



Federal Probation

The Myth of Corporate Immunity to Deterrence:
Ideology and the Creation of the Invincible Criminal

*Francis T. Cullen
Paula J. Dubeck*

Racism, Sexism, and Ageism in the Prison Community

Ann Goetting

Sentence Planning for Long-Term Inmates

Timothy J. Flanagan

Profiles in Terror: The Serial Murderer

*Ronald M. Holmes
James E. DeBurger*

Computers Can Help

Sylvia G. McCollum

FTI Fort Worth Substance Abuse Evaluation:

A Pilot Study

*Jerome Mabli
Karen Nesbitt
Steven Glick
Jaclyn Tilbrook
Barbara Coldwell*

Peter Horne

Probation Officers
of the United Probation Council
and Prisoners

*Paul Gendreau
Marie-Claude Tellier
J.S. Wormith*

The Females
Among Special Population of Probationers
and Prisoners

*God Coulter
Frederick Allen*

100590
-100598
100599
100001

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

L. RALPH MECHAM
Director

DONALD L. CHAMLEE
Chief of Probation

EDITORIAL STAFF

LORENE LAKE
Probation Programs Specialist
Editor

KAREN S. HENKEL ETTA J. JOHNSON
Associate Editor Editorial Secretary

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WILLIAM E. AMOS, Ed. D., Professor and Coordinator, Criminal Justice Programs, North Texas State University, Denton

J.E. BAKER, Federal and State Corrections Administrator (Retired)

RICHARD A. CHAPPELL, Former Chairman, U.S. Board of Parole, and Former Chief, Federal Probation System

ALVIN W. COHN, D.
Director of Justice Services

JOHN P. CONRAD, Director

DANIEL GLASER, Professor
University of Southern California

SUSAN KRUP GRUBER, Director
Administrator, Administrative Office of U.S. Courts

M. KAY HARRIS, Associate
Justice, Temple University

PETER B. HOFFMAN, Director
Parole Commissioner

BEN S. MEEKER, Chief Probation Officer (Retired), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

LOYD E. OHLIN, Ph.D., Professor of Criminology Harvard University Law School

MILTON G. RECTOR, President Emeritus, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Hackensack, New Jersey

ROBERT S. SHAW, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

WILLIAM H. WATSON, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

WILLIAM H. WATSON, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

WILLIAM H. WATSON, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

WILLIAM H. WATSON, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

WILLIAM H. WATSON, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

WILLIAM H. WATSON, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

WILLIAM H. WATSON, Director, U.S. Department of Justice

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

100590-
100598

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Commissioner (Retired), U.S.

of Law, The American
D.C.

Emeritus Professor of
Pennsylvania

Professor of Psychiatry,
ie, University of North

of Probation (Retired), Ad-
e U.S. Courts

Commissioner of Corrections
County, New York, and

Journal of Correction

Federal Probation is published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and is edited by the Probation Division of the Administrative Office.

All phases of preventive and correctional activities in delinquency and crime come within the fields of interest of FEDERAL PROBATION. The Quarterly wishes to share with its readers all constructively worthwhile points of view and welcomes the contributions of those engaged in the study of juvenile and adult offenders. Federal, state, and local organizations, institutions, and agencies—both public and private—are invited to submit any significant experience and findings related to the prevention and control of delinquency and crime.

Manuscripts, editorial matters, books, and communications should be addressed to FEDERAL PROBATION, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544. See inside back cover for information about manuscript preparation and submission.

Subscriptions may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, at an annual rate of \$11.00 (domestic) and \$13.75 (foreign). Single copies are available at \$3.50 (domestic) and \$4.40 (foreign).

Permission to quote is granted on condition that appropriate credit is given to the author and the Quarterly. Information regarding the reprinting of articles may be obtained by writing to the Editors.

FEDERAL PROBATION QUARTERLY.

Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME XLIX

SEPTEMBER 1985

NUMBER 3

This Issue In Brief

NCJRS

MAR 10 1986

The Myth of Corporate Immunity to Deterrence: Ideology and the Creation of the Invincible Criminal.—Commentators frequently assert that the criminal law is ineffective in deterring corporate crime because either (a) the public will not support sanctions against businesses or (b) companies are too powerful to be swayed by existing legal penalties. Authors Francis T. Cullen and Paula J. Dubeck suggest, on the contrary, that studies reveal the public favors the use of criminal sanctions against offending corporations and such sanctions will ultimately diminish future illegality.

Racism, Sexism, and Ageism in the Prison Community.—A survey of literature suggests that blacks, women, and the elderly experience differential treatment in prison and that such treatment is somewhat in concert with that afforded them in the outside community, according to Professor Ann Goetting of Western Kentucky University. She concludes that such discrimination is likely to persist in the institutional setting until such time it is no longer tolerated in society at large.

Sentence Planning for Long-Term Inmates.—Recent sentencing law changes throughout the United States are likely to produce an increase in size and proportion of long-term prisoners in state and Federal correctional facilities. Professor Timothy J. Flanagan of the State University of New York at Albany addresses a number of issues involved in planning constructive sentences for these prisoners and discusses administrative structures for the implementation of long-term sentence planning.

