

1192

PENNSYLVANIA ADULT CORRECTIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTES (P.A.C.T.)

Developed by the
Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections
College of Human Development
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

A Training Module for Trainers of Personnel
in the Administration of Criminal Justice

Designed as Part of the Statewide Training Program for
Executive and Managerial Correctional Personnel

INTERVIEWING AS AN EFFECTIVE TOOL IN
THE CORRECTIONAL PROCESS

Training Module 6912

June, 1969

The Statewide Training Program
for Correctional Personnel is supported
by a grant from the Law Enforcement

Assistance Act, U.S. Department of Justice No. 357-(222)

NCJ001192

PENNSYLVANIA ADULT CORRECTIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTES (P.A.C.T.)

Developed by the
Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections
College of Human Development
The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

A Training Module for Trainers of Personnel
in the Administration of Criminal Justice

Designed as Part of the Statewide Training Program for
Executive and Managerial Correctional Personnel

INTERVIEWING AS AN EFFECTIVE TOOL IN
THE CORRECTIONAL PROCESS

Training Module 6912

June, 1969

The Statewide Training Program
for Correctional Personnel is supported
by a grant from the Law Enforcement
Assistance Act, U.S. Department of Justice No. 357-(222)

CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
A Foreword to the Instructor	iii
The Case Management Approach	1
The Client's Family and the Interviewing Situation	3
The Establishment of Case Goals	4
Direction in Interviewing	5
The Clinical Judgment	6
Levels of Supervision	6
The Problem of the Caseload	8
Principles of Case Management	8
Need for a Work Plan	9
The Case Record	11
Staff-Line Relationships	13
Diagnosis	13
The Objectives of Therapy	14
The Correctional Officer and Change of Behavior	15
The Record of Martin Johnson	15
Further Comments on Interviewing: Objectives	16
Assumptions in Any Treatment System	17
Additional Characteristics of the Interview in a Correctional Setting	17
Some Basic Principles of the Interviewing Situation	18
Note-taking, Interrupting, the Non-judgmental Attitude, the Art of Listening	20
Do's and Don'ts in the Interview	23
Appendix	24
Bibliography	28

A FOREWORD TO THE INSTRUCTOR

The training module, "Interviewing as an Effective Tool in the Correctional Process," was developed by Charles L. Newman, Head of the Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections at The Pennsylvania State University and project director of the Pennsylvania Adult Corrections Training Institutes (P.A.C.T.). This module on interviewing can be used independently as a short course of several hours' duration, or it can be incorporated into the full series which P.A.C.T. has produced.

In order that each module be utilized to its fullest potential, the trainer or instructor first should have a sound background, preferably with field experience in the area in which he will be instructing. Secondly, he should have in-depth knowledge of the bibliographical material listed at the end of the training module, as well as other literature sources. With this basic preparation, the trainer can be in a position to employ the training module as a "road map" for the direction and substance of the course. Throughout the preparation and presentation of the course, the trainer should keep in mind the general objectives of the course as set forth at the outset of the outline.

As the course is presented, each heading and subheading should be treated by the instructor as a theme for expansion. The headings are meant only to provide the structure to the trainer, who should then build on them, expanding and enlarging as the needs of the class are demonstrated and his time and ability permit. Many examples and illustrations should be provided to the class. An abundance of

case material and other examples carefully prepared by the instructor is essential. It is the illustrative material that concretize concepts and enhance learning. The trainer should draw upon his own professional experience as well as the bibliographical material for much of this expansion. Obviously, the trainer should capitalize on the experiences of his class in order to make the material more viable.

While the trainer is preparing for the course, certain chapters and sections of the readings will suggest themselves to him as so basic or important that he will want to assign them to the class. Therefore, the bibliography will serve two purposes: preparation of material for the instructor and training material for the class. No attempt was made on the part of those developing the training modules to dictate what, if any, the class assignment should be. The trainer will know his class and its needs better than anyone else, and should have full discretionary power on assignments, drawing from the bibliographical references or any other sources which he deems relevant.

The staff of the Center for Law Enforcement and Corrections hope that these training modules can serve an effective role in providing assistance to those who have the responsibility for training operating personnel. If the material has the potential to serve as a catalyst, it is, nevertheless, the instructor who stands before the class who carries the burden of teaching success. It is to him that we say, "Good luck."

Charles L. Newman, Project Director

William H. Parsonage, Associate Project Director

Barbara R. Price, Assistant Project Director

Training Module 6912

INTERVIEWING AS AN EFFECTIVE TOOL IN THE CORRECTIONAL PROCESS

The Case Management Approach.

Case management is a process by which the corrections agent, as an agency representative, plans and carries out necessary actions on his total caseload to determine and re-determine eligibility for continuing community or institutional status for the client and by which he provides or arranges for service to the client in a prompt, accurate, and orderly fashion or manner.

1. Agency representative. The agency representative follows through on the objectives of the agency. That is, the objectives of the agency and agent as a representative of the agency must be identical. Otherwise, there can only be confusion, as, for example, when agency objectives are disregarded on the principle that each agent knows what's best and each then goes his own way; this is chaos. The agency must provide policy guidelines. The agent must work within these guidelines.
2. Plans carry the connotation of purposeful behavior. Under this idea, things are done with a purpose rather than simply because it seems to be the appropriate thing to do at the moment.
3. Necessary actions are those actions which must be carried out in order to accomplish the goal or objective. We do not carry out activity on "whim" or because we are "curious" at results. Each activity must be necessary as part of the total plan.
4. Total caseload means simply what it indicates, namely, that activity must be carried on in relation to the entire group of clients, rather than a select group who either present problems or, conversely, who do not present problems.
5. Determining eligibility for continuing community or institutional status for the client and by which he provides service means, basically, the need to develop criteria of eligibility for service. It is important such criteria be formulated for correctional service, since those who are not eligible for such service should be referred to other agencies in the community. There is no point in continuing to interview a client who has no need for, or who is ineligible for, correctional services.

6. Arranging for service to the client. The emphasis should be on the client receiving the service which he needs. Thus, if we have contact with a client once a month, are we actually giving service? In general, the term "eligibility" has not really been used in the correctional field, but it has relevance to the four levels of the administration of justice, namely, enforcement, prosecution and defense, adjudication, disposition. The cases which are correctional cases are the ones which come through the adjudication process. For these cases, we ought to set up eligibility criteria; we ought to be able to say which correctional services are available and which are most effective for specific clients who have come through the adjudication process. If we are not giving the necessary services to the clients who come or who are sent to us for these services, then we are not fulfilling our responsibility and, actually, we should consider whether the best thing to do is to let the client go.

