LEADERSHIP, POWER AND INTERPERSONAL ATTRACTION IN A YOUTH CORRECTIONAL FACILITY

WILLIAM D. TRASK

Leadership, Power and Interpersonal Attraction

in a Youth Correctional Facility

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Science

Submitted by William D. Trask
M.Sc. Student
Applied Social Psychology
Department of Psychology
Memorial University of Newfoundland

1999

Abstract

This study used peer nomination and modified sociometric techniques to examine leadership, power and interpersonal attraction among residents at a youth correctional facility. The results show that the length of time that residents had spent at the facility was a significant predictor of their task-specific leadership, general leadership, friendship and influence status. Those with higher status in these areas tended to have spent more time within the facility than those with lower status. The first type of crime that residents had been convicted of also proved to be a significant predictor of both their task-specific leadership status and their friendship status. In both cases, higher status residents were less likely to have been convicted of a crime against another person than were those with lower status. Finally, residents' age and the total number of crimes that they had been previously convicted of were found to be significant predictors of their task-specific leadership status. Those with higher task-specific leadership status tended to be older and to have committed fewer previous offences than those with lower status.

The characteristics of high status group members were examined and the results largely supported the relationship between time served and residents' leadership, power and friendship status. For the other background characteristics, there was mixed support for the multiple regression analyses.

The relationships between the amount of time residents had served within the facility and their task-specific leadership, general leadership and power status were further supported by the explanations respondents offered for their choices of fellow

residents. Residents' seniority or experience within the facility was frequently provided as an explanation for their status in these areas. The reasons offered also point to the role of other factors, such as residents' personality traits, in determining status in these areas.

The results also showed that, with the exception of the correlation between scores on influence and scores on social supportiveness, each social status measure was significantly related to each of the other measures. This suggests that residents who have high status in one area also tend to have high status in other areas. In particular, general leadership status appears to be highly related to residents' influence over others within the facility.

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who made this research possible. I wish to thank Malcolm Grant from the Department of Psychology, Memorial University and Sharron Callahan from the Department of Justice of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for serving on my thesis committee and for offering invaluable advice throughout the project. I also wish to thank Rick Langer and all of the staff and residents at the Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Centre for their assistance with the project. I would especially like to thank Dr. Abraham Ross for supervising the research and for his continued support throughout the project.

William D. Trask

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
Background 1
Defining Leadership 2
Theories of Leadership 3
Leadership in Correctional Facilities 5
Leadership, Socioemotional Supportiveness and Friendship 10
Leadership and Power 14
Power and Attraction 18
Leadership, Power and Attraction 19
Measuring Social Status 24
The Present Study 26
Method 31
The Facility 31
Participants 31
Procedure 34
Results 39
Independence of the Data 39
Relationships Among Background Characteristics 40
Predictors of Status 41
Characteristics of High-Status Group Members 46
Reasons for Choices Made 51
Relationships among Measures 61
Testing the Proximity-Attraction Hypothesis 63
Discussion 64
Predicting Leadership, Power and Friendship Status 64
Predicting Power 65
Predicting Task Specific Leadership 66
Predicting General Leadership Status 70
Predictors of Attraction 71
Predictors of Socioemotional Supportiveness 72
Relationships Among the Variables 72
The Proximity-Attraction Effect 74
Limitations of this Study 75
Recommendations for Future Research 76
Notes 79
References 82
Appendix A 87
Appendix B 89
Appendix C 94
Appendix D 96

List of Tables

Table 1: Number of residents eligible to participate and number interviewed from each living unit. 33

Table 2: Characteristics of participants and non-participants 33

Table 3: Correlations among resident's age, number of previous crimes and time served within the facility. 41

Table 4: Prediction of task-leadership scores from background characteristics 42

Table 5: Prediction of influence scores from background characteristics 43

Table 6: Prediction of friendship scores from background characteristics 44

Table 7: Prediction of leadership scores from background characteristics 45

Table 8: Prediction of socioemotional supportiveness scores from background characteristics 46

Table 9: Reasons for nominating someone to institutional council 53

Table 10: Explanations of residents' influence 55

Table 11: Explanations for residents' leadership status 57

Table 12: Reasons why respondents would choose to speak to residents if experiencing a personal problem 59

Table 13: Explanations for naming residents as best-liked within living unit 60

Table 14: Explanations for naming residents as best-liked within facility 62

Table 15: Correlations between proportion of nominations received for each measure 63

Introduction

Background

The topic of leadership has been the focus of a great deal of research attention from social scientists. One type of group which appears to have received little attention from researchers in this area is young offenders confined to correctional facilities. The present study will examine leadership among residents of such a facility. In addition, power among the residents and their liking for each other will be assessed. The relationships among leadership, power and attraction in this facility will also be determined.

The paucity of past research using such groups is surprising from both a theoretical and a practical standpoint. The examination of leadership in such a facility is theoretically important in that it represents a unique group situation, quite different from that of most groups which have been studied. Unlike most groups, where membership is at least to a certain degree voluntary, residents of such a facility do not voluntarily join the group, nor do they have the option of leaving the group if not satisfied with their membership. In addition, unlike most groups which have been examined by leadership researchers, this type of group may not have a clearly defined goal or task. Although the goals of the administration in correctional facilities may be clearly defined and recognized by residents, the residents may not share the desire to achieve these goals.

From a practical standpoint, given the emphasis placed on rehabilitating young

offenders, it is possible that the behaviour and attitudes of those occupying a leadership position could moderate rehabilitation attempts. A better understanding of leadership among these individuals would therefore seem to be an important consideration in both designing and implementing treatment programs in these facilities.

Defining Leadership

One factor which complicates the study of leadership in general, and in juvenile correctional facilities, is the lack of a universally accepted definition of leadership. Stogdill (1974) reviewed some of the various definitions which had emerged at the time of his writing. For early researchers in the field (e.g., Tead, 1929, cited in Stogdill, 1974; Bogardus, 1934, cited in Stogdill, 1974), leadership was considered to be an aspect of personality, and the leader was considered to possess certain characteristics which differentiated him or her from non-leaders. For a second group (e.g., Allen, 1958; Bennis, 1959), leadership was seen as the ability to induce compliance in others. Similarly, some researchers (e.g., Bass, 1961; Stogdill, 1950) felt that leadership was best defined as the ability to influence the behaviour of others. Still others (e.g., Gibb, 1969a) have defined leadership as a role which emerges in the processes of role differentiation.

More recently, however, leadership has been defined in terms of the attainment of group goals. The leader is seen as the individual who directs the activities of the group towards attaining their goals. Hogan, Curphy and Hogan (1994) argued that leadership "involves persuading other people to set aside for a period of time their individual

concerns and to pursue a common goal that is important for the responsibilities and welfare of a group" (p. 493). Forsyth (1983) defined leadership as "a reciprocal process in which an individual is permitted to influence and motivate others to facilitate the attainment of mutually satisfying group and individual goals" (p.209). For Katz and Kahn (1978), leadership involved motivating members of the group to expend more energy towards attaining group goals. Although definitions of leadership which incorporate the concept of goal attainment, and emphasize group members striving to reach a common goal have proven useful, such definitions provide little insight into the study of leadership in groups such as young offenders in a correction institution, where there may be no clearly defined group goal.

Theories of Leadership

Just as there have been numerous definitions of leadership put forth, so too have there been numerous theories of leadership. In general, these theories can be classified as taking one of three approaches. These include the *trait or personality* approach, *the situational or environmental* approach, and the *interactionist* approach. The *trait* approach is based on the premise that leaders possess certain personality characteristics which distinguish them from non-leaders (Stogdill, 1974; Forsyth, 1983). These characteristics were viewed as fixed, largely inborn and not situation-specific (Hollander & Offermann, 1990). As Gibb (1969b), pointed out, in general, past reviews of research have failed to produce consistent results concerning the reliability of such personality

traits as predictors of leadership. In response to this, the *situational* approach to leadership emerged (cf. Stogdill, 1974; Forsyth, 1983; Hollander & Offermann, 1990). According to this view, data on personality contributions to leadership are unclear because leadership emergence depends on characteristics of the group situation, rather than personality factors. This situational approach also proved insufficient to explain the emergence of leadership.

Other theories of leadership, including Fiedler's contingency model (Fiedler, 1978, 1981) do not attempt to explain leadership based solely on either personality characters or situational factors. Instead, the emergence of a leader and the nature of leadership is viewed as dependent on the interaction of both personality factors and the situation. In this interactionist view, explanations of leadership must take into account both the characteristics or traits of the leader, and the group situation (Stogdill, 1974).

While early researchers of leadership adopted several theoretical approaches to the subject, Stogdill (1974) argued that later researchers for the most part abandoned the theoretical approach and instead adopted an empirical approach. In part, he attributed the failure of these researchers to examine leadership among criminals to this empirical approach in that the empiricists tend to focus on the aspects of leadership which are researchable in terms of variable measurement and sample availability.

Leadership in Correctional Facilities

Much work has focussed on leadership emergence in task-oriented groups which are formed for the sole purpose of laboratory experimentation (cf. Cronshaw & Ellis, 1991; Anderson & Wanberg, 1991; Hawkins, 1995). Other leadership research has focused on members of naturally occurring groups ranging from company employees (cf. Church & Waclawski, 1998; Hutchinson, Valentino & Kirkner, 1998; Wunderly, Reddy & Dember, 1998) to members of sports teams (cf. Salminen & Liukkonen, 1996; Riemer & Chelladurai, 1995; Shields, Gardner, Bredemeier & Bostro, 1997; Spink, 1998). However, the majority of these studies also focus on groups which may be described as task-oriented, with the group working towards a well-defined goal. In the case of company employees, the goal may be to increase profit margins. For the sports team, a major goal may be to win the championship. Some of the research has been designed to assess the personal determinants of leadership (cf. Lord, De Vader & Allinger, 1986; Gough, 1990; Zaccaro, Foti & Kenny, 1991). Other research has examined the different styles of leadership and the effects that these different styles have on the group (cf. Hawkins & Stewart, 1990; Hains, Hogg & Duck, 1997; Sosik, 1997). Although they provide important clues into the nature and determinants of leadership, such studies provide little insight into the assessment of leadership among groups, such as incarcerated adolescents, which may have no clear task or goal to reach.

Leadership research conducted in adult prisons seems to be more relevant to the present study. Although they are relatively few in number, these studies have been

somewhat more common than studies of youth facilities. One such study was conducted by Schrag (1954) in an attempt to identify leaders and followers in a medium-custody building of an adult prison. Leaders and followers were differentiated using peer nominations, whereby inmates were asked to indicate the inmate who they felt would best represent them on the prison council.

Schrag's results revealed that leadership preferences were related to the crimes for which inmates were committed to prison. Overall, there was a preference for criminals who had committed violent crimes. Compared to non-leaders, leaders were also found to have served more years in prison, to have longer sentences remaining to be served, to be more likely to be repeat offenders, and to have committed a greater number of rule infractions while in prison, including escape, attempted escape, fighting and assault.

Although there was an overall preference for violent offenders, a pattern was also observed where respondents showed a preference for leaders who were similar to them in terms of the type of crime committed. Individuals also tended to choose leaders who were similar to them in terms of whether they were serving short or long sentences, whether they were well behaved or had committed rule infractions while in prison, and whether they were first-time or repeat offenders. Finally, the physical proximity between respondents and leaders proved to be related to choice of leader, as leadership choices varied inversely with the physical distance between inmates.

While a number of the variables assessed by Schrag (1954) appeared to have been predictive of leadership status, the exact relationship between them and leadership status

is unclear. The reason for this is that many of these variables are likely to covary with one another without necessarily having the same effect on the attainment of leadership status. For example, although there was a preference for leaders who had committed violent crimes, having committed violent crimes may not be the reason these individuals attained leadership status. It may be that those who committed violent crimes received longer sentences, which resulted in greater experience with the prison situation, and thus, were accorded leadership status.

Apart from the general preference for violent offenders with a record of prison infractions, an interesting finding from Schrag's study was the effect that respondents' criminal history, behaviour in prison, and length of sentence had on their choices of leaders. Specifically, this involved the inmates' preference for leaders who were similar to themselves. Because individuals tend to be attracted to others who are similar to them, it is possible that those who were nominated as leaders were also the best-liked residents.

