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ABSTRACT

Probation literature has emphasized the existence of two distinct work orientations, which have been commonly referred to as Social Worker and Legalistic. This study attempts to discover, as well as define, some of the variables which might contribute to the development of one or the other of these work orientations in probation officers.

The research process began with a literature review which revealed a lack of consensus about the meaning and origins of these work orientations. The influence of administrative structure, specific to the work setting, on the Probation Officer Work Orientation and Acts had not been analyzed. A questionnaire was designed to elicit information pertaining to worker orientation as well as a variety of individual background variables.

The study was comparative in nature. The target population included all probation officers working within the jurisdiction of the Department of Social Services in the Province of Saskatchewan (excluding those operating within the jurisdiction of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan) and also all probation officers working within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island. Initial pre-testing of the questionnaire took place, thereby permitting the researcher to exclude those questions which were of limited consequence, in terms of their respective validity, clarity, simplicity and/or relevance to the issues involved.

Follow-up procedures, including visits to two separate probation offices, written correspondence and telephone conversations, were
initiated by the researcher, such that, a relatively higher response rate could be ensured. The final questionnaire contained both structured and open-ended questions, thereby providing the researcher with both quantitative and qualitative data.

Statistical methods, including comparison of means and standard deviations, zero-order correlations, coefficients of determination, and multiple regression analysis, were used to look at the interactive effects of structural settings and individual background variables on worker orientation. It was hypothesized that the differential administrative Structure in probation services, between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, would be related to a different worker orientation, with a variety of individual background variables playing a role as independent, intervening variables.

The data supported the hypothesized relationship between Structure and Probation Officer Work Orientation. Saskatchewan probation officers were found to have more of a Social Worker Orientation, while probation officers in Prince Edward Island were more Legalistic. The Number of Years Employed was the only independent variable which supported the hypothesized relationship between individual background variables and Probation Officer Work Orientation. To a lesser degree than hypothesized, Structure was able to explain some variance in the acts of the probation officers. Probation Officer Work Orientation itself was related to certain job activities, such as the Percentage of Time Spent Counselling.

Now that this provincial difference in Probation Officer Work Orientation has been demonstrated, further research should endeavor to
determine if the effectiveness and/or efficiency of probation services themselves, are influenced by the existing administrative Structure. This study adds to the existing literature, and may be useful to academics, administrators, and field staff in increasing their understanding of the relationships between structural differences and variables related to attitudes and performance at work.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Canada has, along with other industrialized and modernized nations, high rates of crime, concentrated predominantly in the large urban centers and port cities. Many geographical areas within Canada are facing an escalation in the official number of persons who do not always conform to the prescribed societal laws. These persons may be subject to prosecution and eventual incarceration. An increasingly utilized alternative to imprisonment, one which all provinces in Canada presently have at their disposal, is the suspension of sentence, more commonly known as Probation.

Probation services, like so many other areas of the human experience, have numerous and diverse dimensions. Probation, as an area of study, has received considerable attention from people who have attempted to come to grips with the many dimensions that this correctional process entails. While complex problems have been investigated in a number of studies, many of these are not based on, or fully relevant to, Canadian probation services.

Some practitioners in the field adhere to the idea that probation, being a straight-forward process, and being clearly preferable to institutionalization, requires no further research. However, the provision of probation services has changed and is constantly changing, keeping in line with developing occupational specializations. There is presently no data on how the role of the probation officer is perceived in Canada. Secondly, although its legal mandate is Federal, the responsibility of providing probation services lies with each province.
and so there is a need to make explicit how different provincial structures affect probation services across Canada. Probation is a process which affects so many persons, yet, there is no general consensus regarding what the process should, or does, involve. This study endeavors to provide further clarification of the area of probation for both policy makers and practitioners.

Several authors have traced the beginning of probation from the time when it was basically a voluntary service and totally dependent upon the judge's goodwill, through its development to the present day, when it is looked upon as a professional service which necessitates "a high level of expertise" (Sheridan and Konrad, 1976:295) and is equally available to all offenders who meet certain criteria. This developmental process, according to Sheridan and Konrad (1976:295), indicates a shift in probation, from a

...purely investigative and supervisory service to the courts to its growth into a fully integrated system for dealing with the offender in society.

Probation services, although integrated into the total justice system, are integrated in different ways throughout Canada. This statement suggests that there may be some basic sociological questions that have to be asked concerning the effects of formal organizational structure on attitudes and behavior.

The provinces, and their respective administrative Structures, that will be of special concern in this study, are Prince Edward Island, where probation services are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, and Saskatchewan, where probation services are under the auspices of the Department of Social Services. Each of these administrations attempts to direct the behavior of the probation
officer in a controlled, explicit and standardized manner which is, in some respects, unique, if compared to the other. These structural distinctions, and their impact on the role of the probation officer, will be the focus of this study.

We assume that any major distinctions found to exist between these two probation services will be influenced, not only by the structure of the administration which directs them, but by other factors as well. Individual-based background variables, and the present professional orientation of the individual probation officer, are both expected to play a part in the determination of acts. It is the intention of this study to explore the interplay among the aforementioned variables.

One of the hypotheses in the study suggests that when probation services are carried out under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice, as is the case in Prince Edward Island, the probation officer functions according to a more Legalistic Work format (Orientation) (L.W.O.) being primarily concerned with complying with the directives of the court. In contrast, in a probation service which is under the auspices of the Department of Social Services, as is the case in Saskatchewan, the probation officer functions more according to a Social Worker format (Orientation) (S.W.O.) and, as a result, seems more concerned with the overall social well-being of the individual "client" rather than striving to work within stringent legal confines, simply as an agent of the court.

The existence of province-to-province variation in structure provides an excellent opportunity to do comparative analysis and ascertain the differences that exist between task performance styles of the
probation officers in each probation service and to explore some of the variables involved in producing these attitudinal and behavioral distinctions. The purpose of this study does not include an assessment of the efficiency or "effectiveness" of either service.

To summarize, it is the contention in this study that the Probation Officer's Work Orientation will be influenced by the existing structural administration in which the probation officer works, as well as by individual background variables. Structure, individual background variables and Probation Officer's Work Orientation, in turn, affect the probation officer acts. The job description (whether verbally designated or in written form) in each of the two Provincial probation services is a prominent factor in the selection and recruiting of individuals who already have ideological orientations more or less compatible with that prescribed by the Structure. We will look, therefore, at two levels of structural impact:

a) the influence of the pre-employment Structure; and

b) the ongoing influence of the on-the-Job Structure, on the Ideological orientation and acts of the probation officer, in terms of his/her overall task performance.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL AND MODERN OVERVIEW OF THE PROBATION PROCESS

2.1 The Meaning of Probation

The existing literature about probation, largely historical in perspective, descriptive in type and lacking in theoretical concerns, reveals varying conceptions of probation. Conceptions, which are found in the literature, range from a punitive emphasis (concerned with the overall society), to a rehabilitative emphasis (concerned with the individual client). The following descriptions of probation illustrate this wide variety of perceptions which exists within the multi-dimensional conceptions of probation.

1) Probation might well be termed the hub of the correctional cycle because probation officers work with all other agencies from the apprehending police officer to the disposition-determining court and the correctional institution. Probation is the right hand, or at least plays a significant part, in the administration of justice (Terwilliger and Adams, 1969:234; Lindem, 1973:23; Clegg, 1974:3; Carney, 1977:75).

2) Probation is the use of a suspended sentence, with or without supervision, which is a unique form of disposition, since it is based on the concept of the deterrent effect of treatment, rather than on the concept of the deterrent effect of punishment (Outerbridge, 1960:2). Further elaboration of this distinction is provided by George Bernard Shaw (cited in Carney, 1977:75):

Now if you are going to punish a man retributively, you must injure him;
If you are to reform him, you must improve him.
And men are not improved by injuries.
3) Probation involves a special type of relationship existing between the ideas of custody, or control, and care. The person on probation is being supervised but is, at the same time, being helped by the probation officer.

4) Probation is, and should continue to be, a viable alternative to the practice of incarceration. It should be looked upon as a positive mechanism by both the public and the person placed on probation.

5) Probation is a process which is aimed at affecting a readjustment, within the community setting, of the attitudes, habits and capabilities of the offender or, in other words, it is a way to help that person get into the right surroundings where he will have a chance to prove himself (Ohlin, 1956:213; Coughlan, 1963:205).

For our purposes, probation will be defined strictly according to the existing legal definitions, contained in the Criminal Code of Canada and the Provincial Statutes of each province (Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island), which concern themselves specifically with probation. The growth of the present definition, which will follow, can be outlined through its history.

2.2 The Historical Growth of Probation Services

Although this specific term has existed only a relatively short time, probation involves a type of practice that has survived in one form or other for literally centuries. Carney (1977:76), suggests that the idea of Benefit of Clergy (privilegium clericale) has had a significant impact on the formation of probation. Although no specific date is given, with regards to the commencement of such a practice, it is generally believed that it developed in the thirteenth century.
According to this practice, people of the church were regulated or directed by the church and the laws which pertained to it, and they were, in effect, not bound or limited by non-religious rulings. Penalties handed down by the church authorities tended to be less severe than those imposed by the state. The practice was eventually abolished by state power. Benefit of Clergy was a means of punishing the offender to a lesser degree than would have been the case had imprisonment been used as a possible recourse. The offender's sense of freedom was respected but, at the same time, the offender realized that he had better "keep his nose clean" or more harsh actions could very well follow.

Another rudimentary form of probation, known as Judicial Reprieve, was used at the judge's discretion. In referring to this particular practice, Sheridan and Konrad (1976:251) state:

It is known that English Common Law recognized the principle of judicial reprieve, the withholding of sentence during a period of good behavior, as early as 1340.

Carney (1977:77) mentions a third practice which was referred to as Recognizance, as used in fourteenth-century England. Recognizance consisted of allowing the individual offender to be left on his own after being released, with the understanding that he had to return to court on a pre-determined date and time.

Binding-over, a term sometimes used interchangeably with Recognizance, was used primarily to guarantee that the offender would return to court and, secondly, for disposition purposes. This type of action was not meant to impose any particular type of punishment on the offender, but was intended rather to communicate the idea that he had better take heed and mend his ways, or further retribution could
result. This process was frequently utilized by a Boston judge named Peter Oxenbridge Thacher who, during his term of office (1823-1843), appeared to be influential in the development of probation in the United States, especially in the State of Massachusetts (United Nations, 1968:6). Binding-over was different from the practice of Recognizance, because with binding-over the threat of something happening to the offender, should he not appear in court on the designated date, seemed to be great, while Recognizance appeared to rely heavily on the good judgment and integrity of the offender to make the right choice and return to court.

In a report to the United Nations (1968:7), mention was made of another elementary form of probation carried out both in England and the United States. Provisional Release on Bail was significant because it was also used as a method of suspending the passing of sentence rather than immediately subjecting the offender to some form of punishment, such as incarceration.

In nineteenth-century Massachusetts, a practice called Provisional Filing of Cases was introduced (Carney, 1977:77). This entailed an effort to diminish the sentence itself or to identify extenuating circumstances. After the suspension of sentence, the case was, in effect, filed away, although this did not constitute a final judgment. The judge had the option to levy or impose conditions which prescribed proper conduct. The Provisional Filing of Cases involved: (1) the suspension of sentence, and (2) the imposition of conditions on the offender by the presiding judge.

Benefit of Clergy, Judicial Reprieve, Release on one's own
Recognizance, Binding-over, Provisional Release on Bail and the Provisional Filing of Cases, while forerunners of modern probation, all lacked an important component of modern probation—the requirement of reporting to a court-designated official.

The purpose of this brief summary of the historical processes leading up to the statutory origin of probation is to make clear that modern probation is a consequence of not one, but a combination of several, previously-existing, legally-based alternatives, all seemingly having the purpose of lightening the impact of the usual sentence. It appears that the development of probation did not follow any single format. Probation has roots in both England and North America. Some of the historical practices mentioned were still in use when the term probation was initially introduced.

There is some controversy as to the identity of the person who first conceived the expression "probation". One author, Fitzgerald (1968:121), gives the definite impression that probation came into being in the United States and, in his opinion, any reference to British Common Law, in relation to the initial implementation of probation, is irrefutably mistaken. Another author, Orland (1973:53), expresses a similar notion concerning the origin of probation. Massachusetts is referred to as being the birthplace of probation. It was in Massachusetts that probation was actually first used as an alternative to incarceration, as well as being the place where probation was beginning to become recognized by the court as a viable service. The first legislation using the term, probation, was passed in the State of Massachusetts. John Augustus, a Bostonian, began the actual service of probation in
1841, when he came to the assistance of alcoholic offenders, who were subsequently placed under his protection. Although the service provided was a rudimentary form of probation, the process had been activated, and before long Augustus had come to be designated as "The Father of American Probation".

While present-day practitioners would regard Augustus' lack of professional training and his motivations with some reservations, the fact remains that this individual helped to initiate the use of particular techniques and procedures employed by probation officers in the field today. Orland (1973:53) underlines the importance of Augustus and his major contribution to probation when he states:

His reference to persons he had bailed on probation is believed to be the first recorded use of the term probation anywhere in the world as applying to the court release and the supervision of the offender.

Sigler (1970:253) further states:

...for eighteen years, until his death in 1859, Augustus 'bailed on probation' almost 2,000 persons, attaining a high degree of success in reforming petty offenders.

The work of John Augustus was continued by other volunteer probation officers in the Boston area. The efforts of all these people led to passage of the first recognized probation act in 1878. It was initially designed as an experiment for Boston. The statute stated that the terms of probation were to be for a period of three months to one year. "The 1878 statute set the tone for current probation practices" (Sigler, 1970:253). Corroboration of the idea that Augustus was the first person to actually commence using probation, as an alternative to incarceration, is provided by such persons as Linden (1973:25), Handler (1975:242), and Sigurisson et al., (1973:364).
However, other authors attribute the founding of the probation process to persons other than Augustus. Parker (1977:87) states:

Iironically, probation started out as a volunteer arrangement attributed to John Augustus of Boston but probably was practised in England by such men as the country-shire Justice of the peace Thomas Barwick Bakor and Matthew Davenport Hill when Recorder of Birmingham.


It is clear that, although only one person is generally associated with the discovery of any particular innovative idea, as in this instance of probation, there are usually many other persons who are involved.

2.3 Probation – The Canadian Context

Canada had adopted a form of probation by the late nineteenth century. Sheridan and Konrad (1976:256) considered "An Act for the More Speedy Trial and Punishment of Juvenile Offenders", passed in 1857, to be the "statutory birth" of probation in Canada, even though it applied only to juveniles and was not extended, until 1889, to include both juveniles and adults. The 1857 Act made allowances for charges being dismissed against children with or without the use of sureties. Although "An Act for the More Speedy Trial and Punishment of Juvenile Offenders" was not formally accepted until 1867, other informal procedures had previously existed. Judges, in the period prior to 1867, were using Recognizance as a means of releasing certain offenders, rather than imposing some form of sentence such as incarceration. Sheridan and Konrad (1976:253-4) noted that this particular method of Recognizance, although not legal, was for the most part
abided by, and was still being used up until the Act of 1889, which involved the "Conditional Release of First Offenders in Certain Cases". Following this, minor amendments to the act occurred a total of five times between the years of 1892 and 1921 (1893, 1900, 1906, 1909 and 1921). The last date (1921) is significant because it is the first mention made of the "offender reporting to any officer that the court may designate" (Sheridan and Konrad, 1976:254). This amendment recognized the value in the supervision of those persons released after their sentence had been suspended. The amendment of 1921, therefore, proved to be a key addition for the development of probation services in Canada. Parker (1977:92) concurs with Sheridan and Konrad (1976), when he states:

Probation started with a very limited scope. Those released on the rather complicated and cumbersome recognizance were not truly on supervised probation (which did not in fact come into operation until 1921).

Coughlan (1963:199), in an historical analysis of conditions supportive of the development of probation in Canada, mentions two factors that have to be taken into consideration. First, probation initially concerned itself mainly with children who found themselves on the "wrong side of the law". Second, private citizens and private societies had to be willing to be involved in the initial provision of services. It would seem that after probation had proven itself to be a viable practice with juveniles, it was then extended to adult offenders. This is in contrast to its development in the United States and Britain.

Canada shared certain practices with Great Britain and the United States (for example, Recognizance), that were not formally accepted out
were being implemented by the judiciary, in lieu of present-day proba-
tion services. With the 1921 amendment of the Act of 1889, the much
needed legal support and stimulus were provided. Probation gradually
gained recognition, initially as a viable alternative to incarceration,
and later, as a preferred alternative.

It is important, however, to realize that conceptions of probation
services appear to differ, in terms of the emphasis given to the major
purposes of probation which have appeared throughout its history, such
as simple reprieve, or supervision, or counselling and support.

2.4 Probation -- The Provincial Context

Within Canada, the provision of probation services has, from the
beginning, come under the jurisdiction of the provinces, although the
legally defined limitations associated with probation, are laid out in
the Criminal Code of Canada (Greenspan, 1978). Sheridan and Konrad
(1976) contend that because of an unclear rationale for such
split-jurisdiction, there has been an unsteady rate of development of
probation services within Canada. This type of developmental process
is made clear in the following sequence of events, as outlined by
Sheridan and Konrad (1976:254):

Ontario was first to act with the passage of the Ontario
Probation Act in 1922. The next province was Alberta in
1940, followed by British Columbia in 1945, Saskatchewan in
1949, Nova Scotia in 1954, Manitoba in 1957, New Brunswick in
1959, the Yukon in 1964, Newfoundland in 1965, the Northwest
Territories in 1966, Quebec in 1967, and Prince Edward Island
in 1972.

The Quebec provincial service, according to Sheridan and Konrad
(1976), was unique in that prior to the involvement of government,
probation services had been provided by private agencies.
The smaller provinces established probation services considerably later than the larger ones. This, according to Sheridan and Konrad (1975:268), is not a result of a more punitive system existing in these smaller provinces but, rather, because of a lack of sufficient funds with which to implement this practice.

The fact that provincial authorities have been left to develop probation services within their own provinces has resulted in a variety of delivery systems. The following descriptions, as devised by Sheridan and Konrad (1975:268), indicate the diverse models under which probation services operate across Canada:

1. Probation as part of the social-welfare system—this model has been most prevalent in the prairie provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba.

2. Probation as an independent service—this is the model for adult probation services in Quebec with the Director of Probation reporting to the Deputy Minister of Justice.

3. Probation as a part of the correctional system—this model is used by Ontario which has a separate Ministry of Correctional Services.

4. Probation as part of a Solicitor General’s Department—this model is used for adult probation services in Alberta. The Solicitor General is responsible for both law enforcement and corrections.

5. Probation as part of the justice system—New Brunswick was the first province to adopt this model. British Columbia is now moving from a correctional model to adoption of this model under the leadership provided by the Justice Development Commission formed in 1974.

The preceding descriptive list does not include Prince Edward Island. Probation in that province is part of the Department of Justice. In 1970, the ministry of the Attorney-General was renamed the Department of Justice, with Probation and Family Court Services as principal divisions of responsibility. (See appendix F, pages 185 to
188 for details on various administrative structures to be found in the provision of probation in the United States.) A report by Mr. Justice Gerald Fauteux (1966), as found in Parizeau and Szabo (1977), concerning alternatives to incarceration, gives further elaboration on the variety of organizational models found in Canada at that time. The preceding elaboration is commented on by Parizeau and Szabo (1977:11). They stated that, when the Fauteux report came out, probation services came under the authority of the Attorney-General in British Columbia, Alberta, and Ontario, while in Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia it came under the Department of Social Welfare. In Quebec, on the other hand, people on probation came under the authority of private after-care agencies. Parizeau and Szabo (1977:11), indicated these distinctions, as found in the provincial probation service administrative structures, are particularly significant because this was the first attempt at close co-operation between Judicial and social authorities. The commission’s report began a trend which grew steadily more pronounced in subsequent years (1966-1972).

Today, such major administrative differences nevertheless continue to exist, with each province somewhat jealously guarding its way as “best”.

2.5 Case History I -- The Province of Saskatchewan

In the province of Saskatchewan, probation services are carried out under the direction of the Department of Social Services. It is noted by Shoom (1970:423), that prior to 1986, there was very little attention paid to the area of corrections. Correctional institutions were being administered by the Provincial Department of Public Works. Government-run probation services were practically nonexistent, but there was voluntary probation counselling being carried out by private
after-care agencies, such as the Salvation Army.

The Saskatchewan Penal Commission, which released its findings in 1946, was, according to several authors (Mather, 1965:352; Shoom, 1970:425), the turning point in the Saskatchewan Corrections Program. The Commission, under the chairmanship of Dr. S.R. Leycock, "made recommendations which concerned the adoption of a preventive and remedial corrections program for Saskatchewan" (Mather, 1965:352). Mather (1965:352) indicated one recommendation was particularly pertinent.

There should be a full probation service for the placing of certain offenders under trained supervision in lieu of a sentence to an institution.

As a result, the Corrections Branch was set up within the Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation in 1947.

The establishment of probation services within Saskatchewan occurred in the Regina City Police Court in 1949, and in the Saskatoon City Police Court later in the same year (Mather, 1965:352; Shoom, 1970:424). By the year 1958, probation services were established in Moose Jaw and have continued to expand since that time.

Mather (1965:354) stated that

...as of May 1, 1965, by Legislative enactment, the Department of Welfare became the new title of the former Department of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation.

Another significant point in the development of probation services in Saskatchewan, as indicated by Shoom (1970:424), is that in 1967 a new Saskatchewan Corrections Act was passed by legislature providing for

...a provincial work training program as well as probation and parole services for offenders convicted of Provincial statute offences...
The transition of the corrections branch, from the Department of Welfare to its present location under the Department of Social Services, occurred in 1972, when the Department of Social Services Act was enacted. As indicated in the Saskatchewan Social Services annual Report (1971-72:4):

This Act, which repeals the former department Act, provides for the Department of Social Services, its staff, departmental organization, powers and duties, and other miscellaneous provisions necessary for the proper conduct of the business of the department including the constitution of the Welfare Board.