In the process of formulating criteria of eligibility, the objectives of the agency, and plans for services must be known. In order to determine eligibility (for probation, for example), we ordinarily get this from the interview:

- (a) Does the client have sufficient internal control to indicate capacity for reasonable conformity to agency rules?;
- (b) Does the client have employment potential or school potential?;
- (c) Does he specify a stated willingness to abide by the rules of the agency?;
- (d) Does he have motivation to succeed?;
- (e) Is there a probability that the community will tolerate him on discharge?

Consideration of these questions requires the accumulation, through the interview, of information about the eligibility of the client for agency services, which will be directed toward change in behavior of the client so that he may return to the community and operate therein on an effective level. If, after determining individual needs through the interview, it is found that the agency does not have the necessary services, then it would be appropriate and important to go back to the judge and recommend alternative disposition.

- (f) The availability of resources to do the job in relation to the need, raises the question as to whether we have the personnel to give this type and extent of service. Actually, in the field of corrections, what we do is to try to handle the best possible solution with the least possible resources; the one tool which the probation officer has is the interview, but the interview should

be related to objectives. We should be aware of criteria and resources, and should know where we are going and should provide the services which are necessary; this actually represents the only way in which we can operate in a prompt, accurate, and orderly fashion.

The Client's Family and the Interviewing Situation.

Additional areas of relevance center on the matter of the client's family. In this instance, it should be remembered the facts do not speak for themselves; for the correctional officer to develop a social history and a family background history simply as a matter of fact gathering leaves us with the question as to what it means. What, for example, does it mean for a person to be born a "fifth child?" It is important to the individual as a part of the family constellation; it is important to know who the significant people in the family are. Suppose we say it is not a "good" family: what does the family mean to the client? If, for example, we feel that this is not a "good" family, we should still recognize that some people need to live in such a family and with such people. Some women need to have alcoholic husbands; some men need to have unfaithful women as wives. If we start with the assumption that all behavior is purposeful, we will be on much safer ground in dealing with the problem and with the individual. It is always important to find out how the client feels about his living conditions, about his family; and we find out by asking him and listening to him. Human behavior is individual and carries individual values about which we should be aware.

In the interviewing situation, it is necessary to know the extent to which the family situation itself created the problem. Whether we secure appropriate information depends upon the way in which we approach the interview. If we ask a question which leads to a "yes" or "no" answer, we will get such an answer. It is important that we be aware of the kind of questions or the kind of comments we make in the course of the interview if we want to get information which gives us more than a monosyllable as an answer.

In the course of the interview, we also need to find out the presenting problem which the client brings to the agency. Of course, we do know that he came to the agency as a result of having done something which transgressed the law but we need to know more. We need to know what some of the problem patterns are, something about the problem, and something about the context within which the problem developed.

We ought to know the problems which remain unsolved, and we can find out about this through the interview. It is important to know this, because it has a treatment impact. It might serve to bring the family together or it might serve to break the family apart. In essence, we are concerned not only with the behavior of this particular individual but we are also concerned about the total behavior in the family. We should, of course, be concerned that needed resources are available to serve the client and his family.

In general, the interview with the client has, as its overall purpose, the important focus of starting the client on the road to solving his own problems. It takes a skillful person to help the client start thinking about the use of his own strengths. A skillful interviewer can do this. The emphasis of the interview should be on the strengths of the client. It is the client's strength which will carry him through to law-abiding behavior. In the interviewing situation, the agent also should be aware of just what it is that the agency can provide by way of needed services.

One of the problems here is the alienation between corrections, on the one hand, and other social welfare agencies, on the other. The problem, or one of the problems, is that of determining who will begin the process of communication and cooperation. Actually, correctional services can and do use community resources, such as vocational rehabilitation and public welfare, which means that operating a good treatment program involves knowing what people need and giving them the appropriate services. Thus, both in interviewing and in planning, it is important to know both the strengths of the client and what we need in giving services.

The Establishment of Case Goals.

One of the more critical dimensions of the investigative and treatment process is the establishment of case goals. Every recommendation for probation or parole should have spelled out the levels of possible attainment of the goals envisaged. There should, first of all, be an overall goal, along with subsidiary goals. It is most important that, in recommending probation or parole, goals, both overall and subsidiary, be spelled out. Thus, if we recommend institutionalization, we must specify what we expect the institutional placement to achieve in relation to the needs of the client. The recommendation of institutionalization is not enough; the probation and parole officer is responsible for the development of a treatment plan, which is based on a diagnostic statement as to the strengths and needs of the individual. This means that there should be and must be individualization in the treatment process; not everybody can be treated alike.

Now, let us look more closely at case goals. One of the reasons we get ourselves in difficulty and do not achieve what we want to achieve is that we are not clear about our goals. The projected plan, based on knowledge of strengths and needs, involves three levels of goals: (a) immediate, (b) intermediate, (c) long-term. If we are to succeed in interviewing, if we are to be effective interviewers, if we are to help clients through a treatment plan, it is necessary that we specify goals which are attainable immediately. Thus, if a person needs to be in school, the immediate problem is to get that person back in school. To succeed in school is an intermediate goal. The completion of the school program is a long-term goal. Thus, in a situation of this kind, we have the three levels, the completion of the school program (long-term), succeeding in school (intermediate level), and getting the person back into school (immediate level). Thus, these three levels are part of the total package. In order to follow through, we need to look at the

individual, the system, the community. Any decision not based on taking into account this total picture will, in all probability, be a poor decision.

Direction in Interviewing.

Effective interviewing must have direction; in the interview, it is necessary to know where you are going and to fit the content into the total system. The interview involves at least two people, and the emphasis should be placed upon people, with their attitudes and feelings. Important, in this connection, is the necessity of understanding the effects of attitudes on behavior. In the process of the interview, we secure the necessary information on the basis of which we might formulate a diagnosis, from which we may develop treatment plans. It is also important to be aware that any interview involves interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee. There is the person who is in need of help in the process of changing his behavior and there is the probation officer who is an agent and representative of the agency. This includes the idea that unless the agency has a goal and unless the interview has its goal, then treatment cannot occur. It is important to realize that gathering information from the client must always be done in relation to a goal. Otherwise, treatment is ineffective.

In the process of the interview, we try to secure the information which we need to know in order to be effective, which means that we must secure the relevant information which enables us to look toward the goal for which we are striving. We need to secure every bit of information we can, in order to have the necessary data on the basis of which to formulate a diagnostic statement, which necessarily leads toward treatment plans. In using the information which we develop as a result of interviewing, we have the problem of determining how information can be communicated from one part of the system to the other. If the information becomes the private property of the probation or parole officer, then we have a "private" agent operating outside of a correctional system. This raises the question of the continuity of data and the problem of isolation. Unfortunately, in the field of juvenile and adult corrections, there appears to be no general feeling of responsibility to make the information available within the total system. Failing to disseminate information leads, of course, almost inevitably, to duplication of effort.