Further supporting the idea that the leaders may also have been the best-liked residents, the probability that an individual was nominated as a leader by a fellow inmate was inversely related to the physical distance between them. Indeed physical proximity has been found to be one of the strongest predictors of friendship (Sears, Freedman & Peplau, 1985). As Forsyth (1983) discussed, at least two general factors may account for this finding. First, individuals who are in close proximity have an increased likelihood of interacting with each other. Furthermore, the cost of such interaction in terms of energy and time requirements is low, compared to these costs when there are greater distances

between individuals. Since interacting with those who are close is less costly, it is more attractive than interacting with those who are further away. The second general factor which may account for the apparent effects of physical proximity on attraction is *mere exposure*; individuals have been shown to have enhanced attitudes towards stimuli after repeated exposures to them (Zajonc, 1968). Thus, the mere presence of individuals over an extended period of time may lead to an increased attraction to them. However, mere exposure does not invariably lead to increased attraction. For example, stimuli which are initially viewed negatively may be viewed even more negatively after repeated exposure (cf. Pearlman & Oskamp, 1971). In addition, boredom or satiation with a stimulus has been shown to reduce the effects of mere exposure (cf. Bornstein, Kale & Cornell, 1990), and in some cases lead to even less favourable attitudes towards the stimuli over time (Imamoglu, 1974).

In one study which was conducted in a correctional facility for young offenders[a,b], Wellford (1973) used a sociometric measure to identify the social structure and residential leaders. Unlike Schrag's study, however, leadership was defined in terms of the number of times a resident was named as a best friend of other residents. Although six different cottages were included in the study, the sociometric results revealed that "there was not an institution structure of choices, but rather that living-units . . . displayed markedly segregated systems of choice" (p.112). In other words, as one would expect based on the above discussion of the relationship between proximity and interpersonal attraction, residents tended to choose others living within their cottage as their closest

friends, rather than those living in a different cottage. In addition, of those choices which were made outside of the respondents cottage, only 6% were reciprocated.

Based on this finding, Wellford (1973) concluded that the institution was not a cohesive unit, and elected to analyze clique structures within each cottage unit. Clique members were defined as those who were linked reciprocally to the cluster of reciprocated choices containing the largest number of cottage residents. All others were considered isolates. Clique members were further categorized as either leaders or followers; leaders were those with three or four reciprocated choices, while followers were those with one or two reciprocated choices.

Wellford (1973) found that first offenses and current offenses of clique members were more often violent than were those of isolates. Clique members had also committed more offenses, and had more previous confinements to correctional facilities. In addition, clique members had served more time for their current offense than had isolates. Similarly, leaders were found to have committed more violent first and current offenses, to have committed more offenses in general, and to have served more time for their current offense than followers.

Leadership, Socioemotional Supportiveness and Friendship

The criminal characteristics of leaders in both the studies by Schrag (1954) and Wellford (1973) were quite similar, even though leadership was assessed using completely different measures. For Schrag (1954), leaders were those who received nominations for a prison council. For Wellford (1973), leaders were the best-liked residents. Given the similarity between the characteristics of the leaders in the studies, and the finding that the respondents in Schrag's study tended to nominate leaders who were similar to themselves, it is possible that for groups, such as incarcerated individuals with no clear task, there may be little differentiation between those who are nominated as leaders and those who are considered best friends.

Although the leaders in Schrag's study may also have been the best-liked residents, research suggests that those individuals who are chosen as leaders need not be the best-liked group members. For example, Hollander and Webb (1958) examined the relationship between leadership and friendship among naval aviation cadets, a group which may be considered task-oriented. The cadets were asked to nominate three fellow cadets who they felt were best qualified to lead a special unit, three who were least qualified for this position, and three cadets who they considered their best friends within their section. The researchers found that the friends were not named as leader two-thirds of the time and concluded that "friendship appears to play only a minor role in the emergence of leadership nominations."

Laboratory research has also shown that the leaders need not be the best-liked

members of a group. For example, Bales and Slater (1955) gave groups of subjects a problem to discuss, and then asked them to rank the group members in terms of who 1) had the best ideas 2) guided the group discussion, 3) they best-liked, and 4) served as the group leader. The researchers found that the individuals receiving the highest ranking on leadership were ranked highest on liking only 14.3% of the time. In contrast, they were ranked highest for having the best ideas 59% of the time and were ranked highest for providing the most guidance 78.6% of the time. To explain these findings the researchers suggested that leadership was a generalized role, filled by individuals who have the ability to solve both task and socioemotional problems of the group, although groups differ in the amount of emphasis they place on each type of problem. In the above case, then, the group appeared to have placed more emphasis on solving the task at hand than on solving socioemotional problems; thus the group leader was more of a task specialist and rarely the best-liked member.

In some group situations, such as when group members are committed to a common group goal (cf. Gustafson, 1973), both the complementary roles of task specialist and socioemotional specialist may be filled by the same group member. However, in some cases these roles may conflict with each other and therefore often have to be fulfilled by different individuals (Bales & Slater, 1955). In this way, the individual who is seen as a specialist for a given task, may not necessarily be the best-liked group member.

Although prison inmates may not have a generally well-defined goal to reach, or

task to accomplish, in some cases the group may be required to accomplish specific tasks. Under such conditions, differentiation between the task and socioemotional leadership roles may occur. Grusky (1959) distinguished between these dimensions in an assessment of leadership in a treatment-oriented prison camp. Inmates were asked to name three individuals who they believed should be on an inmate council. All inmates named more than once were labelled informal leaders. Grusky (1959) examined the degree to which leaders and non-leaders were differentiated on measures of instrumental (i.e., task-related) and expressive (i.e., socioemotional) skills. Measures of instrumental skills included the inmates' and the work foreman's nominations for the best workers, inmates' nominations of who supplied the best ideas in the work group, and membership on the prison softball team. Expressive skills were assessed by asking inmates to name a person who others would ask for help with personal problems, the foreman's ratings of sociability, the number of times they were nominated as other inmates' "best buddy," the number of times they nominated other inmates as "best buddy," and their membership in a sociometric "buddy" dyad. The results revealed that for all measures of both skill areas, leaders were differentiated from non-leaders.

Similar to the findings of Schrag (1954), leaders were found to have spent more time at the prison camp, to have longer minimum sentences, and to have more often committed crimes against people than against property. Also, consistent with the idea that an individual who ranks high on task-related skills is not necessarily a socioemotional specialist, Grusky (1959) found no relationship between group members' rankings of

instrumental and expressive skills.

It should be noted that this failure of Grusky (1959) to find a relationship between instrumental and expressive skills does not necessarily contradict the earlier suggestion that leaders may be the best-liked residents of a correctional facility. As discussed above, leadership skills may be subdivided into instrumental (or task-related) and expressive (or socioemotional) skill dimensions. The lack of relationship between these two variables simply means that a leader who is high on task skills may not necessarily be high on socioemotional skills, and conversely a leader who possesses socioemotional skills may not be a task specialist. It is quite a different issue to say that leaders are, or are not, well liked. For instance, it may be that one leader is especially skilled at solving socioemotional problems, while another may be skilled at solving both task and socioemotional problems. Yet both of these leaders may have been well-liked.

It cannot be concluded that the participants of Grusky's study who possessed expressive skills were the best-liked members, since Grusky (1959) defined expressive skills more broadly than Bales' definition as simply being liked. Thus, individuals who rated high on other expressive skill measures may not have been named as other inmates "best buddy". The present study will aim to clarify the relationships among being liked, possessing socioemotional skills, and having task-related leadership status by separately assessing each of these variables and determining the relationships among them.

Leadership and Power

To this point, several references have been made to the leadership "status" of individuals. Although the concept of leadership as a status position tends to be taken for granted, it has important implications for the present study, and will be discussed in some detail here. Like all group leaders, the leaders discussed in the above studies, may be described as high status group members. Thus, the emergence of a leader may be seen as a form of status differentiation. When such status differentiation occurs, differences in power exist among group members (Wilson, 1978). Given that the group leader occupies a high status position compared to other group members, it not surprising that this concept of power has been used in some formulations of leadership. Although definitions vary, "most definitions of power make reference to behavioural or psychological change through the process of social influence" (Forsyth, 1983, p.174). For example, Kurt Lewin (1938, cited in Gold, 1958) defined power as the potential to get another person to behave in a certain way. As Gold (1958) pointed out, in this view, power refers to the *likelihood* that a person will behave in a certain way if another person attempts to get him or her to do so, rather than an actual change in behaviour. In this way, power is distinguished from influence, which is observed when an *actual change* in behaviour takes place. Therefore, power can be considered *potential influence*. The definition of leadership employed by Gold (1958) depends on the concept of power, in that the leader was defined as the person with greater power, or potential to influence others, in a relationship.

Other researchers do not accept such a definition of leadership. According to

Forsyth (1983), it seems incorrect to refer to individuals who influence others through the use of dominance or coercion as leaders. Instead, he argues that "leadership is a form of power, but power with people, rather than over people"(p.207), and therefore only those who act in the best interest of the group, and with the consent of the group, should be considered leaders. Similarly, Hogan et.al (1994) stated that "leadership is persuasion, not domination; persons who can require others to do their bidding because of their power are not leaders" (p. 493) In this view, those who are granted leadership status possess power, but possessing power does not necessarily grant one leadership status.

Understanding the relationship between leadership and power seems to require a recognition that group members' power may originate from different sources. According to French and Raven (1959), there are five different types of power, each of which has a different basis in the relationship between the power holder and the recipient of the power holder's influence attempt. *Reward power* is based on the ability of one individual to reward another. The strength of this type of power is said to depend on the magnitude of the reward and the recipient's perception that the power holder can mediate the probability that the reward will be forthcoming.

A related type of power, *coercive power*, is based on the recipient's expectation that failure to conform to influence attempts will result in punishment from the power holder. The strength of this type of power is dependent on the magnitude of the punishment and the recipient's perception that the punishment can be avoided by conforming.

A third type of power, *legitimate power*, involves an individual's internalized values which dictate that another individual has a right to influence him or her, despite the fact that the power holder cannot administer rewards or punishment. This type of power may have several bases including cultural values, the acceptance of status differences in a group's social structure, or designation of power to the power holder by a legitimizing agent.

Referent power is based on the recipient's identification with the power holder. Here identification refers to "a feeling of oneness of [the recipient] with [the power holder] or a desire for such an identity" (French & Raven, 1959, p. 266). Referent power is observed when the recipient avoids discomfort or achieves satisfaction by conforming due to identification, and independent of the power holder's response. French and Raven (1959) suggest that the greater the attraction of the recipient to the power holder, the greater the identification and therefore the greater the power. To the extent that an individual conforms to the norms of a reference group, because he or she identifies with this group, the group is said to possess referent power.

The final type of power discussed by French and Raven (1959) is *expert power*, which is based on the knowledge or expertise that the recipient attributes to the power holder (i.e., the power holder's credibility). The result is primary social influence in the form of a change in the recipient's cognitive structure. Changes in the recipient's behaviour may also occur, but are considered to result from cognitive changes.

The exact relationship between power and leadership will likely depend on

several factors, including the researcher's operational definition of leadership and the type of power possessed by group members. If a researcher defines the leader as the group member who has the greatest potential to influence other group members, then the leader would obviously be the individual with the most power over other individuals. However, if leadership is defined in another way, such as the number of nominations received for representing the group on a council (a specific task), the relationship is less clear. In this case individuals may prefer someone who is particularly well suited to that task. This may not be the same person who has the potential to exert the most influence over other residents, if the latter possesses primarily coercive power.

Furthermore, it seems likely that the group member chosen as the leader for one task may not be the same member chosen for another task which requires a different set of skills. In support of this, Hannah (1979) found that the personal resources that high school students deemed necessary for leaders to possess varied across situations. For example, while enthusiasm was judged to be an important characteristic for a school band president, it was not considered necessary for the position of paper editor. Instead, having good ideas was seen as a more important characteristic of a paper editor. In the present case, this suggests that the influential member may achieve leadership status for one type of task, but not another.

Power and Attraction

Just as group leaders may not be the best-liked members of the group, depending on the basis of their power, those who are the most influential members may also not be well-liked. Ben-David (1992) attempted to determine the relationship between therapeutic group members' influence and their sociometric status within the group. A sociometric questionnaire was administered to nine therapeutic groups, including six groups of inmates. Of the six inmate groups, two consisted of individuals sentenced for miscellaneous offenses (n = 10 and 13), two others consisted of individuals sentenced for armed robbery (n = 9 and 8), and the final two consisted of inmates sentenced for sex offenses (n = 17 and 14). Of the three remaining groups, two were groups of probation officers (n = 7 and 9), and the other consisted of teacher-trainees (n = 10).