Probation is presently available throughout the Province of Saskatchewan, administered within eight regional offices. (These are designated in appendix C, page 184.)

2.6 Case History II -- The Province of Prince Edward Island

Probation services, as carried out at the adult level of service delivery (16 years and over), essentially was nonexistent prior to the proclaiming of the Provincial Probation Act in 1972. Periodically, probation officers employed with the Department of Social Services would involve themselves in adult probation cases, where a special request was made to the Director of Social Services, by the presiding judge, for that particular case. In the usual circumstance, however, throughout the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, the legal recourse most often employed, in terms of adult probation services, would be to have the probationer receive a suspended sentence and a two-year probationary period. During the first year of this two-year probationary period, the probationer would be required to report to the commanding officer of the nearest Royal Canadian Mounted Police (R.C.M.P.) detachment, approximately once per month. During the second year, the
reporting would occur approximately once every three months. The reporting schedule for different probationers would vary, depending upon RCMP personnel and their preference, in terms of reporting frequency at each of the respective detachments.

The shift in work orientation, within the Department of Social Services in Prince Edward Island, to the generic, i.e., general versus specific, format, brought about a corresponding realization that a void in service delivery existed, specifically with respect to employees being able to deal solely with adult probationers. In 1971, in a report entitled "Report of the Prince Edward Island Corrections Committee", Barrington stated that there existed "a most serious gap in the Corrections Service on Prince Edward Island... the absence of probation" (Barrington, 1971:3). Barrington contended that the most unfortunate aspect of this gap was that offenders in Prince Edward Island were missing out on the benefits of quality probation supervision. In the Report, Barrington (1971:2) specified several recommendations, three of them relating to probation services:

Recommendation 1:

That Provincial and Federal Legislation be amended to provide for Probation Services and supervision for a period of up to three years, and such amendments should vest jurisdiction in the Court to extend the initial Probation period established by the Court, upon application of the Probation Service, for a further period, or periods, but in no case should the total Probation period exceed five years.

Recommendation 2:

That the Province enact Legislation to permit the court to place any person on Probation who has been convicted under a Provincial Statute.
Recommendation 3:

For a trial period of three years the National parole Service should maintain a District office in Prince Edward Island. This office should accept responsibility for adult probation as well as parole.

Recommendation 1 was subsequently revised to provide for probation services and supervision for a period of up to two years; Recommendation 2, albeit rarely implemented by members of the Prince Edward Island Judiciary, is presently included in the Provincial Probation Act proclaimed in 1972; and Recommendation 3 was never accepted as a viable option.

Both Barrington (1971:6) and Arbing (1978:1) agreed that the Attorney-General, Department of Justice, should be responsible for the Prince Edward Island probation service. With the passage of the Prince Edward Island Probation Service Act in 1972, the recommendation that the Department of Justice be administratively responsible was implemented (Barrington, 1971:6; Bennett, 1973:7; Parker, 1977:77). Clearly, the Report written by Barrington in 1971 was instrumental in outlining the importance of supplementing Prince Edward Island's Corrections Service with the practice of probation. Although suffering from a comparatively late start, under the administration of the Department of Justice, probation services have continued to expand on Prince Edward Island, in relation to the number of probationers, pre-sentence reports (P.S.R.'s) and other duties the probation officers are required to perform.

2.7 Probation Service Administration -- Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island: A Comparison

Equally important to the probation service in Prince Edward Island
and in Saskatchewan, and similar in structure, are such aspects as the Criminal Code of Canada (Sections 562.1-566), the Federal Prisons and Reformatories Act (Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, Chapter P-21; Amended Statutes of Canada, 1974, Chapter 48; Further Amended Statutes of Canada, 1976-77, Chapter 53), the Annual Reports, which describe both the functions and activities of the probation officer, the job description and the actual chain of command (as depicted in appendix D, pages 180 to 182). A general list, based on the 1974 Revised Statutes of Prince Edward Island, pages 2097-8, and the 1967 Statutes of Saskatchewan, pages 170-1, outlining some of the characteristics common to both the probation service in Saskatchewan and in Prince Edward Island, follows:

1) Probation officers have the powers of a peace officer, when performing the duties which are required of them.

2) Probation officers, if asked to carry out a pre-sentence investigation and file a pre-sentence report, are obliged to do so within a prescribed amount of time.

3) Probation officers have a responsibility to supervise the employment, the conduct and also the general lifestyle of the person who has been placed on probation.

4) Probation officers are obliged to notify the court if the probationer is not abiding by the conditions specified in the Probation Order.

Characteristics which these two probation services share, based on the job description used by Saskatchewan probation officers and the Annual Reports of the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island,
are as follows:

5) Probation officers assist in the development of public education in the area of probation and the Criminal Justice System in general.

6) Probation officers are expected to develop effective liaison with other government departments and agencies.

7) Probation officers carry out numerous administrative duties, such as maintenance of statistics, correspondence, recording of cases, opening and closing of files, and attendance at, and participation in, staff meetings and training sessions.

8) Formal qualifications for hiring purposes, required by both provinces, are similar for both probation services.

Differences, however, do exist between these two provincial probation services. The following differences are based on the 1974 Revised Statutes of Prince Edward Island, pages 2097-8, the 1967 Statutes of Saskatchewan, pages 170-1, and the 1973-4 Statutes of Saskatchewan, page 66:

1) Probation officers in Saskatchewan, along with the preparation of pre-sentence reports, are expected, on their own initiative or discretion, to supervise, guide and counsel an offender placed on probation. Probation officers in Prince Edward Island, on the other hand, are deemed to be officers of every court that exists in the province and shall carry out the direction of the judges.

2) Chief probation officers in Saskatchewan, who have no equivalent in Prince Edward Island, prescribe to the other probation officers certain methods by which the pre-sentence report can be completed.
Also, in their supervision of employment, conduct and the general lifestyle of the probationer, probation officers in Prince Edward Island are under the direction of the judge, while probation officers in Saskatchewan are under the direction of the chief probation officer.

3) Probation officers from both provinces report to the judge or prosecutor if the probationer is not complying with the terms of the Probation Order, but in the Statute amendments of the Province of Saskatchewan (1973:4166), the following part of the clause was deleted:

...and then at the judge’s request to lay an information with the police to again have such person brought before the court;

Also, an amendment in the 1973-4 Saskatchewan Statutes deleted the following clause which was contained in the Saskatchewan Corrections Act (Statutes of the Province of Saskatchewan 1967:171):

...to remain informed regarding the convicted person making restitution or reparation where ordered by the court and to report to the judge any failure of the person to carry out the court’s direction or order;

Parallels to these two clauses, according to the 1974 Revised Statutes of Prince Edward Island, have remained intact. The corresponding clauses for Prince Edward Island, as stated in The Revised Statutes of Prince Edward Island (1974:2097-2098), are that the probation officer should

...report to the judge if the person so convicted is or is not carrying out the terms on which the sentence is suspended, and to see that such person, in case of default, is brought again before a judge for sentence;

and also

...to see that any person so released on suspended sentence duly makes restitution and reparation;
4) In the Statutes of the Province of Saskatchewan (1976:171), special mention was made of the following:

...no investigation shall be conducted or carried out by a probation officer for the specific purpose of determining the guilt or innocence of an offender.

Certain behavior is explicitly prohibited in Saskatchewan, but not in Prince Edward Island.

5) Volunteer probation officers are appointed in Saskatchewan by the chief probation officer to work with certain probationers. There were no volunteer probation officers in Prince Edward Island at the time of this study.

6) Probation officers in Saskatchewan are regularly required to make recommendations on pre-sentence reports.

7) And, finally, the probation service in Prince Edward Island is managed by a director who works out of a central location, whereas, in Saskatchewan, each separate region has its own Regional Supervisor.

Certain of the preceding differences are noteworthy, such that, the probation service in Saskatchewan appears to give priority to the rehabilitation of the client and the corresponding counselling skills and constructive guidance methods, whereas, the probation service in Prince Edward Island appears to give priority to supervision and control and the conformity of probationers. It also appears that probation officers in Saskatchewan are more closely associated with the client, while in Prince Edward Island, their relationship to the court process is given priority.

The number of probation officers employed in Prince Edward Island (as depicted in appendix E, page 184) is relatively small, in comparison to that found in Saskatchewan (as appendix E, page 184). In Prince
Edward Island on January 1, 1977, as designated in the Fifth Annual Report of the Department of Justice for Prince Edward Island (1977:20), there were 256 individuals under the supervision of probation officers in the province with 201 new cases added during the year. On December 31, 1977, 196 remained under the supervision of Probation services.

These 196 Probationers were supervised by a total of six probation officers. In Saskatchewan, according to the Saskatchewan Social Services Annual Report (1976-77:24-5), on March 31, 1977, 2,283 probationers were being supervised by a total of 41 probation officers. The total number of pre-sentence reports completed by Saskatchewan probation officers, in an equal time period, was 1,767. Whereas, 206 were completed in Prince Edward Island. This provides a workload ration for Prince Edward Island of 1 to 33 and for Saskatchewan of 1 to 56.

The formal objectives of each probation service, based on job descriptions, Annual Reports and Provincial and Federal Statutes, give a good indication of what is formally expected of the probation officer. However, during informal discussions with probation officers, it became apparent that, in their perception, a great deal of emphasis is placed on counseling within the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan, whereas, less emphasis is placed on this particular aspect in Prince Edward Island within the Department of Justice. This difference does not appear to refer simply to time allocation but, rather, suggests the probation officer in Saskatchewan perceives counseling as a definite priority in his busy, daily work routine. On the other hand, supervision of probationers seems more an area of concern with probation officers in Prince Edward Island than with
probation officers in Saskatchewan.

A couple of general statements, made by Arbing (1978b:1) pointedly ask if there may be apparently different perspectives in practice:

The justice-oriented probation staff likely tend toward responsibility/accountability on the part of the offender for his actions in a protection of society/social defence context. Are social services/probation staff likely to tend toward a medical model approach, the offender is sick, one-to-one counselling, etc?

Preliminary indications of differences in Probation Officer Work Orientation and behaviors, coupled with the major difference in jurisdiction of administration between the provinces, led to the development of this thesis. The goal is to determine the impact of different structural characteristics, on perspective (orientation to one’s job) and behaviors. The target population is all probation officers in Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island.
CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

3.1 Formal Organization Literature

3.1.1 Introduction

According to Hartinger et al (1973:127), in order to understand any organization, it is imperative to

...understand the historical development and the current application of the agency's philosophy and policies... structure and organization...practice and procedures.

The preceding chapter provided an overview of the historical development in the area of probation. This chapter provides a summary of the relevant literature, both on formal organizations and on probation, as well as a description of the theoretical model, focusing on the impact of structural effects.

All formal organizations do have one common feature and that, according to Blau and Scott (1962:1), is

...a number of men have become organized into a social unit -- an organization -- that has been established for the explicit purpose of achieving certain goals.

Generally, then, the explicit formal goals of an organization are assumed to originally dictate the formal structure. But as time passes, goals may change with no change in structure, structure may change with no change in goals, goals may become subservient to a rigid structure, and so on. Etzioni, quoted by Smith (1970:11), points out:

...the basic methodological error is of comparing the present state of an organization (a real state) with the organizational goal (an ideal state), as if the goal was real.
In practice, many organizations adhere to numerous goals simultaneously rather than merely attempting to reach only one goal at a time. A conflict over goals is sometimes inevitable, especially if policy decisions are being determined by various levels of government. Probation services is a case in point, where there are common goals throughout Canada dictated by Federal statutes, but a variety of other goals dictated by provincial legislation and policies. Because of this variety in goals, both explicit and implicit, probation services, from one province to another, operate within different structures.

The impact of organizational differences is of major concern in this thesis. Etzioni, an important contributor in the area of organizational theory, mentions that organizational distinctions have to be kept in mind or errors in research will be made (Smith, 1970:13).

Davies (1977:265) outlines two attributes which allow for a variety of alternative organizational designs for achieving more or less, the same goals:

1) Organizational uniqueness. Structure of the organization or its components and its roles suit the specific individual organization's situation requiring individualized design based on general design principles (Cherns, 1976) in place of imported solutions.

2) Organizational philosophy. The process of organizational design and the organization's structures and roles are congruent with agreed organizational values explicitly stated as organizational philosophy.

Kotlaza (1963:351) takes a slightly different approach to organizational designs when he compares the development of organizational theory to contemporary theories of personality. Both are seen as displaying an array of different approaches that do not contradict each
other, but rather observe and interpret the phenomena within a particular perspective, in terms of selected categories.

Hummon (1972:282), in reviewing The Structure of Organizations by Peter Blau and Richard A. Schoenherr, states the thesis has been developed that organizations are not people. The formal organization can be studied separately from the individuals that help to comprise the organization. These formal structures are viewed as exhibiting strong empirical regularities. Structure is considered to be important because it reflects and accounts for much of the behavior of organization members.

3.1.2 Structural Effects

Herbert Simon (in Blau and Scott, 1962:36) states that decisions to be made within any organization can be complex in nature and have wide repercussions. Consequently, one task of the formal structure of the organization is to limit the scope of the decisions that each member must make. The organization performs this task, according to Blau and Scott (1962:36), by defining formally, responsibilities, goals, mechanisms and channels appropriate to the decisions. Herbert A. Simon, in Czajkosky (1999:240) states that organizations can enforce specialization of decision-making, by grouping workers according to (a) purpose, (b) process, (c) clientele and/or (d) place.

Pugh, et al (1972:25) have examined organizational literature and come up with six important dimensions of organization structure: (1) specialization, (2) standardization, (3) formalization, (4) centralization, (5) configuration, (6) flexibility. The ways in which these dimensions are operationalized will affect work behavior.
Argyris (1972:325) refers to formal organization as the mirror image of the planners' conception of how the intended consequences of the organization may be best achieved. Structure is a representation of the particular objectives of the organization. The manifest goals/objectives of the formal organization may not always correspond with the manifest and/or latent goals and/or objectives of the individuals within the formal organization. The individual, within the organization, has the ultimate choice to choose which path he will follow, although, to a large extent, he follows the structured path.

According to Scott (1975:2),

"early researchers took the structural features of organizations as given and proceeded to explore their implications for the behavior of participants."

If a researcher wanted to study worker satisfaction, for example, or any of a myriad of other processes, the formally defined organizational structure was taken for granted as the setting, or context, within which these processes occurred. However, Udy, as quoted in Scott (1975:2) in the late 50’s, made the suggestion that Weber’s model could be regarded as identifying a set of structural variables whose interrelationships should not be taken as a matter of definition but as a subject for empirical exploration.

Researchers then began to explore the interaction among the variables of structure, attitudes, and behavior, with an emphasis on the difference between explicitly known and implicitly assumed characteristics of each.

Blau and Scott (1952:100-4) suggested the structural component was integral in the determination of prevailing attitudes. An instance of this type of effect is the change in attitude that can be noted,
once an individual joins a particular group. To assess this, it becomes necessary to isolate the structural effect.

According to Warham (1977:95), a social worker's work performance is influenced by the method with which organizations are administered, and by the nature of the social worker's own participation in, and influence upon, administrative structures. The preceding discussion is representative of the interactive and dialectical character of social organizations or, in other words, social organizations are looked upon as being 'socially constructed and socially maintained' (Berger and Luckmann, 1965).

Carlin (1966:101), in speaking about lawyers, claims there is an appreciable amount of influence which can be attributed exclusively to office climate. It might be assumed that office climate is a result, to some extent, of the organizational structure involved.

Sigurdsen et al (1973:266-7) distinguish between bureaucratic principles that maintain the smooth functioning of a probation department and professional principles which control the quality of probation service itself. Two interesting points are raised:

1) The organizational environment strongly influences employee behavior with respect to client service.

2) Most students who fail into probation service...find themselves trying to satisfy bureaucratic requirements at the expense of service to their client. The predictable consequence is a satisfied bureaucracy and a dissatisfied and unserved client population.

Blau (1970) indicated that general research neglected to look at the distinction between the effects resulting from individual characteristics and those resulting from social structures. For Blau, and for the purposes of this study, this distinction is of the utmost importance. Blau (1970:283) suggested:
Individuals can be described in terms of their orientations and dispositions, just as groups or entire societies can be described in terms of prevailing social values and norms; and individuals can be distinguished on the basis of the status distribution in them.

The attributes of individuals that have been acquired socially, or defined socially, are nevertheless distinguishable, in terms of effect, as compared to those attributes characteristic of social structures. Blau (1970:280) points out that in order to systematically analyze the constraints of structural components, as outlined by Robert K. Merton and Alice S. Kitt, you have to simultaneously use indices of social structure and of individual behavior.

Blau (1970:300) contends that Durkheim expressed an argument approximately sixty years before, which illustrated a particular technique by which structural effects were isolated.

The essential principle is that the relationship between the distribution of a given characteristic in various collectivities and an effect criterion is ascertained, while this characteristic is held constant for individuals. This procedure differentiates the effects of social structures upon patterns of action from the influences exerted by the characteristics of the acting individuals or their interpersonal relationships.

When a structural effect is observed, the claim is that processes which originate outside the individual are responsible for existing differences in the dependent variable, patterns of action.

Etzioni (Pugh, et al 1971:31) makes reference to, what he terms, the structural aspect. Etzioni indicated organizations could never completely rely on individuals to perfectly carry out prescribed orders, so it was necessary to have a hierarchy of authority, supervisors, job descriptions and specified procedures for doing things. These all were implemented so that organizations would be less
dependent on the whims of individuals.

Leavitt, et al (1973:43) also refer to the hierarchy of authority as being a form of power distribution, by which authority is assigned to individual roles and, as a result, the organization is institutionalized. The hierarchy of authority which organizes people is complemented by a problem-solving type of hierarchy which organizes tasks. The problem-solving hierarchy allows complex tasks to be broken down into manageable activities.

Tannenbaum (Pennings, 1976:689) suggests the importance of organizational influence as a variable. In his suggestion that, the degree of status and/or approval associated with the particular organizational structure, will differentially influence the individual to comply with the organizational goals.

Rice and Mitchell (1973:56) indicate organizational structure, in the past, has been regarded as an independent variable when investigation concerned such topic areas as job satisfaction, job performance, motivation and leadership. Empirical relationships have been found to exist between individual behavior and the properties of the overall organizational structure but this level of analysis fails to increase our understanding of how structure influences behavior. An approach that seems to offer more promise would be one which includes both the formal organizational structure and the individual's perception of this particular structure. Rice and Mitchell (1973:56), for example, suggest:

...looking at an individual's behavior as a function of his position within an organization.

The rationale behind this level of analysis, being more conducive to
discerning how structure influences behavior, is that it has the potential for describing structure in a way that reflects factors which an individual himself is likely to perceive about his place in the organization.

Porter and Lawler (1965:23) indicate that all organizations are comprised of some type of structural design, such that, positions and parts, as contained in the organization, are systematically related to other positions or parts. Since the structure of organizations is not always the same, it is appropriate to examine the question whether differences in the structure of organizations are related to differences in the attitudes and behavior of the individual members.

Porter and Lawler (1965:24) referred to the formal structure of an organization, by using the formal organizational chart. Using job attitudes and job behavior as the dependent variables, Porter and Lawler (1965:4) found that structure had a greater impact on attitudes than on behavioral variables and further stated this could have been a result of more research being done in the area of attitudes. The suggestion is put forth by Porter and Lawler (1965:31) that future research into the area of organizational theory should focus on the general question of what it is about different organizational levels that seems to create different job attitudes and job behavior. Both Hertzberg, et al. (1959:9) and Davies (1977:265) agree that an individual's attitude toward his work and/or behavior will be influenced by the nature of the structure itself.

Campbell and Alexander (1970:316) state that the time has arrived to come up with a more sophisticated analysis of structural effects.
There is a need to move

...from the characteristics of the total system to the situation faced by the individual due to the effects of those characteristics and then from the social situation confronting the individual to his responses to it.

This study is a search for the interaction between structural effects and other variables. We explore the possibility that, when probation services are provided under different structures, as found in Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, even when clientele are similar, the purposes and processes of the probation officers will differ. The structural variable is separated from the individual background variables of individual probation officers, which are naturally expected to interact with the formally organized features of their jobs. The formal structure, for the purposes of this study, will be defined in terms of a definition by Kast and Rosenzweig (1970:171-2):

1) The pattern of formal relationships and duties—the organization chart plus job descriptions or position guides.

2) Formal rules, operating policies, work procedures, control procedures...and similar devices...within the structure of formal relationships.

3.2 Confusion Over Roles of Probation Officers: A Review of the Literature

3.2.1 Introduction

The literature concerning the roles and, more specifically, the work orientation of probation officers, constitutes an array of descriptive and independent studies which are primarily based on specific concerns expressed by practitioners in the field of probation. There seems to have been no attempt made to construct a theoretical
framework upon which further research could be based. This study is an attempt to provide such a framework.

Diana (1963:199-201) interviewed twenty of the most experienced probation officers from eight Pennsylvania courts, including those trained and those not trained in schools of social work. The probation officers, according to Diana (1963:199-201), were asked to answer, among other questions, the following:

1) How would you define probation? Generally speaking, what does it consist in practice?

The replies varied from:

What it simmers down to is police work. There is no planning, but giving supervision to prevent violations..."

to an alternative reply, such as

Probation is a helping service to a person with a problem. The problem itself may be adjusted or the person is helped to make some adjustment to the problem.

These replies indicated a variety of ways that probation officers view themselves in performing their task. The variety of work orientations expressed suggested that the same formal definition of task can be interpreted in different ways which lead to distinct work styles. As Thatcher (1974:114), later pointed out:

The occupational role...consists of the behavior the organization expects of him by virtue of his holding the job. But each man brings to the role his conceptions of what it is, what it should be and what it might become. These meanings he assigns his job activity might be called his role orientation.

