

AUTONOMY FOR INMATES

Counterculture or Cooptation?

D. WAYNE OSGOOD
ENID GRUBER
MARK A. ARCHER
THEODORE M. NEWCOMB

University of Michigan

An inmate counterculture presents a barrier to the institutional goal of long-term reform. If the counterculture is a reaction to deprivations caused by incarceration, increasing autonomy would help co-opt the counterculture to cooperation with the institutional program. Data concerning autonomy for inmates and their adaptation to incarceration were collected from over 400 residents and 160 staff members at institutions for juvenile offenders. The research design avoided confounding autonomy with inmate characteristics and institutional setting, and included a broad range of measures of inmates' adaptation. Inmate reports of greater autonomy were associated with adaptations that were considerably more favorable to institutional goals. There was little relationship between staff reports of autonomy and either inmate reports of autonomy or inmate adaptation. This can be explained by a lack of variance in staff perceptions of groups, meaning that staff members failed to discriminate differences that were substantial in the eyes of inmates.

It has long been regarded as fact that inmates of correctional institutions tend to develop a counterculture characterized by opposition to institutional rules and goals, norms against informing authorities about rule violations, and the use of physi-

Authors' Note: *An earlier version of this article was presented at the convention of the American Psychological Association, August 1982, Washington, DC. The research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, grant RO1 MH34065, and the Michigan Office of Criminal Justice, grant 31409-1J80. We thank Martin Gold, Janis Jacobs, and anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.*

CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND BEHAVIOR, Vol. 12 No. 1, March 1985 71-89
© 1985 American Association of Correctional Psychologists

cal coercion as a basis of influence among inmates (Clemmer, 1958; Sykes, 1958). Though the major societal goal of incarceration is the long-term reduction of illegal behavior, there is little chance of reaching that goal as long as inmates are enmeshed in the counterculture. Thus the first problem facing a correctional program is finding means of co-opting inmates to support for institutional goals. The subject of the present study is whether increasing autonomy for inmates would help to accomplish that end.

Autonomy refers to independence and self-determination, so a lack of autonomy is a fundamental fact of incarceration. Even within that constraint, however, there is room for considerable variation. Autonomy for inmates would conceivably extend to their having a very active voice in program operation as well as in their personal affairs. Conversely, autonomy is limited by the strictness and pervasiveness of institutional staff's attempts to control inmates' lives. Our concern is the relationship of such variation in autonomy with inmates' adaptations to incarceration—particularly whether those adaptations favor countercultural values or institutional goals.

Sykes's (1958) theoretical analysis of the counterculture provides a strong argument for expecting autonomy to be related to adaptation. He portrayed the counterculture as a shared response to the deprivations of institutional life, and he named the lack of autonomy as one of the specific deprivations provoking that reaction. This perspective leads us to expect that greater autonomy would reduce motivation for supporting the counterculture and improve the chances of co-opting inmates to accepting institutional goals as their own.

Clemmer (1958) offered the contrasting interpretation that the counterculture is characteristic of the individuals who become inmates, rather than being characteristic of the conditions of incarceration. From this point of view, the counterculture is a consequence of incarcerating individuals who have a history of resistance to authority. The implication of this perspective would be that the extent of autonomy for inmates would have no bearing on their support for the counterculture versus institutional goals.

Research concerning the relation between autonomy and adaptation to incarceration can be found in studies by Moos (1975) and McEwen (1978). In relation to present purposes, the scope of these studies is limited and their research designs have serious weaknesses. Nevertheless, the findings are quite suggestive. We will first discuss the findings, after which we will review their limitations in relation to the design of the present study.

Moos's (1975) studies of the social environments of correctional institutions centered on the construction and application of the Correctional Institutions Environment Scale (CIES), which includes subscales measuring inmate autonomy and staff control. Moos found that those units in which inmates felt most autonomous and experienced the least staff control were also those in which inmates liked the staff and rated the program as helpful. Autonomy and decreased staff control also tended to be associated with inmates' satisfaction with an institution, but the relationship was not statistically significant.

