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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important resources in community-based correctional programs are Probation Officers -- the men and women who conduct investigations, prepare reports for the Court, supervise probationers, and obtain or provide services for them. The growth of this resource is usually proportionate to the growth of the number of persons placed on probation by the Courts. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals reports that the most promising alternative to the institutionalization of the public offender is probation and that it is now being used more frequently as a disposition.¹ Even greater use can be projected for the future because the results of probation are as good, if not better, than those of incarceration.² The thrust of the National Advisory Commission's report on probation is that probation will become the


standard sentence in criminal cases. Incarceration will be utilized primarily for those offenders who cannot safely be released to the community. Probation, with its focus on assisting the offender to adjust to the free community and supervising that process, offers greater hope for success and less chance for human misery. The numbers of local and state Probation Officers have been increasing recently as additional persons are placed on probation by the courts. The United States probation system is keeping pace and expanded their Probation Officer complement from 515 to 1236 or 140 per cent between 1972 and 1975. Based on projected workload demands, the total number of United States Probation Officers needed for 1980 is estimated to be 2100.3

As the United States probation system expands and the training needs for Probation Officers change as their roles fluctuate with the rapidly evolving social value systems, increasingly heavy demands are being made upon those responsible for the administration of the continuing education program.

Knowles sets forth the following proposition:

---

... that where adult education, historically, has been a kind of luxury and secondary activity in our culture, as of 1967, I believe that the education of adults is rapidly becoming a central concern, a central need of our civilization. The reason for this change is a growing realization that unless we do something fast to get adults growing and adapting and learning to live in a new kind of world, man is in danger of becoming obsolete. Technologies of work acquired in the teens are increasingly archaic by the time individuals have reached their forties. But even more tragically, social attitudes, values, and relationships that are progressive in one decade are decadent in the next. Clearly, the very survival of civilization requires that systematic learning continue beyond youth. And this is the first time in history that this is so.4

Many respected authorities in the field of adult education proclaim the need for training. Roby Kidd5 stated that preparation for professional service is exacting, but no professional man could practice without renewing himself regularly and systematically, not just in knowledge and technique but in understanding of others and himself as well. Professional men and women must always continue to learn. Continuous learning is one of the essential values and marks of a profession.


Gardner Murphy and Raymond Kuhlen\(^6\) point out that adults have more, not fewer, individual differences than children. Educational need, learning motivations, and teaching methods for adults are different from youth. Those responsible for adult education should develop and implement adult programs which reflect some systematic study of those adult characteristics.

The increasing need for professional educational attention to the United States probation system contributed to the establishment of the Federal Judicial Center in 1967. The desire for continual improvement at the center is inherent among the leadership of continuing education. As more training programs become essential, the need to establish priorities based on the Probation Officer's perception of desired programs for professional growth is imminent. There is urgent need for valid data, in order that those responsible for training might identify the training needs for Probation Officers and develop curriculum and training programs based upon the expressed needs of the practitioner.

Research in adult education has become quite extensive, both in quantity and breadth. In a three-year period,

\(^6\)Gardner Murphy and Raymond Kuhlen, Psychological Needs of Adults (Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Chicago, 1955), p. 23.
1963-66, the number of research reports in adult education nearly tripled. The reports covered such diverse topics as evaluation, program planning, instructional methods and techniques, and clientele appraisal. Therefore, research methodology in adult education and related fields has advanced to a point where reliable studies to determine continuing education needs can be effectively conducted.

Statement of the Problem

In addition to the size and growth of the United States probation system which was noted in the introduction to this chapter, the probation process and its goals are becoming increasingly more diffused and complex. Four explanations will be advanced for this phenomenon. The first is that corrections remains a bastard stepchild in the university setting because of the lack of agency and academic agreement as to which discipline most appropriately represents it. At one time or another it has been claimed by the professions or discipline of social work, sociological criminology, psychology, law enforcement or public administration. It has also been given its own identity in

---

independent programs leading to the baccalaureate, Master's and Doctoral degrees in corrections. A more recent and perhaps more promising trend is the increasing number of universities which are establishing interdisciplinary criminal justice programs with optional tracks, including corrections.

A second explanation is addressed to the multiple, diverse, and rapidly changing roles of the Probation Officer. It is common practice for Probation Officers to interact intensively with probationers and the community as counselors, mediators and advocates in order to reintegrate these offenders back into the community but at a given moment must also be prepared to initiate and participate in the process leading to the arrest and incarceration of the probationer.

The duties and responsibilities of the Probation Officer are viewed from various vantage points by the courts, law enforcement agencies, social service agencies, and psychiatric clinics as well as the public. Consequently there is great disparity in society's expectations of how probationers are to be managed.

A third explanation is the frequent operational policy and procedural changes that must be made by the probation system to conform with the increasing number of higher court decisions pertaining to the constitutional rights of the legal offender. Many of these decisions deal
with the due process rights of the probationer following a new arrest.

The fourth explanation relates to the ineffectiveness of correctional treatment. After a survey of 231 social science research studies on what is known about the rehabilitation of public offenders, Martinson concluded that with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have had no appreciable effect on recidivism.

In considering (a) society's vast philosophical differences about the practice and mission of probation, (b) frequent court decisions that change probation practice, and (c) questionable effectiveness of probation, it is extremely impracticable, if not impossible, for colleges and universities to provide pre-service training for Probation Officers that is both comprehensive and relevant. Training and development in the United States probation system must, therefore, be delivered through continuing education programs for the practicing Probation Officer -- both for basic understanding of the criminal justice system and also for advanced specialized knowledge and skill training.

The Purpose of this Study

This study was designed to identify the continuing education needs of Probation Officers in the United States probation system. Through this study all personnel responsible for providing such programs, specifically the staff of the Federal Judicial Center, will have a better understanding of the training needs that are desired at the present time.

Major Questions

The study was designed to provide answers to seven major questions. These were:

1. What are the demographic and professional characteristics of the responding United States Probation Officers?

2. How important do the United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies to be to the performance of their job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

3. How important do the immediate Supervisors of the United States Probation Officers perceive
selected competencies in the performance of the line Probation Officer's job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

4. How important do the District Chief United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies to be to the performance of the line Probation Officer's job, and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

5. What are the current continuing education needs of the responding United States Probation Officers as perceived by the Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers and District Chief Probation Officers?

6. Do the perceptions of the United States Probation Officer's current continuing education needs differ among the Probation Officers, their Supervisors and District Chiefs?

7. What are the Probation Officer's, Supervising Probation Officer's and Chief Probation Officer's
preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training?

Assumptions

The following assumptions are considered basic to the study.

1. United States Probation Officers, their Supervisors and District Chiefs, are knowledgeable of all the areas of competency necessary to function efficiently and meet the needs of their clientele.

2. United States Probation Officers, their Supervisors and District Chiefs have opinions about those competencies which are more important to the Probation Officer's job. They also have opinions regarding the Probation Officer's present level of understanding of specific competencies.

3. United States Probation Officers, their Supervisors and District Chiefs will differentiate between competencies that are important to the Probation Officer's job and their level of understanding.
Scope and Limitations of this Study

The study consisted of a mailed survey questionnaire in which the respondents were asked to provide information in four areas. These areas were:

1. Information regarding the Probation Officer's personal and educational characteristics.
2. Information regarding the Probation Officer's occupational and professional development.
3. Information regarding the Probation Officer's, Supervising Probation Officer's and Chief United States Probation Officer's perception of areas of competency in probation work in which professional growth may be desired.
4. Information regarding the instructional/educational methods preferred by the Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers, and Chief United States Probation Officers for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training.

Limitations of the study were:

1. The subtraction method of determining educational needs does not differentiate between levels of need.
2. The possibility of the respondents' tendency to rate importance and understanding of the selected competencies similarly.
3. There are other methods of determining continuing education needs which may be more valid.

Because of the specificity of the competencies pertaining to probation work, the content of this study is not applicable to surveys outside probation work. The process and research methodology, however, may be reviewed for replication in other studies determining occupational and professional continuing education needs.

The Writer's Special Interest in the Problem

The problem is of special interest to the writer because of his current responsibilities as a District Chief United States Probation Officer and his related concern about the quality of training being received by United States Probation Officers.

The writer first developed an interest in the education and training for correctional personnel in 1953. Upon completion of an undergraduate program in corrections, he began working as a Probation Officer. He soon noted the disparate and conflicting information being published by various professional organizations and correctional agencies that pertained to pre-service training requirements for Probation and Parole Officers. Some agencies required no more than a high school diploma while others insisted on a Master's degree.

Of those agencies requiring a Bachelor's or Master's degree,
there was little agreement as to the discipline in which the degree should be earned. Some agencies had little concern about the area of study -- many preferred that the degree be in any one of the behavioral sciences while others demanded a Master's degree in social work only.

Inasmuch as the most effective training for correctional workers remained a matter of dispute at both the academic and administrative levels, the writer dealt with the problem in an approved Master's thesis submitted in 1962. The purpose of the study was to determine the curriculum most applicable to the nature of corrections. After the procedures, principles, problems, concepts, theories and research most applicable to corrections were identified and the final conclusions stated, a model graduate correctional curriculum was presented and recommended for adoption by those universities interested in establishing a graduate curriculum for the training of correctional workers.

The writer's concerns with the training needs for Probation Officers were renewed and reinforced between 1965 and 1969, when he was establishing and developing an adult probation system for the State of Ohio. It wasn't until then that he was in a position to view the complexities and interdisciplinary nature of the probation process from the

---

perspective of a trainer and administrator. During this period it became more apparent than ever before that the colleges and universities were not meeting the pre-service or inservice training needs of Probation Officers and that correctional agencies would have to develop their own continuing education programs.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions of key terms will assist in establishing the purposes and parameters of this study.

**Correctional Programs** -- refers to planned, organized activities designed to assist, rehabilitate and supervise convicted offenders.

**Probation** -- for the purpose of this study, refers to a legal status and a process. As a legal status probation is ordered by a court (judge) of law and means that a convicted offender may remain at liberty in the community, for a specified period of time, in lieu of imprisonment and subject to certain conditions -- usually under the counsel and supervision of a Probation Officer. Probation as a process refers to the set of functions, activities and services that characterize the system's transactions with the courts, the offender, and the community. The process includes preparation of reports for the court, supervision of probationers, and obtaining or providing services for them.
Probation Officer -- refers to an individual employed by the judicial or executive branch of government, and having the official responsibility of conducting investigations, preparing reports for the court, supervising probationers, and obtaining or providing services for them. The purpose of the supervisory activities is to assist, rehabilitate and/or reintegrate the probationer back into the mainstream of a law-abiding life in the community. For the purpose of this study the title of Probation Officer will refer to United States Probation Officers unless otherwise specified.

United States Probation Officer -- refers to a Probation Officer employed by a United States District Court to serve the judicial district of the employing court and as a courtesy all other United States District Courts in the continental United States and territorial possessions. United States judicial districts vary geographically from approximately one-third of a state to an entire state or territorial possession depending on population and size. United States Probation Officers also serve as Parole Officers for the United States Parole Board and the Department of Justice.