Also, in an article by Sigler (1970), the point is raised that the particular role perception a probation officer adhered to had an effect on the performance of his daily duties. Sigler (1970:256) commented on New Jersey probation officers appointed by the county court judges, and whose salaries were, in turn, determined by judicial order. These New
Jersey probation officers were perceived as arms of the court and persons who carried out pre-sentence report investigations. These same probation officers were obliged to supervise probationers, in order that they complied with the conditions prescribed in the probation order. This working relationship, which existed between the judiciary and the probation officer, had an impact on the way they perceived themselves as probation officers. Two specific findings resulted:

1) The probation officers would not refer to be referred to as social workers.

2) Only about ten percent of the probation officers in the study identified, or looked upon, themselves as being law enforcement officials of the court. So, according to Sigler (1970:263),

...probation officers do not regard themselves as law enforcement officials or as arms of the judicial system. Yet it is probable that many others, including judges and legislators, do see probation officers in this light.

Whether structure affects orientation, or vice versa, the literature consistently documents the existence and the importance of distinctions among probation officers. The fact that a probation officer can play different roles, can take different approaches to the probationer, and is viewed differently by others in the criminal justice system, is partially accounted for by what Mathieson (1976:67) refers to as "the piecemeal development of the service". The process of development has included working with simple drunks, matrimonial work, early offenders, recidivists, juvenile delinquents and long-term prisoners. Is it any wonder that the probation officer sometimes feels confused as to what role he is best suited to? The idea of role
conflict within the probation system is also talked about by Spica (1977:47):

...in seeking to meet the challenge of his job and perceived role, the modern probation and parole officer finds himself caught up in a peculiar double bind. On the one hand, he must satisfy the rules of the court, the law enforcement agencies, the legal profession, the community, and the standards of the particular agency. On the other hand, the needs of the offender, that is the psychological, physical, social, developmental, and rehabilitative needs must be recognized and met. The two-sided facet of this correctional process results from evolutionary changes in both the concept and scope of the correctional field.

Therefore, the probation officer finds himself in the position where various segments of the population are expecting him to perform his role in very contrasting, and sometimes conflicting, ways.

Schaffer (1977:4) contends that there are some members within the judicial system, who do not really understand the underlying philosophy of probation. Sheridan and Konrad (1976:289) state, with agreement being expressed by Mathieson (1976), all too often the best interpretation that can be expected is that the probation officer is either a quasipoliceman, who hands out curfews to delinquents, or a do-gooder who lets them off. Parker (1977:86) regards the public view in the same way, in that the probation officer is perceived to be a mixture of policeman and old-fashioned charity worker. Carney (1977:112) states that there are numerous misinformed people who perceive probation (and parole) as a form of indulgence, which somehow does not secure society's safety. It is very often the case, according to Day (1976: 71), that probation officers attract sneers from both those who look at them as being agents of social control, and those who regard them as
having too close an identification with the probationer.

An account is given by Kove (1962:51) which speculates as to the reason behind the existence of different perspectives. He partially attributes the varied perspectives to active borrowing from other fields. The emphasis in the following elements is on the probation officer who works in the United States, although there are obvious parallels to the Canadian context. The following are few examples of this type of borrowing:

1) The probation officer who adopts the accoutrements of the constabulary and, as a result, confuses his job with that of the police. This confusion could result in him making use of a police-type badge; he may carry handcuffs, blackjack or a gun; he could have a police radio in his car; or he may place too much emphasis on the offense, when writing up a pre-sentence report. Linden (1973:23) concurs with Kove (1962) in that the probation officer who regards himself primarily as a law enforcement agent, will place major emphasis on details of the crime in the pre-sentence report. He will also tend to concentrate on the prior record of the individual and will recommend his ideas of sentencing so as to fit the particular crime.

2) The probation officer who is regarded as being legalistic, writes a pre-sentence report that is replete with legal jargon and "whose supervision of probationers finds contentment in the upholding of the law for the sake of upholding law, whether or not inward improvement of the probationer is accomplished" (Kove, 1962:52). Linden (1973:25) raises the question of the probation officer's function being absorbed by the legal profession and the subsequent
creation of a new legal specialty. The probation officer is finding
himself more and more in a quasi-judicial position (Czajkoski, 1973:
that both the lawyer and caseworker share in a heritage of social
responsibility and of concern about human relations. The major area of
disruption between the two seems to be that they are not cognizant of
each other's perspective. This lack of appreciation has led to the
existence of ignorance, misunderstanding, and indifference between
these two professional groups.

3) The probation officer who regards himself as a systematic and
thorough investigator. This investigation is in the very narrow and
special sense, and the reports that are written pay special attention
to the safe procedure of presenting facts, facts, facts which, in
effect, exhibit awesome and painstaking exactness but do not shed any
light as to what these facts imply (Keve, 1962:52).

4) The probation officer who receives psychological, psychiatric
or other clinical reports but merely attaches or writes these verbatim
into the pre-sentence report, without blending in the facts uncovered
by his own investigation.

The probation officer, and his prescribed role, is a relatively
new concept in our society, such that, he is oftentimes compared to
other more familiar role models. The person placed on probation may
regard the probation officer as a policeman; the judge may deem him to
be an investigator; while, at the same time, the probation officer
strives to attain the role(s) of big brother and/or therapist.
If you ask a probation officer what his role is and how he would go about defining it, a wide range of answers would result. Both Hardman (1960) and Spica (1977) deal with this particular issue. Hardman (1960:3) outlines several job categorizations that are commonly used: employment agent, vocational counsellor, marital counsellor, school counsellor, psychoanalyst—Junior grade, dream interpreter, street corner watchet, movie watchet, sports analyst, sheriff—deputy grade, father confessor, and moralist. Spica (1977: 47) lengthens the preceding list, by referring to the probation officer in the following manner: employment counsellor, amateur psychologist, legal interpreter, and rehabilitator.

Barrington (1963:403-4) outlines the many roles a probation officer has occasion to play. These, in summary form, are as follows: 1) the guard, 2) the bill collector, 3) the employment counsellor, 4) the psychologist, 5) the teacher, 6) the family financial counsellor, 7) the marriage counsellor, 8) the investigator, 9) the child welfare worker, 10) the salesman, 11) the lawyer, 12) the judge, 13) the policeman, 14) the personnel man, 15) the public health nurse, 16) the public relations man. These, as well as many other roles, constitute the working world of a probation officer, and both the number and variety suggest the task is not an easy one.

The preceding discussion leads us to expect that probation officers are faced with difficult choices in assuming one professional stance over another, or in trying to find ways to combine the roles. Terwilliger and Adams (1969:233) ask the question:
Is it enough to see merely that the offender does not violate the law, or must it also be seen that he is happy, productive, and in conformance with standards of conduct that are desirable but unwritten in law?

Hardman (1960:4) makes an interesting observation in his analysis of what a probation officer should not be required to do. The probation officer's task is

...not to 'maximize the offender's total capacity as an individual', not to 'help him achieve the greatest self and social realization', not to 'help him achieve optimal concord with his total environment', nor any of the other all-encompassing definitions which I'm sure you've heard.

Hardman (1960) believes that the probation officer does not function effectively as a vocational counsellor, psychoanalyst, or a policeman.

Thorsten Sellin, cited in Bates (1960:15), is credited with the idea that the term probation should be reserved for defining the environment within which such tasks as counselling and guidance are assumed to exist but which are all too often absent. Sellin suggests if the only important aspects that probation has to be concerned with are the enforcement of conditions and the collection of fines, it could be just as competently administered by a clerk with a cash register much less expensively than with employees with professional degrees.

3.2.2 Summarizing the Confusion: Care Vs. Control

In Finland, it has been recommended that probation services be abolished (Hinton, 1976:90) because care and control are perceived as uneasy bedfellows, illogically combined in one agency. The caring function was looked upon as belonging to social workers, that of control to police.

Hardman (1960:3) and Ankersmit (1976:33) both suggest the probation officer considered relatively worse is not the one who takes
advantage of his position by using authority as a means to push people around, but rather, the probation officer who does not come right out and define the boundaries of his authority, thereby, leaving the offender unsure and/or confused as to where he stands in this regard. The avenue sometimes used by the offender to actually determine how much authority the probation officer has is to stray from legal conformity and risk the consequences. If these consequences are not forthcoming, the offender quickly loses respect for the authority supposedly vested in the position of probation officer, and in all likelihood a possible constructive relationship will be lost. The person who is unwilling to enter into a relationship with the probation officer or is, in a sense, involuntary finds himself in what Ankersmit (1976:31) refers to as a Barebones Legal Contract. No meaningful counselling can occur within such a contract because the probationer is adamant in saying that he does not want, or indeed require, counselling. That attitude toward the probation officer is clear -- I have to be on probation; I don't like it, and there's nothing I want from you.

In direct contrast to the Barebones Legal Contract is the Counseling Contract, which enables the probationer (client) to vent his anger and/or frustration "in a less harmful way". In the latter type of relationship, the basis for a constructive contract exists when the probationer expresses the desire, or wish, to discontinue being in conflict with the law because of possible unpleasant consequences.

Ankersmit (1976:32) contends the probation officer is capable of combining the two previously mentioned types of contracts, when he refers to the wearing of two hats -- the hat of legal authority and the
counselling hat. Ankersmit (1976) considers it important for the probation officer to clearly specify which hat he has on, when he is dealing with the probationer.

Arcaya (1973:58) states that any human relationship is composed of as many contrasting perspectives of that situation as there are individual members involved in it. Within probation, this question of multiple realities is very much in evidence. The probation officer is faced with a dilemma because he comes in contact with an individual, via a legal force, but this contact occurs in a counselling [and supposedly] trusting relationship. Multiple realities exist, not only because these two individuals do not know each other, but also because the probation officer has to pay close attention to two different perspectives simultaneously. Arcaya (1973:58) perceives these two perspectives as (1) the probation officer's obligations as a court-appointed supervisor of probationers, and (2) the idiosyncratic needs of the probationer in a counselling relationship. Terwilliger and Adams (1969:234) suggest that probation officers walk a tightrope between mollycoddling and prosecution. Mollycoddling, although a term that rolls easily off the tip of the tongue, can be used malevolently. J. Edgar Hoover, former head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the United States, indicated that probation was the hob-sister approach to the problem of crime. Probation officers are oftentimes sarcastically referred to as "bleeding-heart social workers", "do-gooders", "saviors of the world", etc. The tension between these two different perspectives, mollycoddling and prosecution, is considered to be inherent in the job of the probation officer. Tension of this type is
thought to come to bear on the individual probation officer in one of three ways: 1) It is located between the officer and the court (how closely to abide by its formal rules of supervision); 2) between the officer and the probationer (how many breaks to give a probationer); and 3) as part of the internal debate of the probation officer.

A classification by Lloyd Ahlin, Herman Fiven and Donnel M. Pannenfort, places the probation officer in one of three roles rather than two. Miles (1965:16) lists these:

1) Punitive officer -- considered to be the guardian of middle class morality;

2) Protective agent -- goes back and forth between the protection of the offender and the protection of the community;

3) Welfare worker -- main purpose is the overall well-being of the offender. The aim is to provide assistance to the client, in order that he will achieve a successful psychological adjustment. The probation officer's task is characterized by emotional neutrality, and he uses knowledge based upon the probationer's situation, needs and capacities.

In an unpublished monograph (Differing Perspectives, 1978:1-2) Vancouver Police have listed four issues, which they see as important in distinguishing between what they call work orientations of "Social Work" and "Adult Probation", as follows:

1) Issue involves adult criminal act -- The Social Work perspective pays close attention to the helping relationship as well as the facilitator role. The social work perspective is also very much concerned about environmental conditions, as they relate to the criminal act.
The Adult Probation perspective emphasizes the court officer role. Other areas of concern are pre-sentence reports, the supervision aspect and less concentration on counselling and help.

2) Issue involves public safety -- The Social Work perspective concerns itself with this aspect only insofar as it involves a violent situation. If this is not the case, there is less interest and/or concern because this is basically not a social work objective.

The Adult Probation perspective attributes a high level of concern to the issue of public safety. There are few instances of risk taking when public safety is being considered. The breach option is always available, if the need should arise.

3) Issue involves concern for victim -- The Social Work perspective is indirectly concerned, but the major amount of work is with the offender and not the victim.

The Adult Probation perspective is likewise indirectly concerned, but the difference lies in the greater extent to which this concern is expressed.

4) Issue involves concern for confidentiality -- The Social Work perspective has concern for the client's rights, as governed by legal regulations.

The Adult Probation perspective mainly perceives this as being a professional concern or judgment.

Complicating matters, Tomatino (1975:42-5) constructed a Probation Grid, in which he discussed five methods of dealing with the probationer. These five faces of probation are made up of the following types of relationships:
1) The 1/9 Face -- Help him understand -- This relationship involves the probationer wanting to abide by the rules that have been set down. The relationship that exists should be supportive, warm and nonjudgmental.

2) The 9/9 Face -- Have it make sense -- The probationer will abide by the rules when it is credible to do so because, by adhering, individual requirements are met. The probation officer should be open, but firm, and focus on the content of his relations with the probationer.

3) The 5/5 Face -- Let him identify -- If the probationer and probation officer like each other, and the probationer has a sense of identification with the probation officer and his values, adherence to the rules will almost be assured. Steadfast concessions have to be reached in the relationship.

4) the 1/1 Face -- It's up to him -- The probationer is expected to be familiar with what is expected of him and/or what happens in the case of noncompliance with the rules.

5) The 9/1 Face -- Make him do it -- The probationer will abide by the rules only if you take a hard line, put into practice intense supervision and remain completely objective in the relationship.

Spica (1977) constructed a diagram, "The Correctional Novagram," designed so that the role of the probation officer would be made clear and focusing on the two most important functions of probation and parole supervision. The role of the probation officer is described as working in different directions, but struggling to utilize the best of each function, by consolidating their optimum success. The first
function, the Bureaucratic Function (control), concentrates on the philosophy and regulations of the established bureaucracies, that is, the court, the law enforcement agencies, the legal profession, the community, and the particular probation or parole agencies. The second function, the Helping Relationship Function (care), concentrates on the offender himself. A number of things to be considered, in the case of the offender, are diagnosis of the individual being processed, understanding of his situation, a treatment program, examination of services available, counselling, mediation and interpretation of rules. Spade (1977:60) stated the preceding considerations should not be perceived as being mutually exclusive, but it should be kept in mind that, in the genuine world of probation and parole, people's values, commitments and perceptions are all subject to change. The particular agency may alternate in its philosophy at times. These various factors contribute to the changing role of the probation officer.

The preceding review of the literature demonstrates the wide variety of semantics used to refer to what can be more simply regarded as an occupational role which spans a complete continuum between two polar types -- care and control. Although the interrelationships that come to exist between a probationer and the probation officer are indeed so complex and varied that they cannot be narrowed down to one specific role or style, they do tend to be characterized by priority being given to either a caring emphasis or a control emphasis.

3.2.3 Focusing Reliefs of Care and Control Into Role Sets: "Social Worker" and "Legalistic"

For the purpose of bringing some order into this conceptual and
Semantic variety, we will err on the side of simplicity. This study will make use of ideal types, in order to better conceptualize the range of variation that exists when one makes reference to the term, Probation Officer Work Orientation. Miner (1968:174) contends ...that the type is an 'ideal' -- a mental construct. It is a concept derived from observable reality but not conforming to it in detail.

Aspects, chosen from that reality, accentuate the definition of the type because of their apparent interdependence and theoretical importance. This does not necessarily mean, however, that ideal types can be directly used to classify individuals, as seldom will any respondent conform completely to such a type. A major danger in using ideal types is to equate them with reality, rather than regarding them as abstract constructs. An ideal-typical classification, along with all theoretical models, according to Tiryakian (1968:179), ...is not dictated by logical considerations but entails, to an important extent, an initial creative act on the part of the researcher.

Miner (1968:174) further contends that

When used as a basis of comparison with life situations, however, the type suggests possible hypotheses and lines of investigation. Thus, ideal types are to be used in the analysis of empirical reality.

Bendix (1968:495) states that after a question has been carefully looked at and seen as significant, it then becomes necessary to formulate concepts that will present the relevant evidence. This formulation has to be systematic in its developmental process and provide a greater sense of unity than has ever existed in the actual course of development. These ideal types can then be used as reference points for the analysis of behavior.
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Tiryakian (1968:177) refers to empirical science as being grounded, or based, in the following way:

"...assumptions of orderliness of natural phenomena and the rational apprehension of this order of man, the systematic classificatory grouping of phenomena and the explication of the rationale for the classification are indeed tantamount to the codification of the existing state of knowledge in a discipline."

This study makes use of the ideal-typical approach for two reasons, as outlined by Tiryakian (1968:177). First, an ideal type tends to go beyond sheer description, by simplifying the ordering of the elements in a population into distinct groupings. In this way, such a classification creates or constructs some degree of order out of the potential chaos of discrete, discontinuous, or heterogenous observations. Second, by such a codification process, the researcher is permitted to seek out and possibly predict "relationships between phenomena" that do not seem to be otherwise related.

There are many different ways in which to describe work orientations that exist within the area of probation services. The Legalist Work Orientation (L.W.O.) and Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.) distinction appeared early in the literature. King (1964:183) made the point that probation officers understandably vary in their approaches to their task. Two particular extremes were noted, one being the probation officer who identifies completely with the court system and makes use of its authority as a means or technique of keeping the probationer in line, and the other being the probation officer who attempts to understand the probationer's behavior and concerns himself with the factors of cause. The latter more often finds himself in conflict with the restrictions and expectations of the court.
Ironically, some authors have even pointed out that the terminology used to name the occupation illustrates the internal struggle between the L.W.O. and the S.W.O. Linden (1973:25-6) argues that probation has been a religious concept, referring to beneficence and puritanism, while the term officer connotes policing and is bureaucratic in nature. Taken together, the contrasting symbolism represents real orientation differences, which serve as a deterrent to effective rapport between the practitioner and the client and to relations between the occupation and the public.

In an article by Lynch (1976), as reviewed by Harold W. Kelton (1977:61-2), it is stated that social workers adhere to a philosophical stance that sets before them an edict to give of themselves to their client. From this single perspective, agency framework and policy decisions are defined merely as obstructions to the provision of professional service to the client. The social worker chooses to operate without the legal and policy framework of the department. This allows them the liberty to ignore the recommendations of their seniors. Probation officers, partisan to this type of philosophy, regard themselves as social workers and not court workers.

According to Carney (1977:96), many social workers are under the impression that the environment, in which they have to perform probation officer duties, is overly structured, and this aspect subsequently makes them uncomfortable when social work techniques are called for. This idea of structure is also mentioned by Day (1976:72), when he states that the person who works under the direction of a Social Services model would be much more concerned about giving service to the
client, instead of preserving structures.

Wahl (1962:43-4) has stated counselling is the probation officer's principal means of effecting adjustment, but that it can only be effectively accomplished when there is a positive interpersonal relationship between the officer and the probationer. Koontz (1978), however, questions the practicality of a social work approach, given the actual number, as well as the diversity, of probationers. According to Koontz (1978:29), "Social Work has been somewhat the antithesis to progressive organizational management". The Social Work approach requires casework, and Koontz (1978) points out that while social workers may very well ascribe to high ideals of dealing closely and intimately with the probationer, in reality casework becomes little more than brief and infrequent sessions which are used to talk about the major problems the probationer is having.

The ideal processes involved in casework have been outlined in Diana (1963:193) by Taber and McGuire. Taber describes it this way:

Casework...may be defined as a process of attempting to understand the needs, impulses and actions of an individual and of helping him to recognize these in a way that is satisfying to himself and yet in accord with the demands of social living.

McGuire attempts to delineate casework in three phases:

1. Social inquiry into the total situation of the client;
2. Social diagnosis, that is, inquiry into the relationships and attitudes of the client; and
3. Social casework treatment. In this last phase there are three objectives: (1) to introduce right notions of conduct (responsible behavior) in the client; (2) to induce motives which will assure loyalty to good norms of conduct; and (3) to develop the client's latent abilities.

Diestek (Diana, 1963:195) also deals with casework and explains it on the basis of seven needs of the client. The caseworker is supposed to
be sensitive to, understand and appropriately respond to all these needs, while the client is somehow supposed to be aware of and benefit from the caseworker's sensitivity, understanding and responses.

Some people have come to look upon probation supervision and social casework as being compatible (Sheriden and Konrad, 1976:283). As a result, for some, probation is also characterized as being method-oriented in its approach, rather than task-oriented.

Probation officers, who rely on the use of casework, appear to be very concerned with the overall well-being of the individual, even though time limitations thwart these particular motives. This is why the 'importance of the first interview in setting the tone of the therapeutic relationship must not be underestimated' (Czajkoski, 1969: 242).

The probation officer, according to Lloyd Ohlin, cited in Milis (1965:18), would have as his function, promoting the welfare of the community, by aiding the probationer. Ohlin considers the larger field of social work to have an influence on the social worker who works in the area of probation, more so than the more limited correctional organization.

Probation, without doubt, is a legal concept. The legal system provides the machinery for transforming the concept of probation into reality, and every individual, who is referred to as a probation officer, gains this title in accordance with the law. The argument expressed by numerous authors is that probation officers are merely arms or extensions of the court (Wahl, 1962:44; Hartman, 1963:15; King, 1964:21; Allenstein, 1970:181; Devlin, 1971:28; Czajkoski, 1973:9;
Linden, 1973:23; Bratter, 1974:5-6; Clegg, 1974:7; Beaumont, 1976:33; Cohn, 1976:22; Sheridan and Konrad, 1976:265; Carney, 1977:86; Kuchen, 1977:35; Parker, 1977:35). This alternative orientation has the probation officer working very closely with the judiciary in the performance of his duties. As Clegg (1974:7) points out, probation officers work more closely with courts than parole officers do, since probation is, in itself, a legal or judicial function, while parole is an administrative function.

Oberbridge (1960:3) refers to the L.W.O., in discussing the use of legal authority, for the protection of the probationer from unwise use or personal freedom. Carney (1977:101) suggests the probation officer has a quasi-judicial role in performing his daily duties. The analogy is drawn between the prosecutor and probation officer, in that both have an influence on the sentencing process. This idea is clearly contrary to the S.W.O., which stresses the development of the probationer's feeling of self-determination (Barrington, 1963:397; Dieter, 1963:397; Kelly, 1968:28; Pollard, 1974:28; Beaumont, 1975:76). Kelly (1968:28) states if practice violates self-determination, it is counter to the value base of social work.