McEwen's (1978) study of the closing of the Massachusetts training schools yielded very interesting findings concerning autonomy. His work focused on the development of youth subcultures both in the training schools and in the broad range of programs that arose to replace them. One of the program characteristics of special interest to McEwen (1978: 32) was participation, which he defined as: "The extent of opportunities for inmates to share with staff the responsibility of running or making decisions about the organization." Thus defined, participation definitely falls within our conception of autonomy.

In an analysis of 23 living units, McEwen found that there was much more inmate participation of this sort in group treatment programs than in large institutional programs or in programs where youths had frequent contact with the outside community. The programs with high levels of participation were further characterized by greater equality both among staff members and between staff and inmates. The level of participation in a unit was also highly related to the nature of the youth subculture. In units with greater participation, inmates felt close to staff members, believed that it was good to share their feelings with others and try

to solve personal problems, and were in favor of informing staff members about rule violations.

In these two studies, findings relating inmate autonomy to adaptation uniformly supported the deprivation perspective. Greater autonomy was associated with attitudes more favorable to institutional goals and less favorable to the counterculture. Nevertheless, these results must be regarded as suggestive rather than definitive because they are based on rather limited measures of adaptation to incarceration and because their research designs confound autonomy with prior differences among inmates. The present study rectifies both of these problems and also addresses differences between staff and inmate perspectives on autonomy.

THE PRESENT STUDY

Adaptation to incarceration. In the present study we go beyond those dimensions of adaptation covered by Moos (1975) and McEwen (1978), attempting to more systematically cover issues relevant to support for the counterculture versus support for institutional goals. We address adaptation at three levels. The first is inmates' attitudes about the institutional setting. Correctional programs generally aim to provide a setting where inmates need not fear for their own safety and attempt to foster in inmates positive attitudes about each other, the staff, and program activities. These aims are incompatible with a strong inmate counterculture. A second aspect of adaptation with which we are concerned is acceptance of institutional goals—particularly the goal of rehabilitation. One of the foremost difficulties faced by an institutional program is overcoming inmates' resistance to the institutional definition of them as people who need to change their behavior. Our final level of analysis of inmate adaptation concerns behavior and values, issues more closely related to long-term aims.

Inmate autonomy. The present study is also designed to explore different perspectives on autonomy by obtaining reports from staff members as well as from the inmates themselves.

Comparisons of the two points of view can show whether autonomy is a subject of consensual validity or, instead, a matter of independent subjective realities. Staff members may or may not agree with inmates' assessment of their autonomy, and it is not clear that either will be more attuned to the "objective" conditions of incarceration. If personal deprivation links autonomy to adaptation, then staff members' perceptions would be related to adaptation only to the degree that both are related to inmates' perceptions. Thus, we expect inmates' adaptations to be more closely associated with their own views than with those of the staff. Staff perceptions of autonomy are of special importance for relating the findings to policy, because it is through staff members that program designs must be implemented.

Research design. There are weaknesses in the research designs used by Moos (1975) and McEwen (1978) that cast doubt on the validity of their findings. In both studies the living unit served as the unit of analysis, but there were no steps taken to see that youths in different units were comparable before placement. It is therefore possible that the apparent effects of autonomy are due to the assignment of more tractable youths to units that allow greater autonomy—a likely practice in juvenile corrections. Furthermore, both studies include units from very different settings, such as detention centers, group homes, camps, and large institutions.¹ Thus, their findings may actually result from the association of autonomy with other features of the setting, such as security and contact with the community.

The present study avoids these problems by limiting the sample to units with comparable populations in a single type of institutional setting. There is some sacrifice in this approach. The generality of the findings is confined to this institutional setting, and the design precludes considering which institutional factors engender autonomy. Nevertheless, this limitation seems justified by the additional control over extraneous variables.

There is one important limitation the present study shares with previous efforts: It has a cross-sectional design. Such a design does not yield information about the direction of influence between variables. Though we have spoken of autonomy as

influencing adaptation, we cannot rule out the possibility that the degree of autonomy allowed depended on adaptation instead. Staff members might grant autonomy only when they approve of inmates' adaptations. In fact, it seems quite plausible for there to be circular causality between the two, in which increased autonomy leads to a more favorable adaptation—which leads the staff to allow greater autonomy, and so forth. Nevertheless, a cross-sectional design is an important first step. The existence of a substantial contemporaneous relationship would justify investment in the more elaborate research designs needed to establish causal direction.

