

Hair Analysis for the Detection of Drug Use in  
Pretrial, Probation, and Parole Populations ..... *James D. Baer*  
*Werner A. Baumgartner*  
*Virginia A. Hill*  
*William H. Blahd*

Tools for the Trade: Neuro-Linguistic  
Programming and the Art of Communication ..... *Richard Gray*

al Effects of the Status  
..... *Charles Bahn*  
*James R. Davis*

ing in Federal Pretrial Release ..... *Timothy P. Cadigan*

ing in Florida ..... *Joseph E. Papy*  
*Richard Nimer*

n: Hard Realities and **NCJRS**  
..... *Mark W. Osler*

ucation Success ..... **DEC 10 1991** ..... *J.D. Jamieson*  
*William E. Stone*

omen: A Cry for Help **ACQUISITIONS** ..... *Anita Sue Kolman*  
*Claudia Wasserman*

velopmental Perspective:  
orrections ..... *Ted Palmer*

ison Gang Development:  
ssment ..... *Robert S. Fong*  
*Salvador Buentello*

**MARCH 1991**

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

133407-

133416

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

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

# Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME LV

MARCH 1991

NCJRS

NUMBER 1

MAY 16 1991

## This Issue in Brief<sup>ACQUISITIONS</sup>

**Hair Analysis for the Detection of Drug Use in Pretrial, Probation, and Parole Populations.**—Comparing the results of radioimmunoassay (RIA) hair analysis for drug use with urinalysis results and self-reports of drug use among aftercare clients in the Central District of California, authors James D. Baer, Werner A. Baumgartner, Virginia A. Hill, and William H. Bland propose that hair analysis offers the criminal justice system a complementary technique for identifying illegal drug use. The study results are timely in light of the recent decision of a U.S. district court judge who accepted a positive RIA hair analysis result as valid forensic proof that a probationer had violated the conditions of probation (EDNY Dkt. No. 87-CR-824-3).

**Tools for the Trade: Neuro-Linguistic Programming and the Art of Communication.**—Whether viewed as a rehabilitative modality or a sanction, probation remains a person-to-person profession in that probation officers still deal with individuals. According to author Richard Gray, some recent developments in psychology may provide tools for investigation, assessment, helping, and, sometimes, healing. His article describes neuro-linguistic programming and how probation officers may use the technique to develop rapport and communicate effectively and consciously with clients.

**Social-Psychological Effects of the Status of Probationer.**—Authors Charles Bahn and James R. Davis report on a non-random sample of 43 probationers who were tested and interviewed in order to assess the social-psychological effects of probation in four areas: emotions; family, peer, and work relations; self-concept; and stigma. The authors administered an open-ended questionnaire, a scalogram, and a self-concept inventory and found, among other things, that probationers had the support of family, friends, and even some employers. The authors conclude that probation is

more than a "slap on the wrist" but that it does not overwhelm all aspects of a probationer's life.

**Electronic Monitoring in Federal Pretrial Release.**—Author Timothy P. Cadigan focuses on current use of electronic monitoring in Federal pretrial release programs, first discussing, in general, how to establish such programs and what to consider in doing so. Then, based on demographic data about Federal defendants on electronic monitoring, the article assesses whether

### CONTENTS

|  |  |        |
|--|--|--------|
| [ Hair Analysis for the Detection of Drug Use in Pretrial, Probation, and Parole Populations . . . . . | James D. Baer<br>Werner A. Baumgartner<br>Virginia A. Hill<br>William H. Bland 3 | 133407 |
| [ Tools for the Trade: Neuro-Linguistic Programming and the Art of Communication . . . . .             | Richard Gray 11  | 133408 |
| [ Social-Psychological Effects of the Status of Probationer . . . . .                                  | Charles Bahn<br>James R. Davis 17  | 133409 |
| [ Electronic Monitoring in Federal Pretrial Release . . . . .  | Timothy P. Cadigan 26  | 133410 |
| [ Electronic Monitoring in Florida . . . . .   | Joseph E. Papy<br>Richard Nimer 31   | 133411 |
| [ Shock Incarceration: Hard Realities and Real Possibilities . . . . .                                 | Mark W. Osler 34   | 133412 |
| [ Predicting DWI Education Success . . . . .   | J.D. Jamieson<br>William E. Stone 43   | 133413 |
| [ Theft Groups for Women: A Cry for Help . . . . .   | Anita Sue Kolman<br>Claudia Wasserman 48   | 133414 |
| [ The Habilitation/Developmental Perspective: Missing Link in Corrections . . . . .                    | Ted Palmer 55  | 133415 |
| [ The Detection of Prison Gang Development: An Empirical Assessment . . . . .                          | Robert S. Fong<br>Salvador Buentello 66  | 133416 |
| Departments  |  |        |
| News of the Future . . . . .   |  | 70     |
| Looking at the Law . . . . .   |  | 73     |
| Reviews of Professional Periodicals . . . . .  |  | 80     |
| Your Bookshelf on Review . . . . .   |  | 92     |
| It Has Come to Our Attention . . . . .   |  | 100    |

