Federal Probation

JUNE 1990

This Issue in Brief

Community Service: Toward Program Definition.—Over the past two decades, community service work order programs have been established at various points in the adult and juvenile justice systems. On the basis of detailed study of 14 community service programs, authors Joe Hudson and Burt Galalway describe a detailed community service program model. Key elements of program structure are described, including inputs, activities, outputs, and outcomes, along with their linking logic. According to the authors, preparation of this type of program model is a necessary prerequisite for sound management practices, as well as for developing and implementing program evaluation research.

Identifying the Actual and Preferred Goals of Adult Probation.—The field of adult probation has undergone considerable change over the last 10 years, reflecting a perceived public sentiment which emphasizes enforcement and community protection. As a result, the goals of probation have shifted. Based on a survey of adult probation professionals in two midwestern states, author Thomas Ellsworth confirms the existence of a dual goal structure in probation, encompassing both rehabilitation and enforcement. Further, the study results reveal that probation professionals prefer a dual goal structure in administering probation services.

Sharing the Credit, Sharing the Blame: Managing Political Risks in Electronically Monitored House Arrest.—For the last several years, electronically monitored house arrest has been the topic of extensive commentary in the literature. Scant attention, however, has been paid to the political environment in which such programs must exist. Using a brief case study of one county in Ohio, author James L. Walker suggests a four-part implementation strategy aimed at reducing the risks to the political actors involved in these programs. He concludes that only if political considerations are properly managed will efficient and legitimate use of electronic monitoring programs be likely.

CONTENTS

Identifying the Actual and Preferred Goals of Adult Probation*

By Thomas Ellsworth, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor, Department of Criminal Justice Sciences
Illinois State University

Conflict Over Goals

"WHAT ARE the goals of probation?" In attempting to answer this question, many experts have focused on specifically defining the meaning of probation, identifying the practice as a legal disposition, a punishment, an administrative process, a treatment alternative, or even as a measure of leniency (Allen et al., 1979). Many would argue that the field of adult probation has been plagued by an unclear statement of purpose. The prevailing attitude, however, appears to be that if the field is able to define its meaning, than the goals of the probation system will logically flow from such definition.

While we assume that a dual or multi-goal system is likely to prevail (in the absence of the identification of a singular goal), the means to reach probation's goal(s) have also been viewed as ambiguous and sometimes conflicting (Gray, 1986). Among others, Clear (1985) argues that probation experts have not agreed as to "what should" be the primary purpose of the system. In attempting to reach agreement, some experts have focused their attention on one goal versus the other, whether it be enforcement or rehabilitation. These experts see attempts to balance the dual goals as incompatible, preventing officers from successfully performing their duties.

The belief that the goals of probation often conflict has been frequently reported in the literature (Ohlin, Piven, & Pappenfort, 1956; Glaser, 1969; Sigler & Benzanson, 1970; Klockars, 1972; Czajkoski, 1973; Tomaino, 1975; Studt, 1978; McCleary, 1978; von Hirsch & Hanrahan, 1979; Lipsky, 1980; Allen, Eskridge, Latessa, & Vito, 1985). The problem of what should be the singular goal of probation has lead several of the above authors to recommend treatment as the primary goal. Among these are Stanley (1978) and von Hirsch and Hanrahan (1979), who argue

---

in favor of treatment and rehabilitation. Others, such as Dufee (1984), McAnany, Thomson, and Fogel (1984), argue that the service function associated with probation is better left to agencies outside the probation system—agencies which are better able to handle the non-legal problems experienced by probationers. These scholars view probation supervision strictly as the enforcement of the court's order granting probation. Probation under this view is seen primarily as a legal disposition. Gray (1986) attempts to put to rest the on-going discussion over the "one best way" by referring to probation as a "legislative grace" which permits elements of both enforcement and rehabilitation to coexist within the same system. Allen et al. (1985) reports that probation professionals are aware of the conflict in goals, but that agreement has not been reached as to which of the two goals should dominate. Throughout this debate there have been limited opportunities for adult probation officers to voice their opinions regarding the desired methods of offender supervision.