Profiles in Terror: The Serial Murderer.—One alarming aspect of contemporary serial murder is the extent to which its perpetrators believe that violence against human beings is a normal and acceptable means of implementing their goals or motives, assert University of Louisville professors Holmes and

DeBurger. Their article describes a systematic typology of serial murders and indicates some of the general characteristics of the offender.

Computers Can Help.—Until recently the computer-assisted instructional options available to correctional educators were not very practical, reports Federal prisons education specialist Sylvia G. McCollum. The situation has changed sharply, however, and correctional educators can now choose

CONTENTS

The Myth of Corporate Immunity to Deterrence: Ideology and the Creation of the Invincible Criminal	Francis T. Cullen Paula J. Dubeck	3
Racism, Sexism, and Ageism in the Prison Community	Ann Goetting	10
Sentence Planning for Long-Term Inmates	Timothy J. Flanagan	23
Profiles in Terror: The Serial Murderer	Ronald M. Holmes James E. DeBurger	29
Computers Can Help	Sylvia G. McCollum	35
FCI Fort Worth Substance Abuse Evaluation: A Pilot Study	Jerome Mabli Karen Nesbitt Steven Glick Jaclyn Tilbrook Barbara Coldwell	40
Female Correction Officers	Peter Horne	46
Protective Custody: The Emerging Crisis Within Our Prisons?	Paul Gendreau Marie-Claude Tellier J.S. Wormith	55
Changing the Criminal	Gad Czudner	64
The Probationers Speak: Analysis of Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes	G. Frederick Allen	67
Departments:		
News of the Future		76
Looking at the Law		79
Reviews of Professional Periodicals		82
Your Bookshelf on Review		86
It Has Come to Our Attention		90

from a wide variety of user-friendly equipment and software which includes vocational, high-school equivalency, career assessment, job search, and life-skill courses. Those interested in using computers in correctional education may benefit from the Federal prisons experience.

FCI Fort Worth Substance Abuse Evaluation: A Pilot Study.—Dr. Jerome Mabli, research administrator for the South Central Region of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and members of his staff, discuss the preliminary results of a pilot Substance Abuse Program Evaluation. The unit evaluated after 8 months of testing was the FCI Fort Worth STAR (Steps Toward Addiction Recovery) Unit which houses 200 inmates. The authors present a research paradigm which concentrates on cognitive-attitudinal variables and outline recommendations for future evaluation.

Female Correction Officers.—Author Peter Horne presents a current overview of the status of female correction officers in the American penal system, examining data and levels of utilization of females in corrections. The limited progress that female correction officers have made in working in all-male prison facilities is noted and the problems which have impeded their progress are explored. Recommendations are made and administrative strategies outlined in order to promote increased employment of females in opposite sex prisons.

Protective Custody: The Emerging Crisis Within Our Prisons?—The use of protective custody (PC) in North American prisons has increased dramatically over the last two decades with current rates varying from 6 percent to 20 percent of prison populations. According to authors Gendreau, Tellier, and Wormith, the increased use of PC was probably caused by changes in judicial and court-related practices, changing trends in prison populations, and liberalized institutional regulations. They express concern for equitable treatment and an acceptable quality of life in PC.

Changing the Criminal.—Gad Czudner describes a theoretical proposal for a way to change the criminal. The proposal is for a cognitive model with an added moral component which assumes that, only if a person is capable of feeling "bad" about doing "bad," is he able to feel "good" about doing "good." He believes that guilt can be a guide for moral behavior and that awareness of others is the key to this approach.

The Probation Perspective: Analysis of Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes.—Using the

theoretical perspectives of rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, and the justice model as points of reference, this study evaluated probationers' experiences and obtained their ideas as to what the mission of probation should be. Author G. Frederick Allen's findings suggest that probationers are able to conceptualize criminal sanctions as rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, and within a justice model perspective, simultaneously; and that they have useful suggestions for improving the system.

ERRATA: The concluding lines of the article "The Effect of Casino Gambling on Crime" by Jay S. Albanese, which appeared in the June 1985 issue, were eliminated during the printing process. The last two paragraphs of that article should have read as follows:

As a result, states having support for the legalization of casino gambling should not fail to consider legalization due to fear of increases in serious crimes against persons and property. Based on this analysis of the Atlantic City experience, the advent of casino gambling has no direct effect on serious crime. Such finding suggests that any city which undergoes a significant revitalization (whether it be casino-hotels, theme parks, convention centers, or other successful development) that is accompanied by large increases in the number of visitors, hotels, and/or commercial activity, may experience increases in the extent of crime but a *decrease* in the risk of victimization—due to even faster increases in the average daily population of the city.

Although crimes known to the police have increased in Atlantic City since the introduction of casino-hotels, this increase has been more than offset by changes in the average daily population of the city and a general statewide increase in crime. States that follow New Jersey's example in providing a significant crime prevention effort as part of their casino legislation are also likely to experience success in introducing casino-hotels to revitalize a local economy, without an increase in the risk of victimization of its citizens. As this investigation has found, the average visitor to Atlantic City in 1982 was less likely to be the victim of a serious violent or property crime than he or she was before casinos were introduced there.