Linden (1973:23) indicates that if the probation officer has a subservient role to the judiciary, and is constantly concerned with meeting stringent deadlines, it makes for pre-sentence reports that follow a standardized format. More importantly perhaps, the demands of each judge take priority over looking after the requirements of the probationer. Linden (1973:26) further argues that probation officers, like judges, police, prosecutors and defense lawyers, are so deeply
ennmeshed in the court matrix, that their objectivity and evaluations are compromised by other goals they seek. At no point, however, is the suggestion being made (Hartjen, 1972:69) that humanitarianism and legalism are diametrically opposed to one another.

Corney (1977:87-R) proposes the following list of pros and cons for locating probation under the direction of the judicial branch of government:

1. Probation would be more responsive to court direction.
2. Judges get automatic feedback from a staff that they would have more faith in.
3. Courts have a greater awareness of needed resources, and can be advocates for their staffs in obtaining same.
4. Increased use of pretrial diversion will be facilitated.

1. Judges are ill-equipped to administer probation. *
2. Service to the courts would take precedence over service to probationers.
3. Probation staff may be assigned functions that are unrelated to probation, such as serving legal processes.
4. Courts are adjudicatory, rather than service bodies.

* Judges, within both provincial jurisdictions, have a certain amount of judicial discretion. However, working in co-operation with an arm of the Justice Department, judges may feel less pressure to make use of non-legal outside expertise (i.e., Probation Services).

In summary, the literature reveals the existence of two contrasting types of work orientations, L.W.O. versus S.W.O., which appear to be central to the controversial debate. These two orientations are patterned after broader ideological differences found in literature analysing human relationships. Historically speaking, Voit (1975:256) states that social work can be seen to have a tradition of loyalty (obeisance?) to Freud, to psychological orientation, and to psychic determinism. On the other hand, corrections had its ideological beginning in nineteenth-century rationalism and free will, which by itself, is a firm basis for an inherent philosophical incompatibility between
the two orientations. Social work has to regard illegal behavior and/or problem behavior, in terms of rationally uncontrollable intrapsychic processes, requiring treatment and rehabilitation. Meanwhile, corrections, as a part of the criminal justice system, has looked upon deviant behavior as a "function of volitional and cognitive processes necessitating punishment and social control".

The probation officer that works within the administration of criminal justice, and follows closely the due process of law, perceives a probationer as a person who has the ability to distinguish right from wrong, thus responsible for his behavior.

Obviously, there is a distinction between the two work orientations in the way the probationer's needs are initially defined, when he enters the criminal justice system, and the manner in which the probation service is provided.

3.2.4 The Fragile and Troubled Union of Social Worker and Legalistic Orientations

According to Sweet (1973:305), the only purpose served by the continual debate between the healers and the keepers, as it persists in the criminal justice system, is to accentuate the failures of the past and to frustrate innovative, effective analysis and reform. However, policy-makers, researchers and probation workers continue to pursue their discussions of the interaction between the two approaches.

In 1969, Strump and Fox (in Bratter, 1974:7) stressed the positive aspects of casework and the degree of applicability that this practice has, in dealing with the probationer. Also, Sigler (1970:262) found that 69 percent of those probation officers included, in his particular
study, defined the scope of probation as client-oriented, which veered away from such aspects as assistance in the court's disposition of offenders or control of the probationer's conduct.

It has been stated by Levy (1976:38) and Sheridan and Konrod (1975:286) that those people who have had a social work background are motivated by the goal of service. This coincides with the idea that after a probation officer, with a social work background, has had the first couple of interviews with the probationer, and problem areas have been discussed, the task is to reach some viable solution which will best benefit the probationer and then proceed to work toward this goal. Compare this work orientation to that described by Jarvis, (1971:13), when he states that increasingly the probation officer is treated as a partner of the Bench, in the sentencing process. In this situation, the probation officer provides information to the court which will help in the determination of sentence. He also advises the Bench on what particular form the sentence should take. This alignment with the judiciary suggests that the probationer may very well be second, in terms of priority, rather than first, as would be the case if the probation officer ascribed to an S.W.O. The issue is raised by King (1964:181) that probation officers are inclined to be coerced, to a certain degree, into becoming enmeshed in the legal machinery and the processes that this entails. At other times, this coalition would seem to be completely voluntary.

Can an effective merger occur? Kelling (1968:30) suggests that corrections and social work should not strive to become distinct entities, but rather to allow corrections to continue to nourish the
growing knowledge base of social work. On the other hand, in France
the solution has been a clear division of labor. Conrad (1973:179)
indicates that two types of probation officers are employed:

The agent de probation, usually a man, is intended to represen
t authority and is required to carry out surveillance
functions. The assistance sociale, usually a woman, will be
trained as a social worker and will play the part of a
counselor and will deal with personal problems of adjust-
ment... A somewhat similar organization of probation functions
has been introduced in Italy.

In France, both of these roles are under the direction of the "juge
d'application des peines", who finds himself responsible for making
sure the sentence of the court is effectively carried out in treatment.

However, in the United States, efforts have been made to reunite
probation services with the Department of Justice, which would then see
the Bureau of Prisons, United States Board of Parole and Probation
Services functioning as one. The prevailing view, according to Carmey
(1977:91), would seem to be that the probation system should be
completely insulated from any possible influence of the prosecutive arm
of the government.

Linden (1973:23), in speaking about the probation officer and his
being an integral part of the entire criminal justice process, says
that the attitude he expresses as a qualified professional will be in
turn reflected in the pre-sentence reports that he writes. Each report
will be a unique, comprehensive, diagnostic instrument, with clear,
precise recommendations for improvement of the offender, as well as the
protection of the community.

Siegel (1970:263) states that one of the only ways to save proba-
ton officers from working entirely in court-oriented activities is to
have a new category of court officers, who would perform many of the duties now assigned to probation officers.

Meeker (1957:39) specifies that social workers are not really at too much of a disadvantage because the individual client continues to be the focus of the correctional social worker, and his special skill in individualization serves to mitigate the regimenting effects of an impersonal system. Social work is an enabling process and as such can be applied in any setting.

The probation officer, according to Meeker (1957:42), focuses his skill on the individual, whether in the urban metropolis, with its complex value system, or in the simpler Gemeinschaft of the village crossroad.

Three separate arguments are put forth by Handler (1975:241) supporting the use of social work in a variety of correctional settings:

1) Social workers provide a complementary service to the correctional setting, especially in our present-day society, where individuals have problems that are of major concern and need the help and guidance that social workers can and should provide, if some form of stability is to be maintained.

2) The tradition and approaches associated with social workers are more appropriate for tasks of a correctional nature, as compared to approaches used by other types of treatment personnel.

3) A number of the arguments, which suggest corrections should not implement social work practices, are founded on false assumptions concerning social work or on questionable interpretations concerning the causes of ineffectiveness of social work in correctional settings.

Gordon Jones, a senior probation officer in England (Parker, 1977:65), states that he is strongly in favor of the present system of
probation. He goes on to deny that probation is a means by which the probationer is 'let off', and puts forth the argument that the probationer is involved in a contract with the court, which involves continuous obligations and accountability, an enforceable contract, available sanctions and limiting requirements throughout the contract. Jones denies that probation is soft and that the well-being of the offender is its primary objective. The main objective seems to be to keep the offender from becoming involved with the law again, but the probation officer is also expected to be concerned about the welfare of the probationer.

Parker (1977:65) refers to the probation officer, and his involvement in the criminal justice field, as being a dilemma of all those who work in that no-man's land between law and social science or between authority and helping. Handler (1975:241) comments on the fact that there are still some people who look upon probation officers as attenuated policemen, rather than as practicing social workers. Finally, in this regard, Parker (1977:114) asks:

Is the probation officer a mere functionary of the law court or a helping social worker who does not work beyond the law but adds a dimension to the law? Is probation a privilege at the dictate (or whim) of the probation officer or is it a right to be enforced by application of due process and the principle of legality?

Barkdoll (1976:8) suggests that the probation officer become involved in community control. The usage of such a practice provides a varied number of sanctions which do not involve imprisonment. It would isolate the offender, as well as incapacitate him in certain instances, from becoming involved in further altercations with the law. It also provides a certain degree of punishment.
nothing wrong with a probation officer adhering to these types of ideas, and goes on to say that it is imperative for him to think in these terms. It is considered essential that the public view the probation officer functioning within such a punitive system. In point of fact, probation is a form of punishment, as is incarceration, although it is of a lesser degree (Bichy, 1962:47). When a person receives probation, instead of incarceration, he still is deprived of a measure of the freedom allowed the rest of us. This idea is similar to that of the primary principle, as put forth by Rawls (Shireman, 1974: 565) which states:

Each person is to have equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others.

The main idea, which comes from this statement, is that an individual's freedom can only be restricted in order to strengthen the total system of liberty shared by all, a corollary being that justice will always take precedence over efficiency and individual welfare. Barrington (1963:402) counters by saying that in a society which is perceived as being free, there can be no person convicted, confined or supervised in his personal affairs, without giving the definition of what is happening to this individual as being that of punishment and there is no legal or treatment reason why he should. Anything done for him should be helpful.

There is no reason why, according to Davies (1976:88) a probation officer that deals in the area of social control is not capable of having benevolent intentions and a positive effect. Another author (Daye, no date:2) concurs with the preceding statement when he states
that probation officers can remain firm in carrying out legal responsibility, while at the same time being helpful to those individuals assigned to them by the court.

Those persons that adhere to a social work frame of reference, according to Davies (1976:86) are very much aware of the possibility of drifting into a closed system model. This model would have the probation officer being tied down to routine surveillance, concerned only with procedural efficiency and formal relationships. The probation officer may begin with idealistic intentions, but soon finds out that the administration may indeed have other ideas of particular ways to provide the necessary service. Probation officers, therefore, should be committed to the practice of creative skills, to a developmental perspective, and to the constant task of sensitizing society to the needs of its own victims and deviants.

The Perlman social casework model has provided the basis for the helping and treatment process of probation. It starts out with the client being the person with a problem who comes to the probation officer for help. The fact of the matter is that no probationer comes to the agency. The probationer, under reporting conditions, is ordered to attend. Partly based on this fact, Schaffer (1977:2) takes the view that the social casework model, and the premises contained therein, are fundamentally wrong. This leads to the controversial topic of doing social work with involuntary clients (Barrington, 1963:398; Arcaya, 1973:58; Voit, 1975:265). This idea of involuntary clients not being dealt with effectively by social workers has continued to be a topic of considerable debate for a number of years. The contention has
always seemed to be that social workers should get out of the business of dealing with involuntary clients because of the detrimental affect this type of relationship has on the social worker's effectiveness in dealing with the client's problems.

A major change that has occurred within some probation services, partly to hide the involuntariness of the probationer's involvement, is the shift from using the title "offender", "probationer", or "accused", when referring to the person placed on probation, to using the title "client". Daye (no date;1) argues, however, that persons placed on probation should be referred to as probationers and not as clients. Even the terminology is a center of hot debate! It is likely, therefore, that the particular ideological framework chosen by a probation officer will influence his daily task performance.

3.2.6 Summary Definitions of Worker Orientation: Social Worker and Legalistic

Taking into consideration the varied ways in which the roles of a probation officer have been described in the literature, a decision was made to concentrate on only two. The classifications (types) chosen -- Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.) and the Legalistic Worker Orientation (L.W.O.) -- are both prominent in the existing probation literature, and the definitions of each are clearly value-laden. Rarely do people fit easily into a neat classificatory schema. For the purpose of this study, then, it is important to define these two types, or work orientations, as free as possible from value judgments, while retaining the complexity of each type.
Using a combination of variables drawn from the literature, we can suggest the following ideal types.

**Social Worker:**

A probation officer who adheres to an S.W.O. perceives himself as being able to:

1) communicate effectively with the client, in a manner that exhibits mutually positive regard between himself and the client (Sheridan and Konrad, 1976:232);

2) help the client adjust to his own social and psychological situation (Voit, 1975:259; Levy, 1976:149);

3) play the role of behavioral engineer, although, at the same time, having a sense of respect for the sanctity of the personality characteristics of the client (Bretter, 1974:3);

4) express to the client that he is a unique individual, important in his own right, with a necessary and incomparable place in society (Tillich, 1962:16; Hartman, 1963:16; Klockers, 1972:551; Gordon, 1975:75);

5) show the client the wisdom and advantage of seeking to improve himself and the situations surrounding him (Bates, 1960:19);

6) work toward an end point or goal, usually by setting up a contract (King, 1964:97; Schmideberg, 1971:64; Piccard, 1975:48);

7) advise, assist and befriend the client (Versele, 1971:61; Walczak, 1971:58; Great Britain Home Department, 1973:5);

8) help the client in personal or social difficulties to find viable solutions to existing problems or to help him come to terms with those difficulties in ways that are acceptable both to himself and to
society (King, 1969:60); in other words, to artfully introduce the client to a better way of life (Klockars, 1972:551).

**Legalistic Orientation**

A probation officer who adhere to an L.W.O. perceives himself as being able to:

1) provide the court with information which will make the decision-making process, within sentencing, more efficient;

2) help the offender comply with the order of the court (Hordman, 1965:4; Klockars, 1972:550);

3) divert certain probationers away from exposure to alternate routes, such as the prison system or provincial jails, which generally are repressive, somewhat degrading and control oriented (Cornay, 1977:326);

4) contribute, in some manner, to the control of criminality (Coughlan, 1963:201; Beaumont, 1976:76);

5) be concerned about the implementation and comprehension, on the part of the probationer, of the written contract (probation order) (Scott, 1976:62);

6) emphasize that laws drawn up by the community, cannot be broken with impunity (Schaffter, 1977:33);

7) help the probationer overcome, or neutralize, his anti-social behaviors (Tomalino, 1975:42);

8) function effectively, while his work is set against the background of the court, and represent the authority of society, backed by legal sanctions (King, 1964:79).
3.3 Impact Model: Structure, Individual Background Variables and Their Independent Influence on Probation Officer Work Orientation and Five Measures of the Probation Officer Acts.

The model upon which this study is based is a recursive model, which implies that the causal flow in the model is unidirectional. The researcher is aware that the causal flow may be something other than unidirectional, but for the purposes of this study the flow of effect as depicted in the model, is of major concern. If the causal flow is unidirectional, "at a given point in time a variable cannot be both a cause and an effect of another variable" (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973: 308).

The left side of the model depicts a reciprocal relationship between the two independent variable clusters: Structure and individual background variables. These two variable clusters, when found in this particular type of model, are referred to as exogenous variables (Kerlinger and Pedhazur, 1973:308). When exogenous variables are correlated with each other, this relationship is depicted by a curved line with arrowheads at both ends, which indicates the researcher does not conceive of one variable being the cause of the other.

The arrows that originate from Structure and the individual background variables denote that Probation Officer Work Orientation, as a dependent variable, is hypothesized to be influenced by these particular independent variables. It is assumed that other independent variables are influencing Probation Officer Work Orientation, but for the purposes of this study these independent variables are the only ones to be considered.
Probation Officer Work Orientation is conceived of as a continuum. Two ideal types are at opposing ends of this continuum: first, the Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O.) and second, the Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.). Probation Officer Work Orientation, in turn, is hypothesized to influence the five measures of the probation officer acts. These different Acts are outlined in the diagram.

Clearly, the influence of orientation on behavior is not one-way. The literature has demonstrated how some behaviors/actions affect orientation. A study of New Jersey probation officers, by Sigler (1970) suggests that the actions between probation officers and the judge, the police, superiors, clients, the public, other various personnel in the criminal justice system, and other probation officers, all affect work orientation. These actions are affected, in turn, by structure and individual background variables, (i.e., level and/or type of education, geographical origins (farm, town or city), age, gender, personality variables, types of past employment, general socialization within family, variation in past regarding contacts (favorable or not) with personnel in the criminal justice system and others who could alter the probation officer's impression of probation), and so on.

PreFontaine (1978:1) lists those who affect the probation officer's work:

1) the judge -- who is influenced to a great extent by the police;

2) the superior -- who is "primarily interested" in receiving reports and expense accounts on time;
3) the other probation officer -- who cannot, for various reasons, accept "certain types of clients or offenses, or is an isolate".

Both Structure and individual background variables can influence the five measures of the probation officer acts, independent of Probation Officer Work Orientation (direct effect), and also through Probation Officer Work Orientation, as an intervening variable, thus producing an indirect effect.

The primary purpose of this study is to demonstrate how Structure and individual background variables, as independent variables, and independent of each other, influence Probation Officer Work Orientation and the five measures of the probation officer acts, and how Probation Officer Work Orientation affects the five measures of the probation officer acts, independent of the other independent variables.

The focus of the model is Probation Officer Work Orientation. It is the purpose of this study to determine whether occupational Structure and individual background variables are independently influencing Probation Officer Work Orientation. An attempt will also be made to determine whether occupational Structure, individual background variables or Probation Officer Work Orientation, acting independent of each other, influence the five measures of the probation officer acts.

The following statements are a written explanation of the flow of effect, depicted in the model, as well as being the major hypotheses to be tested.

1) Probation officers employed by the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island will have a Legalistic type of Probation Officer
Work Orientation and, conversely, probation officers employed by the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan will have a Social Worker type or Probation Officer Work Orientation.

2) Structure will have a direct effect on Probation Officer Work Orientation.

3) Each of the four individual background variables (Years Employed, Gender, Type of Upbringing or Education Level) have direct effects on Probation Officer Work Orientation.

4) Probation Officer Work Orientation will have a direct effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

5) (i) Structure will have a direct effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

(ii) Structure, via Probation Officer Work Orientation, will have an indirect effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

6) (i) Each of the four individual background variables will have a direct effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

(ii) Each of the four individual background variables, via Probation Officer Work Orientation, will have an indirect effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

Since some characteristics of both the Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O. and the Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.) are required of probation officers, in both Provincial Structures, it will be most unlikely that one would find any examples of a probation officer whose work orientation is exclusively L.W.O. or S.W.O. It is the subtle
distinctions for which we are searching. It must also be kept in mind
that, no matter which particular administrative structure is in effect,
nor what the Probation Officer's Work Orientation is, probation
officers all function within a legally-bounded realm which limits their
behavior, to some extent. From the available literature, it would
appear that the L.W.O gives less priority to the individual as a
composite and complex entity, and more to legally-delimited human
relationships, whereas, the S.W.O. is influenced by a broad array of
general social work philosophies. These work philosophies include a
cumulative process, whereby the client is gradually helped to deal with
his problems in a more constructive manner and become more able to cope
in the future. The S.W.O. also involves the belief in the development of
an open and trustworthy relationship, in which broad human
counselling and personal guidance can take place, within the context of, or in spite of, the legal limits.

Finally, mention should again be made of the fact that this study
will not deal with the question of the comparative effectiveness of
either of these two Probation Officer Work Orientations in service
delivery (i.e., on recidivism rates of probationers). Change in a
person's behavioral patterns, and how this change is brought about in a
corrective setting, is a question which is not within our realm of
concern. Answers to the previous questions would involve an intense
search for unique ways in which different patterns of actual service
delivery, in interaction with the active participation of the recipient
of such a service, have an effect on later involvement in criminal
activities. An analysis, such as this, would require an in-depth look
at the probationer, a variable which has been almost totally excluded from this study. The focus is, rather, on work roles, their source, and their attitudinal and behavioral components, as they may be affected by formal structure. As such, at no point will there be intentional value judgments placed on either work orientation. Neither the L.W.O. nor the S.W.O. guarantee that the probationer will actually change (Pollard, 1974:25). The goal of both work orientations is to provide a proper setting in which the probationer can change if, and when, motivated to do so. The fascinating aspect about the whole idea of motivating the probationer to change is that probation officers have clearly developed contrasting styles by which to achieve this end. How and why these styles originate are the primary focus of this study.
CHAPTER IV

METHODS

4.1 Construction of Questionnaire

Construction of the questionnaire was preceded by an extensive review of the probation literature. The questionnaire contains some segments which have been used in previous studies of probation, and also some parts composed uniquely for this research. Both administrative and field level probation practitioners in Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island assisted greatly in the construction of the questionnaire, a situation which increased the respondents' acceptance of the tool.

A first draft of the questionnaire was used in a pre-test, administered in Saskatchewan to three probation officers in Saskatoon on June 16, 1978, and to three probation officers in Prince Albert on June 22, 1978. Feedback was requested from the pre-test respondents, related to validity of the questions, clarity and simplicity of the questions and relevance of the issues involved.

The researcher was present while the pre-test questionnaires were being filled out, in order to alleviate any of the problems that the probation officers might have in the interpretation of the questions and, more important, to discuss with the practitioners their suggested questions which might better assess the impact in the field of the different organizational Structures.

The pre-test questionnaire, used in both of the Saskatchewan regional offices, was identical, except that the three probation
officers in the Prince Albert regional office were also asked to respond to two hypothetical case studies. These were used to determine if there was any variation in the sentencing recommendations that a probation officer might suggest, given the specific administrative structure.

Probation officers in Prince Edward Island were not included in the pre-test, because in addition to taking into consideration the already small number of possible respondents (six), and the prohibitive expense of travelling to Prince Edward Island, to carry out the pre-test, the general areas of concern, as outlined in the questionnaire, were determined by the researcher, to be similar in both of the Provincial probation services.

Among the alterations made to the completed pre-test questionnaires, the most significant were as follows:

1) Questions were restructured, in order to clarify their purpose. This was especially the case with the attitudinal questions, which comprised the major portion of the first two parts in the questionnaire.

2) Part II of the questionnaire was modified to contain only questions which dealt with attitudes, irrespective of present policy and practices in the probation officer's own office.

4.2 Target Population

The six probation officers employed by the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island comprised the total population of possible respondents. In Saskatchewan, probation officers were segmented into two distinct groups:
a) those serving southern Saskatchewan;

b) those employed by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan (D.N.S.),

For the purpose of this study, those probation officers employed by the Department of Social Services, and working in eight regional offices in southern Saskatchewan, comprised the target population.

