

By the same token, a major weakness of the book also derives from the student-essay approach; one cannot achieve a comprehensive view of urban gangs from a university library in Colorado. Most of the essays suffer from the writers' seeming lack of street contact with gangs. Statements made about gang life and structure are made without the qualifications which come from direct observation. Principles derived from studies of other forms of groups are applied to juvenile gangs without firsthand experience with the differences from most other groups that give gangs their particular stamps. Gangs are different, but one gets insufficient sense of this in most of these essays.

A second weakness results from the brevity of most of the essays. The average essay, including extended notes and references, is seventeen pages long, not enough to do justice to both the extensive literature and its pertinence to the gang scene. The result is occasional superficiality, frequent overgeneralizations, and confusion of suggestion or hypothesis for fact.

Third, and related both to absence of street contact and to the brevity of the essays, is the understandable but very unfortunate failure to distinguish in many instances between findings on adolescents, delinquents, and gang members. Although most gang members are delinquents and almost all are adolescents, it does not follow that research findings on adolescents are unqualifiedly applicable to delinquent behavior, nor that findings about delinquents are unqualifiedly applicable to gang members. We can distinguish the existence of gangs, and we study them separately, because they are to some extent unique. This must be accounted for when applying the more general literature to the more specific referent.

The reverse, of course, is also true: we must guard carefully against generalizing from gang findings to delinquency in general. The sociological literature far too often falls down on this point. The current volume also contributes to this failure by not keeping the necessary distinctions in mind.

Given these qualifications, of what value is this volume, for what should it be used? Clearly, it will not appeal to nor be read by most practitioners. For students and academics, however, its value is considerable. Because of the extensive bibliographic work (excepting the name index which has many omissions) and because of the application of psychological studies to what has been primarily the sociologist's bailiwick, it is more than an antidote—it broadens the current perspectives. As a test or a supplement to a delinquency course, it has too many errors or omissions to stand alone. But in conjunction with another volume—I would select among Short and Strodbeck, Geis, or Klein as the most useful reviews—I would recommend it strongly to someone wanting a concise overview of current fact and pertinent speculation. The volume is a useful addition.

Malcolm W. Klein  
*University of Southern California*

## Note

1. James F. Short and Fred L. Strodbeck, *Group Process and Gang Delinquency* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965); Gilbert Geis, *Juvenile Gangs* (Washington D.C.: President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, 1965); Malcolm W. Klein, *Street Gangs and Street Workers* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971).

**Evaluation and Accountability in Human Service Programs.** Edited by William C. Sze and June G. Hopps. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1974. Pp. viii+216. \$10.00.

As the 1960s drew to a close a climate of reappraisal characterized the disciplines involved in human service planning and evaluation. *Evaluation and Accountability in Human Service Programs* is an expression of this reappraisal, and it provides an excellent glimpse into the current diversity of expert opinion regarding the reasons for the difficulties encountered by program evaluators as well as suggestions for future directions. The book is the product of a symposium sponsored by the Ohio State University School of Social Work and contains the symposium's papers and commentaries organized into four major sections. Its nineteen contributors include seasoned and distinguished scholars. While much of the material duplicates analysis and recommendations already available in the evaluation literature and often authored by these same contributors, a number of the papers represent new contributions.

Part 1 examines macroscopic problems (social, political, and organizational events) affecting the conduct of evaluation and accountability studies. Roland Warren's paper in which he analyzes the conditions necessary for the successful conduct of evaluative research with suggestions for expanded responsibility in program planning and design is insightful and relevant. His argument that too often evaluators have used "atomized fragmented one-variable-at-a-time" (p. 16) approaches to assess poorly conceptualized "fragmented intervention strategies" (p. 16) doomed to failure is a serious criticism of both program planning and research approaches.

Warren's observation that evaluators too often function simply as technicians, denying their roles as social scientists, rings all too true. Perhaps of greatest import is Warren's suggestion that evaluators begin to function as scientists and through informed rational analysis assess the scientific and logical validity of programs to be evaluated before embarking on formalized research assessments.

