

SOCIAL CONTROL IN A RESIDENTIAL TREATMENT CENTRE

SOCIAL CONTROL IN AN INSTITUTION
FOR
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

By
DONALD MALCOLM HILL, B.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts

McMaster University
(October) 1966

MASTER OF ARTS (1966)
(Sociology)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario.

TITLE: Social Control in an Institution for Emotionally
Disturbed Children

AUTHOR: Donald Malcolm Hill, B.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Dr. Frank E. Jones

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 208

SCOPE AND CONTENTS:

Consideration is given in this thesis to the relationship between social control in a treatment institution for emotionally disturbed children and the response to it by the inmate population. Two contrasting modes of social control are compared -- authoritarian and permissive. Inmate response is analyzed in terms of attitudes toward staff and institution, co-operation with staff, group solidarity, integration, informal leadership among the inmates, and overt behaviour. The research was carried out in Hamilton, Ontario at Mount Saint Joseph Institute, a residential treatment centre for emotionally disturbed children.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to acknowledge my great indebtedness to the administration, staff and boys of Mount Saint Joseph Institute for making available the facilities for this research and for their co-operation and patience under very trying circumstances.

I should like to extend a special word of appreciation to my thesis advisor Dr. Frank E. Jones for his many helpful suggestions, constructive criticisms and for the unfailing support which he provided during the study. To Dr. Franklin Henry I wish to extend my sincere thanks for his invaluable assistance with the questionnaires and their statistical analysis. I should also like to thank Mr. Ronald Silvers for his suggestions and advice.

To Sheila Watt goes my warmest appreciation for her patience and resourcefulness in administering the questionnaires to the boys at Mount Saint Joseph Institute.

Finally, to Lillian Giavedoni, my typist, my sincere appreciation for her loyalty, support and competence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY	1
Summary of Objectives	1
Research Design	7
Chapter Outline	13
CHAPTER 2: THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF TREATMENT INSTITUTIONS	15
The Mental Hospital	15
The Therapeutic Milieu	24
CHAPTER 3: THE THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTROL AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR THE TREATMENT INSTITUTION	41
Theory of Authority and Control	41
Correctional Institutions and their Goals	63
Organizational Effectiveness and Social Control	70
Social Control Within the Treatment Setting	75
Mount Saint Joseph Institute	80
Proposition and Hypotheses	90
CHAPTER 4: THE RESEARCH FINDINGS	97
The Preliminary Period	97
The Authoritarian Period	119
The Intervening Period	133
The Permissive Period	134
CHAPTER 5: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	146
Summary of the Findings	146
The Major Weaknesses of the Study	158
Contributions of this Study and Relevance for Further Research	162

<u>Table of Contents:</u>	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii
APPENDICES	165
BIBLIOGRAPHY	199

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Index of Consensus for Boys (Preliminary Period)	104
2 Index of Consensus for Staff (Preliminary Period)	105
3 Inmate Orientation -- Preliminary Period	112
4 Staff Performance Inventory	115
5 Index of Consensus for Boys (Authoritarian Period)	120
6 Comparison of Inmate Orientation -- Preliminary and Authoritarian Periods	125
7 Index of Consensus for Boys (Permissive Period)	137
8 Index of Consensus for Boys -- Three Time Periods Compared	138
9 Comparison of Inmate Orientation -- Authoritarian and Permissive Periods	141

LIST OF APPENDICES

<u>Appendix</u>	<u>Page</u>
A SOCIOMETRIC INDICES	165
Preliminary Period	165
Authoritarian Period	169
Permissive Period	173
B STAFF INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL PERIODS	177
Authoritarian Control	177
Permissive Control	183
C CHART OF OVERT BEHAVIOUR ANALYSIS	185
D QUESTIONNAIRES	186
Consensus	186
Inmate Orientation	189
Staff Role Performance Inventory	193
Sociometric Questionnaire	194
Behaviour Chart	196
E INTERPRETATION OF TABLES	197
Instructions for Reading Sociometric Charts	197
Methodology for Estimating Consensus	198

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Summary of Objectives

One of the most revolutionary changes of the last thirty years in the treatment of disturbed children has been the development of residential treatment centres. They have altered the whole tradition of institutional life for children.¹ Yet, compared to work done in the field of adult treatment centres for the emotionally disturbed or mentally ill, there has been a marked hiatus in sociological research devoted to the analysis of this type of institution. In this study, therefore, I intend to study the organization of one such institution. However, rather than attempt a comprehensive analysis of the total organization, this study is limited to an investigation of the relationship between the social structure² of the treatment centre and the

¹ For a comprehensive discussion of the growth and development of residential treatment centres for children and of the way they have revolutionized the institutional approach to the emotionally disturbed child, see John G. Milner, "The Residential Treatment Centre", The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 355 (September 1964), 98-104; and Hansel H. Hollingsworth, "The Child-Caring Institution on the Move", ibid., 42-48.

² By 'social structure' I take to mean the network of relations which the members of an organization have with respect to one another and the statuses contingent upon them. See Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations, San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.

behaviour patterns of inmates. Specifically, this thesis will direct attention to the relationship between the institution's mode of social control and the response to it by inmates.

In the literature on mental hospitals and treatment institutions increasing attention is being given to the problem of therapy rather than custody³ of patients. Consequently, more attention is being directed towards the treatment environment of mental patients with more enthusiastic support being given by hospital administrators and clinicians to the analysis of structural processes⁴ which impinge upon patients. It is becoming increasingly evident to researchers that however elaborate the facilities provided for the mentally ill may be these processes have significant effects for the patient. For example, Stanton and Schwartz's study of a private mental hospital, Folsky's study of a juvenile treatment centre, Redl's Detroit 'Centre' and numerous ward studies made in large mental hospitals attest to the fact that in spite of the primary focus on treatment there are still structural factors within the organization's setting which by themselves can either

³ For a succinct statement of the transition in theoretical positions in the field of institutional treatment see John H. Vitale, "The Therapeutic Community: A Review Article", in Albert F. Wessan (ed.), The Psychiatric Hospital as a Social System, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1964, pp. 91-110.

⁴ By 'structural processes' I mean such features of the organization as the pattern of communication, the authority structure, patterns of rewards and punishment, status differences of members, the pattern of inmate socialization and those features of the organization associated with its social structure.

hasten or retard a patient's progress.⁵

The advent of the residential treatment centre with its emphasis on intensive group and individual psychotherapy, occupational therapy, recreational and social programs, its high ratio of professional staff to patients, has not altered this situation appreciably. In the present study I have chosen to examine a residential treatment centre whose facilities and treatment approach come close to exemplifying these ideal standards. It is, therefore, the purpose of this study to investigate the effects of one of these structurally determined processes, namely social control, within this residential treatment setting.

Any organization must utilize some form of authority and control over its members if it is to achieve the purpose for which it was established or for which it currently functions. Implicit in such an assertion is that there must be some degree of consensus by the majority of the members as to the norms and values of the institution. This is no less true of the mental hospital and specifically for the treatment institution than it is for the manufacturing concern. Therefore, in the treatment institution the question is not whether social control

⁵ On this point see A. H. Stanton and M. S. Schwartz, The Mental Hospital, New York: Basic Books, 1954; Howard W. Polsky, Cottage Six, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962; Fritz Redl and David Wineman, Children Who Hate, New York: Collier Books, 1962; D. C. Gilbert and D. J. Levinson, "'Custodialism' and 'Humanism' in Staff Ideology", Chapter 3 in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams (eds.), The Patient and The Mental Hospital, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957; Robert Vinter and Morris Janovitz, "Effective Treatment Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents", Social Service Review, 33 (June 1959), 118-130.

shall be used but rather what mode of social control is best suited to the organization's goals. In the treatment centre under study here, the espoused goals are to care for and assist in the treatment of emotionally disturbed children.⁶ Implicit in this treatment goal is the aim of reducing that behaviour in the inmates which is defined as emotional disturbance or at least providing the inmates with sufficient ego strengths so as to minimize the breakdown of emotional controls. It is not within the scope of this thesis to come to terms with the problem of effective therapy, per se. It is, however, hoped that by alternating the modes of authority and control within the organization's formal structure, I may ascertain which mode of control contributes to a more effective treatment environment. More explicitly, I hope to ascertain whether consensus and co-operation on the part of the inmates are heightened under one system of control as opposed to another.

An examination of treatment philosophies in institutions for the mentally ill reveals that two major orientations predominate. While there are no commonly accepted names for these competing viewpoints the distinguishing characteristics of each can be identified. First, there is that ideology associated with the traditional method of handling the institutionalized mentally ill which Gilbert and Levinson called

⁶ The explicit purpose of Mount Saint Joseph as stated in its bylaws is "to house, afford shelter, educate and care for children,... to assist in the treatment of emotionally disturbed children and to afford religious and moral instruction thereto".

"custodialism". Its major features include strict supervision, authoritarian and rigid control, autocratic relationships, a sharp demarcation of roles with respect to staff and patients, and a strong commitment to care and custody rather than treatment.⁷ It is an ideology that is more often associated with penal and reform institutions. The other orientation, which is commonly referred to as the "therapeutic milieu", incorporates such features as a permissive attitude towards patients, a flexible and democratic form of control, democratic relationships between staff and patients and a commitment to treatment rather than to custody.⁸

This study focuses attention on the contingencies of the two modes of control outlined above. The first of these is an autocratic and rigid system. This form of control, which I shall refer to as the "authoritarian" mode of control, has, as I have indicated, been associated with institutions whose primary concern is with the custody of inmates. Gilbert and Levinson among other writers in the field make it abundantly clear that custodial ideologies are related to an authoritarian mode of

⁷ For a further elaboration of this orientation see Doris C Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, op. cit.

⁸ A more comprehensive elaboration of the theoretical orientations of both "therapeutic milieu" and "custodialism" is included in Chapter 2.

control.⁹ The alternative mode of control that I shall refer to throughout this study is the "permissive" mode of control. In the literature it has been associated with the humanistic school of thought in the treatment of the mentally ill. It has been considered by many writers as intricately related to the treatment approach of the therapeutic milieu.¹⁰

The primary objective of this study, the research problem, is to investigate and compare the behavioural response to these two forms of social control. Our theory will allow me to set forth specific propositions and hypotheses which will be tested and evaluated within a controlled research design. The study is not intended to demonstrate conclusively the efficacy of one form of institutional control as opposed to another. Rather, it is to examine the alternative application

⁹ See Gilbert and Levinson, op. cit. Among those other writers who have in their studies indicated the essential relationship between custodialism and authoritarian control, the following may be mentioned: Erving Goffman, "The Characteristics of Total Institutions" in Amitai Etzioni (ed.), Complex Organizations, New York: Holt, Rinehart, 1962; Richard McCleary, "Authoritarianism and the Belief System of Incorrigibles" in Donald R. Cressy (ed.), The Prison, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961; David Street, "Inmate Social Organization: A Comparative Study of Juvenile Correctional Institutions", Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.

¹⁰ On this point see Gilbert and Levinson, op. cit.; Bruno Bettelheim and Emmy Sylvester, "A Therapeutic Milieu", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 18 (January 1948), 191-206; Fritz Redl, "The Concept of a 'Therapeutic Milieu'", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 29 (October 1959), 721-736.

of two modes of control within one institution with a view to expanding our information of a crucial feature of social organization and with the hope that such information might be further applied and tested in settings similar to the one studied here.

Research Design

(1) The Setting of the Study

The research was undertaken at Mount Saint Joseph Centre in Hamilton, Ontario, a residential treatment centre for emotionally disturbed boys between the ages of seven and thirteen.¹¹ At the time of the research there were fifteen boys in residence and these were divided on the basis of age and emotional maturity into three groups: juniors, intermediates and seniors. Each group had its own television and recreation room so that as far as circumstances permitted the activities of each unit was kept separate.¹²

¹¹ Mount Saint Joseph Centre is a private institution operated by the Roman Catholic Order of the Sisters of Saint Joseph. Admission to the treatment institution, however, is not based upon the religious affiliation of the inmate or his family; it is based upon the needs of the particular applicant and upon a clinical assessment of the boy's capability of benefiting from the type of treatment program offered. As far as its treatment facilities are concerned, therefore, Mount Saint Joseph is non-denominational.

¹² In actual fact this was only partially achieved, for, while each unit had its separate indoor activities room, all groups shared common facilities such as washrooms, gymnasium, the dining room and the outside playground. However, because of the tendency for senior boys to exert a disrupting and disturbing influence over the younger boys, the staff endeavoured wherever possible to keep the various units' activities separated. For example, meal times were slightly staggered so that not all units would be present in the dining room at the same time; bedtime hours were also graduated, earlier hours having been set for the juniors; it was similar with the use of other facilities. Also, activities were planned separately for each group where this was feasible.

The institution's staff comprised ten childcare workers in addition to a clinical social worker and the clinical director. Five members of the childcare staff were women and of these four were sisters from the Order of Saint Joseph. The remainder were all male lay personnel.

All of the boys in residence were undergoing treatment for some degree of emotional disturbance. The symptoms of the disturbances exhibited by these boys were lying, stealing, wetting, soiling, excessive masturbation, other types of sexual play, destructiveness, inability to get along with others, hyperactivity and running away. Most of the boys had presented serious behaviour problems to their families, the courts or other law-enforcement agencies and were referred to Mount Saint Joseph by the courts, local Childrens' Aid Societies or other social service agencies.

Treatment services were provided by the clinical staff and childcare workers all of whom have had some formal and considerable practical training in work with emotionally disturbed children. In addition to the treatment staff there was a resident school teacher (also a sister of the Order) who was responsible for the educational instruction of all but one boy who was deemed to have progressed sufficiently to attend an outside school. Although the teacher in the Centre occupies a crucial role in the lives of the boys and is in constant collaboration with the clinical and childcare staff, her position is in some ways marginal, since her role is more formal than that of a childcare worker. The remainder of

the institution's staff included several maintenance and service personnel. Their positions were largely peripheral to the daily lives of the boys.

Therapy in the Centre was a continual, twenty-four hours a day process. Childcare workers were constantly providing support, counselling, calming excited or over-anxious boys, and participating in recreation and other activities with children. Individual psychotherapy on a more intensive level was provided by the clinical social worker, by the clinical director (who was a clinical psychologist by profession) and by the consulting psychiatrist who attended once a week. Daily medication for several children also formed part of the treatment process.

The physical facilities of the Centre included two wings on the ground floor of a building which was originally an orphanage. A large gymnasium, ample yard space and a well equipped playground were also a part of the setting. As mentioned above, each of the three units, junior, intermediate and senior, had its own inside activities room which was equipped with a television set, assorted games and an ample amount of furnishings suitable for young children. Dining facilities comprised a large functional dining room adjacent to the kitchen in the basement and a school room occupied another small wing of the building.

(2) The Experimental Situation

It was my original intention to create an experimental situation comparing different groups of boys under contrasting methods of control but the relatively small inmate population imposed restrictions on

this approach. It was possible, however, to institute for the inmate population as a whole two experimental time periods during which the alternative modes of control were put into effect. Each experimental time period lasted for four weeks and was separated from the other by an interval of six weeks during which time it was hoped that the institutional climate would return to normal.¹³

The objective of the research design was to differentiate, as far as was possible, the social organization of the institution during the two time periods. This differentiation was based upon the two distinctive modes of control. The two modes of control were called "authoritarian" and "permissive". A detailed outline of the research design together with an exposition of the characteristics of each mode of social control was made explicit to the childcare workers and the clinical staff.

We are well aware that these concepts authoritarian and permissive are rather nebulous and vague in their connotation. Moreover, they are highly relative terms and do not represent distinct types of control. For example, permissiveness in one institution may be viewed by another organization as authoritarian and vice versa.¹⁴

¹³ A description of the "normal" institutional climate will be provided in Chapter 3.

¹⁴ On this point see Bruno Bettelheim and Emmy Sylvester, op. cit.

There is, therefore, no absolute criterion of these terms for defining types of control from which we may generalize regarding all institutions. In addition, it must be remembered that we are dealing here with children. This introduces the further problem that what is restrictive and authoritarian for an adult may not be perceived as such by a child.¹⁵ Finally, it must be realized that permissive does not imply anarchy or complete lack of control any more than authoritarian control implies extremely coercive and punitive control where all individual prerogatives are removed. To repeat then, these concepts, as presented here, represent relative dimensions of a single continuum, namely social control and its concomitant factor authority.

The authoritarian mode of control is operationally defined as that system of authority evidenced by a rigid status hierarchy with sharp demarcation of roles between staff and inmates, a downward flow of power and communication, minimization of communication across status lines, a formalized and rigid system of rules and procedures accompanied by strictness, and a punitive attitude toward inmates who transgress these rules.¹⁶

¹⁵ See David Street, "Inmates in Custodial and Treatment Settings", American Sociological Review, 30 (February 1965), 40-55.

¹⁶ For an elaboration of this mode of control see Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, op. cit.; Harvey Fowelson and Reinhard Bendix, "Psychiatry in Prison", Psychiatry, 14 (February 1951), 73-86; A. H. Maslow, "The Authoritarian Character Structure", Journal of Social Psychology, 18 (November 1943), 401-411; T. W. Adorno et al., The Authoritarian Personality, New York: Harper, 1950; Milton Greenblatt, et al., From Custodial to Therapeutic Patient Care in Mental Hospitals, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1955. The theoretical rationale for the operational definitions of both authoritarian and permissive modes of control will be included in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

The permissive mode of control is operationally defined as that system of authority evidenced by a democratic orientation¹⁷ in the relationships between people of different roles, informality and friendliness in staff inmate relationships, the free-flow of communication, the absence of rigid rules and a tolerant and permissive attitude towards inmates.¹⁸

Immediately prior to the onset of the first experimental period -- the authoritarian mode of control -- the Centre's staff was provided with instructions (Appendix B) as to their required conduct during the subsequent four weeks. These instructions emphasized the use of impersonal and formal control, maintenance of a greater than usual degree of social distance, adherence to strict rules and regulations covering all areas of institutional life, and the utilization of punitive

¹⁷ The concept of a 'democratic orientation' has been open to much criticism because of ethnocentric or nationalistic bias. In this study it has no political implications and is restricted to meaning an egalitarian spirit in the interpersonal relations of actors in a social system. See Edward A. Shils, "Authoritarianism: 'Right' and 'Left'", in Christie and Johoda (eds.), Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.

¹⁸ For a more extensive elaboration of this orientation see Morris S. Schwartz, "What is a Therapeutic Milieu", Chapter 8 in M. Greenblatt, D. J. Levinson and R. H. Williams, op. cit.; Maxwell Jones, The Therapeutic Community, New York: Basic Books, 1953; A. H. Stanton and Morris Schwartz, op. cit.; Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, op. cit.

methods of correction.¹⁹

Similarly, just prior to the institution of the permissive mode of control the staff was provided with a list of appropriate instructions (Appendix B). Those instructions stressed the personal, intimate and friendly approach to control. Tolerance and acceptance of aggressive, non-conforming behaviour was required by staff. Relationships between staff and boys were to emphasize a "community" atmosphere where restrictions were imposed only as a last resort for boys who were dangerously aggressive.²⁰

Chapter Outline

In this chapter I have discussed the research objectives of the study, the setting of the study and the methodology which I shall use.

In Chapter 2 I will review the literature on mental hospitals and residential treatment centres of various types in order to illustrate the central problem of this study. Special attention will be directed

¹⁹ It should be understood that the punitive methods of correction did not entail corporal punishment per se. Rather, they involved the loss of privileges such as outings, spending money, home visits, and entailed the imposition of having to write lines and in some instances confinement to dormitories. In extreme cases the boy was confined for short periods to the "quiet room" (a double-doored isolation room approximately five by seven feet and without furnishings of any kind).

²⁰ By 'dangerously aggressive' I mean boys' behaviour that actually threatened the physical safety of themselves and others. In addition we also include behaviour which might have resulted in serious property damage such as setting fires, continual and deliberate smashing of furniture or wanton destruction of property. It does not include the occasional breaking of windows, furniture or toys.

to institutions for children and to the concept of the therapeutic milieu.

Chapter 3 will include a brief review of the literature on organizational theory with particular attention given to the problem of authority and control. The relevance of the theory for treatment institutions will be discussed and an elaboration of the specific theory used in this study will be provided. The propositions and hypotheses deriving from our theoretical framework will also be presented in this chapter.

Chapter 4 will include an analysis of the findings of this research which I shall consider under two separate sections:

1) The Effects of Authoritarian Control and 2) The Effects of Permissive Control.

Chapter 5, the concluding chapter, will consider the findings of the study and discuss the extent to which they fit the theoretical framework. A summary statement of the findings and conclusions will be given with suggestions as to the relevance of the research for future investigation.

CHAPTER 2

THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF TREATMENT INSTITUTIONS

During the past two decades the literature on mental hospitals has been increasing at a tremendous rate. This immense growth of interest not only in mental hospitals per se but in the whole problem of mental health is reflected in the quantity of recent anthropological and sociological research in the field.¹ Our interest here, however, focuses primarily on research pertinent to the mental hospital itself, a field in which it is possible to highlight only some of the more relevant material.

A review of the literature on mental hospital research immediately impresses one with the emphasis being given to the transition in mental hospital ideology; we note a decided swing away from the older traditional orientation with its emphasis on custody and care of the mentally ill to the current humanistic approach which stresses treatment and rehabilitation. This transition in institutional ideology appears to have closely followed developments in ego psychology and socio-cultural theory of mental illness, each of which acknowledges the significance of interpersonal processes in the treatment of the

¹ For example, see Edwin D. Driver, The Sociology and Anthropology of Mental Illness, Amherst, Mass.: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1965.

mentally ill.

The initial phase of this shift in mental hospital ideology has been highlighted by Albert Deutsch² who has provided an excellent history of the treatment of the mentally ill in America. In his work we note that changes in attitudes toward the mentally ill have been much like the swing of a pendulum moving backwards and forward, depending on the social climate of the times, over the past two hundred years. In the early years of America clinicians in mental hospitals were dominated by theories of witchcraft concerning the mentally ill; the widespread superstition of the times led to gross abuses of those afflicted with mental illness. Towards the end of the eighteenth century the influence of reformers like Pinel led to a more enlightened approach in treatment. An examination of the central features of this approach strike one as quite remarkable in the light of current reforms; for example:

provision of a family environment for the patients, as manifested in the non-institutional aspects of buildings and surroundings; emphasis on employment and exercise as conducive to mental health; and the treatment of patients as guests rather than as inmates. Kindness and consideration formed the keystone of the whole theoretical structure. ³

Unfortunately, under the pressure of an increasing inmate population and limited staff and facilities "moral treatment", as the

² Albert Deutsch, The Mentally Ill in America, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

³ Ibid., pp. 93-94.

above approach was called, gave way again to an attitude of custodialism. With the administrations' energies directed almost completely to problems of supervision and custody, mental hospitals became collection agencies once more. With the exception of sporadic and short-lived efforts to rectify a generally deplorable situation little improvement was made in this state of affairs until the early nineteen thirties. At that time the studies of Harry Stack Sullivan⁴ began to focus attention on the influence of the organization of the mental hospital on the patient. He contended that at least part of the patient's disturbed behaviour is intimately related to the individual's environmental situation including the interpersonal processes of such a context. This led mental hospital researchers to examine the institutional context in order to see how it might be altered or controlled to meet the therapeutic needs of treatment.

Another of the relatively early studies of mental hospital organization is that of Howard Rowland.⁵ His research investigates the consequences of role definition and role incumbency for patients in mental hospitals. He envisages the mental hospital as a miniature society in which one primary and collective goal of adjustment has replaced "the individualistic-competitive goal of the larger [outside]

⁴ Harry Stack Sullivan, "Socio-psychiatric Research: Its Implications for the Schizophrenia Problem", American Journal of Psychiatry, 87 (1931).

⁵ Howard Rowland, "Interaction Processes in the State Mental Hospital", Psychiatry, 1 (August 1938), 323-337.

society."⁶ However, it must be remembered that this goal of adjustment means adjustment to the institutional social system, not that of the larger social order. The patient role, therefore, is defined in terms already established in the institutional social system; also, his progress is assessed in terms of the degree of adjustment he makes to the institutional order. The patient in this system must therefore accept the stereotypes which others in the hospital have of him and learn to define himself in their terms if he expects to "recover" from his illness.⁷

Maxwell Jones⁸ has been an outstanding pioneer in experimenting with the total milieu of hospitalization. His research in the Industrial Neurosis Unit at Belmont focuses on the complete twenty-four hour day of the patient and takes into account all the patient's interpersonal contacts. The basic premise of Jones' research at Belmont was that individual attitudes and behaviour are related to the structure

⁶ Ibid., p. 325.

⁷ Erving Goffman has devoted considerable attention to this problem of adaptation in mental hospitals. He points out that the inmate may indeed accept the stereotyped conception of his patient role and make an adjustment to the value system of the institutional order but more frequently, he maintains, the patient will find ways which permit him to pay lip service to the adaptive requirements of the system and at the same time covertly manipulate the system to meet his particular needs -- needs based upon the value system of the larger society, not those encompassed by the institutional conception of the patient role. See, for example, Chapter 3 in Asylums, Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961.

⁸ Maxwell Jones, The Therapeutic Community: A New Treatment Method in Psychiatry, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1953.

and operation of mental institutions and that changes in patients' attitudes can be brought about through structural changes in institutional organization. To achieve this goal in the setting at Belmont, Jones changed the institutional structure by altering the functional roles of both patients and staff from those traditionally prescribed to more informal, community oriented ones.

Stanton and Schwartz in their study of a private mental hospital provide an excellent analysis of the way in which the social structure of an institution impinges on therapeutic processes. Much of their attention is directed to the problem of communication and the disruptive consequences which result when communication is blocked between the various levels of the institutional hierarchy. They demonstrate how this problem of blocking results in conflict and misunderstanding between members of the hospital's therapeutic staff and indicate how this is related to collective disturbances among patients. For example,

All patients who were the centre of attention for the ward for several days or longer during the period of study were the subjects of such covert disagreement [among staff]; the most striking finding was that the subjects of secret, affectively important staff disagreement; and, equally regularly, their excitement terminated usually abruptly, when staff members were brought to discuss seriously their points of disagreement with each other. 9

⁹ Alfred Stanton and Morris Schwartz, The Mental Hospital, New York: Basic Books, 1954.

Caudill¹⁰ in his research approached the study of the mental hospital from the perspective of the participant observer. His observations which were made from a patient's perspective point out how role incumbency within the staff hierarchy influences one's outlook; that is, different status holders within the hierarchy will view the hospital situation in quite different ways. In his study he also indicates the nature of the two-fold hospital structure, namely, the formal and the informal, and the communication patterns pertinent to each. The system studied by Caudill gave rise to a series of conflicting loyalties such that role incumbents found themselves torn between serving the needs of the patient as they perceived them from the perspective of their own status group and serving the needs of the patient as envisaged by higher status groups and the administration. Needless to say, the consequences of such conflicts for patients were hardly conducive to their therapy. Schneider¹¹ has uncovered similar findings in his investigations and shows how the patient is invariably caught in the middle of such conflicts.

Belknap¹² is another researcher who, in his analysis of the

¹⁰ William Caudill, The Psychiatric Hospital as a Small Society, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1958.

¹¹ Irving Schneider, "The Use of Patients to Act Out Professional Conflicts", Psychiatry, 26 (February 1963), 88-94.

¹² Ivan Belknap, Human Problems of a State Mental Hospital, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

social system of a large southern state hospital, has highlighted the barriers within the formal organization of the institution which impede treatment goals. These barriers which were inherent in the rigid formal structure of the organization were the traditional value system and status hierarchy; these values reinforced custodial and administrative functions of personnel at the expense of a treatment orientation. While Belknap's study sheds considerable light on the effects of a rigid formal organization committed to traditional goals his neglect of virtually any consideration of the informal side of the institution leaves a wide gap in our knowledge of the system.

Several other investigators have also concentrated their attention on the problem of statuses and roles of both professional and non-professional staff in mental hospitals. Jules Henry in one article¹³ suggests that the type of subordination system utilized by an institution can have considerable effect upon the role performances and attitudes of staff members. He contends that greater personal satisfaction arises under a system of "multiple differentiated subordination"¹⁴ and that such a system permits personnel to become more actively involved

¹³ Jules Henry, "Types of Institutional Structure", Chapter 5 in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams, op. cit.

¹⁴ This type of subordination refers to that system where subordinate supervisors are granted complete responsibility and autonomy over their particular area of specialization. See ibid., p. 75.

in therapeutic processes. Kahne¹⁵ posits that traditionally prescribed staff roles inhibit effective treatment through the maintenance of strictly formal relationships with patients. For example, he demonstrates how nurses in one hospital have been socialized in accordance with the prevailing value system to be friendly and supportive towards patients but to maintain strict social distance, to be wary, and to remember that inmates as emotionally sick people are not to be trusted. Barabee¹⁶ in one of his early studies found that considerable strain developed among incumbents of traditionally prescribed custodial roles when change was introduced to redefine their roles to include therapeutic functions. He suggests that such strains can be reduced when the incumbent's role perception of himself coincides with the formal definition.