Similarly, we look traditionally at the individual as an isolated entity. There is need for knowledge of the individual and of individual behavior. At the same time, it is also important that we look at the individual in terms of the totality of his environment. It is relevant to our work as correction officers to look at the problem of crime in terms of what the individual has experienced, is experiencing, will experience. Hence, the probation officer concentrates on helping the client solve his problems, effectively giving help through the use of agency resources and through seeing the client in his totality.

As probation and parole officers, our function is not to change basic personality structure, but rather to change behavior so that the person is able to function legally within society and with some sense of personal satisfaction.

The Clinical Judgment.

We return to the question of eligibility for services. In this connection, we might ask ourselves the question of whether the client has enough internal control to function within the community. Then, we are faced with making a "clinical" judgment, which requires an understanding of human development; the level of our expectation depends upon our judgment of the situation and our judgment as to the nature of the internal controls which the client has. However, suppose that the judgment of the probation officer is that the client has no control; then we are faced with the question as to what the institution will do. In this instance, we need to use resources to help the individual to achieve the necessary level of behavior. In this process, it is most important that the probation or parole officer use other agencies in the community which can be called upon for additional services, such as financial assistance, intensive clinical services, medical services. Thus, we do not relinquish our responsibility for helping the person to achieve a more adequate level of behavior; to the contrary, we maintain that responsibility which we cannot slough off. Thus, if we provide counseling services, we must work cooperatively with other agencies; we must work as a member of a team with representatives of other agencies.

Still, the question faces us: How do we get representatives of other agencies to give us necessary information? This involves relationships with the other agencies; it involves the necessity that we work toward developing these relationships with other agencies through constant contact. This has not yet happened but it is our responsibility to work toward it and to overcome our tendency not to share and not to cooperate. Perhaps, our uncooperativeness or unwillingness centers on our recognition that we are not doing anything or that we really do not know what is going on. The matter of confidentiality is really not in point; actually, the problem relates to our lack of doing anything.

Levels of Supervision.

We have mentioned that the establishment of case goals necessitates formulation of immediate, intermediate, and long-term goals. Now, we need to examine another set of variables which relate to and derive from the concept of goals. This relates to levels of supervision of which there are three: (a) maximum, (b) medium, (c) minimum. It is the responsibility of the correctional officer to be able to specify a set of goals to be reached. In this specification, there should be a process of mutual sharing between the officer and the client with respect to the goals; there should also be expectation on the part of the officer that the client can reach the goals, so that, in effect,

the officer may say "we expect you to achieve an education," assuming that the goal is the achievement of education.

Now, the problem of the client is to get back to school. In the process of working through this problem, the interview is the tool, since there must be communication between the probation officer and the client. In addition, there is the consideration of the amount of time we need to spend with the client in his process of achieving the goal. And it is here that we set levels of supervision. It is necessary to provide maximum supervision in the beginning as movement is made forward to attain immediate goals. After the client has attained the immediate goal of attendance, then maximum supervision can be relaxed and intermediate supervision becomes appropriate. Subsequently, as the client moves toward completing the school program and is heading toward discharge, the minimum level of supervision becomes appropriate.

In this process, however, it must be recognized that there might arise crisis situations after progression beyond intermediate supervision. At this point of crisis, it would ordinarily be necessary to return to maximum supervision to give support and to help the client over the crisis, at which point intermediate or minimum supervision becomes again appropriate.

It should not be forgotten that the character of the correctional relationship is authoritative. It is important that we let the client know what we expect of him, that we make this firm, and, in fact, that we give the clear impression that we do have the power of enforcement without making an issue of it. This is particularly the case during the period of maximum supervision. As we move to intermediate and then toward minimum supervision, the authoritative relationship becomes modified accordingly, perhaps, in fact, modified to the point of a consultant relationship with the client. In this instance, the probation officer acts as a sounding board for the client. It is important, throughout, to remember that the probationer is not your friend. It is possible for the probation officer to serve in a "friendly" role in the relationship with the client, but not as a friend, if only because the probation officer does not share his own feelings and values and attitudes with the client.

We are still faced with the question as to what happens to the client who does not progress beyond the maximum level of supervision? In this instance, it is necessary and important to review the situation to be sure that the goals which have been set are not unattainable goals. It is possible, perhaps, that the client remains at the maximum level of supervision because the goals are set too high, they are not immediate. This means that the probation officer must learn to distinguish between long-term goals, intermediate goals, and immediate goals. While it is very important to have ultimate goals, it is equally important to specify and understand the importance of immediate goals which are necessary in order to reach intermediate goals which are, in turn, necessary in order to reach ultimate or long-term goals.

Thus, the interview is always relatively easy and relatively effective if the probation officer knows what he is doing. He can know what he is doing only if there is clarity in the formulation of goals.

The Problem of the Caseload.

The discussion of levels of supervision leads next to the problem of the caseload, of the distribution in the caseload. The probation officer can carry, for example, ten maximum supervision cases and handle them well; another probation officer may carry one hundred minimum supervision cases and handle them. Thus, the number of cases in a probation officer's caseload should depend upon the character of the cases. It must be remembered that corrections is a business and that the product of corrections is people. The probation officer must provide service; that is what he is there for. However, it is the case that all too frequently the probation officer is overwhelmed with a volume of work which makes it practically inevitable that he must handle problems as they arise. Ultimately, this means that, instead of planning and offering effective services, the probation officer is involved in providing crises supervision only. It is important that the probation officer start thinking more effectively about his caseload and start a systematic case analysis.

Principles of Case Management.

What is involved in case analysis? The following are a few relevant considerations:

1. Analysis of case needs.

It is important, in this connection, to go through the caseload and find out what the problems are. Actually, this should be done at the point of intake. If you are not doing this now as probation officers, it is suggested that you start with cases as they come in at this point and work back to the cases which you already have. It is probable that you will find that most are ready for discharge; it is also probable that you will have a better idea as to what the problems are, which is a very important consideration. If you do not know what the problems and needs are in relation to each of your cases, it is impossible to give adequate services. It must be remembered that services are given in relation to problems and needs; since we are to give services as probation officers, it is important to know what the needs are in relation to the services which we can offer.

2. Classify each case.

This should be done in terms of levels of supervision. That is, each case should be classified in relation to whether it needs maximum or intermediate or minimum supervision. Determination of this will be helpful in terms of giving not only appropriate but also effective services.

3. Establish case goals.

This, too, should be done in terms of immediate, intermediate, long-term goals. The problem or the need in any particular case situation should be related to a goal. If you do not have the information in the record, it is most important that you get the information through the interview; if you have it and it is not in the record, then you should put it there. The establishment of case goals is necessary in order to know just what you are doing and where you are going; without the establishment of goals in every individual case situation, there is inevitable diffusion of activity and aimless interviewing which assists neither the client nor the probation officer.