Goals and Organizations

Etzioni (1964) defines organizational goals as "a desired state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize" (p. 6) but warns that few organizations actually achieve their stated goals. What occurs is a feeling of failure to achieve its mission if an organization is unable to reach all of its desired goals. Goals, according to Etzioni, provide an orientation for the organization. They are simply a starting point and serve as guidelines for organizational activity. In another sense, goals also tend to legitimize or justify the existence of the organization. Finally, system goals can be used as a yardstick to measure the success of the organization's activities. The importance of the interaction between the organization and its environment is recognized by Thompson and McEwen (1958) in a discussion of organizational goal-setting. Goals are seen as involving an output to a larger society which strongly influences the internal operation of the organization. Workers, under this view, become constrained by

the wishes of the larger constituency (environment). Organizations, according to Thompson and McEwen, cannot survive indefinitely if their goals are determined arbitrarily without regard to environment.

The dilemma involving the primary purpose of an organized system has not been confined to probation. The conflict between custody (enforcement) and treatment (rehabilitation) is frequently reported in the literature on correctional institutions (Clemmer, 1940; Zald, 1962, 1962a; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980). Similarly, in the mental health profession, King and Raynes (1968) report the conflict over patient control and patient care. Within higher education, universities are frequently confronted with efforts to prioritize the goals of teaching, research, and service. When confronted with ambiguous statements relating to the goals of the system in which they work, workers in the public sector utilize the discretion given to them in order to reconcile the conflicting demands of the job by doing what they feel is "right" at the time. The decision which is "right" for one matter at hand may be an incorrect choice when applied to another case.

Whether or not probation professionals have adopted a particular orientation which they attempt to implement when supervising adult probationers becomes part of the focus of the present research. While probation professionals may indicate that one goal orientation (enforcement or rehabilitation) may be dominant within their department, we know very little about how probation professionals feel the probation system ideally "should be." Harris, Clear, and Baird (1989) have reported that community supervision officers, who previously had supported reintegration and rehabilitation as the goal of community corrections, have shifted their attitudes in the direction of enforcement and protection. This change is especially significant in view of public sentiment which appears to favor enforcement and surveillance as the goal of the adult probation system. The extent to which probation professionals support the dual goals of enforcement and rehabilitation during a time in which public attitudes appear to favor community protection is the focus of the present research.

Methodology

Using the author's experience as an adult probation officer, coupled with interviews of probation staff and administrators and an extensive review of the literature on adult probation, a 49-item questionnaire was constructed which reflected common practices of enforcement and rehabilitation in probation work. The initial draft was reviewed by 33 adult probation professionals in two states for the purposes of removing jargon and unclear descriptions of probation practices. The final instrument contained 30 "goal statements," 17 of which reflected practices of enforcement in probation work and 13 of which reflected practices of rehabilitation in the profession. Items such as "Assure compliance through stringent application of probation rules" and ""Have the same legal powers of arrest as police officers" reflected an enforcement orientation toward probation work. Items such as "Provide counseling when the probationer is in need" and "Transport the probationer to a job interview" were viewed as focusing on offender rehabilitation. Subjects were asked to respond to each of the 30 goal statements using a six-point "Importance Scale" as follows:

> Of Top Importance (1)
> Of Great Importance (2)
> Of Average Importance (3)
> Of Little Importance (4)
> Of No Importance (5)
> Don't Know/Can't Say (6)

In addition, probation professionals were asked a series of questions focusing on the orientation of probation staff, co-workers, supervisors, management, and judges toward offenders. Respondents were also asked to identify the overall orientation of the probation system in their respective states. The primary source of influence in developing the respondent's orientation toward offenders was the final area of inquiry. Items within this area focused on the identification of those who contributed to the development of the respondent's orientation toward offenders.