METHODS

SAMPLE

The study was conducted at four correctional institutions for adolescents in a large Midwestern state. Two of the institutions are state-sponsored and two are run under private auspices. Each institution is subdivided into "centers" for administrative purposes, and within each center youths reside in groups of seven to thirteen members. The group is the organizational unit for virtually all phases of institutional life, including school, meals, recreation, and treatment. Each institution uses a group treatment program called Positive Peer Culture (Vorrath and Brendtro, 1974) or some variation of it.

The populations of these institutions are composed of males between the ages of 13 and 18, almost all committed to institutional residence through adjudication by the juvenile justice system. The average length of stay is just under one year, and release is dependent on satisfactory progress during program commitment. All institutional centers included in the study are open rather than secure, meaning that there are no perimeter fences or walls, and youth are not ordinarily under lock and key.

Because we wished to limit our analysis to living units with comparable populations, it was important to establish that there

were no systematic, preexisting differences among groups. Given that the populations of the various centers differ somewhat in geographic origin and the seriousness of offense histories, differences in adaptation may be due to selection rather than treatment. Therefore, our analysis of the relation between autonomy and adaptation is designed to reflect only differences among groups *within* institutional centers by statistically eliminating differences *between* centers.

This research design requires that the sample be limited to those centers within which assignment to groups is essentially random. In pilot research done to ascertain the comparability of groups within each center, members of the research team interviewed program administrators about assignment practices and examined demographic characteristics of the institutions' populations over a six-month period. On the basis of this information, four centers were excluded from the study. There were no differences among groups within each of the remaining seven centers on a variety of demographic variables or on offense history. Assignment to group was, for all purposes, random—usually dependent only on the first available bed. The present study is based on the 45 groups from these seven centers, with 28 groups in three centers at the public institutions and 17 groups in four centers at the private institutions.

DATA COLLECTION

Data about the 45 groups of incarcerated youths were collected through questionnaires completed by youths and staff members. The youth questionnaire was administered to each group in a single one-hour session by two members of the research team. To assist youths with reading problems, one member of the research staff read the questionnaire out loud while another circulated about the room to offer assistance. This procedure yielded 424 completed questionnaires for a response rate of 91%. Respondents were guaranteed anonymity.

Members of the staff teams responsible for these groups received questionnaires within a week of data collection for their

group. Though the questionnaire covered a variety of topics, only data concerning autonomy will be discussed here. The instrument was distributed to staff members at weekly team meetings and returned to the research team by mail. Participation was voluntary and confidential. Staff members completed 167 questionnaires for a response rate of 81%. Two staff teams were eliminated from the analysis because they returned fewer than three completed questionnaires.

MEASURES

Autonomy. The youth and staff questionnaires included identical measures of perceived autonomy for inmates. Development of the measure of autonomy began with the autonomy and staff control subscales of Moos's (1975) CIES, each composed of nine items. Pilot data from ten groups and their staff teams revealed that substantial modifications were necessary for the present study. These results were consistent with those of Wright and Boudouris (1982), who found that there was little empirical support for the subscale structure Moos hypothesized for the CIES. Thus the present measure is only loosely related to the original CIES subscales. It used a four-choice response format (always, usually, sometimes, never). The eight items retained for the measure are those that (1) best represent the concept of autonomy, defined as meaningful self-determination for inmates versus pervasive and strict control by staff, (2) are clearly applicable to the practices of these institutions, (3) elicited adequate response variance, and (4) showed some modest level of empirical internal consistency. Some examples of the items are:

"The staff give students responsibility."

"Decisions about the group are made by the staff and not by the students."

"Staff order the students around."