Two of the questionnaire items were designed to assess the sociometric status of group members. One of these items asked respondents to name the fellow group member whose company they liked best, while the other asked them to name the one whose company they liked least. The remaining two questions were designed to assess individuals' influence. One of these questions asked respondents to name the group member who exerted the most influence over the events which occurred within the group, while the other asked who exerted the least influence in this respect.

Data from groups consisting of individuals who had committed similar crimes were combined for the purpose of data analysis, as were the two groups of probation officers. The results revealed that the association between group members' influence and

sociometric status varied across the type of groups examined. Specifically, a negative correlation was found between sociometric status and influence within two armed robber groups. In addition, no real sociometric star emerged within these groups. In contrast, within the two groups of sex offenders there was a significant positive correlation between these variables, and a sociometric star did emerge. For the three non-criminal groups, no relationship was found between group members influence and sociometric status.

Leadership, Power and Attraction

While Ben-David (1992) was able to identify the most influential group member, the relationship between influence and leadership was not established. Hence, it remains unclear whether the most influential individuals fulfilled the roles of leaders within their groups. In contrast, a study conducted by Slosar (1978) more directly assessed the relationship between influence and leadership. Unlike the leadership studies of Schrag (1954) and Grusky (1959), which identified leaders by using responses to a single question, Slosar (1978) employed two measures of leadership. One of these measures was similar to the measure used by Schrag (1954) and Grusky (1959), and asked inmates to name a fellow resident whom they would choose to represent them on a prison council. The second was a question similar to that used by Ben-David (1992) and asked respondents to name the resident who had the most influence in getting others to do what he wanted. Individuals who received at least one nomination for the council were

considered *representation leaders* while those who were named as being influential by at least one person were labelled *influence leaders*. In addition, Slosar (1978) obtained measures of respondents' friends by asking them to name who they would prefer to accompany them on a town trip.

Slosar (1978) also examined the relationship between leadership (both representation and influence) and friendship (or interpersonal attraction). Data were gathered from two facilities; one of which was custody-oriented (Federal West) and one of which was treatment-oriented (Federal East). In addition, although they were considered to be youth facilities, the vast majority of respondents were between the ages of 18 and 21 (93% at the treatment-oriented facility and 90% at the custody-oriented facility).

A comparison of those nominated to the prison council with those named as the most influential residents revealed that in both institutions, there were more representation leaders than influence leaders. In addition, those who were named as representation leaders were not always the most influential individuals. At the treatment- and custody-oriented institutions one-third and one-quarter of inmates, respectively, nominated for the inmate council were also seen as being influential. Indeed, after an examination of the data, Slosar (1978) was forced to conclude that the leadership measures used ". . . were tapping two different functions of leadership and that only a small proportion of the total number of inmates identified on the two measures fulfil both of those functions" (p. 102).

Upon an examination of the characteristics of leaders, Slosar (1978) found that for both the treatment-oriented and custody-oriented institutions, influence leadership status was positively related to the amount of time residents had been in the institutions. In contrast, the relationship between representation leadership and length of stay varied across facilities. At the treatment-oriented institution, there was what Slosar (1978) described as a moderate positive relationship, while the relationship was negligible at the custody-oriented facility. Representation and influence leadership status were also related to age, as both types of leaders tended to be older. However, education level was found to be related only to representational leadership status at the treatment-oriented institution. Slosar (1978) suggested that this might have been a result of residents of this facility nominating individuals who they believed staff would expect to be on the council.

Committing a person-oriented offense did not appear to contribute significantly to leadership status. The relationship between having committed this type of offense and having attained leadership status was small and negative in all cases except for influence leaders at the custody-oriented facility for which the relationship was small and positive (Slosar, 1978). The number of previous offenses committed was related to influence leadership status at both institutions, although the relationship was slightly greater at the treatment-oriented institution. In contrast, the relationship between number of previous offenses and representational leadership was non-existent at the custody-oriented facility, and negative but low at the treatment-oriented facility.

Consistent with the earlier suggestion that there may be little differentiation

between being well-liked and holding leadership status in such a facility, Slosar (1978) found that the vast majority of those named as either representational or influence leaders were also named as preferred companions for the town trip. There was also a strong tendency for inmates to choose others within their living unit to accompany them on a town trip, a finding which was consistent with both the findings of Wellford (1973), and predictions based on the relationship between friendship and proximity.

Using residents' background and offense characteristics, Slosar (1978) also examined the extent to which respondents chose friends (i.e., trip partners) who were similar to themselves. The analyses revealed that while residents in the "21 and above" age group at both institutions tended to prefer friends of the same age group, individuals from other age groups showed no such preference. Similarity in the number of previous offenses also seemed to have little effect on inmates' choices of trip companions. The only group which showed a preference for the company of others with a similar number of offenses were residents of the custody-oriented facility who had committed no previous offenses. Similarity in the type of offense for which residents were serving time proved to be related to choices of friends for residents of both institutions who had committed public order offenses, and for individuals at the custody-oriented facility who had committed person-oriented offenses (numbers of individuals who had committed person-oriented were too few to include them in this analysis). Those who had committed property offenses showed what Slosar (1978) described as only a very little tendency to choose property offenders more often than individuals who had committed

other types of offenses.

In general, residents did not seem to choose friends on the bases of whether or not they had been previously incarcerated. The only exception to this was a slight preference for those at the custody-oriented facility who had not been previously incarcerated to choose others who also had not previously spent time in such a facility. In contrast, residents at both facilities tended to choose others who had been at the institution for similar lengths of time.

Slosar (1978) also examined whether similarity of background and offense characteristics affected respondents' selection of representational leaders. In addition to residents' educational attainment, the same variables were used as for the friendship analyses. The results suggested that similarity of age did not seem to play a role in council nominations, as both older and younger respondents tended to nominate older residents. In contrast to the finding that inmates tended to choose leaders who had committed a similar number of previous offenses reported by Schrag (1954), Slosar (1978) found that, in general, there was a preference for individuals with no previous offenses. Therefore, the only residents showing a preference for leaders who had similar numbers of previous offenses were those with no previous offenses themselves.

Recall that Schrag (1954) had also found that leaders tended to have committed similar types of offenses as those who had nominated them. Slosar (1978) found this to be true only for residents of both institutions who had committed public order offenses and to a lesser extent for residents of custody-oriented facility who had committed

person-oriented offenses. However, property offenders showed no such in-group preferences, and in fact, showed a preference for public order offenders as council representatives. Again, inmates at the treatment-oriented institution who had committed person-oriented offenses were not included in the analysis because they were too few in number.

There was no evidence that residents selected leaders who were similar to them on the basis of whether or not they had been previously institutionalized. While similarity in length of stay seemed to have some effect on choice, this effect was found only for those who had been at the institution for longer periods of time. Slosar (1978) concluded that, in general, inmates at both facilities showed a preference for representatives who were at the institution for either the same or greater length of time as themselves.

Measuring Social Status

Thus far, research relevant to the present study has been reviewed. At this point it seems necessary to examine more closely the types of measures used in these studies, as similar measures will be used here. One question which was used to identify leaders in several of these studies was that which asked respondents to name the resident whom they would choose to represent them on a prison council. Although Schrag (1954), Grusky (1959) and Slosar (1978) referred to the question used to identify representation leaders as a sociometric one, this type of question would be better described as a form of the peer nomination technique (Hollander, 1964). In contrast, the sociometric technique is

used to measure the social structure of groups by assessing patterns of attraction and repulsion among group members using simple questions such as "Whom would you like to work with?", or "Whom would you like as a neighbour?" (Moreno, 1953). Once group members responses have been gathered using such questions, the relationship patterns within the group can be summarized using a sociogram. From the sociogram, the researcher can determine whether *cliques*, *sociometric stars* or *isolates* exist in the group. Cliques are defined as clusters of individuals who have made reciprocal choices. A sociometric star refers to the person chosen most often by other group members, while isolates are those chosen infrequently by other group members.

As Moreno (1953) explained, a number of requirements should be met before a technique is considered to be truly sociometric. First, the questions should make use of certain criteria which link group members together, such as "living with" or "working with". These criteria should be "strong, enduring and definite, and not weak, transitory and indefinite" (p.99). Second, the questions should be ones which group members will respond to spontaneously at the moment at which the questions are asked. Related to this, the respondents should be motivated to respond to the questions truthfully, and should fully reveal their feelings. Such motivation may be achieved if respondents know that the information gained will have direct and positive effects for them. For example, in assessing the social relations in a classroom, Moreno (1953) asked children whom they would prefer to sit next to. Since the children were told that their responses would later be used to determine the seating arrangement, the group was said to be motivated to give

accurate responses.

According to Moreno (1953), questions which simply ask respondents to reveal their feelings, without providing them with the motivation to do so, should be considered *near sociometric*. Because of the nature of correctional institutions, the researcher may have little control over such things as the living arrangements; thus, truly sociometric techniques may not be feasible. In such cases, near sociometric techniques may be the best available method for documenting the social structure of the group.

The Present Study

The present study used both peer nomination and near sociometric techniques to examine leadership, power and interpersonal attraction among residents at a youth correctional facility. Information was collected on respondents' background characteristics including their age, number of previous convictions, amount of time served at the facility, and type of first and most recent offense. The relationships among these variables and leadership status, socioemotional supportiveness, influence and friendship were assessed.

There were several components to the investigation. First, an attempt was made to identify leaders among the residents of the facility and to determine whether certain characteristics are predictive of leadership status. In addition to assessing the background characteristics associated with leadership status, residents were asked to indicate why they felt that a given person was considered to be a leader.

One of our main objectives was to determine who were viewed as informal leaders within the institution, as opposed to who were viewed as the best leaders for a given task (e.g., to serve on a council). Thus, leadership was defined by directly asking residents to name who they considered to be leaders. This was done with the recognition that adolescents may not have been willing to directly admit that there was a group leader, or may not have recognized that this role exists (cf. Dunphy, 1969).

At the same time, however, a second objective was to examine whether the person who is generally considered to be a leader in a group which is not primarily task-oriented, is also the group member who would be chosen to lead for a specific task. In other words, we assessed whether one's leadership status generalizes from a non-task situation, to one in which there is a specific task, or whether another group member will be preferred to act as a leader for the specific task. For this reason, the scenario used by Schrag (1954), Grusky (1959), and Slosar (1978) was employed, whereby respondents were asked to name two residents whom they would vote for to serve on a decision-making council. Because we did not know the bases on which residents gain general leadership status, or for that matter, whether residents would even be able to identify such leaders, no attempt was made to predict whether there would be a significant overlap between those named as general leaders and those nominated to the council.

The study was also designed to assess the relationship between leadership and power within the facility. Specifically, the study attempted to assess whether the individuals named as leaders (both general and task-specific) were also considered to be

the most influential residents. Based on the findings of Slosar (1978) we expected that there would be no relationship between the number of nominations individuals received for the council and the number of times they were named as the most influential group members. In addition to examining this relationship, an attempt was also made to determine the bases for residents' power by asking respondents why they thought a given resident was the most influential. The relationships between general leadership status and being liked, between the number of nominations received for the hypothetical council and being liked, and between possessing power and being liked were also examined.

An attempt was also made to determine who residents see as providing socioemotional support within the facility. This was done by asking residents to whom they would talk if they were experiencing personal problems. Using this information, we hoped to determine whether individuals named to represent other residents on the council (a specific task) and those who were named as general leaders, the most influential residents and the best-liked residents, were also those who would be sought for social support. Respondents were asked why they would choose to speak to a given individual if they were experiencing a personal problem and why they liked the best-liked residents. From answers to these questions we attempted to identify the attributes associated with social supportiveness and friendship within the facility.

Although much of this research was exploratory, it was designed to test six specific hypotheses. The first two hypotheses were as follows:

Hypothesis 1: The number of nominations residents receive for the institutional council will be positively related to the length of time they have resided at the facility.

Hypothesis 2: The number of nominations residents receive for the institutional council will be positively related to their age.

The results of Schrag (1954), Grusky (1959) and Slosar (1978) lead us to expect that nominees to the council would have been at the institution longer and would have been older. This may be due to residents' attribution of expertise or wisdom for older, more experienced residents who "know the ropes".

Hypothesis 3: The number of times residents are named as being the most influential will be positively related to the length of time they have resided at the facility.

Hypothesis 4: The number of times residents are named as being the most influential will be positively related to their age.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 were derived from the findings of Slosar (1978), and suggest that the most influential residents would have been those who were either the most intimidating, or who had the most experience in the facility.

Because time spent at the institution often covaries with seriousness of crime,

those nominated may also have committed serious crimes. Such a finding would be congruent with the findings of Schrag (1954). Influential residents may also have committed serious crimes either because of the relationship between time served and nature of the crime, or because more violent offenders tend to be more influential in such a situation.

