearly articulate the nature of the problem under consideration. The problem must consist of observable or empirical phenomenon. Otherwise it will not be amenable to scientific verification. Abstract questions or questions of faith generally defy scientific treatment. For example, the question: "Is their crime in heaven?" is simply unanswerable by ordinary means. However, questions such as: "Is criminality related to levels of intelligence?" Or, Does television viewing affect criminality? They are immediately suggestive of potential data sources or observations. While not all problems in the area of criminology lend themselves to the development of theories to explain various aspects of crime, it is at this stage of the scientific process that theories are introduced.

Review of Literature

Reviewing other research that is related to the research problem or theory under scrutiny is essential. The criminologist may utilize any number of resources including books, professional journals, government documents, private research center reports, and monographs to gain insight into the topic. We will review resources available to students of crime for their research later in this chapter. Part of the training of a criminologist, especially at advanced levels, is learning how to find information about crime phenomena.

Hypothesis

A hypothesis is an educated guess or an anticipated outcome. It is usually made up of one or more **independent (IV)** variables (i.e., assumed causal factors) and one or more **dependent (DV)** variables (i.e., things or events explained). A relational term or clause either suggesting a causal relationship (or a correlation relationship) usually connects the independent and dependent variables. Stated in the form of a hypothesis, our sample research problems above may be expressed as follows:

1. Incarcerated criminals usually demonstrate lower scores on intelligence tests than non-criminals.
2. Large amounts of television viewing lead to criminality.

In the first case, the relationship between variables is not clear. Given the form of the hypothesis, cause cannot be inferred. Criminality may be understood as being associated with lower intelligence scores. In the second hypothesis, however, the term "lead" suggests a causal relationship. Criminality is the dependent variable and television viewing is the independent variable.

In developing the hypothesis for empirical testing, the criminologist must decide on how he/she will precisely observe or measure variables; Operationalization, i.e., step-by-step descriptions or instructions, show how we actually measure the variables. Operationalization of variables is probably the most challenging aspect of the scientific method. For example, in order to test the hypotheses above, careful attention to the definition of such concepts as "criminals", "non-criminals", "intelligence" and "television viewing" are needed, i.e., the concepts must be precisely delineated so that different observers at different times can be confident that variations in results are not due to administrative differences or observational techniques.

Criminologists must also deal with the issues of **validity** (i.e., does the measurement really represent what it purports to represent) and **reliability** (i.e., are the measurements consistent over time and with different samples). For instance, intelligence has been equated with IQ tests. Whether or not IQ is an adequate measure of intelligence raises the issue of validity. Although critics debate the validity of IQ, the test has proved to be relatively reliable, i.e., most people tend to score similarly during independent administrations of the test over time. We therefore know that IQ is a reliable test (it tests something consistently) but we still do not know exactly what it is testing.

Operationalization also includes the instructions for the selection of samples. Exactly who or what will be observed or measured? For instance, in the first hypotheses where the IQs of incarcerated criminals were compared with non-criminals, the question of who will comprise the

sample of inmates and non-criminals must be determined in advance. In short, operationalization answers the questions of who, what, where, when and how! Such topics are covered in basic research courses offered in sociology and criminal justice programs.

Data Collection

The data that criminologists collect for their research may be **primary data** (data collected anew by the researcher; e.g., interviews with convicted criminals), or **secondary data** (data collected by someone else and employed by the researcher for his or her own specific purposes; e.g., use of national surveys of individuals' television viewing behavior or data taken from Uniform Crime Reports). Whether primary or secondary, data can be collected by a variety of techniques depending on the research problem or theory.

Survey designs (administering questionnaires or conducting interviews) probably represent the most frequently employed method of data gathering. Yet, in dealing with deviant and criminal subjects, the survey method is problematic because it is difficult to assure respondents of their anonymity or confidentiality. However, the survey method is used guide effectively in certain types of crime research (e.g., victim surveys and self report delinquency surveys). More recently, the use of survey data as legal evidence in both criminal and civil litigation (e.g., fear of crime surveys to establish "perceptions of dangerousness" in high crime areas of cities) has lead criminologists to be more innovative in their application of the technique (see Thornton and Voigt, 1988; Crespi, 1987). There are several excellent works that provide information on how to construct questionnaires and how to draw samples (Johnson, 1981; Hagan, 1982; Binder and Geis, 1987; Fitzgerald and Cox, 1987).

The collection of data via **direct observation** or intrusion by the criminologist may present difficulty. Much like sexual behavior, criminal behavior rarely lends itself to direct scrutiny, something the police certainly know firsthand. **Unobtrusive** and **participant observation**, e.g., clandestine direct observation can, however, is used effectively to monitor certain types of criminality.

Unobtrusive observations are made indirectly. For instance, in areas where there are state run liquor stores, drops in liquor sales often reflect the arrival of a new shipment of drugs. The prevalence of drug paraphernalia and other remnants of drugs (e.g., needles and containers) also indicate drug use patterns in certain areas of cities.

Some criminologists have employed another type of observation, **participant observation**, where they have penetrated deviant groups to study the behavior of offenders (Irwin, 1970; Polsky, 1967). The problem here is that the criminologist becomes privy to information which is illegal and so runs the risk of becoming an accessory to certain crimes.

The collection of data by clandestine observation opens up a number of ethical issues for the criminologist. In a classic study conducted by Humphreys (1970), homosexual episodes were observed in restrooms in public parks. Humphreys recorded the details of the incident, took the license plate numbers of the participants, and later visited the men's houses under the disguise of conducting a door-to-door survey. His research was criticized along ethical lines of invading the privacy of individuals and using deception.

Criminologists also use the intensive **case history** or life history method of data collection. In-depth interviews with criminals about their careers in crime provide valuable information about their entry into the "profession", their rationalizations for criminality, and their views about changing crime patterns. The technique has been used to study professional thieves (Sutherland, 1937), fences (Klockars, 1974; Steffensmeier, 1986) and rapists (Olsen, 1983; see also Chapter 13).

The **experimental design**, which exposes one group of subjects to an experimental condition (the **experimental group**), and then compares that group to a control group (not exposed to the experimental condition) has also been employed by criminologists. For example, a correctional treatment program may be tested by establishing an experimental group (those who are treated) and a control group (those not treated) and by comparing the results. Since just participating in an experiment can sometimes affect results - special precautions to minimize experimental effects often need to be considered (e.g., the double blind

technique prevents both groups (the experimental and control) from knowing they are part of the experiment; double blind also suggests not letting the researchers know which group is control or experimental until the measurements are completed.

The experimental technique has been used in some very interesting ways (see Steffensmeier and Terry, 1975; Empey, 1980; Miranne and Gray, 1987). Philip Zimbardo (1971; 1972) simulated a mock prison in the basement of a building at Stanford University to test his hypothesis of deindividuation. He postulated that when individuals lose their personal identities, they fail to assume responsibility for their actions and are more likely to commit anti-social behavior. Zimbardo hired twenty-five middle class, well-adjusted undergraduate students as subjects for his experiment. A prison environment was simulated, and half of the subjects were randomly assigned to play the role of guards and half to play the role of prisoners. Both prisoners and guards were given appropriate uniforms. Prisoners were placed in three man cells for the duration of the experiment, which was supposed to last three weeks. The behavior of the prisoners and guards was videotaped. The guards were left to run the prison and Zimbardo served only as the warden.

What happened was shocking and disturbing. Many of the guards became cruel and tyrannical; the prisoners became servile, dehumanized robots that developed a hatred for the guards and other inmates. Zimbardo stated that the deindividuated situation "undid temporarily a lifetime of learning; human values were suspended; self-concepts were challenged, and the ugliest, most base, pathological side of human nature surfaced" (Worcel and Cooper, 1979: 551). The situation became so hostile (e.g., students in the role of guards became physically abusive and student inmates were exhibiting signs of illness, withdrawal and psychological disturbances) that the experiment was terminated only after six days. While this type of experimental simulation helps us understand how total institutions, such as prisons, come to dehumanize those individuals who are both clients (e.g., inmates, patients) and keepers (e.g., prison guards), it too has been widely debated in terms of methodologies and ethical issues.

Content analysis or the systematic classification and recording of data from newspapers, magazines, and other available print resources, as well as the visual media offer the criminologist an excellent source of unobtrusive data (i.e. data originally generated for another purpose but which can be easily obtained and used for research). Content analyzing samples of newspaper headlines over a number of years, for example, may reflect changing crime trends, or reporting of crime in a given community.

Data Analysis

The analysis of data collected by the criminologist can take many forms. **Quantitative data analysis** usually employs statistical tests, which indicate to the criminologist how strong certain numerical relationships are between variables. Statements regarding the strength or weakness of association as in correlation or causal relationships are determined mathematically. The quality of the numeric operationalization, i.e., how numbers are defined and used (level of measurement) suggest which statistics are appropriate. In quantitative analysis the type of measurement and the use of measurement are important to consider. Abuse of numbers is sometimes very subtle. For instance, if we take a husband's income and wife's income and compute a family mean income (an average computed by adding the two incomes and dividing by two or the number of workers); we are making a proper use of the numerical functions in calculating a mean. Yet if we were to take the IQ's of the husband and wife and tried to arrive at an average family IQ, we would commit a statistical error. Statistics courses are designed to make students cognizant of the power and use of numbers and the appropriateness of different tests of strength and association.