All the articles appearing in this magazine are regarded as appropriate expressions of ideas worthy of thought but their publication is not to be taken as an endorsement by the editors or the Federal probation office of the views set forth. The editors may or may not agree with the articles appearing in the magazine, but believe them in any case to be deserving of consideration.

The Probationers Speak: Analysis of the Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes*

BY G. FREDERICK ALLEN, Ph.D.
U.S. Probation Officer

THIS STUDY is an attempt to involve the probationer in the debate on "What should the mission and strategy of probation be?" A review of the literature reflects that a number of viewpoints regarding the direction of the criminal justice system in the United States have developed over the past decade. These viewpoints include misgivings about the efficacy of rehabilitation (Martinson, 1974), the cry for retribution (Bailey, et al., 1974), the appeal for justice and fairness (Fogel, 1975), and the demand for commensurate desert (Von Hirsch, 1976). These viewpoints have all received support from current academic research and discussion. In probation, input has been absent from an important, if not the most important, user of the justice system: the offender. This is true even though by the nature of their experience and the reality of their situation, offenders may be the experts on many critical issues in the justice system. Casper (1972) has suggested that the exclusion of the offender's viewpoint is partly due to the fact that offenders are outsiders in American life. Offenders do not enjoy the benefits of organized interest-group activity; they are generally viewed as less than complete human beings, unworthy, and less deserving than citizens who have not violated the law. Thus, little attention has been paid to the reactions of clients by the agencies which seek to control them. One must ask the question: Is society, through its exclusion of offenders from research and policy development, reinforcing devalued feelings and thus perpetuating the problem? This is the predicament of the offender even though formal organizational theory has tended to regard clients as critical factors in organizational functioning and structure (Lefton and Rosengren, 1966).

Using rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, and justice models as points of reference, this inquiry focuses on the description and analysis of the reported experiences of adult Federal probationers

who have completed a term of probation. The study seeks to assess the probationers' views and the implication of their views for theory, policy, and practice in contemporary probation operation in the Federal courts.

Research Questions¹

This research examined the following questions:

1. What are the characteristics of the sample of probationers?
2. Are these characteristics related to their perceptions of probation as a penal sanction whose goal is rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, or justice; or is it perceived as some combination of these goals?
3. What do the probationers believe to have been the purpose in placing them on probation and how is this related to the probationers' view of probation?
4. How is the probation officer's role viewed by the probationer?
5. Are these views related to the nature of the probation officer/probationer relationship and supervision outcome?
6. What suggestions do probationers have:
 - a. For improving the probation system?
 - b. What would constitute the ideal purpose and goal of probation?
 - c. What services should be provided?
 - d. Who should provide these services?

Review of the Rehabilitation, Deterrence, Desert, and Justice Models

Previous studies in corrections have tended to use the concepts of punishment and rehabilitation as incompatible and having separate dimensions: Vinter and Lind (1958), Street, Vinter, and Perrow, (1966), and Glaser, et al., (1968). Raymond (1974) has demonstrated that the concept of punishment and rehabilitation are two independent, unrelated con-

*An earlier version of this article was presented at the 36th annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati, Ohio, November 7-11, 1984.

¹ For a review of the findings with respect to all research questions see: Allen, G.F., *Correctional Directions in Federal Probation: Analysis of the Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1984.

cepts that are capable of occurring simultaneously. Furthermore, Raymond suggests that a given activity may even involve both punishment and rehabilitation at the same time. He concludes that when punishment is considered to be present to the extent that rehabilitation is absent, and rehabilitation is present to the extent that punishment is absent, the results obtained may be of questionable value. Thus, he proposes that it is logically more accurate to regard punishment and treatment as being separate and having two distinctly different dimensions. In this arrangement, each concept has its own continuum, and there need not be any relationship between them. Punishment and treatment may then be defined independently, rather than in an ascribed antithetical relationship. However, a treatment/punishment perspective does not fully explain all the relevant ideas within the concept of

punishment. Accordingly, this study moves a step beyond a two-dimensional view, and uses the concepts of rehabilitation, deterrence, just desert, and the justice model as frames of reference to cover all the dimensions in order to gain insight, understanding, and to analyze the views of the offender.

As a general introduction to the use of the four models, it should be stated that the concepts on which these models are based are immersed in a great deal of controversy. Therefore, the concepts may be viewed as in the process of refinement and development, and may have slightly different meanings to different authors. Rehabilitation, justice deterrence, and desert models are terms which continue to draw attention to specific ideas relating to goals in criminal justice. Table 1 summarizes some of the important elements of the models.