# Social-Psychological Effects of the Status of Probationer

BY CHARLES BAHN AND JAMES R. DAVIS\*

**P**ROBATION IS the most widely selected correctional program, yet little is actually known about its effectiveness (Allen, Eskridge, Latessa, & Vito, 1985, p. 264). The most popular public view of probation is that it involves leniency with very little punishment (Clear, 1973, p. 112). In fact, within some jurisdictions, probation is nothing more than a suspension of sentence, since little or no supervision or, at best, superficial supervision, is provided (Abadinsky, 1982, p. 96; Scarpitti & Stephenson, 1968, p. 362). Recent research has seemed to justify a distrust in the efficacy of probation as a meaningful sanction. Probation often lacks credibility with the community it serves, including the general public as well as the other agencies of the criminal justice system (Clear & Shapiro, 1986, pp. 42, 43).

However, from the opposite perspective, St. John (1961, p. 30) believes that properly understood and applied, probation is very far from being a "let-off" and makes very difficult demands, some of which can be, for certain individuals, as exacting and painful as a prison sentence. Dressler (1951, p. 39) states that if the public accepts the concept on which the philosophy of probation is based, then it follows that probation is not to be viewed as a form of leniency.

King (1969, p. 91), even in the sixties, wrote that probation may mean different things and arouse different feelings among different probationers, and the probation officer needs to be constantly on guard against stereotypical interpretations and approaches. Andrew (1978, pp. 11-12) believes that many probationers react with either too little or too much anxiety, which can make the probationer act out either passively, by rejecting court orders, or overtly, by fleeing, respectively.

Keve (1954, p. 245) believes that probationers who are polite, pleasant, agreeable, and superficially cooperative are usually keeping their true feelings concealed and are more to be feared than probationers who are hostile and open. Others

(Dressler, 1951, pp. 146-147; St. John, 1961, p. 68) believe that probationers perceive the probation officer as an authority figure, perhaps from childhood, and distrust anyone associated with law enforcement. Dressler (1951, p. 147) believes that it is difficult to identify fully with the fears of the offender.

## *Theoretical Perspective*

It is accepted that punishment has four main objectives: (a) incapacitation, (b) retribution, (c) deterrence, and (d) rehabilitation. Probation can meet all four objectives. However, Hussey and Duffee (1980, pp. 25, 57, 111) argue that probation doesn't have the status of punishment because it subscribes to a rehabilitative philosophy. Clarke (1979, pp. 413-414) states that probation is not usually thought of as retribution or deterrence, although it does involve a substantial loss of privacy and liberty. Czajkoski (1973, p. 13) believes that punishment is implicit in probation. Roundtree, Edwards, and Parker (1984, p. 54) assert that probation is simply rehabilitation.

Allen, Carlson, and Parks (1979, p. 239) list several varied roles of the probation officer. The punitive law enforcement officer is concerned with the protection of the community, through direct control of the probationer. The welfare/therapeutic officer is primarily concerned with the improved welfare of the probationer. The punitive/synthetic officer combines treatment and law-enforcement. The passive/time seeker has little concern for either the welfare of the community or the probationer, and sees his or her job as a sinecure requiring a minimum of effort. The quasi-judicial role emphasizes the legitimacy of plea-bargaining, enforcement of conditions of probation, revocation, etc. In the integrative role, the probation officer attempts to blend the conflicting claims of societal protection and offender rehabilitation. In the counseling role, the probation officer displays a style of empathic understanding with his or her clients.

Probationers can experience a range of emotional reactions, e.g., anxiety, shame, physiological reactions, or even admiration and positive feelings, depending on both the particular probation officer assigned to their case and on the particular objectives emphasized during the probation interaction. A lot also depends on the probation

\*Charles Bahn is professor of psychology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, New York, and James R. Davis is probation officer for the Department of Probation, New York City.

organization.