Supervising United States Probation Officer -- A Supervising United States Probation Officer is responsible for supervising the activities of six to eleven United States
Probation Officers within the judicial district he serves. His duties and responsibilities include, but are not limited to, conferring with Probation Officers individually and in staff meetings; making suggestions for improvement in investigation; case supervising and report writing; planning and implementing a program of inservice training and evaluating the performance of Probation Officers.

**Chief United States Probation Officer** -- A Chief United States Probation Officer is the chief administrative officer for the probation program of the district court he serves. His duties and responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the establishment of policies, rules and procedures for the overall work of the office; selection and recommendation of candidates for appointment as Probation Officer; supervision of the staff; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions and establishes and directs a program of inservice training.

**United States Probation System** -- refers to the inter-relationships and cooperative activities of all the United States probation offices in the continental United States and territorial possessions combined as a whole. Although United States Probation Officers are employed by
and serve at the pleasure of a particular United States District Court, their general administrative and operating policies and procedures are promulgated by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in Washington, D.C.

**Continuing Education** -- refers to learning activities pursued by individuals for a definable purpose.\(1\)\(^\text{10}\),\(1\)\(^\text{11}\) In the context of this study, the term will be used to refer to (1) a specific body of knowledge germane to adult probation work, and (2) the learning activities within this body of knowledge perceived by practicing United States Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers and District Chief United States Probation Officers necessary for further occupational and professional growth.

**Continuing Education Need** -- refers to the difference between the respondents' present level of understanding of selected competencies in probation and their perception of the importance of these activities to their work.


Adult Education -- refers to the new technology of andragogy -- the art and science of helping adults learn and is based on certain crucial assumptions about the difference between children and adults as learners. Methods, techniques, and materials are tailored to the unique characteristics of adults as learners.\(^{12}\)

Federal Judicial Center -- refers to the organization and facility in Washington, D.C., that was established by Federal statute in 1967 and assigned four main functions. The third function is "to stimulate, create, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel of the judicial branch of the government, including, but not limited to, judges, referees, clerks of court, probation officers, and United States commissioners."\(^{13}\)

Criminal Justice System -- refers to the interrelated components that process a public offender from arrest until discharge or release from all government custody and jurisdiction. It begins typically with law enforcement agencies and includes detention, the Prosecutor's office, the courts,


\(^{13}\)Public Law 90-219, December 20, 1967, Title 28, USC, Ch. 42, Sec. 620-629, "Federal Judicial Center."
probation and parole agencies as well as prisons and correctional institutions.

**Competency Statement** -- In this study it is expressed in terms of understanding, knowledge, skills and abilities that are important to the job of United States Probation Officers.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Frank commented on the educational development of correctional manpower by stating:

The future of any field hinges on its ability to recruit and train competent manpower. Nevertheless, the field of corrections lacks clear guidelines for manpower development. Although demands for improved correctional service are stimulated by increased concern over "the crime problem," controversy rages over the nature of these services. Without a reasonable degree of agreement regarding the techniques appropriate for correcting criminal offenders, the task of training correctional workers is beyond accomplishment.\(^{14}\)

Having completed an extensive study of the literature this writer would agree with this assessment.

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the literature and research findings that are significant to this study. The chapter is divided into six sections. First, the historical background of probation is reviewed noting

influences that shaped the field as it is today. Second, the development of professionalized services is examined as it progressed from the utilization of unpaid volunteers as Probation Officers to salaried college graduates. Third, the history of the development and expansion of the United States probation system is viewed as it passed through four distinct periods. Fourth, the evolution of continuing education in the United States probation system is examined from the time of its origin in 1930 through the establishment and development of the Federal Judicial Center. Fifth, the research in continuing education and professional development is reviewed in the light of the contributions that have been made to andragogy, the art and science of helping adults learn. Finally, the continuing education needs in probation work are examined by reviewing the professional literature and research.

**Historical Background of Probation**

As man's concepts about the nature of man changed from the classical point of view (for man was seen as an actor capable of free will) to that of the positive tradition (where man was seen as one whose behavior is determined by forces beyond his will), new ways to control crime and delinquency evolved. While the classical criminologist sought to exercise such control by being concerned with the
law and fixed kinds of punishments, the positivists sought to control the lawbreaker by examining him, as a person, and those forces which might have impelled him to behave in deviant ways. In summary, early criminologists looked at the crime, while later (and contemporary) criminologists looked at the criminal.\footnote{A. W. Cohn, "Decision-Making in the Administration of Probation Services: A Descriptive Study of the Probation Manager" (Dr. C. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1972), p. 86.}

As we trace the history of the ways in which society has sought to control offenders, we notice that various methods of punishment and control have been attempted.

According to Sutherland and Cressey, who take a sociological point of view, "probation is the suspension of a sentence during a period of liberty in the community conditional upon good behavior of the convicted offender."\footnote{Edwin H. Sutherland and Donald R. Cressey, Criminology, 8th ed. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co., 1970), p. 461.} Tappan agrees but expands moderately:

Probation may be viewed both as a sentence of the court and as a correctional process. In the former sense it combines the suspension of a punitive sanction against convicted offenders (ordinarily a prison or jail term) with orders for treatment under conditional liberty in the community. In the latter sense it includes
the conduct of presentence investigations as an aid to court dispositions and the personal supervision and guidance of selected offenders in accordance with the conditions that the court establishes.¹⁷

The theory of probation evolved from earlier practices in England and the United States, all of which intended to lessen or otherwise mitigate the severities of the penal code. It is commonly believed that its origins came from English common law, however, where the courts were presumed to have the power to suspend sentence for specified periods and purposes. Although it is not definite as to which precedent introduced the process that is now referred to as probation, there is some agreement that Benefit of Clergy, Judicial Reprieve, Recognizance, Bail, and the Filing of Cases -- all made some contribution.¹⁸


In the United States, criminologists have traced the development of probation to the work of John Augustus in Boston in 1841; in fact, it was this bootmaker and philanthropist who, it is believed, was the first to use the term "probation." Dressler writes:

The social climate was right for the birth of probation in the 19th century (and in the United States). Thoughtful observers had become convinced that prisons were not 'teaching a lesson,' penitentiaries were not making inmates penitent. It was also coming clear that suspension of sentence without provision for supervision and guidance of the released person served little purpose. So it was that Matthew Davenport Hill of Birmingham, England, pioneered in his country in 1841, the very year that John Augustus performed a like service in Boston for the United States.

Over the earlier years, those who provided probation services (all volunteers) developed a model that, superficially at least, included such activities as investigations, reports, home visits and job placements. Although as England notes:

Probation began not in a spirit prompted by a desire to apply to the offender the

19 Tappan, Crime, Justice and Correction, p. 543.
20 Dressler, Practice and Theory of Probation and Parole, pp. 11-12.
rehabilitative techniques based on scientific knowledge of human behavior, but rather in one reflecting a simple humanitarian wish to keep less serious and/or first offenders from undergoing the corrupting effects of jail terms.22

In 1896, a state visiting agency in Massachusetts was authorized by the legislature to accept the custody of juvenile offenders, with the right of placing them in private families. Although not officially a probation service, 23 per cent of the juvenile offenders convicted in the courts of Boston in the year 1869-1870 were dealt with in this manner.23

But the first statutory provision for probation, which included provision for the hiring and payment of Probation Officers, was in Massachusetts in 1878. According to the statute, the mayor of Boston was authorized to appoint and pay a Probation Officer and it also authorized the municipal court to place offenders on probation. The legislature extended this power to all other mayors in the state in 1880, and in 1891 it "made mandatory the appointment of probation officers by lower-court judges."24


23Sutherland and Cressey, Criminology, p. 464.

24Ibid.
The first "State Commission on Probation was established (in Massachusetts) in 1908." 25

According to Dressier, Missouri enacted the next law, in 1897, with Vermont one year later, in 1898; and by 1900, Illinois, Minnesota, Rhode Island, and New Jersey had passed probation legislation. There were many variations in the early statutes: Illinois and Minnesota provided for juvenile probation only; Rhode Island excluded certain categories of offenders from probation consideration; Vermont utilized the county plan of organization instead of statewide services; while Rhode Island had statewide programs and state controlled administration. 26

Platt 27 presents a perspective on the history, philosophy, and early development of the juvenile court movement, which was begun in 1899 in Chicago and spurred the development of professional juvenile probation services. Dressler comments that these first Probation Officers:

were not paid out of public funds, partly due to the dubious assumption that to offer salaries would attract individuals interested

26 Dressler, Practice and Theory of Probation and Parole, p. 20.
only in the compensation. Volunteers, it was felt, would be men and women of great heart, working for the sheer joy of serving mankind.28

By 1945, all states had finally passed legislation authorizing juvenile probation,29 but it was not until 1957 that provisions for adult probation services had been provided by all the states.30

In a report prepared for the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency states:

Development of the legal basis for probation was accompanied by a definition of the duties and responsibilities of the probation officer, formulation of criteria for granting probation, provision for and definition of the presentence investigation, authorization of the imposition of probation conditions, and revocation, and refinement of policies, practices, and forms of administrative structure.31

28 Dressler, Practice and Theory of Probation and Parole, p. 20.
29 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
Development of Professionalized Services

Although the early services of the volunteer and unpaid Probation Officers were considered adequate, with the advent of psychoanalytic theories and the increasing activities of social welfare enthusiasts in the area of crime and delinquency control, the growth of professionalized probation services, with trained officers, can be viewed as an inevitable development. By 1917, the founder of modern social work, Mary Richmond, published *Social Diagnosis*. In this book, she focuses on the role of the Probation Officer and the processes by which he was supposed to gather pertinent information about clients. Richmond perceived a relationship between social casework and probation services, but also suggested that differences in settings have some bearing on practice:

... a probation officer is known to come from the court and to represent it, certain conditions, favorable and the reverse, are created by this fact; the officer has more authority but less freedom than the social worker who lacks the court background.

32A. W. Cohn, "Decision-Making in the Administration of Probation Services: A Descriptive Study of the Probation Manager" (Dr. C. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1972), p. 91.

Since 1898 when the Summer School of Philanthropic Workers was established in New York (replaced in 1908 by the New York School of Philanthropy), social casework has been identified with probation services, especially as the method by which change could be brought about within the probationers being served by the courts. This is still prevalent today, and according to some, the consequences of providing such services within the authoritarian setting of a court remains a significantly unresolved dilemma for practicing Probation Officers. 34

The National Council on Crime and Delinquency (formerly the National Probation and Parole Association) has for many years promulgated the notion that graduation from a school of social work (usually resulting in a Master's degree in social work), with supervised experience in an ordinary social agency, is the ideal preparation for work in corrections, especially in probation and parole. 35 But because of such factors as prestige, status, salaries, and the authoritarian nature of the court setting, graduate social


workers have been reluctant to seek such employment. Nonetheless, many probation and parole agencies throughout the United States, such as those in California, Wisconsin, Minnesota, New York, and some federal districts, stipulate that a Master's degree in social work is the preferred qualification for those seeking employment. When those with a Master's degree are unavailable, most agencies will hire those who have at least a Bachelor's degree and will frequently accept actual experience in lieu of graduate education and training.