Table 1. FOUR MODELS OF PROBATION PRACTICE

	Rehabilitation Model	Deterrence Model	Desert Model	Justice Model
GOAL	Utilitarian: Community Protection via treatment of the offender.	Utilitarian: Crime reduction via threat of punishment.	Non-utilitarian: penal sanction is deserved for deviant behavior.	Non-utilitarian: just and fair penal sanction for deviant behavior.
ASSUMPTION CONCERNING CAUSE OF DEVIANCE	Social pathology, Disorganization, Differential Associa- tion, Opportunity, Labeling etc.	Economic model- risk-reward decision by of- fender.	Multiple social factors. Risk- reward decision by responsible offender.	Rejects "theories" of causation. Offen- der responsible actor capable of responsible choice.
THEORETICAL CONCERNS	Psychodynamic Treatment-motivated	Punitively Motivated	Punitively Motivated	Punitively Motivated
BASIC CHANGE STRATEGY	Care and control	Threats	Surveillance	Surveillance
SALIENT ROLE OF PROBATION OFFICER	Ego-strengthening via identification and relationship.	Non-treatment role. Surveillance	Enforcement of probation rules	Policing activities Helper as per request. (Advocate for offender)
POLICY IMPLICATION	Decriminalization, Deinstitutionaliza- tion, Community re- organization, Psycho- social oriented programs.	Mandated sentences Reduced dis- cretion judges.	Mandated ranges of sentences.	Concept of fairness and equality. Pro- portional sentencing based on seriousness of offense. Scaling down the levels of punishment. Limiting discretion. Deference to individual's right.

Population and Sample

This study was conducted under the auspices of the United States Probation and Parole Office of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois. This office is located in Chicago, Illinois, and is particularly apt for the purposes of this study because of its high volume and variation of criminal cases which increases the probability of generating data representative of the Federal probation population in large metropolitan areas.

Based on the average number of probation terminations per month, a 3-month data collection period from April 1, 1983, through July 15, 1983, was established. A review of the agency's scheduled termination list generated a total of 106 eligible cases. Of the 106 probationers selected to be included in the sample, 87 (82%) agreed to participate, 3 could not be located, 10 were not contacted on the recommendation of their probation officers, 5 declined, and 1 agreed to participate but was unable to follow through.

Cases were considered eligible for study if they—

1. were scheduled for official termination between April 30, 1983, and July 15, 1983.
2. had received a probation supervision sentence.
3. had never been supervised by the author, who is a current member of the probation staff, in order to remove possible bias.

Methodology

To explore the probationers' views about probation a personal interview was conducted with each probationer shortly after the probationer completed probation. A semistructured interview schedule was used which consisted of three parts. Part I consisted of biographical data which was obtained from the probationer's file. The principal source of data within the probationer's file is the presentence report prepared for the sentencing judge. Presentence reports had been prepared on 95 percent of the sample. Part II, which was administered by the author, consisted of the interview data. The interview data focused on the probationers' perspectives on probation supervision as well as the various factors that may be related to these perspectives. Part III, labeled "General Comments," was open-ended and included concluding remarks the probationers wanted to make about the purpose of probation.

Interview Data

The semistructured interview data section required the probationers to make a judgment on a Likert-type scale regarding their perceptions of probation within our selected perspectives: rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, justice model; and to offer their opinions regarding the perspectives of the sentencing judge and probation officer.

A "General Comments" section invited probationers to elaborate on their ideas and was included because during the pilot study it was noted that after the normal interview was completed, some probationers continued discussions with the researcher about their experiences and attitudes regarding probation. Sometimes these post-discussions ventured into areas beyond the specific limits of the questionnaire, but they contained useful impressions which sometimes summarized probationers' experiences, raised other issues, or provided useful insights and understanding of their views.

To analyze the open-ended data in a systematic, objective, and quantitative manner, and to insure the reliability of the instrument, raters were employed for analysis and coding.

Summary of Findings

Rehabilitation: When the main purpose of probation was identified as rehabilitation: "To help the probationer cope with stressful situations and deal properly with other people, in order to avoid violation of the law," 28.7 percent strongly agreed, 34.5 percent agreed, 8.1 percent were undecided, 22.9 percent disagreed, and 5.8 percent strongly disagreed. Thus, as table 2 indicates, when the "strongly agree" and "agree" categories are combined, 63.2 percent of the sample supported this position.

When the probationers' perceptions of the purpose of probation was compared with their opinions of how judges and probation officers receive probation, the probationers' emphasis on rehabilitation was less than what they believed probation officers' to be (63.2 percent versus 88.5 percent)* while it was similar to what they believed the judges' to be. Based on their experiences 63.2 percent* of the probationers agreed that rehabilitation is the main purpose of probation; the same percentage perceived the sentencing judges as sharing the same view, while 88 percent* believed probation officers view rehabilitation as the main purpose of probation. These data support the notion that probation officers are generally perceived as helpful and as assistance providers.

*"Strongly agree" plus "Agree" categories.

Deterrence: Deterrence was addressed without reference to general deterrence of the community or specific deterrence to the individual probationer. If this question was raised, reference was made to specific deterrence. Probationers were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement: "The main purpose of probation is to keep tabs on the probationer to prevent further violation of the law." As indicated in table 2, when the "Agree" and "Strongly agree" categories were combined, 78.2 percent agreed, 21.8 percent disagreed and none were undecided. When the probationers' responses were compared with their perceptions of the judges' and probation officers' emphasis on deterrence, the difference was not significant: probationers, 78.2 percent; judges, 77.0 percent; and probation officers, 74.7 percent. The data suggest that the probationers believe there is agreement that deterrence is a valid purpose of probation.