Probation officers employed by the D.N.S. were not included as part of the population. Although this area contained probation officers who served the needs of numerous probationers, this particular area of Saskatchewan received a circuit court type of probation service, which was not comparable to the probation service provided in the rest of Saskatchewan. As well, practitioners in various regional offices in Saskatchewan indicated to the researcher that the structure, and set up, of probation in northern Saskatchewan was not comparable with that provided throughout other regional offices in southern Saskatchewan.

Within Saskatchewan, there also existed the Indian Probation Officer's Program, which came into existence on June 1, 1975. The unique nature of this particular structure necessitated its exclusion from this study. The list, depicting the total number of probation officers and their respective places of employment in both Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, is found in appendix E, (page 184).

The total number of possible respondents in Saskatchewan (34) and the total number of possible respondents in Prince Edward Island (six) were included in the study. The total population was the target population, removing the need to use inferential statistics.
4.3 Questionnaire Distribution and Return Rate

The revised questionnaire, along with an introductory letter outlining its purpose (in appendices A and B, pages 152 to 175), was sent to the eight regional probation services offices in Saskatchewan and the central office of probation services in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, on July 25 and 26, 1978. (These offices are also listed in appendix E, page 184). A follow-up letter was sent to all probation services offices to alleviate concern that had been expressed by some probation officers, in both provinces, about the sensitivity of the information and the potential threat to their jobs. This same letter suggested that one of the field staff be put in charge of the administering and the “safe return” of the questionnaires. The researcher subsequently determined that one field staff probation officer in Prince Edward Island had been designated to act in this capacity, whereas, in Saskatchewan, this did not seem to be always the case.

For each of the eight regional probation services offices in Saskatchewan and the central office of probation services in Prince Edward Island, the appropriate number of questionnaires was forwarded, with one letter of explanation for each of the respective offices. The exact number of possible respondents, in each of the probation services offices, in both Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan, had been obtained from the Director of Probation Services in Prince Edward Island and one Regional Supervisor in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

A follow-up letter was mailed on September 8, 1978 to remind those probation officers, who had not yet completed and returned the questionnaire, to do so as soon as possible. There were two reasons for
waiting this period of time before sending a follow-up letter. First, the researcher determined the time period, in which the questionnaires were originally forwarded, coincided with vacation plans of some probation officers. Second, this time period allowed the probation officers a reasonable amount of time in which to complete the questionnaire, without feeling overly rushed. (Copies of all follow-up letters mailed to the different probation services offices are contained in appendix C, pages 176 to 179). Approximately one month after forwarding the follow-up letters to the probation services offices, the researcher made a further attempt to increase the response rate. Telephone calls were placed to three probation services offices to determine the cause of delay in returning the questionnaires. These telephone calls were followed up by a visit to two relatively large offices, at which time the researcher explained, in detail, the purpose to be served by the completion of the questionnaire. The probation officers in the two offices discussed with the researcher, along with other topic areas, the confidentiality of the data. After assurances were given that the respondent's identity would remain anonymous, the completed questionnaires were given to the researcher.

The researcher was able to appreciably increase the response rate by implementing the previously designated follow-up procedures, such that, five completed questionnaires were obtained by visiting the Regina probation services office, one completed questionnaire was obtained by visiting the North Battleford probation services office, one was forwarded to the researcher subsequent to the visit, and one completed questionnaire was obtained subsequent to the afore-mentioned telephone calls.
Table 4.1 indicates the percentage of questionnaires that were completed in each province, out of the total number possible.

Table 4.1 Percentage of Total Possible Completed Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Questionnaires Returned</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 indicates the probation officers in Saskatchewan had a response rate, according to province, of 56.9 percent, whereas, probation officers in Prince Edward Island had a response rate of 63.3 percent. Of the total number of questionnaires administered, Saskatchewan respondents made up 79.2 percent and Prince Edward Island respondents made up 20.8 percent.

The total number of respondents who completed the questionnaire was 24, out of a possible 40. This indicates that overall, 60 percent of the total number of possible respondents completed the questionnaires and returned them to the researcher. Two factors which combined to lower the return rate were:

1) The time the questionnaires were sent to the respective probation services offices coincided with the summer holidays of many probation officers.

2) A questionnaire had been completed just previously by most of the probation officers in Saskatchewan, and these practitioners expressed the opinion that "this whole process of filling out questionnaires was starting to be a bit of a drag". As noted previously,
several attempts were made by the researcher to improve upon the return
rate.

4.4 Operationalization and Coding of Variables

The variables in the model were operationalized by specific
questions included in the questionnaire. The variables are as follows:

1) Structure,
2) Individual background variables,
3) Probation Officer Work Orientation,
4) Five Measures of the probation officer acts.

The major focus for the following discussion will be to indicate
the question(s) utilized for each variable and the method by which the
responses were coded.

4.4.1 Structure

Structure was one of the independent variables that was predicted
to directly influence Probation Officer Work orientation and
indirectly, and directly, influence the five measures of the probation
officer acts. Question 39, as found in the questionnaire, only
indicated the Structure to which each of the probation officers
belonged. It was determined that differences existed, through
reference to Provincial Statutes, Annual Reports and/or Job
descriptions for both Provincial probation services. So, for the
purpose of operationalization, Structure was measured by location.
Location and Structure were treated as synonymous. The Structure
variable was coded as a dummy variable, with the Department of Justice
in Prince Edward Island being assigned 0, and the Department of Social
Services in Saskatchewan being assigned 1.
4.4.2 Individual Background Variables

The individual background variables also were predicted to directly influence Probation Officer Work Orientation and indirectly, and to directly, influence the five measures of the probation officer acts. Each of the four individual background variables, as chosen by the researcher, was represented by a particular question, as contained in the questionnaire. The variable name, the question used to operationalize this variable, and the procedure used for coding were as follows:

1) Years employed --- 40. For what period of time (in years) have you been employed in your present position (as a probation officer)?

This independent variable was coded by using raw scores to indicate the number of years a probation officer had spent in his present position.

2) Gender --------- 46. Gender: Female 1 Male

This independent variable was coded as a dummy variable, with female being assigned 0 and male being assigned 1.

3) Place of upbringing --

48. Would you say you were primarily from a (a) farm, (b) town, (c) city background?

This independent variable was coded by assigning values to each of these three categories: farm - 1, town - 2, city - 3.

4) Education level -- 51. Please indicate the level of education which you have attained. 1) Less than Grade XII, 2) Completed Grade XII, 3)
Technical School, 4) Some University (specify in years completed), 5) Community College, 6) Degree (specify) (i.e., Masters in Criminology), 7) Other (please specify).

This independent variable was coded by the combination of certain education levels, such that, the categories constituted education levels which were meaningful, in terms of the present study. The small number of cases, in the majority of the separate education level categories, indicated that a combination of certain categories was necessary. Categories 1, 2, 3, and 5, since they all consisted of education levels other than that obtained at a University level, were represented by the value (1). The categories of 4 and 7 (Certificate in Social Work) were represented by the value (2) since both consisted of a number of years completed in University. The category of 6 (degree), was broken down into two distinct categories, with the value (3) representing an undergraduate degree (Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Education, and Bachelor of Social Work), and the value (4) representing a Master's degree (Master of Arts, Master of Social Work, and Master of Criminology). It was determined that the major aspect of concern was the level of education, rather than the type of education.

4.4.3 Probation Officer Work Orientation

Probation Officer Work Orientation, for our purposes, was divided into two ideal types: Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.) and Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O.). In order to operationalize these, 23 items were devised (see appendix B, pages 154 to 176) and the respondent was
provided with standard Likert-type response categories (Fishbein, 1967): strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, strongly disagree. The statements were designed so that if a respondent answered positively (strongly agree or agree) to items 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 23, it would be an L.W.O. A negative response (strongly disagree or disagree) would indicate an S.W.O. On the other hand, if a positive answer was given to items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, it would indicate an L.W.O., and a negative answer would indicate an L.W.O. In coding the data, in order to determine a meaningful summary response score for each respondent, the Legalistic items were reverse coded before the score was determined.

Legalistic Items

strongly agree (5)  strongly disagree (1)

Social Work Items

strongly agree (1)  strongly disagree (5)

The result was that a relatively high composite mean score indicated a probation officer with an L.W.O., whereas, a relatively low composite mean score indicated a probation officer with an S.W.O.

The composite scale was evaluated to determine if the 23 items comprised a meaningful scale which could be legitimately summed. The criteria utilized for the evaluation were:

1) Inter-item correlations -- these should be positive and sizable.

2) Item-total correlation -- these should be greater than $\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}$

where $k$ = number of items in the scale.

Items not meeting the above criteria were eliminated, thus reducing the scale from 23 to eight items.
3) Magnitude of reliability coefficient, with coefficient $\alpha$ being the reliability estimate used.

The alpha coefficient ($\alpha$), an internal consistency estimate of reliability, was utilized to indicate whether the items chosen were internally consistent or, in other words, measured the same thing. An alpha coefficient of .70, or higher, is commonly accepted as an indication that the items used to make up a particular composite are internally consistent, and that guideline was used here.

The minimum acceptable item-total correlation, in combination with the inter-item correlation and the corresponding alpha coefficient, indicated which of the items comprised the most acceptable composite. The items, whose item-total correlations were positive, and greater than the minimum acceptable criterion, were retained, while those items whose item-total correlations were negative and/or less than the minimum acceptable criterion, were deleted from the composite.
### Table 4.2 The Composite "Probation Officer Work Orientation"

Item-Total Statistics for the 23 Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.53756</td>
<td>2.45455</td>
<td>1.01076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.65520</td>
<td>3.89182</td>
<td>0.89379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.70113</td>
<td>2.69112</td>
<td>1.30330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.42584</td>
<td>2.50000</td>
<td>1.01183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0.06326</td>
<td>3.46909</td>
<td>0.07555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.43997</td>
<td>3.59051</td>
<td>0.38012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.25155</td>
<td>2.36364</td>
<td>1.05307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.34154</td>
<td>3.27273</td>
<td>1.20245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1971</td>
<td>2.01818</td>
<td>1.15661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05229</td>
<td>2.45456</td>
<td>0.74955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.06772</td>
<td>2.40410</td>
<td>0.76018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.03193</td>
<td>3.27277</td>
<td>1.23179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.16490</td>
<td>3.06545</td>
<td>1.32949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.31399</td>
<td>1.90909</td>
<td>0.62636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.23778</td>
<td>2.31818</td>
<td>1.04115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.31398</td>
<td>2.36364</td>
<td>0.78954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.30555</td>
<td>3.10182</td>
<td>1.09702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.25259</td>
<td>2.85354</td>
<td>1.08213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.07925</td>
<td>2.40909</td>
<td>1.14086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.02612</td>
<td>3.85356</td>
<td>0.94089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.08297</td>
<td>2.72727</td>
<td>1.12045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.42499</td>
<td>2.77273</td>
<td>1.23179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.22927</td>
<td>3.90909</td>
<td>0.97145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum acceptable item-total correlation -- $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} = 0.21$

Coefficient of reliability = $(\alpha)$ = 0.39

As Table 4.2 makes apparent, the 23 items did notmeaningfully form a composite. There were, however, eight items, each with an item-total correlation greater than 0.21 or $\frac{1}{\sqrt{K}}$. Furthermore, seven of the 23 item-total correlations were negative. Lastly, the coefficient of reliability of 0.39 was relatively low. Item 23 was deleted because the most acceptable composite was possible only if this particular item did not appear in the item-total statistics, such that, the deletion of item 23 brought about a corresponding increase in the coefficient of reliability, from an unacceptable 0.39, to an acceptable 0.67.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum acceptable item-total correlation = $1/\sqrt{k} = .35$

Coefficient of reliability = $(k = .67)$

* Corrected item-total correlations for both these particular items are below the minimum acceptable item-total correlation, although they were retained because the most acceptable composite is not obtained if either, or both, item(s) is/are deleted.
4.4.4 Five Measures of the Probation Officer Acts

The five measures of the probation officer acts, as cited in the model, were considered to be dependent variables. Each measure was hypothesized to be directly influenced by Probation Office Work Orientation, Structure and each of the four individual background variables. Each measure was also hypothesized to be indirectly influenced, via the intervening variable, Probation Officer Work Orientation, by both Structure and each of the individual background variables. One question was composed to indicate each of the five measures of the probation officer acts. The variable name, the question used to operationalize this variable, and the procedure used for coding were as follows:

1) Probation officer - police

36. How many times have you had police assistance in supervisory surveillance, gathering information, etc., in the past year? (June 30th, 1977 - June 30th, 1978)

This dependent variable was coded by using raw scores to indicate the number of times the probation officer has had assistance from police.

2) Probation officer - social worker

52. How many of the following groups do you spend time with socially? Check as many as necessary, indicating those you spend the most time with, by the number 1, less time with number 2, and so on.
1) Social workers, (other than probation officers) ____
2) Police ____
3) Judges ____
4) Probation officers ____
5) Lawyers ____

Respondents were asked to rank each of the five different groups. Reverse coding was utilized, such that, each respondent was assigned a score of 5 through 1 for each of the five categories. The number 5 indicated the probation officer had spent the most amount of time with one particular group, whereas, the number 1 indicated the probation officer spent the least amount of time with another particular group.

For the purposes of this study and, in particular, the operationalization of the variable concerned, only social workers, as a group, were selected.

3) Probation officer - Judge

33. Approximately how many times, in the past year, have you informally spoken with a Judge outside the court setting?

(June 30th, 1977 - June 30th, 1978)

This independent variable was coded by using raw scores to indicate the number of times the probation officer had spoken informally with a judge outside the court setting.

4) Probation officer - Probationer

26. Please insert the appropriate percentage which most closely approximates the
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amount of time you spend per month at each of the following activities:

I spend approximately

(Fourth measure of the probation officer acts) — ___% of my time counselling clients.

— ___% of my time writing and investigating P.S.R.'s.

— ___% of my time in the courtroom.

(Fifth measure of the probation officer acts) — ___% of my time in consultation with my superiors.

— ___% of my time in consultation with police

The fourth measure utilized only one of the five activities referred to in Question 26 -- ___% of time counselling clients. This dependent variable was coded by using raw scores to indicate the percentage of time the probation officer spent counselling clients.

5) Probation officer - supervisor

26. (same as above)

The fifth measure utilized only one of the five activities referred to in Question 26 -- ___% of time in consultation with superiors. This dependent variable was coded by using raw scores to indicate the percentage of time the probation officer spent in consultation with superiors.

4.4.5 Open-ended Questions

Several open-ended questions were provided in the questionnaire to allow the respondent more freedom of response. Each of the seven designated open-ended questions (25, 27, 30, 37, 38, 54, and 56) was chosen to provide supplemental information. Meaningful categories were
constructed for the purpose of data analysis. The researcher was well aware that the constructed categories had to be general, not restrictive in their scope, and yet not so all-encompassing that they would lose specificity. The open-ended questions were as follows:

25. Why? (This question follows immediately after question 24 in the questionnaire - Under what administration would Probation Services be best carried out?)

The corresponding categories utilized, in analyzing this particular question, were as follows:

1) Responses indicating probation services should be administered by the Department of Social Services (i.e., Department of Social Services personnel have relatively easy access to various service agencies, which similarly provide assistance to the client, in terms of the rehabilitative process).

2) Responses indicating probation services should be administered by the Department of Justice (i.e., probation services are a legally based process and, as such, should be administered by a government department which has the legal system as its ally).

3) A distinction was not perceived (i.e., it does not matter under which government department probation services is administered).

4) No response.

27. In the following space, please specify other work-related activities which you engage in during regular work hours and which consume a portion of your average working day. Include the percentage which you deem most appropriate.
The corresponding categories utilized, in analyzing this particular question, were as follows:

1) Administrative type functions (i.e., writing memos, calculating statistics, supervision, running records, etc.).

2) Establishing good rapport with community agencies, such that, the probation officer was more effective, in terms of overall task performance (i.e., discussing common problem areas with local community agencies, partaking in discussion groups and explaining task expectations, and regular public relations work).

3) Behavior monitoring (i.e., determining the probationer's outside activities via numerous information sources).

30. In writing up a pre-sentence report, what information do you give priority?

The corresponding categories utilized, in analyzing this particular question, were as follows:

1) Information concerning mental and/or physical health (i.e., stability of home environment and corresponding influence on psychiatric assessment and/or drug-alcohol related assessment).

2) Information concerning the specific offense and/or circumstances surrounding the offense (i.e., the significance of peer group pressure, whether or not this constitutes his/her first criminal involvement, what were the precipitating factors, in terms of the initial perpetration of the offense, the type or serious nature of the offense (property versus physical injury related offenses), etc.).
37. If satisfied, what particular aspects of the position make it a rewarding type of job? 

(It is important to note that this question was related to question 36 in the questionnaire -- Are you satisfied with your present job position?

Yes  No)

The corresponding categories utilized, in analyzing this particular question, were as follows:

1) Community resources and the contacts made (i.e., numerous individuals and/or groups provide a wide range of interest areas and expertise upon which the probation officer can readily rely).

2) The type of assistance that is provided to the probationer (i.e., probation services provide an avenue by which constructive assistance can be provided to the probationer).

3) No response.

38. If not satisfied, what are the factors which contribute to this particular feeling? 

(It is important to note that this question was related to question 36 in the questionnaire -- already noted).

The corresponding categories utilized, in analyzing this particular question, were as follows:

1) Frustration of working with legal and court systems (i.e., the legal system provides a relatively poor basis for a helping relationship because the client realizes he/she has to report regularly to a probation officer, regardless of personal preference).
2) Frustration with bureaucracy (i.e., too much "red tape", not enough independence from rules and/or regulations).
3) No response.

54. Reasons: ________________________________ (This question followed immediately after the recommendation provided for Case I.)

The corresponding categories utilized, in analyzing this particular question, were as follows:
1) In-depth counselling (i.e., a real need exists for extensive personal counselling sessions).
2) Structural guidance (i.e., individual requires rules and/or guidelines, if a conformist type of lifestyle is to be achieved).
3) Straight facts (i.e., given the fact that he/she...one this particular occasion, the appropriate sentence appears to be...)

56. Reasons: ________________________________ (This question followed immediately after the recommendation provided for Case II.)

The corresponding categories utilized, in analyzing this particular question, were as follows:
1) Counselling, or the fact the probationer will make a better life for himself (i.e., the individual has potential, if it is indeed the desire of the probation officer to motivate the nourishment of such positive traits).
2) Make reference to criminal offense (i.e.,...is a serious offense and, as such...
4.5 Statistical Procedures Used to Analyze Data

A comparison of means and standard deviations was utilized as an initial test of the hypotheses on the differences between the two structures on Probation Officer Work Orientation, the five measures of the probation officer acts, and individual background variables. This indicated whether differences existed between probation services in Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan, in terms of the variables contained in the model.

Zero-order correlation coefficients were utilized to test the hypotheses and also to do a comparison of mean values, by examining the magnitude and direction of the relationships between the variables in the hypothesized model. A zero-order correlation coefficient that was [0.70] or above was considered strong (see Summary of Decision Standards Table). A zero-order correlation coefficient between [0.69] and [0.50] was considered relatively strong. A zero-order correlation coefficient between [0.49] and [0.30] was considered relatively weak. A zero-order correlation coefficient less than [0.30] was considered weak (Leonard, 1976:323). The matrix contained all the variables that comprised the model. These zero-order correlations indicated the interrelationships that were existing within the model, and whether the independent and dependent variables were related in a negative or a positive manner.

The coefficients of determination ($r^2$) were utilized, to supplement the comparison of means, and also to indicate the percentage of the variability in the dependent variable being explained by the differences between the two structures. The $r^2$ values could also have
been used as the basis for determining the previously mentioned zero-
order correlation coefficient ranges.

Summary of Decision Standards Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zero-order Correlation</th>
<th>Coefficient of Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( r )</td>
<td>( r^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than ( .30 )</td>
<td>Less than ( .09 ) -- Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [.30 ) to ( .49 )</td>
<td>( [.09 ) to ( .29 ) -- Relatively Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( [.50 ) to ( .69 )</td>
<td>( [.29 ) to ( .49 ) -- Relatively Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than ( .70 )</td>
<td>( [.49 ) -- Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple regression analysis was utilized to simultaneously control for the effects of independent variables, other than the independent variable under consideration. The adjusted R square \( (R^2) \) was used, instead of \( R^2 \), because \( R^2 \) was a more conservative estimate, keeping in mind the small number of cases being considered, and the large number of independent variables.

Kerlinger (1973) discusses the problem encountered when any social researcher is attempting to interpret the results obtained by multiple regression analysis. The usual problem is that the independent variables are correlated and, when "more independent variables are added, interpretation becomes still more complex and difficult" (Kerlinger, 1973:624). Although no method is completely satisfactory, in its bid to nullify this compounding effect, a researcher can make use of squared semipartial correlations (sometimes referred to as part correlations). These are calculated by using the following formula (Kerlinger, 1973:624):
$$Sp^2 = R^2_y, 12 \ldots K - R^2_y, 12 \ldots (K - 1)$$

In short, according to Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973:96) the formula:

...spells out a procedure which residualizes each successive independent variable on the independent variables that preceded it.

Squared semipartial correlations were used primarily in this study to interpret the variance the independent variables were able to explain in the dependent variables, independent of the other independent variables. Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973:93) contend that squared semipartial correlations are not only important in the gaining of a deeper understanding of multiple regression and correlation, but they are considered instrumental in the substantive interpretation of multiple regression results.

The squared semipartial correlations were instrumental in determining whether each independent variable explained a relatively large amount of variance, independent of the other independent variables, or if the variance explanation was negligible. In order for an independent variable to explain a relatively large amount of variance in the dependent variable, the researcher determined the amount of variance explained must be ten percent or greater. The preceding $r^2$ ranges were relatively consistent with ranges used for the multiple $R^2$ and $Sp^2$ in multiple regression.