In considering the recent movement of the National Association of Social Workers toward recognizing the Bachelor's degree in Social Welfare as the professional degree for the practitioner, it can be assumed that this has some implication for a change in the educational requirements of some probation agencies.

History of United States Probation System

In the absence of statutory authority Federal judges began suspending sentencing in selected criminal cases as early as 1808. They felt, in certain instances, that the legally prescribed penalties were too harsh and began to exercise their discretion in modifying them and gradually developing more humane methods of dealing with the offender. There is ample evidence that Federal judges continued this practice through the 19th century and probation was thus established, on an informal basis, in at least 60 United States District Courts before Congress legally provided for such services. In 1916 the United States Supreme Court barred the use of informal probation and there were no probation services of any kind in the Federal Courts for the next 9 years. 37

On March 4, 1925, President Coolidge signed the bill that formally established a Federal probation system. It was not until 1927, however, that the first Probation Officers -- three in number -- were appointed.

The Federal Probation Act, which was based on the best probation laws and practices of the states, authorized

the courts to qualify salaried Probation Officers to obtain essential personal data and social background information about individual offenders before the courts, and to provide a system of effective supervision over offenders, under suspension of sentence, in order to reclaim them and at the same time protect society. Before the enactment of the probation law, there were no provisions for paid Probation Officers in the Federal courts. Those who volunteered their services generally were not qualified by formal education, experience, or understanding of human nature to perform the important investigation responsibilities of a Probation Officer and to render adequate and helpful supervision. 38

In its subsequent growth and development, the United States probation service passed through four distinct periods.

First Period: Experimentation, 1927-1930. The first period was one of experimentation. Eight officers carried out their probation duties with little guidance and encouragement and practically no coordination of effort. The interests of the judges in the Probation Officer's efforts and their receptivity to presentence investigations varied. Without office space, typewriters, forms, and with

little travel funds, they virtually were told "start work and shift for yourself." A significant task of the first officers was to demonstrate to a skeptical court and public the value of probation supervision and presentence investigations.

Federal law-enforcement officers and prosecuting attorneys were somewhat suspicious of the Probation Officers. Initially they viewed probation as leniency and softness that would tend to diminish their success in apprehending and convicting offenders by releasing them from the penalties prescribed by law.

It was only after Probation Officers had demonstrated that they did not favor probation for hardened offenders and that they would take action against probation violators that the apprehending and prosecuting officers began to accept them as useful members of the official court family.39

Second Period: Expansion, 1930-1940. This phase, under the administration of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, was one of expansion and the system grew from 8 to 233 officers.40

39 Ibid.
40 Ibid., p. 31.
Third Period: Continued Expansion and Refinement of Procedures, 1940-1950. The third phase began on July 1, 1940, when the Administrative Office of the United States Courts took over the functions of the United States probation system previously performed by the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Between 1940 and 1950 the number of Probation Officers increased from 233 to 304. Considerable emphasis was given to the qualifications of officers and the quality of their work. In-service training institutes stressed casework skills, methods, and practices. Bulletins, monographs, and a Probation Officer's manual outlined techniques and special procedures relating to presentence investigations, presentence reports, counseling, supervision records, interoffice practices, and statistical reporting. Judges were brought closer to the day-to-day problems of probation, and through discussions at circuit conferences and consideration on committees of the Judicial Conference of the United States, they assumed increasing responsibility for the sound administration of the service. 41


41 Ibid.
Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, was courageous enough to try to predict the pattern of the next 25 years of Federal probation. Mr. Chandler wrote:

It does not seem likely that there will be any substantial change in the present functions of Federal probation officers in the next 25 years. These functions are principally presentence investigations and the supervision of persons on probation and parole.  

In a general sense, this statement still identifies the major functions of the Federal Probation Officer as they existed in 1975, but there have been many dramatic changes which are beyond the scope of Henry Chandler's prediction.

In his account of the Federal probation system, Merrill Smith has characterized the 1960's as "a decade of innovation." There has been a steady growth in the use of probation, and what was a minority disposition has become the most common sentence. There has also been a series of conceptual changes in the nature of probation.

---


It has moved from a jurisprudence of discretionary judicial decisions towards systems of judicial and administrative rights permeated by due process controls. The frequent intervention of the courts in the interpretation of certain due process and civil rights of offenders has expanded into the area of probation. The controversy over disclosure versus confidentiality of presentence reports, the emerging trends in criminal pre-trial procedures encompassing plea bargaining, bail selection, deferred prosecution or judgments, and a series of rules and practices circumscribing the imposition and nature of probation conditions and defining of the procedures to be adhered in probation revocations, have complicated and altered probation services.

The two decades preceding 1975 are characterized by a remarkable array of new resources and programs. Of major significance has been the expansion of sentencing alternatives available to the Federal judges. Prior to the decade of the '50's, except for juveniles, the alternatives were limited to a flat sentence or probation. Now a series of indeterminate and mixed dispositions are available, including a complex set of sentencing procedures for narcotic law violators.

Other significant changes have followed passage of the Criminal Justice Act (1966), which laid the foundation
for the Federal defenders program; the Prisoner's Rehabilitation Act which authorized work release, emergency furloughs and the establishment of "residential treatment centers" by the Federal Bureau of Prisons; and the Act establishing the Federal magistrates and the subsequent increase in misdemeanant probation. In addition, the availability of Employment Placement Personnel, and the movement of Vocational Rehabilitation Services, group counseling, caseload management, paraprofessionals and volunteers into the correctional field, have modified probation practice.

With these trends has come a maturing and professionalizing of the Federal probation system. A strong tradition of in-service training, combined with sound educational qualifications which became mandatory by action of the Judicial Conference of the United States in 1961 and which became effective with implementation of the Judiciary Salary Plan in 1964, has created an outstanding service.

Concepts of professionalism were advocated by the earliest leaders in the Federal probation system and were strongly endorsed by Mr. Chandler, the first Director of the Administrative Office. In 1943 the Judicial Conference recommended standards which culminated in the mandatory qualifications approved by it in 1961. Since that time, the appointment of officers meeting the requirements of a
college degree and two years of prior professional experience has become standard, with 41 per cent of the applicants entering the service in fiscal year 1974 having completed the Master's degree. This is in rather dramatic contrast to the fact that only 58 per cent of the officers appointed during the period from 1943 to 1949 met the qualifications desired.  

Analysis of the United States probation system in 1975 reveals an outstanding development: the expansion of the field force from 515 officers in fiscal year 1972 to 1236 officers in fiscal 1975. This addition of 721 new officers represented a manpower increase of approximately 140 per cent. Before the authorization of these positions, the exceptional ability of its officers enabled the system to perform its duties in a creditable manner, in the face of overwhelming caseload demands.

In 1975 an exciting optimism and enthusiasm pervaded the entire probation system. The new probation officers, primarily young men and women, brought with them the challenge of new ideas and new approaches, as well as excellent education and experience, in keeping with the high standards.

---

of the system. With more personnel to perform the daily tasks, we saw the opportunity to improve the quality of supervision services; to provide more meaningful assistance to the court in the difficult sentencing process; to develop and improve upon community resources; to expand continuing training programs for all officers, new and old alike; and to examine and challenge existing practices with innovative ideas. 45

Evolution of Continuing Education in the United States Probation System

The evolution of continuing education in the United States probation system will be described in three periods.

First Period: Origin and Earliest Development, 1930-1950. It was noted previously that the first three United States Probation Officers were appointed in 1927 and were told to "start work and shift for yourself." By July of 1930 there were eight Probation Officers. With continual increase of Probation Officers, most of whom were inexperienced in casework methods and lacking the knowledge

of probation principles and techniques, the supervisor of probation found that the use of bulletins, circulars, et cetera, and individual instruction by letter had to be supplemented by his individual contact with the officers. His administrative duties kept him a large part of the time in Washington. His visits to the districts were delayed. So he adopted the old-fashioned teacher's institute method of gathering them together for group instruction. By authority of the Attorney General, he called the new officers together with the eight old officers into a group school of instruction held at Louisville in October 1930 at the time of the fiftieth American Prison Congress. There, for four days and nights, with the assistance of the old officers and of the other members of the prison bureau staff and eminent persons in prison, parole, and probation work, he put the 33 officers of the system at that time through the first intensive course of training. This plan was used again in June 1931 at the time of the three-day meeting at Minneapolis of the National Probation Association and the National Conference of Social Workers. All but one of the 63 officers participated in an intensive institute program of prepared papers and discussions, exercises and problem solving and again enjoyed the inspiration and instruction from leaders.
in social and penological work in the country.\textsuperscript{46}

Then conferences were held at Kansas City, Asheville, Houston, San Francisco, New York City, Chillicothe, Tea Springs Lodge, and Blue Ridge.

Early in the establishment of the probation service the conference method was used for instruction and inspiration, motivation and the identification of objectives, threshing out probation methods and practices, and agreement on vital lines of procedure. Correspondence and field trips alone could achieve only in part what was accomplished at these conferences.\textsuperscript{47}

In-service training institutes of three- and four-day duration continued throughout the '30's and '40's to be a helpful means of keeping Probation Officers abreast of the latest thinking in the overall correctional field, acquiring new insights, skills, and knowledge, and utilizing specialized training and experience to their fullest potential.

Five-day institutes were also held in five regions of the country at two- and three-year intervals. They consisted of work sessions, small group meetings, formal papers


by correctional and social work leaders, and discussions of day-to-day problems. They generally were held in cooperation with universities, with members of their sociology, social work, psychology, and education departments and school of law, serving as lecturers. Representatives of the Bureau of Prisons' central office and its institutions, the United States Board of Parole, and United States Public Health Service addressed the institutes and participated in forum discussions. 48

In 1950, James V. Bennett, then Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, commented on the training conducted by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts:

One of the most important unifying influences available at this time is the annual in-service training institutes conducted by the Administrative Office. These meetings serve as opportunities for full discussion of problems, methods, and policies. 49


the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, in cooperation with the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, opened a training center at Chicago for the Federal probation service. Under the direction of Ben S. Meeker, Chief Probation Officer at Chicago, the training center sought and obtained the cooperation of the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago in developing courses of instruction.

A two-week indoctrination course was offered for newly appointed officers shortly after their entrance on duty and periodic refresher courses were provided for all officers. Recognized leaders in the correctional and related fields and faculty from the University of Chicago and Loyola served on the Center's faculty. Instruction in the fields of community organizations, casework, social group work, public welfare administration, sociology and law were a regular part of the program. To maintain a practical orientation, practitioners in the fields of medicine, law, sociology, and psychology were included in the program as well as the Judges in the District Court of Northern Illinois. This program of training lasted until 1972.50

Ben S. Meeker, formerly Director of the Chicago Training Center for United States Probation Officers, reported on the Center in 1975:

Although it will remain for others to assess the ultimate value of the Chicago Training Center, it seemed to me that during the period 1950 to 1970, in addition to its training value, the center in Chicago provided a highly unifying and coordinating influence. The selection of officers to attend the sessions was entirely in the hands of the Division of Probation in Washington, and, to a well-planned mix of officers from district courts everywhere, the center served as a common meeting ground for personnel from around the country. Much of the earlier provincialism and preoccupation with local concerns disappeared as officers discovered that the problems of working with probationers and parolees, whether from Atlanta, Boston, San Antonio, or Seattle, were identical. 51

In 1972, with the advent of the Federal Judicial Center and the availability of funds and staff to carry on a much more comprehensive training program geared to the entire personnel of the courts, the Chicago Center had fulfilled its mission and the training function was gradually transferred to the center in Washington.


of the Federal Judiciary was reached with the passage in 1967 of Public Law 90-219\(^52\) establishing the Federal Judicial Center, now located in the attractive facilities of the Dolley Madison House, Washington, D.C. Functions of the Federal Judicial Center extracted from Public Law 90-219 are listed as follows:

(a) There is established within the judicial branch of the Government a Federal Judicial Center, whose purpose it shall be to further the development and adoption of improved judicial administration in the courts of the United States.