Abadinsky (1982, p. 249) concludes that the label an offender receives results in a negative self-image whereby the offender views himself or herself as inferior and worthless. However, there is disagreement in the literature on whether or not labeling affects the behavior of deviants, including offenders.

Goffman (1974, pp. 3, 30) uses the term "stigma" to refer to an attribute that is discrediting. In general, he states, the tendency for a stigma to spread from the stigmatized individual to his close connections provides a reason why such relations tend either to be avoided or to terminate where it exists. Lansing (1981, p. 120) asserts that it is very difficult to avoid the stigma of being an ex-con.

Shoham and Rahan (1982, pp. 4, 133) most directly state that the stigma of conviction as a criminal, or being identified or tagged as deviant, limits a person's socioeconomic opportunities and forcibly changes his status and role. He may at first reject some of the legitimate groups' norms and seek the company of other ex-convicts and deviants who have similar adjustment problems. The stigma of crime results in narrowing of job opportunities, the severing of business links, the withholding of financial credit, and domestic difficulties.

Hussey and Duffee (1980, pp. 156-160) believe that all offenders must deal with feelings of stigma. A large part of the offenders' interactions with other people will be constrained by the anticipation of rejection. The defenses to this rejection may include secrecy, belligerence, and a propensity to reject other people first. Interaction between the offender and probation officer will make the offender feel overly exposed as offender and further reduce the offender's feeling of status. As a result, some probationers will be suspicious of officials and cynical about programs that claim to help.

Self-concept and self-esteem are sometimes used interchangeably in the literature, although they have different meanings. They are defined in various ways. Some view self-esteem as one of the many dimensions of self-concept.

Bhatti, Derezsotes, Kim, and Specht (1989, pp. 33, 36) define the self-concept as "the totality of a complex and dynamic system of learned beliefs that an individual holds to be true about his or her personal existence and that gives consistency to his or her personality." They claim that self-concept usually refers to the concept that individuals hold of themselves as physical, social, and

spiritual moral beings.

Coopersmith (1967, pp. 5-6) defines self-esteem as the evaluation which the individual makes and customarily maintains with regard to himself. He states that self-esteem concerns the amount of respectful acceptance and concerned treatment that an individual receives from significant others. Kaplan (1975, p. 16) asserts that self-esteem is universally and characteristically a dominant motive.

Hussey and Duffee (1980, p. 298; Kaplan, 1975, pp. 80, 91) claim that for many offenders the deviant self-image is the only consistent way to handle the threat to the self. Allen et al. (1979, p. 149) write that the common ingredient in probation treatment seems to be an attempt to foster the development of a positive self-concept. Some (Bhatti et al., 1989, p. 34; Kitano, 1989, pp. 311, 319) claim that being a member of a minority group doesn't lead to or mean low self-esteem. Keve (1961, p. 30) believes that the building of self-esteem is one of the most important aspects of rehabilitation.

Probationers, as part of the criminal justice system, suffer various emotions, are the victims of labeling and stigmatization, and may or may not suffer damage to their self-concept and self-esteem; these in turn may directly or indirectly affect relations with intimates, friends, peers, and employers. These social-psychological reactions to probation are the subject of this research.

### *Review of the Literature*

The literature on the social-psychological effects of probation on probationers is virtually barren. There are, however, a few studies which assess probationers' views on probation and therefore indirectly contribute to the research problem.

In 1948 (Rumney & Murphy, 1952), 672 probationers who had been on probation in 1937 in New Jersey were interviewed to determine their feelings toward probation. The results showed that 21 percent thought that probation was what they had needed; 30 percent thought well of it; 18 percent said it was a nuisance; 13 percent were unfavorably disposed to it; 2 percent regarded it as a joke; 6 percent thought it was some form of punishment; and 32 percent disliked reporting. The probationers generally thought that probation officers should show more respect and understanding, and some complained of indifference, harshness, and injustice.

Lansing (1981, pp. 284-295) found that misdemeanants in his study had critical attitudes toward their probation officers; some, however,

believed that their probation officers had helped them and had treated them less like a criminal than expected.

Gibbs (1982) interviewed a sample from 125 probationers in New Jersey and found that generally they were a satisfied group. Allen (1985, p. 72), in his study of Federal probationers in Illinois, found that although 28.8 percent of the probationers had found nothing useful in probation supervision, the majority, 66.7 percent, reported that they had received many benefits from probation.