Goffman¹⁷ in his analysis of "total institutions" provides a descriptive account of the chief characteristics of the relationship between staff and inmates. Although his account covers the broad field of total institutions such as prisons, training schools, mental hospitals, private schools, monasteries, and the like, his analysis describes features common to all of them. Much of his discussion focuses on the processes of socialization of inmates in the patient or prisoner

¹⁵ Robert Kahne and John R. P. French, "A Summary of Some Tentative Conclusions", Journal of Social Issues, 18 (July 1962), 122-127.

¹⁶ Paul S. Barabee, "A Study of a Mental Hospital: The Effect of Its Social Structure on Its Function", Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Department of Social Relations, 1951.

¹⁷ Erving Goffman, Asylums, op. cit.

role. At a fairly general level, Goffman traces the mechanisms of institutionalization particularly as these encompass the elements of depersonalization, impersonality in staff-inmate relations, authority structures and methods of control. Other significant aspects include what he calls the moral career of the mental hospital patient, or the process leading to hospitalization and the subsequent learning of the patient role. In addition to the perceptive analysis of the formal aspects of mental hospitals which his work provides, we are also presented with a lucid discussion of the informal mechanisms available to inmates for coping with rigid bureaucratic processes.

At a more abstract level Talcott Parsons¹⁸ provides an excellent theoretical framework for the analysis of the mental hospital. In his article "The Mental Hospital as a Type of Organization" he makes explicit the goals of the institution and draws our attention to the relationship between the mental hospital as a subsystem and the wider community as a superordinate system. Also, he points out a fact which many writers in the field seem to have missed, namely, that the goal of therapy in mental hospitals is subordinate to the custodial goal. As most mental hospitals are presently constituted therapy cannot be affected unless custody is given primacy. In fact, the choice between custody and therapy is not a case of "either-or" but rather of relative emphasis of one or the other, given custodial primacy. While Parsons'

¹⁸ Talcott Parsons, "The Mental Hospital as a Type of Organization", Chapter 7 in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams, op. cit.

analysis provides considerable insight into the broader organizational framework it fails to enumerate many of the specific kinds of interpersonal relationships which develop within the institution and which have consequences for the hospital social system.

The Therapeutic Milieu

The definition of the concept "therapeutic milieu" is not at all clear. In fact, there appears to be a profusion of interpretations in the literature. Jones,¹⁹ as we have pointed out in the preceding section, had much to do with the early exploration of the 'community' approach. His conception of the therapeutic milieu entailed the utilization of this community approach which stressed the total life experience of the patient within the institutional context. His was one of the early attempts to introduce an 'open door' policy and to initiate the involvement of patients in a self-governing inmate group. Jones was acutely aware of the sensitivity of patients to all aspects of their hospital environment and altered the roles of professional personnel from those of detached functionaries to more intimate and personal ones. This active involvement by both staff and patients in the full therapeutic processes of the organization is the focal point of Jones' community approach.

Bettelheim's²⁰ discussion of the term as applied to his treatment

¹⁹ Maxwell Jones, op. cit.

²⁰ Bruno Bettelheim, Truants From Life, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955; also see Bruno Bettelheim and Emmy Sylvester, op. cit.

centre is extremely vague. He speaks of the therapeutic milieu as that kind of context which facilitates the development of the child's mastery over his environment. He argues that a therapeutic environment should entail an emphasis on spontaneity and flexibility. For example, "It makes questions of schedule or routine subservient to the relevance of highly individualized and spontaneous interpersonal relations". One gathers by the tone of his argument that the kind of regimen he calls therapeutic is one which is quite permissive, allows for a good deal of acting out by children²¹ and relegates procedures and rules to an inferior and inconsequential position. However, there are some inconsistencies in his thesis for while he maintains that "compliance with stereotyped rules does not allow for spontaneity"²² he also tells us that in the centre he administers the childrens' activities are arranged for them thus alleviating the need for independent decisions. Nevertheless, one must conclude that the kind of ideal setting Bettelheim envisages entails a maximization of interpersonal relationships between staff and children and encourages the latter's involvement in decision making processes as they apply to many of the daily facets of institutional life.

²¹ Ibid., p. 192.

²² Some indication of this permissiveness may be inferred from his remarks about allowing children to express their hostility by smashing dinner dishes until the child is deemed to no longer need such outlets. Also, no child is expected to do any housework or daily chores (since) the educational value of housework as such is questionable.

Fritz Redl²³ probably offers the most comprehensive analysis of the term. Breaking the concept into its two components he suggests these meanings for the term "therapeutic" as applied to residential treatment centres for children:

- (1) The absence of crude forms of punishments
- (2) An activity program
- (3) A consideration of the socio-cultural factors in the personalities of individual children
- (4) Flexibility in rules and regulations
- (5) A treatment program directed toward the complete personality of the child, not specifically toward his particular problem
- (6) The community approach involving all personnel in a direct partnership with the treatment program
- (7) The re-education of the child for "real life outside" the institution

In discussing the concept milieu he is even more elaborate, as²⁴
these twelve factors attest to.

- (1) The social structure including
 - a. role distribution
 - b. the informal status hierarchy
 - c. the communication network
- (2) The value system
- (3) Rituals and routines
- (4) The impact of inmate group pressures

²³ Fritz Redl, "The Concept of the 'Therapeutic Milieu'", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 29 (October 1959), 721-736.

²⁴ In some instances the researcher has reworded these factors slightly in order to avoid their original vagueness. For example, factor twelve was listed by Redl as "The thermostat for the regulation of clinical resilience", the explanation of which covers three-quarters of a page in his article. In other instances the researcher has used Redl's captions and added very brief explanations of his own in brackets.

- (5) The impact of 'trait clusters' of close inmate associates
- (6) The attitudes and feelings of staff
- (7) Behaviour received (rewards in the form of positive responses from significant others)
- (8) The activity structure (that is, any activity of the centre's program and the nature of the constituent performances by inmates as opposed to their expected performance)
- (9) Facilities
- (10) The influence of the outside world
- (11) The arbitration system
- (12) The control system

While the analysis and interpretation which Redl provides may still not be exhaustive it appears inclusive enough to leave little room for further comment.

Schwartz²⁵ avoids much of Redl's overlapping of the major features of the concept in his discussion of it. He sees the therapeutic milieu as comprising three interwoven features: social structure, interpersonal relationships, and goals. Ideally the social structure of a therapeutic milieu includes a democratic orientation as opposed to an authoritarian one, a treatment emphasis rather than custodial, a humanitarian approach rather than oppressiveness, and flexibility as opposed to rigidity. The interpersonal relationships should be characterized by a personal, sympathetic, kind and respectful attitude by staff rather than a cold and impersonal approach. The goals implicit in a therapeutic milieu are to help the patient accept his illness and to help confront him with reality so that his previous distortions are

²⁵ Morris S. Schwartz, op. cit.

corrected and so that he can achieve a greater feeling of satisfaction with himself and in his relationships with others.

Rinsley and Topeka²⁶ maintain that treatment centres for children which stress the therapeutic milieu approach can be differentiated into two broad categories. The first of these the authors call the "patch and dismiss" school. Its chief characteristics are emphasis on intensive therapy, high dismissal rates combined with relatively short periods of hospitalization, and an administrative ideology committed to view that institutions are at best a poor substitute for the patient's home and family. The second type described by the authors stresses intensive and as prolonged hospitalization as will bring about, in the estimation of the therapists, permanent changes in the personality structure of the patient. The prevailing ideological commitment in this type of organization entails the belief that the hospital or treatment centre is the setting in which therapy must take place and not in any combination of hospital-extramural facilities. The explicit assumption here is that the hospital is the best place for an emotionally disturbed patient. In the authors' estimation the hospital setting can most ideally offer effective therapy since the energies of all the staff can be mobilized in a co-ordinated endeavour to produce permanent personality change in the patient. Thus the inconsistencies in attitudes, beliefs and loyalties which they see as the shortcomings in a mixed mode

²⁶ Donald B. Rinsley and Kan Topeka, "Psychiatric Hospital Treatment", Archives of General Psychiatry, 9 (July-December 1963), 489-496.

of treatment are thereby eliminated. The crucial question to which these writers fail to provide any satisfactory answer is whether the change effected by the second type of institution, (their own preference), is not merely change relative to what the therapist conceived as the original condition of the patient and, more important, change relative to the treatment centre's own value system. The authors do not indicate whether a patient who has successfully internalized the values espoused by such a centre will be able to function adequately in the larger social system where he will undoubtedly face a myriad of inconsistent beliefs and attitudes and ones the dominant tone of which may in fact be quite different from the value system he has learned.

Gynther and Gall²⁷ suggest that the recent tendencies toward idealizing the virtues of the therapeutic community²⁸ can be attributed to the world-wide ideological conflict between Democracy with its emphasis on individual freedom and integrity and Communism with its emphasis on state control and the immersion of the individual within the state. These authors feel that commitment to a therapeutic milieu treatment structure is evidence of support for democratic principles. Evidence in support of such a view can be seen in the numerous testing

²⁷ Malcolm D. Gynther and Howard S. Gall, "Therapeutic Community: Concept, Practice and Evaluation" in Albert F. Wessen (ed.), op. cit.

²⁸ The term "therapeutic community" has become so synonymous with the term "therapeutic milieu" that we are here taking them to mean the same thing.

devices that have been applied in the mental hospital context to evaluate dominant personnel ideologies. For example, Adorno's F Test²⁹, Gilbert and Levinson's C.M.I.³⁰ and C.R.P.³¹ Scales and Jackson's C.T.E. Scale³² have all been used, at least in part, to assess authoritarianism or

²⁹ Theodor Adorno et al. The Authoritarian Personality, New York: Harper, 1950. The development of the California F Test is an attempt to elaborate the several variables comprising what is deemed to be the "authoritarian personality". In accordance with the theoretical framework set forth by the authors, they assert that the authoritarian personality structure exhibits characteristics which lend themselves to a Fascist ideological orientation.

³⁰ Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, "'Custodialism' and 'Humanism' in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology", Chapter 3 in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams, op. cit. In this article Gilbert and Levinson present the development of the "Custodial Mental Illness Ideology (C.M.I.) Scale, an instrument intended to measure the prevalence of custodial-humanistic ideologies among various staff levels and to assess the relationship of these ideologies to other structural aspects of the institutional context.

³¹ Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, "Role Performance, Ideology, and Personality in Mental Hospital Aides", Chapter 11 in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams, op. cit. The construction of this scale is a further attempt by these authors to evaluate certain of the structural features present in the mental hospital environment and to assess the effects of such features for therapy.

³² Jay Jackson, "Towards the Comparative Study of Mental Hospitals", Chapter 3 in Albert F. Wessen (ed.), op. cit. "The Characteristics of Treatment Environment (C.T.E.) Scale is an instrument used by Jackson to assess the custodial climate of a mental hospital. While it has been demonstrated that this scale has definite usefulness in comparing treatment climates of different hospitals, its utility for measuring differences between wards of one institution is somewhat doubtful.

liberalism present in the institutional context with a view to evaluating their therapeutic consequences.³³

Murray and Cohen³⁴ see the therapeutic milieu as characterized by a significantly high rate of interpersonal contact between patients. Rothenberg and Vogel³⁵ also stress the importance of friendship patterns implicit in the therapeutic milieu. Morrice³⁶ considers the ward meeting the keystone of the therapeutic community. All of these writers emphasize informal and uninhibited relationships between patients since it is felt that the environment created by such relationships is most conducive to effective therapy. This type of therapy is enacted by clinicians and by the patients themselves through the greater self-awareness and understanding that such active involvement ostensibly gives rise to.

It can be seen from the foregoing review that there is one major

³³ Many writers have pointed out that attempts to make ideological dichotomies based upon "democratic" - "authoritarian" distinctions are, from both the theoretical and substantive perspective, extremely dubious. On this point see Edward A. Shils, "Authoritarianism": 'Right' and 'Left' in Christie and Johoda (eds.), Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1954.

³⁴ Edward J. Murray and Melvin Cohen, Mental Illness, Milieu Therapy and Social Organization in Ward Groups, A Research Report, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

³⁵ Albert Rothenberg and Ezra F. Vogel, "Patient Cliques and the Therapeutic Community", British Journal of Medical Psychology, 37 (1964), 143-152.

³⁶ J. K. W. Morrice, "The Ward as a Therapeutic Group", British Journal of Medical Psychology, 37 (1964), 157-165.

theme common to all conceptions of the therapeutic milieu. All these writers consider the therapeutic milieu as characterized by a climate of informality in the relationships between staff and inmates and between the inmates themselves. Along with this pattern of informality we also note a de-emphasis of authority in the organizational structure and a movement towards granting the inmate population some measure of self determination. Furthermore, it is evident that the ideological orientation associated with this type of treatment approach entails a conception of the patient as a unique individual who is in the institution for treatment and rehabilitation; he is not simply an object to be processed, labelled and then segregated for safe keeping. From this theoretical perspective the patient is viewed as a personality having special needs, needs which the institution must accommodate through organizational flexibility. Thus the features which we see as forming the crux of the therapeutic milieu are informal relationships, minimization of authority, organizational flexibility and a conception of the patient's individuality and integrity.³⁷

Treatment Institutions for Children

Empirical studies of children's treatment institutions that have fully-implemented treatment programs within the context of a therapeutic milieu can be counted on the fingers of one hand. The

³⁷ For an excellent summary concerning the organization of the therapeutic milieu see William R. Rosengren, "Communication, Organization and Conduct in the 'Therapeutic Milieu'", Administrative Science Quarterly, 9 (June 1964), 70-90.

simple explanation for this is that until lately such institutions have been rare. This is not to say that many residential 'child-caring' institutions do not incorporate some kind of treatment program -- they do, but such therapeutic services as they do provide are an ancillary part of their primary operation, namely, care and custody. Furthermore, with the exception of a few isolated instances the treatment services that have been instituted have been segmented and partial.³⁸ Thus, the handful of studies which follow represent the sum of institutions for children (reported on in the literature) which have utilized the therapeutic milieu approach.

August Aichhorn³⁹ was one of the first to pioneer milieu therapy for children and his Institute established more than forty years ago in Vienna still remains the model upon which all subsequent remedial institutions for children have been fashioned. Aichhorn was a disciple of Freud and therefore laid heavy stress on the latter's psycho-therapeutic techniques but in his Vienna institute he utilized them within the milieu context. For example,

Conditions other than those of the personality of the individual pupils must be considered. I refer to those external conditions which in general constitute the milieu. Not only are the companions with whom he lives important to the

³⁸ On this point see Robert Vinter and Morris Janovitz, "Effective Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents", Social Service Review, 33 (June 1959), 118-130.

³⁹ August Aichhorn, Wayward Youth, Compass Books Edition, New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1965.

dissocial child, but also the material world around him; not only the milieu of the group but also the institution as a whole. 40

The remedial milieu, as Aichhorn called it, entailed most of those features we currently associate with the therapeutic milieu. It incorporated an 'open door' policy where children were free from the restrictions of walled premises, guards and locked doors; it placed a high value on informality in staff-child relationships; corporal punishments were tabooed and therapy was oriented toward equipping the child to deal with life outside the institution. The whole approach is cogently summed up by Aichhorn himself.

We must give the pupils experiences which fit them for life outside and not for the artificial life of an institution. The more the life of the institution conforms to an actual social community, the more certain is the social rehabilitation of the child. There is a great danger in an institution that the individuality of the child does not develop along lines best suited to his needs but that rules are laid down in accordance with administrative requirements which reduce the child to a mere inmate with a number. 41

We are unfortunately left much in the dark as to what were the actual accomplishments of Aichhorn's institution. Although he refers to several cases which stand out as remarkable rehabilitative achievements he is still quite vague about the results in general. Success of the treatment program seems to be evaluated in terms of the degree of empathy between workers and boys and the establishment of a transference

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 146.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 150.

pattern.⁴² Apparently Aichhorn and his co-workers were of the opinion that the institution was effective in this regard. However, it is a mute point here, as with many purely subjective appraisals of effective therapy, whether successful personality adjustment to the wider community has actually been achieved; but this is always a problem where there is no hard criteria of successful personality adjustment.

In America there are two outstanding examples of the application of the therapeutic milieu to treatment centres for children. These are Bettelheim's⁴³ orthogenic school in Chicago and Redl's⁴⁴ Pioneer House in Detroit. An examination of these two settings reveals a marked similarity in their organization and both are quite obviously modeled on Aichhorn's Vienna Institute. The major distinguishing feature between the American institutions and Aichhorn's is in the age composition of the respective inmate groups; the children in the former were younger than those in the Vienna Institute with the result that the American institutions were more highly structured in terms of programs and adult supervision.

In both these institutions it is difficult from the sociological

⁴² By transference Aichhorn means a deep emotional response by boys to the workers (much like the child-parent type of response). For a concise discussion of this mechanism and its relevance for influencing dissocial boys, see ibid., Chapter 6.

⁴³ Bruno Bettelheim, Love is Not Enough, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1950; Bruno Bettelheim, Truants From Life, op. cit.

⁴⁴ Fritz Redl and David Wineman, Controls From Within, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1952.

perspective to evaluate accomplishments. Cases are cited by Bettelheim and Redl which indicate the success of the therapeutic milieu in "reaching" and aiding emotionally disturbed children. The implication of these success stories is that the type of organizational structure and the treatment approach employed is superior to those in other institutions for children with similar emotional problems. In point of fact, there can be little argument against the attraction and desirability of handling problem children in a personal and highly involved manner as opposed to the detached and objective approach. We know, however, that there are always some children whose conditions will improve in almost any treatment context. Therefore we cannot be sure whether success in individual cases is associated with this particular treatment approach or some other undetermined factor. The visible accomplishment of this type of setting is that it offers a revolutionary approach to the care and treatment of children; its treatment program is flexible and readily adaptable to the needs and conditions of children; it treats children as individuals who need help and guidance rather than as objects from which society must be protected.

Another instance of the application of the therapeutic milieu to children's institutions is the one provided by Weeks in his experiment at Highfields.⁴⁵ There are, however, significant differences between this project and the two just mentioned. At Highfields the inmate population consisted of twenty-five boys whose average length of

⁴⁵ H. Ashley Weeks, Youthful Offenders at Highfields, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1958.

residence was three months (a considerably shorter period than in either Bettelheim's or Redl's centre). Moreover, the boys at Highfields had been sentenced to residency there by the courts as an alternative to commitment in a reformatory. Also, rather than using intensive psychotherapeutic techniques as in both the previous instances, the administration at Highfields made extensive use of group therapy and a regular routine of practical work oriented to rehabilitation. Finally, in every case a follow-up study was made to determine whether the individual had been positively influenced by his experience at Highfields; this assessment was based upon the individual's behaviour subsequent to his stay in the institution.

A study of the effects of the therapeutic milieu at Highfields indicated that upon release inmates showed a lower rate of recidivism compared with boys sentenced to more conventional institutions. There was, however, little evidence to show any change in attitudes to the law, society and about life in general; nor could the researchers find any indication of change in the basic personalities of inmates. While the results regarding low rates of recidivism appear encouraging there are two major weaknesses with the organization of Highfields which mitigate against attaching significance to this result. In the first instance there was a sizeable proportion of Negro youths in Highfields inmate population; this undoubtedly introduces complications in assessing the validity of findings when comparisons are made with other institutions. A more serious shortcoming is the fact that a bias was

introduced in Highfields' favour through a process whereby boys were specially selected for residential treatment in this institution. The researchers downgrade this bias by attempting to control for marked differences when comparisons are made with inmate populations of other institutions. Nevertheless, the fact that there were variables influencing the court's decision to refer a youth to Highfields instead of to some other place cannot but help have influenced the findings.

The residential treatment centre has many structural features that are analogous to those found in the organization of prisons, reform schools and similar types of total institutions and therefore the present study involves a number of comparisons demonstrating these similarities as they pertain to the problems of authority and social control. Some of the more significant studies on prisons and reform institutions deserve mention.

In his analysis of a cottage setting for delinquent youths, Polsky⁴⁶ focuses attention on the individual cottage and admirably demonstrates how the inmate primary group functions to thwart the treatment program of the larger organization. He indicates how, at the informal level, peer group loyalties take precedence over the value system of the treatment milieu and give rise to an inmate value system the function of which is to perpetuate a deviant subculture within the larger organization. The coercive power of elites, the abrogated authority of cottage parents, and the lack of awareness of the existence

⁴⁶ Howard W. Polsky, Cottage Six, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962.

of the deviant subculture by the treatment staff all contribute to nullify therapeutic goals.

Syke's⁴⁷ study of a maximum security prison deals with the pattern of relationships between guards and inmates. He shows the conditions which prevent role incumbents from carrying out their formally prescribed role expectations and outlines the adaptive procedures used by guards and inmates for coping with such conditions. From the perspective of this present study we are particularly interested in the strategies used by guards and inmates for reducing the threat of coercive power intrinsic to the custodian role.

Zald's⁴⁸ analysis of five institutions for juvenile offenders provides an excellent account of the relationship between an institution's goals and its control structure. It is Zald's contention that the control structure will vary according to the organization's espoused goals such that institutions with custodial goals tend to concentrate power in top administrative positions whereas those with treatment goals have power widely distributed among several groups.

In addition to the literature cited in this chapter there is a considerable number of studies in the field of formal organizations which have relevance to the problem of this research. Some will be

⁴⁷ Gresham M. Sykes, The Society of Captives, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1958.

⁴⁸ Mayer N. Zald, "Organizational Control Structures in Five Correctional Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents", American Journal of Sociology, 68 (November 1962), 335-345.

mentioned in the following chapter in the context of this study's theoretical framework. In this chapter, however, we have restricted ourselves to a consideration of a number of structural features in the organization of mental hospitals and similar institutions which impinge upon the institutional life of the patient. In addition, we have considered the concept of the therapeutic milieu and shown those features which constitute its essential character. In the chapter which follows we shall relate these considerations to the central problem of this study and, within the theoretical rationale employed, demonstrate their application in generating certain hypotheses about the relationship between the mode of social control and inmate response.

CHAPTER 3

THE THEORY OF SOCIAL CONTROL AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR THE TREATMENT INSTITUTION

Theory of Authority and Control

Social control and authority are central problems in sociology because all social systems have to come to terms with the problem of order. Even the smallest social system is composed of individuals whose sentiments, interests, personalities and constitutions differ from each other. In organizations these differences are compounded by the size of the organization and by the fact that within every organization there is some division of labour based either on technical competence and social status or both. If the organization is to achieve its goals the efforts of its various members have to be co-ordinated and integrated in accordance with the organization's purpose. This means that some measure of control must be exerted over the activities of system members if the disruptive consequences resulting from personal interests are to be avoided. From this perspective, therefore, authority can be viewed as "the institutionalized patterns of rights and duties with regard to initiation, control, or direction in any respect of the activities of the members (of the organization)".¹

¹ Robert F. Bales, Interaction Content Analysis, as quoted in Paul S. Barabee, "A Study of a Mental Hospital," Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Harvard, 1951, p. 252.

In this study we take the universality of authority for granted. Our aim is to investigate the nature and types of authority which may be utilized in a specific organization, namely, an institution for emotionally disturbed children; our purpose in pursuing this aim is to attempt an evaluation of the effects of the organization's authority structure on its members. Our basic premise is that the forms of authority and control vary markedly from one type to the next and have various consequences for the organization under study. Therefore, it is necessary to consider not only the general concept of authority but also the various forms it may take and, concomitantly, the consequences which may accrue from these forms. To do this we must begin our study with an examination of some of the theoretical aspects of authority as they have been conceived by such writers as Weber, Simmel, Gouldner and Etzioni.

A considerable number of sociological studies of authority take their initial problem from Max Weber's theory of bureaucracy and from his conception of the nature and types of authority;² and since it can be justly said that he laid the groundwork for much of the subsequent investigations of the problem, especially in modern industrial societies with their large-scale organizations, we shall begin our consideration of the theoretical aspect of authority by an inspection of his conceptual

² Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Talcott Parsons (ed.), Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1947.

framework.

Weber's concern with authority was on a macroscopic level since, like many of the social theorists of his day, he was to a large extent preoccupied by the question as to the basis for order in society. Marx, for example, had argued that the explanation for social order lay primarily in economic interests and in the relationship which the members of society bore to the means of production; Pareto posited that it was to be found upon the existence of elites who controlled the instruments of force. Weber on the other hand suggested that while both these explanations contained a large measure of truth they were not in themselves complete explanations of the problem. He suggested, and went far in demonstrating his contention that the role of ideas and the value systems contingent on them were of paramount importance in providing any adequate explanation to the problem of social order. He maintained that the dominant idea system or normative order of any society gave rise to its own particular form of authority structure; from his comparative studies of several different civilizations he identified three major forms. The first two of these we shall mention only briefly as they seem to have limited application for the present research; the third we shall discuss more thoroughly and refer to repeatedly throughout this chapter.

The first type of authority he calls 'traditional authority'. It is that mode of authority which the members of a society believe has existed unchanged through time and which is deemed by them to be

imbued with sacred and inviolable qualities. Historically, it has been associated with societies where absolute monarchs held sway and where the social gulf between the ruler and the ruled was extremely great. Subordinates living under this system of authority, owed their allegiance directly to the monarch who in the popular conception epitomized the sanctity of tradition. In this system action was always legitimated by past precedent -- not by the exigencies of the moment.

'Charismatic authority', the second type mentioned by Weber, focuses legitimation in the person of the leader himself who is considered by his followers to be invested with supernatural power. Charismatic authority differs from the previous type in that it is the man himself who is considered to be imbued with inviolable and sacred qualities -- not because he symbolizes the sacredness of past tradition. Usually we associate charismatic authority with revolutionary religious figures such as Christ or Mohammed but such authority may also emerge within secular institutions. The latter instances are evidenced by such leaders as Hitler and Napoleon.³

³ For a further elaboration of both traditional and charismatic authority see Max Weber, on.cit., Chapter 4; also Max Weber, The Protestant Ethic and The Spirit of Capitalism, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958, passim.

These two types of authority have been mentioned here primarily for comparative purposes rather than as possible types applicable to modern organizations per se. Be that as it may, it is interesting to speculate upon the possibility of their occurrence within bureaucratic organizations. For example, the case of charismatic authority might be developed to apply to any organization where a personality such as Albert

The third type of authority mentioned by Weber is 'rational-legal authority', a type which he conceived as peculiar to the emergent bureaucratic phenomenon of modern industrial societies. In his view, this mode of authority was the essential characteristic which differentiated western society from all previous civilizations. Rational-legal authority was distinguished from all other forms of authority in that impersonal and abstract laws and rationality were the only legitimate basis for social action. As the mode of authority par excellence in modern industrial society it was intrinsic to both the highest levels of social organization and to the more mundane organizations of society. Thus, whether the case was that of a nation or a small manufacturing plant employing a score of workers, social action was predicated upon rationality and a system of abstract rules. In such a system, the individual is circumscribed by an elaborate constellation of rules and laws which have been generalized to apply not only to himself but equally to all other members of the particular social system concerned. For example, as an employee the individual is under the authority of company rules, rules which apply to all members of the organization irrespective of their individual situation; as a citizen, the individual is bound by laws that are universally applicable to all citizens and not simply to him as a special entity. As

3 (continued)

Schweitzer assumed directorship. Similarly with traditional authority; it might well be developed to apply to organizations where, for one reason or another, modern methods of administration were abandoned in favour of 'doing things the way they were done in the past'. (A situation of the latter type is Merton's example of an organization where conditions gave rise to rigidity and 'ritualism'; see, for example, Chapter 6 in Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.)

Parsons notes,

the fundamental source of authority in this type is the authority of the impersonal order itself. It extends to individuals only in so far as they occupy a specifically legitimized status under the rules, an office, and even their powers are limited to a sphere of competence as defined in the order. Outside this sphere they are treated as private individuals with no more authority than anybody else.⁴

As has been indicated above, authority as Weber conceived it rested upon a conception of legitimacy. Each of the three types of authority mentioned above is a form of power but power which in each case has been recognized by the majority of system members as right and proper and therefore legitimate. Thus, power per se is distinct from authority, for Weber defined the former as "the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance",⁵ whereas authority rests on the legitimate exercise of power. It can be seen that power as defined in this manner poses certain problems for empirical investigation since the instances of 'raw power' are extremely rare in any social system. Even in past history those who have held such absolute power appear to have been the exception rather than the rule. Thus when we consider power in the Weberian sense we must remember that it has little practical

⁴ Talcott Parsons introduction to Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, op. cit., p. 58.

⁵ Max Weber, op. cit., p. 152.

value for analytic purposes unless we attach the sanction of a certain kind of legitimation to it and then see it as representative of one of his three types of authority; traditional authority has as its legitimation past precedent, the legitimacy of charismatic authority is the sanctity of the leader himself, and in rational-legal authority legitimation resides in rules or laws.

As broad as Weber's theory of authority is, it nevertheless fails to come to terms with virtually any of the informal aspects of authority relationships. This is a serious failing since a great many studies have indicated that especially within organizations the informal relationships which develop can have just as much or in many instances more influence over the individual's behaviour than does the formal authority of the organization. Also as Peter Blau has pointed out Weber assumed that deviation from formal rules and regulations in the rational-legal system was dysfunctional especially if such deviance occurred within the context of a formal organization. This again is far from the actual situation since numerous studies have indicated that unofficial practices may further the efficiency of the organization, rather than hinder it. Aside from these specific criticisms, one of a more general and more critical nature requires mention. Weber touched upon but unfortunately did not elaborate affectual or ideal motives that impinge on any system of authority; in this respect he has left unexplored a very large area of social control. For example, authority may well be in the form of personal power so that the individual being

controlled is emotionally dependent on the superordinate individual. Also, where obedience is demanded by an individual in authority we frequently find that the power influencing the subordinate individual to comply is the power of social norms and values.