(b) The Center shall have the following functions:

1. to conduct research and study of the operation of the courts to the United States, and to stimulate and coordinate such research and study on the part of other public and private persons and agencies;

2. to develop and present for consideration by the Judicial Conference of the United States recommendations for improvement of the administration and management of the courts of the United States;

3. to stimulate, create, develop, and conduct programs of continuing education and training for personnel of the judicial branch of the Government, including, but no limit to, judges, referees, clerks of court, probation officers and United States commissioners; and

\(^{52}\) Public Law 90-219, December 20, 1967, Title 28, USC, Ch. 42, Sec. 620-629, "Federal Judicial Center."
(4) insofar as may be consistent with the performance of the other functions set forth in this section, to provide staff, research, and planning assistance to the Judicial Conference of the United States and its committees.

Although legislation established the Federal Judicial Center in 1967, it did not become completely operational until 1972. Under the leadership of the first director, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Tom Clark, his successor, Senior Circuit Judge Alfred P. Murrah, and the director in 1975, Senior Judge Walter E. Hoffman, a wide spectrum of training and research programs has developed.

Typical training activities conducted by the Federal Judicial Center are those described in the Center's 1974 Annual Report. A total of 333 new Probation Officers attended ten orientation seminars. Innovative training techniques were employed including role playing combined with the use of the Federal Judicial Center's video-tape capability. Six refresher seminars were conducted for 197 experienced Probation Officers and emphasis was placed on workshop-type training in order to allow maximum participation by the attendees.53

A primary purpose of this study is to identify and rank the continuing educational needs of United States Probation Officers. An initial review of appropriate literature from the field of adult education is warranted, to serve as a framework within which the literature in probation work can be reviewed.

It was in the last century that structures in this country were established to offer adult education, train adult educators and conduct research in adult learning and development. 54

Research in adult learning has a comparatively recent history, but has contributed much to the understanding of adults, as described by Knowles.

Certainly the investigations of adult intelligence starting with Thorndike in the 1920's and continuing through Lorge, Wechsler, Birren, Botwinick, Jones, and others, demonstrate that adults maintain their ability to be continuing learners. The work of the developmental psychologists -- especially as synthesized by Pressy and Kuhlen and by Goulet and Baltes --

has documented the continuity of the developmental process during the adult years; adults behave like organisms more than like machines.\textsuperscript{55}

What is evolving from these and other contributions to adult education is a distinct body of empirical knowledge and technical study in adult education, which Knowles has identified by the term "andragogy, the art and science of helping adults learn."\textsuperscript{56, 57}

From the research in adult education that has been conducted, both descriptive and experimental, a basic tenet that has gained wide acceptance is the need for adults to be involved in planning their own educational programs. This is included as one of five principles of adult learning by Gibb.

1. The learner must set or accept the program goals and be involved in program planning.

2. Learning must be problem-centered.

3. Learning must be experienced-centered.

4. The learner must feel free to openly participate in the educational experience.


\textsuperscript{56}Ibid., p. 303.

5. The learner must have feedback about his progress.58

The importance for keeping the learner central in planning any program for adults is also emphasized by Dowling.

The field of adult education or continuing education needs continually to examine its philosophical orientation in order to establish objectives which are in line with the needs of the adults who are its clientele. Neglect of philosophical foundations will create a structure which is in constant danger of toppling because it is not in touch with its reason for being -- in this instance, its clientele.59

A program area in adult education which is germane to this study is continuing education for the professions. Although there is some question of probation work being truly a "profession," the writings in this field are appropriate to professional development of the individual. For example, Houle states the four requirements of any professional person.


The practicing professional needs to keep up with the new knowledge related to his profession.

The practicing professional needs to establish his mastery of the new conceptions of his own profession.

The practicing professional needs to continue his study of the basic disciplines which support his profession.

The practicing professional needs to grow as a person as well as a professional.  

Charters identifies four stages of lifelong learning for the professions in the 1970 Handbook of Adult Education.

The first three stages are preparatory stages with the fourth and longest stage centering on the student's education following formal training.

At this stage -- the continuing education stage -- he is given the authority and assumes the responsibility designated by the profession and by various agencies of society. The curriculum of continuing education should not be a repetition of previous levels of education but should provide an opportunity to explore and study the new.

---


Within the frame of reference which explains and defines current thought on adult education, "andragogy" and continuing professional education, the appropriate literature and research in probation work and other disciplines will be reviewed in the following section.

Continuing Education Needs in Probation Work

Clues to the educational needs of adults can be obtained from several sources. These include an examination of the professional literature and research that is related to the study. Each of these shall now be reviewed separately for a more orderly presentation.

Review of the Professional Literature. From the examination of related professional literature two prevailing trends are apparent. The first is the transition of man's view of man toward a greater awareness of human values and philosophic humanism. The second trend is the increasing recognition of probation as an inter-disciplinary profession. Both trends have as a common denominator the need for continuing educational development of the Probation

---

Officer. Hence both trends warrant a brief examination.

Tannenbaum and Davis integrated the current transition in human values and philosophies into a number of propositions. Ten of the thirteen propositions are particularly relevant to probation work and reflect these changes.

1. Away from a view of man as essentially bad toward a view of him as basically good.

2. Away from avoidance or negative evaluation of individuals toward confirming them as human beings.

3. Away from a view of individuals as fixed toward seeing themselves as being in process.

4. Away from resisting and fearing individual differences toward accepting and utilizing them.

5. Away from walking-off the impression of feelings toward making possible both appropriate expressions and effective use.

6. Away from maskmanship and game playing toward authentic behavior.

7. Away from distrusting people toward trusting them.

8. Away from avoiding facing others with relevant data toward making appropriate confrontation.

9. Away from avoidance of risk-taking toward willingness to risk.
10. Away from a primary emphasis on competition toward a much greater emphasis on collaboration.63

The implication for Probation Officers is that this transition suggests a need to move from a concept of coercive control to one of greater understanding and respect between the probationer and the Probation Officer. A relationship such as this facilitates joint problem solving, mutual agreement planning and participative goal setting.

A second trend is the growing recognition of the interdisciplinary nature of the probation process which is attributed in some measure to the changing, diversified and specialized role of the Probation Officer. Many probation agencies, including a number of federal probation offices, are recruiting and/or assigning Probation Officers to develop and provide intensive services for probationers with special problems and needs. Examples of these services and the related problems include community resource development, employment counseling and placement and providing counseling and other relevant services for those probationers whose offenses are related to drugs, alcohol or a mild psychiatric disorder. As the body of specialized knowledge and

repertoire of skills that are required to effectively work with these types of offenders expands, generically trained personnel will not be adequately prepared to work with them. Probation agencies will need Probation Officers who have the unique knowledge and skills required to make a maximum contribution to the successful adjustment of the probationer in addition to a solid foundation and familiarization with the laws, structures, processes, issues, and problems unique to the criminal justice system generally and corrections particularly.

The curriculum of most schools of social work reflects little, if anything, in the way of course work in criminal justice, criminology or corrections and a number of nationally recognized criminologists have been critical of this limitation of social work training for Probation Officers for many years. 64

As early as 1947, Reckless states:

There is a real fallacy in the assumption that probation and parole work is a form of casework. Just because trained probation and parole officers use an individualized approach does not

mean that they are caseworkers or that probation and parole are casework.65

It was Reckless' contention that probation and parole operations client-wise is not casework and maintained that the foundation for the training of Probation and Parole Officers is not casework but criminology, corrections, social psychology, and specific courses in probation and parole.

Later Reckless asserted:

It is becoming progressively clear that training for correctional work cannot be satisfied merely by training for social work in general. The areas of practice in the social work field are getting too well established to admit the jack-of-all-trades certification. The best preparation for correctional workers consists in courses which contain the philosophy and practices of correctional work. Courses in related areas of social work can be a part of the requirements in a curriculum for the training of correctional workers, but they cannot act as substitutes for courses in the several aspects of correctional operations.66

In 1973 the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals provided a measure of credibility to the assumptions of criminologists by reporting that:

---


One result of the influence of social work on probation has been an overemphasis on casework. Development of child guidance clinics in the 1920's and 1930's influenced particularly the juvenile courts and their probation staff.

The terms "diagnosis" and "treatment" began to appear in social work literature and not long after in corrections literature. Those terms come from the medical field and imply illness. A further implication is that a good probation practitioner will understand the cause and be ready to remedy it, just as the medical practitioner does. Essentially, the medical approach overlooked any connection between crime and such factors as poverty, unemployment, poor housing, poor health, and lack of education.

A review of the literature of the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's indicates that the casework method became equated with social work, and in turn, casework or probation became equated with a therapeutic relationship with a probationer. 67

A significant indication that the universities are beginning to recognize the unique and eclectic needs of corrections is the type of curricula being developed in higher education. Presently there are over one thousand institutions of higher learning which have recently developed A.A., undergraduate and graduate criminal justice programs purporting to train Probation Officers and the curricula of these programs reflect a wide range of courses representing

several relevant disciplines and professions. Typical of these programs is the undergraduate interdisciplinary criminal justice curriculum (Appendix A) offered by the University of Florida.68

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice stated that basic changes must be made in what Probation Officers do:

They usually are trained in casework techniques and know how to counsel and supervise individuals but they are seldom skilled in or oriented to the task required in mobilizing community institutions to help offenders. Much of the assistance that probationers and parolees need can come only from institutions in the community -- help from the schools in gaining the education necessary for employment; help from employment services and vocational training facilities in getting jobs; help in finding housing, solving domestic difficulties, and taking care of medical disabilities.

If corrections is to succeed in mobilizing varied community resources to deal more effectively with offenders, it must significantly change its way of operating. Probation and parole officers today direct their energies primarily toward the offender rather than the social environment with which he must come to terms.

Although it is important that present skills, in working with individual offenders be retained and improved, much is to be gained by

68Brochure announcing Courses Offered (1974-75) Toward Criminal Justice Interdisciplinary Major, Bachelor of Arts -- An Interdisciplinary Major in Criminal Justice (Gainesville: University of Florida, 1974).
developing new work styles that reach out to community resources and relate them to the needs of the caseload. The officer of the future must be a link between the offender and community institutions; a mediator when there is trouble on the job or in school; an advocate of the offender when bureaucratic policies act irrationally to screen him out; a shaper and developer of new jobs, training, recreation, and other institutional resources.