As can be seen in Table 1, which presents descriptive statistics for the full samples on all measures,² the internal consistency

TABLE 1
Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities of Measures

Autonomy	No. of items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Reliability
Youth perception of autonomy	8	22.66	3.51	.53
Staff perception of autonomy	8	22.14	2.49	.55
Adaptation to Incarceration				
Interest in school	3	9.17	1.86	.57
Helping in group	3	8.05	2.05	.72
Friendships with youth	3	6.54	1.98	.61
Friendships with staff	3	8.24	2.24	.70
Fear for safety	3	5.14	1.71	.40
Desire for rehabilitation	4	12.77	2.77	.69
Satisfaction with institution	4	12.12	2.75	.69
Delinquent behavior	11	17.10	6.74	.84
Inmate counterculture	7	9.51	2.79	.73
Delinquent values	8	11.43	2.96	.77

NOTE: The measure of reliability is Cronbach's alpha, reflecting internal scale consistency.

reliability of the autonomy scale is only moderate (for youth, $\alpha = .53$, and for staff, $\alpha = .55$). This reflects our decision to retain items representing the full breadth of the concept of autonomy as we have defined it and to eliminate all items without clear face validity.

Adaptation. The study used measures of ten different aspects of the inmates' adaptation to the institution, all derived from the

youth questionnaire. A four-choice response format (e.g., always, usually, sometimes, never, or strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree) was used for all items unless otherwise noted. Many of the scales included items from the National Assessment of Juvenile Corrections (Vinter et al., 1976).

The first five measures concern inmates' attitudes toward the institutional setting. The measure of *interest in school* reflects a youth's involvement in and his satisfaction with the institution's school. High scores on *helpfulness of group* mean that youths regarded the living group as a source of assistance and social support, a particularly valued outcome in a group-oriented program such as Positive Peer Culture. In a similar vein, the *friendships with youth* scale reflects the extent and closeness of informal relationships among youths. *Friendships with staff* measures perceptions that relationships between staff and youths are cordial and close. It also serves as an inverse index of animosity toward the staff. The index of *fear for safety* assesses the degree to which inmates consider physical aggression a routine part of institutional life.

Two measures pertain to acceptance of institutional goals. High scores on the measure of *desire for rehabilitation* mean that a youth accepts the institutional prescription that he needs to change his behavior. The measure of *satisfaction with institution* assesses youths' attitudes toward the institutional experience. This variable is included among our measures of acceptance of institutional goals because the wording of items implies that respondents believe the institutional program is improving their lives.

The three measures of values and behavior are somewhat more complex. Our self-report measure of *delinquent behavior* has been used in a great deal of research (e.g., Gold and Reimer, 1975; Williams and Gold, 1972) and its criterion validity has been well established (see Gold, 1970). We used two versions of the measure. The first concerned the most recent two months of institutional life, and items were limited to activities likely to occur in an institutional setting. The second measure was used

only for statistical controls, as it concerned behavior during the last four months prior to incarceration.³

The measures of adaptation described above each pertain to inmates' support for countercultural norms versus program goals in some way. The single measure we have labeled as "subscription to the values of an *inmate counterculture*" focuses on the central issue of willingness to join other inmates in opposition to the staff. The measure is a modification of one developed by Schwartz (1973), and it is composed of questions that describe hypothetical situations and ask youths to choose between assisting other youths in opposition to the staff (scored as 3), supporting the staff and institutional rules (scored as 1), or remaining neutral (scored as 2). For example:

Some guys in your group are going to set up another guy so he'll get into trouble. They ask you to help them with their plan. What would you do: help them, not help them but keep quiet about it, or tell the staff?

For our measure of *delinquent values*, respondents were asked to consider a set of activities—some delinquent, some conforming, and some neutral. Youths rated how much they would admire a person doing these things. A high score on the scale reflects admiration for those engaging in delinquent activities and a lack of admiration for those engaging in conforming activities.⁴

As can be seen in Table 1, the internal consistency reliabilities of the measures of adaptation largely fall in the range of .60 to .80. Though not high, these figures are adequate because our purpose is to ascertain relationships among variables rather than make decisions about the treatment of individuals. Though the reliability of the measure of fear for safety is quite low (.40), the measure was retained because of the substantive importance of the topic. Note that many of the measures are comprised of only three or four items. We consider this appropriate as they pertain to narrowly focused concepts, the meaning of which can be covered satisfactorily by a few questions. Naturally, the various measures of adaptation tend to be correlated with one another.