Hypothesis 5: The number of times residents are named as being the most influential will be positively related to the number of previous crimes they have committed.

Based on the work of Slosar (1978), the number of council nominations, but not necessarily degree of influence, was expected to be related to educational attainment. Similarly, degree of influence, but not necessarily council nominations, was expected to be positively related to the number of previous crimes committed.

Hypothesis 6: Residents will tend to name individuals from their own living unit as being best-liked, rather than individuals from other units in the facility.

Hypothesis 6 is based on the proven relationship between proximity and attraction. In the present case, we expected that, even when allowed to choose from the entire population of the facility, residents would tend to name others within their unit as being those that they liked best.

Method

The Facility

The site of the study was The Newfoundland and Labrador Youth Centre at Whitbourne. The facility consists of a main building, six cottages (i.e., living units) and an additional building which is used when the number of residents warrants its use. The main building contains administrative offices, the main security station, the dining facilities and a gymnasium. Two of the cottages are joined to the main building and the others are joined to them forming a circle with a centre courtyard. Units A, C, D, E and F are used as normal residences, while unit B is used as a remand facility for residents entering and leaving the facility. Each unit has the capacity to hold 10 residents and includes 10 bedrooms, a shower area, an office, a common living area, a kitchenette, laundry facilities and a classroom. Unit G is located in the additional building, which is laid out as separate floors and has the capacity to hold up to 20 residents in addition to those staying within the cottage units.

Participants

During the time period in which the interviews were conducted, 71 residents were residing at the facility. Only 10 residents were females, each of whom were housed in unit E. Male residents resided in each of the living units including Unit E. Residents ranged in age from 13 to 19 years old with an average age of 16.2 years old On average, they had been convicted of 12.9 crimes prior to the one(s) they were serving time for

during the period of the interviews. Including the time they had served within the facility for previous convictions, they had spent an average of 195.9 days within the facility. Nineteen of them had been first convicted of a person-oriented crime and 18 were serving time for a person-oriented crime during the interview period. Six of these 18 were among the 19 first convicted of a person-oriented crime. Respondents were residing in six of the seven living units in use at the time of the interviews (units A, C, D, E, F and G). The five residents residing in Unit B were excluded from the interviews because that unit serves only as a temporary residence for those entering and leaving the facility. Because of the anticipated difficulty in obtaining parental consent, only residents who were 16 years of age and older were invited to take part in the interviews. In total, 34 residents (4 females and 30 males) of the 48 who met this age criteria volunteered and were interviewed during the period of the study. The number of eligible residents from each unit and the number who were interviewed are shown in Table 1.

Table 2 presents the characteristics of residents who participated in the study (i.e., volunteers) and those who were eligible to participate but chose not to (i.e., non-volunteers). Statistical analysis of the characteristics of the two groups revealed that there were no significant differences in gender composition ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.743, p>.05$), age ($F_{(1,46)} < 1, p>.05$), type of last crime they had been convicted of ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 0.134, p>.05$), the number of previous crimes they had been convicted of ($F_{(1,46)} = 2.975, p>.05$) or the amount of time they had served at the facility ($F_{(1,46)} = 2.049, p>.05$). However, a significant difference was found in the first crimes the groups had been convicted of

($\chi^2_{(1)} = 10.572, p<.01$). Specifically, volunteers were less likely to have been first convicted of a person-oriented crime than were non-volunteers.

Table 1
Number of residents eligible to participate and number interviewed from each living unit.

	Living Unit					
	A	C	D	E	F	G
Number eligible	10	7	7	10	5	9
Number interviewed	9	3	6	6	3	7

Table 2
Characteristics of volunteers and non-volunteers

	Volunteers	Non-Volunteers
Gender	30 males (88.2%)	11 males (78.6%)
Type of first crime	4 person-oriented (11.8%)	7 person-oriented (58.3%)
Type of last crime	8 person-oriented (23.5%)	4 person-oriented (28.6%)
Mean age	16.8 years old	16.9 years old
Mean amount of time at facility	191.3 days	283.2 days
Mean number of previous crimes	11.3 crimes	17.6 crimes

Procedure

Peer nomination and near-sociometric measures were incorporated into personal interviews which were conducted with respondents between June 7 and June 22, 1997. Respondents were interviewed on an individual basis with each interview lasting approximately 30 minutes. Prior to the interviews, the nature of the study was explained to respondents and they were asked to sign an informed consent form. Participation was on a completely voluntary basis and confidentiality was assured to participants. A copy of the interview guide that was used is included in Appendix B.

To assess residents' task-specific leadership status a scenario similar to that used by Schrag (1954) and Grusky (1959) was used. Residents were asked to imagine that the administration of the facility had decided to form a council to deal with problems that residents may have been experiencing and the changes that could be made to solve these problems. They were then asked to name two individuals living within their unit whom they would vote for if an election was held to determine who would be on the council.

General leadership status was assessed by directly asking respondents to name two residents within their living units who were leaders. In addition, resident's influence or power was assessed by asking respondents to name two residents from within their unit who had the most ability to influence the behaviour of other residents in the unit. The socioemotional supportiveness of residents was gauged by asking respondents to name two residents from their living unit whom they would talk to if they were experiencing a personal problem.

Finally, to measure residents' friendship, respondents were asked to name the two residents that they liked best. To test the proximity-attraction hypothesis and to determine the cohesiveness of the facility, respondents were asked to name the two individuals they liked best within their unit and the two they liked best within the entire facility. A preference for residents within respondents' living units would support the proximity-attraction effect and would suggest that this facility, like the one examined by Wellford (1973), is non-cohesive.

Information on residents' background characteristics including their age, gender, the first crime they were convicted of, the crime they were serving time for at the time of the interviews, and the total number of crimes they had been convicted of prior to their current conviction was obtained through the use of the facility's electronic database. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to determine the extent to which each of the available background characteristics were predictive of individuals' status in the areas assessed. Our interest was in determining the predictive power of these characteristics with the effects of the other characteristics controlled for, rather than in testing a predictive model of status or assessing the change in predictive power when other variables were added to the regression equation. Therefore, simultaneous multiple regression analyses were used whereby each of the characteristics were entered simultaneously into the regression analyses. Specifically, the number of days residents had spent at the facility up to the final day of interviewing, their age on that day, their gender, the nature of both the first crime(s) they were convicted of and the crime(s) for

which they were serving time (i.e., person-oriented versus non-person-oriented) and the total number of their previous crimes were entered as independent variables into a simultaneous multiple regression analyses. Residents' first crime and the crimes that they were serving time for during the interviews were classified as person-oriented if they were crimes against another person or non-person-oriented if they were not (see Appendix C). For individuals whose first or last conviction had been for multiple crimes, the crimes were classified as non-person-oriented if none of them had been against another person and as person-oriented if at least one of them had been against another person.

Because the number of times that an individual resident could have been named for a given measure was limited by the number of respondents from within his or her unit, using the actual number of times that each individual was named by respondents within his or her unit as the dependent variable is problematic. Instead, scores reflecting the proportion of nominations that each individual received were calculated by dividing the number of times that they were mentioned by residents within their unit by the number of times that they could potentially have been mentioned. Thus, an individual who was named five times in a unit where ten residents provided at least one name was named five times out of a possible ten times and was assigned a score of .5. Similarly, an individual who was named three times in a unit where six residents provided at least one name each was assigned a score of .5. Using this method, each resident was assigned a score on task-leadership, socioemotional supportiveness, influence, friendship, and

general leadership

Given the dynamic nature of the youth facility, residents frequently move from one unit to another, something which can obviously have an impact on the social structure of the unit. This situation gives rise to the question of how to deal with movement within the facility when conducting a study such as the present one. This question was not addressed in previous studies. Such movement could have a number of different effects on the data collected, depending on the timing of the movement in relation to the timing of the interviews. In the present study, two problem situations had to be resolved. First, a number of individuals who were not present on the first day of interviewing moved into the unit on or before the second day. Second, three residents moved from units where interviews had been conducted early in the study to units which were interviewed at a later date. These individuals were therefore present in two different units during the times at which interviews were conducted within those units.

Both of these problems were dealt with in the multiple regression analysis by adjusting the potential number of times each resident could have been named for each measure. Individuals who were present on the second day of interviewing within a given unit but not on the first day could not have been named by individuals who were interviewed on the first day. Therefore, the potential number of times that these individuals could have been named was determined based on the number of individuals who were interviewed during the second day of interviewing within that unit. Interestingly, some individuals who had left after the first day of interviewing within the

unit, were still named by respondents on the second interview day. It was therefore decided to base the potential number of nominations that could have been received by individuals who had left their units on the total number of individuals who had been interviewed over the two day period.

Individuals who were present in two different units during the times at which interviews were conducted in those units, could have been named by all of the residents interviewed in the two units. The potential number of times these individuals were named was therefore based on the total number of individuals interviewed within the two units. Of the three residents who were present in two units, the two who met the age requirement for interviewing were interviewed while they were in the first of the two units but not while they were in the second.

Results

Independence of the Data

Before presenting the results of the data analyses, it should be noted that because of the nature of the youth facility and the method of data collection used, it could be argued that the data from each interview are not independent therefore violating one of the assumptions of both multiple regression and correlational analyses. First, it could be argued that because residents within living units can potentially affect the attitudes and opinions of others within their unit, the responses of those interviewed from the same unit may not be truly independent. Second, the method of asking respondents to name two fellow residents on each measure of social status may be viewed as having created non-independence of the data. Specifically, respondents' second choices on a given measure could not be independent of their first choices, since they would have to name a different residents for their second choices. While this difficulty could have been avoided by using only their first nominations to compute residents' scores on the measures of social status, the small number of available respondents would not permit limiting the data in that way. However, had the study been conducted within a larger facility, using only one nomination per respondent would have been a preferable approach.

Because of the potential difficulties caused by the violation of the assumption of independence of the data, the validity of the results of the multiple regression and correlation analyses may be questioned. For this reason, the multiple regression analyses

were complemented with an examination of the characteristics of high-status group members in comparison to the characteristics of residents with lower status.

Relationships Among Background Characteristics

To determine the extent to which residents' age, the number of previous crimes they had committed prior to the one(s) they were serving time for at the time of the interviews and the total amount of time they had spent at the facility were related, the correlations among these variables were examined. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 3. As can be seen from that table, no significant relationship was found between residents' age and the number of crimes they had committed prior to the one(s) they were serving time for during the interview period. However, there was a statistically significant positive correlation between residents' age and the total amount of time they had spent at the facility, including time served for prior convictions. In other words, older residents tended to have spent more time in the facility than younger residents. In addition, a statistically significant positive correlation was found between the total amount of time residents had spent at the facility and the number of crimes they had been previously convicted of.

Residents who had committed more previous crimes had served more time in total within the facility than had those who had committed fewer crimes.

Table 3
Correlations among resident's age, number of previous crimes and time served within the facility.

	Age	Time served	Previous crimes
Age	---	.311*	-.066
Time served	.	---	.424*
Previous crimes			---

*p<.01.

Predictors of Status

The results of the simultaneous multiple regression analyses lend support to Hypothesis 1. As can be seen in Table 4, the number of days that residents had spent at the facility proved to be a significant predictor of the proportion of nominations that they received for the specific task of serving on the institutional council (Beta = 0.688, p<.001) . In fact, an examination of the standardized regression coefficients suggest that, of the background characteristics assessed, the amount of time served is the most reliable predictor of task-specific leadership status.

Support was also found for Hypothesis 2 as respondents' age was a significant predictor of the proportion of nominations they received (Beta = 0.198, p = .049) .Both predictors were positively related to the proportion of nominations received. In other words those who had resided within the facility for longer periods of time and those who were older tended to be nominated more often than those who had served less time within

the facility and those who were younger. The analysis also showed that the first type of crime (Beta = 0.216, p = .026) and the total number of previous crimes committed (Beta = -0.273, p = .013) were significant predictors of the proportion of nominations received for the council. Individuals with fewer previous offenses received a greater proportion of the nominations than those with more, while those whose first offense was non-person-oriented received a greater proportion than those who had committed person-oriented offenses. Neither the last type of crime residents had committed nor their gender were significant predictors of the proportion of nominations they received.