The presence of an interaction effect between Structures and the individual background variables will be determined by including interaction terms in the multiple regression equation. If the interaction terms do not explain a relatively large amount of the variance in the dependent variables, they will be subsequently excluded from the analysis. A linear additive regression model will then be assumed.
The standardized beta coefficient ($B^*$) was utilized as a further means of assessing the effect of an independent variable, independent of the other independent variables, on the dependent variable. (Supplementary to SP2). The use of ($B^*$) determined the direction of the effect and involved a similar procedure to that used in path analysis.

The following diagram, besides helping to illustrate the indirect and direct effect, indicates the operation and interpretation of an indirect effect. The five measures of the probation officer acts could be either directly influenced by Structure, or indirectly influenced by Structure via the intervening variable, Probation Officer Work Orientation:

1. It is possible for Probation Officer Work Orientation to be an independent, dependent, and intervening variable, although never simultaneously, as it is only possible to deal with one relationship at a time in any model.

The indirect effect was estimated by following the procedure employed in path analysis. The magnitude and direction of the indirect effect was determined by multiplying the appropriate beta (path) coefficients. To determine the indirect effect between Structure and Number of Times Probation Officers Seek Police Assistance, via Probation Officer Work Orientation, as indicated in the above diagram, it was necessary to multiply (A) by (B).
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

5.1 Discussion of Model Variables Using Comparison of Means

The preceding chapter provided a description of the methodology to be implemented in this particular study. This chapter applies the statistical procedures which provide a quantitative picture of the data and which test the validity of the stated hypotheses.

Table 5.1 indicates that probation officers in Saskatchewan, as compared to those in Prince Edward Island, (Saskatchewan, with respect to statistical procedures in this study, will always be mentioned first, primarily to provide consistency in measurement), are more likely to have been working in their present employment capacity for a relatively longer period of time, presumably because adult probation services have been in existence in the province of Saskatchewan since 1949, whereas, in Prince Edward Island, adult probation services commenced in 1972.

Saskatchewan probation officers have a relatively low level of education. Initially the educational grade level requirement for probation officers in Saskatchewan was relatively low, although it has, since then, been consistently upgraded. In contrast, in Prince Edward Island, the educational grade level requirement has, since the inception of probation services in 1972, always been a master’s degree.
Table 5.1 Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>P.E.I. (n=5)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Sask. (n=19)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. Empl.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R - U</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.W.O.</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>33.46</td>
<td>19.79</td>
<td>30.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>31.85</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>25.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couns.</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>15.29</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sup.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In regard to the variable Gender, all five of the respondents in Prince Edward Island were male. In Saskatchewan, the total number of 19 respondents included 13 males and six females.

For the purpose of data analysis the following symbols will represent the variables contained in the model:

- Struc. = Structure
- Yrs. Empl. = Years Employed
- Gender = Gender
- R-U = Place of Upbringing
- Educ. = Education Level
- P.W.O. = Probation Officer Work Orientation
- Pol. = Number of Times Probation Officers Seek Police Assistance
- S.W. = Amount of Informal Time Spent With Social Workers
- Judge = Number of Times Probation Officers Speak informally With a Judge
- Couns. = Percentage of Time Spent Counselling
- C. Sup. = Percentage of Time Spent in Consultation With Superiors
Probation officers in Saskatchewan have a Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.) whereas, probation officers in Prince Edward Island have an Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O.). Saskatchewan probation officers seek police assistance relatively less often, presumably because a probation officer employed with the Department of Social Services has a different work orientation, and as a direct result, the areas of mutual concern are relatively few in number and/or type. Probation officers in Saskatchewan spend relatively more time with social workers, presumably because there is greater opportunity for accessibility and/or regular contact.

5.2 Zero-Order Correlations

5.2.1 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients Between Structure and Probation Officer Work Orientation

In Table 5.2, the zero-order correlation ($r$), between Structure (Struc.) and Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.), (-.45), indicates probation officers employed with the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan are more likely to have a Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.) whereas, probation officers in Prince Edward Island are more likely to have a Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O.). The respective mean values of P.W.O. for Saskatchewan (19.06) and Prince Edward Island (23.80) are consistent with this relationship.

The coefficient of determination ($r^2$) between Struc. and P.W.O. (.2025) indicates 20.25 percent of the variability in P.W.O. is being explained by the differences between the two Structures (Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan and the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island). It should be noted that both the $r$ and $r^2$ values are
### Table 5.2 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Struc.</td>
<td>0.7917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yrs. Empl.</td>
<td>3.6125</td>
<td>2.7258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-U</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ.</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.W.O.</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W.</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couns.</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sup.</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>5.5417</td>
<td>2.5662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determined, without taking into consideration the influence of other
independent variables.

This data supports the first hypothesis, that probation officers
in Saskatchewan will have a relatively strong S.W.O., as compared to
probation officers in Prince Edward Island.

5.2.2 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients Between Each of the
Four Individual Background Variables and Probation Officer
Work Orientation

1) Years Employed (Yrs. Empl.) and Probation Officer Work Orien-
tation (P.W.O.)

The relatively strong relationship \( r = .52 \) suggests that proba-
tion officers with shorter work experience will more likely have an
L.W.O., whereas probation officers with longer work experience will
more likely have an S.W.O. The respective mean values of Yrs. Empl.
for Saskatchewan (3.67) and Prince Edward Island (3.40) are consistent
with this relationship. The \( r^2 \) value (.2704) indicates 27.04 percent
of the variability in P.W.O. is explained by Yrs. Empl.

2) Gender and Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.)

There is a weak but clear relationship \( r = .23 \) between Gender and
P.W.O. with females being more likely than males to have an L.W.O. All
of the female respondents (six) were employed with the Department of
Social Services in Saskatchewan. The \( r^2 \) value (.0529) however, indi-
cates that only 5.29 percent of the variability in P.W.O. is being
explained by Gender.

3) Place of Upbringing (R-U) and Probation Officer Work Orienta-
tion (P.W.O.)
A weak but positive relationship \( r = .18 \) indicates that probation officers raised on a farm (coded 1) will more likely have an S.W.O. However, the mean values indicated probation officers in Saskatchewan are more likely to have a city/urban type of upbringing, such that, the location variable (Structure) has probably weakened this particular relationship. The \( r^2 \) value (.0784) indicates 7.84 percent of the variability in P.W.O. is being explained by R-U.

4) Education Level (Educ.) and Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.)

A weak but positive relationship \( r = .31 \) indicates that as education increases, the more likely the probation officer will have an L.W.O. The respective mean values of Educ. for Saskatchewan (2.63) and Prince Edward Island (4.00) are consistent with this relationship. The \( r^2 \) value (.0961) indicates 9.61 percent of the variability in P.W.O. is explained by Educ.

5.2.3 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients Between Structure and Each of the Five Measures of the Probation Officer Acts

1) Structure (Struc.) and Number of times Probation Officers Seek Police Assistance (Pol.)

The negative relationship \( r = -.28 \) between Struc. and Pol. suggests that Saskatchewan probation officers seek police assistance less often than Prince Edward Island probation officers. The respective mean values of Struc. for Saskatchewan (10.79) and Prince Edward Island (41.40) are consistent with this relationship. The \( r^2 \) value (.0324) indicates 3.24 percent of the variability in Pol. is being explained by Struc.

2) Structure (Struc.) and Amount of informal Time Spent With Social Workers (S.W.)
It appears from an $r$ of .38 that probation officers in Saskatchewan spend relatively more informal time with social workers than probation officers in Prince Edward Island. The respective mean values of Struc. for Saskatchewan (4.31) and Prince Edward Island (2.75) are consistent with this relationship. The $R^2$ value (.1444) indicates 14.44 percent of the variability in S.W. is being explained by Struc.

3) Structure (Struc.) and Number of Times Probation Officers Speak Informally With A Judge (Judge)

A negative relationship ($r$.44) suggests that probation officers employed with the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan speak relatively less often with a Judge as compared to probation officers employed with the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island. The respective mean values of Struc. for Saskatchewan (26.36) and Prince Edward Island (57.00), in addition to being consistent with this relationship, indicate probation officers in Saskatchewan speak informally to a Judge less than half as often as probation officers in Prince Edward Island. The $r^2$ value (.1936) indicates 19.36 percent of the variability in Judge is being explained by Struc.

4) Structure (Struc.) and Percentage of Time Spent Counselling (Couns.)

The relatively weak positive relationship ($r$.43) indicates probation officers in Saskatchewan spend more time counselling clients than probation officers in the province of Prince Edward Island. The respective mean values of Struc. for Saskatchewan (36.42) and Prince Edward Island (20.20) are consistent with this relationship. It should be noted the previously designated mean values also indicate probation officers in Saskatchewan spend almost twice as much time counselling as
do probation officers in Prince Edward Island. The \( r^2 \) value (.1040) indicates 18.49 percent of the variability in Couns. is being explained by Struc.

8) Structure (Struc.) and Percentage of Time Spent in Consultation with Superiors (C. Sup.)

A weak but positive relationship \( (r=.30) \) indicates probation officers employed with the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan spend relatively more time in consultation with superiors, compared to probation officers employed with the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island. The respective mean values of Struc. for Saskatchewan (5.95) and Prince Edward Island (4.00) are consistent with this relationship. The \( r^2 \) value (.0900) indicates 9.00 percent of the variability in C. Sup. is being explained by Struc.

5.2.4 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients Between Each of the Four Individual Background Variables, and Each of the Five Measures of the Probation Officer Acts

With the exception of three relationships, all the zero-order correlations between individual background variables and the five measures of the probation officer acts are very weak. However, the following are worth noting:

1) Education Level (Educ.) and Percentage of Time Spent Counselling (Couns.)

A negative relationship \( (r=-.43) \) shows that probation officers with a relatively low level of education, will spend a greater percentage of their time counselling clients than probation officers with a relatively high level of education. The respective mean values of Educ. for Saskatchewan (2.63) and Prince Edward Island (4.00) are consistent with this relationship, such that, they indicate probation
officers in Saskatchewan have a relatively low education level, as compared to probation officers in Prince Edward Island. The \( r^2 \) value (.1849) indicates 18.49 percent of the variability in Comms. is explained by Educ.

2) Gender and Number of Times Probation Officers Seek Police Assistance (Pol.)

A positive relationship \( (r=.33) \) suggests males are more likely to seek police assistance than females. The independent variable, Gender, as noted, was coded as a dummy variable, with female being assigned 0, and male being assigned 1, and as such, mean values were not calculated as they relate to this particular independent variable. The \( r^2 \) value (.1109) indicates 10.89 percent of the variability in Pol. is explained by Gender.

3) Gender and Percentage of Time Spent in Consultation With Superiors (C. Sup.)

The negative relationship \( (r=-.32) \) indicates females are more likely to spend a greater percentage of their time in consultation with superiors than are males. The independent variable, Gender, as was aforementioned, was coded as a dummy variable, and as such, mean values were not calculated in this particular instance. The \( r^2 \) value (.1024) indicates 10.24 percent of the variability in C. Sup. is explained by Gender.

The above discussion is merely taking into account simple relationships between two variables, and does not take into consideration the other differences, independent of each other. Multiple regression will be utilized to provide information of this particular type.
5.4 Independent Variables and Their Ability to Explain Variance, Independent of Each Other in the Dependent Variable(s)

Multiple regression, as a statistical procedure, was utilized to simultaneously control for the effects of the independent variables, other than the independent variable under consideration. Therefore, the goal of the researcher, in this particular instance, was to determine which smallest number of independent variables could be utilized to explain the greatest amount of variance in the dependent variable being considered.

The direct effect, as depicted in Table 5.3 by the standardized beta coefficient ($\beta^*$), indicates that with a standard deviation unit change in the independent variable there is a corresponding standard deviation unit change in the dependent variable concerned. This implies, based on the relative size of the corresponding beta coefficient, and the squared semi-partial correlation ($S^{2}$) (this statistical procedure enabled the researcher to determine if the amount of variance explanation was relatively large, 10 percent or greater, or indeed negligible, less than 10 percent) that one particular independent variable, independent of the remaining independent variables, was the most important predictor of the dependent variable being considered. The use of $\beta^*$ determined the direction of the influence and was utilized primarily as a supplementary means to $S^{2}$ by which to assess the influence of an independent variable, independent of the other independent variables, on the dependent variable.

The $R^2$ value indicates that the independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain a certain amount of the variance in a particular dependent variable. The shrunken or adjusted
Table 5.3 Multiple Regression of Independent Variables on Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRUC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.W.O.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT EFFECT</td>
<td>-.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^*$</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^2$</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^2$</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT EFFECT</td>
<td>-.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^*$</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^2$</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^2$</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT EFFECT</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^*$</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^2$</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^2$</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT EFFECT</td>
<td>-.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^*$</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^2$</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^2$</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT EFFECT</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^*$</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^2$</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^2$</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.SUP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT EFFECT</td>
<td>-.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta^*$</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta^2$</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi^2$</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$R^2$ value provides a relatively more conservative estimate of the variance in the dependent variable being simultaneously explained by the independent variables, taking into consideration the small size of the population and the relatively large number of independent variables. The indirect effect will be determined, following the procedure indicated in the preceding methods chapter.

5.4.1 Multiple Regression Between Individual Background Variables, Structure and Probation Officer Work Orientation

Table 5.3 indicates that the five independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain 56 percent of the variance in Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.) ($R^2 = .56$). The shrunken multiple ($\overline{R^2} = .43$) is relatively smaller, however, being a more conservative estimate, it takes into consideration the small size of the population and the relatively large number of independent variables.

The direct effect (-.468), in Table 5.3., indicates, based on the relative size of the corresponding beta coefficient and the squared semi-partial correlation coefficient ($SP^2 = .134$), that Structure (Struc.), independent of the individual background variables, is the most important predictor of P.W.O. The corresponding sign indicates that if a probation officer is employed by the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan, it is more likely he/she will have a Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.), whereas, if a probation officer is employed by the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island, it is more likely he/she will have a Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O.).

The $SP^2 (.134)$ indicates that Struc., independent of the individual background variables, explains approximately 13 percent of the
variance in P.W.O. The administrative Structure (Struc.) within which a probation officer functions, whether it be the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan, or alternatively, the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island, therefore influences P.W.O., independent of the individual background variables, as we initially hypothesized. This particular relationship occurs because if a probation officer is employed within a particular work environment, his/her work orientation is determined primarily by Struc. itself, rather than by other independent variables. The probation officer may indeed gravitate towards a particular administrative Structure, merely because of his/her prior academic training, geographical residential preference, etc., although in the final analysis, he/she must function within a prescribed set of administrative rules and/or regulations, thus resulting in a particular P.W.O. Alternatively, the probation officer can seek employment elsewhere, if the administrative Structure concerned is not to his/her liking.

Given that Struc., independent of the individual background variables, is able to explain in excess of ten percent of the variance in P.W.O., the data supports H2, as follows:

H2 - Structure will have a direct effect on Probation Officer Work Orientation

The direct effect (-.403), depicted in Table 5.3, indicates, based on the relative size of the SR (.112), that Years Employed (Yrs. Empl.), independent of the individual background variables, is the second most important predictor of P.W.O. The corresponding sign
(.403) indicates that probation officers employed at their present position for a relatively short period of time are more likely to have an L.W.O. One factor to be considered, when making inferences from the aforementioned relationship, is that probation officers in Saskatchewan have been employed, on the average, for a relatively longer period of time, as compared to probation officers employed in the Province of Prince Edward Island. In addition, the provision of probation services in the Province of Saskatchewan has taken place for a relatively longer period of time (inception dates of respective probation services - Saskatchewan, 1949; Prince Edward Island, 1972), therefore, the correlation between Yrs. Empl. and P.W.O. may more so be influenced by the specific administrative structure, within which the probation officer is presently employed, rather than the actual number of years employed in said Struc. In this particular instance the independent variables, Struc., Yrs. Empl., and Education Level (Educ.), overlap each other, in terms of influence, and as a direct result the presence of one is likely to cancel out the effect/influence of the others.

The $\text{Sp}^2 (\cdot.112)$ indicates that Yrs. Empl., independent of Struc. and the other individual background variables, explains approximately eleven percent of the variance in P.W.O., thus partially supporting $H_2$, as follows:

$H_2$ - Each of the four individual background variables (Years Employed, Gender, Type of Upbringing or Education Level), have direct effects on Probation Officer Work Orientation.

As Table 5.3 indicates, the corresponding $\text{Sp}^2$ for three of the possible five independent variables (Gender, Place of Upbringing (R-U), and Education Level (Educ.), .027, .071 and .000, respectively), were
not of a sufficient size to support the data. In other words, these three particular independent variables were unable to explain the minimum acceptable variance of ten percent in P.W.O., thus not supporting H₂. In terms of providing an explanation as to why each of the three aforementioned independent variables was unable to explain at least ten percent of the variance in P.W.O., independent of the other independent variables consider the following:

Firstly, although all six female respondents were employees of the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan, Gender, as an independent variable, did not explain any variance in P.W.O.

Secondly, R-U is unable to explain any variance in P.W.O. The probation officer could initially reside in a rural setting, subsequently receive his secondary education background in the urban setting, thereby contributing to a possible conflict of orientations as the scholastic career progresses. In other words, in terms of physical geographical location, the probation officer could be born in a rural setting, receive his University education, or alternative scholastic training, in an urban setting, and the P.W.O. would ultimately be influenced by a combination of both these environmental factors.

Thirdly, Educ. is overlapping, in terms of influence on the P.W.O., primarily with respect to Struc. and Yrs. Empl., thereby subtracting from its potential to explain variance in the dependent variable concerned. Probation officers in Saskatchewan have various educational backgrounds, in terms of actual grade levels, because probation services have been in existence in this particular province since 1949, whereas, in Prince Edward Island, probation services were
enacted in 1972, and since that time the minimum acceptable grade level has been a master's degree. In addition, the probation officers in Saskatchewan, on the average, have been employed for a relatively longer period of time, such that, it is difficult to accurately ascertain the extent to which these three particular independent variables (Educ., Struc. and Yrs. Empl.) overlap, in terms of their influence on P.W.O.

5.4.2 Multiple Regression Between Individual Background Variables, Structure, Probation Office Work Orientation and the Number of Times Probation Officers Seek Police Assistance

Table 5.3 indicates that the six independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain 34 percent of the variance in the Number of Times Probation Officers Seek Police Assistance (Pol.). The shrunken multiple \( R^2 = .09 \) indicates that the same six independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain nine percent of the variance in the aforementioned dependent variable.

Table 5.3 indicates that the squared semipartial correlation coefficient \( \text{SP}^2 \) for each of the six independent variables is not of a sufficient size to support the hypothesis. In other words, each of the six independent variables, independent of each other, is unable to explain the previously designated minimum acceptable variance in Pol., thus not supporting any of the hypotheses. Structure (Struc.) and Years Employed (Yrs. Empl.), as independent variables, were both able to explain a similar amount of variance in Pol.

Yrs. Empl. overlaps Struc. and Education Level (Educ.), such that, the amount of variance explained by Yrs. Empl. may be negatively or
positively influenced by those, as well as the other, independent variables. Females and males seek assistance from the police approximately the same number of times, a factor perhaps resulting from a similar educational background, the corresponding Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.), Yrs. Emp., or the administrative Structure within which they are presently employed. In other words, the overlap of the aforementioned independent variables may be subtracting from the influence of Gender on Pol.

The Place of Upbringing (R-U), as an independent variable, was unable to explain a sufficient amount of variance in Pol. to support any of the hypotheses, primarily because probation officers have instilled firm impressions of how to interact with police authorities, possibly as a direct result of their academic training, prior to being employed as a probation officer, regardless of the administrative Structure concerned. In addition, working within the confines of the Department of Social Services, the probation officer must overcome the obvious philosophical distinctions, real or assumed, between police officers and social workers. In other words, R-U, as an independent variable, overlaps other independent variables, including Educ., and P.W.O., thereby subtracting from its ultimate potential to explain variance in Pol.

P.W.O. was also unable to explain a sufficient amount of variance in Pol. to support any of the hypotheses. This particular independent variable overlaps the other independent variables, especially Struc., Yrs. Emp., and Educ., thereby subtracting from its ability to explain variance in Pol. It is apparent from the corresponding $R^2$ values that
Struc. and Yrs. Empl. are the best predictors of Pol., although the aforementioned overlapping process undermines the potential for influence of even these particular independent variables.

The indirect effect (.172) indicates that Struc., via P.W.O., and keeping in mind the relatively high beta coefficient (-.502), and squared semipartial correlation coefficient (.090), is the most important predictor of Pol. In some instances in the data analysis, as was the case in this particular instance, it was determined that the indirect effect sign, as it relates specifically to .172, and the direct effect sign, as designated by the beta coefficient, as it relates specifically to -.502, do not correspond. It would be natural to assume that these signs would usually correspond, keeping in mind the relationship between a particular independent and a particular dependent variable is, in both instances, being considered for study. Two possible reasons for the occurrence of differing signs, as it relates to the aforementioned statistical values, are as follows: 1) the small number of cases and 2) the relatively large number of independent variables.

Table 5.3 also indicates Yrs. Empl, independent of the other independent variables, is able to explain a similar amount of variance in Pol., as Struc. (nine percent), although, the corresponding beta coefficient was not of an equal value. The SP², in combination with the corresponding beta coefficient, indicates Yrs. Empl. is the second most important predictor of Pol.
5.4.3 Multiple Regression Between Individual Background Variables, Structure, Probation Officer Work Orientation and the Percentage of Time Spent Counselling

Table 5.3 indicates that the six independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain 42 percent of the variance in the Percentage of Time Spent Counselling (Couns.). The shrunken multiple ($R^2 = .20$) indicates that the same six independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain 20 percent of the variance in the aforementioned dependent variable.

Table 5.3 also indicates that both Place of Upbringing (R-U) and Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.) are the only two independent variables able to explain any of the variance in Couns., taking into consideration the independent variance capability of each of the six independent variables. Table 5.3 indicates that the $R^2$ for P.W.O. (.186) is the only $R^2$ of a sufficient size to support the fourth hypothesis, as follows:

$H_4$ - Probation Officer Work Orientation will have a direct effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.) is able to explain 12.8 percent of the variability in Couns., primarily because a probation officer's work orientation is of the utmost importance, when considering his manner of job performance. As is evidenced by the corresponding beta coefficient (.576), a probation officer with a Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.), will spend more time counselling, whereas, a probation officer with a Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O.), will spend relatively less time counselling. The $R^2$, in
addition to the corresponding size of the beta coefficient, suggests that P.W.O., independent of the other independent variables, is the most important predictor of Counts.