Nevertheless, these correlations remain well below the reliabilities of the individual measures, supporting their discriminant validity.⁵

RESULTS

The data for our analysis consist of reports from both youths and staff about autonomy and from youths about their adaptation to the institution. We present analyses of the relation between autonomy and adaptation, and these are followed by additional analyses that help clarify the major results.

Autonomy and adaptation. Our research design requires that we conduct our primary analysis of the relationship between autonomy and adaptation with the group (living unit and associated staff team) as the unit of analysis. We have established that the groups within each center are comparable, so a group level of analysis will not be confounded by differences prior to incarceration. This comparability does not hold for the relationships between individual perceptions of autonomy and individual adaptation. Group data were formed by taking the mean scores for a group and its staff team.

Our index of relationship between autonomy and adaptation is the partial correlation, controlling for a set of dummy variables representing institutional centers. This index eliminates the influence of differences in the centers' populations. Tables also include zero-order correlations for comparison.

Table 2 presents the major findings for both youth-reported and staff-reported autonomy. The analysis reveals that an adaptation favorable to institutional goals was highly associated with autonomy as reported by group members themselves, but not as reported by their staff teams. Youths' perceptions of autonomy were related to more favorable attitudes toward the institutional setting for all five measures, very strongly related to acceptance of institutional goals (for desire for rehabilitation $r = .69$), and negatively related to countercultural values. Though not

TABLE 2
Partial Correlations of Autonomy to Adaptation

Measure of Adaptation	Measure of Autonomy			
	Youth Reports		Staff Reports	
Interest in School	.39*	(.33)	.08	(.02)
Helping in Group	.54**	(.52)	.03	(.27)
Friendships with Youths	.56**	(.55)	-.13	(.27)
Friendships with Staff	.56**	(.57)	-.43**	(.17)
Fear for Safety	-.59**	(-.52)	-.07	(.00)
Desire for Rehabilitation	.69**	(.68)	-.13	(.10)
Satisfaction with Institution	.59**	(.60)	-.23	(.06)
Delinquent Behavior	-.01	(.08)	-.38*	(-.06)
Inmate Counterculture	-.39*	(-.29)	-.05	(-.08)
Delinquent Values	-.24	(.03)	-.23	(-.09)

NOTE: All analyses performed on means of group or staff team responses. Zero-order (uncorrected) correlations are in parentheses. All other entries are partial correlations controlling for center membership. Significance levels are based on F tests with 1 and 37 degrees of freedom for youth reports of autonomy and 1 and 35 degrees of freedom for staff reports of autonomy.

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

statistically significant, the relationship to delinquent values was also negative. There was no indication of any relationship of youth-reported autonomy to delinquent behavior. Overall, there was less association of youths' reports of autonomy with values and behavior than with issues more specific to the institutional setting.

There was no clear pattern of relations between staff estimates of general autonomy and youths' adaptations to the institution. Only two partial correlations were statistically significant, and their implications for adaptation are contradictory. Higher staff estimates of autonomy related negatively to both youth reports of friendships with the staff and youth reports of delinquent behaviors. Even these relationships may not be reliable because the partial correlations bear little resemblance to the zero-order correlations. The staff's estimates of general autonomy seem to be functioning quite differently from the youths'.

Comparing measures of autonomy. In line with the deprivation perspective on the inmate counterculture, we had expected institutional adaptation to be more highly correlated with youth reports of autonomy than with staff reports. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the difference is surprising and seems to indicate that youths and staff reported substantially different phenomena. Indeed, the partial correlation between the two was only .08, with the zero-order correlation slightly higher at .20. This lack of agreement was not a matter of a general bias of staff claiming autonomy where youths saw none. As can be seen in Table 1, the mean levels of autonomy reported by the two sources were quite similar, and the small difference that occurred was in the direction of youths feeling more autonomous than the staff perceived them to be.

