

Curiously, in the foreword, the authors are complimented for their extensive referencing.

One impressive feature in the work of Drs. Allen and Simonsen is their careful and extensive footnoting and their up-to-date and comprehensive annotated bibliographies, one for each section of the book (p.xvi).

Yet, in the preface the authors themselves explain that they have tried to create a new style of text "... one which abandons extensive footnotes" (p.xvii). More importantly, while the first quotation is correct in that there is a brief selected bibliography (recommended readings) at the end of each of the seven major sections, it is questionable as to how readily available certain of the documents listed would be to the average undergraduate student for whom this text is designed [e.g., Proceedings, National Conference of Superintendents of Institutions for Delinquent Females (Collegeville, Minn., 1971); The Disturbed and Intractable Ward: A Staff Analysis and Report (California Youth Authority, 1969)].

On balance, this would appear to be an adequate introductory text for undergraduate classes — provided the instructor desiring continuity of theme is willing to reorganize certain material for his assignments by picking and choosing from among the various subsections.

Peter Hoffman
 Director of Research
 U.S. Board of Parole
 U.S. Department of Justice
 Washington, D.C. 20537

Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings by Rudolf H. Moos. John Wiley and Sons (605 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10016), 1975, 377 pp., hardcover — \$15.95.

Despite growing pressure for the evaluation of correctional programs, there is little agreement on what constitutes effectiveness or how to measure it. Program administrators, researchers, and policy makers are confronted with a variety of assessment strategies and little consensus about them or their applicability to different settings. Many of these techniques require investments in time and resources that are not feasible for most agencies. As an extension of previous work on psychiatric treatment facilities at the Social Ecology Laboratory at Stanford University, this book is an important attempt to characterize correctional programs by their "social climate."

Social climate, though not specifically defined in the book except as the "personality of the environment" refers to the pressures and demands of the setting placed on the participants. The characterization of actual social climate is subjective, based on the perceptions of both residents and staff. The different dimensions of social climate are reflected in subscales, and different scales were constructed for military companies, families, and correctional programs. The major focus of this book is on correctional institutions, however. Items contained in the scales, as well as guidelines for their use — such as sampling and details of test administration, are given. A parallel set of items to tap participants' desired social climate can be used to note discrepancies between real and ideal conditions. Short forms of both scales can be used for relatively rapid evaluations.

Numerous applications of these scales are presented and certain patterns begin to emerge. Correctional programs are very diversified though in general participants in juvenile programs are more positive than in adult programs. The variation in perceptions even within the same program is often sizable so that the unit within the facility is used as the unit of analysis.

Across different kinds of programs, staff consistently felt that they were more helpful and benign than did residents. The reputations of facilities often differed considerably from the reports of staff and residents. Perhaps one of the most interesting findings was that there seemed to little relationship between the perceptions of social climate and the post-program behavior of residents, though within-program misconduct was related to environmental perceptions.

A systematic, easily administered scale, such as the CIES (Correctional Institutions Environment Scale) can be very useful for program evaluation. For reasons we will discuss later, the approach is more appropriate for designs involving a particular program than for comparisons across programs. Comparisons of particular programs over time, the impact of treatment interventions on residents, comparison of different units within a program, discovery of discrepancies between actual and ideal program conditions, predictions of absconding in a program, are all facilitated by the CIES scale. Yet it is important to consider some serious conceptual and methodological problems in the definition and measurement of social climate.

Perhaps the most basic dilemma concerns the extent to which aggregate perceptions of participants constitute a valid measure of the environment. Programs are evaluated and compared to the average subscale scores of respondents but information is not given about the degree of consensus in these responses within programs. Though overall standard deviations are given in a manual available from the author, they are not shown in the book. Further, in at least one of the chapters we are told that an individual's perception of the program may be highly idiosyncratic and that different individuals often see the same program differently. The author uses the incongruent perceptions of residents and staff as an explanatory variable in several instances, but does not deal with the critical question of how one can compare programs when there is lack of agreement in the perceptions of each of them.