One author (Davis, 1985) interviewed 35 probationers and eight families of these probationers in the Bronx, New York, to ascertain levels of familial and social support during probation. The results revealed that the majority had received advice and concrete help from their relatives; some suffered anxiety and shame. Davis concluded that there was a subculture among probationers and their families and friends, many of whom had been in trouble with the law, which helped to mitigate negative psychological reactions to probation.

Gibbs (1985) tape-recorded interviews with over 50 men and women who were on probation in New Jersey. The results revealed that although 35 percent thought of probation constantly or occasionally, for the majority, images of probation didn't protrude into everyday thought. Over 70 percent reported at least one undesirable feature, but about three-fourths liked their probation officer. Some, however, would spend a certain proportion of time in jail or prison or pay a certain fine in lieu of probation. Gibbs concludes that probation was generally considered a mild penalty.

### *Methodology*

A non-random sample of 43 adult probationers was identified by including all those who consecutively volunteered on or after a set date from the case load of one author. Three probationers declined participation and were not included. Three instruments were administered to the ensuing sample:

- a questionnaire, consisting of 16 open-ended questions, administered in interview format;
- a scalogram consisting of 15 items, with five choices for each item, which had been devised for this study by the authors;
- the Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI), a self-concept scale developed by Bennett, Soren-

sen, and Forshay (1971), which was itself a modified version of the seminal Coopersmith (1967) self-esteem inventory.

The latter two instruments were administered to only 41 of the 43 respondents in the sample because of scheduling difficulties. However, pilot testing of all three instruments was done with three probationers whose responses were not included in this study.

To ensure that the SAI was a satisfactory and valid measure of self-esteem, additional pilot work was undertaken. First, reliability measures of the SAI ranged from .60 to .80 and are significant at the .01 level. In all studies (Brodsky & Smitherman, 1983, pp. 570-571), the SAI is also identified as having content validity. As a further check, both the SAI and the longer and more elaborately developed MSEI (Multidimensional Self-Esteem Inventory, Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc., 1988) were administered to 36 graduate students. Correlational tests of the results produced a significant overall correlation of .83 between the SAI and the MSEI, and significant correlations ranging from .42 to .72 between the SAI and each of the 11 subdimension scales of the MSEI. This supports the validity of the SAI, despite its shorter, less elaborate format and content. The SAI, because of its relative simplicity, is more appropriate for use with a probationer sample.

The sample was mainly male (40 of 43), Hispanic or black (39 of 43), mainly in the age group 19 to 35 (34 of 43), single (29 of 43), with less than a high school education (28 of 43), and employed full or part-time (35 of 43). Most were charged with felonies (36 of 43) and property and drug crimes (34 of 43). Twelve of the 43 had violations of probation pending, and 11 had a drug or alcohol problem. The majority had been on probation from 1 to 3 years (24 of 43). In agreement with the literature, the probationers were not a very criminally oriented group, since 19 of the 43 had no prior record, and 35 of the 43 had no subsequent record during probation supervision. The mean of the number of prior arrests was 1.3, and the mean of the number of subsequent arrests was .4.

### *Findings*

The 16 questions of the questionnaire are shown in appendix A. The main results of the responses follow:

1. Virtually all except one told their family, and 23 told their friends, of their probation status. Forty of the 43 stated that their family helped

them, e.g., advice, money, employment, and legal help; many family members tried to redirect the respondents into law-abiding lives. However, most respondents stated that their families had always helped them. About half, 22, had family or friends who were or had been in trouble with the law.

2. The majority, 28, had told, or would have told, their boss that they were on probation. Those who hadn't, 15, were afraid of the boss' reaction or afraid of being fired.

3. Most subjects, 31, thought about being on probation incessantly, with the main themes centering on reporting, rearrest, and stigma.

4. A plurality, 37, had something positive to say about probation, e.g., liked their probation officer; infrequency of reporting; better than jail; and the help received in staying out of trouble. Only 13 had anything negative to say about probation, e.g., long period of probation supervision; reporting; feelings of being a criminal; future employment concerns; and referral to a mental health clinic.

5. Almost all probationers wanted additional help from their probation officer for some concrete problems, e.g., education, marital problems, employment, legal advice, which apparently they thought they were not getting. Concurrent with these perceptions, the majority thought that the purpose of probation was deterrence or punishment, not rehabilitation.