The most plausible explanation of the weak relationship of staff reports to other variables is that staff members reported only negligible variation in autonomy among groups. Unless the staff reports reliably differentiate groups from one another, it is not possible for their reports to significantly correlate with other characteristics of the groups. For youth reports of autonomy, group level variance (after controlling for center membership) was 24% of individual level variance; for staff members, group level variance was only 9% of individual level youth variance. This difference was due to both lower variance for staff at the individual level (see Table 1) and a greater proportion of their

TABLE 3
Correlations of Individual Adaptation to Autonomy Reported by Other Group Members

Individual Adaptation	Autonomy Perceived by Other Group Members	
Interest in School	.03	(.02)
Helping in Group	.17**	(.18)
Friendships with Youths	.19**	(.21)
Friendships with Staff	.14**	(.22)
Fear for Safety	-.13*	(-.13)
Desire for Rehabilitation	.15**	(.17)
Satisfaction with Institution	.13*	(.17)
Delinquent Behavior	.00	(.09)
Inmate Counterculture	-.11*	(-.03)
Delinquent Values	-.10	(-.02)

NOTE: Zero-order (uncorrected) correlations are in parentheses. All other entries are partial correlations with age, previous delinquent behavior, length of stay, and center membership partialled out. All significance levels are based on F tests with 1 and 360 degrees of freedom.

* $p \leq .05$; ** $p \leq .01$.

overall group level variance being accounted for by center memberships (3% for youths and 48% for staff). Clearly, youths discriminated very different amounts of autonomy, and staff members did not.

Halo effect. A potential weakness of the findings is that the strongest relationships are between variables measured by the same instrument. Measures of youths' perceptions of autonomy and their adaptation to the institution both come from the youth questionnaire. It is possible that instead of indicating a meaningful relationship, correlations between them simply reflect each inmate's willingness to say nice things about the institution. This interpretation seems plausible because the staff reports of autonomy—which are an independent source—had much weaker relationships with adaptation.

In order to test for this possibility, each individual's adaptation scores were correlated to the mean level of autonomy reported by all *other* group members. This procedure yielded an index of autonomy that was uncontaminated by any method variance arising through relating different responses obtained from the same person at the same time. Furthermore, the measure of autonomy remained unconfounded with characteristics of the respondent.

Results of this analysis appear in Table 3. Because of the loss of aggregation in shifting to an individual level of analysis, these partial correlations were considerably smaller than those for the comparable analysis appearing in Table 2. Nevertheless, the pattern of relationships was not altered. All partial correlations significant in Table 2 remained significant, with the exception of interest in school. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that there is a genuine relationship in addition to any halo effect.

DISCUSSION

The findings are very much in accord with Sykes's (1958) contention that feeling deprived of autonomy provokes support for the inmate counterculture. Those groups in which inmates feel the most autonomous are also the one in which inmates' adaptations are most favorable to institutional goals. The results are strongest for attitudes about the institutional setting and acceptance of institutional goals. Together, these factors indicate

that when a group's members feel more autonomous they are also happier and more comfortable in the institutional setting. Autonomy was least related to behavior and delinquent values. Given that change in values and behavior are central long-term goals, this may indicate that the correlates of autonomy are confined to the institutional setting. Even if this is so, autonomy might still be an important component of any effective program by helping make inmates more open to treatment efforts. Further, because autonomy is associated with less fear for safety and with generally favorable attitudes about the program, it seems that autonomy is associated with a more orderly and humane setting, even without being related to rates of delinquent behavior.

The study also showed a lack of convergence between staff and inmate perspectives on autonomy. On the average, both parties see inmates as receiving similar levels of autonomy. Disagreement is largely a matter of staff reporting much more uniformity among groups. Given that there is evidence against interpreting the relationship between inmate reports of autonomy and adaptation as a halo effect, it appears that staff members are unaware of genuine variation in autonomy. It seems that program changes to increase autonomy should focus on both changing specific program practices and on heightening staff members' sensitivities to inmates' views about their treatment.

In considering the application of the present findings, it should be remembered that they are based on a single type of program. The institutions studied all use a treatment program that encourages a relatively high degree of autonomy. The results of increasing autonomy for inmates in a setting oriented to social control may be more complex. The relation of autonomy to adaptation is likely to depend, at least in part, on a treatment program and staff organization designed to support a high level of participation by inmates. In fact, McEwen (1978) found that participation is only common in programs that—like the ones we studied—use group treatment and have little status differentiation among staff members.