Table 4
Prediction of task-leadership scores from background characteristics

	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
(Constant)	-0.888	0.342		-2.598	0.012
Time	0.001	0	0.688	6.423	<.001
Age	0.041	0.02	0.198	2.008	0.049
Gender	0.053	0.062	0.08	0.858	0.394
First Crime	0.114	0.05	0.216	2.278	0.026
Last Crime	-0.005	0.05	-0.009	-0.095	0.925
Previous Crimes	-0.006	0.002	-0.273	-2.568	0.013

Person-oriented crime = 1, Non-person-oriented crime = 2, Male = 1, Female = 2
$R^2 = .528$, $p < .001$

As shown in Table 5, Hypothesis 3 was also supported in that time was found to

be a unique predictor of residents' influence scores (Beta = 0.663, p<.001). Compared to others within their living unit, individuals named more often as the most influential residents tended to have served more time within the facility[c]. However, the results failed to support both Hypotheses 4, and 5; neither residents' age nor the number of crimes they had been previously convicted of were found to be significant predictor of residents' influence scores. In addition, none of the remaining variables was found to be a significant predictor of influence scores.

Table 5
Prediction of influence scores from background characteristics

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-0.205	0.482		-0.425	0.673
Time	0.001	0.000	0.663	5.412	0.000
Age	0.005	0.029	0.018	0.16	0.874
Gender	-0.032	0.087	-0.039	-0.369	0.713
First Crime	0.083	0.071	0.128	1.181	0.242
Last Crime	-0.012	0.071	-0.019	-0.171	0.860
Previous Crimes	-0.005	0.003	-0.171	-1.407	0.165

Person-oriented crime = 1, Non-person-oriented crime = 2, Male = 1, Female = 2
R^2 = .381, p<.001

Although no specific predictions were made concerning the number of times individuals were named as best-liked or as general leaders, as shown in Tables 6 and 7,

the analyses revealed that time spent in the facility was a unique predictor of both friendship (Beta = 0.332, p = .021) and leadership scores (Beta = 0.756, p = <.001). In both cases, individuals who had served more time within the facility were named more often than others within their unit. In addition, as shown in Table 6, the type of first crime also proved to be a unique predictor of residents' friendship scores (Beta = 0.265, p = .037) In this case, those who were first convicted of non-person-oriented crimes were more often named as the best-liked residents within their units than were those who had committed person-oriented crimes.

Table 6
Prediction of friendship scores from background characteristics

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-0.227	0.354		-0.641	0.524
Time	0.0005	0.000	0.332	2.369	0.021
Age	0.015	0.021	0.090	0.699	0.487
Gender	-0.027	0.064	-0.052	-0.428	0.671
First Crime	0.111	0.052	0.265	2.140	0.037
Last Crime	-0.043	0.052	-0.099	-0.822	0.414
Previous Crimes	-0.002	0.002	-0.089	-0.639	0.526

Person-oriented crime = 1, Non-person-oriented crime = 2, Male = 1, Female = 2
$R^2 = .193$, p=.05

None of the background characteristics was found to be a unique predictor of

socioemotional specialism (see Table 8).

Table 7
Prediction of leadership scores from background characteristics

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-0.356	0.466		-0.764	0.448
Time	0.002	0.000	0.756	6.772	0.000
Age	0.001	0.028	0.002	0.024	0.981
Gender	0.076	0.084	0.088	0.91	0.367
First Crime	0.126	0.068	0.183	1.854	0.069
Last Crime	-0.016	0.068	-0.023	-0.241	0.811
Previous Crimes	-0.006	0.003	0.220	-1.981	0.052

Person-oriented crime = 1, Non-person-oriented crime = 2, Male = 1, Female = 2
$R^2 = .486$, $p<.001$

Table 8
Prediction of socioemotional supportiveness scores from background characteristics

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-0.383	0.527		-0.726	0.471
Time	0.0003	0.000	0.171	1.146	0.257
Age	0.018	0.031	0.078	0.570	0.571
Gender	-0.049	0.095	-0.067	-0.518	0.607
First Crime	0.065	0.077	0.111	0.841	0.404
Last Crime	0.071	0.077	0.118	0.926	0.358
Previous Crimes	0.001	0.004	0.034	0.228	0.820

Person-oriented crime = 1, Non-person-oriented crime = 2, Male = 1, Female = 2
$R^2 = .082$, $p > .05$

Characteristics of High-Status Group Members

To complement the above analyses and to gain a better understanding of the relationship between high status group members and their background characteristics, the characteristics of these residents were examined. Individuals or clusters of individuals, who were named at least two times more than all other residents within their unit were considered to have higher status than the others within their unit, and were classified as task specific leaders, socioemotional specialists, powerful (i.e., influential) residents, sociometric stars (i.e., best-liked) and general leaders, respectively. The characteristics of these high status members were then examined. Their ages, the amount of time they had

served within the facility and the number of crimes they had been convicted of prior to the ones they were serving time for were compared to the averages for their respective units[1]. Because the results of such an analysis could be misleading if only a small number of residents from a given unit were interviewed, only those units where at least fifty percent of eligible respondents were interviewed were included (units A, D, E and G). Although three of the five eligible residents from unit F were interviewed, one of these respondents failed to name fellow residents for eleven of the twelve interview questions. Since responses for the majority of questions were available for only two of the five respondents from that unit, it was decided to exclude that unit from the analysis also.

Based on the classification scheme discussed above, none of the residents within the facility emerged as socioemotional specialists. In contrast, task-specific leaders emerged in three of the four units examined. In total, five residents were classified as task-specific leaders, including residents AK from unit A, DF from unit D and GC, GD and GJ from unit G. As expected, based on the multiple regression analyses, all five individuals had served more time within the facility than the average for residents in their units. Residents AK, DF and GD had served more time within the facility than any other residents in their respective units. GC and GJ had served the second and third most time

[1] The mean ages for units A, D, E and G were 16.3, 16.4, 15.9 and 16.9 years-old respectively. The mean amount of time served for units A, D, E and G was 213.2 days, 185.1 days, 147.0 days and 192.6 days, respectively. The mean number of previous crimes for units A, D, E and G were 10.3, 11.3, 11.7 and 9.2, respectively.

in the facility among residents in unit G.

As suggested by the results of the multiple regression analyses, four of these five residents (AK, DF, GC and GD) were above the average age for their respective units. However, AK was the only task-specific leader who was the oldest resident within his unit. Two residents in unit D were older than DF and two were the same age. Five residents within unit G were the same age as GC and GD, and two residents were older. In contrast, GJ was the youngest individual within that unit.

The multiple regression analyses also suggests that the task-specific leaders would have been convicted of fewer previous crimes than others within their unit. However, this was not found to be the case. In fact, GC was the only resident to have been convicted of fewer than the average number of crimes for his unit. Each of the other four residents had been convicted of more than the average number for their respective units. Only two residents in unit A had been convicted of more crimes than AK. Similarly, only two residents in unit D had been convicted of more crimes than DF. GD and GJ had been convicted of the second most and fourth most crimes among residents in their unit. In contrast, only two residents had been previously convicted of fewer crimes than GC.

Finally, the multiple regression results suggest that the first convictions of task-specific leaders would have been for non-person-oriented crimes rather than crimes against other people. This was found to be true for at least four of the five leaders. The type of crime for which the fifth resident (AK) was first convicted was nondisclosable[d], and therefore it could not be determined whether it was non-person-oriented or person-

oriented. Although the crime for which residents were currently serving time was not found to be a significant predictor of task-specific leadership scores, none of the five task-specific leaders was currently serving time for a person-oriented crime.

AK, DF and GC from units A, D and G respectively, were also classified as powerful residents within their units. As suggested by the results of the multiple regression analysis, these residents had served more than the average time served by residents in their units. In fact, AK and DF had served more time within the facility than anyone else in their respective units and only one resident in unit G had served more time than GC.

While the multiple regression analyses suggested that there was a lack of association between age and power status all three of these residents were above the average age of residents within their units. AK was the oldest resident from Unit A. Only two residents in unit D were older than DF and two were the same age. Similarly, two residents from unit G were older than GC, and five were the same age.

There was also some variation in the number of previous crimes that these three residents had committed. Both AK and DF had been convicted of more crimes than the average for their respective units. Two residents in unit A had been convicted of more crimes than AK, while one had been convicted of the same number. Similarly, two residents from unit D had committed more crimes than DF. In contrast, GC had committed relatively few crimes, as compared to other residents within his unit. In fact, seven residents from unit G had committed more crimes than GC.

The available information suggests that there was no variation in the type of first and last crimes that these residents were convicted of. While the first crime that AK was convicted of was non-disclosable, the first crimes for which DF and GC were convicted were non-person-oriented, as were the crimes for which all three were last convicted.

Based on respondents' choices of the best liked residents within their living units, GC was the only resident classified as a sociometric star within the facility. Interestingly, he was also classified as a task-specific leader and as a powerful resident. The findings of the multiple regression analysis suggest that individuals named more often as the best-liked residents within their units would also have served relatively more time within the facility and would have been first convicted of a non-person-oriented offence. Both were true for GC. As noted above, he had served the second most time among residents within his unit. He was first convicted of a non-person-oriented offense and last convicted of a non-person-oriented crime. In addition, two residents were older than he, while five were the same age. He had been convicted of relatively few crimes previously, with only two residents having been convicted of fewer.

Finally, three residents were classified as general leaders within their units. Two of these individuals (DF and DD) resided in unit D, while the other (GC) resided in unit G. As noted above, both DF and GC were classified as task-specific leaders and powerful residents, while GC was also classified as a sociometric star.

As suggested by the multiple regression analysis, all three of these individuals had served more time than the average resident within their units. In fact, both GC and DF

had served more time in the facility than anyone else in their respective units, while DD was second only to DF in time served by residents in their unit. Each of these three residents were above the average age of residents in their units. In fact, DD was older than all but one resident who was the same age as he. Two residents (DD and another resident) were older than DF and two were the same age. GC was of average age for unit G. Two residents within that unit were older than he, and five were the same age.

Both DD and DG had been previously convicted of more than the average number of crimes for residents in unit D. In fact, DD had been convicted of more crimes than anyone else in that unit and DF had been convicted of the third most crimes. In contrast, GC had been convicted of fewer than the average number of crimes. In fact, only two residents had been convicted of fewer.

Reasons for Choices Made

In order to gain a better understanding of the determinants of leadership, power and friendship within the facility, respondents were asked to explain their choices for each of the measures. Content analysis was used to summarize the resulting qualitative data . This method involves establishing a set of specific categories (i.e., codes) and counting the number of instances that fall into each category (Silvermen, 1993).

As shown in Table 9, respondents offered a number of reasons for why they would nominate certain residents to an institutional council. The specific reasons provided were assigned to six categories. One of these categories included reasons

related to some *personality characteristics* that the individual possessed such as being trustworthy or honest, being nice, normal, fair or generous, and being mature or responsible. Another category included reasons related to the amount of *seniority* that the individual had within the institution, such as having been within the facility the longest, "knowing the ropes" and knowing how to deal with the staff. Other reasons offered were related to the *intelligence* of the residents such as them having good ideas, being smart or having good marks in schools.

Another category of responses included reasons related to the *task-related abilities* nominees' ability to speak up in a group and their ability to get things done or to negotiate and settle. Being a *good friend* either within or outside the facility was also mentioned as a reason for nominating someone. Finally, several *other* reasons were offered including the nominee having a lot of time left to serve, the person wanting to do something good, the respondent thinking others would vote for that person and the respondent feeling that the resident "is under no one else's rules" (i.e., does not follow the rules of other residents).

Table 9
Reasons for nominating someone to institutional council

Category	Specific Response	Number of Mentions
Ideas		
	Good Ideas/smart/good marks in school	12
Experience		
	Been here longest	10
	Knows the ropes	4
	Knows how to deal with staff/staff on level with him or her	2
Task-related abilities		
	Speaks up/wouldn't be shy	5
	Could get things done/could negotiate and settle	4
Personal characteristics		
	Trustworthy/honest	7
	Nice/normal/fair/generous	7
	Well- behaved	5
	Doesn't pick on people/not a trouble maker/keeps to self/quiet	5
	Mature/responsible	4
	I can talk to him or her/he or she listens to me	2
Good friend		
	Good friend of mine/know on the outside	5
Other reasons		
	Others getting out/he or she has lots of time left here	2
	I know that others would vote for him	1
	I would like to do something good	1
	He or she is "under no one else's rules"	1

Seniority or experience within the facility was also frequently mentioned as an explanation of residents' influence over others within their living unit (see Table 10). Responses assigned to this category included residents' having been in the facility a few times or having been there for quite a while, their knowledge of the system or the rules of the facility, their ability to explain the privilege system and how not to lose these privileges, and finally their age.