6. A majority of respondents, 34, stated that their life had changed since being placed on probation, e.g., don't "hang out" at night; stay home more; avoid certain associates; try to "stay out of trouble"; more responsibility; refraining from drugs or alcohol; and thought more seriously of their lives.

7. Twenty, slightly less than half, stated that they were afraid or anxious about probation, e.g., jail, violation of probation, and missing appointments. Eleven stated that they felt depressed, e.g., due to their crime, ban on traveling, and other restrictions.

8. Most, 36, did not think of themselves as criminals. They thought that their actions were misunderstood or were justified; or their crime was not serious. Some stated that only robbers, thieves, or murderers are criminals; some stated that millions commit crimes; one said that those who commit government crimes are criminals; one claimed self-defense. Sixteen respondents didn't believe their arrest was justified, e.g., innocence, forced to do it, no evidence, victim of circumstances. The majority, however, 34, thought of proba-

tion as a just punishment, e.g., first offense, no prior record, crime a mistake, not a "killer," and employed.

A shortened version of the scalogram, developed by the authors, with the responses of the 41 probationers, is shown in table 1. The full scalogram is shown in appendix B.

Looking at the first six items in table 1, it can be seen that probationers prefer probation to jail or prison, to being charged with a sexual crime, to arrest, and to drug treatment. However, they prefer community service and counseling to probation. This reveals that probationers know about community service, and they know also that probation is not necessarily counseling. Looking at items 7 and 8, the majority felt good after talking to their probation officer and liked coming to the probation office. Looking at item 9, the majority indicated that family and friends helped. Looking at item 10, the majority would tell their boss of their probation status. Looking at item 11, most indicated that their crime was not serious. Looking at item 15, the majority are frightened of jail.

The results of the scalogram are generally consistent with the results of the questionnaire. The only exception is item 14, in which the majority stated that they felt very good about themselves, but on the questionnaire 20 stated that they were anxious and 11 stated that they were depressed. The difference might be in the wording and meaning of the terms in the questionnaire and scalogram or in the presentation of the questions in context.

These responses were based on the modal responses to the scalogram. For 1 item, the modal and mean responses were equal, choice number 1; for 4 items, the mean response was choice number 3; for 8 items, the mean response was choice number 2; and for 2 items, the mean response was choice number 4. Therefore, for at least 11 items, the mean choice was the same or close to the modal response.

The SAI, or self-concept scale, is a 50-item paper and pencil test with statements about the respondent in which he or she is asked to mark "like me" or "unlike me." The statements are worded so that for 24 items a "like me" and for 26 items an "unlike me" are indicative of high self-esteem.

The SAI can be scored from 0 to 50, depending on the number of correct responses. For this study, the raw scores were converted into T scores.<sup>1</sup> The means of the T scores for the respondents and the college students were 49.9927 and 49.9912, respectively, and the difference was non-

TABLE 1. SCALOGRAM WITH CUMULATED NUMBER OF CHOICES FOR EACH ITEM

|                              | 1 <sup>a</sup>    | 2   | 3    | 4   | 5   |                                    |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|------------------------------------|
| 1. Probation                 | 32** <sup>b</sup> | 5   | 3    | 0   | 1   | 1. Jail, prison                    |
| 2. Probation                 | 20*               | 3** | 8    | 3   | 7   | 2. Sexual crime                    |
| 3. Arrest                    | 5                 | 2   | 6    | 4** | 24* | 3. Probation                       |
| 4. Community service         | 17*               | 7** | 7    | 2   | 8   | 4. Probation                       |
| 5. Drug treatment            | 12                | 5   | 6**  | 2   | 16* | 5. Probation                       |
| 6. Counseling                | 14*               | 7   | 11** | 1   | 8   | 6. Probation                       |
| 7. Good <sup>c</sup>         | 33*               | 2** | 2    | 1   | 3   | 7. Nervous                         |
| 8. Like <sup>d</sup>         | 18*               | 8** | 7    | 2   | 6   | 8. Don't like                      |
| 9. Helped <sup>e</sup>       | 31*               | 2** | 5    | 1   | 2   | 9. Not helped                      |
| 10. Tell <sup>f</sup>        | 24*               | 1** | 8    | 1   | 7   | 10. Not tell                       |
| 11. Not serious <sup>g</sup> | 13*               | 4   | 10** | 6   | 8   | 11. Serious                        |
| 12. Same <sup>h</sup>        | 31*               | 2** | 3    | 2   | 3   | 12. Different                      |
| 13. Don't know <sup>i</sup>  | 7                 | 7   | 7**  | 0   | 20* | 13. Know                           |
| 14. Very good <sup>j</sup>   | 30*               | 2** | 2    | 2   | 5   | 14. Nervous, depressed,<br>ashamed |
| 15. Not afraid <sup>k</sup>  | 1                 | 2   | 6    | 4** | 28* | 15. Frighten                       |