A total of 1,406 adult probation professionals (line staff, supervisors, and administrators) from two midwestern state probation systems were identified. The sample consisted of 50 percent of the population, for a sample of 703 subjects. In one of the two states, a large metropolitan department accounted for 35 percent of all staff employed in that state's probation system. A stratified sample, reflecting the proportion of that department's staff to the entire state, was drawn. Both of the states were viewed as being quite different in terms of their organizational structure. In one state, the probation system is combined with parole (for purposes of offender supervision) and is administered as a state (exec-

utive branch) agency. The second state is aligned with the judiciary and contains approximately 90 county or judicial circuit probation departments.

Results

A total of 512 questionnaires were returned and found usable for analysis (a return rate of 72 percent). Table 1 reports the demographic charac-

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

	Probation System "A"		Probation System "B"	
Sample Size	244		268	
Gender				
male	127	(52.0%)	166	(61.9%)
female	116	(47.5%)	101	(37.7%)
Race				
white	219	(89.8%)	230	(85.8%)
black	24	(9.8%)	26	(9.7%)
hispanic	0	(0.0%)	7	(2.6%)
other	0	(0.0%)	4	(1.5%)
Age				
21-24	10	(4.1%)	14	(5.2%)
25-34	116	(47.5%)	131	(48.9%)
35-46	91	(37.3%)	87	(32.5%)
47-55	18	(7.4%)	20	(7.5%)
56-above	8	(3.3%)	11	(4.1%)
Position				
prob. officer	191	(78.2%)	199	(74.3%)
supv./admin.	51	(20.9%)	67	(25.0%)
Caseload Size				
0-50	28	(11.5%)	40	(14.9%)
51-100	150	(61.5%)	82	(30.6%)
101-150	16	(6.6%)	55	(20.5%)
151-200	0	(0.0%)	10	(3.0%)
201/above	2	(0.8%)	8	(3.0%)
Yrs. of Experience				
0-2 years	116	(47.5%)	132	(49.3%)
3-8 years	87	(35.7%)	100	(37.3%)
9-15 years	35	(14.3%)	32	(11.9%)
16-25 years	6	(2.5%)	4	(1.5%)
Educational Level				
high school	0	(0.0%)	6	(2.2%)
some college	8	(3.3%)	23	(8.6%)
college degree	123	(50.4%)	141	(53.6%)
some master's	55	(22.5%)	50	(18.7%)
master's degree	48	(19.7%)	38	(14.2%)
beyond master's	10	(4.1%)	8	(3.0%)
Office Size				
0-10	94	(38.5%)	88	(32.8%)
11-25	88	(36.1%)	61	(22.8%)
26-50	22	(9.0%)	35	(13.1%)
51-110	15	(6.1%)	31	(11.6%)
111-350	24	(9.8%)	45	(16.8%)
Office Location				
small town	6	(2.3%)	6	(2.2%)
town	28	(11.5%)	31	(11.6%)
small city	55	(22.5%)	71	(26.5%)
city 50,000	36	(14.8%)	65	(24.3%)
city 150,000	22	(9.0%)	18	(6.7%)
metro area	68	(27.9%)	52	(19.4%)
suburban	27	(11.1%)	24	(9.0%)

teristics of the respondents. Slightly less than half (42 percent) of the respondents were female. Approximately one-half (48 percent) were between the ages of 25 and 34. The greater proportion (87 percent) of the respondents were white/caucasians. A total of 230 (44 percent) were line officers supervising a "regular caseload." Almost half (45 percent) of those with caseload responsibilities had between 51-100 offenders on their caseload. Interesting was the fact that almost half (48 percent) reported 2 years or less experience in their present position. Also of interest was the fact that half (53 percent) indicated no prior criminal justice experience before entering probation work. As expected, the largest group (93 percent) reported holding at least a college degree (with also 40 percent indicating academic work beyond a bachelor's degree). Slightly more than one-third indicated that they worked in relatively small offices, where 10 or fewer staff members were employed. Those employed in small cities (of populations between 10,000 and 50,000) comprised 25 percent of those responding. Those employed in metropolitan offices (populations over 500,000) also represented approximately one-quarter (23 percent) of the respondents.