A second set of explanations for residents' influence included responses related to their ability to *bully* others. This category included suggestions that the influential residents are bullies, are feared by others, are bigger than other residents, are bossy, pushy or have a big mouth, "run the unit", or have someone in another unit who can "back them up." Other explanations for individuals' influential status were related to *respectable* traits such as being mature, nice or treating others well and being respected by other residents. Still other reasons offered were related to the *persuasiveness* of these residents through means other than the use of physical force, including their ability to argue, the willingness of others to listen to them and their ability to get their own way. Being an *attention-seeker* was offered as an explanation for others' influence. Finally, other explanations offered were that the influential residents were *leaders* and that they were *decision-makers*.

Table 10
Explanations of residents' influence

Category	Specific Response	Number of Mentions
Seniority		
	Here a few times/been here a long time	15
	Knows the system/knows the rules	7
	Tells others how to behave/tells them about losing privileges	2
	One of oldest in unit	1
Bully		
	Bully/some people afraid of him/he's big	13
	Has someone else to back him up	3
	Bossy pushy has a big mouth	1
	Runs unit	1
Attention seeker		
	A laugh/hyper/seeks attention	6
Respectable		
	Mature/nice person/treats others good/not a trouble maker	3
	Others look up to him/others respect	2
Persuasive	Able to argue and make you see it their way	3
	People listen to him	2
	Usually get own way	1
Leader		
	He is a leader	1
	Younger residents follow him	1
Decision-Maker		
	Makes right decisions	1

Having *seniority or experience* within the facility was a frequently cited explanation of residents' leadership status (see Table 11). Included within this category were suggestions that leaders had been within the facility for a while and that they had a greater knowledge of the facility or knew more about the rules of the facility. Another frequently offered explanation for residents' leadership status was related to their ability to *bully* others, such as their size, their ability to fight, their ability to intimidate others, their being feared by others, their ability to keep other residents in line and their ability to organize bigger residents.

Residents' leadership status was slightly less often attributed to the fact that they were *well-liked* by there fellow residents. Responses assigned to this category included suggestions that leaders were nice to everyone, that they got along with everyone, that they were outgoing and that they were liked by staff. Another category of responses suggested that leaders' status was due to their *influence* over other residents, including their ability to bring the unit together and the fact that other residents looked up to them or listened to them. Another explanation offered for residents' leadership status was simply that those nominated as leaders did not listen to others or were not intimidated by others. In other words, leaders were *not followers*. Finally, *other* explanations for residents' leadership status included that they were mature, attractive, quiet or were well-behaved.

Table 11
Explanations for residents' leadership status

Category	Specific Response	Number of Mentions
Seniority		
	Been here a while	18
	Knows more about place/knows rules of place	7
Bully	Bigger than the rest/can fight/intimidating/others afraid of him	13
	Keeps others in line	2
Well-liked	Nice to everyone/gets along with everyone/outgoing	11
	Staff like him or her	1
Influential		
	People listen to him or her	6
	Brings unit together	2
	Others look up to	2
Not a follower		
	Doesn't listen to anyone else/doesn't let others mess with him or her	4
Other		
	Mature	2
	She's pretty	2
	Young and not smart but can organize bigger residents	1
	Quiet	1
	Well-behaved	1

The reasons individuals provided for naming a given resident as someone they would speak to if they were experiencing a personal problem were grouped into two main categories (see Table 12). One of these categories included reasons related to the respondents' *friendship* with the residents they named. Specifically, respondents mentioned being friends with or knowing the individual either within or outside the institution, or simply "getting along good" with the person who they named. The other main category of responses included reasons related to the socioemotional skills possessed by the individual. These included the belief that the person would not laugh at the respondent, that they were good listeners, that they let others talk or were nice to talk to and that they could be trusted and would be unlikely to tell others.

Respondents also offered a number of reasons why they named certain individuals within their units as those that they liked best (see Table 13). One category of reasons were related to the *friendliness* of those named including that they were "good for a laugh" or easy to get along with and that they were friendly, caring or nice. *Friendship* also seemed to play a large role in respondents choices of the best-liked residents. A number of respondents indicated that they knew or were friends with the individuals outside of the facility, while others indicated that they had met within the facility some time prior to the interview.

Another major determinant of liking identified by respondents was the *supportiveness* of those named, such as making themselves available to talk to or "sticking together" with the respondents. The *trustworthiness* of residents, including

confidence that they would not "stab you in the back" or that they would "watch your back" was named less often as a reason for liking someone. *Other* explanations for choosing someone as best-liked were that they were not troublemakers or they did not bother others, that they were mature, that they did what the respondent told them to do and that they were the kind of person that respondents would "hang around with" outside of the facility.

Table 12
Reasons why respondents would choose to speak to residents if experiencing a personal problem

Category	Specific Response	Number of Mentions
Friends		
	Met in here and have known for a while/one of my friends in here	10
	Know on the outside/grew up with him or her/know from home	6
	Get along good with him or her/seems like an alright person	2
Socioemotional Skills		
	Won't laugh at me/understanding/mature	8
	Listens to me/lets you talk/nice person to talk to	5
	Wouldn't tell others/can trust him or her	3

Table 13
Explanations for naming residents as best-liked within living unit

Category	Specific Response	Number of Mentions
Friendly		
	Good for a laugh/easy to get along with/we get along together	29
	Friendly/caring/nice person/fair	5
Supportive		
	There if you want to talk/good to talk to	14
	We stick together/each goes along with what the other says	2
	Stood up for me when I first came here	1
Trustworthy		
	Trustworthy/wouldn't stab you in the back/watches your back	5
	Stood up for me when I first came here	1
Friends	Grew up with him or her/know on the outside/friend from the outside	11
	Good friend	5
	Know from last time here/met in here a while ago	3
Other		
	Not a trouble maker/not saucy/quiet/doesn't bother me	3
	Mature	3
	Does what I say	2
	Kind of person I'd hang around with on the outside	2

While the reasons offered for choosing the residents that they liked best within the entire facility were similar to those offered for choosing those that they liked best within their units, being friends with the person outside of the facility was given as a reason for choosing someone outside of their unit noticeably more often (see Table 14).

Relationships among Measures

To determine the extent to which being nominated on one measure was related to being nominated for others, the correlations among the proportion of nominations that each resident received on each of the measures were examined (a complete correlation matrix containing all variables is included in Appendix D) . As shown in Table 15, with the exception of the correlation between the number of times individuals were named as the person residents would most like to talk to and the number of times they were named as the most influential resident in their unit, all correlations were found to be statistically significant.

Of particular interest is the high correlation between leadership and influence. Specifically, nearly one-half of the variance in leadership scores is accounted for by residents' scores on influence. This suggests that, to a large extent, respondents who were nominated as leaders within their unit also tended to be named as the most influential residents within those units.

Table 14
Explanations for naming residents as best-liked within facility

Category	Specific Response	Number of Mentions
Friendly		
	Good for a laugh/easy to get along with/we get along together	19
	Friendly/caring/nice person/fair	4
Supportive		
	There if you want to talk/Good to talk to	7
	We stick together/each goes along with what the other says	4
Trustworthy		
	Stood up for me when I first came here	1
Friends	Grew up with him or her/know on the outside/friend from the outside	22
	Know from last time here/Met in here a while ago	4
	Good friend	3
Other		
	Not a trouble maker/not saucy/quiet/doesn't bother me	6
	Kind of person I'd hang around with on the outside	2
	Like me/likes the same things I do/we have things in common	2
	She's my girlfriend	2
	Not trying to protect ego	1
	Mature	1
	He's my brother	1
	Attractive	1

Table 15
Correlations between proportion of nominations received for each measure

	Task-leadership	Social Supportiveness	Influence	Best-liked	Leadership
Task-leadership	---	.340**	.516**	.495**	.564**
Social Supportiveness		---	.152	.487**	.256*
Influence			---	.380**	.759**
Best-liked				---	.448**
Leadership					---

*p<.05. **p<.01.

Testing the Proximity-Attraction Hypothesis

Based on the observed relationship between proximity and attraction, it was hypothesised that when asked to name the residents that they like the best within the entire facility, respondents would choose residents from within their own living unit more often than they would choose those from another unit (see Hypothesis 6). An examination of participants' responses showed that 25 of the 60 choices were of residents residing within their living unit (i.e., in-group choices). Chi-squared analysis[e] revealed that this number of in-group choices is significantly greater than would be expected based on chance alone ($\chi^2_{(1)} = 32.168, p<.001$) providing evidence of the proximity-attraction effect and lending support to Hypothesis 6.

Discussion

Predicting Leadership, Power and Friendship Status

Previous research into leadership within correctional facilities have used varying operational definitions of leadership. Schrag (1954) defined leadership in terms of the number of nominations residents received to serve on a prison council, while Wellford (1973) defined leadership in terms of choices for the best-liked residents. Other researchers have attempted to distinguish among different types of leaders or different sets of leadership skills. For example Grusky (1959) distinguished between expressive and instrumental skills possessed by leaders and Slosar (1978) identified both representational leaders and influence leaders within a correctional facility. These different approaches to the study of leadership highlight the fact that the topic of leadership is a complicated one. The characteristics of residents which allow them to gain leadership status in one situation may not afford them this status in another situation. Furthermore, the relationship among leadership, power and interpersonal attraction will likely vary depending on the operational definition of leadership that is chosen.

The present study was designed to provide insight into leadership within a youth correctional facility. A distinction was drawn between task-specific leadership and general leadership. Task-specific leadership status was defined by the number of nominations residents received to serve on a hypothetical council. General leadership status was defined by the number of times residents were named as leaders by others

within their living units. Data obtained on residents' background characteristics were then used to determine the extent to which these variables were useful in predicting residents' leadership status as well as their power, social supportiveness and friendship status. In an attempt to help clarify the relationship between task-specific leadership, general leadership, power, social supportiveness and friendship, the correlations among residents' scores on the corresponding measures were examined.

Predicting Power

The results suggest that time served within the facility is a unique predictor of residents' power (i.e., their ability to exert influence over other residents). The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that residents who had spent more time within the facility were named as the most influential residents within their units more often than were those who had spent less time within the facility. An examination of the characteristics of the three residents who were identified as powerful residents provide further support for the relationship between the amount of time served and residents' power. Of the three residents who were classified as powerful residents, two had spent more time within the facility than anyone else within their unit, while the third had served more time than all but one of the residents within his unit. Further evidence of the relationship between the amount time served by residents and their ability to influence other residents was found from the explanations respondents offered for residents' influence. In fact, the most frequently mentioned reasons provided were related to their

seniority or experience within the facility. While none of the other background characteristics was found to be a unique predictor of residents' power in the multiple regression analysis, the explanations that respondents provided suggest that the ability to bully other residents is another basis of power within the facility.

These results provide evidence that there are at least two types of power which allow certain residents within the facility to exert influence over other residents. First, there is power based on the expertise or knowledge that residents possess (referred to as *expert power* by French and Raven). Second, there is power based on the ability of the power holder to bully other residents (referred to as *coercive power* by French and Raven).

Predicting Task Specific Leadership

Based on the findings of Schrag (1954), Grusky (1959) and Slosar (1978) it was hypothesised that the number of nominations that individuals received for the hypothetical council, a specific task, would be positively related to the amount of time they had served within the facility. The results of this study lend support to this hypothesis. The multiple regression analyses showed that when the other background characteristics were controlled, the amount of time residents had served was a unique predictor (and the most reliable predictor) of their scores on task-specific leadership. In addition, an examination of the characteristics of residents categorized as task-specific leaders revealed that they had served more time within the facility than any other

residents from their respective units. Finally, having experience or seniority within the facility was frequently mentioned as a reason for nominating someone for the council.

Support was also found for the hypothesised relationship between age and task-specific leadership. The results of the multiple regression analysis showed that age was a unique predictor of task-specific leadership scores when the effects of the other background characteristics (including the amount of time they had served) were controlled for. However, an examination of the characteristics of those identified as task-specific leaders did not completely support this finding. Although four of the five individuals identified as task-specific leaders were above the average age of residents within their respective units, only one of these individuals was the oldest resident from his unit and another was the youngest from his unit. In addition, none of the respondents gave residents' age as an explanation for nominating someone to serve on the council.

While Slosar (1978) failed to find a significant relationship between the number of nominations individuals received and the number of previous crimes they had committed, the multiple regression analyses in the present study showed that residents who received relatively more nominations tended to have been convicted of fewer previous crimes. Again, however, a somewhat different pattern was observed when the characteristics of individuals identified as task-specific leaders were examined. Although overall residents with higher task-specific leadership status tended to have committed fewer previous crimes, only one of the five individuals identified as task-specific leaders was found to have committed less than the average number of crimes for residents of

their respective units.