Some of the areas left out of Weber's analysis have been covered in Georg Simmel's essays on Superordination and Subordination.⁶ Simmel investigated the problem of authority from a more individualistic level than did Weber and discussed in considerable detail both the subjective and objective aspects, that is, from the individual's perspective and from the system level of analysis.

Simmel suggests that man is ambivalent in his attitude toward authority:

On the one hand (man) wants to be dominated. The majority of men not only cannot exist without leadership, they also feel they cannot: they seek the higher power which relieves them of responsibility; they seek a restrictive, regulatory vigor which protects them not only against the outside world but against themselves. But no less do they need opposition to the leading power, which only through this opposition through move and counter move, as it were, attains the right place in the life pattern of those who obey it. ⁷

Such ambivalence persists regardless of the source of domination. To understand better the nature of this ambivalence and the reciprocal character of authority relationships we must examine Simmel's typology

⁶ Georg Simmel, "Superordination and Subordination", part three in Kurt H. Wolff (ed.), The Sociology of Georg Simmel, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950.

⁷ Ibid., p. 193.

of superordination-subordination.

The first type of authority which he describes is subordination under an individual; that is, a single individual occupies the dominant position vis a vis another actor or a group of actors. Where a group occupies the subordinate position the nature of the relationship may take one of two forms: in the one, the group will find positive expression and unity in the person of the leader; in the other, the group forms a solidary opposition to the leader. In both forms ambivalence is present. As Simmel has indicated, people are aware of the necessity for leadership and desire it to give direction and a sense of purpose to their activities but at the same time they resent it and seek to impose limits on the leader. Even in situations where subordinates' interests are best served by the leader and where the nature of the authority relationship constitutes the first mentioned form, individual desires and interests make some degree of ambivalence inevitable.

The second type of authority relationship is subordination under a plurality. As Simmel envisages this type, the consequences for the subjective individual vary considerably according to the character of the superordinate group which may take any number of forms. One of the chief differences between this kind of subordination and the type previously mentioned lies in its impersonality; an authority relationship based on individual superordination tends to generate some feelings of personal association with the dominant figure; where the dominant

entity is a plurality this personal association is no longer possible because individual members of a corporate authority lose their identity in its totality. As a form of authority, corporate superordination can be particularly frustrating for the subordinate because responsibility for harsh decisions and dictates are ascribed to the corporate entity thus cloaking individual members with immunity. It is a form of authority where a subordinate is often particularly helpless.

The third type of subordination is subordination to a principle. It takes three major forms: subordination to the law, to an object, and to conscience. It will be seen that in the first two mentioned forms the objectivity and impersonality of authority is extremely great -- laws and ideologies stand above the individual and above society. Yet, in spite of the universalistic character of such an objective authority as law, it frequently poses lesser evils than individual or plural subordination in that it does not fall prey to personal whims and fancy or the irrationality of group behaviour.

Subordination to an object possibly imposes the most severe form of domination. The reason for this is that a man who becomes dominated by a "thing" tends to become little more than a depersonalized object himself. This is especially true in a system of patrimony where individuals are merely chattles belonging to the land itself.

Subordination to one's own conscience is the third form of domination by a principle. Here the individual is subject to what might best be called the moral imperatives of society internalized and acting

through the conscience as a check against the self's subjective egoism. Subordination to conscience is a critical type of domination for it forms the ultimate bridge between the self and society; and while Simmel does not elaborate extensively on this point, it must be appreciated that this form is an extremely complex type of subordination in as much as it is virtually impossible to determine when the individual is acting as self or as society personified as self. It does, however, focus attention on the confrontation by the individual with external reality, whatever the latter may be.

At this point we must ask what implications Simmel's theory has for organizational analysis. It appears that there are several important implications for correctional and treatment organizations. In many superordinate-subordinate relationships the subordinate person must submit only a part of his personality to the dominant force; it may be that part of his personality governing areas of technical expertise, his purely intellectual faculties, his emotions or sometimes his body but he is seldom called upon to submit his total personality to the dominant authority. In "total institutions" the segments of an individual's personality which fall under the force of authority comprise a very large portion of his total personality. In fact, these organizations are extremely demanding in that all but the individual's sentiments and feelings are subject to authority; in some instances even these latter components must be submitted. In prisons and many correctional institutions only the individual's emotions remain free

to any extent; in mental hospital and treatment organizations the further step is taken. Ideally in these organizations access to and control over the total personality is sought. It should be remembered that under the ideology of the treatment institution the individual is conceived as being emotionally ill and therefore all his time, actions, impulses, feelings and interests are under careful scrutiny and, if possible, direction so that remedial action may be taken. Those persons unable or unwilling to submit themselves in this fashion are commonly viewed by authorities as intractable and therefore incapable of effective treatment.

There is also another important implication for organizational analysis. If the structure of an organization is such that the domination is of an objective kind then the subordinate individual will tend to fare badly as far as his emotional needs are concerned; intimate personal matters are of no consequence in a system of detached authority. This is frequently the case in correctional institutions with the result that the individual is reduced to the level of a mere thing to be manipulated according to the needs of the organization; according to Simmel, this represents the harshest form of domination -- subjugation to an "object". It would appear, therefore, that in the case of the treatment institution where the superordinate powers require the individual to submit his total personality, an "objective" form of authority is inappropriate. In its place an authority based upon an intimate and personal relationship seems best suited.

The difficulty with Simmel's theory lies in its abstract quality. It goes without saying that the kinds of authority relationships elaborated by this writer are insightful and provide stimulating thought but much of what is offered remains at such a highly theoretical level that there is little room to manoeuver in the empirical instance. This seems especially so in the case of organizational analysis. The greatest asset of the theory appears to lie in its heuristic value but whether it can be transformed for purposes of organizational analysis is a practical problem to which only further experimentation can provide satisfactory clues.

Gouldner's approach to the analysis of authority is entirely different from either of the foregoing examples.⁸ His theory arises from an analysis of the bureaucratic structure of an empirical situation; thus his findings in one manufacturing plant lead him to suggest that organizational authority may be classified according to a three-fold typology.

The first category of authority is what he calls "mock bureaucracy". This kind of authority is characterized by rules and regulations imposed on the organization by external agencies. In "mock bureaucracy" both the management and the workers view these external rules as largely foreign to their interests and therefore of little importance. While lip service is paid to them they are largely ignored

⁸ Alvin W. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.

except in instances where representatives of the external agencies are present.

"Representative" bureaucracy, the second type of authority, is characterized by rules which have been worked out and agreed upon by both management and workers. Rules in this type of authority are usually perceived as embodying the interests and values of all parties concerned.

"Punishment-centered bureaucracy" is the third type of authority discussed by Gouldner. The focus here is on the interests of the company and of the administration insofar as the latter symbolizes the company's interests. Rules in this system are initiated by the company's executives without consultation with workers; in this sense these rules are imposed on the workers and they are subordinate to them. However, punishment-centered bureaucracy can work in the opposite direction as well; through their union workers may impose regulations and restrictions on the company and these must be adhered to just as strictly as those formulated by the company. Implicit in this type of authority is the rule by force.

It will be noticed in the above conception of authority that none of the three types is mutually exclusive; elements of each type can be present in an organization. Also, it is evident that this scheme has definite advantage in allowing the researcher to assess and identify the various types of authority found in organizations. The difficulty with the typology seems to be that its usefulness is largely restricted

to organizations of an economic kind. There are a great many organizations where it is hard to imagine the lower echelons participating in decision making processes; among such institutions one can readily think of grade schools, a number of religious institutions, military organizations, some correctional institutions and mental hospitals. Moreover, there are many organizations with an authority structure which under Gouldner's schema could only be categorized as punishment centered; by attempting to force an organization's pattern of authority into one particular class we may run the risk of distorting an accurate analysis of its functions. This is particularly true of many socializing and treatment organizations; one cannot accurately label their authority systems as punishment-centered even though they may at times give evidence of arbitrary authority. Yet in this theory we are at a loss to find an appropriate alternative. The evidence seems to suggest that Gouldner's theory allows limited possibility for generalizing to complex organizations other than those whose functions are primarily economic. Therefore, we have rejected it as a possible analytical framework in the present instance.

The last theory that we shall call attention to here is the one we have used as the analytical framework for the present research. This is Etzioni's theory of organizational compliance structures.⁹ Etzioni points out that there have been considerable shortcomings in

⁹ Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.

the studies of bureaucratic organizations. One of the faults of students of these organizations has been their tendency to overgeneralize the findings of small-scale studies to a wide range of organizational analysis. Another has been that fault usually ascribed to grand-scales theorists namely that of construct-universal models of the "Ideal Type" which when applied to the empirical situation of ten fail to accommodate the facts as they are found. Etzioni's work is an attempt to rectify these shortcomings by offering a middle range theory which can be applied to studies of comparative analysis of bureaucratic organizations. To achieve this desirable convergence of theory with empirical reality Etzioni proposes as the basis for comparative analysis the concept of compliance.

Compliance, as envisaged by this writer, is used to refer to both the structural aspect of the organization, the type of power it utilizes to implement its directives, and, the motivational component of individual actors within the organization namely the type of commitment they make to the organization.

Etzioni suggests that power is not of a single kind but differs according to the "means" which an organization employs to make subjects comply. These "means" constitute three major kinds of power:

1 Coercive Power

Coercive power rests on the application, or threat of application, of physical sanctions such as the infliction of pain, deformity or death; generation of frustration through restriction of movement; or controlling through force the satisfaction of needs such as those of food, sex, comfort and the like.

2 Remunerative Power

Remunerative power is based on control over material resources and rewards through the allocation of salaries and wages, commissions and contributions, 'fringe benefits', services and commodities.

3 Normative Power

Normative power rests on the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards and deprivations through employment of leaders, manipulation of mass media, allocation of esteem and prestige symbols, administration of ritual, and influence over the distribution of 'acceptance' and 'positive response'. 10

The second component of compliance similarly comprises three types of commitment or involvement: "alienative involvement" indicates that members have a negative orientation to the organization; "calculative involvement" indicates either a positive or negative involvement of rather low intensity; and "moral involvement" indicates an orientation of high positive intensity and of a positive quality.

When combined these two components form a three-fold typology of compliance which together with specific variations comprise an exhaustive classification for all types of organizations.

Etzioni's analytical schema does not halt here, however. It is expanded to demonstrate how the correlates of compliance -- organizational goals, elites, patterns of communication, and socialization -- all complement each other to form a consistent organizational structure. For example, organizations will have goals that are

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 5.

in conformity with their compliance structures and organizations with similar compliance structures tend to have similar goals. Since there are three major types of compliance structures there are also three major organizational goals: organizations with "order" goals are in some way concerned with controlling actors who are perceived as deviant by the wider society, organizations having "economic" goals have as their objective the production of goods or services for profit and organizations with "cultural" goals are concerned with the creation, preservation of cultural values.

Etzioni asserts that, in general, organizations are under pressure to be effective in the pursuit of their particular goals and therefore he believes that organizations having less structural strain are apt to be more efficient. He suggests that when the type of power utilized by the organization is congruent with the motivational orientation of members there is less possibility of structural strain and therefore more likelihood of efficiency in the pursuit of goals. Whether this is in fact the case is open to discussion and we intend to examine this contention.

In the present instance, the strength of Etzioni's theory seems to lie in its usefulness for analyzing the contingencies of power and authority. And while the effectiveness of an organization is undoubtedly an important consideration we are of the opinion that some organizations do not lend themselves to a satisfactory analysis of this particular problem. Therefore, rather than applying the theory to this

kind of problem we are using it as a framework for the analysis of the contingencies of authority; in doing so it is hoped that some light will be focused on the second component of compliance, the motivational orientation of members and, on such correlates as consensus, member solidarity, attitudes toward the organization and the concrete manifestation of these as found in the overt behaviour of members.

Before leaving this discussion of the theoretical perspectives of authority brief mention must be made of two other relevant studies. Both are of particular significance for the present research since they pertain to children.

The first of these is Jean Piaget's study of rules in marble playing among a group of Swiss children.¹¹ He is concerned with the formation of morality in children and perceives its development as coterminus with the gradual appreciation of rules in childhood games. In their growth and maturation children pass through progressive stages in the application of rules to games; each of these stages is related to the child's perception of rules. For example, the very young child perceives rules as received unconsciously and have little connotation or meaning other than a purely ritual character; later, between the ages of two to eight, rules are recognized as imposed externally, as emanating from adults and lasting forever; in the final stage rules lose their sacred quality and are seen as resulting from mutual consent.

¹¹ Jean Piaget, The Moral Judgement of the Child, New York: The Free Press, 1965.

The final stage is characterized by co-operation and by an elaboration of the rules which Piaget asserts is the truly social stage of the child's development.

It appears that what Piaget is saying is that in the child's early development rules are imposed on the individual from an external source. The child accepts this and tends to view rules as having a sacred and unchanging quality. Later in the child's development (around the age of ten) rules cease to become external and coercive but are based upon a conception of co-operation. At this point rules become autonomous and emanate from the pattern of reciprocal relations between the individual and other members of his peer group. In short, the authority which governs individual action is the 'rational ideal' inherent in the principle of reciprocity.

If we are to accept Piaget's argument then it would seem that the dominate force governing the relationships of children is the rule of reciprocity among themselves. External restraint and coercion by adults or elders are of secondary importance. Thus rules and laws are of importance and are judged as fair in so far as they have the support of the majority of the peer group; ideas of the just and unjust have no external reference point but the group itself.

If this is the actual situation with children then it would seem that the theory has particular relevance for the treatment or correctional institution for children. As applied to such institutions the theory would allow us to suggest that rules imposed by adults will

have less impact for eliciting conformity than the autonomous rules emanating from the reciprocal relationships of the inmate group itself. To induce commitment to acceptable social values, therefore, clinicians and researchers in treatment centres might well find it profitable to see how Piaget's theory might be implemented. For example, if inmate group norms run counter to those espoused by the formal authority structure and if the former set of norms constitute the conditioning agent of 'morality' then we would suggest that effective treatment is rather a hopeless task. Perhaps an institution's endeavours at treatment might be greatly enhanced if a core of well adjusted inmates were to serve as the primary socializing and therefore treatment agents in the institutions.

Actually, Piaget's study opens an extremely interesting avenue of approach to the problem of treating disturbed children. But before embarking on such an approach it would seem wise to investigate the relative impact of various modes of authority on children. For example, studies could be carried out to assess the degree of influence that externally imposed authority has for individual action; this could be compared with traditional authority and subsequently with authority as it arises out of mutual co-operation among equals. If extensive research were to support Piaget's contentions and the techniques applied to disturbed children the treatment centre as it is presently constituted might indeed prove to be as archaic as medieval dungeons.

The studies of Lewin, Lippit and White offer a further perspective

of the nature of authority.¹² In their first research experimental work groups consisting of ten and eleven year old children were studied under alternate forms of leadership -- democratic and autocratic. Their findings suggest that under autocratic leadership the group structure tended to be somewhat unstable, individual aggressiveness increased, scapegoating emerged and attitudes were egoistically oriented rather than group oriented. Under a democratic form of leadership group solidarity and cohesiveness was heightened, interaction between members was mutually supportive and constructive, and scapegoating did not occur. In a second study the groups were augmented by the introduction of a "laissez-faire" form of leadership. The findings in this study indicate that aggressive acts were highest under "laissez-faire" authority and lowest under an autocracy. These results have to be in part qualified because of the nature of the experiment: the researchers moved boys from one group to another at different intervals with the result that while aggressive reaction was not always the response to autocracy, hostility towards it was invariably high; the reaction to autocracy was either apathy or aggression. Boys under a democratic or "laissez-faire" authority liked their leader; this was not the case with autocratic leaders.

¹² Kurt Lewin and Ronald Lippitt, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note", Chapter 10 in Hare, Borgatta and Bales (eds.), Small Groups, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.

In the field of small group research the Lewin, Lippitt and White studies have been the outstanding efforts in evaluating reaction to various forms of authority. Yet, important as they are, they have a number of weaknesses which limit their usefulness in the present context. It must be remembered that the groups studied were only present in the experimental situation for very short periods of time and then under highly contrived surroundings. Boys were free to exempt themselves from the groups if they felt so disposed as a few did. In the residential treatment setting children are present twenty-four hours a day and subject to whatever mode of authority predominates. Their involvement is total involvement and the reality which surrounds their daily lives is not contrived. It seems extremely doubtful that the findings of this study could be generalized to cover empirical situations where an authoritarian type of leadership exists. Nevertheless these writers have pointed to some of the contingencies of authority which have relevance for the present research: the level of aggression and hostility, tension and attitudes, as these are associated with alternate modes of authority.

Correctional Institutions and Their Goals

Correctional institutions rarely have just one goal as their raison d'etre. Almost invariably they have multiple goals among which custody and treatment tend to emerge as the most important. Moreover, if one were to take a random sample of correctional institutions and

examine their goals it would likely be found that they could be placed along a hypothetical continuum. At the one extreme there would be those with harsh and repressive goals like concentration camps and, at the other there would be those with treatment and care goals. Close to the first mentioned end of the continuum one might find traditionally oriented institutions and maximum security prisons. In these institutions there is relatively little emphasis on rehabilitation and although inmate work programs may be incorporated as an organizational feature they are not oriented to the needs of the individuals concerned; rather, such vocational programs as may exist are usually of a pragmatic nature serving organizational or state needs. In these institutions the primary goal is custody or, in the extreme position, extermination. Further along the continuum towards the centre one might find what Mayer Zald calls "benign-custodial institutions".¹³ These are institutions whose goals are more clearly split between custody and rehabilitation. It has been suggested by some writers¹⁴ that these organizations pay lip service to treatment needs and have successfully eliminated the worst aspects of repressive control but have not yet implemented full treatment or rehabilitative programs. Many such institutions still rely heavily

¹³ Mayer H. Zald, "Comparative Analysis and Measurement of Organizational Goals: The Case of Correctional Institutions for Delinquents", a research report for the National Institute of Health, (USPHS, M2104), Chicago, August, 1962.

¹⁴ See Robert D. Vinter and Morris Janowitz, op. cit.

on mass handling and mass programming of inmate activities as opposed to meeting the particular needs of prisoners. At the other side of the continuum are those institutions that have largely de-emphasized custody in favour of treatment goals. These institutions like the one under study here have more of an "open-door" policy and spend the greatest part of staff energies in helping the individual inmate adjust his behaviour and attitudes to ones that are acceptable to the wider society. Custody may indeed be important in these institutions but it is a secondary concern to that of treatment.

Custody and treatment are goals which to a very large degree are incompatible with each other. Admittedly both custodial and treatment institutions have to deal with basically the same problem, that of providing facilities for those individuals who have demonstrated that they cannot function adequately in the wider society and who in the opinion of some delegated authority must be segregated from the main stream of social life. The thing which differentiates institutions is the mechanism employed to meet this basic task. One mechanism, characteristic of custodial institutions is repressive control, the other mechanism, associated with treatment institutions is normative control.¹⁵ In order to understand why these techniques and their associated goals are incompatible some appreciation of their respective value orientations is required.

¹⁵ The concept of 'normative' control was discussed in the preceding section dealing with Etzioni's theory of compliance structures. See page 57 of this thesis.

To begin, we shall take the case of the concentration camp. It's function can only be understood within the context of certain kinds of political regimes, usually totalitarian ones. In such regimes it is generally understood that the state through the personification of its leader (or leaders) prescribe in an authoritarian manner some definition of the common good which is deemed to be coincident with the good of the state. The stability of a totalitarian state rests on the absence of threat to its objectives; within the state the threat to instability manifests itself most readily in political opposition. Thus vociferous opponents of the state present a threat to social order. To maintain social order the state employs the mechanism of the concentration camp where non-conformists may be silenced permanently or at least segregated so that their presence no longer presents a disturbing influence.¹⁶ Not so completely different is the case of traditional prisons with oppressive regimentation programs. These institutions like that of the concentration camp must be understood within the context of wider social values. As we know, one of the pre-eminent values of Western society, especially capitalist society, is the institution of private property. Property is sacrosanct and must be protected against those who would violate the public morality. Individuals who demonstrate a disregard for this prime value must either be

¹⁶ For an elaboration of the methods of control in concentration camps, see Elie A. Cohen, Human Behaviour in the Concentration Camp, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1953.

punished or at least segregated in places where their aberrant ways no longer pose a threat to public order. To a somewhat lesser degree those who have offended other moral values pertinent to life and sexual codes must also be contained in a place of safe-keeping.

In both of the above instances it can be seen that the primary concern is with protection either of property or of dogmatic doctrines; the function of each, stated in broad terms, is to provide society or the state with a means of maintaining social order. According to Etzioni's theory of compliance structures, organizations which have been given a mandate to contain and control the activities of non-conformists have "order goals";¹⁷ generally speaking "order goals" are primarily negative since the organization has been entrusted with the task of preventing, either permanently or temporarily the recurrence of acts viewed as threatening the social order of the wider society.

On the other hand, institutions that are predominantly concerned with treatment and rehabilitation of inmates can be conceptualized as having "cultural goals".¹⁸ For example, in the case of the residential treatment centre it can be understood as attempting to create or reinforce certain values which the wider society or some segment of it deems important. In that sense it has a positive function and is thus

¹⁷ See the discussion on page 57 of this thesis for a more complete account of the theory of "order" and "cultural" goals.

¹⁸ Ibid, pp. 57-8.

distinct from both the traditional prison and the concentration camp.

It provides a service in as much as it endeavours to

institutionalize conditions needed for the creation and preservation of symbolic objects, their application and the creation or reinforcement of commitments to such objects. [It] also contributes to the preservation of the cultural heritage by transferring it from generation to generation, mainly through teaching. 19

Both treatment institutions and traditional prisons are entrusted with the responsibility of handling social deviates and both constitute places where such people may be segregated from the rest of society. However, they differ markedly from each other in the nature of their goals and particularly in their mode of handling their respective populations. To a large degree their respective goals determine the way in which they handle their inmate population; custodial institutions prescribe methods of handling which run counter to those utilized in treatment institutions thus making the goal of treatment incompatible with that of custody. A brief discussion of these divergent methods of handling inmate populations will demonstrate the basic conflict between custody and treatment.

In the traditional prison the focus is on confinement and close surveillance of inmates; inmates are present in the institution to have their deviant activities curtailed and controlled. They are all seen as being more or less alike, as wilfully or negligently deviant and therefore requiring discipline. Since they are alike, the emphasis

¹⁹ Amitai Etzioni, op. cit., p. 73.

is on mass handling -- a condition which requires the individual to adapt himself to the institution's value system. The individual is a nonentity in a crowd of similar social outcasts. The maintenance of order within the institution and the unerring conformity to institutional regimentation are the prime virtues and the only ones of any real import to the administration whose responsibility is to ensure order.

On the other hand, treatment institutions focus attention on the individual; here the organization adapts itself, to a fairly large degree, to the client. The client's feelings and desires are important and therefore the staff are concerned with strategies of 'reaching' the individual through psychotherapeutic techniques and through marshalling the total institutional environment for therapeutic purposes. And while it is obvious that the client must be present within the institution before therapy can be attempted, the emphasis on custody is a secondary consideration. Surveillance strictly from a negative perspective is minimal and in its place is found a relatively free atmosphere intended to allow the client maximum scope for developing in a positive direction.

It can be seen therefore that an institution which offers relative freedom of movement and activity for the purpose of inducing change from its clients will have an organizational climate diametrically opposed to one where every activity is closely restricted and circumscribed by a myriad of rules and regulations. In the one, the staff is primarily concerned with organizational needs, in the other, with

the needs of the individual. It is not inconceivable that the two goals might be present within the same institution but the evidence from concrete instances casts doubt on the probability of such a situation. Almost invariably either custody or treatment will emerge as the dominant orientation; when it does, the other must take second place.

Organizational Effectiveness and Social Control

One method of evaluating organizational effectiveness is to assess the extent to which the organization achieves its objectives or goals. In many organizations, particularly those with economic goals, the criteria of effectiveness are fairly well established.²⁰ Unfortunately, in prisons, mental hospitals and treatment institutions the criteria of effectiveness is quite vague or ill-defined. This is in part due to the lack of clarity in organizational goals and in part to the difficulty of assessing the success of the means used in implementing goals. A second method of gauging organizational effectiveness is

²⁰ It should be noted, however, that even in organizations having economic goals the criteria of effectiveness, namely, making a profit, is not as clear cut as it seems. Some researchers have suggested that other criteria such as organizational productivity, organizational flexibility and, absence of intra-organizational strain may be more useful in evaluating effectiveness. See B. S. Georgopoulos and A. S. Tannenbaum, "Organizational Effectiveness", American Sociological Review, 22 (October 1957), 534-540.

the system model of analysis suggested by Etzioni.²¹ Here the question is not "how devoted is the organization to its goal" but rather "under the given conditions how does the organizational allocation of resources approach an optimum distribution."²²

However, in organizations such as prisons, mental hospitals and treatment institutions the system model also poses problems for analyzing effectiveness; the problem is that of determining just when the allocation of resources approaches 'an optimum distribution'. The difficulties with both systems are especially evident in assessing the effectiveness of an organization's authority structure and its method of social control. This can best be demonstrated by reference to two recent studies.

In Sykes' study of a maximum security prison²³ it was found that

²¹ Etzioni has suggested that the goal model of analyzing organizational effectiveness is inadequate because it usually shows that organizations do not realize goals and because it frequently shows that organizations have goals other than the ones they claim. See Amitai Etzioni, "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique and Suggestion", Administrative Science Quarterly, 5 (September 1960), 257-278.

²² For an elaboration of the usefulness of this model for analyzing effectiveness particularly in welfare organizations see Herman D. Stein, "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness", Research in Social Welfare Administration, New York: The National Association of Social Workers, 1962, pp. 22-32.

²³ Gresham Sykes, op. cit.

the organization was called upon to pursue three tasks: to punish offenders, to deter them from further deviant acts, and to reform them. Unfortunately, these objectives could not be pursued in any coherent policy. Given the conditions of the prison it is in fact very doubtful if the last two goals could be achieved to any appreciable degree. Obviously, the goal of reforming over 1,200 inmates is virtually impossible given the overwhelming preoccupation of the officials with maintaining order. The administration simply does not expect to be effective in reforming inmates. Similarly with the goal of deterrence, the rate of recidivism provides ample proof that effectiveness in the pursuit of this goal is not achieved. Only the goal of punishment is met within this type of organization; but even here one might well ask by what criteria can this objective be judged to be effectively achieved.

The second study which illustrates the problem of evaluating organizational effectiveness in correctional institutions is Howard Polsky's analysis of Hollymeade, a residential treatment centre for juvenile delinquents.²⁴ The goal of this organization was to reform inmates through a psychotherapeutic treatment program. The institution appeared to have ample facilities to pursue this task; there was an adequate number of capable case workers and therapists, the institutional climate was non-punitive and reasonably permissive and the ideals of the 'therapeutic community' comprised the orientation.

²⁴ Howard S. Polsky, op. cit.

Yet in spite of these conditions the organization failed rather badly in achieving its objective. Individual boys at Hollymeade used the permissive atmosphere to assert their physical superiority over other boys and assumed the role of leader within the cottage setting. Permissiveness provided them with an environment where their old values of fraud, violence, manipulation and chicanery found not only sympathy and acceptance but also reinforcement. The cottage setting as it developed at Hollymeade constituted a deviant subculture within the overall organization; it was a system in which the inmates were at home and one to which they were morally committed. The organization's ideology and value system was completely rejected by the boys except insofar as it could be used to manipulate staff. Cottage parents who were in closest contact with the boys and knew the situation were helpless to do anything about it. All meaningful authority had been denied them by the professional staff who viewed them as having no significant place in the treatment program. The professional staff on the other hand felt that they were closest to the boys as they were dealing with them personally from an intimate and highly technical perspective; in fact the professional workers were farthest removed from the situation and subsequently were quite ignorant of the cottage subculture. Such a situation made the achievement of treatment goals virtually impossible.

While the above mentioned studies are hardly a sufficient sample from which to generalize they do illustrate some of the difficulties involved in assessing effectiveness of control techniques in

correctional institutions. The situation is similar in a residential treatment centre for disturbed children because it is extremely difficult to know when you are effectively treating a disturbed youngster. This is complicated by the fact that a treatment institution is usually concerned both with the immediate short-run objectives of setting limits on behaviour and with the long-run goal of inducing permanent change in the children. In some instances it may be a relatively simple matter to effect short-run changes in behaviour and attitudes but there is no assurance that such changes will be permanent. One cannot be sure that the adjustment made by the individual is simply adjustment relative to the institution concerned. Whether the long-range goal has been achieved can only be evaluated some ten or fifteen years later and to date there have been very few institutions making such evaluations of their effectiveness.

In the treatment setting, as in the previously mentioned correctional institutions, it is quite impossible to measure effectiveness in terms of the organization's goals. If the system model of calculating effectiveness is used we run into difficulty in utilizing the suggested criteria.²⁵ For example, organizational productivity is a criterion which has no operational definition in the field of client centred therapy; absence of intra-organizational strain is quite inconceivable in institutions where the energies of the staff are largely

²⁵ For an elaboration of this criteria see B. S. Georgopoulos and A. S. Tannenbaum, op. cit.

concerned with managing emotional conflicts and tensions. Only the one criterion of organizational flexibility offers possibilities for analysis.