Table 2 reports the rank order of the 30 actual goal statements of the adult probation system as reported by the 512 respondents. Among the 10 statements ranked as most important by respondents are found 5 items identified as reflecting enforcement practices. In addition, five items reflecting rehabilitation practices are also identified by respondents. Within the middle third (those ranked 11 through 20) are found six items of enforcement and four rehabilitation goal statements. Among the lower third of the goal statements are six enforcement and four rehabilitation items. Overall, rehabilitation and enforcement as actual goals of probation are well distributed throughout the ranking. This is especially true among the top 10 goal statements. Probation professionals clearly view probation goals as equally focused on both enforcement and rehabilitation. This particular finding is significant in view of the public's demand that probation should apply its energies in the direction of enforcement-oriented practices such as intensive supervision, electronic monitoring, and other "punishment-oriented" efforts.

Table 2 also contains a rank order of the 30 preferred goals of the probation system in which the respondent was employed. From the 10 items identified as being most important for probation to achieve its mission are found an equal num-

TABLE 2. RANK ORDER OF ACTUAL AND PREFERRED ENFORCEMENT AND REHABILITATION ITEMS (N=512)

Item Descriptor	Mean (Rank) Actual	Preferred
Notify courts when probationer breaks law (e)	1.85 (1)	1.66 (1)
Require alcohol treatment (r)	2.00 (2)	1.76 (3)
Primary office function is community protection (e)	2.21 (3)	1.66 (2)
Stringent application of probation rules (e)	2.24 (4)	1.84 (4)
Primary office function is rehabilitation (r)	2.25 (5)	1.89 (6)
Provide counseling (r)	2.27 (6)	1.94 (7)
Closely supervise all probationers (e)	2.33 (7)	1.85 (5)
Refer probationers vocational counseling (r)	2.55 (8)	2.18 (9)
Notify courts when technical rules are violated (e)	2.65 (9)	2.51 (11)
Refer to vocational rehabilitation (r)	2.65 (10)	2.23 (10)
Permit violators doing OK to continue (r)	2.74 (11)	2.64 (14)
Require drug testing (e)	2.86 (12)	2.08 (8)
Require permission before leaving the area (e)	2.96 (13)	2.74 (16)
Have legal powers to issue warrants (e)	3.07 (14)	2.57 (13)
Have power to arrest probation violators (e)	3.08 (15)	2.54 (12)
Come in weekends/evenings to meet clients (r)	3.39 (16)	3.40 (23)
Permit probationers to telephone at home (r)	3.45 (17)	3.80 (27)
Help plan a budget (r)	3.49 (18)	3.00 (19)
Use PSI data to assist police (e)	3.50 (19)	2.82 (18)
Have same legal powers as police (e)	3.53 (20)	3.00 (20)
Coordinate supervision with police (e)	3.63 (21)	2.67 (15)
Recruit potential employers for clients (r)	3.71 (22)	3.16 (21)
Use techniques to keep track of offenders (e)	3.81 (23)	2.82 (17)
Require jail as condition of probation (e)	4.03 (24)	3.39 (22)
Audit and approve billing paying activities (r)	4.07 (25)	3.71 (26)
Require curfew/initial stages of probation (e)	4.23 (26)	3.61 (25)
Call to set employment interviews (r)	4.27 (27)	4.10 (28)
Require waiver of search and seizure (e)	4.37 (28)	3.54 (24)
Transport clients to job interviews (r)	4.60 (29)	4.42 (29)
Lend money to probationers (r)	4.99 (30)	4.95 (30)