Qualitative data analysis relies more on descriptive indicators not easily reduced to numbers. Some observations and judgements of relative significance cannot be translated into numeric form and so are not amenable to statistical tests. Qualitative analysis is often associated with field research techniques where criminologists go into a community to study first

hand some crime phenomena. They observe, interview and otherwise gain as much knowledge as possible about whatever they are studying.

Criminologist Carl Taylor (1989) recently used field techniques to study the makeup of Detroit juvenile gangs. He and his research team interviewed gang members as well as residents, merchants and school officials in the areas where there was gang activity. His study revealed that unlike juvenile gangs in the past, new inner city drug oriented gangs are highly organized entities, which resemble a business corporation with divisions in charge of marketing, sales and accounting. Their multi-million dollar profits are invisible and illegal and gang members go to lengths not to attract attention to them. Data from this type of research may not be amenable to statistical analysis. In cases where observation can be expressed numerically, special statistical procedures to be used for qualitative analysis are available.

Conclusions and Interpretation of Data

The last component of the scientific method entails a summary of the research findings and research process. Hypotheses that are both confirmed and rejected are reported. If there is no support for given hypotheses, researchers offer possible reasons and suggest how the research could be altered or enhanced. Future implications of the research and its relative value for the field of criminology generally are among the topics addressed in the interpretation of data.

The use of criminological research findings remains a controversial topic in the field. Some criminologists have no qualms about using specific research in some policy application. Crime control policies, for example, may dictate that one correctional practice (e.g., the use of electronic monitoring devices to track offenders on probation) produces less recidivism than another (exemplars include Wilson, 1983; Van den Haag, 1976). Yet other criminologists, while perhaps not opposed to the use of their research for certain crime control policies may feel that such use diverts criminologists from their task, i.e., to stress the continued search for the "root causes" of criminality including racism and inequality.

The Link Between Theory and Research

Part of the task of science is to offer an explanation of the phenomena under study. Such explanations are usually stated in the form of theories. **Theories** can be defined as "logically interconnected sets of propositions from which empirical uniformities can be derived" (Merton, 1949: 39). Criminologists develop theories to explain, among other things, lawbreaking, law making, reactions to lawbreaking and the nature of social order and human behavior (Gibbons, 1979: 11). Without the development of theories, a discipline would remain a hodgepodge of unrelated information. Theories help organize material into some logical format which can be tested with empirical data.

Deduction vs. Induction

While theories to explain social phenomena may not be as precise as theories in the physical sciences, the **logic** of theory construction remains the same. Some theories of crime are constructed using the **deductive method**, (i.e., the process of reasoning from the general to the specific). This is a form of logical inference in which particular conclusions are drawn from general principles or laws. On the other hand, the **inductive method**, (i.e., the process of reasoning from the specific to the general) begins with particular findings or occurrences, and seeks to develop or find general principles or postulates as explanations.

One of the dilemmas that criminologists face is the development of general principles or "laws", to explain, for example, why certain people commit certain types of crimes. To date, no such principles or laws exist and probably never will. Criminologists, therefore, speak in terms of statistical probabilities that certain events will occur. This means that the effects of something occur more often when the causes are present than when the causes are absent. Statistically, it is possible to estimate the likelihood that some event will occur.

In order to show the logic of theory construction, we use the following example from a perspective known as social control theory. The example uses deductive reasoning.

Postulate I: Children who have low commitments to school are more likely than those with high commitments to school to associate with delinquent peers.

Postulate II: Children who associate with delinquent peers are more likely than those who do not to become involved in delinquent behaviors.

Theorem: Therefore, children who have low commitments to school are more likely than those with high commitments to school to engage in delinquent behaviors.

According to social control theorists, delinquent acts result from the weakening, breakdown, or absence of effective social controls on youths' behavior such as attachment to family members (e.g., expressing love of parents), involvement in conventional activities (e.g., playing sports), and commitment to conventional goals (e.g., having some future aspirations for a job or success). In our illustration of control theory, it is postulated that those children who have low commitments to school are more likely to associate with delinquent peers and therefore are prone to become delinquent themselves.

Obviously the above two postulates cannot be classified as general principles which hold true in all instances. However, there is evidence from delinquency research to suggest that children who fit this model are more likely to become involved in delinquent activities than children who do not (Hirschi, 1969; Thornton and Voigt, 1984).

A reverse logical ordering is suggested by the inductive method which would begin with the particular observation that there are a number of youth who are delinquent, and who appear to have delinquent companions. In this case the search would entail the derivation of some general principles that would relate or explain delinquency rates and the degree of association with delinquent companions to a relative lack of commitment to school.

Concepts, Variables, and Operationalization

The example above makes reference to several concepts□, or what Jonathan Turner, a sociological theorist, called "the basic building blocks of a theory" (1982: 3). Concepts refer to abstract elements representing classes of phenomena of what we are trying to explain. The concepts, which make up our theory of social control include: **children**, **commitment to school**, **delinquent companions**, and **delinquent behavior**. In order to test or verify the theory we must define the concepts in concrete, observable terms, i.e., we must operationalize them into concrete variables. A variable, in essence, is a concept's empirical counterpart.

As you recall, operationalization refers to how we actually measure the variable under scrutiny. For example, the variable "children" may be defined in terms of a specific sample of youth aged 12-16. A **sample** refers to a carefully selected group of individuals (e.g., several 7th through 10th grade classes) from a larger **population** (e.g., a large metropolitan school system). We may measure **commitment to school** by (1) the child's grade point average in school; and (2) responses to survey questions such as: "How important is getting good grades to you personally?" **Delinquent companions** may be measured by the child's responses to such questions as: "Have any of your close friends asked you to do something that is against the law?" and "Have any of your close friends ever been "arrested" by the police?"

Although the variable, "delinquent behavior " may appear self explanatory, we have to specify exactly what we mean by the term. For instance, we may define delinquency in reference to formal adjudication or judgement of delinquent by the juvenile court or we may define it according to admissions of delinquent activity by self-report questionnaires. In the illustration that we use, the operationalization of **delinquent behavior** is based on youths' responses to self-report delinquency surveys asking respondents how many times they have engaged in certain illegal behaviors during the last year. For each variable - commitment to school, delinquency of companions and self reported delinquency - each respondent is given a score of low, medium or high.¹

One of the problems with criminological theorizing is that criminologists often operationalize their variables differently even when testing the same theory. Many

criminologists who have tested social control theory use different measures for their social control variables. For example, instead of using self-report measures of delinquent activity, some criminologists rely exclusively on official police and court records thus shifting the attention away from the number of committed offenses to the individuals who have been labeled "delinquent," (i.e., one who has official contact with the juvenile justice system). Thus when comparing research results, one has to be aware of varying operationalizations. What may appear to be a contradiction in results may actually be a case of measuring the same variable with different indicators. To illustrate this point let us take poverty, which has historically been linked to crime. Poverty has been found to be significantly associated with adjudicated delinquents. However, in self-report surveys, poverty is not as significant, i.e., children from all social classes report engaging in delinquent acts. In this case, one conclusion is not more correct than the other. Competing operationalizations often suggest other influencing variables.

Causality and Correlation

Since criminological theories attempt to explain some aspect of crime phenomena, the issue of causation must enter into theory testing. **Causation** is the state in which some condition produces, or always results in, a particular consequence. A **necessary cause** is one without which a given effect cannot occur (e.g., criminal motive is necessary for a crime to occur but not sufficient because criminal motive does not always result in the actual commission of a crime). A **sufficient cause** is always followed or accompanied by a given effect; it may or may not be a necessary cause (e.g., a heavy dose of arsenic is a sufficient cause of death, it always leads to death but is not necessary because other things can lead to death). In the social sciences, causal statements are rarely necessary or sufficient (e.g., XYY chromosome studies of criminals claim to be sufficient explanations but other research has disputed such claims). Because the subject matter of the social sciences is very complex, and has infinitely more variables and effects to control and explain than the physical sciences, there are no causal

statements, which are both necessary and sufficient. Few if any ever approach either necessary or sufficient causal statements.

Within theoretical propositions, independent variables are tested against dependent variables in order to determine causality. In our example of the relationship between social control and delinquency, we delineate two independent variables (i.e., commitment to school and delinquency of companions) and one dependent variable (i.e., delinquent behavior). In other words, we are postulating in our theory that a relationship exists between children who are weakly committed to school, who have delinquent companions, and their own commission of delinquent acts. This statement is referred to as an **hypothesis**; it is in reality an educated guess as to what we expect to find. Until this theoretical hypothesis is tested with actual data, we do not know whether the independent variables are able to explain delinquent behavior (the dependent variable). Establishing causality is very difficult in the social sciences, and is rarely obtained, even in the best-designed studies.² three criteria are necessary to establish causality.

These are:

- (1) **Time order:** We must show that the independent variable or causal variable precedes or comes before the dependent or effect variable. Thus, if we say there is a relationship between low commitment to school and delinquency, low commitment must precede delinquency, and not vice versa.
- (2) **Co variation:** We must show that the independent and dependent variables are statistically related to one another; or that when there is a change in one, there is a significant change in the other. Statistics are used to measure the strength of a relationship between an independent and dependent variable. Thus, when low commitment to school is present, delinquency must also be present, and vice versa.
- (3) **Influence of Other Variables:** We must check for the possibility that other causal variables not included within our hypothesis might have some influence on the dependent variable. In research terms, we seek to control or hold constant other variables, which may help clarify or actually

explain our initial relationship. Other factors such as the child's age, family social class, sex, and IQ might also explain delinquency or at least clarify or specify the initial relationship between low commitment to school and delinquency.