4. Imposition of time limits.

Once goals are established, it is necessary to impose time limits on ourselves and on the clients. Thus, we might ask ourselves the question: How much time will we give to the attainment of goals? This depends, of course, on what the goal is: Is it immediate? Is it intermediate? Is it long-term? If, for example, the goal is to find a job for the client, then the time limit is two weeks, or, perhaps, three weeks. The imposition of time limits gives strength and direction and vigor to the relationship; it also defines a point at which achievement is expected. Put negatively, it avoids aimless wandering with no end in sight.

Put succinctly, it is important that we know what we are doing and where we are going. It is most important, also, that we formulate our plans and that we use these plans consciously and constructively. The relationship with clients is a dynamic process; the process of achieving goals is also a dynamic process.

Throughout the relationship, which is directed toward helping the client to work through his own problems, we are constantly faced with the problem which we discussed earlier, namely, consciously avoiding asking questions which lead to a "yes" or "no" answer; it is most important that in the total process, we ask questions which allow the person to open up and express himself.

Need for a Work Plan.

Every probation officer ought to have a work plan, which is systematic, based on an understanding of needs and problems, and directed toward goals. Priorities must be established; we must know why we established them and why we are working with the client and to what end we are striving. Otherwise, we wander aimlessly, achieve nothing, and confuse the client as to our function.

In the whole process, we still have problems to face:

1. We tend to think of our own unique assignment and, as a result, get boxed in. We tend to think of clients and our own specific work as "our own". We are not inclined to think of the system within which we operate. It is important that we recognize that we cannot handle case situations alone and without reference to the system. At the same time, even if we think of "our" responsibilities within "our" system, we tend to continue to limit our involvement and service to our own system and do not relate to the community within which the system operates. Thus, we should raise our sights and see our clients within our system and see our system within the total community within which the system has its being.
2. We need to think more about programs. We build excellent physical plants, we spend a great deal of money on these. How about programs? Have we thought about ways in which current programs could be improved and enlarged? Have we thought about new programs? Thus, what about specialized programs, such as programs for alcoholics? We should start thinking about programming so as to handle case situations and get things done in relation to the problems, needs, and goals.

We also need to ask ourselves many questions relative to dealing with clients.

1. Is this contact really necessary? If the answer is "yes", then it is imperative that you indicate what you hope to accomplish as a result of the contact. If the answer is "no", then why have the contact? These are pertinent and important questions which each probation officer should ask himself.
2. Am I choosing the best type of activity for the occasion, taking into consideration the agency, the client, the use of my own time? In this, we recognize the agency, the client, and probation officer, all of whom are involved in the total situation. Thus, we might well ask ourselves whether it is necessary to make a home visit when an office visit would be more effective. We also need to ask ourselves whether we require an office visit when a home visit would give the type of input needed. The point is that it is important for the probation officer to think about the best type of activity in relation to the problem and the need, which might be formulated as a result of cases analysis. This is also relevant to the formulation of goals.

3. Am I holding the client to the responsibility which he is expected to assume and which he is capable of assuming? This is a critical question, since, if the client is not capable of assuming the responsibility, then the probation officer is wasting his time because the goal is too high. This relates to the important consideration of case analysis, discussed earlier. If the probation officer does not have a clear idea of problems and needs, if he does not have a clear idea of client's strengths and needs, then there is no possibility of setting goals on a reasonable and factual basis. Either the probation officer must know the direction, in which instance the interview can become effective and reasonable, or he does not know where he is going, in which instance the interview is a waste of both the probation officer's and the client's time.
4. Am I thinking and working in terms of reasonable time limits? What sort of controls am I imposing on myself? Am I making three visits or contacts when one will do? Am I making a visit when a telephone call will do? We really have two commodities: time and communication skill. If we wish to conserve our time and if we wish to improve our communication skill, we must use the knowledge of the needs and problems of the clients and we must be aware of the goals which we are striving to achieve.

The Case Record.

At this point, we take up the problem of the report of contact with the client. The best report and the best recording is one which is simple, one which uses simple and direct language; it is very important to avoid verbosity. In writing reports, it would be important to keep in mind the following considerations:

- (a) The identification of the nature of the client's problem. This does not refer to the specific legal offense with which the individual is charged; the court knows why the person is there. In explaining further, it is important to be aware of other factors which brought the client to the correctional setting. In order, then, to get at the nature of the problem, it is necessary to go beyond the immediate offense for which the client is charged.
- (b) In the process of securing additional information which gives us something of the nature of the problem beyond the immediate charge, we should be aware of whether we can provide the services with respect to the nature of the problem. Thus, if a child calls his mother a name, we really do not have a good reason for correctional intervention. If a person drinks to excess, this is not necessarily a correctional problem, since it might really be a mental health problem.

This leads to some additional considerations which are pertinent. If the problem which we are facing is not a correctional problem, then we have no business dealing with it. It is important that we know why we are concerned with the problem, and it is also important that the client know why we are concerned with it and why we are there; this is simple honesty with ourselves and our clients. If a person steals a bicycle and is brought to court and if the court says that the person must be on probation, then we must be sure as to the place of supervision, whether it is maximum or intermediate or minimum, and what our goal in relation to the individual is. We need to clarify not only the problem and the needs but also the objectives, the goals, and the level of supervision. It is only then that we can do a job of probation, because, simply put, probation has to be related to problems and needs which the individual brings to the court in the first place.

And somewhere along the line, we must relate client needs to available services of the agency. Is this a person for whom we can provide services? The correctional field apparatus cannot, for example, handle extremely emotionally disturbed persons, who do not respond well on probation or parole. What is necessary for us to recognize here is that if we cannot give the service, then we should refer the client to an agency or organization which can give the service because it offers the necessary services in relation to his problems and his needs. Institutions are better suited to some persons' needs; probation or parole to other persons' needs. Good professional practice and common sense dictates that proper assignments be made.

The case record should reflect the interpretation and the evaluation of each interview. It should also reflect the purpose, the goal, the objective, because it is a professional record of a professional relationship. The record should also evaluate and interpret the use which has been made of the resources of the individual, the family, the agency, and the community, all combined toward alleviating or solving the problem. This is not a rigid process, because, even if we have objectives and goals, which are necessary, such objectives and goals are in dynamic balance and process and are constantly changing. Nonetheless, it remains important that the interview have a purpose in relation to understanding of needs and problems and in relation to goals, long-term, intermediate, and immediate.

The final point that should be made with respect to the case record is that it should reflect the corrections officer's activity in relation to what he can do without interfering in the life of the client. If an activity is not necessary, skip it; it is important not to pry or ask questions which are not relevant to the need or to the problem with which the officer can help. If the problem is one of sex adjustment of the client, then it is appropriate for the probation officer to work with the client in relation to the problem; if the problem centers in employment, then it is important to leave sex alone. The general principle is that we need to have information and we need to engage in activities which are relevant to the problem and the need of the client.