Individual-level variables, such as personality, age, length of stay, and number of times sentenced have very low associations with perceptions of social climate, leading the author to conclude that incongruent perceptions may be related to actual experiential differences rather than to background characteristics. However, no efforts were made to explore this possibility of different subenvironments. The association with background characteristics may well have been dismissed prematurely since many of them were not studied (e.g., sex, race, offense history) and the previous environmental experiences leading to variable relative deprivation as an explanation was not even considered.

Little attention was given to comparing actual policies and procedures of programs with the subjective perceptions of participants. Though such perceptions and program size, staff/resident ratios, and a measure of adult status policies were only weakly correlated, there are other relevant dimensions to be compared. Such features of institutional environments as rules enforced, typical rewards and punishments, frequency of treatment sessions, surveillance policies, and isolation may be important correlates of perceived social climate. If there are no such correlations, one would question the extent to which social climate is an organizational indicator. If there are such correlations, it becomes easier to modify and change particular practices in order to produce more positive outcomes.

Nine dimensions or subscales of social climate are identified as crucial, distinguishable features of correctional programs (involvement, support, autonomy, expressiveness, personal problem orientation, practical orientation, program clarity, order and organization, and social control). I had considerable difficulty in disentangling several of these dimensions and this was not made easier by examining the individual items. Since we are not given correlations between all the items or with correlations between the subscale scores, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the dimensions are really separate. Moreover, many important features of

correctional programs, such as isolation and stigmatization, are not tapped by the CIES. Despite these reservations, the attempt at differentiating various facets of programs should not be underestimated in an area where they have been traditionally dichotomized as treatment- or control-oriented on a single continuum.

Several chapters contain generalizations from the sample to the entire population of juvenile and adult programs. The reader should be aware that the programs studied were largely in California, were not randomly sampled, and were almost predominantly male.

Several analyses related the social climate scales to the misconduct of program residents. Yet the author operationalized misconduct by official staff reports, thus only tapping misconduct known and catalogued by staff. It is becoming increasingly evident that in these settings, there are often wide discrepancies between official and self-reported delinquency. In interpreting these results, the reader should carefully consider the ways in which misconduct was measured.

The construction of a typology of correctional and community-based settings is of extreme importance for purposes of program comparison and evaluation. Moos attempts, through cluster analysis, to develop six distinct types of programs based on the social climate profiles of residents. This attempt is tentative at best and largely fails because the clusters are extremely difficult to conceive of and to interpret. The difficulty becomes clear as the reader notices that these types are never used in any of the applications in the book. Perhaps with future attempts to relate objective and structural characteristics of programs to these different profiles, an empirically derived but conceptually clear typology will emerge.

Despite the flaws and the unresolved issues, this is a thoughtful and fascinating book, which is relevant to a variety of audiences. It provides an important approach to describing programs and, by a well-written clarification of previous work in the field, places it in a context where its relative merits can be considered. The scales are not only useful as components of a research effort using a variety of other indicators but are also particularly helpful for small-scale, rapid assessments. The author carefully documents the strong impact of human service organizations on human beings in involuntary settings. By providing ways of changing these environments through ongoing consultation and feedback, this approach can result in making such settings more responsive and humane.

Elaine Selo
Research Associate
Institute of Labor and
Industrial Relations
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

Delinquent Behavior, Second Edition by Don Gibbons. Prentice-Hall, Inc. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632), 1976, 298 pp., hardcover — \$10.95

This book is an excellent and concise text for advanced undergraduates, provided that its omissions are covered with supplementary readings. Gibbons has addressed three traditional and mistaken views of delinquency: (1) that juvenile delinquents are distinctly different from non-delinquents; (2) that interventive treatment is necessary for and successful in correcting juvenile misconduct; and (3) that since this treatment is benevolent, the legal rights of juveniles need not be safeguarded.