In our theory, we postulated that low commitment to school and delinquency of companions causes or comes before the onset of delinquency. This **time order** may or may not be the case. In fact, since we have two independent variables, the time order among these variables may be complicated. Low commitment to school may come before association with delinquent companions, or the reverse.³ Covariate may be easier to establish. Statistical tests could indicate that the independent and dependent variables are indeed significantly related to one another (i.e., when there is a change in one, there is a change in the other). However, the co variation between each independent variable and the dependent variable may vary in strength.

Checking for the influence of other possible causal variables presents the most difficult task. We may find, for example, that other independent variables such as social class of family, viewing violence on television, and lack of parental social control **better** explain delinquent behavior than our hypothesized variables. If this were the case, we would have to alter our initial theory in light of new findings. The best that criminologists can usually do in theory testing is to be vigilant in their efforts to establish causality and let their theories guide their arguments. More likely, they settle for an approximation of causality, which always leaves room for the interjection of other plausible hypotheses.

Most criminologists present findings between independent and dependent variables in terms of a correlation rather than a cause. A **correlation** refers to the measured strength of a relationship between an independent and dependent variable. Although there are many statistical measures of correlation, most are interpreted in a similar way. When two variables are unrelated to each other, their correlation is 0. When two variables are perfectly related in a **positive** direction, i.e., an increase in one leads to an increase in another, the correlation coefficient is + 1.0. When two variables are perfectly correlated but in a **negative** direction, i.e.,

an increase in one leads to a decrease in the other, the correlation coefficient is - 1.0. For example, if we find a positive correlation between commitment to school (e.g., grades above average which range from low to high) and delinquent behavior (e.g., admission to committing illegal acts which range from a low involvement to high involvement), we would interpret a positive relationship in the following manner: the higher the grades, the greater the delinquency involvement. A negative correlation or inverse relationship, however, would have been the expected result: the higher the commitment to school, the lower the self-admitted involvement in delinquent behavior.

In reality, perfect positive or negative relationships are rare in crime research. Usually, a numerical value between 0 and + or - 1.0 is found (e.g., .30, .60, -.50, etc.). The higher the value, the stronger the relationship. A correlation is not to be confused or substituted for causation. Two variables may correlate and be caused by yet another variable or set of variables. While a correlation does not prove causation, causation cannot be said to exist without correlation, i.e., correlation is a necessary but not sufficient condition of causation.

Ecological Correlation Fallacy

Much of the data that is collected by criminologists in their theory testing is "group data" or aggregate data, which is collected from many individuals through surveys and observations. It is impossible to deduce from such data that "specific" individuals are affected in the ways predicted by the hypothesis. If we found support for our social control theory, we could not say, for example, that a specific youth who has low commitment to school and delinquent companions is likely to be delinquent. If we said this, we would commit the **ecological correlation fallacy**. What we could say is that **adolescents** who possess these characteristics are more likely to become delinquents than those who do not possess these characteristics.

The ecological correlation fallacy has a counterpart - the **individualistic fallacy**. Both involve a relation between variables for one unit of analysis, which are then generalized to a

smaller or larger unit of analysis. The individualistic fallacy, however, involves taking characteristics or a relationships of individuals and using them to make generalizations regarding groups or institutions of which they are a part. If we survey prison inmates and find that they strongly favor democratic values, we commit the individualistic fallacy if we then assume that prisons are democratic institutions.

Box 7.1: "Correlation and Causality"

EVALUATION RESEARCH

An applied type of research that became popular during the 1960s, probably as a result of federal funding policies requiring accountability for large grants given to criminologists and criminal justice agencies, is **evaluation research** (See Klein and Teilmann, 1980). This type of research utilizes the same data collection and analysis techniques we discussed earlier. It differs because researchers are given sets of goals or objectives before the research begins (See Kosecoff and Fink, 1982; Rossi and Freeman, 1985; Posavac and Carey, 1985).

In evaluation research, the investigator designs a study to determine whether or not the goals of the program or policy are being met and whether or not changes are necessary. The technique is basically fact finding asking the question: Is the program achieving its desired results or outcomes. The results or outcomes may meet, exceed, or fall short of the stated goals of the program.⁴ A more precise definition of evaluation research may be stated in the following manner:

Evaluation is essentially an effort to determine what changes occur as a result of a planned program by comparing actual changes (results) with desired changes (stated goals) and by identifying the degree to which the activity (planned program) is responsible for the changes (LaPatra, 1978: 73).

Numerous examples of evaluation research can be cited from the criminal justice literature:

- (1) The evaluation of the effects of changes in police procedure such as greater use of foot patrols upon crime or fear of crime indicators (Mastrofski, 1981; Trojanowicz, 1983).
- (2) The evaluation of neighborhood crime prevention program such as Neighborhood Watch and other residential collectivities (e.g., Rossi and White, 1987).
- (3) The evaluation of correctional treatment programs on recidivism (e.g., Clear and Gallagher, 1983; Morash and Green, 1986).
- (4) The evaluation of community correctional programs as compared to institutional programs on crime recidivist rates (e.g., Wilkins, 1969; Gendreau and Ross, 1981).
- (5) The evaluation of capital punishment on homicide rates (Sellin, 1969; Reckless, 1969).
- (6) The evaluation of criminal court reforms on the efficiency of the judicial system (e.g., Rhodes and Matsuba, 1984; Sherwood-Fabre, 1987).
- (7) The evaluation of juvenile diversion programs (e.g., Krisberg, 1980; Bynum and Green, 1984; Blomberg, Heald, and Ezell, 1986).

Individuals or organizations may decide to have a program or policy evaluated for many reasons. These include:

- (1) **fulfilling grant requirements** : Most federally funded projects require a full evaluation either at periodic intervals during the project or at the completion of the project.
- (2) **public relations** : If a particular program appears to be operating effectively, such as a new police crime prevention program, it is good publicity for the organization to advertise in the newspaper or on television the results of the program.
- (3) **continuation or discontinuation of a program** : Periodic review of any program is necessary to see if the goals of the program are being met or need to be changed . For example, if a drug rehabilitation program for first offenders is not eliminating their drug problem, goals of gradually reducing or controlling the problem may be more realistic. On the other hand, some programs may simply need to be discontinued either

because they have met their goals , or are no longer necessary, or because the program is unworkable in its present format.

- (4) **improvement** : Evaluation of a program may lead to its improvement and the pin pointing of deficiencies. Many early juvenile delinquent diversion programs upon evaluation suggested that greater resources for the use of juvenile's time was needed rather than psychotherapies.
- (5) **vindication** : A program that has never been evaluated and comes under attack or scrutiny for whatever reasons, may request review to vindicate or prove itself. There is always the risk, however, that vindication will not be forthcoming and the program will be called into question . Police department administrators have routinely requested funds for specialized police patrols. A classic evaluation of police patrol procedures, the Kansas City Patrol Experiment, found that variations in police patrol procedures have little impact on crime (Kelling, et al, 1974).

The evaluation research process can be broken down into several stages or steps. This process is essentially one in which there is continual feedback: definition of goals to operation to assessment to adjustment to redefinition, etc. (see Figure 7.2).

Defining the Goal(s) of the Program, Policy, or Organization

The first step in the evaluation process is the formulation of program goals. Even though a program has been in operation for many years, the goals of the program may not be clear. Goals are influenced by the values of the individuals operating a program or setting a policy. Some goals, such as increased profits, are clearly utilitarian. Others, such as preventing juveniles from continuing into delinquency, may be based on humanitarian values.

Administrators of criminal justice programs often present their goals in an imprecise fashion. For example, they speak in vague terms such as "reducing crime", "reducing fear of crime", and "improving law enforcement." For the evaluator, such general or global goals have to be made **clear, specific, and measurable (or operationalizable)**. Goals, therefore, must be defined or delineated so that the evaluator knows exactly what to look for. To this extent, the evaluator may have to get help from the host organization (i.e., the people who employ the

evaluator) to define the goals of the study. Some goals are obviously easier to define than others. Despite the difficulties of measurement, the future of many programs rests upon their evaluation results. One example of a program, which failed to meet its goals is discussed below.

The Juvenile Education Program (JEP) conducted at Lansing State Penitentiary in Michigan (Locke et al., 1986) was modeled after the Scared Straight "exposure to prison" philosophy. In this program, delinquents were forced to interact with adult criminals in an effort to shock them from committing future crimes. This program was different from others because it matched juvenile offenders with adult inmates in terms of past lifestyles (e.g., raised in an inner city slum and coming from a broken home). Juveniles were forced into interaction with the inmates who were aggressive and verbal in their descriptions of life in prison. Theoretically the experience was designed to show juveniles how they might end up if they continued to commit crimes. The goals of the program were to examine the impact of the JEP on the recidivism rates of juvenile and young adult offenders. In traditional scientific research terminology, the JEP would be classified as the independent or causal variable and recidivism rates would be the dependent or effect variable. An initial sample of 53 youth on juvenile probation was used as a "target" for the evaluation.

Select the Methods of Measuring Outcomes

The methods we select for our measurements are often connected with different outcomes. In our example the goal of the program was to reduce recidivism rates for the juvenile offenders, the method used by the researchers to measure this accomplishment was self reported delinquent offenses and official police and court reports. Juveniles were asked how many times they had committed certain delinquent and criminal offenses during the past year. Offenses included both minor (e.g., status offenses such as running away or curfew violations) and more serious offenses (e.g., breaking and entering and thefts). A total offense

score based on the number of reported offenses was obtained. Total number of police and court contacts was used as a second measure of recidivism.