Table 2. SUMMARY OF PROBATIONERS' RESPONSE ON THE FOUR PERSPECTIVES*

Scale	Rehabilitation	Deterrence	Desert	Justice
Strongly Agree	28.7%	34.5%	11.5%	10.3%
Agree	34.5%	43.7%	49.4%	31.0%
Undecided	8.1%	0.0%	4.6%	20.7%
Disagree	22.9%	17.2%	27.6%	31.0%
Strongly Disagree	5.8%	4.6%	6.9%	6.9%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Data were analyzed using a single sample chi-square goodness-to-fit test on all items to determine the probability that the deserved frequencies occurred by chance. All test revealed a chi-square that was significant ($p < .001$).

Desert: On the issue of desert, probationers were asked to agree or disagree with the statement: "The main purpose of probation is to provide a deserved punishment to probationers for their violation of the law." Slightly over 60 percent (60.9)* agreed, 4.6 percent were undecided, and 34.5 percent** disagreed. When the probationers' own perceptions are compared with their opinions of the sentencing judges' and probation officers' emphasis on desert as the main purpose of probation, 60.9 percent* probationers agreed; 78.1 percent* believed this view was shared by the judges; and 41.4 percent believed

this view was shared by probation officers. Four and six-tenths percent of probationers were undecided; they believed 3.4 percent of judges and 14.9 percent of probation officers were undecided. Thirty four and a half percent of probationers disagreed while they believed 18.4 percent of judges and 43.6 percent of probation officers disagreed. These data suggest that as in the case of rehabilitation and deterrence, probationers tend to perceive probation within the desert model, and believe that this view is held more by judges than by probation officers.

Justice Model: The justice model perspective was presented via the following statement: "The main purpose of probation is to resolve the problem between the probationer and the victim in a fair and just manner." Table 2 lists the responses as follows: 41.3 percent* of the probationers agreed with the statement; 20.7 percent were undecided; and 37.9 percent disagreed. They perceived the relative emphasis judges and probation officers place on the justice model as follows: 47.1 percent agreed that judges view probation from this perspective; 20.7 percent were undecided; and 32.2 percent disagreed. For probation officers, 40.2 percent agreed; 28.7 percent were undecided; and 31.0 percent disagreed.

The difference between the probationers' perceptions of probation within the justice model and how they perceive the relative emphasis placed upon justice by the probation officer and sentencing judge is very small, indicating that the probationers interviewed believed that the judge and probation officer shared their views of probation as justice. More probationers were undecided about the justice model than the other three perspectives, probably indicating their lack of familiarity with the justice model. While the concepts of rehabilitation, deterrence, and punishment are fairly straightforward in their meanings, the practical consequences of the justice model may not be immediately perceived. Offenders may have had difficulty conceptualizing a probation operation seeking to achieve justice and fairness. In fact, the concept of justice and fairness is essentially a philosophical one.

Although based on their experiences, probationers viewed deterrence as the main purpose of probation (78.2 percent). When asked what the main purpose of probation *should* be ideally, their responses showed a slight shift in focus (table 3) and rehabilitation was preferred (69.0 percent). Deterrence was rated second (55.2 percent), desert third (17.2 percent), justice fourth (6.9 percent), and "other" fifth (1.8 percent). An analysis by raters of the open-ended discussions with probationers revealed that

*"Strongly agree" plus "Agree" categories.

**"Disagree" plus "Strongly disagree" categories.

rehabilitation was emphasized, receiving the highest rating, with deterrence second, and desert and justice third and fourth respectively.

The data suggest that probationers tend to view probation in a variety of ways, with rehabilitation and deterrence as the major conceptualizations. It also points to the need to bridge the gap between legal concerns and the utilitarian aims of rehabilitation. From the offender's perspective, these two views are not incompatible, but appear to be intrinsically joined together. Instead of competing models, what is needed is a comprehensive model which integrates the useful ideas of these models.

Table 3. PROBATIONER'S IDEAL PURPOSE OF PROBATION

Model	Number	Percent
Rehabilitation	60	69.0
Deterrence	48	55.2
Desert	15	17.2
Justice	6	6.9
Other	1	1.1
<hr/>		
TOTAL	130	149.4*