These same problems are present when an examination of social control is made. Social control is of central importance to the matter of organizational effectiveness but there is considerable difficulty in assessing the success of various control techniques. Especially in treatment institutions the questions which have to be asked repeatedly, and to which there are no hard and fast guide-lines, are 'what should appropriate staff behaviour be?' and 'what mode of control will best elicit commitment to acceptable norms and values?'. Arguments range back and forth between those who hold that an authoritarian approach is more effective and those who feel guided permissiveness is best. Unfortunately, we are unable to judge the validity of either viewpoint.

In the present research there is no intention of proving one mode of social control's superiority to another's. We take the neutral stance that the most effective type of organizational structure has yet to be determined. We have, however, selected a number of variables associated with the formal value system of the treatment institution and examined which mode of control is more effective in inducing attitudes and behaviour appropriate to it.

Social Control Within the Treatment Setting

The residential treatment centre belongs to a particular class

of organization. It is what Robert Vinter has called a 'people-changing' organization and as such belongs to that class of organizations which has been established primarily for the purpose of effecting change in the behaviour and attitudes of its members.²⁶ The school, university, monastery, political indoctrination centre, mental hospital and corrective institutions all belong to this general class. The functions of such organizations include socialization and social control. However, the emphasis on these functions will vary according to the particular nature of the organization. The school, for example, places emphasis on socialization, the prison and similar types of corrective institutions stress control and the mental hospital and military institutions emphasize both functions; the treatment institution also is concerned with both functions. Yet within this broad category of 'people-changing' organizations the residential treatment centre must be viewed as a special kind of organization.

One of the crucial distinctions between the residential treatment centre and organizations such as schools is the nature of the change sought. The school, for example, seeks to imbue its population -- pupils -- with certain values, skills and attitudes; this it does, generally speaking, on a "fresh" population -- one that has not been socialized in a similar manner before. The school's function, therefore, is to impart new knowledge to its clientele, a clientele commonly perceived to be developing normally. The residential treatment centre

²⁶ Robert D. Vinter, op. cit.

on the other hand is a re-socializing agency; its function, like that of the mental hospital and certain other correctional institutions, is to "correct" attitudes and values. This distinction between a straight-forward socializing agency and a treatment agency is summarized by

Vinter:

Primary schools, youth-serving agencies, seek to prepare individuals for adequate performance of their social roles. The persons worked with are perceived as moving along a normal developmental gradient. In general, it is presumed that these persons are motivated to change and that the essential task is to facilitate their development through provision of requisite facilities and by design of appropriate learning opportunities.

Treatment organizations in contrast, seek to resolve problems of deviance and serve persons who have demonstrated that they are not following normal developmental gradients, and for one reason or another are not actually performing conventional social roles. Delinquents and criminals, the emotionally disturbed and the chronically unemployed are regarded as possessing defective attributes or as improperly motivated and oriented. Their behaviour is disapproved; conditions in their past or present life situations are believed to be adverse and likely to impede change efforts. 27

The clientele in the treatment centre under study here conforms to the description presented in the second paragraph above. Children have been admitted to this treatment centre because they have presented a threat to the public interest and to themselves or because their behaviour has offended conventional morality. In one important sense, therefore, they have been institutionalized for containment against

²⁷ Ibid., pp. 4-5.

further disruptive behaviour; in an equally important sense they have been admitted to this particular centre because it is felt that they are amenable to change and to proper social adjustment. The task, therefore, of the treatment institution is to contain its clients in order to induce desirable changes in them. This is the point at which the matter of social control becomes a prime concern; the question facing the institution is "what mode of control is necessary to contain the disruptive behaviour of disturbed children and at the same time elicit from them commitment to the values and behaviour pattern espoused by the institution?"

As has been pointed out in the previous sections of this chapter the strategies of control vary widely. Some of these strategies tend to alienate an inmate population, others help to induce a positive commitment. Where the mode of control is coercive and authoritarian one usually finds a high level of deprivation. In some instances it has been found that the reaction to this is a "prisonized" response; this is evidenced by a negative attitude towards the staff and institution and a view of the institution as a kind of prison. Inmate group allegiances develop with values in opposition to those of the organization; inmate solidarity is characterized by defensive mechanisms; illicit and secret acts along with disruptive behaviour tend to increase. Where the opposite organizational strategy is employed, namely, a treatment approach with a permissive orientation the inmates tend to organize relationships around friendship patterns rather than

defense patterns. The level of integration is heightened; the kind of reward and punishment system existing in the inmate group tends to be more consistent with staff conceptions of appropriate response. Attitudes toward the staff and institution take a positive orientation and overt behaviour becomes less hostile.

Implicit in the above contrasts is that inmates under an authoritarian system will be less inclined to identify with the organization's value system and hence less disposed to changing their old attitudes and behaviour; an opposite tendency is thought to be consistent with the more permissive approach. Having said this, however, there is still a very real awareness that the therapeutic milieu which utilizes a permissive type of control, does not solve all the problems related to its "people changing" function. There is in fact little concrete evidence to support any contention that the treatment environment actually does induce permanent commitment to positive social values. To those who see such a method of institutional organization as a cure-all we would say this: as a method of treatment the milieu therapy approach is an orientation to be experimented with and adapted according to current exigencies; in itself, it is not a solution to the complicated remedial problem.

We have stated the above to make explicit the limitation of the present research. Where treatment is concerned we are still in doubt as to the most effective organizational structure for inducing acceptance of "normal" standards of behaviour. Once again therefore it

must be stated. The present research is not directed toward proving any one method's superiority. We shall analyze the relationship between control and the kind of behaviour mentioned on the previous page but we cannot prove the link between positive attitudes and behaviour and effective character change. The latter requires long range and intensive research.

Mount Saint Joseph Institute

1 The Inmate Population

Mount Saint Joseph Institute is a residential treatment centre which serves an inmate population of between fifteen and twenty boys. As previously stated, the number of boys in residence at the time of the research was fifteen. The function of the institution, stated in broad terms, is a positive one, namely to provide treatment and care for the children under its direction. None of the boys is viewed as being wilfully delinquent. Rather, they are all conceived as youngsters who have been damaged emotionally or who have inadequate personalities; some have been socialized through various subcultural groups such as family or neighbourhood associates in some manner which is socially deviant. They could be described as exhibiting an "inability to internalize social norms and to restrain impulsivity, or to achieve a viable state of emotional integration."²⁸ More specifically, therefore, Mount

²⁸ This description was made by Vinter and Janowitz in discussing the personality syndrome of children in institutions similar to the one under study here. Robert Vinter and Morris Janowitz, op. cit.

Saint Joseph has as its function to aid in the development of effective personal controls in the children under its care so that they may properly perform acceptable social roles.

The boys in Mount Saint Joseph Institute demonstrate, in varying degrees, a lack of self control. This is manifested by impulsive behaviour such as aggressive outbursts, stealing, hyperactivity, the use of obscene language and by running away. Frequently such activity on the part of one boy will have a spontaneous effect and spread through a large segment of the inmate population, with the result that the institution finds itself periodically faced with an unsettling state of affairs. At such times the staff and administration endeavour to assess the situation and in so doing raise the question as to whether the means of social control currently being used is effective as a means of maintaining order.

As we have indicated previously, the institutional atmosphere was what might best be called a milieu therapy approach. There was a conscientious effort by administration and staff to work out the most viable program possible given the task at hand. Consistent with this was a conscientious effort to allow a certain amount of 'acting-out' on the part of the boys as long as it took place within reasonable limits and did not culminate in destructive and harmful aggression. There was a realization that group living imposes frustrations, that living in an institution away from home and parents means deprivation, that learning the need for self control can be extremely onerous for children who have been exposed to few controls in the past. For these reasons

there was a tolerance and acceptance by the staff of the need for these boys to express hostility and aggression. At the same time, there was a realization that the institution had been given a mandate to maintain order, to exercise control over behaviour which the wider society saw as undesirable and, to impart to inmates an appreciation of the need for sustaining selfcontrol. The problem which faced Mount Saint Joseph Institute, therefore, was that of assessing what methods of social control would best satisfy the needs of the organization and those of the boys. To understand the problem and its implication for the institution a brief account of its authority structure and the nature of control is required.

2 Authority Structure

In Mount Saint Joseph Institute, as in all organizations, there is a division of labour and a hierarchy of authority. The kind of authority structure and the division of labour which is found in Mount Saint Joseph conforms quite closely to the "simple undifferentiated system" described by Henry²⁹ in his analysis of Bettelheim's Orthogenic School for disturbed children. There is a director who is responsible for over-all control and to whom all subordinates are responsible; he is in charge of the activity and treatment programs and is in addition a clinical psychologist who conducts much of the individual

²⁹ Jules Henry, "Types of Institutional Structure", in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams (eds.), op. cit., pp. 73-90.

psychotherapy and testing. Working along with the director is a clinical social worker who is also responsible for individual therapy; his duties include counseling the parents or foster parents so that a greater liaison can be developed between them, the institution and the boys. Augmenting the professional services of these two men is a staff of ten trained child care workers. In describing their function it should be remembered that the responsibility for rehabilitating emotionally disturbed children is in fact a relatively undifferentiated task because treatment is a full-time, twenty-four hour a day process. All of the staff form a team in this process; and while the director and social worker spend considerable time with the boys the great weight of ongoing therapy falls heavily on the shoulders of the child care workers for they are the ones working with the children all through the day.

3 The Institutional Routine

The nature of this undifferentiated task follows a fairly regular course. A typical day starts at 7:30 A.M. when the child care workers see to waking, washing and dressing of boys; the workers on duty then have breakfast with them and following, help get them ready for school. During school hours if workers are not planning activities for later in the day or writing up reports on any particular problems which have occurred during the night they are usually assisting individual boys, helping them with their spelling, arithmetic or some such matter that a boy is having special difficulty with. At recess time usually two workers are on duty in the yard and playground or, if it

happens to be a wet day, in the gymnasium. At lunch time workers eat with the boys sitting with them at their tables, serving them and helping in the management of any problems which may arise. At four o'clock workers are again on hand in the various game rooms or dormitories as the boys return from school; there they may be involved in managing tensions or frustrations that have developed in the classroom and in discussing the planning of after-school activities with the boys. Supper is at 5:30 P.M.; like lunchtime it is a further time for therapeutic management. After supper is activity time; activities may comprise organized recreation in the playground or gymnasium, shop projects, watching television, playing ping-pong, writing letters home, listening to the latest 'hit parade' or Beattle song, or any number of such things. During this time workers are responsible for supervising activities, providing support to boys with particular tensions, limiting the behaviour of those who become hyperactive or disturbingly impulsive; as well they must act as therapist and confident. In short they must assume a broad perspective of responsibilities.

Bedtime which is about 8:30 P.M. is a time that can be very stress-producing both for the workers and the boys; it is often that point of the day when childrens' anxieties find greatest expression. Much of the workers' time and talents, therefore, have to be spent in calming these sometimes overwhelming anxieties by reading bedtime stories to the younger boys, staying with them frequently late into the

night and in the case of older boys limiting by various means their restless behaviour.

What has just been described is more or less a typical day but there are many alternatives. Workers may be responsible for taking a group of boys on a shopping trip, a field trip to a park or farm and during the summer months to the municipale swimming pool; at various times of the year he (or she) helps to plan parties and special outings. Thus it may be seen that the nature of the undifferentiated task of the therapeutic process imposes broad demands on all the staff to the degree that the organization functions as a single unit. Treatment is not a segmented process.

4 Social Control

Since our primary concern in this study is to focus on the implications of social control we must indicate how the patterns of control fit into this undifferentiated authority system. Corporal punishment per se is not utilized in Mount Saint Joseph Institute. Controls are exercised in the first instance by reasoning with the boys who indicate their behaviour is getting out of hand. If, for example, the disturbance occurs in the playground, the worker will call a boy apart from the others and try to work out with him the reason for the particular difficulty and in so doing examines whether there is a better way for the boy to handle his emotions. If this does not succeed and the boy persists in his behaviour he usually is separated

from the other boys for a short period either in his dormitory or at least somewhere inside the building where he can settle down. There are certain periods during the day when such impulsive behaviour becomes more pronounced; these are meal times, especially lunch and supper, after school when the boys are free in the playground and in the evening around bedtime. The actual form that such behaviour takes varies with individual boys; some will repeatedly direct their hostility and aggression towards other boys inciting a fight; sometimes the object of aggression is the worker. Frequently, frustrations are taken out in destructive acts to property, either the boy's own or that of some other boy; in some cases property belonging to the institution bears the brunt of an angry boy. Quite often an upset boy will manifest his lack of self control through hyperactivity; hyperactivity can pose just as serious a problem as any other form of outburst since it frequently has a spontaneous effect among the other boys. Among some of the children acting-out takes the form of stealing either from other boys or the kitchen, or, when the opportunity is present, from an outside store. Other prominent forms of acting-out are refusal to settle at bedtime and running away. In some instances boys seek an escape from reality by withdrawing to their own peculiar fantasy world; this, of course, does not pose any serious control problem but when boys come to rely very heavily on it, it does become a problem of emotional management and one which may require considerable attention from workers. Our main concern here, however, is with the previously

mentioned forms of acting-out.

If separation for short periods does not prove to be effective in curtailing an individual's disruptive behaviour then other mechanisms must be employed by the worker. As physical punishment is not an available means there are a limited number of other alternatives which a worker may resort to. One approach is to 'ground' the boy by suspending all outside play privileges for a period of several days. In some cases it may be necessary to deprive the boy of all special outing privileges until he has demonstrated that he can control himself. Sometimes confinement has to be made more arduous by restricting the individual to his dormitory. Some forms of behaviour merit a withdrawal of spending money. As a final method of limiting a very hostile and disruptive boy the worker may have to place him in the 'quiet room' for a short interval. The 'quiet room' is an isolation room where a boy can be kept completely segregated from others and where he can be watched closely by workers until his anger has begun to wear off. In all of these methods it should be clearly understood that the motive in controlling an individual is not punitive; rather, the rationale is that of setting limits on disruptive behaviour and helping a boy. When such limits as those described above are imposed on an individual they are prescribed with the intent of helping the boy to realize the perimeters of acceptable behaviour and conduct himself accordingly.

5 The Contingencies of Social Control

As was indicated earlier, we have taken the basic problem of social control for granted. We are not concerned here with social control per se but rather with the implications of social control for the treatment institution. This being the case, we must indicate how the theory we have utilized lends itself to an analysis of the contingencies of social control.

Etzioni's theory of compliance structures seems well suited as a framework for analyzing the implications of social control; it allows scope to deal both with the structural component of the organization, its authority system, and with the motivational component -- the commitment of the lower participants to the organization's value system. It will be remembered that Etzioni's theory of compliance deals primarily with these two components. However, rather than utilizing the full range of Etzioni's theory we have restricted ourselves to an examination of the contingencies of only two modes of authority -- authoritarian and permissive. By using the organization's authority structure as the independent variable and by altering the mode of authority it is hoped that some light will be shed on the implications of social control.

According to Etzioni, organizations employing a coercive type of authority will tend to have lower participants who indicate a negative commitment to the organization's value system. (Coercive authority usually relies on negative sanctions such as the threat of

physical punishment, the threat of it or the deprivation of physical comforts to enforce conformity with its directives and values.) This would certainly appear to be the case in many total institutions like prisons and reform schools. However, we do not know the degree to which such a negative orientation is an original feature of participants' attitudes or a product of the organization's authority structure. By examining attitudes and behaviour at different intervals and under different modes of authority it is expected that some knowledge can be gained on this point. Etzioni's theory further suggests that organizations employing a 'normative' authority structure may evidence a moral commitment to its values on the part of its members. (These organizations attempt to induce conformity with its values through the manipulation of symbolic rewards such as esteem, acceptance and positive responses; they appeal to the member's sense of 'the right'.) Etzioni suggests that lower participants in this kind of organization tend to accept and identify with its values. We are interested in seeing whether in the particular setting under study this is in fact the case.

In our attempt to evaluate the contingencies of these two modes of social control we are seeking answers to the following pertinent questions: what perspectives does the inmate population hold of the organization under the two modes of authority; what degree of co-operation is manifest under the contrasting systems; how is inmate solidarity and integration affected by authority; what changes in overt behaviour can be recognized; does the mode of authority influence the type of informal leader who may emerge?

Propositions and Hypotheses

According to Etzioni's typology of compliance an organization's goals will tend to be consistent with its mode of authority and the type of commitment its members make. He posits three major types of organization goals: order, economic and culture. Of these, culture best describes the goal of Mount Saint Joseph Institute since by definition

Organizations that have 'culture' goals institutionalize conditions needed for the creation and preservation of symbolic objects, their application, and the creation or reinforcement of commitment to such objects. 30

Mount Saint Joseph Institute is endeavouring to be effective in aiding the treatment of emotionally disturbed children and pursues this objective by seeking from the children a positive commitment to symbols and values which are deemed acceptable to the wider society. Etzioni suggests that organizations of this kind will tend to have a normative compliance structure wherein the type of authority will be normative as opposed to coercive and in which the members' involvement will be of a moral rather than an alienative nature. If, as Etzioni suggests, organizations tend to be more effective when their goals and compliance structure are congruent, it seems reasonable to posit that a lenient form of control which is consonant with normative authority would be more

³⁰ Amitai Etzioni, op. cit., p. 73.

likely to induce a positive commitment to the organization's values; on the other hand it appears reasonable to suggest that an authoritarian mode of control will produce an alienative form of commitment which will mitigate against members' acceptance of organizational values.³¹ As applied to Mount Saint Joseph Institute Etzioni's theory therefore leads me to venture the following proposition:

Mount Saint Joseph Institute is an organization with cultural goals; it is seeking from its inmate population a positive commitment to the value system which it espouses. It might therefore be expected that a normative form of authority characterized by permissive control would best promote this goal.

If, as Etzioni maintains, coercive authority tends to alienate the lower participants of an organization, we would expect to find that its functional equivalent -- authoritarian control -- alienates the children in the institution under study here. Alienation as discussed by Etzioni involves resentment, hostility towards the organization and

³¹ It can, of course, be cogently argued that many organizations which employ a coercive or authoritarian mode of control are quite effective in encouraging a positive commitment to their values. Examples of this are military organizations. Actually military organizations utilize both normative and coercive types of power to obtain commitment to its values and as such are difficult to classify on the basis of authority. At some times, normative control is utilized, at others, coercive control is used but the use of each mode of control is usually separated by time so that they do not conflict with each other to the detriment of the organization as a whole. Also military organizations have goals which differ significantly depending on whether a peace-time or war time situation is current. Therefore, this kind of organization must be seen as a "dual" organization both with respect to goals and its compliance structure. See Amitai Etzioni, op. cit., pp. 56-59.

its administration and generally negative feelings towards those in authority. This suggests the following hypothesis:

A permissive mode of control will induce a more positive orientation toward the staff and institution than will an authoritarian mode of control.

It also seems reasonable to suggest that an organization which minimizes alienative tendencies will encourage greater co-operation from the lower-echelon members than it would if it were to use coercive measures of control; from this I adduce the second hypothesis:

A permissive mode of control will engender greater co-operation on the part of the boys in Mount Saint Joseph Institute than would authoritarian control

Concomitant with the above hypothesis is the suggestion that hostility and frustration engendered by an authoritarian mode of control will manifest itself in collective outbursts.³² This suggests the next hypothesis:

Collective outbursts and lack of self control will tend to be more pronounced among the boys in the institution during an authoritarian mode of control than it will during a permissive type of authority. ³³

³² This assertion and the accompanying hypothesis do not come directly from the theory as outlined. They are contingent to it but derive primarily from the Lewin, Lippitt and White studies cited earlier in this chapter.

³³ I do not mean to infer that collective outbursts are purely symptomatic of coercive or authoritarian control. In the treatment institution, especially one for children, collective outbursts are frequent irrespective of the organization's authority structure. Therefore, the hypothesis should be understood to imply that the incidence of collective outbursts is expected to be comparatively more frequent under authoritarian control.

Coercive and authoritarian methods of control tend to exert deprivations on lower echelon members. In fact, Etzioni asserts that coercive control is synonymous with punitive sanctions of a rather severe kind. In response to this physical and emotional deprivation, inmates in many total institutions form what can best be described as a solidary opposition to the organization. This is evidenced by a high degree of group solidarity the dominant quality of which is a defensive response to deprivation.³⁴ It does not seem unreasonable to assume, therefore, that children in the residential treatment centre will likewise view authoritarian control as a form of deprivation against which they will endeavour to provide a mutually supportive defense. From this we would adduce this hypothesis:

Inmate group solidarity will tend to be highest under an authoritarian mode of control.

On the other hand, where an alienating influence is absent in the organization we would expect to find a positive orientation to the organization. It seems reasonable to expect that when positive perspectives dominate the organizational climate we would expect to find more inmates

³⁴ See for example Gresham M. Sykes and Sheldon L. Messinger, "The Inmate Social System" in Richard A. Cloward, et al., Theoretical Studies in the Social Organization of the Prison, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1960; also the discussion of the "solidary opposition model" of the inmate social system by David Street, "The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings", American Sociological Review, 30 (February 1965), pp. 40-55.

who are better integrated within the informal inmate group.³⁵ Therefore this hypothesis is ventured for the treatment centre:

The level of integration will be higher under a permissive mode of social control.

Etzioni's theory leaves the matter of informal leadership within the organization undeveloped but his discussion of membership involvement permits some guarded predictions. He suggests, for example, that under extreme forms of coercion such as the concentration camp situation many inmates will identify with and take on the values of guards and those in authority. In less coercive but still depriving settings inmates form an alliance against authority. In the latter setting individuals among the inmate group who ideally epitomize the group's attitudes to formal authority and who constitute informal models for the inmate primary group tend to emerge as leaders. In the treatment setting it seems reasonable to assume that leaders will also tend to represent the dominant inmate opinion vis a vis the formal organization.

³⁵ The operational definition of "better integrated" which I have used follows David Street's example, that is inmates who have two or more close friends in the institution. See David Street, Ibid.

Once again the work of Lewin, Lippitt and White lends support to this contention. They found that groups working under a "democratic" form of authority tended to be more stable and relationships between members were warm and friendly as opposed to tense and 'ego-centered' under autocratic authority. See Kurt Lewin and Ronald Lippitt, "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy: A Preliminary Note", op. cit.; and Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behaviour in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'", op. cit.

Therefore, I would posit that under authoritarian control leaders would reflect attitudes that represent an alienative involvement on the part of the children and conversely a positive orientation under a permissive authority. This expectation is presented in the final hypothesis:

During a permissive mode of control the informal leaders will exhibit behaviour that more closely conforms to the institution's ideals.

To recapitulate then, Etzioni's theory as applied to Mount Saint Joseph Institute appears to allow the suggestion of a general proposition from which we adduce several specific hypotheses regarding the contingencies of authority in the treatment institution. The subsequent chapters offer an investigation of these suggestions.

Proposition: Mount Saint Joseph Institute is an organization with cultural goals; it is seeking from its inmate population a positive commitment to the value system which it espouses. It might therefore be expected that a normative form of authority characterized by permissive control would best promote this goal.

Hypothesis 1: A permissive mode of control will induce a more positive orientation toward the staff and institution than will an authoritarian mode of control.

Hypothesis 2: A permissive mode of control will engender greater co-operation on the part of the boys in Mount Saint Joseph Institute than would authoritarian control.

- Hypothesis 3: Collective outbursts and lack of self control will tend to be more pronounced among the boys in the institution during an authoritarian mode of control than it will during a permissive type of authority.
- Hypothesis 4: Inmate group solidarity will tend to be highest under an authoritarian mode of control.
- Hypothesis 5: The level of integration will be higher under a permissive mode of social control.
- Hypothesis 6: During a permissive mode of control the informal leaders will exhibit behaviour that more closely conforms to the institution's ideals.

CHAPTER 4

THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The total duration of the field research at Mount Saint Joseph Institute was approximately five months and was divided into four distinct periods: the preliminary period, the authoritarian period, the readjustment period and the permissive control period. The preliminary period which lasted for six weeks constituted an orientation phase during which the ordinary situation was evaluated. Following this preliminary period, an authoritarian mode of control was instituted; it was retained for four weeks. For six weeks following the end of the authoritarian control period the institution was allowed to readjust itself to its usual mode of life. Finally a four week period of permissive control concluded the field research.

In the analysis which follows, each of these four periods is examined separately in chronological order of their incidence in the research.

The Preliminary Period

The preliminary period constituted an intensive study of the 'normal' situation in the treatment centre. I say 'normal' advisedly because Mount Saint Joseph Institute has an organization which is undergoing considerable change: methods of treatment, program activities,

and organization of inmate population according to needs and development are under continual assessment and revision. The normal situation is therefore defined quite loosely and operationally in terms of the non-experimental situation existing during this preliminary period.

Before discussing the objective findings of conditions of this period it will be of some help to the reader if a brief descriptive account of the researcher's impressions are given.¹ The daily routine at the Centre was much the same as that described in the previous chapter. The atmosphere was generally relaxed. A visitor would find the boys noisy, casual and usually fairly active in the games room or in the yard; if the boys were playing inside the situation might seem almost chaotic at first and possibly quite deafening with "Tweetie Bird", the pet buggie, making as loud a contribution as any boy or record player. The impression gained would not be appreciably different from seeing any other group of active boys together in relatively close quarters -- carefree seems a most apt description of their behaviour. Child-care workers, either lay personnel or sisters of the Order would be seen wandering about the premises sometimes engaged with the boys in their activities, sometimes apparently doing nothing. Occasionally a worker would be noticed "jawing" with a boy in a casual manner or

¹ The researcher was present in the institution as a participant observer. My presence was taken for granted by the boys since, after a fairly lengthy association, I was regarded merely as an inquisitive university student interested in 'writing a book about Mount Saint Joseph'. The staff knew the general purpose of my involvement but were not informed of the exact nature of the research.

perhaps helping a youngster tape a broken plastic gun together or possibly shouting at a boy to get down off the fence. There are times, of course, when a visitor would find the situation far from relaxed; there are days when anxieties and tensions spread through the whole fabric of the organization seizing both staff and boys with noticeable strain. When this situation occurs it might last for only a few hours but in some instances it could last considerably longer with repercussions felt for several days. Group disturbances of this sort are not at all uncommon to treatment centres where group life imposes frustrations or conflicts of individual interests. At these times, frustrations and anxieties find their expression in collective outbursts directed either against the staff or some other boys or group of boys. Its features may include total lack of co-operation with staff accompanied by a high level of aggression, refusal to conform to rules or performance of routine duties; it may entail running away, destructive acts or acts of physical violence or scapegoating techniques whereby one or two boys are the continual butt of hostility. Because the actual cause of an outburst is frequently unclear the problem of control is extremely difficult. Social control in the Centre at times like this can best be described as rather mixed. Generally speaking staff are quite tolerant and accepting of the need of children to express impulsive and aggressive behaviour but the level of toleration varies according to each staff member's level of acceptance and according to the circumstances prevailing at the time. For example, some staff members tend to be more rigid than others and as a result are

somewhat arbitrary in enforcing control when they feel restrictions are required.² Sometimes the situation calls for firmer than usual handling; at such times anything but a firm method of control could easily result in serious consequences both for the boys' own stability and for the institution as a whole.

The day-to-day life at the Centre under normal conditions is not a perfectly smooth process. It is marked by much variation and by moods that can change as rapidly as the weather for no apparent reason. It may be relaxed occasionally or stress ridden. However, in general the atmosphere is dominated by informality, by friendliness and by acceptance of boys as individuals who have many needs and many moods.

Consensus During the Preliminary Period.

One aspect of group integration is the prevalence of common values and norms held by group members. Another aspect is the degree to which members share close friendship relations with other members of the

²It should be realized that the absence of specific methods of handling each similar act by different children conforms to child-care practice in treatment centres. There is no set way of handling children. Individual children have different needs as do workers themselves and therefore response to a boy's acts is largely an individual response guided primarily by principles of acceptance and perceived need. For this reason workers are left largely to their own initiative and resources in the management of children.

group.³ In evaluating the level of consensus among the inmates at Mount Saint Joseph Institute we are focusing attention on this first aspect of integration. The researcher was concerned with assessing the degree to which boys at the Centre shared a common set of norms pertaining to life in the institution; the underlying assumption was that the higher the index of consensus with respect to norms the greater the level of integration. With this objective in mind and with a view to ascertaining boys' response to authoritarian-permissive orientations, an index comprising a list of common infractions was compiled along with a set of possible consequences.⁴ Boys were asked how they thought each infraction of a norm or rule ought to be handled by the staff.⁵ They were required to choose their response from a list of realistic alternatives (methods which were in general use at the Centre) which varied between a lenient and a strict mode of handling.

³ For a theoretical discussion of social integration see Peter M. Blau, "A Theory of Social Integration", The American Journal of Sociology, 65 (May 1960), 545-556. A more specific discussion of integration of inmates in treatment and custodial institutions is provided by David Street, "The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings", The American Sociological Review, 30 (Feb. 1965), 40-55.

⁴ See Appendix D for this index and the response alternatives.