Both self reported delinquency scores for status and criminal offenses and total number of official police and court contacts were obtained for each group before and after the JEP program. Since only the experimental group actually engaged in the prison education program, a comparison of before and after offenses for each group revealed if the program actually had an impact on juveniles' recidivism - i.e., whether juveniles who were exposed to the program actually were dissuaded from engaging in future criminality as compared to juveniles who were not exposed to the program (i.e., those in the control group).

Select the Criteria by Which to Judge the Accomplishment or Outcomes

The criteria of success or failure of a program is often very arbitrary. Agreement over the criteria of success or failure prior to the evaluation is, for obvious reasons, preferable. Unless the goals are clearly defined, criteria will be difficult to establish. Often criteria are set by comparing the relative differences between some targeted population and a control group or comparisons are made between "before and after" circumstances. In this case reductions in self reported delinquency and in official police and court contacts by youth who participated in the JED program were delineated as criteria to judge the effectiveness of the program. Sometimes a change may not be enough to determine success or failure. Justifying a specific amount of change in success or failure may be very difficult.

Collection and Analysis of Outcomes Data

In the experimental group, a six-month pre-measure period (i.e., before the prison education program) revealed that subjects had an average of 1.25 charges filed against them in juvenile court; for the control group the average was 1.66. The differences between the groups were not statistically significant; no differences with respect to prior amounts of criminality existed between the two groups of juveniles. Also, there were no statistical

differences between experimental and control groups in the average number of self reported status or criminal offenses committed during the pre-measure period. Six to eight months after the JEP program, a comparison of average self report offenses and average number of police and court contacts with pre program measures revealed no significant differences. In other words, the goals of the delinquency prevention program were not met; the prison education program did not reduce future delinquent and criminal acts. Those youth exposed to the program were no better off than the youth not exposed to the program.

Make Recommendations for Adjustments or Changes to Goals

The researchers who conducted this evaluation indicated that more evaluations were needed for this type of diversion program. Other prison education programs have reached similar findings (e.g., Finckennauer and Stori, 1978; Finckennhauer, 1979). The researchers suggest that juvenile offenders react quite differently to such programs and rather than looking for group or average reductions in future crime totals, different types of juveniles, e.g., serious delinquents only, and how they are affected by the program should be evaluated. Others have argued that given the poor performance of past prison education programs in reducing recidivism rates, the programs should be discontinued, and resources used to fund more successful programs.

If the goals of the prison education program had been met, and recidivism rates were substantially reduced for the participants, the researchers could recommend that the program continue as is; or, they could recommend that minor changes be made. If the evaluation suggested that the goals were not met, the researchers may pursue several lines of recommendations. For example, failure to meet the goals may be a function of inappropriate selected measures or indicators for success or outcomes. Failures in this context implies that other measures of success should be considered. It may be that the "assumed" goals and "real" goals were sufficiently inconsistent to cause suspicious or confusing results. Or, it may be that failure really means failure; in which case the program may be redesigned or discontinued.

Box 7.2: "Evaluating Criminal Justice Programs"

THE ETHICS AND POLITICS OF CRIMINOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Up to this point two important issues have been left out of our discussion of research in criminology. We have concentrated on the logic and techniques of doing research, which are obviously important. Just as important, however, are the ethics and the politics of criminological research.

Ethical issues refer to how information or data is obtained from the criminal, the victim, the criminal justice system, criminal justice practitioners and/or the public. The collection of data from these and other resources entails a fine balance between obtaining vital information and doing possible harm to subjects. Each case presents its own ethical dilemmas.

The politics of research deal less with how the data is collected from clients and organizations, but emphasize the substance and use of the research (Babbie, 1986: 462). For example, once a study has been conducted, key questions include: What happens to the research?; who uses the research? and how are the findings applied? As social scientists, criminologists have often been oblivious, or at least naive, as to how their research results are used by politicians and other policy makers. Politicians for instance often fail to address the scientific caveats or measurement and theoretical weaknesses of highly complex studies when they seize upon certain results. Findings are frequently generalized to populations that are quite different from the samples employed in the original research. Abuses notwithstanding, many criminologists are, of course, pleased to see their research become part of political campaigns and official reports and commissions.

Ethical Issues In Criminological Research

We cannot address all aspects of ethics in criminological research in our limited space. However, there are key areas, which are important in any discussion of ethics.

Professional Code of Ethics

Criminologists have not developed their own professional code of ethics. However, since criminology is multidisciplinary, other codes of ethics are available to guide crime research. The Committee on Professional Ethics of the American Sociological Association, for example, developed a Code of Ethics in 1982. An excerpt entitled "Sociological Research and Practice" dealt with "respect for the rights of research populations" in the following:

- (1) Individuals, families, households, kin, and friendship groups that are subjects of research are entitled to rights of biographical anonymity. Organizations, large collectivities such as neighborhoods, ethnic groups, or religious denominations, corporations, governments, public agencies, public officials, persons in the public eye, are not entitled automatically to privacy and need not be extended routinely guarantees of privacy and confidentiality. However, if any guarantees are made, they must be honored unless there are clear and compelling reasons not to do so.
- (2) Information about persons obtained from records that are open to public scrutiny cannot be protected by guarantees of privacy or confidentiality.
- (3) The process of conducting sociological research must not expose subjects to substantial risk or personal harm. Where modest risk or harm is anticipated, informed consent must be obtained.
- (4) To the extent possible in a given study, researchers should anticipate potential threats to confidentiality. Such means as the removal of identifiers, the use of randomized responses, and other statistical solutions to problems of privacy should be used where appropriate.
- (5) Confidential information provided by research participants must be treated as such by sociologists, even when this information enjoys no legal protection or privilege and legal force is applied. The obligation to respect confidentiality also applies to member of research organizations (interviewers, coders, clerical staff, etc.) who have access to the information. It is the responsibility

of the chief investigator to instruct staff members on this point (American Sociological Association, 1982).

Other guidelines, in addition to those above, have been developed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The rules for the protection of human subjects were developed originally in 1971 (Code of Federal Regulations, 1975). The National Research Act of 1974 created the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects, which published the well-known *Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research*. This report called for the recognition of three basic principles: (1) the principle of respect for persons (basically protecting people as autonomous agents); (2) the principle of beneficence (minimizing harm to subjects and maximizing benefits); and (3) the principle of justice (both the benefits and burdens of research must be distributed equitably through the selection of subjects (Hagan, 1982: 280).

Voluntary Participation

The collection of data or information from subjects, though varying in degrees, represents some intrusion into their lives. When possible, subjects must be voluntary participants and not coerced to participate in the study. People who are interviewed or asked to fill out a questionnaire give up their time as well as divulge often very personal information about themselves and their families. Greater degrees of intrusion take place, for example, in the collection of data through the controlled experiment. In the past, most experimental drug testing utilized prisoners as test subjects. New drugs were tested on groups of inmates who theoretically volunteered for participation. Although they were instructed about possible harm, many participated because they anticipated early release or some other rewards. The "voluntaries" of their participation was often very suspect for these reasons.

Under current law, researchers must acquire **informed consent** for many types of research. This involves having a potential subject sign a form indicating that he or she is willing to participate in a research project and understands any dangers involved and that they may

withdraw at anytime. There is still much controversy over when to request informed consent, and whether certain individuals even understand informed consent (Boruch, 1983; Zeisel, 1983).

In field research, where the criminologist observes participants in a natural setting, such as criminal defendants or attorneys involved in trying cases, it is impossible to inform people that a study is going on. Divulging that research is being conducted, however, could significantly affect the processes being examined. Thus subjects in these instances are not given the opportunity to voluntarily participate. A decision to conduct involuntary research is strictly left to the researcher who must reconcile the ideals of research with the rights of subjects and who is ultimately responsible for the consequences.

No Harm to the Participants

Another ethical consideration, one in which there are no exceptions, is ensuring that no harm comes to subjects or research participants. Filling out an anonymous questionnaire might represent the least possible harm to a research subject; participating in an experiment might represent the greatest possible harm.

An experiment conducted in a California prison some years ago is a case in point. Subjects in the experiment were men who had a record of committing repeated assaults against others or who had a record of self-mutilation and suicide attempts. Treatment entailed the use of aversive therapy to reduce future aggressive behavior. Inmates who engaged in aggressive behavior were injected with a drug called emetine (Succinylcholine), which resulted in "complete muscular paralysis including temporary respiratory arrest...for approximately two minutes." (Owens and Krieger, 1968: 6). The experimenters themselves indicated that the consequences of receiving the drug were "frightening". Yet, the experiment was conducted. Inmates were later asked: How would you describe the experience?" Thirty two percent said, "like dying", 7

percent said, "like when drowning", and 41 percent said, "scary", or "terrible" (Zeisel, 1983: 60-61).

In recent years, criminologists conducting research in universities, prisons, and research centers, especially if funded through outside agencies, are required to have an independent evaluation of their research proposal by a "human subjects committee" which serves as a check on possible harm to participants. In the final analysis, however, researchers must be guided by their professional ethics not to harm subjects.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

Some research can be designed so that it is impossible to know who the participants are. A self-report delinquency questionnaire, given to several thousand youth, in which no names are included on the instrument, probably achieves anonymity. The responses to the questionnaire items are entered into a computer and become aggregate or group data. On the other hand, other types of criminological research may require the necessity of the identity of the participants. **Longitudinal research**, where the same participants are interviewed at several points in time obviously requires knowing the identity of the participants. Confidentiality is important because the researcher promises not to reveal the names of the participants to anyone else. As soon as data gathering is over, however, identification numbers should replace the names of the subjects thus ensuring eventual anonymity. Research with rape victims, for example, in which the purpose of the research is to measure victim's later psychological adjustment to the incident would require the name of the victim. However, due to the type and seriousness of the offense, confidentiality would be extremely important.