<sup>a</sup>1=prefer the left the most; 2=prefer the left somewhat less; 3=neutral, prefer either right or left; 4=prefer the right somewhat; 5=prefer the right the most.

<sup>b</sup>One asterisk indicates the modal response; two asterisks indicate the mean response.

<sup>c</sup>Refers talking to his or her probation officer.

<sup>d</sup>Refers to coming to the probation office.

<sup>e</sup>Refers to family and friends.

<sup>f</sup>Refers to his or her boss.

<sup>g</sup>Refers to crime which resulted in probation.

<sup>h</sup>Refers to treatment by family and friends.

<sup>i</sup>Refers to whether or not family and friends know about probation.

<sup>j</sup>Refers to probationers' personal feelings since probation.

<sup>k</sup>Refers to jail.

significant at the .05 level.

A series of five  $t$  tests was conducted by dividing the sample of 41 respondents into two groups of unequal size to determine if respondents with five characteristics—(a) fear and anxiety, (b) strong family and peer support, (c) family and friends in trouble with the law, (d) positive relationship with their probation officer, and (e) arrest not justified—would have a more positive self-concept than others. The results showed that none of the  $t$  tests was significant at the .05 level.<sup>2</sup>

### Conclusions

One conclusion strongly supported is that probationers receive a great deal of help and support from family, friends, and even from some employers. This occurs regardless of the seriousness of the crime. Intimates and peers did not avoid our respondents because of their probation status. This support helps to mitigate the stigma of being on probation. Although some help proffered involved financial aid, employment, and legal advice, much help was advice and lecturing on how to lead a law-abiding life. Virtually none of

the family or peers condoned a life of crime in spite of the fact that many themselves had been in trouble with the law. Many employers continued respondents' employment in spite of probation.

Another conclusion supported by the data is that many of the respondents had felt the effects of probation to some extent. For example, many would not tell their employers for fear of being fired. Many would not tell distant relatives or some friends possibly due to stigma. Many thought of probation frequently, e.g., employment, rearrest, reporting, etc. Many experienced nervousness, depression, shame, and possibly stigma. Many railed against the long period of probation supervision. Many respondents stated that they had changed their behavior and their way of thinking, e.g., avoiding undesirable associates, refraining from alcohol and drugs, reflecting on how to live a law-abiding life, etc.

Another conclusion relates to the pervasive fear of jail or prison perceived among the probationers. They generally tended to think in terms of jail and prison versus probation; deterrence and punishment were primary concerns for them.



However, probationers wanted other types of treatment, e.g., counseling, community service, and help for concrete problems, e.g., education, employment, which they felt they were not receiving.

Another conclusion is that the specific probation officer assigned to a probationer's case is important. Many expressed preferences for their probation officers, and they compared them to others they had had or to other officers others had had. Probation officers have a good deal of discretion in performing their roles. This exercise of their discretion can affect probationers' reactions to probation. In light of this, many stated that they liked probation because it made them think seriously about their lives, their mistakes, and it acted as a control on their behavior.

Another less startling conclusion is that the majority of probationers did not perceive themselves as criminals. Many didn't think that their crime was serious or that they were a bad person; several didn't think that their arrest was at all justified. Most tended to rationalize their criminal activity and to give excuses and justifications for their crimes. In doing so, their relatives supported them in spite of the seriousness of their crimes. Prior record and prison experience didn't affect their relationships with family and friends. However, it must be reemphasized that these probationers are generally a distinctive group tending to have a light prior record and relatively nonserious conviction charges (albeit after plea bargaining).

A surprising result was that the self-concept of the respondents measured by the SAI was about the same as the self-concept of a group of college students measured by the same SAI. None of the  $t$  tests for comparing self-concept among various groups of probationers with certain characteristics was significant. It is difficult to determine if probation enhances or lowers self-concept or has no effect. Too many factors enter into the analysis. Self-concept requires a research study by itself.