⁵ This "index of consensus" questionnaire, like all other questionnaires used in this study, was administered privately to each boy.

The index of consensus was also administered to the institution's staff to ascertain the degree to which the staff is integrated as a group and also to obtain some indication as to whether inmates and staff share the same perspectives of institutional norms and the way infractions of these ought to be handled.

The Results

The data indicates that among the boys consensus is greatest on norms relating to private property and about the institution's regulation of keeping inside the yard. When asked what should be done with boys who destroy property belonging to other boys, there was a high level of agreement on how it ought to be handled (the index of consensus was 82). The index was higher (84) when the same question was asked with respect to the Centre's property. The highest index of consensus (86) was obtained on "leaving the yard".

In each of these three instances infractions were judged to be fairly serious and meriting strict handling. From a sociological viewpoint these results would seem to indicate that boys hold fairly conventional norms as to the sanctity of private property and especially that belonging to the Centre. The strongest agreement on the regulation about staying in the yard indicates the preeminence of this rule in the minds of the boys.

Items which showed considerable strength of agreement but not as marked as the three above are also ones pertinent to property and to

bounds. For example, when asked "what should be done about boys who grabbed things at the table" there was noticeable agreement that this was a serious business and most took an authoritarian view towards it. A suggested interpretation for this finding is that what is placed on one's plate at dinner is very personal property which no other boy has a right to unless it is voluntarily shared. With respect to the other item which has to do with staying out of the front yard we would suggest that the high degree of consensus is partly due to the realization that it is 'special property' belonging to the Order which is not for general use by the boys and partly to the fact that as a rule it is of prime importance as is "leaving the yard".

Items on which consensus was lowest was "hurting another boy", "throwing food around at the dinner table" and "going out of one's unit's boundaries" (i.e., junior, intermediate or senior). An explanation of low consensus on physically hurting another boy can be tied to the relatively high value attached by boys to physical prowess. The virtues of being tough and a good fighter are ones which are generally extolled by the inmate group and an indication of an individual's possession of these virtues is his ability to "really pound or kill a guy". Therefore, hurting another boy does not entail the negative connotations that adults with predominantly middle-class values attach to it.⁶ Similarly with throwing food around at the dinner table. There

⁶ Howard Polsky's study of a treatment setting draws attention to this same tendency to idolizing physical superiority and aggression. He notes that the boys of Cottage Six came from subcultures where the

TABLE 1

INDEX OF CONSENSUS
PRELIMINARY PERIOD

SUMMARY OF PERCENTAGES

ITEMS	ALTERNATIVES					INDEX OF CONSENSUS
	STRICT		LENIENT			
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. hurting another boy	14	36*	14	14	21	21
2. grabs things at dinner table	43*	29	7	21	0	50
3. strikes others at dinner table	29	43*	7	7	14	44
4. throws food around at table	7	36*	14	14	29	24
5. noisy before rising time	29	36*	21	0	14	40
6. refuses to settle at bed time	14	43*	7	7	28	32
7. vulgar language	0	29	21	14	36*	35
8. destructive acts to other boys' property	7	71*	21	0	0	82
9. destructive acts to Center's property	0	79*	7	14	0	84
10. out of bounds - front yard	0	50*	29	7	14	59
11. out of bounds - leaves yard	0	86*	0	0	14	86
12. out of bounds - from unit	14	36*	21	7	21	28
13. refuses to wash himself	0	50*	14	21	14	44
14. refuses to make his bed	21	43*	21	7	7	44
TOTAL						
PERCENTAGES	13	48	15	9	15	48
	61		15	24		

* Mode

TABLE 2

INDEX OF CONSENSUSSTAFF

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>STRICT</u>		<u>LENIENT</u>		5	<u>INDEX OF CONSENSUS</u>
	1	2	3	4		
1. hurting another boy	67*	0	11	22	0	67
2. grabs things at dinner table	22	0	22	56*	0	56
3. strikes others at dinner table	56*	33	22	11	0	56
4. throws food around at table	22	33*	22	11	0	50
5. noisy before rising time	33	0	44*	22	0	42
6. refuses to settle at bed time	56*	0	0	44	0	54
7. vulgar language	22	0	0	44*	33	50
8. destructive acts to other boys' property	11	44*	22	22	0	45
9. destructive acts to Center's property	11	22	33*	22	0	26
10. out of bounds - front yard	11	11	44*	22	11	40
11. out of bounds - leaves yard	11	11	56*	22	0	61
12. out of bounds - from unit	11	11	44*	22	0	50
13. refuses to wash himself	11	0	22	67*	0	72
14. refuses to make his bed	0	0	44	56*	0	78
TOTAL						53
PERCENTAGES	25	12	28	32	3	
	37		28	35		

* Mode

are again positive informal rewards to be derived from throwing food around which outweigh the formal negative sanctions. For example, being a good aim and landing a roll in somebody's soup from across the room attaches considerable status to the thrower. Also playing the clown and getting a good laugh from peer members has its rewards as well. With respect to "going out of unit bounds" there is little that can be offered as an explanation for low consensus other than the fact that at this time it was not seen as a particularly serious infraction nor was it regarded so by staff.⁷

An inspection of the index of consensus for all items shows that in every case but one, agreement about handling transgression of norms and rules was definitely on the strict side of the continuum. This one exception concerned the use of vulgar language. The use of obscene profanity was in widespread use among the boys and in fact constituted an important part of the informal group language. Its use was quite legitimate among the boys and although it was not condoned by the lay staff they tended to view it as a normal safety valve for

6 (continued) values of toughness and physical superiority were predominant. A boy's status depended on his ability to physically coerce other boys in meeting his demands and his role as a leader was established if physical supremacy could be held against all comers. These same values were maintained in the treatment setting and were crucial in the formation of a deviant subculture there. See Howard W. Polsky, Cottage Six, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962.

⁷ This was not the case later in the study when the administration decided that more effective handling of boys could be maintained if the maintenance of unit boundaries were more consistently enforced.

frustration and anger. In the beginning of the study the use of obscenities had an additional function which was valued among the boys. It had a special value as a means of embarrassing certain people who were sensitive to it. This was particularly so with the Sisters of the Order who worked on the child-care staff. Boys could get back at them (for any perceived wrong) in this way when no other avenue of approach was open.⁸

The evidence suggests that all the items on the index with the exception of "using vulgar language" are regarded as illegitimate behaviour and that such infractions ought to be dealt with relatively strictly. This tendency to prefer authoritarian types of handling is somewhat baffling when we consider the deprivations which institutional life already imposes on inmates. When boys' comments are added to the data a remarkable punitive attitude is evident. For example, such verbatim comments as "I'd sock him in the mouth", "put him in the quiet room", "spank him really hard" and "make him miss his supper" were commonplace. While this study has not investigated pre-institutionalization variables such as family conditions the data suggests the presence of attitudes usually associated with working class authoritarianism. We notice this in respect to the relative punitive attitude boys hold about infractions and the emphasis placed on physical

⁸ Only in the later part of this study when the administration advised all staff to ignore it completely did obscene language cease to serve this punitive embarrassment function.

aggression. This relationship cannot be demonstrated here but the possibility of association appears probable. In any event, it seems significant that 61 per cent of all responses are on the strict side of the continuum, yet only thirteen per cent opt for the most punitive methods. This suggests that while boys prefer a strict mode of handling, they are not generally in favour of the most punitive methods.

The situation with the staff is not as clear cut as it is with the boys. In no instance is there strong consensus for favouring very lenient attitudes towards infraction of norms and rules. The two highest indices of consensus are found on items pertinent to routine chores (Items 13 and 14) and the response is for moderately lenient management. The interpretation this suggests is that failure to perform routine chores is regarded as relatively inconsequential by staff. However, when items which focus on physical aggression are examined staff consensus is high for a strict method of handling. There are two possible reasons for this agreement about physical aggression. The first is a treatment consideration, namely, that if an impulsive and emotionally disturbed child acts out his aggressions he may cause serious harm to other boys. A second explanation which invariably lurks in the background is the fact that the treatment staff has predominantly a middle class outlook inherent in which is a rejection of physical aggression because the latter is not consistent with middle class values.

Generally speaking, however, staff consensus is relatively low-

to-moderate in intensity and, with respect to direction, is quite neutral in orientation. No decisive tendency either towards strictness or leniency is evident in the analysis.

When the staff index of consensus is compared with that of the boys we note that there is a rather low level of agreement between the two groups. These children tend to view norms and rules in a noticeably consistent manner while staff take a far more individualistic stance. In some instances it appears that child-care staff have simply withheld judgement as to the proper approach to these institutional values while the children, on the other hand, obviously see things in straight forward dichotomies and take a more definite stance.

Taking consensus as one aspect of integration our findings at this time suggest that inmate integration is moderately high in that the boys' view of the institution's normative system follows a fairly consistent pattern. They show a predominant tendency towards favouring an authoritarian mode of handling infractions of institutional norms. Staff on the other hand are inclined to see normative infractions in a fairly neutral manner.

Inmate Orientation

The orientation of children (toward the staff and institution) was evaluated primarily by a questionnaire, which I chose to label "Inmate Perspectives".⁹ This was composed of nineteen items which were

⁹ See Appendix D for questionnaire. Generally speaking the questionnaire owes its origin to David Street who used it as a comparative

intended to assess a plurality of factors.¹⁰ Attitudes toward staff, attitudes towards the institution, inmate co-operation with staff,

9 (continued) device for assessing 'custodialism' and 'treatment', orientations of inmates in four juvenile institutions. See David Street, "The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings", American Sociological Review, 30 (February 1965), 40-55.

¹⁰ The specific items pertinent to each factor were as follows:

Attitudes toward the institution:

- 1) Is Mount Saint Joseph a better or worse place than you thought at first it would be?
- 2) Why do you think boys come to Mount Saint Joseph?
- 3) Do you think most of the boys who are here should be here in the first place?
- 4) Do you think boys are better when they leave here?
- 5) If you had a choice would you prefer to come here or go someplace else?

Attitudes toward staff:

- 1) Why do you think the workers are here?
- 2) Do you think the workers are fair in their treatment of boys?
- 3) Do you think the workers here can help you?

Co-operation:

- 1) Would you tell a worker if boys started to fight?
- 2) Would you tell a worker which boys were stealing if group punishment were involved?
- 3) What would you do if you knew boys planned to "take off"?

Solidarity:

- 1) How many boys here do you usually 'hang around with'?
- 2) How many of the boys here would you like to keep as friends after you leave here?
- 3) Would you talk over a personal problem with other boys here?
- 4) How much of the time do you think boys here really stick together?

Prisonization:

- 1) What do you think is the best way to get along here?
- 2) What do you think is the best way to get discharged from Mount Saint Joseph?

inmate solidarity, integration,¹¹ and prisonization.¹²

The rationale behind the utilization of the "Inmate Perspective" questionnaire was the idea that attitudes towards the staff, institution, the other boys and about oneself provide one important indicator of member-involvement in the organization and thereby show the relationship between the type of authority structure and attitudes. The specific function of the questionnaire was to assess differences in boys' attitudes between the preliminary study period and the two experimental periods and then between each of the latter two periods.

It is difficult, therefore, to attach much significance to the findings of the preliminary period for without some basis of comparison they cannot be given a meaningful interpretation. The figures listed in Table 3 are important in that they are themselves the basis from which comparison was made in the two subsequent experimental periods.

¹¹ This is the second of two aspects of integration. The first focused on the extent to which boys agreed on institutional norms. The second aspect here focuses on the extent to which the individual boy "fits into" the peer group as indicated by the number of boys an inmate says he "hangs around with".

¹² The rationale in including questions relating to "prisonization" was to provide some indication as to whether the boys perceived the institution in terms of a prison where they had been sent for punishment or a treatment centre where they had been sent for help with their emotional problems. It in part includes an attitude towards the institution and in part a perception of themselves as either prisoners or patients.

TABLE 3

<u>FACTORS</u>	<u>AVERAGE PERCENT FAVOURABLE RESPONSE</u>
1. Attitudes to Institution	85
2. Attitudes to Staff	91
3. Co-operation with Staff	73
4. Group Solidarity	63
5. Integration	43
6. Prisonization	43

Interpreted very briefly the pattern of response shows that during this relatively permissive and casual preliminary period attitudes toward both staff and institution were extremely favourable. Co-operation with staff was also quite positive but not as marked as the first two factors. The explanation for this seems to lie in the reticence boys have about "squealing" on their peers especially in regard to running away. There is a conflict of interests here between loyalty to the peer group and loyalty towards staff; it appears that co-operating with staff to the extent you would inform on peers who planned to "take off" is a serious betrayal which is unacceptable to most boys. Group solidarity is only moderately strong which is as it was expected under a relaxed form of social control. Integration as measured by the number of boys an individual has as 'pals' is relatively low. "Prisonization" in boys' attitudes is quite pronounced. This is a somewhat surprising discovery for it means that in spite of a relaxed atmosphere in the institution the majority of the boys believe the best way to get along is by ritual obedience and not by trying to understand and help themselves.

Sociometric Response Pattern

Sociometric tests were given to each boy who was asked to state those other boys in the Centre with whom he would like (and would not like) to associate. Also the boys were asked to make similar choices regarding staff in the institution. The first three questions on the test concerned meaningful activities associated with activities in the Centre. The fourth question in which boys were asked to choose staff members was not meaningful in terms of concrete reality but was introduced with the intention of proposing to the child a conception of an unknown factor which might produce certain anxieties in the mind of a young boy.

A word of caution about sociometric choice seems warranted. It would be unwise to assert that the sociometric test provides an accurate and objective test of the interpersonal relations existing in a group. It should be remembered that a sociometric test records only the preferred choice of individuals not their actual associations; the picture provided by a sociometric choice pattern may be a distorted representation since subjects may not want to admit either to themselves or others their actual feelings. Therefore, the data presented here should be viewed as a rough gauge of choice sentiments which must be evaluated with care and caution.

Results

The results of the sociometric choice indicate the presence of three informal leaders in the inmate group. All three - Bites, Round, and School - were senior boys who in their actual behaviour acted as models

and/or spokesmen for the group as a whole. It is tempting to include the other senior, Chess, among the leadership clique because of the relatively high number of choice 'votes' caste in his favour but his generally exclusive nature and his tendency to withdraw from the rest of the group persuade me to think he belongs to a special case.¹³ Both with respect to boys receiving a high number of choices and those with very few choices the sociogram reflects a fairly accurate picture of the pattern of relationships existing at this time. Boys receiving a high number of choices generally comprised the dominant group; boys with very few choices made in their favour were in fact isolates. An examination of negative choice patterns supports this suggestion.

Staff Performance Inventory

In order to expand our information about the nature of children's selection of adult staff members on sociometric choice an inventory of individual staff member's performance was taken to assess their inclination to authoritarianism or permissiveness in orientation.¹⁴ This inventory was

¹³ On numerous occasions Chess told me he thought most of the boys were 'nuts' because they fought and engaged in aggressive and hostile play. He said he preferred to play by himself or with another boy who could play quietly without getting riled. Chess' play habits were to a large degree different from those of other boys since he rarely engaged in organized or aggressive activities.

¹⁴ The inventory we have used in this evaluation is a modification of Gilbert and Levinson's "Custodial Role Performance Inventory" adapted with items to suit the particular setting. Ratings of workers were made independently by the institution's clinical director, the clinical social workers and myself. A reliability check was made of individual items on the inventory and two questions, numbers five and seven, were found to

conducted without reference to an individual's performance in either of the experimental periods but as a general appraisal of the worker's inclinations. As would be expected with any group of workers, some individuals tended to be fairly authoritarian in their general orientation while others were quite permissive. The concern here was not with the staff members per se but rather with the children's propensity to select or reject adults who held one or other of these orientations.

TABLE 4

STAFF PERFORMANCE INVENTORY*

SILGAN	- 7
NOLIM	30
LYREST	22
SEKET	-23
FAHID	23
NAMTER	26
REYAB	- 3
REHRAG	22
SORTED	33

* This table represents the inclination of individual staff members towards either a custodial or treatment orientation. Negative indices represent the tendency of a staff member to perform the role of child-care worker in an authoritarian and custodial manner while high positive figures indicate that the person's performance is oriented in a treatment and more permissive direction.

14 (continued) produce extreme variation between raters; therefore they were deleted from the final assessment ratings of workers. See Appendix for this Inventory and for the authoritarian-permissive ratings of workers. For a full description of the "Custodial Role Performance Inventory" see Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, "Role Performance, Ideology and Personality in Mental Hospital Aides", in Milton Greenblatt, Daniel J. Levinson, and Richard H. Williams (eds.), The Patient and The Mental Hospital, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

Summary of Findings for the Preliminary Period

The preliminary period was characterized by a fairly lenient and permissive orientation. Relations between staff and boys were casual and on a personal basis. Communication appeared to be marked by an egalitarian spirit as opposed to a vertical authority pattern. In general, the institution relied primarily upon normative means of control and resorted to coercive means only as a secondary measure. Typically, control was exercised through informal talk, relations between staff and boys, through the personalities of staff and, through the diffuse social pressure of the institutional "community". Mount Saint Joseph Institute at this time approached Etzioni's conception of a 'normative' organization in that it emphasized normative compliance. Yet, it departed from his theoretical conception by the imposition of physical boundaries (i.e., boys must remain inside the yard at all times unless special permission is granted) and the frequent resort to some form of coercive control (for example, the "quiet room"). In spite of this departure from the ideal, Mount Saint Joseph Institute is predominantly a normative institution which relies on normative control in the form of symbolic rewards such as acceptance, support and 'positive responses' by staff to influence conformity with organizational values.

The boys' reaction to this predominantly normative control has been assessed in terms of a number of variables thought to be related to social control. For example, data on group integration as manifest by consensus of opinion regarding institutional norms, indicated that boys perceive the

situation in a markedly similar and consistent fashion. The evidence shows a high level of agreement on property norms and boundary maintenance rules and, a generally low aversion to physical aggressiveness and to foul language which is regarded as a legitimate prerogative. Also of particular note is the fact that the inmate group takes a predominantly authoritarian stance on infraction of rules in that it shows a preference for strict handling of non-conformists.

Interpreted within the context of our theory I would suggest that normative control allows inmates a considerable amount of freedom of association and at the same time is a less depriving atmosphere. Therefore boys will tend to derive rewards from sharing the value system of the institution with other boys and tend towards increased integration with a commonly shared set of norms. The theory does not provide an adequate interpretation of boys' inclinations toward authoritarian handling but it seems likely that boys will tend to conform more to the institution's norms when non-coercive control is in force and when they are good terms with staff members whom they wish to please.

Attitudes towards staff and institution show a strong positive attitude indicating that under a relaxed system of management inmates are more positively committed to institutional values as these are personified by staff members.

Group solidarity is only moderately strong which indicates support for the contention that boys living under a fairly permissive form of control do not have to rely primarily on an ameliorative system for adequate rewards

and satisfactions which they would presumably have to if relationships between staff and boys were strained and if the general atmosphere was depriving. Therefore, while the inmate group is still a source of satisfaction under a relatively permissive regime it is not the only important source; staff prove to be a fundamental source of positive sanctions and incentives, particularly those with whom boys find it easy to relate.

This is given ample support in the pattern of sociometric choice. When asked to choose adult staff members boys show a definite pattern in their selection in that no single staff member who was independently rated as tending towards authoritarian performance of duties in the institution was given a positive choice. Those who were most popular were those whose performance was most strongly directed to a treatment rather than custodial orientation. On the other hand those who were rejected most frequently were either definite authority figures or with whom association was difficult or strained.

On peer group sociometric choice we note that leaders comprise three senior boys all of whom tend to be quite positively oriented to the institution at this time. Boys most often rejected were generally boys who were least integrated into the inmate group.

In summary, during a period of relative permissiveness when relationships between staff and boys are relaxed and informal and when the orientation is normative, by which I mean treatment oriented rather than custodial, the response by inmates is highly positive, integration seems strong and leaders tend to reflect values more closely identified with those of the institution.

The Authoritarian Period

The authoritarian period was the first experimental period of the research. The objective during this phase was to make explicit the rules and regulations¹⁵ of the institution and to implement any infraction by negative sanctions.¹⁶ The rules were posted on the bulletin board and with them were included a comprehensive list of sanctions pertinent to each infraction. Child-care workers were also provided with specific instructions covering all possible areas of daily activities. They were also advised to be detached and impersonal in their relationships with boys.¹⁷ The objective in this period was to create an organizational atmosphere which would be dominantly custodial: rigid, impersonal, highly centralized in its authority structure and characteristically restrictive in its mode of social control.

Consensus During the Authoritarian Period

The analysis of consensus during this period shows that agreement on eight of the fourteen items of normative behaviour has declined while on the remaining there has been slight increase. The total effect is that the

¹⁵ See Appendix B for these rules and regulations.

¹⁶ See Appendix B for the sanctions contingent upon infraction of the rules.

¹⁷ There was, unfortunately, no objective assessment as to the way staff members actually performed their authoritarian role. The researcher's presence and supervision along with that of the director and social worker were the only check on staff's performance. While this leaves much to be desired from a methodological viewpoint, I was quite well satisfied that staff did in fact conform to their custodial and authoritarian roles in spite of the considerable stress which it imposed on them.

TABLE 5

INDEX OF CONSENSUS
AUTHORITARIAN PERIOD

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>STRICT</u>		<u>LENIENT</u>			<u>INDEX OF CONSENSUS</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	
1. hurting another boy	40*	33	0	0	27	43
2. grabs things at dinner table	33*	27	7	7	27	25
3. strikes others at dinner table	20	40*	7	7	27	30
4. throws food around at table	20	33*	20	0	27	33
5. noisy before rising time	27	33*	0	13	27	27
6. refuses to settle at bed time	33	40*	13	0	13	48
7. vulgar language	13	53*	7	20	7	50
8. destructive acts to other boys' property	7	73*	7	7	7	65
9. destructive acts to Center's property	13	67*	7	0	13	67
10. out of bounds - front yard	13	67*	0	13	7	65
11. out of bounds - leaves yard	7	73*	0	13	7	70
12. out of bounds - from unit	40*	33	13	7	7	46
13. refuses to was himself	13	47*	13	7	20	37
14. refuses to make his bed	33*	27	13	0	27	30
TOTAL						
PERCENTAGES	23	43	8	7	18	45
		66	8		25	

* Note

average index of consensus has declined slightly under a strict mode of social control. An examination of some of the prominent items suggests that boys still strongly agree on norms regarding property and on the importance of the rule of staying within bounds; however, the strength of agreement is not nearly as pronounced as in the earlier period. Authoritarian control has apparently made boys more conscious of some of the norms that they heretofore regarded lightly. For example, we note that there is increased tendency to take a negative view of physical aggression and particularly of using foul language.

A surprising consequence of the change in institutional authority is the effect it has had on the shift of direction of consensus.

The direction of this shift was towards a stricter mode of handling boys who did not conform to expected behaviour. Surprising as it may seem, this shift was not simply towards the moderately strict category but towards the strictest possible alternative. The total percentage in the most stringent mode of handling category jumped from thirteen percent during the preliminary period to twenty-three percent in the Authoritarian Period. In fact there was not a single item on which the modal group occupied any other category but a moderately or very strict alternative.

These results suggest that an authoritarian mode of social control in the institution does not produce a negative orientation towards relatively strict methods of handling infractions. If anything, an authoritarian mode of control apparently reinforces an already present inclination for strict control. This raises the interesting question as to the degree of strictness

to which authority could progress before an alienative attitude on the part of these boys would manifest itself. While we are not prepared to answer this question directly, it seems that social control could have progressed even further in an authoritarian direction before consensus about the sanctioning of behaviour reached its critical point.

Inmate Orientation

An analysis of the data on inmate perspectives indicates that the type of social control which dominates an organization can influence the attitudes of its lower participants. When we examine each factor on the index of inmate perspectives we can better appreciate the ways which the organization's authority structure has in this instance influenced the boys' attitudes.

During the period of authoritarian control attitudes toward the institution changed significantly in a negative direction.¹⁸ While the over-all attitudes of boys toward the institution was still strongly positive during this period the strength of positive feelings had declined appreciably. A statistical analysis of this change indicates that it is significant at the .01 level of significance. We may therefore assert that the change is highly significant and suggest that the form of authority has adversely influenced opinion on this factor.

¹⁸ The "Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Rank Test was used to evaluate changes in boys' attitudes between the different authority conditions of the institution. This test was used because the same questionnaire was applied to a matched sample at different intervals. See Sidney Seigel, Nonparametric Statistics For the Behavioral Sciences, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Similarly with respect to attitudes toward staff. It was found that there was an appreciable change between the preliminary period and the subsequent authoritarian period. The direction of this shift in attitudes was in a negative direction indicating that favourable attitudes toward the staff had declined during this phase of the research. The difference is statistically significant at the .05 level of significance. Once again we may note that the attitudes toward staff remain highly positive but at a definitely reduced level from that of the preliminary period.

With respect to the "Co-operation with Staff" factor we note a decrease in the propensity of boys to co-operate with staff during the authoritarian regimen. This change is not nearly as striking as that of the first two factors but it is nevertheless notable. While the statistical analysis of this change does not quite approach the significance requirement at the .05 level, we come so close that the implication of the transition in attitudes here is of importance (the T required for statistical significance was 21; the value obtained in assessing the differences in attitudes was 22 or 1 point away from significance). The implication is that there is a definite tendency for the children to be less well disposed towards the staff under an authoritarian mode of control and they give evidence of this in their attitudes about co-operation with staff.

An examination of "Group Solidarity" opinions during this period indicates that there was a tendency for solidarity to increase during an authoritarian regimen. However, as the statistics are not significant

the findings are inconclusive. All that we can say is that judging from the comparison of total scores on this factor there was an inclination of boys to show a slightly greater degree of group solidarity.

The results on the "Integration" factor are also inconclusive. There is a slight tendency of an increase in integration judging from the fact that more boys in this period indicate they 'pal around' with two or more boys than was the case in the preceding period. However, this increase in integration is not statistically significant and the figures suggest that little importance should be attached to the shift.

The scores on the items pertaining to "Prisonization" show very little variation from the earlier phase of the research. The data indicates that a somewhat more positive perspective is evident during the authoritarian period but the gain is so slight as to render it inconsequential.

The over-all results on the "Inmate Perspectives" questionnaire indicate that during the period of authoritarian control attitudes toward the staff and institution remain at a relatively high level. The same is true with respect to co-operation with staff. In spite of this, there were marked changes in attitudes on each of these three factors. In the first two instances these changes were quite significant from a statistical viewpoint. In the third case, the shift in opinion appeared equally impressive although the change did not quite reach a statistically significant level. The shift of opinion was in a negative direction indicating that authoritarian control had in some

degree influenced the attitudes of children on these three factors. With respect to group solidarity, integration and prisonization, the results are far less striking. There was relatively little change in any one of these and what little change appeared was not significant.

TABLE 6

Comparison of Inmate Perspectives -- First Two Research Periods

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Preliminary Period</u>	<u>Authoritarian Period</u>
	Percent Favourable	Percent Favourable
Attitudes to Institution	85	75
Attitudes to Staff	91	72
Co-Operation	73	68
Solidarity	63	66
Integration	59	66
Prisonization	43	44

Sociometric Response Pattern

A comparison of the sociometric pattern of positive choices of the preliminary and authoritarian periods indicates that during the latter period children tend to concentrate their preferences on boys who are the most assertive in each of the three institutional units -- junior, intermediate and senior. This is a change from the preliminary

period when only senior boys emerged as most popular recipients of choice. The results now indicate that while senior boys are still the most frequently chosen, the pattern of choice is no longer concentrated on them. Leaders can be seen to have emerged in each of the three institutional units, one in the junior unit, one in the intermediate and, as before, three in the senior unit. A careful examination of the attitudes of these boys does not suggest that they have a negative orientation towards the institution as judged from their responses on questionnaires. Rather, they are quite positively oriented. They are however boys who are quite vociferous and assertive in their behaviour

There does not appear to be any simple explanation for the appearance of unit leaders under an authoritarian regimen. It may be that enforcement of rules regarding the maintenance of boundaries between units forces each unit to be more self-contained in all respects including independent leadership. Be that as it may, the pattern of choice emphasizes the preeminent position of the three senior boys who in many respects are the models whom the rest of the boys fashion their attitudes.

The negative choice pattern fairly well complements the results on the positive choice dimension. Generally speaking, boys who were chosen frequently by their peers on the positive selection did not receive many votes on the negative side. Three boys, Able, Angel and Startz who were most frequently cited as negative choices in the preliminary period were again the three most rejected in the authoritarian

period. It is interesting to note, however, that in both periods the two of the three rejected most often were juniors and that the vast majority of those boys who caste negative votes, caste them for junior members. In other words, negative choices with respect to juniors were by and large directed from actors outside the junior unit. Similar external rejection is not nearly as pronounced in the other units.

With respect to boys' choice of adult figures during the period of authoritarian control a definite tendency in positive choice is evident. The recipients of the largest number of choices are invariably those who least epitomize authority and who tend towards a more consistent pattern of permissiveness. The situation was considerably different in the preceding phase when there was some ambivalence of choice; at that time most popular choice was split between a somewhat authoritarian figure and a worker who tended to exhibit greater flexibility in handling children. The results here suggest that during a period of fairly rigid control children are attracted to workers who are less representative of authority and reject adults who are perceived as authority figures.