Analysis and Reporting

Whether research is to be published in a criminological journal for consumption by other professionals or in a report for an agency or organization, the researcher must be scrupulously

honest in revealing all aspects of the study. If hypotheses are not supported, negative findings must be revealed. If evaluation research is conducted, and support for goals of a given program are not forthcoming, such a finding must be clearly stated. Although there have been very few cases of criminologists falsifying data, serious misrepresentations in various disciplines can be found (Culliton, 1987; New Scientist, 1988).

The Politics of Criminological Research

Political and ethical issues are frequently intertwined and therefore difficult to separate. For the sake of simplification ethical codes may be said to deal with the methods of research whereas political aspects concern the **substance** and use of research. Indeed very often the groups external to science stop or delay research because they question where the results will lead. Nelkin and Swazey (1985) address this issue:

In real life, research projects are stopped or delayed as groups external to science, and in some cases scientists themselves, question the moral implications of research activities, their immediate impacts, and their long-range social consequences. In the late twentieth-century social assessment of science, questions are raised about the limits of scientific inquiry, and efforts are made to redefine and in some cases to sharply delimit its boundaries. Is some research so threatening to the basic values of certain groups or so potentially risky to human subjects that it should not be done at all? Who are, or ought to be, the "experts" in decisions about the nature and governance of research? Is the traditional freedom of scientists to define and control their own research still reasonable given the expanded possibilities of modern science in areas such as human biology and behavior (344-345)?

While the social science research community typically dictates ethical standards, no group has produced any formal codes dealing with political protocol for researchers. No one has developed a set of guidelines or norms for researchers to follow in the selection of topics for study or in the uses or consequences of research. The value neutrality and the emphasis upon objectivity, which are usually associated with the scientific method, may sometimes have the effect of suppressing consideration of politics within science. Sociologist Max Weber advocated

a **value free sociology** in his famous "Science as a Vocation" lecture in 1918. He argued that liberals and conservatives alike are able to recognize the "facts" of biology and mathematics and so similarly they are able to recognize the "facts" of the social sciences regardless of how these facts relate to their personal beliefs.

The bulk of social scientists and criminologists aspire to Weber's ideal of a value free social science. However, not all agree with this general stance. Some have argued that a separation of science from human values leads to moral deprivation of the scientific enterprise. This position argues that the mere study of social problems such as crime is vacuous without a commitment to a more humane or better quality of life for all. According to this stance social research including criminological research is the product of a perpetual struggle in which the ruling elite of society control the development and flow of knowledge for their own benefit.

Accordingly, only certain definitions or explanations of behavior are accepted and these are generally based on the self-interests of the elite or ruling classes. The charge is that researchers tend to confine their research to the context provided by existing values and that this practice sometimes gives way to the tacit approval of injustice.

Politicians and Crime Research

Historically, crime has played a major role in local, state and federal politics in the United States. The presidential campaigns of 1960, 1964, 1968, and 1972 saw crime emerge as a major issue between the candidates. After his inauguration, President Kennedy launched his "war on crime." Following Kennedy's assassination, Johnson continued the war on crime with the infusion of massive amounts of federal money via LEAA. Richard Nixon ran on a platform of "law and order" justifying his position with the rising rate of street crime and campus unrest during the later sixties decade. Nixon promised a return to "law and order" and saw recent Supreme Court decisions as weakening the police and courts. Nixon argued for harsher penalties for offenders. Under Gerald Ford's administration the "war on crime" continued and was subsequently picked up by President Ronald Reagan who particularly during his first term

attempted to curb violent street crime. Reagan's second term directed federal support to control violent crime, drug trafficking, and organized crime (See Platt, 1988). George Bush, to a large extent has continued the hard-line approach for the control of crime including tougher laws for armed criminals, drug dealers, softening the exclusionary rule, reinforcing law enforcement at the federal level, and building more prisons. His more recent "war on drugs" on the home front and in Columbia and Peru has directed most resources at law enforcement efforts to control drug use and dealing, rather than addressing the reasons why certain people use drugs or why coca growing is intricately linked to the economy of drug producing countries.

James K. Stewart, Director of the National Institute of Justice, indicated in the forward to the Research Program Plan for Fiscal Year 1989, that much future federally funded research will be directed towards such things as: (1) crime control and criminal careers; (2) drugs, alcohol and crime; (3) offender classification and the prediction of criminal behavior; (4) violent criminal behavior; (5) punishment and control of offenders; (6) public safety and corrections; and (7) white collar and organized crime. He suggested that past funding has been on a piecemeal basis rather than aimed at the criminal justice system as a whole, and that future funding efforts will seek to remedy this situation (NIJ, Research Program Plan: 1989).

State politicians have also capitalized on the crime issue and as a result state legislatures across the country have revised criminal codes, reinstated the death penalty and pushed for harsher criminal sanctions in the form of mandatory and determinate sentences for severe crimes (See Platt, 1987). More recently the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that it is not "cruel and unusual" punishment to execute juveniles for crimes committed before they are 18 (*Stanford v. Kentucky* (1988)) or to execute the mentally retarded (*Penry v. Lynaugh* (1989)).

The relationship between criminological research and politics is a tenuous one (Bazelon, 1978). While it is difficult to make sweeping generalizations about political philosophies, conservative politicians generally stress law and order as crime control strategies and are likely to be sympathetic to research directed towards this effort (e.g., greater effectiveness of police and justification of harsher sanctions and the expansion of correctional institutions). More

liberal oriented politicians see crime as a result of poverty, unemployment, and discrimination and are more sensitive to crime research directed toward social reform and the elimination of these "root causes." (Rosch, 1985: 20-21). One of the problems that social scientists often face when dealing with policy makers is explaining that crime is a complex phenomenon and that there are very few quick solutions to the problem. When politicians fund research, they often expect immediate results, especially those adhering to a crime control model (Rossum, 1978: 183).⁵

Federal Impact on Research

Criminology has been active as a discipline in the United States since the early 20th Century (see Chapter 6). Initially, the individual criminologist carried out most criminological research with support coming either from his or her own resources or from a university or social agency. Increasingly, however, criminological research is funded as well as guided by government sponsored entities. During the 1930s, for example, the National Commission on Law Observance and Law Enforcement, known as the Wickersham Commission, sponsored research on the police at a national level. Since that time, the federal government has spawned dozens of agencies and special commissions to fund and study crime (see chapter 5 on the costs of crime). To a large degree federal funding has directed the development of criminological and criminal justice research in the United States (Wellford, 1983: 1375-1378).

One of the more prestigious crime commissions was the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration created by President Lyndon Johnson in 1965. Out of this commission came the report *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society* (1967) that made numerous recommendations among them being the need for a well-funded national research program. A series of other commission reports on the police, corrections, juvenile delinquency, and organized crime were also forthcoming.

Possibly the largest effort to federally sponsor crime research began in 1968 when Congress passed the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act (amended in 1970, 1973

and 1976). This act allowed for the creation of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice under the aegis of the Department of Justice. A provision of the Omnibus Act also created the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), which was organized to function in five ways:

- (1) by supporting statewide planning in the field of criminal justice through the creation of state planning agencies (SPAs);
- (2) by supplying states and localities with block grants of federal funds to improve their criminal justice systems;
- (3) by making discretionary grants to special programs in the field of criminal justice;
- (4) by developing new devices, techniques, and approaches to law enforcement through the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, the research arm of LEAA; and
- (5) by supplying money for the training and education of criminal justice personnel (Twentieth Century Task Force, 1976: 4)

Although LEAA experienced numerous problems in its distribution of resources, evaluation of funded projects, and eventually its overall impact on reducing crime rates in the United States, it pumped millions of dollars into various research projects. Before its demise in 1982, LEAA had an annual budget approaching \$100 million. More recently, there is a move to revive LEAA with special emphasis on law enforcement funding to combat drug use in the United States.

From the start, some criminologists were opposed to the general thrust of Leaa's initial goals, i.e., the improvement of law enforcement and the criminal justice system, and a perceived over-concentration on street level crime to the exclusion of higher-level political crimes. To some degree, these criticisms were valid; nevertheless important criminological research was generated through LEAA. Areas of study included:

1. **Correlates and determinants of criminal behavior:** Research on biological, psychological and sociological characteristics of offenders and on such matters as the relationship of drug use to crime.
2. **Violent Crime:** Research on weapons and violent crime, collective violence including riots, and individual violence such as homicide and rape.

3. **Community crime prevention:** Research dealing with the effectiveness of anti-crime programs.
4. **Career criminals:** Research on characteristics of career criminals, the nature and number of their crimes, patterns of criminal behavior by adults and juveniles, and the impact of correctional treatment programs on habitual criminals.
5. **Utilization and deployment of police resources:** Research studies on preventive patrol, police response calls for service, and criminal investigations.
6. **Pre-trial process:** Research dealing with reasons for felony case dismissals, plea bargaining practices, alternative methods of resolving disputes, etc.
7. **Rehabilitation:** Research on the effectiveness of specific rehabilitation approaches for certain types of offenders, as well as efforts to develop more precise methods of measuring the effects of correctional programs.
8. **Sentencing:** Research involving the development and testing of sentencing guidelines.
9. **Crime deterrence:** Research, which develops tools for measuring deterrence and assessing its effectiveness.
10. **Performance standards and measures:** Research on issues involved in measuring the efficiency, effectiveness, equity, responsiveness, and productivity of criminal justice services.
11. **Alternative data sources:** Funding for projects such as the National Crime Survey of victimization.
12. **Organized crime, white collar and official corruption:** Research on the structure of organized crime in America as well as studies on white-collar crime.