In addition, although Schrag (1954) and Grusky (1959) had found a preference for violent offenders in nominations to the prison council, this pattern was not observed here. In fact, the analyses revealed that there was actually a preference for residents whose first conviction was for non-person-oriented crimes, while nominations did not seem to be related to the type of crimes residents were serving time for during the interview period. Consistent with the findings of the multiple regression, four of the five residents identified as task-specific leaders had been first convicted of non-person-oriented offences. Not surprisingly, neither the first type of crime, nor the total number of crimes were offered by respondents as reasons for their nominations.

The relationship between the amount of time served and task-specific leadership status is not surprising given that individuals who had spent more time within the facility would be expected to have a greater knowledge of the facility, its rules and how to deal with staff. The reasons that participants provided for their nominations suggest that they recognize such knowledge as an important attribute for someone given the task of serving on the council.

The reasons respondents provided for their nominations also provide insight into the relationship between age and task-specific leadership status. Their responses suggest that possessing characteristics such as maturity, responsibility and the ability to deal with staff are important for serving on a decision-making council. Given that older residents would be more likely to possess these characteristics, it is understandable that there was a

preference for them.

The observed preference for individuals who had committed fewer previous crimes is less clear. It is possible that individuals who had committed fewer previous crimes would be seen as having desirable characteristics such as maturity, honesty, trustworthiness and good behaviour more so than would those who had committed more previous crimes. Similarly, people who had been first convicted of a non-person-oriented crime may be viewed as more respectable than people who had committed crimes against another person. However, if this were true, we would expect there to have been a preference for individuals who were serving time for a non-person-oriented crime, which was not found to be the case.

In summary, of the background characteristics assessed, the amount of time served appears to be the most reliable predictor of residents' task-specific leadership status. Although residents' age, the first type of crime they were convicted of and the number of crimes they had been previously convicted of appear to have some predictive power, they are less reliable predictors of status. Of course, it would be unrealistic to expect these variables to lead to perfect prediction of residents' task-specific leadership status as other factors would undoubtably have an influence. The explanations respondents offered for their choices suggest that other important factors may include personality characteristics or task-related abilities. Respondents' comments also suggest that residents' grades in school may play a role in determining their task-specific leadership status. Unfortunately, their grades were unavailable for inclusion in the

analysis.

Predicting General Leadership Status

The results suggest that time served within the facility is a unique predictor of the general leadership status of residents. The multiple regression analysis showed time to be a unique predictor of residents' leadership scores. In addition, the three residents' who were classified as leaders within the facility had spent more time within the facility than anyone else from their respective units. Finally, respondents often cited residents' seniority or experience within the facility as explanations for their leadership status.

It is not difficult to imagine how people who had served more time within the facility could obtain general leadership status. Residents' explanations for their choice of leaders indicate that having seniority and possessing knowledge of the facility and its rules is an important factor in gaining leadership status. Compared to other residents, those who had spent more time at the facility would be experts on both the written and unwritten rules of the institution and would be able to pass this knowledge on to others. In other words, these individuals possess expert power.

It seems that possessing coercive power can also help individuals gain general leadership status within the facility. As evidence of this, the explanations respondents' offered for some residents' general leadership status suggest that their physical size, their fighting ability and their ability to intimidate or bully others afford them leadership status.

Predictors of Attraction

In accordance with the findings of Wellford (1973), the amount of time served within the facility also proved to be a predictor of the number of times individuals were named as "best-liked". The results of the multiple regression analysis suggest that those individuals who were more often named as the best-liked residents within their units tended to have spent more time within the facility than those who were named less often. As further evidence, the only resident to emerge as a sociometric star within the facility had served more time within the facility than all but one of the residents within his unit. Not surprisingly, the amount of time residents had served was not mentioned by any of the respondents as a reason for naming them as the best-liked.

The first type of crime for which residents were convicted also appears to be related to their sociometric status. The results of the multiple regression analysis revealed that the residents who were more often named as best-liked tended to have committed non-person-oriented crimes. In addition, the one individual who emerged as a sociometric star had been first convicted of a non-person-oriented crime. Although the type of first crime was not mentioned as a reason for naming someone best-liked, reasons related to the friendliness, supportiveness and trustworthiness of residents were. These findings contradict those of Wellford (1973), who found that individuals named as buddies or best-liked were more often violent offenders or had committed crimes against people rather than property.

Predictors of Socioemotional Supportiveness

None of the background characteristics proved to be predictive of residents scores on socioemotional supportiveness, which may be in part due to the fact that a large number of respondents indicated that they would not speak to anyone if they were experiencing a personal problem. This seems to be at least in part due to the lack of trust among residents and their general unwillingness to discuss personal problems.

Relationships Among the Variables

The correlational analyses revealed that with the exception of the correlation between scores on influence and scores on social supportiveness, each social status measure was significantly related to each of the other measures. This suggests that residents who have high status in one area also tend to have high status in other areas.

The reasons for these relationships are not clear at this time. In some cases, simply having high status in one area may grant one higher status in another area. For example, some leaders may be better liked than non-leaders simply because they hold this high status position and are therefore viewed with respect and admiration by their fellow residents. However, another possible explanation for the overlap observed in the various measures of status is that the same characteristics that grant an individual high status in one area may also grant him or her high status in another area. The amount of time residents had served in the facility appears to be one such characteristic. Having served

more time in the facility seemed to play a role in residents' task-specific and general leadership status, their influence and their attractiveness to other residents.

The relationships between task-leadership and general leadership status suggests that the characteristics that grant an individual general leadership status may also generalize to the specific task of serving on a decision-making council. Apart from the amount of time served within the facility, residents' power may be one such characteristic. The observed relationship between residents' scores on influence and their scores on general leadership status and task-related leadership status highlights the role that influence plays in both types of leadership within the facility. Influence scores accounted for more than one-half of the variance in general leadership scores ($r^2 = .576$) and more than one-quarter of the variance in task-specific leadership scores ($r^2 = .266$). In addition, two of the three residents classified as general leaders and three of the five residents classified as task-specific leaders also emerged as powerful residents within the facility.

Although the degree of influence that residents possess appears to be related to both their general leadership and task-specific leadership status, there is evidence that the basis of power may differ for the two types of leadership. The explanations that respondents offered for their choices suggest that the expert power that residents possess because of their knowledge of the facility may be an important factor in both general and task-specific leadership status. However, while coercive power seems to play a role in residents' general leadership status, no evidence was found that the use of coercive tactics

is related to task specific leadership status within the facility.

If influence can be gained through the possession of either expert power or coercive power, high general leadership status is related to possessing either expert or coercive power and task-specific leadership is related to possessing only expert power, we would expect there to be more shared variation between general leadership scores and scores on influence than there is between task-specific leadership scores and scores on influence. In other words, residents' scores on general leadership would be expected to account for more variation in influence scores than would their scores on task-specific leadership. Because of these differences in shared variation, we would expect there to be a stronger relationship between general leadership scores and scores on influence than there is between task-specific leadership scores and scores on influence. Further analysis supported this assumption. Using a technique outlined by Howell (1992) for testing the difference between correlations obtained from non-independent samples, the relationship between general leadership and power was found to be significantly stronger than the relationship between task-specific leadership and power ($t_{(63)} = 3.13$, $p<.01$).

The Proximity-Attraction Effect

The idea that individuals generally like those who are in close proximity to them more than those who are further away is well-established and was further supported in this study. When residents were asked to name the individuals whom they liked best within the entire facility, 25 of the 60 choices were individuals living within respondents'

units. However, given that 35 of 60 choices consisted of residents living in another living unit, unlike the facility studied by Wellford (1973), the facility examined in the present study cannot be considered a non-cohesive unit.

There are at least two factors within the facility which may be used to explain the large number of out-group choices. First, residents have a great deal of contact with those outside of their unit during mealtimes, school and sporting events. In fact, unless there is reason to believe that either security at the facility or residents' safety would be jeopardized, interaction among individuals from different living units is encouraged. Second, many residents were friends with others outside of their living unit prior to their admittance to the facility. In many cases, they grew up with these individuals in their hometown.

Limitations of this Study

Although this study helps to provide some useful information into the nature of leadership, power and interpersonal attraction within a youth facility, it has some limitations. First, because of the anticipated difficulty obtaining parental consent from residents under 16 years of age, only residents above that age could be interviewed for the study. Therefore, the results obtained cannot be generalized to younger residents of the facility. Second, of those who were eligible to participate, volunteers were less likely to have been first convicted of a person-oriented crime than were non-volunteers. Differences were also observed in the number of previous crimes that volunteers and non-

volunteers had been convicted of, as well as the amount of time they had spent within the facility. Although these differences were not found to be statistically significant, this may have been in part due to the small sample size. It is uncertain as to whether these differences would have been reflected in non-volunteers views of the facility. However, this possibility should be recognized. Third, because of the age restriction for interviewing and the small size of the facility, the number of participants interviewed for the study was relatively small, which further limits the ability to generalize the results and restricted the type of analysis that could be performed. Finally, many respondents within the facility were friends with others within the facility prior to their admittance. Therefore some social relations were formed prior to the time at which the residents entered the facility. It is difficult to determine the impact that this had on the social structure of the facility. At the very least, however, it had an impact on their choices of the residents they named as being the best-liked.

Recommendations for Future Research

Given the potential effects of the social structure of youth correctional facilities on rehabilitation attempts, it is important that the topics addressed in this study are addressed in more detail in future research. Many of the difficulties associated with this study could be overcome by conducting similar studies in larger facilities. The larger number of residents in such facilities would allow for a more detailed and reliable analysis of the predictors of social status. In addition to conducting statistical analyses and attempting to

predict residents' status from quantifiable variables, future research should attempt to gather additional qualitative data from the residents of youth facilities through personal interviews and focus groups. Such studies would provide researchers and practitioners with a much more detailed understanding of the determinants of social status and the social structure of youth correctional facilities than would statistical analyses alone.

The findings of this study also give rise to questions about the validity of past measures used to define leadership and suggest that caution should be used in deciding on future measures. While Wellford (1973) chose to define leadership in terms of the number of "best friend" nominations that residents received, the results presented here suggest that the two are not equivalent. Although residents' scores on friendship were found to be significantly related to their scores on both task-leadership and general leadership, friendship scores accounted for only 25% ($r^2 = .245$) of the variance in task leadership and 20% of the variance in general leadership ($r^2 = .201$). In addition, based on the feedback obtained from respondents, friendship but not leadership appears to be based to a large extent on the length of time that residents had known each other. In many cases, residents named individuals that they had known from their hometown or whom they had met within the facility some time prior to the interviews.

Similarly, although there was a significant correlation between measures of friendship and socioemotional supportiveness, the findings of this study suggest that caution should be used when equating the two. While most residents could readily name someone whom they liked best within the facility, many indicated that they would not

speak to someone if they were experiencing a personal problem. It therefore seems that liking someone or being friends with someone or "liking them the best" does not necessarily mean that these individuals will be sought to provide social support.

Finally, the results show that the relationship between leadership and power or influence will likely depend on the definition of leadership employed. In the present case, both task-leadership and general leadership as defined by residents appear to be related to residents' expert power, while only general leadership appears to be related to coercive power.

Notes

a. Another relevant study, conducted by Van-Aken, Van-Lieshout, Roosen & Roeffen (1991), examined the peer relations and sociometric status of children and adolescents receiving residential and semi-residential treatment for behaviour disorders. Unfortunately, the article was published in Dutch and the English translation was unavailable.

b. Charles Wellford was contacted to determine if he had conducted more recent research in this area or if he was aware of any additional research. He indicated that he no longer conducts research on this topic and is not aware of any additional research.

c. We also included a number of "negative measures" in the study. Specifically, residents were asked to name two individuals from their unit they would definitely not vote for to be on the hypothetical council, two who were definitely not leaders, two who were the least influential residents in their units and two whom they would definitely not speak to if they were experiencing a personal problem. They were also asked to name the two within their living units and the two residents from the entire facility whom they liked least.