Overt Behaviour Analysis

Beginning at the onset of authoritarian control a careful assessment was made by workers of each boy's daily behaviour. This provided an index of each boy's overt behaviour as manifested by such indicators as aggressiveness, acceptance of limits, notable fears and anxieties, behaviour at meals and at bed time.¹⁹

¹⁹ For a comprehensive list of the items on this daily report see the original assessment chart in Appendix D .

Each item of behaviour was given a numerical weight so that the chart provided an index of hostile or disturbed behaviour. The total performance for all boys was totalled for each day and charted on graphs to provide a daily picture of the level of group behaviour.²⁰

Unfortunately the day to day variation of this collective behaviour is not great enough to allow a statistical analysis of variance. The graph indicates a relatively constant level of overt group behaviour with only minor fluctuations throughout the authoritarian period. The quantitative index suggests that behaviour was generally quite moderate with relatively few instances of collective outbursts.²¹

The Response of Staff to an Authoritarian Mode of Control

Staff found the authoritarian extremely stress-producing because of the conflicts it produced with a normal treatment orientation. It must be remembered that most workers conceptualized their role in terms of accepted case-work practice; that is, each client is seen as a unique individual who has to be dealt with according to his special set of needs. In view of the fact that the authoritarian mode of control demanded a uniform approach to all children regardless of their personal needs workers frequently voiced the opinion that they "felt

²⁰ See Graph, Appendix C.

²¹ While collective outbursts of hostility or disturbance did occur these tended to be moderated by a relatively low level of similar behaviour by the remainder of the boys.

like guards". "The children think we've all gone whacky" was frequently mentioned by several staff members. This created a considerable amount of guilt in the minds of most workers who were extremely anxious to have this phase of the research ended. Doubts were raised about the inconsistency of the approach and there was at first a reticence to impose strict limits on boys' behaviour. Nevertheless, workers performed their roles with satisfactory consistency in spite of the anxieties this created.

While the authoritarian mode of control did not produce dissension among workers they asserted that they found this authority system very "wearing". "It shows that external control can really cut down on swearing and maybe a few things like that but whether it's worth it I don't knowI feel like a real old Scrooge" was a typical comment.

Summary of Findings for the Authoritarian Period

The authoritarian period was characterized by an organizational bureaucracy of a rigid type where the predominant orientation was custodial. Relations between staff and boys were on a highly formal basis with status distinctions emphasized by social distance and impersonality. The orientation of staff was not towards the individual child but to the organization as a whole; the attitude, ideally stated, was "what is good for the institution as a whole is good for the individual". Communication was on a highly formal level with the

emphasis on formal channels and status differences. In general, the organization relied heavily on coercive measures or threat of same as the primary means of exercising social control. In this environment control was typically enforced by loss of privileges, abrupt removal from the group, confinement to dormitories and frequent use of the isolation room (the quiet room). In Etzioni's terms the institution during this period could be classified as a coercive organization since it stressed the maintenance of order and conformity to rules and used punitive sanctions to implement them. Admittedly, there is considerable variation in coercive organizations depending on the degree of physical coercion employed and in this respect Mount Saint Joseph can only be classified as relatively coercive because of the absence of actual physical punishment. Nevertheless, it is coercive in that it relies predominantly on punitive sanctions to enforce its demands.

According to the theory we would expect that increased pressure on the boys would induce greater conformity to institutional rules and norms but that they will be less positively oriented to the staff and institution. Our findings suggest that this is the case in Mount Saint Joseph. For example, the average index of consensus drops slightly in this period although there is an increased tendency for the boys to see misdemeanors as more serious. Among the most obvious changes was that dealing with the use of vulgar language; there is much greater agreement that this is a serious offence and ought to be dealt with strictly. Similarly, there was increased recognition that physically

hurting other boys was unacceptable. Attitudes toward destruction of the Centre's property showed a marked decrease which would seem to indicate that boys are less positively disposed towards the institution. The outstanding characteristic of consensus during this period is the notable shift in boys' attitudes towards favouring strict sanctions for infractions. This would lead me to believe that under the threat of punitive sanctions boys will tend to align their views more closely with the official view. Thus duress enforces greater conformity with official attitudes but at the same time lowers the favourableness with which they regard the institution.

These less favourable attitudes are given ample support from the data on inmate orientations where we find a significant decrease in positive attitudes. Obviously children do not tend to be favourably disposed to those objects which he sees as unrewarding. Adult staff members under authoritarian control deprive inmates of positive rewards and therefore can no longer be seen as objects of gratification. Also inmates are less likely to co-operate with the objects of their frustration except in instances where it is necessary to ensure avoidance of punishment. When gratifications from one source are removed we would expect to find some kind of substitution taking place. The aloofness and rigidity of staff increases the need for inmate group solutions to the problem of deprivation and thus inmate group solidarity increases. I would suggest that increased group solidarity also functions as a defensive response to punitive control; the informal inmate group is

organized to allocate both legitimate and illegitimate rewards and mutual aid in opposition to formal authority.

It was expected that increased pressure for conformity with official demands would be accompanied by an increase in stress at the inmate level which, because of anxieties and frustrations, would in turn result in a general lowering of inmate integration. My rationale was that individuals would find themselves exposed to conflicting interests: loyalty to the inmate group and conformity with organizational demands. This ambivalence was expected to have induced individuals to restrict associations to a few close friends. This did not happen. Rather the level of integration, as measured by the number of close friends, increased, suggesting that authoritarian control forced boys into a broader pattern of inmate associations than that which existed under permissive control.

Sociometric choice during this period indicates pronounced rejection of staff who more closely represent the established order and, on the inmate level there is a trend to choose boys with less positive attitudes towards the organization.

In summary, this period was marked by strictness and formality and by an orientation that was predominantly custodial. The response to it by inmates is characterized by a decrease in positive attitudes to the established order, by increased group solidarity, by selection of leaders who are more inclined to oppose the regimen and yet, by a tendency to conform more consistently with the norms of the formal system.

The Intervening Period

Between the end of the period of Authoritarian control and the onset of Permissive control there was an interval of six weeks during which time the mode of authority reverted to its original form. This space of time was utilized to allow the social climate to settle as much as possible before the second experimental period ensued. The intervening period came at a most convenient time - the approach of Christmas and the accompanying holidays. During this interval relationships between staff and boys reverted to an intimate friendly level, communication was on a personal and informal basis as opposed to the former rigid and narrowly defined character, status differences were minimized and limits on aggressive behaviour were left to the individual worker's discretion. In order to let this atmosphere take firm hold I waited till the end of January before instituting the Permissive mode of control.

In order to determine whether in fact the social climate had returned to some degree of normalcy we relied almost exclusively on daily records of boys' behaviour, daily staff reports and a subjective evaluation. This is perhaps one of the most serious shortcomings of the study - the fact that objective evaluation of attitudes analyzed by questionnaires was not attempted. The reason for not reapplying the tests at this time was the fact that considerable hostility by the boys had developed towards the tests at the end of the authoritarian period. I did not want to attempt anything that would create unnecessary anxieties in their minds by forcing them to answer the questionnaires a third time at this particular phase of the

research.²² Nor did I wish to induce attitudes anomalous to those of the previous period by using authority in forcing them to comply with my requests. Therefore, I relied on the other techniques just mentioned.

The Permissive Period

The permissive period constituted the final phase of field research. The objective during this final four weeks was to create an atmosphere that was as free as possible of negative restrictions, where the atmosphere in the institution was dominated by warm friendly relationships between staff and children and where leniency and flexibility were the guiding principles.²³

It was not the intention to create a situation where complete anarchy prevailed; therefore a certain minimum of control had to be exercised for the sake of all concerned. When limits had to be imposed on individuals, as was invariably required, these were applied in a non-punitive manner, the

²² It should be mentioned that many boys found it considerably upsetting to be forced to repeatedly answer questions, the nature of which seemed very threatening to them. For example, on the sociometric choice questionnaire several boys found it extremely disturbing to have to make a negative selection of staff or even other boys, in spite of the fact that they had been ensured that their responses would not be revealed to anyone. Even on positive choices 'agonies' over decisions were quite evident. The psychological explanation for this particular difficulty lies in the tremendous insecurity that several of these boys manifest with their particular emotional problems. In addition to this problem, which recurred again with other questionnaires, there was a barrier to abstract conceptualization. Many children could not think in terms other than concrete examples and therefore it was difficult to get them to conceive of theoretically possible alternatives to a particular course of action. Examples had to be made specific and in some instances their use created a good deal of anxiety.

²³ For the Staff Instructions for this period see Appendix B.

boy was first spoken to, warned and finally reprimanded if he did not desist from his disruptive behaviour. In every possible instance the boy concerned was reasoned with and appealed to and, finally, the necessity for sanctioning was explained. Children, therefore, were not permitted to run wild. Rules with respect to running away and staying within certain prescribed boundaries were still in force although they were not made as explicit as heretofore.

During this period boys were encouraged to become actively involved in the planning of activities and outings so that they might better feel they were an important part of a community rather than an object of directives. Duties and activities were not forced on individuals who did not wish to participate although their 'group spirit' was appealed to to encourage involvement.

Ideally, the intention of this period was to create as far as circumstances permitted, a model therapeutic milieu where informality, flexibility and a community spirit prevailed.

Consensus

Eleven of the fourteen items on the index of consensus showed a marked increase in the level of agreement over the previous results of the authoritarian period. On eight items there was a definite increase over the preliminary period. The only items on which the index of consensus decreased at all were those pertaining to the maintenance of bounds. The most striking increase occurs on the question which probes the reaction to hurting another boy. Here an index of 82 indicates high

agreement that moderately strict action should be taken against a boy who hurst others. There is a similar marked increase in agreement as to what ought to be done with boys who strike others at the dinner table. Absolute agreement was obtained on the matter of destructive acts to the Centre's property. Here 100 per cent agreed that boys who transgressed this norm ought to be handled in a fairly strict fashion. It is of interest to note that there was considerably stronger feeling about the Centre's property than that belonging to boys themselves. This would certainly seem to indicate very strong positive feelings towards the institution itself.

There is a further notable development that is indicated at this time. The shift towards strict methods of handling infractions is very pronounced. This significant movement of opinion in a somewhat authoritarian direction does not indicate that the boys' attitudes are more in line with those of workers but it does appear to reflect a more conventional attitude towards unacceptable behaviour. In this shift towards an authoritarian method of management we also note that an increasing percentage of boys favour the most stringent methods available.

It appears that the permissive orientation has had the effect of inducing attitudes that are strongly slanted towards conventional values. Physical aggression in the forms mentioned here are apparently rejected, as is any destructive act to the institution's property. Even those items on which consensus is least evident (boundary maintenance) there is a definite trend to view infractions in a way that more closely conforms to the staff's attitudes.

TABLE 7

INDEX OF CONSENSUS
PERMISSIVE PERIOD

<u>ITEMS</u>	<u>STRICT</u>		<u>LENIENT</u>		<u>INDEX OF CONSENSUS</u>
	1	2	3	4	
1. hurting another boy	36	64*	0	0	82**
2. grabs things at dinner table	36*	21	7	21	28**
3. strikes others at dinner table	57*	42	0	0	79**
4. throws food around at table	36	50*	14	0	68**
5. noisy before rising time	36	50*	7	0	63**
6. refuses to settle at bed time	36*	36	21	0	61**
7. vulgar language	7	71*	7	7	65**
8. destructive acts to other boys' property	14	71*	14	0	79**
9. destructive acts to Center's property	0	100*	0	0	100**
10. out of bounds - front yard	29	43*	7	0	45
11. out of bounds - leaves yard	21	50*	0	14	59
12. out of bounds - from unit	14	42*	14	14	44
13. refuses to wash himself	7	57*	7	7	51**
14. refuses to make his bed	7	57*	21	0	60**
TOTAL					
PERCENTAGES	25	55	9	5	7
	80		9	12	

* Mode

** Indicates increase over authoritarian period.

How enduring these attitudes will be is of course difficult to predict. They may be merely a transitory reaction to the particular social climate that has been produced at this time. Even if the latter proved to be the case it might be more desirable than the preservation of attitudes which run counter to the wider social ethic. If, as the data here suggest, a permissive mode of control is more conducive to the development of conventional attitudes and since in large measure this is one of the objectives of treatment, then it certainly seems that a permissive mode of control is more effective in aiding one aspect of residential treatment.

TABLE 8
COMPARISON OF INDICES OF CONSENSUS

ITEMS	PRELIMINARY PERIOD	AUTHORITARIAN PERIOD	PERMISSIVE PERIOD
1	21	43	82
2	50	25	28
3	44	30	79
4	24	33	68
5	40	27	63
6	32	48	61
7	35	50	65
8	82	65	79
9	84	67	100
10	59	65	45
11	86	70	59
12	28	46	44
13	44	37	51
14	44	30	60

Inmate Orientation

The data from the questionnaire which probes inmate perspectives suggests in part that the mode of organizational authority affects the attitudes of its members.

On the factor of "attitudes towards the institution", we note that there has been a considerable increase in positive feelings. While this change falls slightly short of statistical significance the shift is nonetheless impressive and persuades us that there is an association between inmates' attitudes toward the institution and the type of authority in force. This association appears more striking when "attitudes toward staff" are evaluated. Here the shift towards a more favourable attitude is quite impressive and the change is significant at the .05 level. It will be remembered that the negative change during the authoritarian period was also significant which lends further support to the contention that the change which now occurs is not simply a whimsical swing. There seems ample basis therefore to contend that the mode of authority has direct bearing on the perspectives which inmates have of staff.

The results on the "co-operation" factor appear somewhat disappointing. While there is an increase in the propensity to co-operate with staff the figures are far from significant. Judging from the decrease of positive feelings on this factor during the authoritarian period and the slight increase occurring now it seems reasonable to suggest that there is probably some association between authority and inclination to co-operate with staff but that further research needs to be undertaken to evaluate the association.

"Group solidarity" showed a slight fluctuation in the expected direction, a decrease, but as in the earlier experimental period this change was not significant. In both the authoritarian and permissive periods the change was in conformity with original predictions but the variation was so small as to warrant caution in suggesting an association between authority and group solidarity.

The situation with respect to 'member integration' is less clear than any of the other factors. Integration showed a marked increase over the level of the authoritarian period. However, the level increased in the authoritarian period from that of the earlier phase. Therefore, there is no meaningful shift that can be discerned on this factor.

The response to "Prisonization" shows that there is virtually no change from the preceding authoritarian period. There is a consistent pattern of belief regarding the best modus vivendi at the institution-ritual conformity with rules and regulations.

The over-all results of the analysis of inmate perspectives at this time generally lends support to several of the original hypotheses as to the relation between authority and attitudes of inmates. Some of the relationships are more pronounced than others and some indicate a need for further investigation but the over-all impression suggests that different modes of authority induce corresponding differences in the reactions of actors.

COMPARISON OF INMATE PERSPECTIVES

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Authoritarian Period</u>	<u>Permissive Period</u>
	Percent Favourable	Percent Favourable
Attitudes to Institution	75	84
Attitudes to Staff	72	83
Co-Operation	68	71
Solidarity	66	61
Integration	66	79
Prisonization	44	55

Sociometric Response Pattern

The results on sociometric charts for this period indicate that the pattern of choice among boys is considerably less concentrated on a few key individuals as was the case under authoritarian control. Positive choice is spread more evenly among more boys during the permissive period. The presence of "unit leaders" is not nearly as pronounced as it was earlier and boys who tend towards passiveness receive a larger share of votes than they did formerly. As has been the case all the way through the study a leadership clique comprised of three senior boys still dominates the informal group structure. A fourth boy, Chess, also emerges as a very popular object of choice but, as was mentioned earlier, he cannot clearly be defined as a leader in the strict sense because of his passive and generally retiring character. Comparative data from other periods substantiate this contention about Chess; for example, in periods of stress such as authoritarian control his popularity decreases considerably and

risers just as markedly when the institutional climate is relatively relaxed.

The pattern of negative choices also appears to reflect the more relaxed conditions of this period. Negative choices are, with a couple of exceptions, far more evenly distributed throughout the whole group. The two boys who are rejected most often at this time are boys whose general behaviour is markedly non-conformist both in terms of group values and in terms of wider social norms. This statement can be extended to other boys who receive relatively high negative votes - they are less likely to reflect group values and at the same time are boys who present greater problems of control to the staff.

Again, with respect to choice of adult objects of inmate choice, we note a greater tendency to spread selection more evenly between members of the entire staff group at this time. Two male members of the child-care staff appear to be most popular but they neither are particularly lenient nor authoritarian in their own orientation so we cannot associate choice with permissive adults as was the case under authoritarian control. With respect to negative choices individuals who tend to be more authoritarian are those most frequently rejected by the boys.

In summary, sociometric choice during the period of permissive control is marked by a more even distribution of selection than was the case under the authoritarian period. Boys tend to reject other boys who least conform to group norms and to values one would associate with the wider society. A similar pattern is noted with boys' selection of staff: there is a fairly even distribution of positive choices and on the negative

side adults who tend towards rigidity are rejected most frequently.

Overt Behaviour

The data on overt behaviour during the permissive period exhibited a good deal more fluctuation in the day-to-day analysis than during the authoritarian period. Once again, in this period the variation was not sufficient to allow a detailed statistical analysis so we must rely on an impressionistic account of daily variance as this is provided by a graphical representation. From an inspection of this graph we note that 'collective outbursts' or 'group disturbances' were quite pronounced in this period. While the level of collective disturbance does not indicate extreme variation it is evident that boys were far more prone to a more frequent and more serious outbursts at this time. This seems to suggest that permissive control allows greater freedom for expression of hostilities and frustrations as these are manifest by overt behaviour than was the case under a strict form of authority.

Summary of Findings for the Permissive Period

The results of the analysis of data for the period of Permissive Control generally indicate a more favourable orientation by inmates to the organization. Consensus about the management of infractions is higher at this time than in any other period and the direction of opinions is remarkable in that it reflects a pronounced authoritarian quality. Agreement between staff and boys is not particularly evident except in a few instances. Nevertheless, the data seem to suggest a definite shift towards

accepting a more conventional view regarding infraction of rules and norms.

Attitudes toward staff and institution change to a considerably more positive level during this period and while only in the instance of "attitudes toward staff" was the shift statistically significant, the results tend most definitely to support the contention that attitudes are related to the organization's authority structure. Attitudes regarding co-operation with staff also show a positive increase and indicate that this is another factor influenced by the organization's authority structure. However, lack of statistical significance in the test of difference on this factor fails to provide concrete support of this association. 'Group solidarity' appears to diminish slightly during permissive control but the change is not significant. Data on 'member integration' is far from conclusive and persuades me to believe that little if any meaningful interpretation can be attached to its inconsistent change.

The results from the sociometric tests indicate a tendency towards a more even distribution of choice selections. Three senior boys are consistently the leaders and poll the greatest number of positive choices but selection is not as concentrated on them during this period as it was under authoritarian control. Boys who are rejected most often are those who least conform to inmate group norms. Adult staff members also receive a fairly equal distribution of positive choices during the permissive period and those who receive negative votes are individuals who tend to be less flexible in their orientation.

Overt behaviour as judged from the perceived level of disturbance appears to fluctuate more widely during the period of permissive control

than was the case under the authoritarian regime. This seems to suggest that the lenient character of permissive control induces boys to express anxieties and frustrations more freely and that this is manifest by more frequent and by somewhat more extreme levels of collective outbursts.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of the Findings

In this study I have examined some of the contingencies of social control as it operates within the organizational context of a residential treatment centre for emotionally disturbed children. More specifically, I was concerned with the ways in which different types of organizational authority affects the lower participants (who in this instance are the children in treatment). In order to investigate this problem, experimental conditions were established in the organization under study so that two contrasting modes of social control -- authoritarian and permissive -- could be examined and compared in terms of the responses of the children.

My primary concern was to ascertain the nature of commitment to the organization and its value system under these two contrasting modes of control. Several theories which suggested the relationship between authority and members' involvement in organizations were examined in Chapter 3 of this study. The foremost of these was Etzioni's theory "compliance structures" in complex organizations. He suggested that organizations differ in terms of their mode of authority and in terms of the kind of involvement which members have in the organization. For example, the organization may employ "normative", "remunerative" or "coercive" power depending on its goals; members involvement may be

high or low, negative or positive. If involvement is high and the direction positive Etzioni calls it "moral commitment"; if it is low and negative then he refers to it as "alienation". According to the theory an individual's involvement rests primarily on the type of power utilized by the organization so that if power is "coercive" the individual's involvement is likely to be of the alienative kind and conversely, if "normative" power is utilized then the actor is likely to be morally involved. As indicated, the use of one form of power as opposed to another depends largely on the organization's goals which may be either "order", "economic" or "cultural".

In this study I have referred largely to organizations with either order or cultural goals for these kinds of organizations conform most closely to the type under investigation. It has been demonstrated that in many respects the residential treatment institution has goals that are not clear cut. The traditional prison, for example, is easy to categorize; its primary concern is with the control and custody of people who are deemed a threat to society. In as much as the prison controls the activities of its members (inmates) and restrains them from deviant activities for the good of the wider social order, it may be said to have order goals. A school, on the other hand, which is entrusted with socializing its lower participants with quasi-sacred social values for the first time can be said to have "cultural" goals. The treatment institution tends to have goals which overlap. In some respects it can be seen to have "order" goals because its lower

participants are individuals who are viewed by some important segment of society as deviant. In as much as the treatment institution is concerned with participants' custody for the prevention of deviant activities, it is concerned with order. In other respects the residential treatment centre must be understood to have cultural goals; it is attempting to restore its lower participants' commitment to acceptable norms and values. However, when examined closely the treatment organization must be viewed as having predominantly cultural as opposed to order goals. Their primary purpose is to win from the individual his acceptance of wider social values so that he may be returned to the community and function there in a viable manner. The maintenance of order is secondary to the treatment function.

It is Etzioni's contention that commitment to organizational values is more effectively achieved where the power utilized is normative. Since the treatment institution is concerned primarily with helping inmates to internalize its directives and perceive them as legitimate it follows, from the theory, that the type of social control most conducive to this end will comprise manipulation of esteem, acceptance and positive response.

It is still a matter of some debate whether commitment to organizational values is achieved more effectively under a coercive form of social control or a normative system. In this study I have not attempted any exhaustive analysis. Social control based upon punitive sanctions and coercive measures may induce conformity with organizational

directives but not commitment to the organization. If this in fact is the case in the treatment centre inmates will not be positively oriented to the organization but will indicate an alienative involvement.

In this study I have taken this theory as our framework and analyzed two contrasting modes of authority.¹ I was not concerned with conclusively proving the efficacy of either of these modes of authority, for treatment but rather to indicate some of the ways in which each may effect participants' involvement in the organization.

These findings lend definite support to the suggestion that inmate orientations toward staff and institution are related to the organization's authority structure. Under a permissive mode of control staff endeavour to elicit acceptance of institutional values through the manipulation of symbolic rewards such as 'acceptance', esteem and positive response. At this time adult staff members are viewed by the children as the repository of gratifications and rewards and therefore children are positively oriented towards them. This contention is provided with additional support when inmate sociometric choice is examined. Children show a marked preference to choose staff members

¹ As mentioned earlier, authority may be viewed as legitimated power. Thus coercive authority is coercive power that has been legitimated in terms of some broader social values; and similarly with normative power. On this point see Talcott Parsons' discussion of Max Weber's use of power in the introduction to The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

who are most clearly identified with a permissive orientation and to reject those who tend to represent authority and rigidity. It seems reasonable to assert that relations with permissive adults produce less strain and offer greater satisfaction of inmate needs while those with more rigid authority figures cause stress and inhibit the free flow of communication and interaction. Observations made during the research period suggest that children tend to avoid interaction with staff who are more traditional authority figures or interact with them in a more formal manner. On the other hand boys exhibit considerable freedom in their relationships with permissive adults, bantering with them, swearing at them in a relaxed manner, hitting them or wrestling with them and talking to them more as equals than as representatives of formal authority. This is manifest to some extent in differences in relations with religious staff as opposed to lay personnel. The nature of their office imposes certain restrictions on the sisters of the Order; they tend to be reserved and limited in their freedom of expression and, more than other personnel, their persons are somewhat sacred and therefore are less approachable in some respects than lay people. For example, a child is not likely to come up to a Sister, hit her and then expect to be hit back in a friendly uninhibited manner. I do not wish to assert that relations between children and sisters are characterized by strain but only to point out that the nature of their office and of their traditional role limits to some degree freedom of interaction between them and the boys.

Under an authoritarian mode of control inmates are under constant pressure to conform to the institution's directives. This is not to say that there was not pressure under a permissive mode of authority but that pressure for conformity was quite latent in Merton's terms, whereas under the authoritarian system it was 'manifest' and openly intended. Under authoritarian control conformity was demanded on a formal basis with the explicit understanding that failure to comply would result in negative sanctions. In this system staff members were viewed as the agents of authority who controlled the distribution of these punitive sanctions rather than as the objects of rewards. Therefore, strain was induced in staff-inmate relationships that strongly inhibited interaction. This strain was evident in the lowered percentage of positive responses to staff members and by the concentration of positive sociometric choice on staff members who were less inclined to be identified with the formal system of authority.

In order to demonstrate how authority has effected inmates' involvement in Mount Saint Joseph Institute we shall return to our hypotheses as presented in Chapter 3 and examine them in the light of our findings.

My first hypothesis concerned the functional equivalents of power in the institution. I suggested, following Etzioni, that a permissive mode of social control would induce a more positive attitude toward the organization and staff than an authoritarian mode of control. In assessing this hypothesis an objective-type questionnaire was

administered to children under three different time periods: a preliminary period in which the institutional atmosphere was relatively relaxed, the authoritarian period which was marked by strictness and a punitive orientation and a permissive period where control was relaxed and the institutional atmosphere as friendly and liberal as possible.

Under the experiment period of permissive control inmate group opinion was strongly positive toward the staff and institution. When attitudes of the children during this period were compared with those during the authoritarian period a marked change was noted. Taking attitudes to staff and attitudes towards institution as separate factors we found that the change with respect to staff was statistically significant; change in orientation to the institution while not significant is nevertheless impressive.

The drop in positive attitudes towards the institution as distinct from staff can be related to the boys' views on prisonization. During an authoritarian regime boys are noticeably inclined to take the view that the best way to get along is to obey the rules and do what the staff tell them. This ritual conformity to rules intimates a tendency to view the institution more as a prison than a treatment community. When permissive control is in force there is an appreciable increase in positive attitudes; boys are more inclined to respond that the best way to get along is "to find out why they act the way they do" rather than merely obeying rules.

Thus we must conclude that there is fairly strong support for

the suggestion that attitudes are related to the mode of authority utilized by the organization.

The second hypothesis suggests that permissive control will engender greater co-operation with staff by inmates. The results are less convincing than we had hoped for but nevertheless indicate that there is some association between authority and co-operation although it is much less pronounced than that between authority and attitudes toward staff. It is found that co-operation is slightly enhanced under permissive control indicating that staff are viewed more favourably at this time than under a rigid system of authority. Data on co-operation introduces a barrier to satisfactory analysis in that the items on the questionnaire dealing with this factor produces a conflict in values for the boys. It is a generally accepted norm among boys that one does not "squeal" to the staff about elicit behaviour without incurring severe sanction from peers.

In-group loyalties on such matters are strong enough to more than compensate for any possible rewards a boy could receive from staff and therefore the peer group values supercede the formal value system. For this reason and because results on objective evaluation are so inconclusive I cannot with any degree of certainty maintain that co-operation is related to the authority system. Only further and more detailed analysis will shed light on this matter.

The third hypothesis indicated that hostility in the form of collective outbursts and lack of self control would increase during an

authoritarian system of control. The theory led me to suggest that authoritarian control would tend to induce an alienative response by the inmate group which I believed would be marked by collective outbursts of hostility and lack of self control. The authority structure of this mode of control places strain on relationships between boys and staff and creates deprivations for the former group because of frustrations and the lack of positive rewards which the system produces. Generally speaking, tensions within the institution are usually evident by collective disturbances and therefore it was assumed that increased tension would be manifest by such outbreaks. The evidence does not support this contention. In fact the findings are completely contrary to expectations. The objective evaluation of overt behaviour demonstrated that a coercive type of pressure and concomitant negative sanctions contingent upon infractions forces the boys into a more restrained pattern of behaviour. Group disturbances, as measured by the overt level of disturbance are infrequent and not pronounced. This is quite different from the behaviour pattern in the permissive period when the level of perceived disturbance rose quite markedly on several occasions. Interpreting this increased level of group disturbance in terms of the organization's authority structure I would suggest that during a permissive regimen acceptance and toleration of inmates' acting-out is greater and that a relaxation of stringent methods of control allows boys considerable freedom to express anxieties, frustrations and hostile feelings. There is no longer the fear that

failure to comply with institutional norms will bring quick reprisals. Thus it seems reasonable to suggest that while the pressure of authoritarian control undoubtedly creates serious strain and with it a certain amount of antagonism toward staff and institution, it enforces a higher level of conformity with organizational norms and acts as a restraint on the expression of group sentiments.