The disbanding of LEAA resulted in curtailing the funds for many large-scale crime research projects. However, other federal programs supporting research have remained constant since the 1960s. Chief among these are the Center for Crime and Delinquency at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the National Science Foundation, and the Federal Judicial Center. NIMH, for example, funds numerous research proposals submitted by individual criminologists dealing with such problems as drug abuse and crime, predictions of dangerousness and crime causation.

While no one knows what the role of federal funding on crime will be in the future, it is probably safe to say that it will remain significant. Private foundations have not shown an interest in funding crime studies over the last two decades.

Criminologists and Public Policy

There is debate among criminologists over both their roles in applied settings, and how their research should be used in policy making (See Cohen, 1985). British criminologist Roger Hood (1987) cautioned:

There is a danger that too great an involvement in practical concerns can blunt objective judgement, stifle curiosity and lead to an absorption into prevailing institutionally supported opinions and structures. The role of scientist, investigator, and critical analyst is at the heart of the criminological pursuit (528).

This stance, however, negates the expertise that criminologists might have in offering innovative changes in crime control and, if anything, leaving much criminal justice decisions in the hands of lesser-qualified "experts."

Elliot Currie in his book, *Confronting Crime* (1985), takes both conservative and liberal criminologists to task for their unimaginative efforts at crime prevention/control. Conservatives, he argued, have unwavingly pushed for harsher penalties and other control policies. Liberals, on the other hand, have not "acknowledged the depth and seriousness of the human damage that violent crime both caused and reflected. This sometimes leads liberals, he added, to deny the seriousness of the crime problem and more often, to underestimate the resources and energies required to control it (12-13).

In reality, criminologists compete among themselves for support and forums to present their views. Such forums today include the acquisition of limited grants funds, publication of research studies, and inclusion of criminologists on criminal justice decision making committees.

RESOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF CRIME

For the student of criminology, there are abundant resources for the study crime and the criminal justice system. Since one of the first steps in "doing research" is narrowing down a theory or problem, knowing how to do a literature search is vital. Part of the process of becoming a professional in any discipline is learning how to find relevant information. We provide a brief introduction to the major criminological resources, which can be obtained, from libraries, government agencies and organizations, and professional societies. There are a number of excellent works, which offer more comprehensive listings of materials for the study of crime (e.g., O'Block, 1986).

Indexes, Abstracts, and Journals

One of the most useful tools for researching a topic are **indexes**. Indexes are specialized bibliographic devices, which allow a researcher to locate crime information in an organized fashion on a specific topic by subject area or author. If one is interested in a specific topic, such as the use of peer juries with juvenile offenders, the subject index refers you to specific citations which include: (1) the name of the author; (2) the title of the work; (3) the name of the journal (or other publication); and (4) the date and page numbers. Some indexes provide abstracts or brief summaries of research in addition to basic bibliographic material. This allows the researcher to see if the article is germane to his/her own research.

The following example of a work on peer juries comes from *Criminal Justice Abstracts* (1985), and includes all relevant information that the researcher would obtain by looking under the subject heading of "peer jury" or author heading "Reichel" (if the author were known).

Reichel, Philip; Seyfrit, Carole, "A peer jury in the juvenile court." *Crime & Delinquency* (San Francisco, CA), 30(3): 423-438, 1984

Peer juries are diversion programs where age peers make recommendations for the disposition of adjudicated youth that have volunteered to go before them. The origins of the peer jury are traced, and an in-depth description is provided of a peer jury program in

Columbia County, Georgia. A questionnaire was developed and administered to 54 peer jury members, 43 youths that appeared before the peer jury, and the youths' parents covering the period June 1980 through December 1981.

Offenders and their parents agreed that juror recommendations were fair, but there was some disagreement about the extent of leniency. The peer jury was seen as a supportive and understanding environment. The majority of jurors, offenders and parents felt that the program produced positive behavioral changes.

The index refers us to the work entitled "A peer jury in the juvenile court," written by Philip Reichel and Carol Seyfrit. The work is published in the journal, *Crime and Delinquency*, Volume 30, issue number 3, pages 423-438, 1984.

There are several excellent indexes, many of which are abstracting indexes, pertaining to criminology:

Indexes and Abstracts

Abstracts on Criminology and Penology.

This abstracting index is international and provides more than 3000 abstracts on criminological and corrections research.

Criminal Justice Abstracts.

This index contains thousands of crime research entries from over 90 criminology/criminal justice journals.

Criminology Index.

A comprehensive source of interdisciplinary research and theory on crime from major journals in criminology, sociology, psychology, law, economics, psychiatry, and anthropology. This index is particularly useful for research published between 1945 and 1972 on such topics as kinds of offenders, crime causation, deterrence, victimology, and criminal statistics.

Index to Abstracts on Crime and Juvenile Delinquency, 1968-1975.

This index provides access to the abstract collection of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and has approximately 11,000 citations.

Index-Abstracts of Research in the Bureau of Prisons, 1976-1977.

This is a specialized index from the Federal Bureau of Prisons, which is a comprehensive listing of abstracts of research studies on projects in the federal prisons.

Index to Legal Periodicals.

A non-abstracting index, which provides historical and current access to law, related issues, many of which relate to criminology and criminal justice.

Police Science Abstracts.

This is an international abstracting index providing over 1500 citations on police science, forensic science, and forensic medicine.

Psychological Abstracts.

This abstracting index is the major source for works in the field of psychology. It includes, however, subject and author headings for many crime and criminal justice works in the areas of adjudication, corrections, crime types, and treatment.

Sociological Abstracts.

An abstracting index publishing leading works in the field of sociology, many pertaining to crime and juvenile delinquency.

Journals

Journals are published collections of research in a given discipline. There are dozens of American and foreign journals (many in English), which publish crime, related research. Very few university libraries subscribe to all of the journals in the field. It is frustrating for a student to find a relevant citation in an index, and then discover that his/her library does not have the work. Most libraries provide a service referred to as "interlibrary loan" where the journal article (or other reference) can be obtained from another library. Often a copy of the article, usually running a few pages, is provided for a small fee. Also, many universities provide data based computer searches, which allow for the on-line printing of certain requested journal articles.

We include by general subject some of the most frequently cited criminology and criminal justice journals. With some exceptions, most of the journals publish research on all areas of the discipline (e.g., juvenile delinquency, criminal law, offender types, crime causation, victimology, corrections, theory and international criminology).

Criminology and Criminal Justice:

Crime and Delinquency. Continental Plaza, Hackensack Avenue, Hackensack, N.J., 07601

Crime and Social Justice. P.O. Box 601, San Francisco, CA 94140

Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal. The American Society of Criminology, 1314 Kinnear Road, Columbus, OH 43212

The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice. Institute of Criminology, CB# 9DT, United Kingdom

Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice. Dept. of Criminal Justice, California State Univ., Long Beach, CA

Journal of Criminal Justice. Maxwell House. Fairview Park, Elmsford, NY 10523

Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology. 428 E. Preston St., Baltimore, MD 21202

Journal of Quantitative Criminology. Winterslake. Rd, Bristol 53 2NT, England

Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 411 Hackensack Avenue, Hackensack, N.J., 07604

Victimology: An International Journal. Visage Press, Inc. P.O. Box 39045, Washington DC 20016

Corrections:

Canadian Journal of Criminology. 55 Parkdale Ave., Ottawa, K1Y 1E5, Ontario, Canada

Criminal Justice and Behavior. 275 South Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Federal Probation. Supt. of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402

International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology. 199 Gloucester Place, London, England

Journal of Correctional Administration. Box 99, Huntsville, TX, 77340

Courts and the Law:

American Criminal Law Review. University of Texas, School of Law, 2500 Red River, Austin, TX 78705

Criminal Law Bulletin. 210 South St., Boston, MA 02111

Law and Society Review . University of Denver College of Law, 200 West 14th Av., Denver, CO 80204

Juvenile Justice:

Juvenile Court Digest . National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, P.O. Box 8978, University of Nevada, Reno, NV 89507

Juvenile and Family Court Journal . National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, University of Nevada, Reno, NV 89507

Juvenile Justice Digest. Washington Crime News Services, 7620 Little River Turnpike, Annandale, Va 22003

In addition to these journals, disciplinary journals including sociology, social work, psychology, and political science, to name a few, also publish crime related research on a regular basis.

Government Sponsorship of Crime Research

There are a number of federal agencies and programs, which either conduct their own research or fund outside research projects conducted by criminologists. This research is available to students either directly from the agencies or through university libraries.

Under the Department of Justice, through the Office of Justice Programs, a number of agencies exist chiefly to conduct research on crime and criminal justice and to offer assistance to crime control agents, agencies, and scholars in the field.

National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is a research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Institute's mission is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes, and control. The 1984 Justice Assistance Act mandated NIJ to do several things in order to fulfill its mission. These are:

(1) To provide more accurate information on the causes and correlates of crime and juvenile delinquency, (2) to develop new methods for the prevention and reduction of crime, (3) to evaluate the effectiveness of criminal justice programs, (4) to make recommendations for action to federal, state and local governments for the improvement of their systems of criminal justice, and (5) to serve as a national and international clearinghouse for the exchange of information on crime and criminal justice-related matters (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987: 1).