Staff-Line Relationships.

We have talked about the worker-client relationship and about its importance. The relationship between administration and line personnel is also critical. The administration ought to be cognizant of staff as people. People should not treat others in ways other than those in which they are themselves treated. If the administration is rigid, then we cannot expect the probation officer to be other than rigid with clients. If the administration is insensitive to needs of staff, then staff will deal with clients similarly; that is, they will in all probability be insensitive to needs of clients. This means that administration should have skill in dealing with people; it means that administration should be aware of needs of staff as people and work with these needs appropriately. Thus, the administrator of an agency has a heavy responsibility in working with staff whose needs and problems must be taken in account.

Diagnosis.

As to the problem of diagnosis, it is important for us to realize that the formulation of a diagnosis need not fit into any one language pattern. Whatever language pattern we use, whatever diagnostic formulation we make, whether we call an individual a "psychopath" or whether we call him a "neurotic", it is vital that we describe the behavior in relation to the person with whom we are working and where he is in relation to others. "Normality" is relative. We have developed, for example, a normal curve with respect to a variety of measurable factors. Thus, there is a normal intelligence, normal weight, normal height, none of which is exact but all of which represent a measure of the normal as a guide. From this, we have a suggestion of abnormality in either direction. People who are very short or tall, are, in fact, abnormal. We value some abnormality and reject others. A seven-foot tall athlete, though abnormal in relation to height, is a prized possession of a basketball team.

This leads us to the very important principle that we do not look for an absolute point but rather for the range. Thus, a person who washes his hands before luncheon is behaving normally; a person who washes every fifteen minutes or who never washes at all is not acting normally. Circumstances not infrequently dictate the nature of behavior. For example, there is the instance of a child who was picked up one Sunday morning at 3:00 A.M. because he was riding the subway. He was brought in and questioned. The child explained that he rode the subway continuously every weekend from Friday night to Sunday night, which is not normal behavior. But what were the circumstances? They were very clear; the child explained that on Friday night his father came home totally hostile and beat everybody. Hence, in order to escape his father during the weekend, he simply stayed away and the best way that he could stay away was to ride the subway from Friday night until Sunday night, after which his father went to work and, for the rest of the week, all went well.

What the child had done was to accommodate himself quite well to the circumstances. Although riding the subway from Friday night to Sunday night was not socially acceptable and was not ordinarily normal behavior, he had come to a very reasonable conclusion that, if he is to escape the beating by his father, he should separate himself from his home for that period of time. If we had looked only at the outward circumstances, we would have said that the behavior is abnormal, and it certainly would have been from the point of view of the circumstances alone; however, when we found out why this child did what he did, we could only say that he had handled the situation well and effectively.

No behavior is universally considered as being normal. We can only look at what is normal in our own social structure, which might well be abnormal from another point of view. It can be said, however, that, to be regarded as normal in any society, an individual must learn that the best way to safeguard his comfort and well-being in the long run is to face reality. That is, it is necessary for a person to expose himself, on occasion, to present hardship as the surest way of assuring future survival. This is part of the job of the corrections officer: to assist the client to face the reality of his own problem-producing behavior. Behavior is valuable to an individual if it helps him to survive; if it does not, then he is in for problems. The individual must find a balance which will allow him to survive in society, to reduce tension, to resolve some of the conflicts as a result of daily demands on him.

Hence, in a sense, we are, as correctional personnel, attempting to socialize people so that they will not be in conflict with us. We are not attempting to over-socialize or to under-socialize; what we are trying to do, as correctional personnel, is to establish a mid-point between under-socialization and over-socialization so that there might be integration of behavior and an ability to get along with the rest of us.

The Objectives of Therapy.

The objectives of therapy are:

1. To provide opportunity for development of a sense of independence;
2. To develop a sense of individuality, to see own self as a person with an identity;
3. To assist the individual as part of the counseling process to develop self-confidence, confidence in others, ability to trust others, a sense of emotional security;
4. To develop a sense of direction: what goals, what objectives?

The simple tool called the interview serves to provide these objectives of therapy. It would be important, for example, at some point in the judgment of the probation officer to say to a client: "What do you want to be ten years from now?" Actually, we can ask ourselves this same question at various times. The

well-integrated individual can give a response which indicates direction and aspiration, if only to do better than he is doing now. One of the disappointing components in people with whom we deal in the correctional field is their satisfaction with the status quo. Actually, it is only the person himself who can make a change; we, as correctional personnel, provide the opportunity, the framework. The client must take advantage of this opportunity for himself; we can try to force it but there is substantial question as to how permanent forced behavior is.

The Correctional Officer and Change of Behavior.

It is not the responsibility of the correctional officer to punish. The deliberate plan of the correctional officer ought to center in changing behavior. This is our purpose and then what needs to be done must be done in relation to the purpose. Actually, there is nothing in probation and parole or in the corrections area generally, which calls for punishment; even on those occasions, which are seldom, when it is appropriate to "punish" a prisoner, it should be done in relation to an analysis and an understanding of the effects of this behavior on the client in relation to the purpose which the probation officer or parole officer or custodian has in mind, namely, to change behavior. And in the case of deprivation of privilege or physical punishment, or even in the case of placing a person in isolation, the question which the corrections person must take into account is whether such behavior in relation to the client is effective toward achieving the purpose, which is change in behavior. The general principle which, as correctional people, we must keep in mind, is that our services are to enable a person to modify his behavior; our service is not to punish but to correct.

The Record of Martin Johnson¹

The case record of Martin Johnson raises certain specific questions:

1. What effect does the interview on June 3 have on the relationship between the probation officer and Mr. Johnson?
2. How should an agent handle Mr. Johnson's hostility?
3. What do you do when the client, as in the case of Mr. Johnson, tests you?
4. What dangers are there in encouraging dependency?

¹See Appendix for the case material.

5. Why did Mr. Johnson call the agent relative to his planned trip to see his wife?
6. What about the interview with the client when the client was "high?"
7. Why did Mr. Johnson have to drink?
8. What about the probation officer's approach in counseling with respect to drinking?

Further Comments on Interviewing: Objectives.

In relation to the Johnson record and in relation to whatever answers are given to the questions specified, we might look at a few additional items relevant to interviewing. The first basic objective of the interview is to provide an increase in understanding of the problem both by the client, by the probation officer, and by the agency. One of the responsibilities in supervision of a probationer or parolee is to see that "production is kept up to snuff"; otherwise, there is always a question as to whether the probation officer is really doing his job. Thus, if the probation officer sees the client and if nothing changes, then, either (a) the probation officer is not doing his job or (b) he is not seeing or understanding what he ought to see or understand.