Experience with intensive casework programs that have attempted rehabilitation in isolation from these institutions indicates that generally such efforts have only a marginal bearing on an offender's success or failure.

**Review of Research.** The following is a summary of the research that related directly to this study.

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training requested Louis Harris and Associates to make a study of the attitudes of a broad cross section of correctional personnel to measure those qualitative factors

---


which substantially determine how persons employed in corrections can be educated and trained to do effective work.\textsuperscript{71} The respondents were selected from four functional levels of institutional and community based corrections, including local and state Probation Officers. Although no federal Probation Officers were included, the functions of federal and state Probation Officers are so similar that the results are believed to have some application to this study. The following suggestions for content of in-service training programs are ranked according to per cent of specialists (including Probation Officers) suggesting a particular area of training:

1. Dynamics of Human Behavior 20%
2. Legal Training 13%
3. On-the-job Service Training 11%
4. Methods of Rehabilitation 9%
5. Management-Supervisory Techniques 8%
   Community Relations 8%
   College Courses 8%
6. Group Counseling and Training 7%
7. Interviewing Techniques 6%

A commentary on the above data stated that eight per cent volunteered a suggestion for "legal training"; but in a direct question, 49 per cent indicated they felt legal training would be helpful. There is obvious interest in this area.

In 1972 the Federal Judicial Center\textsuperscript{72} conducted a survey of all District Chief United States Probation Officers to ascertain their suggestions for training courses for line Probation Officers. Their suggestions are ranked according to number of comments per suggestion in Appendix B.

The Research, Training and Projects Committee of the Federal Probation Officers Association surveyed its membership to determine the need for an expanded orientation training experience for newly appointed United States Probation Officers.\textsuperscript{73} The results of the survey are contained in Appendix C.

In another section of their report, the FPOA also presented an agenda for a recommended two-week orientation


\textsuperscript{73}Correspondence to The Honorable Walter E. Hoffman from Thomas L. Barnes, dated August 6, 1976.
program and the subject matter (competencies) are listed in Appendix D in the same sequence presented, excluding introductory remarks, et cetera.

Knowles stated that "individuals themselves," i.e., Probation Officers and people in "helping roles," i.e., supervisors and administrators of probation personnel are reliable sources of useful information in determining educational needs. Although the review of the research focused on these particular areas, a surprising result of the writer's search was that the surveys of the Federal Judicial Center and the Federal Probation Officers Association cited above, were the only two that surveyed the educational needs of Probation Officers exclusively.

Within the United States probation system, as well as local and state probation agencies, a sophisticated, rigidly controlled and comprehensive survey of the Probation Officers' demographic and professional characteristics as well as educational needs, as perceived by the Probation Officer, could not be identified. The paucity of such surveys reflects a basic void which this study hopefully helps to fill.

A number of studies, however, have been conducted in the identification of continuing educational needs of specific occupational groups, some in occupations similar to probation work, i.e., social and governmental administrative occupations. Although not indicated in any of the studies, one might assume some transfer of continuing education needs. However, as was the case in this study, the attempt to specify the areas germane to an occupation necessarily limits the amount of reference to or from other studies. One study that was related was the identification of continuing education needs of city managers where emphasis was given to a greater understanding of behavioral and management science.75

Summary

This chapter has traced the historical development of probation in general, the United States Probation System in particular and reviewed the evolution of professionalized services. The concepts contributing to probation work as an occupation and the increasing trend toward continuing training and development were also examined.

The contribution of theories and research from the field of adult education was reviewed, followed with a review of general and specific trends that are influencing the development of correctional curricula in the universities as well as continuing education for Probation Officers.

Finally, a review of studies identifying content for in-service training programs for various correctional personnel resulted in the conclusion that there is a paucity of such surveys.

The following chapter will describe in detail this study which was conducted to determine perceived needs for the educational growth of United States Probation Officers.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study examines selected characteristics of United States Probation Officers, their perceived continuing education needs and preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training. It also examines their continuing education needs as perceived by their immediate Supervisors and District Chiefs. This chapter describes the population of this study, the respondents, the instruments used in gathering the information considered essential for answering the seven questions presented in the introduction and, finally, a description of how the resulting data were analyzed.

The Population of This Survey

This study was conducted with the cooperation of the Federal Judicial Center and the Probation Division of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. The Continuing Education and Training Division of the Federal
Judicial Center is interested in the results of this study as a potential resource for their planning of continuing education programs for probation officers.

From these sources a list of all 1236 Probation Officers was provided. A 30 per cent sample was selected from the list by utilizing a table of random numbers.\(^7\) Thus, the 30 per cent sample for this study was 371.

The Respondents. The respondents for this study were the 30 per cent sample (371) of Probation Officers mentioned above as well as all 129 Supervising United States Probation Officers and all District Chief United States Probation Officers in the system, excluding the writer (91). The Probation Officers were requested to complete the entire questionnaire and the Supervisors and District Chiefs were asked to complete a modification of the primary questionnaire which excluded the questions related to demographic data and characteristics of the Probation Officer.

The Survey Instrument

The mailed questionnaire inquiry method was used for gathering the data for this study. Generally, a mailed questionnaire consists of a list of questions for information and/or opinion which is mailed to a group pre-selected within some criteria.77 As with all research methods, there are advantages and disadvantages to the mailed questionnaire. The major weakness is the problem of nonreturns, with most studies yielding a return of 10 per cent to 25 per cent.78 Among the advantages noted by Wallace are factors which are applicable to this study. These include the following:

1. Permits wide coverage for minimum expense both in money and effort.
2. Affords wider geographic contact.
3. Reaches people who are difficult to locate and interview.
4. Greater coverage may yield greater validity


through larger and more representative samples.

5. Permits more considered answers.

6. More adequate in situations in which the respondent has to check his information.

7. Greater uniformity in the manner in which questions are posed.


9. Lessens interviewer effect.  

For these advantages the mailed questionnaire was utilized.

Description of the Questionnaire. The questionnaire that was used in this study is included in Appendix E. It was constructed with continuous referral to the guidelines suggested by Wallace, and Backstrom and Hursh. 80, 81

Content of the questionnaire was determined after review of the literature and relevant research projects. Further refinement resulted in the questionnaire which

79 Ibid., p. 77.
80 Ibid.
contained questions exploring four areas. These were:

1. Information regarding the Probation Officer's personal and educational characteristics.
2. Information regarding the Probation Officer's occupational development.
3. Information regarding the Probation Officer's, Supervisor's and District Chief's perception of areas of competency in which the Probation Officer's professional growth is desired.
4. Information regarding the Probation Officer's, Supervisor's, and District Chief's preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training.

A cover letter was designed to communicate the purpose of the study, the interest of the Federal Judicial Center and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in the results of the study, an assurance of the confidentiality and the intended benefit of the results of this study to the respondent.

The first part of the study requested information pertaining to the following characteristics:

1. Demographic characteristics -- age, sex, and marital status.
2. Pre-service level of education and education completed after appointment as United States Probation Officer.

3. Occupational information -- years of employment as United States Probation Officer.

All the above information was secured through direct questions.

The second part, information about the Probation Officer's professional development, requested responses to the following:

1. Plans made while in school regarding a career in corrections.

2. Perceived present level of professional preparation.

3. Intent of seeking an additional degree.

4. Participation in continuing education the past 12 months.

5. Membership in professional associations.

6. Professional literature regularly perused.

The questions for the above six areas are also direct inquiries.

The third part of the questionnaire sought the Probation Officer's, Supervisor's and District Chief's perceptions of the areas of competency in which further knowledge
and functional understanding is desired. A scale was developed which asked the respondents to evaluate the importance of 19 specific competencies. Each competency is presented in the questionnaire (refer to Appendix).

The respondents evaluated the importance of the 19 competencies in two different conditions:

1. The importance of each competency to the Probation Officer's job now.
2. The Probation Officer's present level of understanding of each competency.

The scale evolves from a concept of learning motivation in which deficiencies are identified. As stated by Lindgren, "the individual is motivated to learn when he realizes that there is an imbalance or a discrepancy between what he is or can do, and what he should be and should do." 82

The scale utilized for evaluating each competency is a modification of a scale used in a similar study by Bruny. 83

The competencies are listed twice. The respondents were


first asked to rate their perception of the importance of each competency to their job on a scale ranging from "very important" to "almost no importance." Secondly, they were asked to rate their perception of their level of understanding of each competency from "very high understanding" to "almost no understanding."

The fourth and final part of the questionnaire requested information on the respondents' preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training. This section was included in the questionnaire to assist the personnel of the Federal Judicial Center in their determination of appropriate instructional programming and methodology.

In summary, the questionnaire gave the Probation Officers an opportunity to:

1. Describe their personal characteristics, level of education and occupational development.
2. Describe their perceptions of their educational need in terms of the importance of selected competencies to their job.
3. Describe their perception of the level of understanding of selected job competencies.
4. Describe their preference of methods for the
administration of orientation, basic and advanced training.

Parts three and four gave the Supervisors and District Chief United States Probation Officers an opportunity to:

1. Describe their perceptions of the importance of selected competencies to the United States Probation Officer's job.
2. Describe their perception of the United States Probation Officer's level of understanding of selected probation competencies.
3. Describe their preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training for United States Probation Officers.

**Developing and Testing the Survey Instrument.** The development and testing of the questionnaire used in this study consisted of two phases from the initial steps following approval of the research proposal to the receiving of the completed answer forms.

**Phase One.** Copies of the questionnaire located in the Appendix were sent to the following:
2. Two members of the Federal Judicial Center's Division of Continuing Education and Training.
3. Two members of the Probation Division of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
5. One probation management consultant.
6. Three adult education administrators.

Each of the above was asked to complete the questionnaire, noting the time required to complete the form. They were also asked to identify any questions that (1) were difficult to understand, (2) should be removed from the questionnaire, and (3) were not asked and should be included. Also, the evaluators were asked to review the competencies listed under part three (described above) and identify any they believed to be redundant or unnecessary.

**Phase Two.** From the responses provided by the evaluators, the instrument was revised. It was then pre-tested by administering it to 20 United States Probation Officers in the United States Probation Office, Eastern District of Pennsylvania.
From their responses additional changes were made, and the final questionnaire was prepared for distribution. The cover letter and questionnaire were mailed in the same envelope with a self-addressed envelope enclosed.

**Treatment of the Data for Analyzing the Seven Basic Questions of Study**

In the Introduction, seven questions serving as a basis for this study were presented. Each of these questions is reiterated in Table 1, with the data that were gathered in attempting to answer each question being listed to the right of each question.

**Analysis of the Data to Determine the Answers to the Seven Questions.** Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 7 were analyzed similarly. The number, frequencies, and percentages were presented in tables and discussed.