The most important conclusion, however, is that probation is more than "a slap on the wrist," but is not something that completely overwhelms probationers' lives. Many of the negative consequences of probation depend on the individual probationer's perception and psychological make-up. Probation has some psychological effect upon probationers, but it is individualized, and it depends on the reaction of the individual probation officer assigned to the case.

This research was a social-psychological study

because it centers on groups, organizations, institutions, and societal reactions such as street-culture, family, work organization, stigmatization, labeling, and especially the interaction with the probation organization, e.g., rules and regulations, probation contract, the assignment of cases, the disposition of revocations of probation, etc. Perceived in this way, one can grasp the broader interconnections of this study.

Like other research, this study has limitations; small sample size and non-random selection of respondents; confined to one probation officer's caseload; no responses were elicited from either probationers who absconded or from family and peers; no matched comparison or control group; the strength of the scales used. An important limitation was the role conflict of author Davis, probation officer and researcher. This may well have caused the probationers to present themselves much in the way they regularly present themselves to the criminal justice system, rationalizing their criminal behavior and complaining about their treatment.

This research can be considered exploratory, but innovative. In spite of the limitations, the authors believe that the findings are valid and perhaps generalizable. This is based on years of experience in the criminal justice system. Further research must be conducted to explore the central research question posed here, namely, the effects probation has as a mode of punishment upon the probationers, particularly on their self-esteem.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The raw scores were converted into Z scores, then multiplied by 10, the standard deviation of the T distribution, then added to or subtracted from 50, the mean of the T distribution.

<sup>2</sup>The  $t$  test assumes random sampling, but is robust to this assumption. The population here is the 150 probationers on author Davis' caseload.

## REFERENCES

- Abadinsky, H. (1982). *Probation and parole: Theory and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Allen, G.F. (1985). The probationers speak: Analysis of the probationers' experiences and attitudes. *Federal Probation*, 49, 67-75.
- Allen, H.E., Carlson, E.W., & Parks, E.C. (1979). *Critical issues in adult probation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
- Allen, H.E., Eskridge, C.W., Latessa, E.J., & Vito, G.F. (1985). *Probation and parole in America*. New York: Free Press.
- Andrew, J.M. (1978). Values in counseling probationers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Criminology*, 22, 11-20.
- Bennett, L.A., Sorensen, D.E., & Forshay, H. (1971). The ap-

- plication of self-esteem measures in a correctional setting: I. Reliability of the scale and relationships to other measures. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 8, 1-9.
- Bhatti, B., Derezotes, D., Kim, S., & Specht, H. (1989). The association between child maltreatment and self-esteem. In A.M. Mecca, N.J. Smelser, & J. Vasconcellos (Eds.), *The social importance of self-esteem* (pp. 24-62). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Brodsky, S.L., & Smitherman, H.O. (1983). *Handbook of scales for research in crime and delinquency*. New York: Plenum.
- Clarke, S.H. (1979). What is the purpose of probation and why do we revoke it? *Crime & Delinquency*, 25, 409-424.
- Clear, T. (1977). *The specification of behavioral objectives in probation supervision*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Albany.
- Clear, T., & Shapiro, C. (1986). Identification of high-risk probationers for supervision in the community. *Federal Probation*, 50, 42-49.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). *The antecedents of self-esteem*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Czajkowski, E.H. (1973). Exposing the quasi-judicial role of the probation officer. *Federal Probation*, 37, 9-13.
- Davis, J.R. (1985, March). *Families of probationers: How the criminal justice system affects families of offenders placed on probation*. Paper presented at the Eastern Sociological Society, Philadelphia, PA.
- Dressler, D. (1951). *Probation and parole*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gibbs, J.J. (1982). Measuring the needs and satisfaction of probationers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 10, 469-480.
- Gibbs, J.J. (1985). Clients' view of community corrections. In L.F. Travis III (Ed.), *Probation, parole, and community corrections: A reader* (pp. 97-108). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Hussey, F.A., & Duffee, D.E. (1980). *Probation, parole, and community field services: Policy, structure, and process*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kaplan, H.B. (1975). *Self-attitudes and deviant behavior*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.
- Keve, P.W. (1954). *Prison, probation, or parole?: A probation officer reports*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Keve, P.W. (1961). *Imaginative program in probation and parole*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- King, J.F.S. (1969). *The probationer and after-care service* (3rd ed.). London: Butterworth.
- Kitano, H.L. (1989). Alcohol and drug use and self-esteem: A sociocultural perspective. In A. M. Mecca, N. J. Smelser, & J. Vasconcellos (Eds.), *The social importance of self-esteem* (pp. 294-300). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lansing, S.H. (1981). *Misdemeanor probation: An examination of the decision-making process*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington.
- Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc. (1988). *Multi-dimensional self-esteem inventory*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- Roundtree, G.A., Edwards, D.W., & Parker, J.B. (1984). A study of the personal characteristics of probationers as related to recidivism. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services & Rehabilitation*, 8, 53-61.
- Rumney, J., & Murphy, J.P. (1952). *Probation and social adjustment*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Scarpitti, F.R., & Stevenson, R.M. (1968). A study of probation effectiveness. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, & Police Science*, 59, 361-369.
- Shoham, S.G., & Rahan, G. (1982). *The mark of Cain: The stigma theory of crime and social deviance*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- St. John, J. (1961). *Probation: The second chance*. New York: Humanities Press.