A second basic objective of the interview is to pass information along between the client and the agency. This is important because, in this way, the client may have a better picture and a better understanding of the system within which he is currently functioning. He might also derive a clearer, better understanding of his relationship with the probation officer.

Another, and third, basic objective of the interview is to help the client increase his insight into the nature of his problem. It is the responsibility of the probation officer or the parole officer, as a correctional person, to gather more detailed and more extensive information and, through this, to help the client understand some of the broader aspects of the situation in which he finds himself.

Fourthly, the interview should produce sufficient information to establish case goals and objectives and an assessment of the problem. This helps the probation officer to understand something more comprehensively about the direction in which the interview ought to be cast. Through this, the probation officer helps the client understand more adequately his own problems. In effect, the interview, as a tool, provides communication between the probation officer and the client, in a mutual process in which the probation officer finds out more about the total picture and in which the client participates in the process by which he comes to the point of changing his behavior.

As indicated previously, it is important that, in the course of the interview, we be aware of the types of questions which we ask. The problem which we face here is that we must differentiate

questions which lead to a "yes" or "no" answer from those questions which give us more substantial information and which encourage the client to express himself. The types of questions are as follows:

1. Clarifying questions.
2. Reflective questions.
3. Counseling questions.
4. Information-gathering questions.
5. Confronting questions.

Looking at the interview somewhat more specifically, the only tool which the probation officer has is the interview, through which he understands the offender and his behavior and through which the offender comes to understand more adequately his own self and his own behavior. As indicated previously, the ultimate objective of any correctional interview is to help the individual modify behavior so that it becomes more acceptable to him and to society.

Assumptions in Any Treatment System.

In any treatment system, whether casework or vocational counseling, there are certain assumptions:

1. That behavior can be modified. If we reject this principle, then we must reject everything that follows;
2. That the individual client has the capacity to modify his behavior; otherwise, there is no point in going any further;
3. That the interview is the tool which is used to accomplish both ends, namely, to help the client modify his behavior and to encourage the client to utilize his capacity to modify his behavior.

If we accept these three assumptions, then we accept the potential of the interview as an effective instrument. If one does not accept all three of these assumptions, then there is a question as to whether that person ought to continue his involvement in corrections. The interview involves much more than simply one question after another by the probation officer and the client, a relationship which is necessary in order that the probation officer be helpful to the client in modifying behavior.

Additional Characteristics of the Interview in a Correctional Setting.

There are some additional characteristics of the interview in a correctional setting, whether it is in the field services, adult or juvenile, institution, or camp:

1. The interview involves a relationship between at least two persons;
2. The relationship in the interview is made somewhat more complex than in other settings which involve voluntary participation. The client goes to those settings on his own; in corrections, the client is sent to us, which requires of the officer the use of a much greater skill in establishing the relationship because of the necessity of overcoming the initial negative reaction to authority.
3. The clientele in corrections feel they are people for whom nobody cares or wants. The fact of the matter is that the clientele are correct in making these judgments. They and society are reciprocally alienated.
4. One of the most crucial aspects of the corrections interview is communicating to the client that we are interested in him as a human being and that he is capable of change. Actually, what we need to face is the important consideration that the client, when he comes to the probation officer, doubts his ability to do or to be anything other than what he is. We must realize that when the client goes into court for the first time this is not the first time that he has been told that he is no good, because he has been told this many times over again.

Some Basic Principles of the Interviewing Situation.

It is important that the probation officer not add to the destructive self-image of the client, as a result of experiences of this kind. On the other hand, it is easy to suggest that the client is capable of change, but we must be aware that reassurance and much support should be contingent upon our basic knowledge that this person has the ultimate capacity to change. In the interview, in which the relationship is developed, there are certain basic principles which must be recognized:

1. The officer must try to place himself in the client's place. It is important to see the problem from the point of view of the client. If he complains about the court condition that he was refrained from making contact with others, it is important to understand why he feels this way, which does not mean that the officer agrees but only that he wants to understand why the client is feeling this way.
2. The officer must appreciate the fact that many times, it is impossible to understand client reactions, why clients function as they do, why they function in self-destructive ways. Perhaps this does not make sense to us but it certainly makes sense to the client. Whatever the clients do, they do because they want to get people to accept them. From our point of view, this may not be reasonable; but

from another point of view, it might well be reasonable. Many times, their behavior is exactly like ours, particularly if we remember that it is very difficult for us to change our own behavior. In that sense, at least, clients are more like us than they are different from us.

3. The probation officer must recognize that, frequently, the reaction of the client to him in terms of awe, hostility, or submission has little to do with him, the probation officer, as a person.
4. The probation officer is, to the client, an authoritative figure who controls him now as authoritative figures have controlled him in the past.
5. The responsibilities of the probation officer for leadership in the interview is central and important. The probation officer has responsibility for providing leadership, firmness without belittling or cajoling. It is important, in this connection, that we understand that client behavior is not necessarily like our own, so that really we cannot say that "I restrained my rampaging id, why can't he?" This is identifying yourself with the client and avoiding the very important consideration of individualizing. Actually, one of the most important procedures of the officer is to recognize individuality and to understand that what appears to be similar experiences outwardly carry with them entirely different human reactions inwardly.
6. For the interview to be successful, there must be faith in the basic goodness of human beings and in their potential for growth and development. Even when the picture is dark and dismal, it is still necessary that we retain our belief in the capacity for change and development.
7. It is important that, in the interview, the officer convey to the client his concern, that he make the client the center of attention, that he give the client the very clear idea that he, the client, is capable of improving and developing and growing. Some of the ways in which we might give this attention are:
 - (a) When the client comes in, clear your desk;
 - (b) Put your pencil down;
 - (c) Don't tap your feet;
 - (d) Don't gaze out the window;
 - (e) Don't accept telephone calls;
 - (f) Don't take notes during the interview except when there are data which are important for accurate records, such as birthdates, number in family.

8. It is important that the probation officer or the parole officer give the client an opportunity to talk, to open up, to express himself; not infrequently, the reason that clients do not talk is that they are not given an opportunity to talk;
9. The probation officer and the parole officer in the interview should not force a response. That is to say, the probation officer should not say to the client "Do you think that the reason for your trouble is that you stay out late at night, that you do not obey your mother and father?" and then record that Johnny is not communicative. Actually, in a situation like this, which is not uncommon, how much does the probation officer understand about the problem?
10. The probation officer or the parole officer, in the interviewing situation, should be professional and not a friend. This does not mean that the probation or parole officer should be cold and unfeeling, but that he should get the client to tell him, the probation officer, about his feelings; it is not the business of the probation or the parole officer to tell the client about his own feelings.