The data for the fifth question, current continuing education needs, were derived by subtracting the means of each response on the Level of Understanding scale from Importance to the Job scale on each of the 19 competencies. These competencies and data were also presented in tables and ranked. Nine of the more important competencies were first listed in descending order of importance. Then the
TABLE 1

THE SEVEN QUESTIONS OF THIS STUDY AND THE DATA ELEMENTS INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ANSWERING EACH QUESTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Elements in Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. What are the demographic and professional characteristics of the responding United States probation officers? | a. Age  
b. Sex  
c. Marital status  
d. Level of education (before appointment as U.S.P.O.)  
e. College work completed (since appointment as U.S.P.O.)  
f. Total years of employment as U.S. probation officer  
g. Career plans in college  
h. Present level of professional preparation  
i. Intentions of seeking an additional degree  
j. Participation in non-credit program in past 12 months  
k. Membership in professional organizations  
l. Professional literature regularly perused. |
| 2. How important do U.S. probation officers perceive selected competencies to be to the performance of their job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies. | a. Importance of the 19 probation competencies to the job now  
b. Present level of understanding of the 19 probation competencies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Elements in Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. What competencies are perceived by the supervisors of the U.S.</td>
<td>a. Importance of the 19 probation competencies to the job now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probation officers as being important to the line probation officer's</td>
<td>b. Present level of understanding of the 19 probation competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>these competencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What competencies are perceived by the district chief U.S. probation</td>
<td>a. Importance of the 19 probation competencies to the job now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>officers as being important to the line probation officer's job and</td>
<td>b. Present level of understanding of the 19 probation competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competencies?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the continuing education needs of the responding U.S.</td>
<td>a. Importance of the 19 probation competencies to the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probation officers as perceived by the probation officers, supervising</td>
<td>b. Present level of understanding of the 19 probation competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probation officers and district chief probation officers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do the perceptions of the U.S. probation officer's continuing</td>
<td>a. Importance of the 19 probation competencies to the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education needs differ from the perceptions of their supervisors and</td>
<td>b. Present level of understanding of the 19 probation competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the perceptions of the district chiefs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1  (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Data Elements in Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. What are the probation officer's, supervising probation officer's and chief probation officer's preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training?</td>
<td>a. Orientation training: location preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Orientation training: facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Need for basic training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. Duration of basic training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Basic training: preferred location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f. Basic training: facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g. Advanced training: location preferred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h. Advanced training: facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. Training methods preferred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine competencies of less importance were listed beginning with the competency of least importance. The rationale for listing the most important and least important competencies in groups of nine is because an equal number for each group was preferred, and nine is approximately one-half the total of the 19 competencies. If more than nine of the most important competencies were listed, the last ones listed would be duplicated in a listing of those that are least important. This was accomplished for the three respondent groups: the Probation Officers, their Supervisors, and their
District Chiefs.

The sixth question asks if there is a difference in the perceptions among the Probation Officers, Supervisors, and District Chiefs, as to the Probation Officers' continuing education needs. For each respondent, the difference between the Level of Understanding and the Importance to the Job was calculated for each competency. One-way analyses of variance, with Scheffe post hoc tests, were then performed for each competency, the data displayed in an ANOVA summary table and discussed.

Summary

This chapter identifies and describes the research population, respondents and survey instrument as well as the procedures used to collect the data and the statistical methods used for analyzing the seven basic questions of the study.

The following chapter will present the results of this analysis.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The descriptive and inferential information collected in accordance with the research methods described in Chapter III of the study are reported in this chapter. The purpose of this reporting is to display and interpret the types of information this survey assessment has produced regarding the characteristics of United States Probation Officers and perceptions of their continuing education needs.

The chapter is divided into five parts. The first part identifies the total number of respondents to the survey. The second part presents the data collected in examining the first question of this study, thereby providing a demographic description of the respondents as well as their professional growth and development. The third part presents the data collected in examining Questions 2, 3, and 4 which consider the perceived level of understanding of selected competencies and the importance of these
competencies to the United States Probation Officer's job. Question 2 is concerned with the perceptions of the Probation Officers. Question 3 is addressed to the Supervising Probation Officers, while Question 4 pertains to the perceptions of the District Chief Probation Officers. Part four presents the data collected in examining Questions 5 and 6 of this study. Question 5 is concerned with the continuing education needs of United States Probation Officers as perceived by the Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers, and District Chief Probation Officers. Question 6 considers whether there is a difference in the perceptions of these three respondent groups. The fifth and final part of this chapter presents the data collected in examining the last question of this study, i.e., the Probation Officers', Supervising Probation Officers', and District Chief Probation Officers' preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training.

Response to the Questionnaire

In May, 1977, 591 questionnaires and answer forms were mailed to three respondent groups located in the 50 states and four territorial possessions of the United States. Three hundred seventy-one questionnaires, representing a thirty per cent random sample, were mailed to
United States Probation Officers. All Supervising United States Probation Officers (129) and all Chief United States Probation Officers except the writer (91) were also mailed a questionnaire.

By July, 1977, 527 of the three respondent groups had returned completed answer forms. Three hundred thirty-one (89 per cent) completed answer forms were returned by the Probation Officers, one hundred eighteen (91 per cent) were returned by the Supervisors, and seventy-eight (86 per cent) were returned by the District Chiefs.

Demographic and Professional Characteristics of the Responding United States Probation Officers

Question 1 of this study is:

What are the demographic and professional characteristics of the responding United States Probation Officers?

Personal Characteristics. Table 2 shows a summary of three personal characteristics: sex, age and marital status. The majority of the respondents are male (86.4 per cent), under 35 years of age (53 per cent), and married (81 per cent). Further examination of the data also reveals that 80.5 per cent of the Probation Officers are between the
TABLE 2
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS (SEX, AGE, MARITAL STATUS)
OF RESPONDING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS
N = 331

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed, Divorced or Separated</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on those respondents who replied to the question.*
ages of 25 and 45. The primary explanation for one-half of the Probation Officers being under the age of 35 is the unusually high number (721) of new Probation Officer positions authorized by the Congress between 1972 and 1975.

**Educational Characteristics.** Table 3 shows a summary of four educational characteristics: pre-service level of education, undergraduate major, pre-service graduate major, and in-service college work. Prior to their appointments nearly all (99 per cent) had graduated from college, 35 per cent had completed some graduate work, and well over one-third (43.5 per cent) had an advanced degree.

United States Probation Officers are a somewhat heterogeneous group so far as their undergraduate and graduate training is concerned. At the undergraduate level 27.2 per cent majored in sociology, 17.2 per cent chose psychology, 15.1 per cent selected education and several other disciplines are represented to a lesser degree. At least 28.7 per cent majored at the undergraduate level in disciplines largely unrelated to the social and behavioral sciences.

Twenty per cent (53) of the respondents who studied at the graduate level before their appointment to the United States Probation System were majoring in criminal justice. Eighteen per cent were majoring in education; 16 per cent,
TABLE 3

EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS (PRE-SERVICE LEVEL, UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR, PRE-SERVICE GRADUATE MAJOR AND IN-SERVICE COLLEGE WORK) OF RESPONDING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS

N = 331

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Service Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>35.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work, Social Service</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections/criminology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Service Graduate Major</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal justice</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Service College Work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree plus additional work</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree, no additional work</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more graduate courses, no degree</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more undergraduate courses, no degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on those respondents who replied to the question.
*The reader will note that the total number of replies is greater than the total number of respondents because four respondents reported two majors.

Social work; and 13 per cent studied psychology.

The need for continuing education at the college level is well recognized by Probation Officers in the United States Probation System. Nearly one-half (42.1 per cent) of the respondents pursued graduate work subsequent to their appointment and 20 per cent earned an advanced degree. Seventeen and six-tenths per cent earned a Masters Degree and seven (2.2 per cent) were awarded a Doctorate. Further analysis of the data revealed that nearly two-thirds (63.3 per cent) of all respondents now have an advanced degree.
Occupational Characteristics. Table 4 shows a summary of the years of service for the responding Probation Officers. The data reveal that over three-fourths (77.9 per cent) of the Probation Officers had less than six years of service and 13.6 per cent had more than 10 years of service in the United States Probation System. Furthermore it is noticed on closer inspection of the data that nearly two-thirds (60.3 per cent) of the respondents had one to three years of service and 28.1 had two years of service or less.

TABLE 4

OCCUPATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS (YEARS OF SERVICE)
OF RESPONDING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS
N = 331

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years of Service</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>77.9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aWhen the 1-5 year frequency cell is broken down to one-year intervals the data reveal that 4.2 per cent of the respondents have one year of service, 23.9 per cent have two years of service, 32.2 per cent have three years of service, 12.4 per cent have four years of service, and 5.1 per cent have five years of service.

*The reader will note that the total number of replies is less than the total number of respondents because 18 respondents did not answer the question.
Participation in Non-Credit Program of Professional Growth. Table 5 discloses a summary of the Probation Officer's recent participation in organized non-credit training programs, such as seminars, workshops, or conferences excluding their own office and programs sponsored by the Federal Judicial Center. The data indicates that nearly one-half of the Probation Officers attended no external workshops, conferences, et cetera, during the preceding twelve months and at least three-fourths of them (77 per cent) did not receive the minimum of 40 hours of training per year recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. At least 17 per cent and no more than 23 per cent of the respondents received the 40 hours recommended.

Plans to Take Additional Courses and Complete Another Degree. Table 6 reveals a summary of the plans of United States Probation Officers to take additional college courses and complete another degree. According to the data, approximately two-thirds (63.1 per cent) of the Probation Officers plan to take additional college courses and over one-half

### TABLE 5

**PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS IN NON-CREDIT TRAINING PROGRAMS IN PAST TWELVE MONTHS**

\(N = 331\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man Hours</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 6

**PLANS OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS TO TAKE ADDITIONAL COLLEGE COURSES AND COMPLETE ANOTHER DEGREE**

\(N = 331\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plans</th>
<th>Yes N (%)</th>
<th>No N (%)</th>
<th>No Reply N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take additional courses</td>
<td>209 (63.1)</td>
<td>119 (36.1)</td>
<td>3 (.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete another degree</td>
<td>127 (60.8)</td>
<td>64 (30.6)</td>
<td>18 (8.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(60.8 per cent) of this group plan to complete another degree. Further analysis indicates that over 38.3 per cent of the entire respondent group plan to complete another degree.

**Participation in Professional Organizations.** Table 7 displays a summary of the extent of United States Probation Officers' participation in professional organizations. The data revealed two significant points. The first is that an overwhelming majority (88.8 per cent) of the respondents are members of the Federal Probation Officers Association and very little interest is shown in memberships in the American Correctional Association (10 per cent) or the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (10 per cent). The second is that more interest is also shown by the Probation Officers in memberships in state and multi-state organizations (28.4 per cent) and local organizations (21.8 per cent) than in the ACA or the NCCD.

Twenty-two and six-tenths per cent of the respondents who are members of the Federal Probation Officers Association, approximately 10 per cent of those holding a membership in state and/or local organizations and 1.8 per cent of those with a membership in the ACA and/or the NCCD, are moderately active in their respective organizations. Less than six per cent of the respondents considered themselves "very active" in any one of the organizations listed.
### TABLE 7

**PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

**N = 331**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Organization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Probation Officers Association</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a member</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inactive member</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relatively inactive member</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderately active member</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very active member</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Correctional Association</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a member</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inactive member</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relatively inactive member</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderately active member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very active member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Council Crime and Delinquency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a member</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inactive member</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relatively inactive member</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderately active member</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very active member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State (or multi-state) Probation, Parole or Corrections Association</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a member</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inactive member</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relatively inactive member</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderately active member</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very active member</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Organization</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Probation, Parole and/or Corrections Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a member</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inactive member</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A relatively inactive member</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderately active member</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very active member</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of Professional Journals and Periodicals.