*Percent exceeds 100 due to multiple selections

Table 4. PROBATIONERS' VIEW AND THEIR RELATED CHARACTERISTICS

Selected Variables	Chi Square (corrected for ties)	Significance
Probationers' view of probation as rehabilitation as the purpose of probation by education.	14.0837	.0497*
Probationers' view that the judge supports a justice perspective by sentence arrangement.	6.4622	.0395*
Probationers' view that the judge supports rehabilitation as the purpose of probation by plea bargaining.	8.4532	.0146*
Probationers' view that PO's support the justice perspective as the purpose of probation by prior supervision.	8.5521	.0139*
Probationers' view of the justice perspective as the purpose of probation by prior supervision.	6.9972	.0302*
Probationers' view that PO's support rehabilitation as the purpose of probation by employment status.	6.6083	.0367*
Probationers' view that the judge supports deterrence as the purpose of probation by juvenile record.	-	.0025**
Probationers' view that PO's support rehabilitation as the purpose of probation by prior probation status.	-	.0481**
Probationers' view that PO's support a justice perspective as the purpose of probation by prior probation status.	-	.0095**
Probationers' view that a justice perspective is the purpose of probation by prior probation status.	-	.0068**

*Kruskal-Wallis One-way Analysis of Variance

**Mann-Whitney U test (Probability of U statistics)

How the Probation Officers Are Viewed

The data suggest that probationers generally perceived probation officers as agents whose main interest is to assist the probationer, while they viewed judges more as agents whose main interest is to punish the offender for wrongdoings. Probationers split on the issue of using the assistance of the probation officer for resolving personal problems, with 53% of the probationers preferring to seek assistance from other sources. This implies that while officers may be very effective in working with probationers around personal issues, substantial barriers exist for some probationers in accepting help from the probation officer, particularly around the issues of trust. Thus, probation officers should be aware that they will not be effective in helping some probationer some of the time, with some of their predicaments, but that a referral to resources outside the probation office may be needed. The question here is: Who should be referred and what resources are needed? This is an area for program development and evaluation. While 28.8 percent of the probationers found nothing useful in probation supervision, the majority (66.7 percent) reported that they received benefits via counseling, encouragement, and other supportive interventions.

This study also explored the relationship between probationer views and probationer characteristics. The probationers' education, existence of prior probation status, and employment status, showed a statistical link to perceiving the officer as a rehabilitationist. The absence of a juvenile record showed a positive relationship with viewing the officer as an agent of deterrence. Perceiving the officer as supporting justice was related to the absence of a prior probation status. Thus, the presence or absence of prior experience in the criminal justice system may have some significant impact on the probationer's view of the role of the probation officer. If probationers perceived the officer as primarily interested in their well-being, they viewed the officer as a rehabilitationist, indicating that the probationer not only may want assistance, but may be able to utilize it effectively. Table 4 summarizes the findings.

The relationship between probationers' perceptions of the probation officer's role and the outcome of probation was explored, but no significant rela-

tionship was found. Table 5 summarizes these results.

Table 5. PROBATIONERS' VIEWS OF PROBATION OFFICER BY OUTCOME OF PROBATION SUPERVISION

Outcome	Cases	Rehabilitation	Deterrence	Desert	Justice
		Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank	Mean Rank
Continually Difficultly Free	79	44.43	44.72	44.95	44.94
Difficultly Encountered	4	38.25	28.75	50.25	31.50
Arrested	2	48.25	45.00	34.00	41.25
Convicted	2	34.25	45.00	4.00	34.50
Significance	87	.8712*	.5943*	.1001*	.6835*

*Not significant, P .05.

Probationers' Suggestions for Improving the System

If client satisfaction can be measured by the suggestions for improvement by the clients served, then this sample seems to be relatively satisfied with the existing level of service. While most probationers indicated that they had no suggestions (75%), those who made suggestions touched on some important issues. These issues may be summarized as follows: (1) The probation officer should be a client advocate; (2) The probation office should increase its emphasis on employment assistance to probationers; (3) Probation officers should be granted more authority to act without instructions from the court—for example, in decisions regarding contact level; (4) The probation system should provide incentives and rewards for compliance—for example, early termination from probation for good conduct;² (5) Contact level should be based on offender risk or need and not be established arbitrarily across the board;³ (6) Lower caseloads for more thorough supervision; (7) Probation officers should maintain closer contact with probationers; (8) Probation officers should make more home visits; and, (9) Probation should benefit the community directly.

Several themes became apparent from the general comments made by probationers. Probationers tended to be uninformed about the court system and

² A number of Federal districts permit the probation officer to petition the court to terminate probation prior to the scheduled expiration date. However, in the Northern District of Illinois, as a general policy the probationers' attorney initiates the petition rather than the probation officer.

³ In the Northern District of Illinois use of the Risk Prediction Scale for classification is subordinate to an across-the-board monthly contact.

its processes. Most of them are grateful that they received probation and they have maintained a traditional view that their probation constitutes a one-time opportunity given to them by the judge to make a positive adjustment. They expressed concern throughout their probation about making a mistake which would land them in jail. Yet, in fact, the system is far less punitive and violation is a rare occurrence. There are few violations for technical infractions such as failing to report and keeping appointments. Usually, probation revocation and incarceration come about only after a probationer's conviction for a new offense.

It is generally assumed that the low violation rates in the Federal system are largely a function of the selection process: good risk defendants are selected for probation. However, the question is raised as to whether probationers' uninformed perceptions about the court system contribute to Federal probation success and deterrence. This is an important issue and further experimentation with control groups could provide useful information on the probation process and deterrence.