Structure (Struc.), as an independent variable, although not explaining any of the variance in Counts, as determined by the $SP^2$, has the largest value, in terms of the indirect effect (.270) which would seem to suggest there is an overlapping of statistical influence in this particular instance, as it relates specifically to the influence of Struc. and P.W.O. on Counts. R-U, in addition to being the only other independent variable able to explain any variance in Counts. ($SP^2 = .042$), also has the second largest beta coefficient value (.293) thus indicating it is the second best predictor of Counts. There does not appear to be any rationale for the existence of such a statistical relationship, other than the suggestion that there may again be an overlapping of influence between the independent variables involved, thus artificially increasing the variance explanation ability of a particular independent variable. The four remaining independent variables do not explain any variance in $SP^2$, although they can be ranked, in terms of importance, by method of perusing their respective beta coefficient values.

5.4.4 Multiple Regression Between Individual Background Variables, Structure, Probation Officer Work Orientation and the Number of Times Probation Officers Speak Informally With A Judge

Table 5.3 indicates that the six independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain 30 percent of the variance in the Number of Times Probation Officers Speak Informally With A Judge (Judge). The shrunken multiple ($R^2 = .04$) indicates that the same six
independent variables explain approximately four percent of the variance in the aforementioned dependent variable.

Table 5.3 also indicates both Structure (Struc.) and Education Level (Educ.) were the only two independent variables able to explain any of the variance in Judge, taking into simultaneous consideration the variance capability of each of the six independent variables (each of the two aforementioned independent variables was able to explain approximately four percent of the variance in Judge). The $R^2$ values for both Struc. and Educ. were not of a sufficient amount to support any of the hypotheses.

Struc., as an independent variable, although it does not explain a sufficient amount of variance in order to support any of the corresponding hypotheses, does have the largest value, in terms of both the indirect effect (0.016) and direct effect (-0.026), the latter being measured by means of the beta coefficient, thus indicative of the fact that Struc. is the best predictor of Judge. Considering the same values for Educ., it was determined that this particular independent variable was the second best predictor of Judge.

Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.O.W.O.), in addition to not being able to explain a sufficient amount of variance in Judge to support any of the hypotheses, by virtue of the corresponding $R^2$ value (0.001), had the lowest value, with respect to the beta coefficient (-0.034), thus indicating P.O.W.O., as an independent variable, was the least able to be a predictor of Judge. P.O.W.O. was unable to explain a sufficient amount of variance in Judge, primarily because of the overlapping effect noted earlier in this particular chapter of the study.
It is important to note, however, that Struc. was the most important predictor of Judge, regardless if it was able to explain sufficient variance in Judge to support any of the hypotheses. A similar ranking system, as that noted in Section 5.4.3, preceding, can be implemented, with respect to the remaining four independent variables, and their respective abilities to explain variance in the dependent variable, Judge.

5.4.5 Multiple Regression Between Individual Background Variables, Structure, Probation Officer Work Orientation and the Amount of Informal Time Spent With Social Workers

Table 5.3 indicates that the six independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain 34 percent of the variance in the Amount of Informal Time Spent With Social Workers (S.W.). The shrunken multiple ($R^2 = .02$) indicates that the same six independent variables explain approximately two percent of the variance in S.W., when considering the simultaneous independent variance explanation ability of each of the six independent variables.

Table 5.3 also indicates Structure (Struc.) and Gender were each able to explain approximately two percent of the variance in S.W., although this amount was not of a sufficient amount to support any of the hypotheses. One explanation, as to why Gender was able to explain an equal amount of variance, as that of Struc., is that all six female respondents work in the Province of Saskatchewan, and in addition, the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan, as an organizational Structure, is relatively conducive to the commencement of interpersonal relationships, both formal and informal in origin, between social workers and probation officers. It is therefore somewhat difficult to accurately ascertain as to whether the amount of time spent with social
workers is influenced more by Struc. or alternatively by Gender.

Struc., by making reference to the corresponding $r^2 (0.021)$, indirect and direct (beta coefficient) values (.072 and .428, respectively), is the best predictor of S.W., although it is unable to explain a sufficient amount of variance in said dependent variable to support any of the hypotheses.

Probation Officer Work Orientation (P.W.O.) is unable to explain any variance in S.W., with the primary factor, in this regard, being the difficulty in determining its ultimate independent influence on S.W., considering the overlapping influence of Struc. and the other independent variables. Struc., as an independent variable, specifically would overlap with P.W.O., considering social workers would have relatively more opportunity to socialize with probation officers if they were employed within the Department of Social Services; their educational backgrounds would, in all likelihood, be similar; and lastly, their respective work orientations would be similar.

Four independent variables, as depicted in Table 5.3, do not explain any variance in S.W., although as noted earlier, these can be ranked by perusing their respective beta coefficient values.

5.4.5 Multiple Regression Between Individual Background Variables, Structure, Probation Officer Work Orientation and the Percentage of Time Spent in Consultation With Superiors

Table 5.3 indicates that the six independent variables, when taken into consideration simultaneously, explain 21 percent of the variance in the Percentage of Time Spent in Consultation With Superiors (C. Sup.). The shrunken multiple ($R^2 = .00$) indicates that the same six
independent variables are not able to explain any of the variance in C. Sup.

Table 5.3 also indicates, by means of reviewing the corresponding $\text{sp}^2$ values, that each and every one of the six independent variables was unable to explain any of the variance in C. Sup., thereby not supporting any of the hypotheses. Structure (Struc.), by virtue of the corresponding beta coefficient (.408), was determined to be the best predictor of C. Sup., whereas, Gender was the second best predictor of C. Sup. One possible rationale for Struc. being the most important predictor of C. Sup. is that probation officers in the Province of Saskatchewan work in close association with their superiors, whereas, in Prince Edward Island physical distance, although relatively minimal, does prevent regular contact between field staff personnel and the Director of Probation and Family Court Services, who works in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island.

The overlapping influence of independent variables appears to be a matter of concern in this particular instance, thereby actually increasing or alternatively decreasing the corresponding $\text{sp}^2$, $B^*$ and/or indirect effect values. The ranking system aforementioned in section 5.4.5 can again be implemented in this particular case.

5.5 Categorical Variables

5.5.1 Structure and The Reasons Provided for Why Probation Services Would be Best Carried Out by a Particular Administrative Structure

The following discussion of categorical variables will provide complementary information to that already provided as a direct result of multiple regression analysis. Table 5.4 indicates that there is a difference between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, in terms of
the Department of Social Services. This indicates that 66.42 percent of the probation officers in Saskatchewan provided reasons, or indeed felt, that it is better to have probation services under the administration of the Department of Social Services, whereas, none of the probation officers in Prince Edward Island provided such reasons.

Two responses which help to clarify the preceding type of statement, regardless of the Structure involved, are as follows:

1) Social Services administering probation services lessens the chances of the Judicial system, or any other prosecution arm of the system (i.e., the police), being the main determinants of how the client is handled by the probation officer.

2) Social Services has access to a body of material and resources, which, if made available, provides a valuable source of communication and co-ordination between all services which are involved with the client.

The preceding difference in the respective administrative Structures, Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan and Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island, and those differences to be indicated in the following pages of this study, may occur, due to the size of the organizational Structures themselves, the aforementioned including the geographical areas being provided probation services, and the number of supervisory and field staff involved in service delivery. In addition, the length or time the probation service has been operational may bring about administrative differences. Accountability, especially as it relates to various levels of supervisory personnel, may also be instrumental in bringing about these differences.
Table 5.4: Determination of Differences Between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island Probation Officers, as it Relates Specifically to the Question, "Under What Administration Would Probation Services Be Best Carried Out?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>Dept. of S.S.</th>
<th>Dept. of J.</th>
<th>No Dist. Perc.</th>
<th>N. R.</th>
<th>Total Percentage</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>98.42</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dept. of S.S. = Responses indicating probation services should be administered by the Department of Social Services.

Dept. of J. = Responses indicating probation services should be administered by the Department of Justice.

No Dist. Perc. = A distinction in administration is not perceived.

N. R. = No response.

n = Number of cases being considered in both Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island.

Table 5.4 also indicates that there is a difference between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, in terms of the Department of Justice. This indicates that 5.26 percent of the probation officers in Saskatchewan believed that it is better to have probation services under the administration of the Department of Justice, whereas, 100 percent of the probation officers in Prince Edward Island were of the same opinion.

One response which helps to clarify the preceding statement, regardless of the structure involved, is as follows:

Probation services should be carried out by the Department of Justice, since probation involves legal principles and boundaries, and functions within the Criminal Justice System.
Table 5.4 indicates a difference between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, such that, 5.26 percent of the probation officers in the Province of Saskatchewan perceive no distinction, when it comes to comparing different administrative Structures. Table 5.4 also indicates that there is a difference between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, such that, 21.11 percent of the probation officers in Saskatchewan did not respond to this particular question. The preceding percentage was made up of approximately eleven percent of the probation officers who did not respond to the previous question, concerning their actual choice of administrative Structure for probation services; approximately five percent who stated that they "did not know the difference" in the previous question contained in the questionnaire; and approximately five percent who stated it "didn't really matter".

5.5.2 Structure and the Percentage of Regular Work Hours Spent, in Terms of Specified Work-Related Activities
Table 5.5 Determination of Differences Between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island Probation Officers, as it Relates Specifically to the Question, "Please Insert the Appropriate Percentage Which Most Closely Approximates the Amount of Time You Spend Per Month at Each of the Following Activities..."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>Admin. Type Func.</th>
<th>Rapport</th>
<th>Beh. Mon.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admin. Type Func. = Administrative Type Functions.
Rapport = Establishing rapport with community agencies which help the probation officer to be more effective with client.

Table 5.5 indicates that there is a difference between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, such that, a greater percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan engage themselves in administrative functions, than do probation officers in Prince Edward Island. Table 5.5 also indicates that there is no difference per se between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, in that probation officers in both administrative structures establish rapport with other community agencies to approximately the same degree.

Table 5.5 indicates that zero percent of the probation officers in Saskatchewan have stated that they engage in behavior monitoring, while 40 percent of the probation officers stated they do so in Prince Edward Island. This particular difference clearly indicates that probation officers in Saskatchewan do not consider the function of behavior monitoring to be of any appreciable importance, in terms of their daily
routine, whereas, probation officers in Prince Edward Island apparently place a considerable amount of emphasis in this particular function. Behavior monitoring is the type of task which a probation officer working within the Department of Social Services would have considerable difficulty performing, primarily because the probation officer would be acting in a manner which did not correspond with his/her educational background and/or the philosophy/orientation instilled within the probation services field staff, as a direct result of administrative rules and/or guidelines.

5.5.2 Structure and Information on a Pre-Sentence Report Given Priority Status

Table 5.6 Determination of Differences Between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island Probation Officers, as it Relates Specifically to the Question, "In Writing a Pre-Sentence Report, What Information Do You Give Priority?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>Inf. Men. Phy.</th>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>73.60</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inf. Men. Phy. = Information concerning mental and/or physical health.

Offense = Information concerning circumstances surrounding the offense.

Table 5.6 indicates that a greater percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan give priority to information concerning mental and/or physical health. This particular difference constitutes supportive data in the sense that it clearly indicates that the probation officers in Saskatchewan are relatively more concerned about
emphasizing information on a pre-sentence report which deals specifically with the individual offender and the personality and/or physical traits of said individual. Whereas, probation officers in Prince Edward Island, as is indicated in Table 5.6, concern themselves more with circumstances surrounding the offense.

The difference depicted in Table 5.6 clearly indicates probation officers in Saskatchewan, as compared to probation officers in Prince Edward Island, are more concerned about the rehabilitative model, thereby regarding the offender as an individual with a distinct personality and physical characteristics that should be considered as vital components in the determination of the offender's general mode of conduct. Probation officers in Prince Edward Island, on the other hand, regard circumstances surrounding the offense to be of appreciable importance, when completing the investigation for a pre-sentence report. This indicates that the offense itself, the circumstances surrounding its commission, and the ultimate impact on the society at large, are of paramount importance, rather than the individual characteristics of the offender involved.

A basic distinction therefore exists, in terms of probation service delivery, such that, probation officers in Saskatchewan are more concerned about the offender and his mental and physical well-being, whereas, probation officers in Prince Edward Island are more concerned about the society at large, and the repercussions of a furtherance of criminal-type behavior, on the part of the offender. The Social Worker Orientation (S.W.O.) versus Legalistic Work Orientation (L.W.O.) is clearly in evidence in this particular instance, with
the probation officer having the S.W.O. placing a relatively greater amount of emphasis on the idiosyncratic characteristics of the individual offender; however, the probation officer with the I.W.O. appears more likely to concern himself/herself with factors external to the offender and related to the actual commission of the offense, than the mitigating circumstances associated with the commission of a specific offense.

5.5.4 Structure and the Specific Aspects of the Probation Position Which Make It a Rewarding Type of Job

Table 5.7 Determination of Differences Between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island Probation Officers, as It Relates Specifically to the Question, "If Satisfied, What Particular Aspects of the Position Make It a Rewarding Type of Job?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Pro. Assis.</th>
<th>N. R.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Resources = Community resources and the contacts made.
- Pro. Assis. = The type of assistance that is provided to the probationer.
- N. R. = No response.

Table 5.7 indicates that there is a difference between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, such that, 36.84 percent of the probation officers in Saskatchewan regard the community resources, and the various contacts made, as being an asset of the position they now hold, while none of the probation officers in Prince Edward Island
refer to satisfying aspects of their position in this way. One reason why the aforementioned difference exists is because probation officers employed within the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan rely on external agencies for both support and credibility, whereas, probation officers employed within the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island are able to rely on the credibility of the Department of Justice. Oftentimes, during the course of this particular study, probation officers in the Province of Saskatchewan remarked that they would like to be employed under the administrative umbrella of the Department of Justice, primarily because this particular governmental branch had "teeth" if the circumstances were deemed appropriate.

Table 5.7 indicates that there was a greater percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan who were satisfied by the type of service provided to the probationer, as was the case with probation officers in Prince Edward Island. Table 5.7 also indicates that a lesser percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan did not respond to this particular question.

5.5.6 Structure and the Specific Aspects of the Probation Position Which Do Not Make it a Rewarding Type of Job
Table 5.8 Determination of Differences Between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island Probation Officers, as it Relates Specifically to the Question, "If Not Satisfied, With Your Present Position, What are the Factors Which Contribute to This Particular Feeling."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>73.68</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frust. Leg. Crt. = Frustration of working with legal and court systems.


N. R. = No response.

Table 5.8 indicates that there is a difference between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, such that, approximately 16 percent of the probation officers in Saskatchewan expressed frustration about working with the legal and/or court system, while none of the probation officers from Prince Edward Island expressed a similar concern. The previously designated finding clearly indicates probation officers employed with the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan feel uncomfortable working within a legal milieu, whereas, probation officers in Prince Edward Island have a work orientation which more closely adheres to a Legalistic framework, thereby enabling them to function without correspondingly feeling frustrated with the prevailing administrative Structure. In other words, probation officers in the Province of Saskatchewan are relatively less in tune
with the philosophical orientation of the existing administrative structure if this orientation primarily includes legal principles per se and general court processes. Probation officers in Prince Edward Island regard the legal system as being instrumental in performing their daily task/functions within an environment which is relatively rigid in mandate and comprehensive in scope. The legal system also permits the probation officer in Prince Edward Island to work within a cohesive working partnership with various other practitioners in the Criminal Justice System, i.e., police, correctional staff, parole staff, lawyers, etc. Probation officers in Saskatchewan, however, regard the legal system per se as being a maze of rules/regulations which thwarts/obstructs the relatively more important function of dealing with the individual probationer on a personal basis and attempting to assist this particular individual in coming to grips with his/her problems and providing him/her with alternative constructive/positive avenues by which to proceed.

Table 5.8 also indicates that a lesser percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan expressed frustration with bureaucracy, and that a large number of probation officers did not respond to this particular question. The fact that a large number of probation officers did not respond at all to this particular question may be due to the potential threat to their position, in the eventuality that supervisory staff were able to peruse this information.
### 5.5.6 Structure and Reasons for Indicating a Specific Recommendation for Case 1

Table 5.9 Determination of Differences Between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island Probation Officers, as it Relates Specifically to the Question, "Reasons" Provided by Probation Officer as to Why a Specific Recommendation was Provided for Case 1, as Found in Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>I.D. Couns.</th>
<th>Struc. Guide</th>
<th>Facts</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>57.89</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I.D. Couns. = In-Depth counselling.
Facts = Straight Facts.

Table 5.9 indicates a greater percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan gave "in-depth counselling" as a reason for indicating a specific recommendation for Case 1. In addition, a lesser percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan gave "straight facts" as a reason for indicating a specific recommendation for Case 1. These differences indicate that a distinction in work orientation parallels the differences in the two Provincial administrative Structures concerned. Probation officers in Saskatchewan are concerned about counselling probationers, providing constructive advice/direction and attempting to bring about a change in attitude in the individual probationer. Probation officers in Prince Edward Island, considering their contrasting Legalistic Work Orientation, are more concerned about keeping the court informed, as to the various activities and whereabouts of the
probationer, and providing the society at large with some assurances
that further criminal behavior will not occur, as it relates specifi-
cally to this particular probationer.

5.5.7 Structure and Reasons for Indicating a Specific Recom-
   mendation for Case II

Table 5.10 Determination of Differences Between Saskatchewan and
Prince Edward Island Probation Officers, as it Relates
Specifically to the Question, "Reasons" Provided by
Probation Officer as to Why a Particular Recommendation was
Provided for Case II, as Found in Questionnaire.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLE</th>
<th>Counselling</th>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>78.89</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counselling = Counselling or the fact that the probationer will make a
better life for himself.

Crime = Make reference to crime.

Table 5.10 indicates that there is an appreciable difference
between Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, such that, a greater
percentage of probation officers in Saskatchewan indicate that counsel-
ing, or the fact that the probationer will make a better life for
himself, is the reason for indicating a specific recommendation for
Case II. Table 5.10 also indicates a lesser percentage of probation
officers in Saskatchewan refer more often to the actual crime, when
indicating a specific recommendation for Case II. Again a distinct
difference in Probation Officer Work Orientation is seen to exist, when
considering the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan, and,
alternatively, the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island.
6.1 Summary

The main concerns of the study were as follows:
a) to test for the existence of Probation Officer Work Orientation;
b) to determine what effect Structure and individual probation officer background factors had in producing differential work orientations;
c) to explore ways in which Structure and other factors might interact with differential work orientation, to result in different forms of on-the-job acts.

The work orientation of the individual probation officer, as is evidenced throughout this study, and in particular the preceding chapter, is important when attempting to determine the manner in which a probation officer will ultimately perform his/her role. Both the administrative Structure within which the probation officer is employed and his/her corresponding work orientation determine, to a large extent, his/her attitude in the workplace, the type of interrelationships with work-related agencies, i.e., police, lawyers, correctional employees, social workers, etc.; and the priorities chosen, in terms of the actual tasks performed by the probation officer.

Probation Officer Work Orientation manifested itself, in terms of two distinct types, these being the Social Worker Orientation and the
Legalistic Work Orientation. A composite scale of eight items was utilized to measure the type of work orientation of the probation officer. Probation officers employed within the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan and the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island were seen to have been influenced, in terms of work orientation, primarily by the administrative structure itself and, secondarily, by the individual background variables. Selected acts of the probation officers involved in this study were seen to have been influenced not only by Probation Officer Work Orientation but also by the existing administrative structure and individual probation officer background variables.

Direct and indirect effects were calculated and provided supplemental findings. Open-ended questions were analyzed by regarding Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island as separate structures, coming up with meaningful categories for the responses given, and then determining if any differences existed, with respect to the way probation officers in Saskatchewan answered questions, as compared to probation officers in Prince Edward Island. The use of both the preceding procedures provided the researcher with information regarding differences that do exist, in terms of attitudes and acts between probation officers in Saskatchewan and probation officers in Prince Edward Island.

6.2 Discussion of Hypotheses

H1 - Probation officers employed by the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island will have a Legalistic type of Probation Officer Work Orientation, and, conversely, probation officers employed by the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan will have a Social Worker type of Probation Officer Work Orientation.
The data supported this particular hypothesis. The comparison of means indicated that probation officers in Prince Edward Island had a relatively high mean composite score for Probation Officer Work Orientation, as compared to probation officers in Saskatchewan. This implied that probation officers in Prince Edward Island were more likely to have a Legalistic type of Probation Officer Work Orientation, and conversely, probation officers in Saskatchewan were more likely to have a Social Worker type of Probation Officer Work Orientation.

The zero-order correlation coefficients further supported this hypothesis. The zero-order correlation coefficient between Structure and Probation Officer Work Orientation, although relatively weak, indicated that if the probation officer is employed by the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island, there will be a corresponding increase in the composite mean score for Probation Officer Work Orientation, and, conversely, if the probation officer is employed by the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan, there will be a corresponding decrease in the composite mean score for Probation Officer Work Orientation.

H2 - Structure will have a direct effect on Probation Officer Work Orientation.

The data supported this particular hypothesis because Structure was able to explain approximately 13 percent of the variance, independent of the other independent variables, in Probation Officer Work Orientation.

H3 - Each of the four individual background variables (Years Employed, Gender, Type of Upbringing or Education Level), have direct effects on Probation Officer Work Orientation.
The data, in regards to Years Employed, supports this hypothesis, because it was able to explain approximately eleven percent of the variance, independent of the other independent variables, in Probation Officer Work Orientation. The data, in regards to Type of Upbringing, Gender and Education Level, does not support this hypothesis.