(e) Denotes enforcement orientation item

(r) Denotes rehabilitation orientation item

ber of both enforcement and rehabilitation goal statements. The middle third (items ranked 11-20) are skewed in favor of enforcement, with 8 of 10 items identified as reflecting enforcement practices. Six of the remaining 10 goal statements were seen as exemplifying efforts to rehabilitate the offender. The results shown in this table are significant in that even when given a choice as to which orientation or goal of probation should prevail, probation professionals willingly accept both enforcement and rehabilitation, rejecting the notion that probation should concentrate its efforts in the direction of one goal over another. A dual goal structure was found to not only exist (results shown in table 2), but was actually the preferred way to conduct probation business during a time when public sentiment appears to have shifted away from rehabilitation and offender change.

An effort to determine how probation professionals perceive their colleagues, supervisors, and management in terms of an orientation toward offenders yielded the data contained in table 3. Again, the duality of goals appears at all levels of the system. Judges in the respondent's county or district, while not as strong as the respondents themselves, were perceived as accepting the dual goals of enforcement and rehabilitation for the probation system. Three-quarters (75 percent) of the respondents identified their personal orientation as a blend of both enforcing rules and providing rehabilitative services.

TABLE 3. IDENTIFICATION OF ORIENTATION
TOWARD OFFENDERS

	Favor Rehabilitation		Equally Favor Both Orientations		Favor Enforcement	
	N	(Pct)	N	(Pct)	N	(Pct)
Self	60	(13.3)	387	(75.6)	51	(10.0)
Co-Workers	45	(8.8)	347	(67.8)	92	(18.0)
Supervisors	97	(18.9)	282	(55.1)	101	(19.7)
Management	124	(24.2)	267	(52.1)	76	(14.8)
State	140	(27.3)	247	(48.2)	67	(13.1)
Judges	95	(18.6)	298	(58.2)	79	(15.4)

In Table 4 respondents reported that the primary source of influence in the development of their orientation toward offenders was the offenders themselves (28 percent), followed by su-

pervisors/administrators (17 percent), and other probation officers (11 percent). The importance of the respondent's "college academic program" in determining the respondent's orientation toward offenders was surprisingly low (7 percent), giving rise to the belief that college and university programs in criminal justice either have not adopted a philosophy toward offender supervision in the manner course material is delivered to students, or that such programs present a balanced approach, leaving it up to the students to decide which approach works best once they have entered the field of practice.

TABLE 4. PRIMARY SOURCE OF INFLUENCE IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ORIENTATION TOWARD OFFENDERS

Source	Number	Percent
Other Probation Officers	57	11.1
Supervisors/Administrators	88	17.2
Judges/Officials in the "System"	30	5.9
Probationers Themselves	148	28.9
College Academic Program	37	7.2
Family/Close Friends	22	4.3
Other	19	3.7
Missing	111	21.6
Total	512	100.

Understanding the Dual Goals of Probation

It has become apparent that a dual goal system exists in the adult probation systems under study. This finding is significant not only because we have recognized a dual system for many years, but because in the 1980's the community corrections system clearly focused on the enforcement aspect of offender supervision. Harris, Clear, and Baird (1989) have reported that over a decade community supervision officers have changed from being concerned with offender reintegration and change toward authority and enforcement. Their findings are significant because of the reported diminished importance placed on the assistance objective of adult probation. The present research, while not focusing on the longitudinal changes experienced by probation personnel over the period reported by Harris, Clear, and Baird (1989), nevertheless supports the belief that rehabilitation is "alive and well" as a practice and goal of the two probation systems studied. Equally important was the finding that even when given a choice to reconfigure the probation system, obviously to meet the needs of the public for community protection, probation professionals rise to the historical challenge of providing rehabilitative services to the offender. These findings give rise to the perception that while much of the

rhetoric about community protection is operationalized in terms of statutory change, increased commitment rates to correctional facilities, and the use of new, innovative protective practices such as home detention, electronic monitors, and intensive supervision, much more of the rhetoric about community protection is simply that, rhetoric. Much about probation has changed over the last 10 years, but there appears to be a core element which has resisted change and continues to focus its energies in the direction of rehabilitation. In the field of juvenile probation, we are best reminded of the work by Petronio (1983), who found that even though the message of enforcement and surveillance was communicated down the hierarchy to staff, probation officers were free to implement whatever strategy worked best, whether it was enforcement or rehabilitation.