Table 8 identifies and presents a summary of the value of five professional journals and periodicals that are helpful to United States Probation Officers. The data indicate that the **Federal Probation** quarterly is the most helpful publication to the respondents because well over one-third of them (39 per cent) consider it "very helpful" and 98.2 per cent read it. The publication that could be ranked second in helpfulness is the **NCGD Journal** with 6.6 per cent considering it "very helpful." Although social work practice has been closely associated with probation work for many years, three-fourths (74.6 per cent) of the respondents reported that they do not read the **Social Work Journal** and only three per cent rated it to be "very helpful."
### TABLE 8

PROFESSIONAL JOURNALS AND PERIODICALS HELPFUL TO UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS

N = 331

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journals and Periodicals</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Probation Quarterly</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat helpful</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost no help</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not read it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>American Journal of Corrections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat helpful</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost no help</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not read it</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.C.C.D. Journal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat helpful</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost no help</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not read it</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Work Journal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat helpful</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost no help</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not read it</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Importance and Level of Understanding of Selected Competencies Related to the Job of United States Probation Officers

Having identified the respondents' demographic and professional characteristics, attention shall now be directed to identifying their level of understanding of probation competencies and the importance of these competencies to their job. This will be accomplished by examining the data reflecting the perceptions of Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers and Chief United States Probation Officers.

Question 2 of this study is:

How important do the United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies to be to the performance
of their job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

The data for this question were derived from two questions. First, the respondents were asked to indicate their present level of professional preparation by selecting one of five levels of preparation identified as "very well prepared," "well prepared," "somewhat prepared," "little preparation," or "poorly prepared." Second, the questionnaire contained a list of 19 competencies related to the Probation Officer's job. The respondents were asked to indicate the importance of each competency to the Probation Officer's job by marking one of five levels of importance: Very important, Important, Somewhat important, Little importance, or Almost no importance. Third, the respondents were then asked to indicate the Probation Officer's present level of understanding of the same competencies by marking one of five levels of understanding: very high understanding, high understanding, some understanding, little understanding, or almost no understanding. The response to each question will now be examined.

Table 9 presents a summary of the Probation Officers' perceived level of professional preparation. According to the data over one-half (55.6 per cent) of the respondents perceive themselves to be "well prepared" and an additional
TABLE 9

LEVEL OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PERCEIVED BY RESPONDING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS

N = 331

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Preparation (Overall)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well Prepared</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Prepared</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Prepared</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Preparation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly Prepared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

one-third (35.6 per cent) perceive themselves to be "very well prepared." The respondents, in other words, collectively perceive their present overall level of professional preparation to be adequate.

Table 10 shows a summary of (1) the mean of the Probation Officer's perception of the importance of 19 competencies to their job, (2) the mean of their present level of understanding of these competencies, and (3) the ranking of the competencies for both the importance to the job and level of understanding. The rankings are based on the mean (\( \bar{X} \)) response for each competency.
## TABLE 10

COMPETENCIES IMPORTANT TO THE UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICER'S JOB AND LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING AS PERCEIVED BY UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS

N = 331

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Importance to Job</th>
<th>Level of Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding components of cj system</td>
<td>1.402 7</td>
<td>1.731 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding criminal law</td>
<td>1.408 8</td>
<td>1.882 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding constitutional law</td>
<td>2.018 15</td>
<td>2.529 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical development of probation</td>
<td>3.021 19</td>
<td>2.637 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (Causation Theory and Social Problems)</td>
<td>2.097 17</td>
<td>2.269 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Principles (Personality and Behavioral Disorders)</td>
<td>1.686 11</td>
<td>2.178 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent developments in probation</td>
<td>1.816 12</td>
<td>2.686 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues in probation: National</td>
<td>2.048 16</td>
<td>2.607 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of investigative resources</td>
<td>1.245 3</td>
<td>1.535 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>1.196 1</td>
<td>1.613 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sentencing alternatives</td>
<td>1.215 2</td>
<td>1.831 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports</td>
<td>1.299 4</td>
<td>1.616 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The competencies considered most important to the Probation Officers' job were ranked first, i.e., the lower the mean the higher the ranking. Based on the rank and the mean, the competencies perceived by the Probation Officers to be most important are the following:

- Interviewing skills
- Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
- Knowledge of investigative resources
Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
Skill in dictating evaluative reports
Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
Understanding components of the criminal justice system
Understanding criminal law
Ability to properly refer probationers

The competencies perceived by Probation Officers to be least important are the following:

Historical development of probation
Ability to classify caseload
Criminology (Causation Theory and Social Problems)
Current issues in probation: National
Understanding constitutional law
Public relations
Skill as mediator and advocate
Recent developments in probation
Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)

Based on the rank and the means, the competencies perceived by the Probation Officers to be most understood are the following:
Knowledge of investigative resources
Interviewing skills
Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
Skill in dictating evaluative reports
Understanding components of the criminal justice system
Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
Ability to manage caseload efficiently
Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
Ability to classify caseload

The competencies perceived by the Probation Officers to be the least understood are the following:
Recent developments in probation
Historical development of probation
Current issues in probation: National
Understanding constitutional law
Skills as mediator and advocate
Criminology (Theory of Causation and Social Problems)
Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)
Public relations
Ability to properly refer probationers
Question 3 of this study is:

How important do the immediate supervisors of the United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies in the performance of the Line Probation Officer's job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

The data for this question were generated by questionnaires completed by Supervising United States Probation Officers. It was a modified questionnaire containing the same questions related to the 19 competencies in the questionnaires answered by the Probation Officers.

The construction of Table 11 is the same as Table 10 but the data reflect the perceptions of the Probation Officers' Supervisors. Based on the rank and the means, the competencies perceived by the Supervisors to be most important for Probation Officers are the following:

- Skill in dictating evaluative reports
- Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
- Interviewing skills
- Knowledge of investigative resources
- Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
- Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Importance to Job $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Level of Understanding $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding components of cj system</td>
<td>1.449</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.322</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding criminal law</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.466</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding constitutional law</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.059</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical development of probation</td>
<td>2.949</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.246</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (causation theory and social problems)</td>
<td>1.847</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.610</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological principles (personality and behavioral disorders)</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.729</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent developments in probation</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues in probation: National</td>
<td>2.203</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of investigative resources</td>
<td>1.246</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.881</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.102</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sentencing alternatives</td>
<td>1.212</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.992</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 11 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Importance to Job</th>
<th>Level of Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X Rank</td>
<td>X Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in dictating evaluative reports</td>
<td>1.212 1</td>
<td>2.229 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling</td>
<td>1.322 5</td>
<td>2.297 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to properly refer probationers</td>
<td>1.525 8</td>
<td>2.220 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills as mediator and advocate</td>
<td>2.034 13</td>
<td>2.797 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to classify caseloads</td>
<td>2.034 13</td>
<td>2.297 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage caseload efficiently</td>
<td>1.585 10</td>
<td>2.390 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>2.186 15</td>
<td>2.712 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Understanding components of the criminal justice system

Understanding criminal law

Ability to properly refer probationers

The competencies perceived by Supervisors to be least important for Probation Officers are the following:

- Historical development of probation
- Current issues in probation: National
Public relations
Understanding constitutional law
Ability to classify caseload
Skills as mediator and advocate
Recent developments in probation
Criminology (causation theory and social problems)
Ability to manage caseload efficiently

Based on the rank and the means (X), the competencies perceived by the Supervisors to be most understood are the following:

Knowledge of investigative resources
Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
Interviewing skills
Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
Ability to properly refer probationers
Skill in dictating evaluative reports
Ability to classify caseload
Understanding components of the criminal justice system
Ability to manage caseload efficiently

The competencies perceived by the Supervisors to be least understood are the following:
Historical development of probation
Understanding constitutional law
Recent developments in probation
Current issues in probation: National Skills as mediator and advocate
Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)
Public relations
Criminology (causation theory and social problems)
Understanding criminal law

Question 4 of this study is:

How important do the District Chief United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies to be to the performance of the line Probation Officer's job, and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

The data for this question are also generated by the modified questionnaires completed by Supervising United States Probation Officers and the construction of Table 12 is the same as Table 10. The data, however, reflect the perceptions of the District Chief Probation Officers. Based on the rank and the means, the competencies perceived by the District Chiefs to be most important to the Probation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Importance to Job</th>
<th>Level of Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding components of cj system</td>
<td>1.308 6</td>
<td>2.192 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding criminal law</td>
<td>1.410 8</td>
<td>2.321 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding constitutional law</td>
<td>1.910 12</td>
<td>2.910 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical development of probation</td>
<td>2.744 17</td>
<td>3.231 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (causation theory and social problems)</td>
<td>1.795 10</td>
<td>2.603 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological principles (personality and behavioral disorders)</td>
<td>1.564 9</td>
<td>2.667 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent developments in probation</td>
<td>1.872 11</td>
<td>2.872 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues in probation: National</td>
<td>2.128 16</td>
<td>2.744 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of investigative resources</td>
<td>1.141 2</td>
<td>1.821 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>1.077 1</td>
<td>2.077 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sentencing alternatives</td>
<td>1.192 4</td>
<td>2.115 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports</td>
<td>1.141 2</td>
<td>2.179 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Importance to Job</th>
<th>Level of Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$ Rank</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$ Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in dictating evaluative reports</td>
<td>1.179 3</td>
<td>2.256 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling</td>
<td>1.205 5</td>
<td>2.269 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to properly refer probationers</td>
<td>1.346 7</td>
<td>2.192 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills as mediator and advocate</td>
<td>2.077 15</td>
<td>2.667 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to classify caseloads</td>
<td>1.923 13</td>
<td>2.256 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage caseload efficiently</td>
<td>1.346 7</td>
<td>2.308 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>1.974 14</td>
<td>2.628 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officer's job performance** are the following:

- Interviewing skills
- Knowledge of investigative resources
- Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
- Skill in dictating evaluative reports
- Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
- Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
- Understanding components of the criminal justice system
Ability to manage caseload efficiently
Ability to properly refer probationers
Understanding criminal law

The competencies perceived by District Chiefs to be least important to the Probation Officer's job performance are the following:

Historical development of probation
Current issues in probation: National
Skills as mediator and advocate
Public relations
Ability to classify caseload
Understanding constitutional law
Recent developments in probation
Criminology (causation theory and social problems)
Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)

Based on the rank and the means, the competencies perceived by the District Chief Probation Officers to be most understood are the following:

Knowledge of investigative resources
Interviewing skills
Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
Understanding components of the criminal justice system
Ability to properly refer probationers
Skill in dictating evaluative reports
Ability to classify caseload
Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling

The competencies perceived by the District Chiefs to be least understood are the following:

- Historical development of probation
- Understanding constitutional law
- Recent developments in probation
- Current issues in probation: National Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)
- Skills as mediator and advocate
- Public relations
- Criminology (causation theory and social problems)
- Understanding criminal law
The Continuing Education Needs of United States Probation Officers

Question 5 in this study is:

What are the current continuing education needs of the responding United States Probation Officers as Perceived by the Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers, and District Chief Probation Officers?