Our findings raise two important questions that should be addressed by future research. The first would be the direction of

influence between autonomy and adaptation. A longitudinal analysis is needed to determine if autonomy has a causal impact. Another pertinent issue is the long-term effect of inmate autonomy after return to the community. It is here that a program innovation must prove its worth to the community.

To summarize, our findings support the contention that autonomy for inmates decreases support for countercultural values and increases acceptance of the treatment program. The present study strengthens conclusions from earlier research by using a research design that does not confound autonomy with inmate characteristics and the type of institutional setting. Furthermore, the present study demonstrates the relevance of autonomy to a broader range of measures of adaptation to incarceration than previously has been investigated.

NOTES

1. Moos (1975) actually studied three samples, one of which was limited to a single setting. Nevertheless, he reports only findings averaged across the three samples.

2. Descriptive statistics presented in Table 1 are calculated with the individual as the unit of analysis, even though most of the analyses are at the group or staff team level. This is because we consider it necessary for the measures to be adequate at the individual level before they can be useful at the group level.

3. For delinquent behavior during incarceration, the response choices were scored as follows: 1 = never, 2 = once, 3 = twice, 4 = three or more times. Response choices for delinquent behavior prior to incarceration were: 1 = never, 2 = once, 3 = twice, 4 = three or four times, 5 = six or more times.

4. Response choices for these items were: "I would admire him a lot," "I would admire him a little," and "I would not admire him at all."

5. A sole exception is the correlation between fear for safety and helping in group ($r = .41$) which is slightly larger than the reliability of the fear for safety scale. Even so, the correlation corrected for attenuation is well below unity ($r(\text{disatt}) = .76$).

REFERENCES

- CLEMMER, D. (1958) *The Prison Community*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
 GOLD, M. (1970) *Delinquent Behavior in an American City*. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

- GOLD, M., and D. J. REIMER (1975) "Changing patterns of delinquent behavior among Americans 13 to 16 years old: 1967-1972." *Crime and Delinquency Literature* 7: 483-517.
- McEWEN, C. A. (1978) *Designing Correctional Organizations for Youths: Dilemmas of Subculture Development*. Cambridge: MA: Ballinger.
- MOOS, R. H. (1975) *Evaluating Correctional and Community Settings*. New York: John Wiley.
- SCHWARTZ, B. (1973) "Peer versus authority effects in a correctional community." *Criminology* 11: 233-257.
- STREET, D., R. VINTER, and C. PERROW (1966) *Organization for Treatment: A Comparative Study of Institutions for Delinquents*. New York: Macmillan.
- SYKES, G. (1958) *Society of Captives*. Princeton: NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- VINTER, R. D., T. M. NEWCOMB, and R. KISH [Eds.] (1976) *Time Out: A National Study of Juvenile Corrections Programs*. Ann Arbor Univ. of Michigan School of Social Work.
- VORRATH, H. and T. K. BRENDTRO (1974) *Positive Peer Culture*. Chicago: Aldine.
- WILLIAMS, J. R. and M. GOLD (1972) "From delinquent behavior to official delinquency." *Social Problems* 20: 209-229.
- WRIGHT, K. N. and J. BOUDORIS (1982) "An assessment of the Moos Correctional Institutions Environment Scale." *J. of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 19: 255-276.

D. Wayne Osgood is Assistant Research Scientist at the Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. His current research interests are peer influence in juvenile correctional institutions, reference-group influence on the cessation of serious delinquency, and longitudinal relationships among alternative forms of deviance.

Enid Gruber is Assistant Statistician in the Division of Program Evaluation, Department of Psychiatry at the University of California, San Francisco. Her current research interests are juvenile correctional institutions, the effects of organizational environments, adolescent sexuality, and delivery of mental health services to the severely mentally disabled.

Mark A. Archer is a Research Psychologist with Science Applications International Corporation in McLean, Virginia. His current research areas include military command group behavior, the human-computer interface, and cybernetic modeling.

Theodore M. Newcomb is Professor Emeritus of Psychology and Sociology and Faculty Associate of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan. His long-term interests have been interpersonal attraction and social influence. He is currently engaged in a follow-up study of the women from Bennington College whose political attitudes he initially studied in the 1930s.