What about those situations in which people do not talk? In such situations, we might well ask ourselves "why?" Perhaps, the reason is that people are afraid. Particularly in a situation involving a court disposition, which is an authoritative decision, there is fear and anxiety and it is not surprising that people do not talk. In such situations, it is not unreasonable to consider the possibility that the probation officer also remain quiet, at least for a while, unless the situation is one which demands action. The point is that the probation officer must develop a relationship of trust with the probationer or the parolee, without which there is no possibility of effectively working out problems. Sometimes, it takes much more than one interview to get a client to talk; it should be recognized, in such situations, that it takes more than one interview for the client to develop a sense of confidence and trust in the probation officer.

Note-taking, Interrupting, the Non-judgmental Attitude, the Art of Listening.

There remain a few additional items which should be referred to in the matter of the interview, namely,

1. Note-taking.

It is necessary, of course, to make notes on factual information, since it is important to secure facts relevant to the problem and the situation in order to formulate a diagnostic statement, on the basis of which treatment plans can be made and goals can be established.

However, a caution should be kept in mind, namely, that if you spend too much time on note-taking, you will miss a great deal which the client will tell you both about himself and about the situation. In writing up the content of the interview, remember that if the record is well done, it should be the basis for the next interview. Thus, actually, note-taking should be judged sensitively and carefully in order to secure factual information but not too much time should be spent in note-taking and a great deal of time in listening to what the client has to say. It should also be emphasized and re-emphasized that if the record is well done, it should be the basis for planning and for succeeding interviews; this will insure the important principle that the probation officer should, in order to be effective in his interviewing, know where he has been and where he is going.

2. Another concern involves the question of when the client is allowed to talk and when interruption is appropriate. There is no rule of thumb on this matter, since it depends on sensitivity, perception, intuition; however, it might be said that (a) the probation officer should not interrupt while the client is talking or when he, the probation officer, is irritated or annoyed; (b) the officer should interrupt when it is appropriate and effective to re-direct the direction of the interview.

It is very important to give the client the opportunity to ramble as he will until such time as he might say something on which the probation officer might want to pick up. This enables the probation officer to develop a relationship, because listening to what the client has to say is central to conveying the impression that the probation officer is interested, concerned, and wants to help. The relationship is not established once and forever; it is something which can be broken and has to be nurtured and kept alive. It is most important, in this connection, to remember that it is necessary for the probation officer to avoid judgment; this is difficult but it should also be remembered that passing judgment is the function of the court and not of the probation officer. The function of the probation officer is to help the client recognize his own attitudes, his own abilities, and to enable him to use his abilities to develop more adequate and more constructive forms of behavior.

Correctional personnel must remember that they deal with people who are uncommunicative, who have low levels of self-esteem. This means, specifically, that we should not be overwhelming in the interview, thus running the risk of losing the client. It is important also that we not try to impress the client either with our authority or with our high level of intelligence; perhaps, at times, it is important to say, "I don't know," but it is equally important to follow this with a question as to why the client asks and find out something about the significance of the question.

3. Non-judgmental attitude.

This does not mean that we condone anti-social behavior. It simply means that while we are concerned about behavior, we are more concerned about him as a person. Suppose a youngster is brought to you with the complaint that he is swearing at his mother. It is not the business of the probation officer to say "that's too bad" or "she deserved it"; rather it is the business of the probation officer to find out why the youngster was swearing at his mother and something about the feelings of the youngster which led him to swear at his mother and something about the general total situation within which this kind of behavior took place. The task is not to be sympathetic or critical but to be concerned.

4. Art of listening.

It is probably the case that probation officers and parole officers talk too much; it is most important for them to understand and realize that listening is one of the most important techniques in the interview. There are certain elements of listening:

(a) Non-verbal communication (seeing).

This means watching responses and noting whether there are facial expressions which carry certain meanings with them; watching for signs of tension, such as nail biting, squirming, perspiring, twitching; watching to see whether the person is attractive or unattractive; whether the client is well dressed or shabbily dressed.

(b) Hearing not only the client's actual words but also his tone of voice, which gives some idea as to his alertness or despondency.

(c) Listening with the "third ear".

This means trying to understand what the client is saying. Thus, the probation officer hears the words, but his perception penetrates beneath the words to what the client means by what he says, what the client is trying to communicate without actually saying it. Thus, the probation officer uses what the client says to understand what the client means; if the probation officer gets to this point, then his response is always directed, not necessarily to what the client is actually saying, but specifically to what the client is meaning.

Do's and Don'ts in the Interview.

Certain do's and don'ts should be observed by both the probation officer and the parole officer.

DO'S

1. Greet counselee in friendly and unhurried manner.
2. Have a chair beside the desk or table and not across from it and a clean desk if at all possible.
3. Have a clean, neat, uncluttered office.
4. Wherever there is a secretary, have her hold the calls while the interview is in progress.
5. Help interviewee to tell his story by being accepting, interested; let the interviewee talk.
6. Give client chance to pause and think if he wants to; enjoy the glorious sound of silence.
7. Ask questions that call for discussion or explanation.
8. Try to keep up with the client as to what he is saying, doing, or feeling.
9. Try to meet the client's demand for answers by defining your role as counselor.
10. Give client idea as to how much time he has for the interview.
11. Close the interview tactfully and smoothly with definite time set for next appointment if needed.

DON'TS

1. Give impression of being harried and impatient.
2. Face counselee across the expanse of a desk, suggesting that you are the boss.
3. Have a curiosity shop that is more interesting for the client to look at than for the client to talk to you.
4. Have a telephone that rings constantly.
5. Prod the counselee to "tell all" or tell him about your own experiences.
6. Fill in the pauses with talk.
7. Ask questions which can be answered with "yes" or "no".
8. Ignore the question which calls for direct answers or give counselee the solution for his problems.
9. Allow the client to get involved in an important discussion that has to be interrupted when time is up.
10. Leave the client with the feeling he is being pushed out.

If, in the field of corrections, we are to take our work seriously, and if we are to give it the importance which it inherently has, then we must recognize the central significance of the interview.

APPENDIX

The Probation Record of Martin Johnson

THE PROBATION RECORD OF MARTIN JOHNSON

This man (age 27) had been arrested by the police on the complaint of his wife because he had been drinking. He was charged with disturbing the peace, pleaded guilty, and was placed on probation for one year. The court set down as a condition of probation - "no drinking." At the probation office it was learned that he had been married five years and there were three children. He worked regularly as a carpenter. His wife was a very devout member of a church which forbade dancing, attending movies and theaters. His wife described him as a wonderful person "except when he drinks" and said the children were very fond of him. He was said to get drunk a few times a month but he denied this. He said his wife went home to her mother, taking the children, every time he was a "little late" coming home. They rent their home.

The conditions of the probation were given to him and briefly discussed. When asked if he knew what the probation officer's job was supposed to be, he replied, "Just keep an eye on me." He said he had no questions because he figured the only thing he had to do was "keep my nose clean."