In accomplishing its goals as a clearinghouse for crime research, the NIJ established the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS). This program is an invaluable resource for anyone conducting research in the field of criminology. Many of the publications are free upon request or are available through a document and microfiche loan program. NCJRS publishes a bi-monthly journal, *NIJ Reports*, which lists and describes current research available through NIJ and other vendors. A more detailed *User's Guide* is available elaborating the full services offered by NCJRS. The *NIJ Reports* and *User's Guide* can be obtained by becoming a registered member of the service. This is a free membership and an application can be obtained by writing the following address: National Institute of Justice/ NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850 or by calling their toll free number, 800-851-3420.

NCJRS provides an online data base collection consisting of books, journal articles, unpublished papers, grant/contract final reports, government publications, doctoral dissertations and other documents, many quite hard to find. This collection provides information on all aspects of the administration of justice and crime causation, prevention and control. NCJRS specialists are knowledgeable about the content and methods of searching other online databases in the fields of sociology, psychology, business, and medicine, which have crime applications. For a nominal fee, NCJRS specialists will provide detailed computer searches of on line databases relating to almost any conceivable topic in criminology. However, they also provide topical searches, i.e., a computer search providing a quick overview of a particular crime topic. These topical searches span over 70 different crime topics and are continually updated.

NCJRS has a specialized Juvenile Justice Clearinghouse, created in 1979, which provides detailed material (including data base searches) on juvenile delinquency and juvenile justice. A new clearinghouse on drugs/crime research has been added to NCJRS.

The National Institute of Justice provides several other very useful research tools for the criminologist. Once they fund a research project, NIJ requires the principal investigators to supply the agency with data sets (i.e., the data that was collected for an NIJ funded project). Other criminologists can obtain these data sets (via computer tape or disk) for secondary analysis. Presently, NIJ sends the data sets to the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan where they may be obtained. The NIJ publication, *Data Resources of the National Institute of Justice* (May, 1987) lists all documents data sets (around 100), which are currently available.

NIJ publishes on a regular basis, free upon request, their *Research in Brief* series, which is a two to three page summary of specific research funded by the agency. In addition to getting a quick, up to data synopsis of developments in criminology, criminal justice, criminal law and corrections, a full detailed report is also available.

In addition, NIJ publishes a series of selected translations in law enforcement and criminal justice titled *International Summaries*. Each summary is a translated publication from another country. Summaries are a few pages in length and have covered a variety of subjects over the years.

Box 7.3: NIJ Reports

Bureau of Justice Statistics

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) is an agency of the U.S. Department of Justice, which was created in 1970 by the Justice System Improvement Act (which superseded the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Acts). The bureau collects, analyzes, publishes and disseminates statistics on crime, victims of crime, criminal offenders, and operations of the justice systems in the United States.

One of the major BJS projects, begun in 1973, produces the national annual estimates of the National Crime Survey, which is the statistical base for the Criminal Victimization in the United States series. In this series, data are obtained on the amount of crime against persons and households, the characteristics of victims, criminal events and offenders in major American cities. More specialized reports deal with public attitudes about crime, police and the criminal justice system. In addition, the bureau publishes the annual reports *Parole in the United States*, *Prisoners in State and Federal Institutions*, and *Capital Punishment*, among others. The BJS disseminates its *Bulletin*, on a regular basis, which provides brief statistical accounts of some of its larger statistical projects. For example, recent *Bulletins* have dealt with "Crime and the Elderly," "Tracking White Collar Crime," and "Measuring Crime."

One of the more comprehensive BJS publications is the *Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics* which is published annually, and provides detailed data on six areas: (1) Characteristics of the Criminal Justice System; (2) Public Attitudes Toward Crime and Criminal Justice; (3) Nature and Distribution of Known Offenses; (4) Characteristics and Distribution of Persons Arrested; (5) Judicial Processing of Defendants; and (6) Persons Under Correctional Supervision.

Box 7.4: "What is the Bureau of Justice Statistics?"

More information can be obtained about any BJS publication by writing to the following address: BJS, 633 Indiana Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20532 or by calling 202-724-7765.

Bureau of Justice Assistance

To fulfill its mission under the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) provides funds and technical assistance to state and local government to control crime and drug use and to improve the criminal justice system. In support of these activities, the BJA created a clearinghouse, now a component of NCJRS, which provides current information on drugs and crime.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention

This agency was created in 1974 to guide federal efforts to control juvenile delinquency in the United States. OJJDP stimulates research on crime by providing grants to outside researchers. Numerous publications dealing with all aspects of juvenile delinquency can be obtained from OJDP directly or via the NCJRS.

Federal Bureau of Investigation

Though supported in part by the BJS, the Federal Bureau of Investigation maintains a nationwide view of crime based on the cooperative efforts of over 16,000 city, county and state law enforcement agencies reporting data on crimes. Since 1930, the FBI has collected and tabulated crimes "known to the police" and arrest statistics on serious (Index or Part 1 Offenses) and less serious (Non Index or Part 2) crimes. This data is published annually in the *Uniform Crime Reports*, and though it is often criticized for certain inadequacies, criminologists have come to rely on this information for research and planning activities.

International Data Sources

The study of crime in other countries is a subject that American criminologists find both fascinating and frustrating. Frustration often comes from not being able to obtain current information and material about another country. While many excellent cross cultural works in criminology have been written or translated during the past few years, comparative research requires perseverance.

International Organizations

Several international organizations exist which have made it possible for criminologists to exchange people, ideas and data regarding crime.

International Society of Criminology

In 1934, at the Ministry of Justice in Paris, an international meeting was held in order to form a federation of societies of the criminological sciences. Based on the efforts of the participants, the International Society for Criminology was created and the first International Congress of Criminology was held in Rome four years later. Holist wrote: "The purpose of the society is to develop criminological research and coordinate initiatives and international undertakings concerning the prevention and counteraction of crime" (1979: 305). To accomplish this task, the society organizes international congresses every five years; the 10th International Congress of Criminology met in Hamburg, Germany in 1988. Research was exchanged on such issues as criminal careers, crime and the abuse of power, problems in corrections and police effectiveness. The society also conducts criminological courses, collects and disseminates crime research, organizes lectures and provides funding for the exchanges of professors through its International Center of Comparative Criminology at the University of Montreal (Canada). All aspects of cross-cultural criminology have been funded by the Center. The Society publishes much of its research in a journal, the *International Annals of Criminology*. Included in the journal are "national reports, systematic bibliographies of papers in specialized journals, and news items about the field, as well as critical reviews of criminological works..." (48).

The United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch

The first international organization, which obtained international cooperation, including the prevention of crime, was the League of Nations in 1919. Based on the United Nations charter in 1945, activities of the League were promoted by the United Nations. Although the early League of Nations initiated several bilateral and multi-lateral international agreements regarding certain areas of international crime (e.g., prohibition of white slavery), the UN has been actively involved in preventing and combating crime since its creation.

The Economic and Social Council, one of the six main organs of the UN, conducts research on socioeconomic problems, many of which bear directly on crime related matters. The United Nations Secretariat administers and coordinates functions crime prevention through the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch. There is a rich source of international material on all aspects of crime and delinquency disseminated through this branch of the UN. While much of this information can be obtained through the government documents section of your university library, some of it must be obtained through a UN depository library. Works can also be ordered directly from the United Nations Publications Center (Room DC2-853, Dept, 701, New York, N.Y. 10017 (212-963-8302). There is a charge, however, for most of these publications when ordered directly. Following is a list of major UN works on crime:

A World Dictionary of Criminological Institutes . E.87.111.N.1, 1986. (This publication provides a description and address of all major criminological institutes throughout the world).

International Review of Criminal Policy . (New York: United Nations, 1953-present). This series deals with different policies/topics each year. Each issue presents articles and summaries of meetings and programs, which pertain to a specific criminal justice topic).

Report of the Secretary-General on Capital Punishment . United Nations, E/1980/9

Report on the First United Nations Survey on Crime Trends, Operations of Criminal Justice Systems and Crime Prevention Strategies . A/32/199, Sept. 22, 1977

Report on the Second United Nations Survey on Crime Trends, Operations of Criminal Justice Systems and Crime Prevention Strategies . A/Conf 121/18 May 30, 1985

Eighth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders . United Nations, A/Conf. 144/iPM 1-5, 1988. (This series offers a number of reports dealing with juvenile and adult offenders; model legislation and guidelines for their treatment is provided.)

United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Newsletter. (Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Branch, published semi-annually since 1976).

The United Nations Criminal Justice Information Network

This service is a computer network. It allows members to obtain international crime statistics and information, newsletters, reports from criminal justice organizations, and other cross cultural material regarding crime and crime control. Information about the service can be obtained from the School of Criminal Justice at the State University of New York (SUNY), (135 Western Avenue, Albany, New York 21222).

International Society of Social Defense

The Society publishes the *Bulletin of the International Society of Social Defense*. The aim of the society is "to study the best means of combating crime, profiting in a specific way from the results of scientific studies concerning man." (Holyst, 1979: 322). The society has held twelve congresses since 1947, each of which has dealt with a specific crime topic. The Society now has consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL)

This organization's chief mission is to develop cooperation among the police of different countries. INTERPOL serves as a point of contact for both American and foreign police seeking assistance in criminal investigations that extend beyond their national boundaries. It also disseminates information about the development of international crime. INTERPOL more recently expanded its mission to include world illegal narcotics trade and international acts of terrorism and violence. The organization sponsors two publications: *International Criminal Police Review* and *International Crime Statistics*.