### APPENDIX A Questionnaire

1. Have you told your family, relatives, and friends that you are on probation? Why or why not?
2. Have any of your family, relatives, or friends been in trouble with the law?
3. Have the actions or what was said to you by your family or friends changed in any way after they found out that you were on probation?
4. Have any of your family, relatives, or friends helped you since you were on probation? In what way? Before probation?
5. Have you told your boss that you were on probation? Why or why not?
6. Do you think about the fact that you are on probation very often? Is it something that's on your mind?
7. Is there anything you especially like about your probation?
8. Is there anything you especially dislike about your probation?
9. What would you like to go on between me and you? What would you like to talk about?
10. What do you think the purpose of probation is?
11. Has your life changed since you have been placed on probation? How?
12. Are you afraid or anxious about probation? Why?
13. Have you felt depressed since you have been on probation? Why?
14. Do you think of yourself as a criminal since you have been on probation? Why or why not?
15. Do you think your arrest was justified? Why or why not?
16. Do you think the judge should have placed you on probation for the offense? Why or why not?

### APPENDIX B Scalogram

Compare the following items. Place an X on the scale corresponding to the number that you prefer or applies to you. The scale values are:

- 1 = prefer the left the most  
 2 = prefer the left somewhat less  
 3 = neutral, prefer either right or left  
 4 = prefer the right somewhat  
 5 = prefer the right the most

- |              |                   |
|--------------|-------------------|
| 1. Probation | 1. Jail or prison |
| Probation    | Jail, prison      |
| 1 2 3 4 5    |                   |

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 2. Probation   | 2. Being charged with a sexual crime   |
| Probation  | Sexual crime   |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 3. Arrest  | 3. Probation   |
| Arrest   | Probation  |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 4. Community service   | 4. Probation   |
| Community service  | Probation  |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 5. Drug treatment  | 5. Probation   |
| Drug treatment   | Probation  |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 6. Counseling  | 6. Probation   |
| Counseling   | Probation  |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 7. I feel good after talking to my probation officer                       | 7. I feel nervous when I am with my probation officer                            |
| Good   | Nervous  |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 8. Sometimes I like coming here  | 8. Most of the time I don't like coming here                                     |
| Like   | Don't like   |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 9. My family and friends have helped me a lot since I've been on probation | 9. Most of my family and friends have not helped me since I've been on probation |
| Helped   | Not helped   |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 10. I would tell my boss I'm on probation                                  | 10. I would not tell my boss I'm on probation                                    |
| Tell   | Not tell   |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 11. My crime is not considered serious                                     | 11. My crime is considered serious   |
| Not serious  | Serious  |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 12. My family and friends treat me the same since I'm on probation         | 12. My family and friends treat me different since I'm on probation              |
| Same   | Different  |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |
| 13. Some of my family and friends don't know I'm on probation.             | 13. News travels fast. All my family and friends know I'm on probation           |
| Don't know   | Know   |
| 1 2 3 4 5  |  |

# STATUS OF PROBATIONER

25

14. I feel very good about  
myself even though I'm  
on probation

Very good

1 2 3 4 5

14. I am nervous,  
depressed, and  
ashamed since  
I'm on probation

Nervous, depressed,  
ashamed

15. I'm not afraid of going  
to jail; I can do my  
time

Not afraid

1 2 3 4 5

15. Going to jail  
would frighten me  
right now

Frighten