In a related theme, probationers tend to perceive their probation as a contract between themselves and the government. The contract may be conceptualized in terms of deterrence, desert, justice, or rehabilitation, or a combination of these terms. However, whatever the perceived terms of the contract probationers appear to expect probation officers to fulfill their role(s). Thus, rehabilitation-oriented probationers expect to receive rehabilitative support from probation officers, and the deterrence-oriented probationers expect to have probation officers monitor their behavior. The researcher's own experience suggests that officers often become apologetic in dealing with some types of probationers—for example, monitoring offenders who present little or no risk. Probationers who expect to be monitored perceived the officer as doing an adequate or inadequate job, which may indirectly influence the way they respond to supervision.

Finally, a third theme is the manner in which probationers in this sample perceived themselves relative to their offender status. They did not consider themselves criminals, sick, or morally deficient. On the contrary, they represented themselves as having a rational understanding of the circumstances contributing to their conviction, and in general they tended to expect to continue a normal existence and participation in the social institutions of the community.

These themes have important implications for the supervision process and raise important issues con-

cerning the directions that the criminal justice system should pursue.

Implication of the Research

The data indicate that probationers are not as concerned about the diffusion of goals in corrections as theoreticians are. In other words, while theoreticians have been debating the appropriateness of a rehabilitation model, a deterrence model, a desert model, or a justice model, to varying degrees probationers tend to view all these models as valid goals of probation. These preferences are probably controlled by variables, the identification of which is beyond the scope of this research. The research raises the question of whether the differentiation that the theoreticians have strongly maintained is useful in understanding and evaluating criminal justice programs. More useful than a debate on what theoretical perspective is more appropriate in molding contemporary correctional programs would be a concerted effort to extract and incorporate the useful elements of each perspective in the design of correctional programs.

The implications of this analysis for the theoretician lie in the issue of the proper place for ideological doctrine in criminal justice enterprise. As Miller (1973) has posited, the theoretical perspectives used in this research are nothing but ideological positions or assumptions that have no empirical validity. In the past, these divergent views were essentially a part of a conservative or liberal orientation. However, the current debate in criminal justice concerning its mission has been extended beyond a conservative/liberal fence. Both conservatives and liberals call for reform in the justice system. The responses of the probationers in this research suggest that the validity of current ideological intensification may need to be evaluated carefully. The finding that offenders perceive probation in a variety of ways and tend to accommodate a variety of theoretical perspectives suggests that participants in the current debate may be misapplying their energies. What is needed is a broader and more accommodating position that is capable of mutual respect for all the participants in the justice system.

Practice Issues and Implication

Probation officers are supposed to be both treatment and social control agents. Performing these nearly contradictory functions has been a perennial dilemma for probation officers. Bartollas, Miller, and Wice (1983:212) cite three reasons for this: (1) Each type of officer may be attracted to one role more than the others; (2) actual conflict does exist

between the policing and the helping roles; (3) these officers often encounter conflicting expectations from the public, from other practitioners in the criminal justice system, and from supervisors and peers in the agency. Bartollas, et al. (1983), have noted further that probation officers are often confused by this role conflict and are generally uncertain about what they are supposed to do. Eventually, the officer yields to the various pressures and gravitates towards one role.

The data obtained in this research suggest that probation work is a multidimensional process requiring the probation officer to respond to a variety of needs and special situations, and that the psychodynamics of many offenders may require an assistance-control approach.

Conclusion

Since this is an exploratory/descriptive study that has attempted to explore the offender's perceptions of probation, the results may be tentative at best. Yet, the real value of this study goes beyond the results of the data. It focuses on an important concept: Offenders are willing to provide input and they have something to say. The writer was impressed that the majority of probationers contacted were willing to participate, welcomed the researcher, and in most instances made a genuine effort to provide meaningful and useful information. Reflected in the data is the offenders' complete willingness to share various aspects of their probation experiences. For many probationers it was an appropriate concluding activity to their probation. These interviews gave them an opportunity to reflect on their probation experiences and served as a coda to their experiences, enabling them to consolidate the useful elements of these experiences and to integrate them in their future probation-free lives.

As stated in the introduction, not much input has been received from the offender. Perhaps it was thought that offenders were unwilling to reveal themselves or uninterested in providing their views. This study reveals that not only are offenders willing to give their views, but they have an important contribution to make. Correctional agencies should benefit from contemporary management strategy. As Peters and Waterman (1984:196) advised: "...the excellent companies are not only better on service, quality, reliability, and finding a niche. They are also good listeners....The customer is truly in a partnership with the effective companies and vice versa." It is hoped that this study will serve as a basis for further inquiry and development, and encourage administrators, policymakers, and others to

include the offender in the process of redesigning the criminal justice system.