The fourth hypothesis suggested that under an authoritarian mode of control group solidarity would be heightened. It was felt that the authoritarian system would deprive the inmate group of needed rewards and support from the staff. Under the strain and deprivation of this form of control it was expected that inmates would fall back on their own resources and organize themselves to provide mutual support and defence against the formal system. Only slight support for this contention was found in the data. Group solidarity was evaluated solely on the basis of questionnaire response and the results indicate a slight but insignificant increase in the percentage figures during the authoritarian period. It is still tempting to imagine that some relation does exist between the organization's authority structure and solidarity since the results do not entirely rule out the possibility. I would be inclined to accept the contention inherent in this hypothesis but at the same time admit the point has not been proven with the available information. Perhaps a replication of this aspect of the research using a more sensitive measurement would provide more conclusive

evidence on the matter.

Hypothesis five asserts that inmate integration will increase during the period of permissive control. Authoritarian control exerts a certain amount of cross pressure on individual inmates; they are under duress to conform to the institution's directives and at the same time they have obligations to their own peer group. These obligations are more demanding under coercive authority than under permissive authority because in the former system the individual must rely more heavily on rewards that favourable reciprocal relations with peers provide. This hypothesis finds only partial support from the facts. Integration was evaluated in terms of consensus which here is the amount of agreement about the organization's value system and in terms of the number of close friends boys claimed to have in the institution. On both these criteria integration was found to increase during the permissive period but data from the preliminary period of the research which was marked by a moderate degree of permissiveness failed to show consensus as being as high as either of the two experimental periods. I am only partly justified, therefore, in suggesting that when more positive perspectives dominate the inmate group we will find boys better integrated within the informal inmate group.

The last hypothesis, number six, maintained that under permissive control informal leaders in the inmate group will exhibit behaviour that more closely conforms to the institution's ideals. From this the obverse was also thought to occur, namely, that under

authoritarian control informal group leaders would emerge whose attitudes are negative and unco-operative towards staff and institution. These suggestions were only partly confirmed in the research. During the preliminary period and the period of permissive control three leaders were clearly in evidence and each indicated quite positive orientation to the organization. In the authoritarian period the positive orientation of these three boys remained consistently strong. The only evidence that could be rallied in support of our final hypothesis cannot be shown to be conclusively proven or disproven.

At this point the relevance of the findings of this research for the original problem must be shown. According to Etzioni's theory of complex organizations treatment centres of the kind described in this thesis can be seen as having predominantly cultural goals in that they are seeking from their lower participants (inmates) a positive commitment to values and symbols deemed to be desirable by the wider society. The theory holds that organizations with cultural goals use primarily normative power in inducing commitment to its values and that coercive power tends to alienate lower participants. It has been argued that Mount Saint Joseph Institute is trying to achieve effective treatment of its boys by inducing them to accept the values and norms which it espouses. We have further maintained that normative power and its functional equivalent, normative authority, better aids in achieving the positive commitment it is striving for. The data from the present

study suggest that this is in part the case. We have examined the contingencies of social control within the organizational setting and found that they are influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the mode of social control. It has been demonstrated that where normative control which in this case is characterized by a permissive orientation on the part of the organization is more effective in inducing positive attitudes towards the organization, co-operation, inmate integration both tend to be more positively oriented and prisonized responses decrease. Leadership also tends to be somewhat more positive. While not all of these contingencies have shown conclusive evidence in support of normative control the general conclusion must be made that normative authority as characterized by permissive control is more effective in inducing a positive orientation to the institution than its opposite form of authority -- authoritarian control.

The Major Weaknesses of this Study

In the view of the writer there are a number of weaknesses in this study which are of both a conceptual and methodological nature. I shall not attempt to cover all of these but only those which are most striking and which I feel constitute major weaknesses.

The reader will undoubtedly be aware of a conceptual bias towards a characteristically American ideology regarding a "democratic-permissive" orientation on the part of the researcher. While I have conscientiously endeavoured to avoid such a bias it nevertheless appears at several points. For example, with respect to the authoritarian method

of social control I have neglected to consider the added effect on inmates of socializing mechanisms. I have treated authoritarian social control as a single variable without including socializing techniques which are frequently employed in authoritarian social systems. Many authoritarian political systems employ quite effective techniques in winning an individual's commitment to the system's ideology. An example of this is found in political indoctrination camps where inmates are moved from one inmate group to another depending on their degree of ideological acceptance. This mechanism and many others like it are authoritarian without being especially punitive. It is quite possible that comparable techniques could have been employed in this research in connection with authoritarian control; had they been, the pattern of inmate response might have been appreciably different than that found in the research. Moreover, it should be appreciated that an authoritarian method of control which employs such socializing techniques need not have the negative connotations which our own society usually ascribes to it.

Another major weakness is the failure to readminister all questionnaires again during the period which intervened between the two experimental periods. The fact that we had to rely predominantly on subjective evaluation of boys during this interval fails to provide the study with a complete and consistent analysis of every phase. Be that as it may, it is extremely doubtful whether this could have been attempted were the study repeated. The reason for this, as was mentioned earlier, was the fact that answering intimate and somewhat disturbing questions

was very anxiety producing for many of the children; therefore, in the interests of both children and staff the questionnaires were not administered at this time.

Another weakness which undoubtedly affects our results to some degree was the fact that the researcher was not able to continually supervise the enforcement of the two types of authority. To have provided complete supervision over staff would have entailed almost complete twenty-four-hour-a-day observation and this was obviously out of the question. Connected with this failing is one referred to earlier in this study. This was the absence of any effective assessment of the way staff members actually performed their roles in both the authoritarian and permissive periods. This constitutes a fairly serious methodological shortcoming since an objective evaluation through the use of some 'role performance inventory' other than the general one provided here would have been highly desirable.

Also in connection with the staff's performance more consideration could have been given to the effect of the staffs' attitudes and sentiments upon the inmates' pattern of response. As I have mentioned in Chapter 4 the staff expressed feelings of strain and anxiety in carrying out an authoritarian mode of control. No assessment was made as to how their anxieties might have affected inmates' attitudes and behaviour. For example, one may well ask whether the authoritarian mode of control per se was sufficient to have induced a decrease in inmates' positive attitudes and patterns of behaviour. How much of this change from one

period to the next might be attributed to the staffs' emotional feelings and how much to the mode of social control per se has not been evaluated in this study.

The actual timing of the social control periods may also have influenced the findings. I have mentioned the fact that the authoritarian period of control ended just prior to the Christmas holidays. It is therefore possible that some of the negative feelings occurring at this time may have been attributed to inmates' anxieties about plans for the holiday season. To have controlled for this contingency the research might better have been carried out either in the early fall or in the spring.

There is also a further area of investigation which was not given attention in this study. It will be remembered that only two of Etzioni's three theoretical types of organizational power were utilized in conducting this study. Remunerative power was not employed as a possible alternative although it quite conceivably could have been. If, for example, a large provision of candies, popcorn, toys and so forth had been used to induce conformity with rules and to engender positive attitudes the study would have had a broader base for comparing types of social control.

Finally, one further weakness of the study lies in the difficulty of administering effective questionnaires to children of a young age. One of the questionnaires used in this study was adapted from a study done on older children in the teen-age range. The questionnaire was not

pretested to iron out possible weaknesses that might have been peculiar to the children under study. The fact that we were unable to obtain more conclusive information on "group solidarity" and "member integration" may be due in part to inadequate preparation of questionnaire items.

Contributions of This Study and the Relevance for Further Research

This study represents an attempt to contribute further knowledge to the study of organizational authority. Specifically it has been the objective of the study to investigate the relationship between an organization's authority structure and the response to it by the "lower participants" of the organization. The concern here has been with a residential treatment centre for children, a type of organization on which there have been very few studies. Numerous studies have been conducted with a similar objective to this research but they have been largely confined to institutions for older children. Whereas some of these studies have compared the authority structures of several correctional institutions and compared inmate orientation to them, the present research has been confined to a single case. Research into the problem of the most effective institutional structure for the treatment of children is a relatively recent development; the solution to this problem appears to be still a long way off. Nevertheless, this study has focused attention on a number of sociological variables which under further investigation may enhance our knowledge of a vital problem.

It is evident that the problem of social control is central to

the operation of both treatment centres, correctional institutions and adult mental hospitals. Inmate energies, emotions, their frustrations and hostilities have to be subject to some degree of authority and control. The question remains what kind of authority will best serve this control function yet not alienate the individual from treatment or rehabilitation goals. The present study has indicated the relationship between authority and attitudes but considerably more research needs to be undertaken before a greater understanding of the relationship is reached.

To gain further knowledge on this relationship it is the opinion of the researcher that the present study could be used as the basis of additional studies. For example, a controlled experiment in a larger institution for children might compare two wards with differing forms of authority. Ready comparisons could be made of inmates' responses and general behaviour. In addition it seems feasible that comparative studies be made of two or more similar treatment institutions, each using a somewhat different mode of authority.

There is a further area that demands special research. Not all institutions are comprised of inmates with similar background variables. Some institutions are so constituted that their clientele is largely middle class, others will have populations made up primarily of individuals coming from working class homes. Therefore it is conceivable that the child's background will affect his response to authority. For example, numerous writers have drawn attention to the relationship between working class

authoritarianism and social behaviour in other areas of life. Some writers contend that working class individuals tend to accept authority and operate more effectively when the lines of authority are carefully and fairly rigidly drawn. To what extent such a situation persists in young children of working class backgrounds has not received much attention. It may well be that such children will respect more stringent authority than do middle class children and may therefore be more prone to committing themselves to values which more closely conform to those of their particular background. I would suggest therefore that a study could be made of this relationship in the institutional setting using a research design similar to the one undertaken here.

When placed within the wider context of effective therapy of children in treatment institutions this study can be seen to have considerable heuristic value. While the relationship between the institution's authority structure and inmates' response has not provided any conclusive proof concerning the efficacy of one or other mode of social control for treatment, I feel that the findings have been fruitful in pointing out the importance of authority for inducing attitudes among inmates that may have a significant bearing on their therapy.

The findings of this study that there is a strong relationship between authority and the attitudes of inmates suggests that this research could also be fruitful in developing further hypotheses about organizational structure of treatment settings which could be investigated in other empirical contexts.

APPENDIX A

SOCIOMETRIC INDICES

TIME PERIOD #1 PRE-STUDY CONDITIONS Positive Choices

	Angel	Able	Wetherby	Candle	Macbeth	Wanders	Bites	Startz	Little	Round	George	Wessen	School	Greenstreet	Chess
1. Angel															
2. Able	32			2						3			1	1	
3. Wetherby							33			21			12	1	
4. Candle							12	3		1			2		
5. Macbeth				2		2	3			3			2		1
6. Wanders					33		3			2			11		
7. Bites					1					2			1		
8. Startz			3				2					2		21	
9. Little			2				1							3	
10. Round							22						11		33
11. George							2						1		3
12. Wessen	1					3								32	
13. School	1	3			2		33			11					
14. Greenstreet			22				3	2		1					
15. Chess			2			2						2		13	
												3		1	
													1		
Total as first choice	2				1		3			6		1	10	4	5
Total as second choice	1		4	2	1	2	5	1		3		4	5	2	1
Total as third choice	1	1	1		2	1	9	1		5		1		3	7
Total choices	4	1	5	2	4	3	17	2		14		6	15	9	13
Percentages	42	11	53	21	42	32	179	21	0	14.7	0	6.3	15.8	9.5	137

TIME PERIOD #1 PRE-STUDY CONDITIONS Negative Choices

	Angel	Able	Wetherby	Candle	Macbeth	Wanders	Bites	Startz	Little	Round	George	Wessen	School	Greenstreet	Chess
1. Angel															
2. Able				1			32	1				23			3
3. Wetherby				3 1			3	1 3		1			2		2 2
4. Candle	3	11				3		3				2			
5. Macbeth	11 1	33 3										22 2			
6. Wanders	32 2	23 3													
7. Bites	11	22						3 3				3			
8. Startz				33 3						11 1			22 2		
9. Little															
10. Round		22				1		11 3				2			
11. George															
12. Wessen	3	32			11	2 1								3	
13. School	22 2	33 3						11 1							
14. Greenstreet	22 1	31				3		2					1 3		
15. Chess															
Total as first choice	6	3		2	2	2		8		4			2		
Total as second choice	7	6	1			2	1	1				7	4		2
Total as third choice	3	10		4		2	2	5				2	1	1	1
Total choices	16	19	1	6	2	6	3	14		4		9	7	1	3
Percentages	17.6	20.9	1.1	6.6	2.2	6.6	3.3	15.4	0	4.4	0	9.9	7.7	1.1	3.3

TIME PERIOD #1 (PRE-STUDY CONDITIONS) Positive Choices

	Silegan	Molim	Rebor	Lyrest	Serbert	Fahid	Dayar	Legnart	Karam	Biscuits	Namter	Rettab	Sinnes	Rehrag	Sortred	Others
1. Angel													3		2	1
2. Able										1	2			3		
3. Wetherby								3		1					2	
4. Candle				3						1				2		
5. Macbeth						2				1				3	3	1
6. Wanders										2				3	2	
7. Bites										1				3	1	
8. Startz																
9. Little										1				3	2	
10. Round																
11. George										1				3	2	
12. Wessen								2		1					3	
13. School										2					3	
14. Greenstreet		1					2	1								
15. Chess			3													
Total as first choice		1						1		7					1	2
Total as second choice						1	1	1		2	1			1	5	
Total as third choice			1	1				1					1	5	3	
Total choices		1	1	1		1	1	3		9	1		1	6	9	2
Percentages	0	2.8	2.8	2.8	0	2.8	2.8	8.3	0	25.0	2.8	0	2.8	16.7	25.0	5.6

TIME PERIOD #1 (PRE-STUDY CONDITIONS) Negative Choices

	Silegan	Molim	Rebor	Lyrest	Serbert	Fahid	Dayar	Legnart	Karam	Biscuits	Namter	Rettab	Sinnes	Rehrag	Sortred	Others
1. Angel																
2. Able							2	1		3						
3. Wetherby								3					2		1	
4. Candle	1	3			2											
5. Macbeth	1	2			3											
6. Wanders		3		2						1						
7. Bites				3	2	1										
8. Startz	3	2										1				
9. Little																
10. Round						2		3				1				
11. George																
12. Wessen						1	2	3								
13. School					1											2,3
14. Greenstreet					1	2						3				
15. Chess						3				1					2	
Total as first choice	2				2	2		1		2		2			1	
Total as second choice		2		1	2	2	2						1		1	1
Total as third choice	1	2		1	1	1		3		1		1				1
Total choices	3	4		2	5	5	2	4		3		3	1		2	2
Percentages	3.3	11.1	0	5.6	13.9	13.9	5.6	11.1	0	8.3	0	8.3	2.8	0	5.6	5.6

TIME PERIOD #2 AUTHORITY CONTROL Positive Choices

	Angel	Able	Wetherby	Candle	Macbeth	Wanders	Bites	Startz	Little	Round	George	Wessen	School	Greenstreet	Chess
1. Angel							22 2			31 1			13 3		
2. Able	13 2		2									2 3		31 1	
3. Wetherby	1	2			3		3 1			2 2			1 3		
4. Candle			2 2				13 1			3			2		1 3
5. Macbeth															
6. Wanders			33 3		12 1		21 2								
7. Bites						3				21 2			12 1		3 3
8. Startz				22 1		11 2				3			33		
9. Little	1 2		1		3		2			3		2 3	1		
10. Round							32 3						13 1		21 2
11. George			2				11 1			22			33 3		
12. Wessen	33		22		1					3				1 1	
		2													
13. School			33 2				22 3			11 1					
14. Greenstreet	1 3				32	3				1 1	2				
15. Chess										11					
Total as first choice	4		1	1	3	2	7			10			7	4	2
Total as second choice	2	2	7	2	2	1	10			6		3	2		2
Total as third choice	4		5		3	2	5			5		2	9	1	3
Total choices	10	2	13	3	8	5	22			21		5	18	5	7
Percentages	3.4	1.7	10.9	2.5	6.7	4.2	18.5	0	0	17.6	0	4.2	15.1	4.2	5.9

TIME PERIOD #2 AUTHORITY CONTROL Negative Choices

	Angel	Able	Wetherby	Candle	Macbeth	Wanders	Bites	Startz	Little	Round	George	Wessen	School	Greenstreet	Chess
1. Angel		11 1				33 3						22 2			
2. Able			1		3	2				1 1		2	3 3		2
3. Wetherby	2 1	1				31 2		2	3						3
4. Candle	11 1	22 2				3 3								3	
5. Macbeth	21 2	12 1						33						3	
6. Wanders								33 3		21 2			12 1		
7. Bites	2 3	12 1		3				1 2						3	
8. Startz			13							21		32			
9. Little		32	3			11	1			2		2	3		
10. Round	2 1		3	2		3 3		11 2							
11. George	2 2	3		3				11 3				2 1			
12. Wessen					2		3 2	1 1	1 1		2		3 3		
13. School	11 2	22 3												33 1	
14. Greenstreet		1 3	2	33				1	2	1		2			
15. Chess		1 2	2	33					2	1				3	
Total as first choice	9	10	2			3	1	7	2	6		1	2	1	
Total as second choice	8	9	2	1	1	2	1	3	2	4	1	8	1		1
Total as third choice	1	4	3	6	1	8	1	6	1			1	5	6	1
Total choices	18	23	7	7	2	13	3	16	5	10	1	10	8	7	2
Percentages	13.6	17.4	5.3	5.3	1.5	9.8	2.3	12.1	3.8	7.6	.8	7.6	6.1	5.3	1.5

TIME PERIOD #2 AUTHORITARIAN CONTROL Positive Choices

	Silegan	Molim	Rebor	Lyrest	Serbert	Fahid	Dayar	Legnart	Karam	Biscuits	Namter	Rettab	Sinnes	Rehrag	Sortred	Others
1. Angel					1							3	1	3	2	
2. Able		2						3						1	2	
3. Wetherby								2		1				3		
4. Candle						3								2	1	
5. Macbeth																
6. Wanders		2	1								3			1	2	3
7. Bites												2			1	
8. Startz						3									2	
9. Little						1									2	3
10. Round											2	3		1		
11. George						2					1	3				
12. Wessen		3									1			2		
13. School						3		2						1		
14. Greenstreet	3	2			1											
15. Chess																
Total as first choice			1		2	1				1	2		1	4	2	
Total as second choice		3				1		2			1	1		2	4	
Total as third choice	1	1				3		1			1	3		2		2
Total choices	1	4	1		2	5		3		1	4	4	1	8	6	2
Percentages	2.4	9.5	2.4	0	4.8	11.9	0	7.1	0	2.4	9.5	9.5	2.4	19.0	14.3	4.8

TIME PERIOD #2 AUTHORITARIAN CONTROL Negative Choices

	Silegan	Molim	Rebor	Lyrest	Serbert	Fahid	Dayar	Legnart	Karam	Biscuits	Nanter	Rettab	Sinnes	Rehrag	Sortred	Others
1. Angel	3	1			2											
2. Able						3	2	1								
3. Wetherby							1		3		2					
4. Candle						1	2									3
5. Macbeth											1	2				3
6. Wanders						2									1	3
7. Bites																
8. Startz																
9. Little	3	1			2											
10. Round	3	1			2											
11. George									3				1	2		
12. Wessen					3										2	1
13. School											2	1			3	
14. Greenstreet							2	3							1	
15. Chess																
Total as first choice		3				1	1	1			1	1	1		2	1
Total as second choice					3	1	3				2	1		1	1	
Total as third choice	3				1	1		1	2						1	3
Total choices	3	3			4	3	4	2	2		3	2	1	1	4	4
Percentages	8.3	8.3	0	0	11.1	8.3	11.1	5.6	5.6	0	8.3	5.6	2.8	2.8	11.1	11.1

TIME PERIOD #3 PERMISSIVE CONTROL Positive Choices

	Angel	Able	Wetherby	Candle	Macbeth	Wanders	Bites	Startz	Little	Round	George	Wessen	School	Greenstreet	Chess
1. Angel		1		2			1		3	2		2	1		3
2. Able	11 3		2						1	32			3	2	3
3. Wetherby					1		2 1			3 2	3		1 3	2	
4. Candle			33 2				1			22 1					1 3
5. Macbeth				1			2			22			11	3	33
6. Wanders			1 3		32 2		1		2					3 1	
7. Bites									3 3	12 2			3		21 1
8. Startz				1 2		3	2 3							2	31 1
9. Little							22 2			33 3			11 1		
10. Round				3			3 3						22 2		11 1
11. George			31 3		2 2		2			13 1					
12. Wessen	3 3	2 1							11 2		2		3		
13. School				23 3			32 2			11 1					
14. Greenstreet	1	3	2		31	3				1	2		2		
15. Chess															
Total as first choice	3	2	2	2	2		4		3	8			7	1	8
Total as second choice		1	3	3	4		9		2	9	2	1	4	3	1
Total as third choice	3	1	5	3	2	2	4		3	6	1		4	2	6
Total choices	6	4	10	8	8	2	17		8	23	3	1	15	6	15
Percentages	4.8	3.2	7.9	6.3	6.3	1.6	13.5	0	6.3	18.3	24	.8	11.9	4.8	11.9

TIME PERIOD #3 PERMISSIVE CONTROL Negative Choices

	Angel	Able	Wetherby	Candle	Macbeth	Wanders	Bites	Startz	Little	Round	George	Wessen	School	Greenstreet	Chess
1. Angel			2		3	1	2			13	3			1	
2. Able				1 3		3				21 1	2			32	2
3. Wetherby	3	2			1 1	1					2	3		3	
4. Candle	2 2	3				11 2		3 1					3		
5. Macbeth	21	12 2				1			3			33			
6. Wanders								32 3		1			21 2		
7. Bites															
8. Startz	3			1 2	3 2					22			13 1		
9. Little	3					22 2		11 1				33			
10. Round		3 3		2 2			2	11 1						3	
11. George		1				22		13 3						31 2	
12. Wessen						1	2 3	23 1		31 2					
13. School	2	23 2						11 1						3 3	
14. Greenstreet	1		1			3 2		3	2 1		2	3			
15. Chess															
Total as first choice	2	2	1	2	2	6		12	1	5			3	2	
Total as second choice	4	6	1	2	1	7	3	2	1	4	3		2	2	1
Total as third choice	3	4		1	2	2	1	7	1	2	1	6	2	6	
Total choices	9	12	2	5	5	15	4	21	3	11	4	6	7	10	1
Percentages	7.8	10.4	1.7	4.3	4.3	13.0	3.5	18.3	2.6	9.6	3.5	5.2	6.1	8.7	.9

TIME PERIOD #3 PERMISSIVE CONTROL Positive Choices

	Silegan	Molim	Rebor	Lyrest	Serbert	Fahid	Dayar	Legnart	Karam	Biscuits	Namter	Rettab	Sinnes	Rehrag	Sortred	Others
1. Angel				3					2							1
2. Able						3							2		1	
3. Wetherby	3					2		3			1	2		1	2	
4. Candle										2	1			3		
5. Macbeth											1					
6. Wanders											1					
7. Bites						3					1				1	
8. Startz											3			2	1	
9. Little	3	1		2							2			1	3	
10. Round						2					3			1		
11. George							3	2				1				
12. Wessen																
13. School									3	2					1	
14. Greenstreet																
15. Chess																
Total as first choice		1									3	1		3	4	1
Total as second choice				1		2		1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	
Total as third choice	2			1		2	1	1	1		3			1	1	
Total choices	2	1		2		4	1	2	2	2	7	2	1	5	7	1
Percentages	5.1	2.6	0	5.1	0	10.3	2.6	5.1	5.1	5.1	17.9	5.1	2.6	12.8	17.9	2.6

TIME PERIOD #3 PERMISSIVE CONTROL Negative Choices

	Silegan	Molim	Rebor	Lyrest	Serbert	Fahid	Dayar	Legnart	Karam	Biscuits	Namter	Rettab	Sinnes	Rehrag	Sortred	Others
1. Angel	3						1			3				2	1	2
2. Able						2					3	1				
3. Wetherby					1											
4. Candle	3	2			3	1			2							
5. Macbeth																
6. Wanders	3	2							1							
7. Bites																
8. Startz	3	1			2											
9. Little					1											2,3
10. Round	2	1			3											
11. George									1			3			2	
12. Wessen									1				3		2	
13. School																
14. Greenstreet						1					2					3
15. Chess																
Total as first choice		2			2	2	1		3			1			1	
Total as second choice	1	2			1	1			1		1			1	2	2
Total as third choice	4				2					1	1	1	1			2
Total Choices	5	4			5	3	1		4	1	2	2	1	1	3	4
Percentages	13.9	11.1	0	0	13.9	8.3	2.8	0	11.1	2.8	5.6	5.6	2.8	2.8	8.3	11.1

APPENDIX B

STAFF INSTRUCTIONS FOR EXPERIMENTAL PERIODS

AUTHORITARIAN MODE OF SOCIAL CONTROL

General Rules and Procedures

Rules and procedures are to be formulated by the director and enforced with impartiality by the staff.

Rules should be strictly enforced and punitive action taken by the staff when deviance occurs.

Communication

Communication should be maintained on a formal and general level (i.e., the casework approach where each child is treated as an individual and instructed accordingly should be kept to a minimum during this period).

Announcements should be made on a formal and impersonal basis.

Maximum use should be made of the notice board where this is possible.

Allocation of Duties

The allocation of duties should be strictly discharged by the worker. That is, the individual boys should not be allowed the choice of duties nor the discretion as to when or how they are to be carried out.

Outings and Recreational Activities

Planning of outings, hikes, swimming and other recreational activities should be carried out by the staff without the soliciting of opinions from the boys.

TYPE OF BEHAVIOUR EXHIBITEDMODE OF HANDLING

1. Hurting another boy

The boy causing the hurt should be separated from the other boy and from the group. If the action occurs outside in the yard the boy should be sent inside to his room. Similarly, if it occurs indoors the boy should be confined to his room for a period of not less than thirty minutes.

2. Disorderly and disruptive behaviour at the dinner table (includes throwing things about, striking out at others and other instances of disruptive behaviour which interferes with the calm and orderly situation)

The boy should be warned first. If he persists he is to be sent from the room and to return after the others have finished to eat his meal alone. The boy will also automatically lose his dessert if he is sent from the room.

3. Disruptive behaviour before rising and after bedtime.

The boy should be warned first. If he persists he should be separated from the other boys. As a consequence the boy is to go to bed one half hour earlier than usual. For subsequent disturbances the boy will lose additional half hours, i.e., the boy will go to bed an hour earlier than normal.

TYPE OF BEHAVIOUR EXHIBITEDMODE OF HANDLING

4. Use of Vulgar Language

The boy should be warned first. If he persists, he must be sent to his room and be required to write out "I must not use bad language" one hundred times. If this has no effect then the boy will pay an appropriate fine from his allowance and lose outing privileges.

5. Breaking the property of other boys or that belonging to the Centre.
(This includes toys, clothing, comic books, cards and any other property.)
It also includes the taking of property belonging to others.

The boy must pay for the damaged or taken property either in kind as in the case of comic books or cards, or the boy must pay for it from his own allowance.

6. Going out of bounds.

The boy should be warned. If he persists then he loses his freedom and is put in restriction, i.e., confined to his room (in P.J's if seriousness merits this).
The amount of time for a first offence should be half an hour. Subsequent restriction should be commensurate with additional offences.

TYPE OF BEHAVIOUR EXHIBITEDMODE OF HANDLING

7. Duties and Responsibilities.

(This includes school work as well as any other required by the Centre).

The boy should be warned. If he persists then he loses outing privileges. If the behaviour still continues after two weeks running then the boy is to lose his privilege to visit home.

8. Running.

Child has to make up for whatever failings result from his escapade, i.e., (a) everything should be thoroughly checked and compensation, especially for stolen goods, should be made, (b) whatever schooling or other responsibilities the child misses while away has to be made up.

For leaving the grounds without permission, the child should make-up by spending a similar period of time in some degree of confinement, i.e., if for only a short while and the matter can be settled more quickly to the advantage of the child, use the quiet room, if for a relatively long time, use bedroom. P.J's can be used when it will have a "quieting" effect or when it can make it easier to carry out the confinement.

The child may also have his home-visiting privileges cancelled.

MOUNT SAINT JOSEPH CENTRERULES

Rising: Boys who get up in the morning before rising time must take care not to disturb other boys who are still sleeping. Rising time is 7:30 a.m.

Bedtime: Bedtime for juniors is 8:00 p.m.
Bedtime for seniors is 8:30 p.m.

Outside Play: Boys should play in the yard or playground and stay away from the parking lot, garage, laundry and front yard.

Living Room
and
T.V. Room: These rooms are for you to play in and enjoy. They are to be used at these times:

After breakfast

Before lunch

Before supper

Before bedtime

Rough play or disturbing behaviour will result in the loss of the privilege of using these rooms.

Proper use of furniture and games is required at all times. If you damage things you will have to pay for them out of your own pocket money.

Dining Room: Boys should proceed in an orderly and quiet way to their places in the dining room.

Improper behaviour during meals may result in loss of dessert. Boys must stay out of the kitchen at all times.