James Coke and John Hansen provide an excellent perspective on the political context of evaluation, taking the position that "evaluation and politics are inextricably intertwined . . ." and that "the technology of evaluation . . . has no meaning unless it is embedded in a political decision-making process" (p. 45). Coke and Hansen assert that descriptive, nonexperimental methodologies concerned with exploring rather than testing would better fit directional planning, the type of planning most relevant given the unfolding form of most experimental intervention. They also argue against the utility of experimental design to test programs characterized by multiple, vaguely stated, often conflicting goals resulting from their political processing. I wonder whether even nonexperimental research evaluation is indicated with such programs. Saad Nagi's discussion of the organizational context of evaluation is an excellent analysis of the intake norms used by service organizations; however, the broader organizational issues influencing evaluation and accountability studies are not addressed.

Part 2 examines the technological problems of evaluation and accountability research. Louis Higgs's discussion of experimental design contains a number of interesting observations; however, I agree with Clyde Franklin's commentary that "while Higgs' paper has been polemical and provocative, I remain unconvinced that perspectives on 'evaluation research' have been enhanced" (p. 112).

Carol Weiss's paper provides a succinct, clear, and useful contribution describing evaluation research as an element in decision making and specifying three alternative models suitable for addressing different levels of decisions.

Part 3 contains three program-evaluation case studies. The study described by Robert Washington and John Turner represents a unique contribution

and should be especially useful to students desiring an illustration of the application of a formative, behavioral, systems-oriented evaluation model.

Leonard Schneiderman presents an integrative concluding overview in which he analyzes the various authors' contributions from the perspective of their contrasting views of human service systems, the role of evaluators in those systems, and the evaluation methods available. The volume concludes with a useful bibliography and discussion on the developmental perspective of program evaluation authored by Sze and Hopps.

*Evaluation and Accountability in Human Service Programs* is a valuable contribution to the serious students' resource library. The insights presented and the varying perspectives of the contributors when added to those already available in the rapidly growing evaluation research literature should hasten development of the competence necessary for the design of more effective human service programs.

E. J. Mullen

*Fordham University and Case Western Reserve University*

**Community Treatment and Social Control.** By Paul Lerman. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975. Pp. xv+254. \$12.50.

The title is deceptive, but otherwise this book is an honest and workmanlike report of what might be called one man's research into research by others. From the title it might be supposed that this is a study—with a broad and general perspective—of community treatment programs wherever they may be. Not so. It turns its scrutiny to just two programs, both in the same state. It is nevertheless a useful scrutiny, for it looks at two programs that are widely known and considered very important, if not highly successful.

The Community Treatment Project (CTP) in California has been the subject of remarkably thorough and prolonged research. Dr. Lerman finds that research to be misleading and defective. The other project, California's probation subsidy program, is even more famous and has been publicized through research reports that encourage great hope for this kind of approach. Lerman finds the research to be misleading and defective.

Whether Lerman's opinions are the final authority or not the book is to be appreciated, for these two California programs have been watched so eagerly and enjoy so much likelihood of imitation that we do need to know all we can about their true value. Lerman, with a contract from National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), studied both programs through exhaustive review and analysis of the voluminous statistical and research reports produced by the primary researchers. He had access to both published reports and many other documents that filled agency archives. What emerges then is not truly new material, but new and significant interpretations or analyses.

He finds, for instance, that in the CTP the original goals included the reduction of correctional costs per case and the reduction of institutional time in favor of intensive treatment in the community. However, Lerman finds that because short-term detention was used as a control measure it was in fact resorted to so much that the subjects spent more time in detention than in treatment contacts with their workers in the community. His view is that, contrary to the announced intent of the program, incarceration became a major control method. He also finds that the CTP workers were reluctant to close cases, and when actual case time increased to two or more years instead of the originally intended span of less than a year the result was that the program became more costly than conventional programs. Altogether he