REFERENCES

- Allen, F. *The Decline of the Rehabilitative Ideal*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1981.
- Allen, G.F. "Correctional Directions in Federal Probation: Analysis of the Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1984.
- American Friends Service Committee, *Struggle for Justice: A Report on Crime and Justice in America*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1971.
- Bailey, W.C., Martin, J.D. and Gray, L.N. "Crime and Deterrence: A Correlational Analysis" *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 1974, 2: 124-43.
- Bartollas, C., Miller, S.J. and Wice, P.B. *Participants in American Criminal Justice: The Promise and the Performance*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1983.
- Carter, R.M., and Wilkins, T. *Probation and Parole: Selected Readings*. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Casper, J.D. *American Criminal Justice: The Defendant's Perspective*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Cullen, F.T. and Gilbert, K.E. *Reaffirming Rehabilitation*. Cincinnati: Anderson, 1982.
- Fogel, D. *We Are the Living Proof: The Justice Model for Correction*. Cincinnati: Anderson, 1975.
- Fogel, D. and Hudson, J. (Eds.) *Justice as Fairness: Perspectives on the Justice Model*. Cincinnati: Anderson, 1981.
- Grupp, S. (Ed.) *Theories of Punishment*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1971.
- Halleck, S., and White, A. "Is Rehabilitation Dead." *Crime and Delinquency*, 1977, (October), 372-382.
- Halpern, I. *A Decade of Probation*. New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1969.
- Haxby, D. *Probation: A Changing Service*. London: Constable & Company Ltd., 1978.
- Lefton, M., and Rosingren, W. "Organization and Clients: Lateral and Longitudinal Dimensions," in Hasenfeld, Y., and English, R. (Eds.) *Human Service Organizations*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press, 1974.
- Lerman, P. "The Medical Model of Treatment: Historical Development of an Archaic Standard." *Crime and Delinquency*, 1972, 18, 204-212.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R. and Wilks, J. *The Effectiveness of Correctional Treatment*. New York: Praeger, 1975.
- Martinson, R. "What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform," *The Public Interest*, 1974, 35, 22-54.
- Mayer, J., and Timms, N. *The Client Speaks: Working Class Impressions of Casework*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1976.
- McAnany, P. "Doing Justice to the Justice Model: An Exorcism of Some Persistent Myths." Unpublished paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November 5-8, 1980, San Francisco, California.
- McAnany, P. Thomson, D. and Fogel, D. (Eds.) *Probation and Justice: Surfacing a Hidden Mission*. (Vols 1-3) Chicago: Center for Research in Law and Justice, Univ. of Illinois at Chicago Circle, 1982.
- McAnany, P. *Probation Mission: Practice in Search of a Principle*. Chicago: Center for Research in Law and Justice, Univ. of Illinois at Chicago Circle, 1981.
- Meeker, B. "The Social Worker in the Correctional Field." *Federal Probation*, 1957, 21, (September).
- _____. (1948) "Probation is Casework." *Federal Probation*, 1948, 12, 51-54 (June).
- Miller, H. "The Right to Treatment: Rehabilitation and Cure?" *The Public Interest*, 1977, 46, 96-118.
- Morris, N. *The Future of Imprisonment*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1975.

- Murphy, J. (Ed.) *Punishment and Rehabilitation*. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1973.
- Newman, C. "Concepts of Treatment in Probation and Parole Supervision." *Federal Probation*, 1961, 25, (March), 11-18.
- Orland, L. *Justice, Punishment, Treatment: The Correctional Process*. New York: Free Press, 1973.
- Palmer, T. *Correctional Interventions and Research: Current Issues and Future Prospects*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1978.
- Parker, H. (Ed.) *Social Work and the Courts*. London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1979.
- Peters, T., and Waterman, R. *In Search of Excellence: Lessons From America's Best-Run Companies*. New York: Harper and Row, 1984.
- Plattner, M. "The Rehabilitation of Punishment." *Public Interest*, 1976, 44, 104-114.
- Raymond, F. "To Punish or Treat?" *Social Work*, 1974, 19, (May), 305-312.
- Rumney, J. and Murphy, J. *Probation and Social Adjustment*. New Jersey: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1952.
- Sechrest, L., White, S. and Brown, E. *The Rehabilitation of Criminal Offenders; Problems and Prospects*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academy of Sciences, 1979.
- Shireman, C. (1963) "Casework in Probation and Parole: Some Consideration in Diagnosis and Treatment." *Federal Probation*, 1963, 27, (June), 51-57.
- Singer, R. *Just Deserts: Sentencing Based on Equality and Desert*. Massachusetts: Ballinger, 1979.
- Street, D., Vinter, R. and Perrow, C. *Organization For Treatment*. New York: Free Press, 1966.
- Treger, H. (1958) "Treating the Alcoholic Offender." *Federal Probation*, 1958, 22, (March), 25-30.
- _____. "Social Work in the Justice System: An Overview." in A. Roberts, *Social Work in Juvenile and Criminal Justice Settings*. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1983.
- van den Haag, E. *Punishing Criminals: Concerning a Very Old and Painful Question*. New York: Basic Books, 1975.
- Vinter, R., and Lind, R. *Staff Relationship in a Juvenile Correctional Institution*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan, 1958.
- von Hirsch, A. *Doing Justice: The Choice of Punishments*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.
- Zimring, R. *Deterrence: The Legal Threat in Crime Control*. Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1973.