RULES

- School Room: Boys should line up quietly and go quickly to their places in the classroom.
- Recess Time: All boys are expected to play outside during recess if the weather is fine. If the weather does not allow you to play outside, then the gym is to be used.
- Health Habits: Boys are expected to wash properly and brush their teeth.
- Personal Property: Boys should keep their things in a safe place.
If boys cannot use their things properly they may be taken from them and kept by the worker.
Trading is not allowed unless a unit leader witnesses the trade and agrees that it is fair.
- Inside Bounds: On the main floor the end of the junior unit is the end of bounds; so is the door to the offices.
Boys are not allowed to go into any bedroom or unit beside their own unless a worker gives permission.
Boys must stay out of the staff rooms.
- Vulgar Language: The use of vulgar language will not be tolerated. Boys who use it will be required to pay a fine from their own allowance or pay an appropriate penalty.
- Hurting Another Person: Hurting other boys or staff will not be tolerated.
Remember -- no one likes to be hurt.

PERMISSIVE MODE OF SOCIAL CONTROL

General Rules and Procedures

Rules and procedures should be formulated on the basis of consensus among staff as far as this is possible and should be applied according to the worker's discretion of the particular situation.

Permissiveness is the orientation and therefore rules should be applied in a nonpunitive way. Leniency and flexibility should be the guiding principles -- as these are perceived by the individual worker.

Communication

Communication should be maintained on an informal and intimate basis. Status differences between workers and boys should be held to a minimum. Emphasis should be placed on a "buddy" type relationship where social distance is minimized and where the free flow of information and ease of interaction is the standard.

Announcements affecting the whole group should be made as informal as possible.

Allocation of Duties

The allocation of duties should be carried out in consultation with the boys. The individual boy should be free to have some say in determining what chores he ought to do and also how these might best be carried out. Duties should be construed by the worker not as impositions but rather as a necessary part of everyone's life, as something expected from each boy but to which there are no consequences attached if they are not carried out.

Outings and Recreational Activities

Planning of outings, hikes, swimming and other organized activities should be carried out in consultation with the boys. Their opinions should be encouraged and solicited with a view to satisfying the wishes of the majority. In activities the worker should form an integral part of the group in all cases where this is possible.

Page Two

Childcare Policies

These should be conceived as aids to achieving greater consistency of childcare practices among the staff. Several interpretations are always possible within the policy of any written rule. Each worker should therefore strive to follow what to himself would constitute the more permissive interpretation of our policies. If at staff meetings some point relating to existing policies comes under discussion we should be ready to tentatively adopt more permissive policies at least for the duration of 'The Permissive Control' period.

Since one of the necessary characteristics of a permissive regime is the expression of individual feelings by staff as well as children, it would be entirely false to dictate methods of handling nonconforming behaviour to the Child Care staff.

It is therefore contingent upon the individual worker to decide for himself what, in the particular instance, is the least limiting and most permissive mode of handling the situation.

APPENDIX C

CHART OF OVERT BEHAVIOUR ANALYSIS

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONNAIRES

INDEX OF CONSENSUS

Here is a list of questions about boys' behaviour here at Mount St. Joseph.

We would like to know what you yourself think about such behaviour and what you think ought to be done about it.

To help you decide we are providing you with five different choices.

Read each choice over carefully.

When you've decided which answer is best, make a check beside the choice number you have chosen.

HERE ARE THE QUESTIONS

1. What do you think should be done about a boy who is really hurting another boy?

(1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____

2. When a boy reaches and grabs things at the dinner table?

(1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____

3. When a boy strikes others at the dinner table?

(1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____

4. When a boy throws food about at the dinner table?

(1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____

5. If a boy gets up before rising time and persists in being noisy what do you think should be done?

(1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____

6. After bed time when a boy refuses to settle down what do you think is the best way to deal with it.

(1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____

7. What about the use of vulgar language? How do you make a boy realize that he should not use it?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____
8. When a boy is destructive and breaks property belonging to others, what do you think should be done about it?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____
9. When a boy breaks property belonging to the Centre what do you think should be done?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____
10. When a boy goes out of bounds, say out on the front yard, what do you think is the best thing to do about it?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____
11. When a boy leaves the yard what do you think should be done?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____
12. When a boy is out of bounds from his unit what do you think should be done?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____
13. When a boy refuses to do a routine thing like wash himself what do you think should be done about it?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____
14. When a boy refuses to make his own bed what do you think should be done?
- (1) _____ (2) _____ (3) _____ (4) _____ (5) _____

HERE ARE THE FIVE DIFFERENT ANSWERS YOU CAN GIVE

1. Make the boy stop it by removing him from the other boys.
2. Make the boy suffer the consequences.
3. Ask the boy to do what he knows is right and tell him if he doesn't behave he will suffer the consequences.
4. Let the boy know you don't approve of his behaviour. Tell him that's not the way to act. But just leave it up to him to decide.
5. Pay no attention. Let him find out for himself that this is no way to act.

INMATE ORIENTATION

Questionnaire

- (1) What do you think about Mount St. Joseph Centre now after you've been here a while. Is it a better place than you thought it would be at first or is it worse?

1 a lot better
 1 ☒ 5 a lot worse

- (2) Do boys come to Mount St. Joseph because ...

1 It is a place that helps boys who have problems.
 3 ☒ 3 There was no one to look after them where they were before.
 5 It is a place for boys who are really bad.

- (3) Do you think that most of the boys who are here should be here in the first place?

5 ☒ 1 yes
 5 no

- (4) Do you feel that the boys are better when they leave here?

1 yes
 1 ☒ 5 no

- (5) Before coming here, if you had your choice would you choose ...

1 to come here
 1 ☒ 5 to go to some other place (NOT YOUR HOME)

- (6) What do you think about the workers here. Do you think that they're here at Mount St. Joseph because...

15 they have a job to do
 3 they have to look after the place
☒ 1 they like the boys and want to help them.

(7) Do you agree or disagree?

The workers here are pretty fair in the treatment of boys.

- ☒ 1 always fair
☒ 3 sometimes
☐ 5 hardly ever

(8) Do you think that the workers here can help you find out why you get into trouble or why you have problems and help you get along better.

The workers here can...

- ☒ 1 help me a lot
☐ 2 help me some
☐ 3 only help me a little
☐ 4 not help me at all

(9) Do you think that you yourself have been helped by being here?

- ☒ 1 Yes
☐ 5 No

(10) If some of the boys started to fight do you think its better to go tell the worker?

- ☒ 1 Yes
☐ 5 No

(11) Suppose some of the boys were stealing food from the kitchen and you knew about it and knew who they were; and suppose a worker found out about it but didn't know who had done it and said that all the boys suffered the consequences. Would you...

- ☐ 1 tell the worker who had done it
☒ 5 keep quiet

- (12) If you knew that some of the boys were planning on taking off do you think it would be better for you to...

☐ 1 try to talk them out of it
☒ 5 leave it up to themselves

- (13) Sometimes some of the boys around here hang around with just one or two other boys, some of them hang around with a lot of other boys. Do you usually hang around....

☐ 1 with several guys
☐ 2 with only a few guys
☒ 3 mostly with just one boy
 1 ☒ 4 none of them

- (14) How many of the boys that you have met here at Mount St. Joseph Centre would you like to meet again and keep as friends after you leave here?

☐ 1 almost all of the boys
☐ 2 several of the boys
 2 ☒ 3 only one or two of them
☐ 4 none of them

- (15) Suppose you were feeling sad and bothered by a personal problem. Are there boys here that you would talk your problem over with? How many?

☐ 1 almost all of the boys
☐ 2 several of them
☐ 3 only one or two of them
 1 ☒ 4 none of them

- (16) How much of the time do you think boys around here really stick together?

5/ ✓ 1 almost all of the time
 _____ 2 -about half of the time
 _____ 3 only occasionally
 _____ 4 never

12

- (17) Would you say the best way to get along here is to...

_____ 1 find out for yourself what makes you behave the way you do
 _____ 2 do what you think is right
J 3 don't break any rules and keep out of trouble
J 4 mind your own business and don't break any rules

- (18) (to be asked the boy)

What do you think is the best way to be discharged from Mount St. Joseph soonest?

Be good & don't go in the quiet room. Don't break any rules. Don't go and steal food. Don't let Tweedie out of the cage.

- (19) (to be asked the boy).

Boys come to Mount St. Joseph for a lot of different reasons. Think about yourself. Why do you think you came to Mount St. Joseph?

Cause I didn't have no father. I have a mother right now. Because I hang around other boys.

You go swimming in the winter at the Kwanan club.

the

1..	Does he explain to the boy the reasons for his requests; for example, does he explain how his request might benefit the boy?	-2	-1	0	1	2
2..	Does he try to establish a basis of friendship and companionship with the boys?	-2	-1	0	1	2
3..	Is he supportive and friendly to anxious or excited boys?	-2	-1	0	1	2
4..	Does he get overinvolved with boys? i.e., does he identify with the boys?	-2	-1	0	1	2
5..	Is he so easy going with boys that he does not ask them to do what they do not want to do, e.g., chores such as mopping up the bathroom, cleaning up after themselves, polishing shoes, etc?	-2	-1	0	1	2
6..	Is he sensitive to the emotional needs of boys, i.e., to what degree is he able to empathize with them?	-2	-1	0	1	2
7..	In limiting boys' non-conforming behaviour does he go about it in a friendly yet firm manner?	-2	-1	0	1	2
8..	Does he show genuine warmth and friendliness when he talks to boys?	-2	-1	0	1	2
9..	Does he seek new ways to give boys more freedom and involvement (in the Centre's program)?	-2	-1	0	1	2
10..	Do boys seem to enjoy being with him and talking to him?	-2	-1	0	1	2
11..	Do anxious boys seem to be more at ease around him?	-2	-1	0	1	2
12..	Does he let his own emotions interfere with his relationships with boys?	-2	-1	0	1	2

SOCIOMETRIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Suppose you had the chance to go on an over-night camping trip. If you could choose a friend from the other boys here to take with you on such a trip, who would be your:

(1) first choice _____
(2) second choice _____
(3) third choice _____

Now that you have chosen those boys you would like to have as friends for a camping trip think for a moment and write down those boys here at Mount St. Joseph you would rather not take with you on such a trip.

(1) your first choice _____
(2) your second choice _____
(3) your third choice _____

2. Suppose you had the chance to choose your own room-mate from the other boys here. Who would be your

(1) first choice _____
(2) second choice _____
(3) third choice _____

Who would you rather not have as your room-mate?

(1) your first choice _____
(2) your second choice _____
(3) your third choice _____

3. Suppose you got money and were told you could go to the Dairy Queen to buy a sundae for yourself and three other boys here. Which boys would be:

(1) your first choice to treat _____

(2) your second choice to treat _____

(3) your third choice to treat _____

Which of the boys would you rather not treat?

(1) your first choice _____

(2) your second choice _____

(3) your third choice _____

4. Suppose you were given the chance to go on a plane trip to Africa and were told you could take three grown-ups with you. Of the grown-ups here at Mount St. Joseph who would you choose to go with you?

(1) your first choice _____

(2) your second choice _____

(3) your third choice _____

Which of the grown-ups here would you not choose to go with you?

(1) your first choice _____

(2) your second choice _____

(3) your third choice _____

BEHAVIOUR CHART

PATIENT _____ DATE _____

RECORDER _____ SHIFT _____

1. ATTITUDES TO OTHERS

	<u>To Children</u>	<u>To Staff</u>
Positive	()	()
Neutral	()	()
Ambivalent	()	()
Negative	()	()

2. AGGRESSIVITY

<u>Direction</u>	<u>Type</u>		<u>Frequency</u>		<u>Degree</u>		<u>Victim</u>
	Phys	Verb	High	Low	Serious	Mild	
Property	()	()	()	()	()	()	
Self	()	()	()	()	()	()	
Children	()	()	()	()	()	()	
Staff	()	()	()	()	()	()	

3. STATUS IN GROUP

Leader () Boss () Follower () Ambivalent () Rejected () Withdrawn ()

5. ACCEPTANCE OF PROGRAM ACTIVITY

Shows initiative () Cooperative () Passive () Refuses () Subversive ()

6. FEAR OR ANXIETY

Constant () Frequent () Occasional () None ()

7. ACCEPTANCE OF LIMITS

Over concerned () Accepts Normally () Resists Passively () Rebels Openly ()
Subversively Rebels ()

8. EATING PROBLEMS IF ANY:

9. SLEEPING PROBLEMS IF ANY:

10. OTHER SYMPTOMS

Hyperactivity () Depression () Obs/Comp () Excess Fantasy ()
Encopresis () Wetting () Psychosomatic Factors ()

11. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

2022-2023

2022-2023

2022-2023

2022-2023

APPENDIX E

INTERPRETATION OF TABLES

INSTRUCTIONS FOR READING SOCIOMETRIC CHARTS

In many blocks, three digits appear. They have a special order according to the item. For example, if boy A (boy listed on left hand column) chooses boy B (boy chosen is read from the names across the top of the page) as his first choice for item one, the the figure 1 appears in the top left hand side of the block. If the boy chosen is A's second choice for item one, then a 2 will appear in the same position, and so on, till all three choices for the first item are made.

When the figure is on the top right hand side it means that is the second question or item. Whatever figure appears there represents a first, second or third choice by the chooser.

When the figure is on the bottom left hand side it denotes the third question. As in the above cases, the digit represents the order of choice.

The position of the digit indicates the question number. The actual digit represents the order of choice.

METHODOLOGY FOR ESTIMATING CONSENSUS

Note: The index of consensus was obtained by:

- (1) Starting at the mode and taking the next step and multiplying the figure there by 1 (the step away from the mode), then the next and multiply it by 2 (the second step way) from the mode until all four possible steps away from the mode are accounted for.
- (2) Then divide the total product by 2 and hold this result. Start again at the mode and take the next largest figure to the mode and multiply by 1, then the next and multiply by 2 and so on till all the numbers are accounted for. Divide the total product by 2. Add the resulting figure to the result of (1) and subtract the total from unity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, Theodor et al. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Agnew, Paul and Francis L. K. Hsu. "Introducing Change in a Mental Hospital", Human Organizations, 19, 4 (Winter 1960-61), 195-198.
- Aichhorn, August. Wayward Youth. Compass Books Edition. New York: The Viking Press, Inc., 1955.
- Anderson, Theodore R. and Seymour Mervin. "Organizational Size and Functional Complexity: A Study of Administration in Hospitals", American Sociological Review, 26 (February 1961).
- Augustine, Brother. "The Institutional Approach to Delinquency" in The Adolescent: His Search For Understanding. William C. Bier (ed.), New York: Fordham University Press, 1963, pp. 114-121.
- Barabee, Paul S. "A Study of a Mental Hospital: The Effect of Its Social Structure on Its Function", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Department of Social Relations, 1951.
- Bateman, J. F. "The State Mental Hospital as a Specialized Community Experience", American Journal of Psychiatry, 105 (Dec. 1948), 445-448.
- Belknap, Ivan. Human Problems of a State Mental Hospital. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.
- Beskind, Harry. "Psychiatric Inpatient Treatment of Adolescents: A Review of Clinical Experience", Comprehensive Psychiatry, 3 (December 1962), 354-369.
- Bettelheim, Bruno. Love is Not Enough. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1950.
- , Truants From Life. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Bettelheim, Bruno and Betsy Sylvester. "A Therapeutic Milieu", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 18 (Jan. 1948), 191-206.

- Blau, Peter. Bureaucracy in Modern Society. New York: Random House, 1956.
- , "Co-operation and Competition in a Bureaucracy", The American Journal of Sociology, 59 (May 1954), 530-535.
- , The Dynamics of Bureaucracy. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- , "A Theory of Social Integration", The American Journal of Sociology, 65 (May 1960), 545-556.
- Blau, Peter and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations. San Francisco, California: Chandler Publishing Company, 1962.
- Bredemeier, Harry C. and Richard Stephenson. The Analysis of Social Systems. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1962.
- Bromberg, W. and T. Rogers. "Authority in the Treatment of Delinquents", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 16 (1946), 672-685.
- Cameron, K. "Inpatient Treatment of Psychotic Adolescents", British Journal of Medical Psychology, 23 (1950), 107-109.
- Campeel, John D. "Peer Relations in Childhood", Martin L. and Lois W. Hoffman, (eds.), Review of Child Development Research, 1 289-322.
- Caudill, William. The Psychiatric Hospital as a Small Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Clausen, J. "The Sociology of Mental Illness" in R. K. Merton, L. Broom and Leonard Cottrell, Jr., (eds.), Sociology To-day, New York: Basic Books, 1959, 485-508.
- Clemmer, Donald. The Prison Community. Boston: Christopher, 1940.
- Cloward, Richard A. "The Correctional Institution for Juveniles: A Discussion of Selected Problems", paper read at the New York School of Social Work, 1956.
- Conte, Morag. Beyond All Reason. London: Constable, 1964.
- Cressey, Donald R. "Contradictory Directives in Complex Organizations: The Case of the Prisons", Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (June 1959), 1-19.

- . The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Croog, Sydney. "Interpersonal Relations in Medical Settings", Handbook of Medical Sociology, H. E. Freeman, S. Levine and L. Reeder (eds.), Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1963, pp. 241-272.
- Crozier, Michel. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Denman, Loretta. "Mental Patients as 'Line Workers', 'Machines' and 'Outputs'", Journal of Health and Human Behaviour, 4, 3 (Fall 1963), 211-214.
- Dentler, Robert A. and Kai T. Erikson. "The Function of Deviance in Groups", Social Problems, 7 (Fall 1959).
- Deutsch, Albert. The Mentally Ill in America. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.
- Dinitz, Simon, Mark Lefton et al. "The Ward Behaviour of Psychiatric Patients", Social Problems, 6, 2 (1958), 107-115.
- Driver, Edwin D. The Sociology and Anthropology of Mental Illness. Amherst, Mass.: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1965.
- Etzioni, Amitai. "Administration and the Consumer", Administrative Science Quarterly, 3 (Sept. 1958), 251-264.
- . "Authority Structure and Organizational Effectiveness", Administrative Science Quarterly, 4 (1959), 43-67.
- . A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.
- . Complex Organizations: A Sociological Reader. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- . "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique and a Suggestion", Administrative Science Quarterly, 5 (Sept. 1960), 257-278.
- Gardner, Eric and George G. Thompson. Social Relations and Morale in Small Groups. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956.
- Georgopoulos, B. S. and A. S. Tannenbaum. "A Study of Organizational Effectiveness", American Sociological Review, 22 (1957), 534-540.

- Gilbert, Doris C. and Daniel J. Levinson. "'Custodialism' and 'Humanism' in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology", in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams (eds.), The Patient and The Mental Hospital, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957, chapter 3.
- . "Role Performance, Ideology and Personality in Mental Hospital Aides", in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams (eds.), The Patient and The Mental Hospital, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957, pp. 197-208.
- Glasser, William. "Reality Therapy Compared to Traditional Therapy in the Treatment of Delinquent Children", Juvenile Offender Therapy, 6, 2 (Sept. 1962), 34-36.
- Goffman, Erving. Asylums. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books, Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961.
- . "The Characteristics of Total Institutions", in Symposium on Preventive and Social Psychiatry, Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957, 43-84.
- Gooderich and Iflund. "Staff Perceptions and Reality in Clinical Behavioural Reporting", Human Relations, 15 (1962), 351-363.
- Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles", in Administrative Science Quarterly, 2 (Dec. - March 1958).
- Greaves, D. C. and P. F. Regan. "Intensive Psychotherapy of the Hospitalized Adolescent", (Mimeographed), Payne Whitney Psychiatric Clinic, New York, 1955.
- Greenblatt, Milton, Daniel J. Levinson and Richard H. Williams (eds.). The Patient and The Mental Hospital. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957.
- Greenblatt, Milton, Richard H. York and E. L. Brown. From Custodial to Therapeutic Patient Care in Mental Hospitals. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1955.
- Grosser, George P. "The Role of Informal Inmate Groups in the Change of Values", Children, 5 (Jan. - Feb. 1958).
- Grusky, Oscar. "Organizational Goals and the Behaviour of Informal Leaders", American Journal of Sociology, 65 (July 1959), 59-67.

- Gump, Paul, Phil Schoggan and Fritz Redl. "The Camp Milieu and its Immediate Effects", Journal of Social Issues, 13, 1 (1957), 40-46.
- Gynther, Malcolm D. and Howard S. Gall. "Therapeutic Community: Concept Practice and Evaluation", in Albert F. Wessen (ed.), The Psychiatric Hospital as a Social System, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1964, Chapter 7.
- Henry, Jules. "Types of Institutional Structure", Chapter 5 in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams, The Patient and The Mental Hospital, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.
- Hollingsworth, Hansel H. "The Child-Caring Institution on the Move", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 355 (Sept. 1964), 42-48.
- Jackson, Jay. "Towards the Comparative Study of Mental Hospitals" in Albert F. Wessen (ed.), The Psychiatric Hospital as a Social System, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1964, Chapter 3.
- Jennings, Helen H. Leadership and Isolation. New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1943.
- Jones, Howard. "A Contribution to the Evaluation of Some Methods of Residential Therapy", Human Relations, 11 (1958), 55-65.
- Jones, Maxwell. The Therapeutic Community: A New Treatment Method in Psychiatry, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1953.
- Jones, K. and R. Sidebothan. Mental Hospitals at Work. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- Kahne, Merton J. "Bureaucratic Structure and Impersonal Experience in Mental Hospitals", Psychiatry, 22 (Nov. 1959), 363-375.
- "Some Implications of the Concept of Position for the Study of Mental Hospital Organization", Psychiatry, 25 (August 1962), 227-228.
- Kahn Robert and John R. P. French. "A Summary of Some Tentative Conclusions", Journal of Social Issues, 18 (July 1962), 122-127.
- Kerlinger, Fred A. "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Factors of Educational Attitudes", Journal of Social Psychology, 47-48 (1958), 111-134.

- Landy, D. "Anthropology and the Approach to the Mental Hospital", Human Organization, 17 (Fall 1958).
- Lewin, Kurt and Ronald Lippitt. "An Experimental Approach to the Study of Autocracy and Democracy", Chapter 10 in Paul Hare, Edgar F. Borgatta and Robert F. Bales, (eds.), Small Groups, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1962.
- Lewin, Kurt, Ronald Lippitt and Ralph K. White. "Patterns of Aggressive Behaviour in Experimentally Created 'Social Climates'", Journal of Social Psychology, 10, 2 (May 1939).
- McCorkle, Lloyd W. The Highfields Story. New York: Henry Holt, 1958.
- March, James G. and Herbert A. Simon. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Martin, Harry W. "Structural Sources of Strain in a Small Psychiatric Hospital", Psychiatry, 25 (Nov. 1962), 347-353.
- Maslow, A. H. "The Authoritarian Character Structure", Journal of Social Psychology, 18 (November 1943), 401-411.
- Merton, Robert K. "Bureaucratic Structure and Personality", Chapter 3 in Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.
- Middleman, Ruth and Frank Seever. "Short-Term Camping for Boys with Behaviour Problems", Social Work, 8, 2 (April 1962), 88-95.
- Milner, John A. "The Residential Treatment Centre", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 355 (Sept. 1964), 98-104.
- Moreno, J. L. Sociometry and the Social Order. New York: Beacon House, Inc., 1943.
- Morrice, J. K. W. "The Ward as a Therapeutic Group", British Journal of Medical Psychology, 37 (1964), 157-165.
- Murray, Edward J. and Melvin Cohen. Mental Illness, Milieu Therapy and Social Organization in Ward Groups. A Research Report, Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

Madel, S. F. "Social Control and Self Regulation", Social Forces, 31 (1953), 265-273.

Norris, Sara. The Wayward Ones. New York: Signet Pocket Books, 1952.

Ohlin, Lloyd E. Sociology and The Field of Corrections. Russel Sage Foundation, New York, 1956.

Ohlin, Lloyd E. and William C. Lawrence. "Social Interaction Among Clients as a Treatment Problem", Social Work, 4 (April 1959), 3-14.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Mental Hospital as a Type of Organization", Chapter 7 in Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams, The Patient and The Mental Hospital, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957.

-----, "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations", Administrative Science Quarterly, 1 (1956), 63-85.

Perrow, Charles. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations", The American Sociological Review, 26 (December 1961), 854-866.

Piaget, Jean. The Moral Judgement of the Child. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Polsky, Howard W. Cottage Six. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1962.

Powelson, Harvov and Reinhard Bendix. "Psychiatry in Prison", Psychiatry, 14 (February 1951), 73-86.

Ramsey, Glenn. "Sociotherapeutic Camping for the Mentally Ill", Social Work, 1964, 9, 1, 45-53.

Redl, Fritz. "The Concept of a 'Therapeutic Milieu'", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 29 (October 1959), 721-736.

Redl, Fritz and David Wineman. The Aggressive Child. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

-----, Children Who Hate. New York: Collier Books, 1962.

-----, Controls From Within. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1952.

- Winslow, Donald B and Ken Topeka. "Psychiatric Hospital Treatment With Special Reference to Children", Archives of General Psychiatry, 9 (July-December 1963), 489-496.
- Rose, Arnold M. and George H. Weber. "Changes in Attitudes Among Delinquent Boys Committed to Open and Closed Institutions", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 52, 2 (July-August 1961), 166-177.
- Rosen, Jacqueline. "Personality Factors in the Reactions of Child-Care Workers to Emotionally Disturbed Children", Psychiatry, 26, 3 (1963), 257-265.
- Rosengren, William R. "Communication, Organization and Conduct in the 'Therapeutic Milieu'", Administrative Science Quarterly, 9 (June 1964), 70-90.
- Rothenberg, Albert and Ezra F. Vogel. "Patient Cliques and the Therapeutic Community", British Journal of Medical Psychology, 37 (1964), 143-152.
- Rowland, Howard. "Friendship Patterns in a State Mental Hospital", Psychiatry, 2 (May 1939), 363-373.
- , "Interaction Processes in a State Mental Hospital", Psychiatry, 1 (1938), 332-337.
- Rubenfield, Seymour and John W. Stafford. "An Adolescent Inmate Social System: A Psychosocial Account", Psychiatry, 26, 3 (1963), 241-256.
- Sarri, Rosemary Conzemius. "Organizational Patterns and Client Perspectives in Juvenile Correctional Institutions", unpublished Ph.d. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.
- Schneider, Irving. "The Use of Patients to Act out Professional Conflicts", Psychiatry, 26(Feb. 1963), 88-94.
- Schrag, Clarence. "Leadership Among Prison Inmates", American Sociological Review, 19 (Feb. 1954), 37-42.
- Schwartz, Morris S. "What is a Therapeutic Milieu?", The Patient and the Mental Hospital, Greenblatt, Levinson and Williams, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957, pp. 130-145.

- Scott, Frances G. "Action Theory and Research in Social Organizations", American Journal of Sociology, 64 (Jan. 1959), 386-396.
- Zelmanick, Philip. "An Approach to a Theory of Bureaucracy", American Sociological Review, 6, 1 (February 1943), 47-54.
- , "Foundations of the Theory of Organization", American Sociological Review, (Feb. 1948), 25-35.
- , Leadership and Administration: A Sociological Interpretation. Evanston: Row Peterson, 1957.
- Shils, Edward A. "Authoritarianism: 'Right' and 'Left'", in Christie and Jahoda (eds.), Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1954.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Simmel, George. Conflict and the Web of Group Affiliations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1955.
- Simpson, Jon B., Thomas C. Synon and W. C. Reckless. "Institutionalization as Perceived by the Juvenile Offender", Sociology and Social Research, 48, 1 (October 1963), 13-23.
- Skipper, James. "Some Possible Consequences of Limited Communication Between Patients and Hospital Functionaries", Journal of Health and Human Behaviour, 5, 1 (Spring 1964), 34-39.
- Stanton, Alfred and Morris Schwartz. "Medical Opinion and the Social Context in the Mental Hospital", Psychiatry, 12 (August 1949), 243-249.
- , The Mental Hospital. New York: Basic Books, 1954.
- Stein, Herman D. "The Study of Organizational Effectiveness" in Research in Social Welfare Administration, edited by David Farnshel, New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1962, pp. 22-32.
- Street, David. "Inmate Social Organization: A Comparative Study of Juvenile Correctional Institutions", unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962.

-----, "Inmates in Custodial and Treatment Settings", American Sociological Review, 30 (February 1965), 40-55.

Sullivan, Harry Stack. "Socio-psychiatric Research: Its Implications for the Schizophrenia Problem", American Journal of Psychiatry, 87 (1931).

Sykes, Gresham. "The Corruption of Authority and Rehabilitation", Social Forces, 34 (March 1956), 256-262.

-----, Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.

Vinter, Robert and Morris Janowitz. "Effective Institutions for Juvenile Offenders: A Research Statement", Social Service Review, 33 (June 1959), 118-131.

Vinter, Robert and Charles Perrow. "Client Organization in the Correctional Institution", mimeographed, University of Michigan, 1960.

Vitale, John H. "The Therapeutic Community: A Review Article", in Albert F. Wessan (ed.), The Psychiatric Hospital as a Social System, Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1964, pp. 91-110.

Warren, W. "The Treatment of Youths With Behaviour Disorders in a Psychiatric Hospital", British Journal of Delinquency, 3 (1953), 234-247.

Weinburg, S. Kirson. "Aspects of a Prison's Social Structure", American Journal of Sociology, 47 (1942), 717-726.

Zald, Mayer. "The Correctional Institution for Juvenile Offenders: An Analysis of Organizational 'Character'", Social Problems, 8 (Summer 1960), 57-67.

-----, "Organizational Control Structures in Five Correctional Institutions for Juvenile Delinquents", American Journal of Sociology, 68 (November 1962), 335-345.