Division on International Criminology (A Unit of the American Society of Criminology)

The American Society of Criminology (ASC) began a separate division for the study of cross-cultural criminology in 1980. Since that time, the Division on International Criminology

publishes a newsletter detailing the work of comparative criminologists; and also coordinates special sessions on international criminology at the ASC annual meetings. The Society's journal, *Criminology* routinely publishes articles on international crime issues.

International Journals and Other Reference Works

There are many excellent journals and bibliographic references and materials, which report international research on criminology and criminal justice or offer information regarding resources of information. Most of these materials are easily located in university and specialty libraries around the country.

Journals

A guide to these journals is entitled:

International Guide to Periodicals in Criminal Justice . Charles P. McDowell, Gerald L. Russell, and Theodore C. Hines. North Carolina Justice Institute, Sandy Ridge Press, Greensboro, N.C.

Most international journals of criminology are general in their coverage of crime topics. Some are specialty journals, devoted to research on specific topics such as the police, juveniles, or corrections. A sample list follows:

Australian Law Review

British Journal of Criminology

British Journal of Law and Society

Canadian Journal of Criminology

C.J. International

Deviance et Society

International Journal of Criminology and Penology

International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice

International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology.

The America Journal of Comparative Law

Other Reference Works

Beginning in the 1970s, a number of reference works examining crime, criminal justice, and criminal law in other countries were written. Included in most of the collections are bibliographies that refer the student to other material. We include several of the more recent books, which we have found useful in our studies of cross-cultural criminology.

Avanesov, G. **The Principles of Criminology.** Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1982. Written by a Soviet criminologist, this work offers a glimpse into Soviet thought on the subject of crime. Crime is viewed as a historical component of dialectical materialism and Soviet criminology exists, for the most part, to describe, explain and forecast crime within this context. (More recent Soviet criminology does not follow this line of thought).

Bassiouni, C. and Savitski, V.M. **The Criminal Justice System of the USSR.** Springfield, Ill.: Chas Thomas, 1979. These authors provide detailed information on the criminal justice system of The USSR, with special emphasis on law and procedure.

Cole, G.F., Frankoswki, S.J., and Gertz, M.G. **Major Criminal Justice Systems: A Comparative Survey.** Beverly Hills: Sage, 1987. This book examines the criminal justice systems in the following countries: USA, England, Nigeria, The Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden, Japan, The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland.

Connor, W.D. **Deviance in Soviet Society: Crime, Delinquency, and Alcoholism.** New York: Columbia University Press, 1972. Though somewhat dated, this work provides a nice overview of Soviet crime and delinquency through the 1960s. A particularly good chapter is included on juvenile delinquency.

Holyst, B. **Comparative Criminology.** Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1979. This work provides an excellent review of the history of international criminology including rich detail of the role of the United Nations and other professional organizations in the study of crime.

International Criminal Justice Systems, Volumes 1 and 2. Editors, C. Fenwick and D. Bracey. American Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (1985-86). The volumes provide a detailed course syllabus on international criminal justice and criminology in several countries. References are given for all aspects of criminal justice (e.g., the law, the system, crime statistics, etc.). Volume 1 examines the following countries: Canada, Australia, Sweden, People's Republic of China, The Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the Federal Republic of Germany. Volume 2 examines Denmark, Egypt, India, Israel, Ireland, Malaysia, The Netherlands, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, and the Republic of Korea.

Johnson, E.H. **International Handbook of Contemporary Developments in Criminology.** Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1983. Volume 1 of this work has a series of articles on criminological development in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia (34 different countries); Volume 2 covers North and South America and in addition has articles on international criminological associations.

Solomon, P.H. **Soviet Criminologists and Criminal Policy.** New York: Columbia University Press, 1978. This work offers insights into the role of soviet criminologists and their participation in crime and delinquency control policies.

Terrill, R.J. **World Criminal Justice Systems: A Survey.** Cincinnati: Anderson, 1984. This book offers a comprehensive analysis of the criminal and justice systems of England, France, Sweden, Japan, and the Soviet Union.

Foreign Government Resources

One of the problems in conducting cross-cultural research on crime is the lack of uniformity in justice systems and the legal definitions of crime from country to country. This is especially a problem when studying juvenile delinquency. Some countries, such as Great

Britain, do not delineate specific juvenile offenses, but use only those offenses defined in the ordinary criminal law. Also, not all countries like the United States have agencies, which collect national crime data. However, many of the larger nations have government agencies, which publish criminal statistics, which can be used in comparative research.

National Statistics Programs

Here we list a few of those countries, which offer national statistical information. There is usually a charge for obtaining these data. Once researchers have selected countries for their studies, they may begin the task of finding out about the countries (e.g., their legal system, crime reporting service, if any, etc.). Global crime statistics and comparisons can be obtained from various international crime surveys (e.g., United Nations First, Second, and Third Surveys; *International Crime Statistics*, INTERPOL (see Chapter 22). However, these sources give only basic crime data (e.g., rates for major crimes). They provide very little detail. One must therefore obtain, if available, specific crime statistics from the country under scrutiny. Listed are a few countries, which have participated in national crime statistics programs .

Canada

Canadian Crime Statistics
Canadian Center for Justice Statistics
Statistics Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K10 0T6

Japan

Summary White Paper on Crime
Research and Training Institute
1-1-1- Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100, Japan

Australia

Year Book Australia. Australia Bureau of Statistics, Canberra

Source Book of Australian Criminal and Social Statistics, 1804-1988
Australian Institute of Criminology
Colbee Court, Phillip, ACT 2606, Australia

England and Wales

Criminal Statistics: England and Wales
Home Office, Statistical Department
Room 1834, Lunar House
40 Ellesley Rd
Croydon, CRO 9YD

(also available through UNIPUB
4611-F Assembly Drive
Lanham, MD 20706)

Soviet Union

Crime Statistics and Other Indicators
Goskomstat (Government Statistics)
USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Information Center
Moscow

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Criminologists engage in both pure research and applied research. In each type of research, the scientific research method is employed for the collection and analysis of data. While the scientific method or the evaluation process model does not guarantee objectivity, the use of such techniques lessens the probability that bias will enter into the research. Scientific analysis of crime phenomena is far superior to intuition or common sense speculation, which can lead to inaccurate observations, over-generalizations, stereotypical information, theoretical or political bias and premature closure of inquiry.

Criminologists construct theories to offer explanations of crime phenomena. Theories are interconnected sets of propositions from which empirical uniformities can be derived. Some theories of crime are constructed using deductive logic in which specific conclusions are drawn from general principles or laws. On the other hand, inductive logic or the seeking of general

principles or laws from particular findings can be employed in theory construction. Variables used in criminological theories must be operationalized (empirically defined) so that the criminologist can accurately measure the proposed relationships between variables.

Theories seek to establish causal relationships between variables. However, in reality, causality is difficult to prove. Three criteria necessary to establish causality are time order, co-variation and the elimination of other factors, which might better, explain the original relationship. More often than not, the criminologist finds a strong or weak correlation or association between variables.

The scientific method is a technique providing a logical way of testing criminological theories or solving problems. The first step in the process is to clearly articulate the nature of the problem under consideration. Specific variables, their operationalization, and presumed causal paths, are clearly indicated. In the next step, other research is examined using a variety of resources including journal articles, books, government documents and official reports. The third stage is the formation of an hypothesis; i.e., an anticipated outcome of the original relationship. In the data collection stage, information can be obtained by a variety of techniques including survey designs, observation, case histories, experiments, and content analysis. Data analysis can range from very sophisticated to relatively simple depending on the nature of the problem, level of data collected, and consumer audience. The last step in the scientific method entails a brief summary of the research and findings.

Evaluation research begins with a given set of goals, and the purpose of the study is to evaluate whether the goals of a program or policy are being met and whether changes are necessary. The technique is fact finding because it determines if a program is achieving results or not. Evaluation research is employed to study crime or the criminal justice system including law enforcement, correctional programs, and court reforms.

Criminologists conducting research in which data is collected from the criminal, the victim, the criminal justice system, criminal justice practitioners and/or the public must be concerned with ethical issues. Codes of ethics can serve as a guide for the criminologist on a

number of sensitive issues including data collection, protection of anonymity of respondents, and dissemination of results.

By its very nature criminological research may have political implications. The federal government has funded much criminological research. Federally sponsored research has examined such areas as determinants of criminal behavior, violent crime, community crime prevention, career criminals, law enforcement practices, sentencing, rehabilitation and corrections. There is always a danger that only certain types of research, e.g., crime control, will receive funding. Politicians often use criminological research in questionable ways. Thus, there is debate among criminologists over how their research findings should be utilized.

There are many resources for studying crime and the criminal justice system. In addition to indexes and abstracts, computer searches offer comprehensive lists of the most current references including professional journals, books, monographs, and government reports. Federal criminal justice agencies and private research centers also provide a wealth of data for the criminologist. Similarly, a number of international data sources are available.

In addition to offering information on available resources and reviewing basic concepts and techniques of research, this chapter serves to develop critical consumption skills. The glut of crime-related research (of varying quality) necessitates the development of these critical skills. We all consume large quantities of information. Unless we are able to determine what information is relevant and which is useless, we are subject to the gross manipulation of vested interests and the myth producing forces in our society.

The knowledge and critical skills along with a healthy cynicism and critical attitude should be taken and applied as the following chapters are read (i.e., chapters 8,9,10 and 11). These chapters review the bodies of theories and research on crime, criminals and criminal justice.