During the first six weeks on probation Johnson reported every two weeks. It was noticeable that he was reluctant to talk about anything, including his feelings about being on probation. Nothing outstanding transpired during this time and then nearly two months after he was placed on probation, a report was received that he had been arrested the night before following a family argument but released the next morning. His wife called the same day that report was received asking the probation officer to come see her. She was seen the following day.

Extract from Chronological Record

6/3 Visited Johnson's wife at home of her parents. She mentioned that her only complaint against her husband is his drinking. He is a fine, considerate father and husband but goes on a "toot" every so often. She implied she would not return to him unless he assures her definitely he will quit drinking.

She introduced her children, all of whom appeared to be well behaved and healthy. Her parents' home was immaculate, and the furnishings and objects therein would indicate her family background reflected a close family relationship. There were books for group singing, games, and other indications of family activity.

She told me they had been planning to buy a home and had made a down payment; but following this latest episode, she was going to ask for the money back. She requested that I not discuss with her husband any of the things she had mentioned. She did believe, however, that it

would be a good idea for me to try to reach him at his parents' home.

Later: Visited home of probationer's parents--three rooms over a store that is shabby in appearance. Johnson's sister opened the door and he was seated on the davenport, facing the door, drinking a cup of black coffee. On seeing me he said, "Oh, oh--call the cops." and then invited me in.

I asked how things were coming along and he said everything was fine though he was a little high right now. His mother and sister retired to another room appearing hesitant and expectant. He talked in partially belligerent tones appearing to attempt an air of nonchalance. He asked if I would excuse him while he shaved. He also asked if I wanted a bottle of beer. I told him "no" and went on to explain the inadvisability of this while on the job.

He shaved, cutting himself several times. Meanwhile, he ordered his mother to get various articles that he needed to shave. She seemed continually on the verge of tears. When he finished shaving, he asked his mother and sister if they would go out for a while so that he could talk to his probation officer. They left and he then seated himself in a posture of seeming indifference on the davenport.

He asked me why I didn't call the police. He said, "You are a cop, aren't you?" I told him that we had some of the duties of police officers, but I wondered what good it would be to call the police at the present moment. I felt I would rather talk to him first. He then affected a type of sloppy appreciation. He replied, "I see that you have a psychology. That's certainly different from the police officers, but there was one of them who had a psychology, too. He came to see me in my cell and told me what a fool I was making of myself." He then went into an explanation of how the police had pushed him around and refused to listen to him; he said that he couldn't stand being in jail; he would rather hang himself.

I told him that it seemed as though being put in jail had quite an effect on him--also that I was wondering what had brought about this recent difficulty resulting in his arrest. He related at length how his wife was overly religious; he and his wife had formerly participated mutually in church activities. He felt his wife paid too great heed to her mother's wishes. He was getting drunk because it was the only way to strike back at his wife and her parents. He could not reason with them, so he went out and got drunk.

I pointed out that often people used drinking to hurt others and wondered if he felt this helped him to accomplish his aim. He felt it did benefit him to some extent. I wondered if he had ever found any other way in which he would work off these feelings. He replied that he didn't know and actually hadn't thought of it in that way. I then explained to him that sometimes we found in talking to an outsider that we might find other ways of getting rid of these feelings and approaching our own problems. He replied that he had never thought of that before. He seemed definitely interested in this point.

We discussed the use of alcohol further and I asked if its use seemed to present any problem to him. He denied that alcohol was a problem and added, "I have it well in hand." He explained that he was well liked on his job, that he could miss work, and that his employer would still want him back. (Previously this had been verified by his wife.)

He then asked me what I was going to do, and I told him I was wondering what would be the best solution for this situation. I commented that perhaps he had not gained a very good understanding in the first interview of what my job as a probation officer involved and why the court had placed him on probation. It meant that we were given the responsibility by the court as an agent of society to see that the conditions of probation were carried out. This would mean, of course, that I would be working with him to see that he lived by the rules of his probation. I went somewhat into the background of probation as a rehabilitation measure. I told him that we were also attempting to help him as a person, as he was an individual and an important member of society; and that this was one of the reasons he was placed on probation-- in order that he might have an opportunity to utilize outside assistance in facing his problems.

He said, "Then you really are trying to help me rather than put me in jail." I told him that was correct. He said that he had never thought of it in this way; he had always thought we were just trying to put him back in jail. He then asked, "Are you a psychologist?" I told him that one might look at it in that way.

The conversation went on in areas of his interest. We discussed his home and his family. He mentioned that he and his wife were going to buy a home and seemed enthused about this and the work of fixing it up. He was very serious and showing appropriate emotions. He sometimes had tears in his eyes when discussing his wife. He described her as a wonderful wife and mother and said that he wanted to have her back and would like to be able to quit his drinking as this was the only thing that made them separate.

I said, "Then you do feel that drinking is a problem with you." He replied that it was a problem. I told him that perhaps we could work on that problem during the time he was on probation. He asked, "Can I call you up whenever I feel I am getting into trouble?" I told him that he certainly could. He became quite quiet and reflective. He mentioned that he was going to try to see his wife in the evening and attempt a reconciliation. He wanted to phone me and tell me how he made out. I told him I would not be at work on this occasion explaining that we usually do not desire home calls. He appeared to understand this and said that he would do it this time only.

I then decided I would have to return to the office. He grabbed my hand and looking the other way, said with considerable emotion, "Thank you very much, Mr. Roe."

Later: In the evening, he phoned and stated he was on his way over to see his wife and did not know how late it would be, so he was phoning first. I told him I was very glad to hear about it anyway and would await developments with interest.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Fenlason, Anne F., et. al., Essentials in Interviewing, rev. ed., New York, Harper-Row, 1962.

Garrett, Annette, Interviewing, Its Principles and Methods, New York, Family Service Association of America, 1942.

Hartman, Henry L., "Interviewing Techniques in Probation and Parole: Building the Relationship," Federal Probation, March, 1963.

Hartman, Henry L., "Interviewing Techniques in Probation and Parole: The Art of Listening," Federal Probation, June, 1963.

Hartman, Henry L., "Interviewing Techniques in Probation and Parole: The Initial Interview (Part 1)," Federal Probation, September, 1963.

Hartman, Henry L., "Interviewing Techniques in Probation and Parole: The Initial Interview (Part 2)," Federal Probation, December, 1963.

Newman, Charles L., "Concepts of Treatment in Probation and Parole Supervision," in Sourcebook on Probation, Parole and Pardons, ed. Charles L. Newman, Springfield, Charles C. Thomas, 1968. Also in Federal Probation, 24 (No. 1): 11-19, March, 1961.

U.S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Task Force on Corrections, Task Force Report: Corrections. 1967.