Hq - Probation Officer Work Orientation will have a direct effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

The data, in regards to Probation Officer Work Orientation related to Percentage of Time Spent Counselling, supports this hypothesis because Probation Officer Work Orientation was able to explain approximately 13 percent of the variance, independent of the other independent variables, in the dependent variable. Probation Officer Work Orientation had no measurable effect on the other four measures of the Probation Officer Acts.

Hq (I) Structure will have a direct effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

Hq (II) Structure, via Probation Officer Work Orientation, will have an indirect effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

The data does not support the hypothesis.

Hq (I) Each of the four individual background variables will have a direct effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

Hq (II) Each of the four individual background variables, via Probation Officer Work Orientation, will have an indirect effect on each of the five measures of the probation officer acts.

The data does not support this hypothesis.

A number of limitations of this study should be taken into consideration. One limitation is that there are no other studies of this nature, such that, comparison is impossible. Secondly, the number
of cases was relatively small, although the probation officers concerned constituted the entire population in both Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, with the exception of probation officers employed with the Department of Northern Saskatchewan and also those employed with the special Native Indian Probation Program provided in Saskatchewan. In addition, the number of independent variables was relatively large, thereby making it somewhat difficult to deduce a specific assumption, based on the corresponding statistical data. In addition, another factor to take into consideration is the difficulty in accurately ascertaining the existing interrelationships between the attitudes overtly expressed, and the corresponding acts of individual probation officers.

6.3 Implications and Suggestions for Further Research

This study has added to the study of Sociology, in the areas of organizational theory and the relationship between attitudes and behaviors. Specifically, it has contributed knowledge about an important part of the criminal justice system.

The delivery of probation services is a constantly changing process. It is necessary for supervisors and practitioners in the field to familiarize themselves with the various work orientations and their effects, in order to better conceptualize and control the factors which influence their attitudinal responses and behaviors. This study has determined that important attitudinal differences in probation officers do exist, and likely have implications for service delivery, although assessing the relationship between worker orientation, and the efficiency and effectiveness components of probation services was beyond its scope.
Probationers, those persons who are the recipients of the service being provided, may perceive a difference in service delivery, depending upon the administrative structure in question. Probationers’ perceptions of Probation Officer Work Orientation would be an important addition to this particular area of study.

Supervisory personnel are instrumental, in terms of policy decisions for provincial probation services across Canada and, therefore, further research should focus on the orientations and perspectives of these individuals, in order to obtain a more comprehensive view of the system. Comparing and contrasting the orientations and perspectives of supervisors, probation officers and probationers, within one type of structure, would be a useful addition to this area of study.

Organization theory has suggested that administrative structure, as an independent variable, affects attitudes and the behaviors of the individuals that help to comprise the organization. Further comparative research, using all the other types of organizational structures which exist in the provincial probation services across Canada, including Indian Probation programs, could strengthen, or alternatively weaken, the findings of this study. The factor of organizational size, with its implications for all aspects of management-worker relations, could have an important effect on worker orientation, and should be tested in further research.

In conclusion, structure, as an independent variable, was found to be an important predictor of Probation Officer Work Orientation. More research is needed, in order to determine what the implications, in
respect to attitudes and behavior, are in having contrasting structures. The practitioners in the field, as well as the general public, will surely benefit from such research.
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APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO RESPONDENTS
July 25, 1978

Dear

Please find enclosed copies of the questionnaire which are to be completed by your field staff. This questionnaire, constructed with the co-operative effort of Tom Stickland of Saskatoon and Phil Arling, Director of Probation Services in Prince Edward Island, will assist me in the completion of my master's thesis for the University of Saskatchewan in Saskatoon. These questionnaires are to be filled out by probation officers in both Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan and are expected to produce valuable information regarding Probation Services in general.

I realize that an early return of these questionnaires may not be possible due to respondents being on holidays but it is hoped that the staff presently working would be able to complete the questionnaire as soon as possible.

I am also enclosing an addressed envelope for the return of the completed questionnaires. I suggest you forward the questionnaires which are completed by your present staff in this envelope and forward the others when it is possible to do so.

It is my wish to receive the completed questionnaires within a week of your receiving them at your office. Such an excellent response time would enhance my data collection and therefore enable me to provide the Probation Service with the information which I believe the questionnaire is capable of providing.

Thank you for your co-operation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Frank Lavandier
APPENDIX B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE
This is a study of probation officers' perspectives and opinions about their jobs. For comparative purposes, it is being given to probation workers in Prince Edward Island, where Probation is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice and to probation workers in Saskatchewan, where Probation is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Social Services.

The questionnaire has four parts:

Part I: Attitudes of the probation officer in performing his daily work.

Part II: Ideals for Probation Services.

Part III: Descriptive Information -- Work and Background.

Part IV: Hypothetical Cases.

Your individual answers will be seen only by the researcher and will be strictly confidential. No individual identification will be part of the published information. Please answer honestly, and fully, making extra comments if necessary, in order to qualify your answers. Take all the time you require.

Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

* The choice of "his" throughout the questionnaire reflects no bias against female workers, but is simply pragmatic.
PART I

Answer the following questions by circling the response which most appropriately reflects your attitudes towards task performance, i.e.: reflecting how you presently carry out your daily work.

1. An important clue to a worker's general orientation to probation is in his approach to advising probationers.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree  
   3. undecided  
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree

2. The judicial system plays only a small role in the determination of a probation officer's performance.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree  
   3. undecided  
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree

3. The more priority given to personal counselling by the probation officer, the more likely the offender will benefit as a result.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree  
   3. undecided  
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree
4. In the eyes of the Judge, a probation officer has to be capable of showing both lenient and stringent methods of dealing with probationers before he is considered a competent probation officer.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

5. A probation officer has to assert constantly his independence from the Judicial System.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

6. In writing up a P.S.R., the worker always gives priority to some types of information over others (i.e., an area of concentration).
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

7. The probationer gets an improved sense of self-determination if he is allowed to decide on such things as the frequency of reporting, the length of the interviews, the time of reporting, and the topics to be discussed during the interview.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree
8. Above all else, Probation Services are controlled by the application of the law.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree

9. In the eyes of the police, a probation officer has to be capable of showing both lenient and stringent methods of dealing with probationers before he is considered a competent probation officer.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree

10. Probation Service benefits the community most.
    1. strongly agree  2. agree
    3. undecided
    4. disagree  5. strongly disagree

11. Probation Services are a process in which worker and client jointly define the problems, specify goals, and work toward the accomplishment of these goals.
    1. strongly agree  2. agree
    3. undecided
    4. disagree  5. strongly disagree
12. The more clear the worker's legal authority is from the very beginning, the more possible it is to develop a helping relationship.
   1. strongly agree    2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree          5. strongly disagree

13. Probation officers readily accept the help of police in the supervision of clients.
   1. strongly agree    2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree          5. strongly disagree

14. The area of concentration in a P.S.R. normally concerns the crime and circumstances surrounding it.
   1. strongly agree    2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree          5. strongly disagree

15. The amount of informal and casual time which the probation officer and probationer spend together increases the effectiveness of the relationship.
   1. strongly agree    2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree          5. strongly disagree
16. Once a probation officer has made a decision, it is necessary for him to steadfastly resist efforts the client makes to alter that decision.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree       5. strongly disagree

17. Police and probation officers are co-operative in their attempts to assist the offender.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree       5. strongly disagree

18. The use of a probation officer's recommendations is a clear indication of the weight of his authority in the legal setting.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree       5. strongly disagree
Please answer the following questions as you would like to see things done, irrespective of present policy and practices in your office.

19. Recommendations, by the individual probation officer, are necessary if the sentence is to be the most appropriate for the offender.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree

20. The placing of specific conditions on a Probation Order should be the sole responsibility of the Probation Service.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree

21. Easy access to information about an offender, which is possessed by Social Service Departments, should be a policy of Probation Services.
   1. strongly agree  2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree  5. strongly disagree
22. Probation Services would be best carried out under the administration of the Department of Social Services.
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

23. Even when a client is not involved, the probation officer should spend considerable time developing rapport with court personnel (Judges, Prosecutors, Police).
   1. strongly agree
   2. agree
   3. undecided
   4. disagree
   5. strongly disagree

24. Under what administration would Probation Services be best carried out?

25. Why?
Section A  (Work)

26. Please insert the appropriate percentage which most closely approximates the amount of time you spend per month at each of the following activities:
   I spend approximately
   __________ % of my time counselling clients.
   __________ % of my time writing and investigating P.S.R.'s.
   __________ % of my time in the courtroom.
   __________ % of my time in consultation with my superiors.
   __________ % of my time in consultation with police.

27. In the following space, please specify other work-related activities which you engage in during regular work hours and which consume a portion of your average working day. Include the percentage which you deem most appropriate.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

28. What is the average length of time you spend on your first interview with a Probationer?

________________________________________________________________________
29. What aspect of Probation do you review in the first interview with a Probationer?
   (Circle the most important one.)
   a) possible sanctions in case of a breach of Probation.
   b) the reasons why the probationer finds himself in his present situation.
   c) various times of future interviews.
   d) a detailed discussion of the Probation Order.
   e) other (please specify) ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
   f) none of the above.

30. In writing up a P.S.R., what information do you give priority?
   a) ____________________________
   b) ____________________________
   c) ____________________________
   d) ____________________________
   e) ____________________________
   f) ____________________________
   g) ____________________________
31. Approximately what percentage of your P.S.R.'s have been contradicted or seriously questioned by a judge in the past year? (June 30th, 1977 - June 30th, 1978).

32. What is the average monthly number of breaches you have laid in the past year? (June 30th, 1977 - June 30th, 1978).

33. Approximately how many times in the past year have you informally spoken with a judge outside the court setting? (June 30th, 1977 - June 30th, 1978).

34. Approximately how many times have you visited the local police lock-up to visit a probationer in the past year? (June 30, 1977 - June 30th, 1978).

35. How many times have you had police assist in supervisory surveillance, gaining information, etc., in the past year? (June 30, 1977 - June 30th, 1978).

36. Are you satisfied with your present job position?  
   ______ yes  ______ no
37. If satisfied, what particular aspects of the position make it a rewarding type of job?
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e) 

38. If not satisfied, what are the factors which contribute to this particular feeling?
   a) 
   b) 
   c) 
   d) 
   e) 

39. Where are you presently employed? (Location) _____________________________

40. For what period of time, (in years), have you been employed in your present position (as a probation officer)? _____________________________

41. Have you been transferred from another Probation Service office?
If yes, please specify.
1) 
2) 
3) 

42. What were your employment positions prior to being employed by Probation Services? (specify)
1) ____________________________________________ (Last Position)
2) 
3) 
4) 
5) 
6) ____________________________________________ (First Position)

43. How many probation officers are there in your particular region?

44. What was the number of probationers in your caseload for the month of June, 1978? ____________________________
Section B (Background)

45. Age: _______ years
46. Sex: _______ male _______ female
47. Marital Status: _______ single _______ separated
       _______ married _______ divorced
       _______ common law _______ widowed

48. Would you say you were primarily from a (a) farm (b) town (c) city background?

49. Do you belong to any Professional organizations?
       _______ yes _______ no

50. If so, please specify.
       1) _______  4) _______
       2) _______  5) _______
       3) _______  6) _______

51. Please indicate the level of education you have attained.
       1) Less than Grade XII
       2) Completed Grade XII
       3) Technical School
       4) Some University (specify in years completed)
5) Community College

6) Degree (specify) (i.e., Masters in Criminology)

7) Other (please specify)

52. How many of the following groups do you spend time with socially?
Check as many as necessary, indicating those you spend the most
time with, by the number 1, less time with a number 2, and so on.
1) Social Workers, (other than probation officers). (_____)
2) Police. (_______)
3) Judges. (_______)
4) Probation officers. (_______)
5) Lawyers. (_______)
PART IV

Hypothetical Cases

Make what you feel is a suitable recommendation for each of the following cases. Please explain in detail what aspects of the case study you used in coming to your conclusion and why. The officer mentioned in both cases is not a probation officer but rather a police officer.

CASE I:

Social Summary -- Anthony Jeffrey Harder, presently 18 years of age, comes from a broken home in which he was the youngest of six children. His father is presently serving six to ten years in a Maximum Security Penitentiary for receiving stolen goods. Mr. Harder's father has had a long police record and has never made any valid attempt to take care of his family.

The boy's mother has been living in a common-law relationship with another man for the past four years. There are two children from this marriage. The boy lives with his mother, who has tried to look after him, but since she has always been employed and had other family responsibilities, he has been pretty much on his own.

He is of dull mentality, has a poor school record, and since leaving school at 16 has been irregularly employed at various unskilled, low-paid jobs open to boys of his age.
Criminal record -- This young man has no previous criminal record. He was before the juvenile court on the complaint of a teacher that he was in possession of a dangerous weapon -- a switch blade knife. There is no indication that he threatened any person with this weapon.

Officer’s comments -- There is not much to build on and yet many boys like him “make out” with low intelligence, no life plan, and no roots. He needs to get into a life pattern of work and some simple, legitimate pleasures.

Comments by a former employer -- He was not motivated into performing a good day’s work. There always seemed as if there was something more important that he would rather be doing. In the two years he worked for this company he was only involved in two minor arguments with other employees, both of which were admittedly started by Mr. Harder.

Offense -- The defendant is before the court for disposition following a charge of entering with the intent to steal. He was found by the police about one o’clock in the morning hiding in a large cardboard box in a clothing store. The police had been called to the store by a report of a suspicious-looking loiterer. Before they arrived, he had entered through a broken window and had jumped into the box when he heard the policeman. He stated that he badly needed some new clothes.
53. Recommendation: 

54. Reasons: 

Case II

Social Summary -- Joseph Gary Viva was born out of wedlock and spent his first five years in a dozen different households. The father was generally absent from the picture. The mother was busy trying to earn a living for herself and her one child. The history clearly shows that during these years Mr. Viva did not have any opportunity to develop stable and meaningful relationships with a parent-figure.

His search for affection and enduring relationships with adults had consistently been met with negative reinforcement in the form of hurt, rejection or abrupt termination of a relationship which was starting to be formed. The resentful and angry feelings such situations produced toward various adults soon generalized to all adults and authority figures.
At the age of 16, he could not truthfully say that he was close to any person or really loved anyone. He was able to recall that even at the age of six, he had more love and feeling for his pet dog than for any human being he knew. Perhaps he had also felt that his pet dog cared more for him than did anyone else.

Criminal record -- Starting at age four years, he was in numerous difficulties. He would get into fights, often run away from home, was very destructive and even set fires. He was subsequently involved in repeated truancy from school, long absences from home, stealing, and purse snatching.

From age nine to 16, he had been confined in various institutions because of his delinquencies. Over the years his behavior had been getting worse. He tended to be very explosive, suspicious of people, rebellious and assaultive. He felt he was formerly unjustly and harshly treated. He has no adult criminal record.

Officer's comments -- I have personally known of this man for a total of ten years. In the past his behavior has been somewhat delinquent in nature. He is now 23 years of age and has not been involved in any kind of illegal activity for the past seven years. This change has taken place as a result of his meeting a young and attractive girl, who has managed to keep him on the straight and narrow. They have been married two years and are expecting their first child, which seems to be a very welcome event as far as both are concerned.
Comments by present employer: He is a fine worker, dependable and well aware of promotions which are soon to be his if his present method of work prevails. The event which happened is a very hard thing to believe but I realize what his wife means to him.

Offense: The defendant and his wife were watching a Drive-in movie when a drunk ventured over to the couple's car and slapped his wife in the face for no apparent reason. At this point the defendant became enraged and jumped out of the car and smashed the drunk in the face without thinking of the consequences of his actions. The drunk suffered severe brain damage and the defendant was taken up on a charge of aggravated assault. He was found guilty as charged.

55. Recommendation: 

56. Reasons: 

I would like to thank you for your co-operation in filling out this questionnaire.

It is the impression of myself and the directors of both Probation Services, (P.E.I. and Saskatchewan), that this questionnaire will be helpful in giving a more distinct picture as to the functioning of both Services.

Any comments, which you may have, concerning the questionnaire, would be greatly appreciated.
APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP LETTERS TO RESPONDENTS
July 26, 1978

Dear

There may be respondents presently on holidays, so it is my opinion that it is best if those presently working, forward the questionnaires while those on holidays forward them as soon as possible.

Since these questionnaires are to be confidential in nature, I thought it best if one of the field staff was appointed to be in charge of the questionnaires and return them to the address given rather than have administrative staff influencing the answers given by being in charge.

In order to analyze the data, it is hoped that the information will be returned as soon as possible.

Please remind the field staff that any comments concerning the questionnaire will help provide me with a more comprehensive thesis and provide Probation Services with a more clear idea as to how the Service works.

Thanking you for your co-operation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Frank Lavender
August 1, 1978

Dear

Further to my letter, concerning the questionnaires, there is a vital piece of information which I failed to inquire about in the original questionnaire. Please inform the field staff to respond to the following question which can be answered on the back of the last page of the questionnaire:

What was the size of your caseload in the month of June, 1978?

If the questionnaires have already been forwarded to my address, I would appreciate the names of each probation officer and the corresponding caseload number being sent as soon as possible.

I am truly sorry for the inconvenience that this request may cause but this information is indeed necessary if a comprehensive picture of Probation Services in both Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island is to be attained.

Thank you for your co-operation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Frank Lavandier
September 8, 1978

Dear

I am presently sending this letter to all Regional Probation Service Supervisors in both Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan with the hope that it will serve as a reminder to those field staff who have not, as of yet, returned the questionnaires which were sent to them a couple of weeks ago.

Numerous Probation Officers have expressed interest in reviewing the final data analysis and it is my wish that this will be possible in the not too distant future. I am, therefore, hopeful that those who have not already completed the questionnaires will do so shortly.

If the total number of questionnaires have been returned by your entire field staff, then please disregard this letter.

Thank you for your co-operation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Frank Lavandier
APPENDIX D

ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS FOR BOTH THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES IN SASKATCHEWAN AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND
Organizational Chart for the Department of Social Services in Saskatchewan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minister</th>
<th>Deputy Minister</th>
<th>Administrative Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Services</td>
<td>Administration Branch</td>
<td>Personnel and Training Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Evaluation Branch</td>
<td>Social Services Branch</td>
<td>Corrections Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Security Branch</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Affairs Branch</td>
<td>Verifications</td>
<td>Community Training Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services to Youth and Families</td>
<td>Senior Citizens</td>
<td>Correctional Centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services (Adults)</td>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
<td>Community Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Offices</td>
<td>Program and Policy</td>
<td>Fine Option Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Institutions</td>
<td>Employment Support Services</td>
<td>Probation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saskatoon: As a Point of Reference

Director of Corrections (Terry Thompson)
Chief Probation Officer (Len Boyd)
Regional Supervisor (Tom Stickland)
Assistant Supervisor (Mel Robinson)

(P.O.) (P.O.) (P.O.) (P.O.) (P.O.) (P.O.) (P.O.) (P.O.)}
Organizational Chart for the Department of Justice in Prince Edward Island

Minister of Justice
(Bennett Campbell)

Deputy Minister
(Shelby Stewart)

Corrections
Branch Director --
Leo Lynch

Queen's County
Jail

Prince County
P.O. (P.O.)

Prison County
Jail

King's County
Jail

Provincial
Correctional Centre

Probation
Services Director --
Phillip Arbing
APPENDIX E

LIST DEPICTING PROBATION OFFICERS EMPLOYED IN BOTH SASKATCHEWAN AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND
At the time of this study, the following list represented the number of probation officers employed in both Saskatchewan and Prince Edward Island, who made up the total population.

The Number of Saskatchewan Probation Officers (not including D.N.S.)

1. Mr. R. Fryklund, Supervisor (1)
   Provincial Government Building
   350 Cheadle Street West
   Swift Current, Sask.

2. Mr. J. Anderson, Supervisor (5)
   60 Fairford West
   Moose Jaw, Sask.

3. Mr. A. Goudar, Supervisor (13)
   1731 College Avenue
   Regina, Sask.

4. Mr. R.D. Bromley, Supervisor (2)
   72 Smith Street
   Yorkton, Sask.

5. Mr. D. Chubb, Supervisor (2)
   405 Provincial Building
   1146 102nd Street
   North Battleford, Sask.

6. Mr. D. Simpson, Supervisor (2)
   101 15th Street East
   Prince Albert, Sask.

7. Mr. L. Britton (2)
   Box 459
   Melfort, Sask.

8. Mr. T. Stickland (7)
   112 1030 Idylwyld Drive North
   Saskatoon, Sask.

The Total Number of Prince Edward Island Probation Officers

Mr. Phillip Arting
Director of Probation Service
Box 2000
Department of Justice
Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island

Prince County (2)
Summerside, P.E.I.

Queen's County (8)
Charlottetown, P.E.I.
APPENDIX F

UNITED STATES AGENCIES RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING PROBATION SERVICES
PARENT AGENCY RESPONSIBLE FOR ADMINISTERING SERVICES*
(By States)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Adult Probation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Board of Pardons &amp; Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Division of Youth &amp; Adult Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>Board of Pardons, Paroles &amp; Prob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Parole Div &amp; Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Comm on Adult Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Dept. of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Prob &amp; Parole Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Board of Prob &amp; local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>Board of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Board of Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Board of Prob &amp; Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>Dept. of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Dept. of Insts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Dept. of Mental Health &amp; Corrections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some states also have some local services in addition to state services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Dept. of Parole &amp; Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>Commission on Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Dept. of Corrections &amp; local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Dept. of Corrections &amp; local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Board of Probation &amp; Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Board of Probation &amp; Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Board of Pardons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>District Judges Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Dept. of Parole &amp; Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Dept. of Probation &amp; local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Board of Probation &amp; Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Probation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>Dept. of Parole &amp; Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Board of Parole &amp; Probation &amp; local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Dept. of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Prob, Parole and Pardon Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Board of Pardons &amp; Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>Dept. of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Board of Corrections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Dept. of Insts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Dept. of Welfare &amp; Insts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Board of Prison Terms &amp; Paroles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>DPW &amp; local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>DPW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Dept. of Prob &amp; Parole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>Adm Office of Courts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>