Time was found to be a significant predictor of the proportion of nominations

individuals received for being the least influential resident within their unit. Those who had served less time were more likely to have been named as being the least influential resident in their units. None of the background characteristics were found to be significant predictors of the proportion of votes residents received for the other "negative measures."

d. According to the Young Offenders Act, records of young offenders may be considered nondisclosable in a number of circumstances. When a youth is acquitted of an offence for reasons other than a verdict of not criminally responsible due to a mental disorder the record will be considered nondisclosable two months following the expiration of the time allowed for appealing a court's decision or, when an appeal is made, three months following appeal procedures. In addition, a youth record is considered nondisclosable one year following the time at which the charge is withdrawn for reasons other than acquittal or withdrawal or one year following the time at which the charges are stayed. Youth records would also be considered nondisclosable two years after the young offender has consented to participate in an alternative measures program for the crime committed. In the case of a summary conviction offence, the record will be considered nondisclosable five years following a guilty verdict. In the case of an indictable offence, records are considered nondisclosable five years after all dispositions for that offence or five years after the dispositions for other indictable offences for which the youth has been found guilty

before the first five years have expired.

e. Expected numbers of within-unit and outside-of-unit choices were calculated based on respondents each choosing two residents as those they liked best within the facility. The responses of two participants who had each only named one resident as best-liked were omitted from the analysis, resulting in a total of 58 choices. Thirty-four of these 58 choices consisted of individuals living outside of respondents' living units.

References

Allen, L.A.(1958). Management and Organization. New York: McGrath-Hill.

Anderson, S.D., Wanberg, K.W. (1991). A convergent validity model of emergent leadership in groups. Small Group Research, 22, 380-397.

Bales, R.F., & Slater, P.E. (1955). Role differentiation in small groups. In T. Parsons, R.F. Bales, J. Olds, M. Zelditch & P.E. Slater. Family, socialization and interaction process, Glencoe, Ill: Free Press.

Bass, B.M. (1961). Some observations about a general theory of leadership and interpersonal behaviour. In L. Petrullo & B.M. Bass. Leadership and interpersonal behaviour. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Ben-David, S. (1992). Influence, leadership, and social desirability in psychotherapeutic groups. Journal of Group Psychotherapy, Psychodrama and Sociometry, 45, 17-23.

Bennis, W.G. (1959). Leadership theory and administrative behaviour: The problems of authority. Admin Sci Quarterly, 4, 259-301.

Bornstein, R.F., Kale, A.R., & Cornell, K.R. (1990). Boredom as a limiting condition on the mere exposure effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 791-800.

Church, A.H., & Waclawski, J. (1998). The relationship between individual personality orientation and executive leadership behaviour. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 71, 99-125.

Cronshaw, S.F., & Ellis, R.J. (1991). A process investigation of self-monitoring and leader emergence. Small Group Research, 22, 403-420.

Dunphy, D.C. (1969). Cliques, crowds & gangs. Melbourne: Cheshire.

Fiedler, F.E. (1978). The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 12, pp. 59-112). New York: Academic Press.

Fiedler, F.E. (1981). Leadership Effectiveness. American Behavioral Scientist, 24, 619-632.

Forsyth , D.R. (1983). An introduction to group dynamics. Monterey: Brooks/Cole.

French , J.R.P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.) Studies in social power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

Gibb, C.A. (1969a). An interactional view of the emergence of leadership. In C.A. Gibb (Ed.) Leadership. Penguin.

Gibb, C.A. (1969b). Leadership. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds). Handbook of social psychology, 2nd ed., vol 4. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Gold, M. (1958). Power in the classroom. Sociometry, 21, 50-60.

Gordon, T. (1955). Group-centred leadership- A way of releasing the creative power of groups. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Gough, H.G. (1990). Testing for leadership with the California Psychological Inventory. In K.E. Clark & M.B. Clark (Eds). Measures of leadership (pp. 335-379). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

Grusky , O. (1959). Organizational goals and the behaviour of informal leaders. American Journal of Sociology, 65, 59-67.

Gustafson, D.P. (1973). Task commitment and role differentiation. Human Relations, 26, 667-679.

Hains, S.C., Hogg, M.A., & Duck, J.M. (1997). Self categorization and leadership: Effects of group prototypicality and leader stereotypicality. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23, 1087-1099.

Hannah, M.E. (1979). High school leadership: Situational and personal components. Journal Of Psychology, 103, 163-168.

Hawkins, K.W. (1995). Effects of gender and communication content on leadership emergence in small task-oriented groups. Journal of Small Group Research, 26, 234-249.

Hawkins, K.W., & Stewart, R.A. (1990). Temporal effects of leadership style on state communication anxiety in small task-oriented groups. Communication Research Reports, 7, 3-8.

Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. American Psychologist, 49, 493-504.

Hollander, E.P., & Offermann, L.R. (1990). Power and leadership in organizations: Relationships in transition. American Psychologist, 45, 179-189.

Hollander, E.P., & Webb, W.B. (1958). Leadership, followership, and friendship: An analysis of peer nominations. In E.E. Maccoby, T.M. Newcomb, and E.L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Hollander, E.P. (1964). Leaders, groups, and influence. New York: Oxford University Press.

Howell, D.C. (1992). Statistical methods for psychology (3rd ed.). Belmont: Duxbury Press.

Hutchinson, S., Valentino, K.E., & Kirkner, S.L. (1998). What works for the gander does not work as well for the goose: The effects of leader behavior. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28, 171-182.

Imamoglu, E.O. (1974). Initial evaluation of stimuli as another limiting condition of the exposure effect. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 13, 157-159.

Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley.

Lord, R.G., De Vader, C.L., & Allinger, G.M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relationship between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 402-410.

Moreno, J.L. (1953). Who shall survive?. Beacon, New York: Beacon House.

Pearlman, D. & Oskamp, S. (1971). The effects of picture content and exposure frequency on evaluations of negroes and whites. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 7, 503-514.

Riemer, H.A., & Chelladurai, P. (1995). Leadership and satisfaction in athletics. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 17, 276-293.

Salminen, S., & Liukkonen, J. (1996). Coach-athlete relationship and coaching behaviour in training sessions. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 27, 59-67.

Schrag, C. (1954). Leadership among prison inmates. American Sociological Review, 19, 37-42.

Sears, D.O., Freedman, J.L., & Peplau, L.A. (1985). Social psychology (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Shields, D.L., Gardner, D.E., Bredemeier, B.J., & Bostro, A. (1997). The relationship between leadership behaviours and group cohesion in team sports. Journal of Psychology, 131, 196-210.

Silvermen, D. (1993). Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analyzing talk, text and interaction. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Slosar, J.A. (1978). Prisonization, friendship, and leadership. Toronto: D.C. Heath and Company.

Sosik, J.J. (1997). Effects of Transformational leadership and anonymity on idea generation in computer-mediated groups. Group and Organizational Management, 22, 460-487.

Spink, K.S. (1998). Mediational effects of social cohesion on the leadership behavior-intention to return relationship in sport. Group Dynamics, 2, 92-100.

Stogdill, R.M. (1950). Leadership, membership and organization. Psychological Bulletin, 47, 1-14.

Stogdill, R.M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Van-Aken, M.A., Van-Lieshout, C.F., Roosen, M.A., & Roeffen, J.T. (1991). Peer relations in (semi) residentially treated children. Pedagogische-Studieen, 68, 68-77.

Wellford, C. (1973). Contact and commitment in a correctional community. British Journal of Criminology, 13, 108-120.

Wilson, S.W. (1978). Informal groups: An introduction. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Wunderley, L.J., Reddy, W.B., & Dember, W.N. (1998). Optimism and pessimism in business leaders. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28, 751-760.

Zaccaro, S.J., Foti, R.J. & Kenny, D.A. (1991). Self-monitoring and trait-based variance in leadership: An investigation of leader flexibility across multiple group situations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76, 308-315.

Zajonc, R.B. (1968). Attitudinal effects of mere exposure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (Monograph Supplement), 9, 2-27.

Appendix A

Participant Consent Form

Informed Consent Form:
Social Structure of a Youth Correctional Facility

I, _____ , the undersigned agree to my participation in the research study described.

_____ _____
(Signature of Participant) (Date)

To be signed by Investigator

To the best of my ability I have fully explained to the participant the nature of this research study. I have invited questions and provided answers. I believe that the subject fully understands the implications and voluntary nature of the study.

_____ _____
(Signature of Investigator) (Date)

_____
(Telephone Number)

Appendix B

Interview Guide

Imagine that the administration of this facility has decided to form a council to deal with problems that residents may be having and changes which could be made to solve these problems. If an election were held to determine which residents would be on this council, name two individuals living within your unit whom you would vote for.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why would you vote for "person 1"?

Why would you vote for "person 2"?

Which two individuals would you definitely not vote for?

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

If you were experiencing a personal problem, and wished to talk with someone about it, name two individuals within your living unit whom you would most like to talk to.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why would you choose to speak to "person 1"?

Why would you choose to speak with "person 2"?

Name two individuals within your living unit whom you would least like to talk to about this problem.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why would you choose not to speak to "person 1"?

Why would you choose not to speak with "person 2"?

Name two people within your living unit who seem to have the most influence over the behaviour of those living in your unit ? You may include yourself.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you think "person 1" has this influence over the behaviour of others?

Why do you think "person 2" has this influence over the behaviour of others?

Name two people within your living unit who seem to have the least influence over the behaviour of those living in your unit ? You may include yourself.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you think "person 1" has the least influence over the behaviour of others?

Why do you think "person 2" has the least influence over the behaviour of others?

Out of all of the residents that live within your unit name the two that you like best.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you like "person 1"?

Why do you like "person 2"?

Out of all of the residents that live within your unit name the two that you like least.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you like "person 1" least?

Why do you like "person 2" least?

Out of all of the residents that live within this youth centre, and not just your unit, name the two that you like best. These people may or may not live within your unit, and may be the same people you mentioned in the last question.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you like "person 1"?

Why do you like "person 2"?

Out of all of the residents that live within this youth centre, and not just your unit, name the two that you like least. These individuals may or may not live in your unit.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you like "person 1" least?

Why do you like "person 2" least?

Within groups of people, there are often certain individuals who seem to be leaders for other group members. Name two individuals living within your unit who you would consider to be the leaders.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you consider "person 1" to be a leader?

Why do you consider "person 2" to be a leader?

Within groups of people, there are also certain individuals who are definitely not leaders. Name two individuals living within your unit who you would definitely not consider to be the leaders.

Person 1 _____
Person 2 _____

Why do you consider "person 1" not to be a leader?

Why did you consider "person 2" not to be a leader?

Which unit are you now living in? ___

How old are you ? ___

Are you attending school while here? Yes No

If "yes" what grade are you in? ___

How much time do you have remaining in your sentence? ___

For what offense are you currently living here? ___

Have you been convicted of an offense prior to this one? Yes No

If "Yes" how many have you been convicted of ? ___

What offense were you first convicted of ? ___

Is this your first time staying at this facility? Yes No

If "No" how many times have you been here before? ___

Including the time you have already served for your current offense, in total, how much time have you spent at this facility? ___

Appendix C

Non-Person-oriented and Person-oriented Crimes

Non-person-oriented crimes

Possession of unregistered restricted weapon
Offenses relating to public or peace officer
Public Mischief
Escape and being at large without excuse
Dangerous operation of motor vehicles, vessels and aircraft
Theft
Taking motor vehicle or vessel without consent
Theft, forgery, etc. of credit card
Fraudulent concealment
Breaking and entering with intent, committing offense or breaking out
Possession of property obtained by crime
Fraudulently obtaining food
Mischief
Arson, damage to property
False alarm of fire
Attempts, accessories
Fraud
Forged documents
Trafficking in restricted drugs
Failure to comply with disposition
Possession of narcotic
Fraudulent concealment

Person-oriented crimes

Pointing a firearm/ possessing a firearm
Causing a disturbance, indecent exhibition, loitering, etc.
Acceleration of death
Criminal Harassment
Uttering threats
Assault with a weapon or causing bodily harm
Assaulting a peace officer
Sexual assault
Robbery
Harassing phone calls

Appendix D

Complete Correlation Matrix

Correlations between all variables

	Task-leadership	Social Supportiveness	Influence	Best-liked	Leadership	Age	Gender	First Crime	Last Crime	Previous Crimes	Time
Task-leadership	---	.340**	.516**	.495**	.564**	.433**	.025	.224	.029	-.018	.533**
Social Supportiveness		---	.152	.487**	.256*	.137	-.089	.117	.130	.126	.175
Influence			---	.380**	.759**	.268*	-.091	.086	.017	.146	.592**
Best-liked				---	.448**	.300*	-.102	.256*	-.029	.106	.443**
Leadership					---	.264*	.029	.113	.025	.142	.624**
Age						---	-.114	.233	.035	-.066	.311**
Gender							---	-.023	.050	-.145	-.093
First Crime								---	.077	-.121	-.121
Last Crime									---	.060	.084
Previous Crimes										---	.424**
Time											---

*p<.05. **p<.01.

Person-oriented crime = 1, Non-person-oriented crime = 2, Male = 1, Female = 2