The problems associated with a dual goal system, cited earlier in this word, are undoubtedly real, though the extent to which the duality of goals has traumatized probation professionals and affected their careers remains unclear. This is especially true when we examine the preferred goals of adult probation. When given the opportunity to create a more perfect "world" for themselves, probation professionals choose to accept both goals as important aspects of offender supervision. The present research identifies a dual goal system as important in carrying out the mission of probation. While enforcement may some day overtake rehabilitation and emerge as the primary goal of probation, the change is not likely to occur in the near future. The history of probation has a foundation which is firmly embedded in a tradition of helping the offender, a tradition which is not likely to be easily replaced.

REFERENCES

Allen, H., Carlson, E., & Parks, E. (1979). *Critical issues in adult probation.* Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Allen, H., Eskridge, C., Latessa, E., & Vito, G. (1985). *Probation and parole in America.* New York: Free Press.

Clear, T.R. (1985). Managerial issues in community corrections. In L.F. Travis (Ed.), *Probation, parole, & community corrections.* (pp. 33-46). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community.* Quincy, MA: Christopher.

Duffee, D. (1984). Models of probation supervision. In P. McAnany, D. Thomson, & D. Fogel (Eds.), *Probation and justice: Reconsideration of mission.* Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain Publishers, Inc.

Czajkoski, E. (1973). Exposing the quasi-judicial role of the probation officer. *Federal Probation, 37,* 9-13.

Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gray, R. (1986). Probation: An exploration in meaning. *Federal Probation, 50*(4), 26-31.

Harris, P.M., Clear, T.R., & Baird, S.C. (1989). Have community service officers changed their attitude toward their work? *Justice Quarterly, 6*(2), 233-246.

Hepburn, J.R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions: An empirical examination of the treatment-custody dilemma among correctional staff. *Criminology, 17*(4), 445-459.

King, R., & Raynes, N. (1968). An operational measure of inmate management in residential institutions. *Social Science and Medicine, 2,* 41-53.

Klockars, K.B. (1972). A theory of probation officer supervision. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, & Police Science, 63,* 550-557.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy.* New York: Russell Sage.

McAnany, P., Thomson, D., & Fogel, D. (Eds.). (1984). *Probation and justice: Reconsideration of mission.* Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain Publishers.

McCleary, R. (1978). *Dangerous men: The sociology of parole.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Ohlin, L., Piven, H., & Pappenfort, D. (1956). Major dilemmas of the social worker in probation and parole. *National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 11,* 211-225.

Petronio, R. (1983). Role socialization of juvenile court probation officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9*(2), 143-158.

Sigler, J., & Bezanson, T. (1970). Role perceptions among New Jersey probation officers. *Rutgers Camden Law Journal, 2,* 156-260.

Stanley, D.T. (1976). *Prisoners among us.* Washington, DC: Brookings.

Studt, E. (1978). *Surveillance and service in parole.* U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

Thompson, J.D., & McEwen. W.J. (1958). Goals, environmental pressure & organizational characteristics. *American Sociological Review, 27*(1), 344-351.

Tomaino, L. (1975). The five faces of probation. *Federal Probation, 39,* 41-46.

von Hirsch, A., & Hanrahan, K. (1979). *The question of parole.* Cambridge: Ballinger.

Zald, M.N. (1962). Power balance and staff conflict in correctional institutions. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 7,* 22-49.

Zald, M.N. (1962). Organizational control structure in five correctional institutions. *American Journal of Sociology, 68,* 335-345.