Continuing education need in this study is defined as the difference between the Probation Officer's present level of understanding of each job-related competency and the importance of these competencies to their job. A high continuing education need for a competency would exist when the respondents indicate the competency is highly important to the Probation Officer's job, but they presently have a low or little understanding of the competency. However, if the competency is of high importance to their job but their present level of understanding is also high, the difference between the two factors is zero, near zero, or positive; and hence, there is little or no need for continuing education.

Current continuing education needs are determined by subtracting the mean of each competency under "level of
understanding" (Tables 10, 11, 12) from the mean of the same competency under "importance to the job." The difference is the degree that a competency reflects a continuing education need. The highest level of understanding and importance, on the evaluation scales, were assigned a point value of one and the lowest level a value of five. Thus, the greater the negative value, the greater the continuing education need; conversely, the greater the positive value, the less the continuing education need.

Table 13 shows a summary of the differences as perceived by Probation Officers and the ranking of the competencies based on the differences for current continuing education needs. The nine most important current continuing education needs, as perceived by Probation Officers, are listed in descending order of importance:

Recent developments in probation
Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
Current issues in probation: National
Understanding constitutional law
Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)
Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
Understanding criminal law
TABLE 13
CONTINUING EDUCATION NEEDS OF RESPONDING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>ITJ^a</th>
<th>LOU^b</th>
<th>Difference Between Means (X)</th>
<th>Rank^c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding components ofcj system</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.402</td>
<td>331 1.731</td>
<td>-.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding criminal law</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>331 1.882</td>
<td>-.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding constitutional law</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>331 2.529</td>
<td>-.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical development of probation</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>3.021</td>
<td>331 2.637</td>
<td>+.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (causation theory and social problems)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.097</td>
<td>331 2.269</td>
<td>-.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.686</td>
<td>331 2.178</td>
<td>-.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent developments in probation</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.816</td>
<td>331 2.686</td>
<td>-.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues in probation: National</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.048</td>
<td>331 2.607</td>
<td>-.559</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 13 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>ITJ&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>LOU&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference Between Means (X)</th>
<th>Rank&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of investigative resources</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.245</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sentencing alternatives</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.299</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in dictating evaluative reports</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to properly refer probationers</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.420</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills as mediator and advocate</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.915</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to classify caseload</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.115</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage caseload efficiently</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.529</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>ITJa</td>
<td>LOUb</td>
<td>Difference Between Means (X)</td>
<td>Rankc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>1.958</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>2.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aImportance to job.

bLevel of understanding.

cRank order of continuing education need is based on the difference between the means of the importance to the job and the level of understanding with highest ranked first.

Ability to properly refer probationers

Interviewing skills

The competencies considered by Probation Officers to be the least important current continuing education needs are the nine competencies which have a relatively low negative value. The competencies are:

Historical development of probation

Ability to classify caseload

Public relations

Criminology (causation theory and social problems)

Knowledge of investigative resources

Ability to manage caseload efficiently
Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports

Understanding components of the criminal justice system

Skill as mediator and advocate

Table 14 shows a summary of the differences as perceived by Supervisors and the ranking of these competencies based on the differences for current continuing education needs. The nine most important current continuing education needs, as perceived by the Probation Officers' Supervisors, are listed in descending order of importance:

Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)
Recent developments in probation
Skill in dictating evaluative reports
Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
Understanding criminal law
Understanding constitutional law
Interviewing skills
Understanding components of the criminal justice system
Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
### TABLE 14

**CONTINUING EDUCATION NEEDS OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS AS PERCEIVED BY SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>ITJ$^a$</th>
<th>LOU$^b$</th>
<th>Difference Between Means ($\bar{X}$)</th>
<th>Rank$^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding components of cj system</td>
<td>118 1.449</td>
<td>118 2.322</td>
<td>-0.873</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding criminal law</td>
<td>118 1.500</td>
<td>118 2.466</td>
<td>-0.967</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding constitutional law</td>
<td>118 2.136</td>
<td>118 3.059</td>
<td>-0.924</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical development of probation</td>
<td>118 2.949</td>
<td>118 3.246</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (causation theory and social problems)</td>
<td>118 1.847</td>
<td>118 2.610</td>
<td>-0.763</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological principles (personality and behavioral disorders)</td>
<td>118 1.542</td>
<td>118 2.729</td>
<td>-1.186</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent developments in probation</td>
<td>118 1.949</td>
<td>118 2.992</td>
<td>-1.042</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues in probation: National</td>
<td>118 2.203</td>
<td>118 2.932</td>
<td>-0.729</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>ITJ&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>LOU&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Difference Between Means (X)</td>
<td>Rank&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of investigative resources</td>
<td>118 1.246</td>
<td>118 1.881</td>
<td>-.635</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>118 1.220</td>
<td>118 2.102</td>
<td>-.881</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sentencing alternatives</td>
<td>118 1.212</td>
<td>118 1.992</td>
<td>-.780</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports</td>
<td>118 1.271</td>
<td>118 2.136</td>
<td>-.864</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in dictating evaluative reports</td>
<td>118 1.212</td>
<td>118 2.229</td>
<td>-.975</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling</td>
<td>118 1.322</td>
<td>118 2.297</td>
<td>-.695</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to properly refer probationers</td>
<td>118 1.525</td>
<td>118 2.220</td>
<td>-.763</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills as mediator and advocate</td>
<td>118 2.034</td>
<td>118 2.797</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to classify caseload</td>
<td>118 2.034</td>
<td>118 2.297</td>
<td>-.805</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage caseload efficiently</td>
<td>118 1.585</td>
<td>118 2.390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>ITJ&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>LOU&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference Between Means (X)</th>
<th>Rank&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>118 2.186</td>
<td>118 2.712</td>
<td>-.525</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Importance to job.

<sup>b</sup>Level of understanding.

<sup>c</sup>Rank order of continuing education need is based on the difference between the means of the importance to the job and the level of understanding with highest ranked first.

The competencies considered by the Probation Officers' Supervisors to be the least important current continuing education needs are the nine competencies which have a relatively high positive value. These competencies are:

- Ability to classify caseload
- Historical development of probation
- Public relations
- Knowledge of investigative resources
- Ability to properly refer probationers
- Current issues in probation: National Criminology (causation theory and social problems) (T)*
- Skills as mediator and advocate (T)

* Denotes a tie.
Knowledge of sentencing alternatives

Table 15 shows a summary of the differences as perceived by District Chief Probation Officers and the ranking of the competencies based on the differences for current continuing education needs. The nine most important current continuing education needs, as perceived by Chief Probation Officers, are listed in descending order of importance:

- Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders)
- Skill in dictating evaluative reports
- Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
- Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
- Recent developments in probation (T)
- Understanding constitutional law (T)
- Interviewing skills (T)
- Ability to manage caseload efficiently
- Knowledge of sentencing alternatives

The competencies considered by Chief Probation Officers to be the least important current continuing education needs are the nine competencies which have a relatively high positive value. These competencies are:
### TABLE 15

Continuing Education Needs of United States Probation Officers as Perceived by Chief United States Probation Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>ITJ&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>LOU&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference Between Means (X)</th>
<th>Rank&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding components of cj system</td>
<td>78 1.308</td>
<td>78 2.192</td>
<td>-0.885</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding criminal law</td>
<td>78 1.410</td>
<td>78 2.321</td>
<td>-0.910</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding constitutional law</td>
<td>78 1.910</td>
<td>78 2.910</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical development of probation</td>
<td>78 2.744</td>
<td>78 3.231</td>
<td>-0.487</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (causation theory and social problems)</td>
<td>78 1.795</td>
<td>78 2.603</td>
<td>-0.808</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological principles (personality and behavioral disorders)</td>
<td>78 1.564</td>
<td>78 2.667</td>
<td>-1.103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent developments in probation</td>
<td>78 1.872</td>
<td>78 2.872</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues in probation: National</td>
<td>78 2.128</td>
<td>78 2.744</td>
<td>-0.615</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>ITJ\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>LOU\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>Difference Between Means (X)</td>
<td>Rank\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of investigative resources</td>
<td>78 1.141</td>
<td>78 1.821</td>
<td>-.679</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td>78 1.077</td>
<td>78 2.077</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sentencing alternatives</td>
<td>78 1.192</td>
<td>78 2.115</td>
<td>-.923</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports</td>
<td>78 1.141</td>
<td>78 2.179</td>
<td>-1.038</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in dictating evaluative reports</td>
<td>78 1.179</td>
<td>78 2.256</td>
<td>-1.077</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling</td>
<td>78 1.205</td>
<td>78 2.269</td>
<td>-1.064</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to properly refer probationers</td>
<td>78 1.346</td>
<td>78 2.192</td>
<td>-.846</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills as mediator and advocate</td>
<td>78 2.077</td>
<td>78 2.667</td>
<td>-.590</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to classify caseload</td>
<td>78 1.923</td>
<td>78 2.256</td>
<td>-.333</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage caseload efficiently</td>
<td>78 1.346</td>
<td>78 2.308</td>
<td>-.962</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 15 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>ITJ&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>LOU&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Difference Between Means (X)</th>
<th>Rank&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Importance to job.

<sup>b</sup>Level of understanding.

<sup>c</sup>Rank order of continuing education need is based on the difference between the means of the importance to the job and the level of understanding with highest ranked first.

Ability to classify caseload

Historical development of probation

Skills as mediator and advocate

Current issues in probation: National Public relations

Knowledge of investigative resources

Criminology (causation theory and social problems)

Ability to properly refer probationers

Understanding components of the criminal justice system

The continuing education needs of United States Probation Officers, as perceived by the three respondent groups,
were identified above. Attention will now be focused on determining whether there are differences in the perceptions of the three groups.

Differences in the Perceptions of the United States Probation Officer's Continuing Education Needs Among Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers, and District Chief Probation Officers

Question 6 of this study is:

Do the perceptions of the United States Probation Officer's current continuing education needs differ among the Probation Officers, their Supervisors, and District Chiefs?

The data related to this question were derived from responses to the importance and level of understanding of the 19 competencies previously discussed.

Table 16 is an ANOVA summary table comparing the three respondent groups' perceptions of the continuing education needs for United States Probation Officers. An analysis of variance was conducted to discern whether the three groups viewed the continuing education needs of the Probation Officers differently. Table 16 indeed shows that for all competencies except two, i.e., Recent Developments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding components of cj system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>37.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>350.16</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding criminal law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>384.77</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding constitutional law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>459.02</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical development of probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>72.09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>42.31</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>446.38</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminology (causation theory and social problems)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>45.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>490.66</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological principles (personality and behavioral disorders)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>54.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>33.26</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>425.81</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent developments in probation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>466.20</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current issues in probation: National</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>441.39</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of investigative resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>13.68</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>312.47</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>32.30</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>266.80</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of sentencing alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>298.08</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>41.49</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>304.41</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in dictating evalua-tive reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>308.54</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.66</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>316.18</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to properly refer probationers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>383.52</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills as mediator and advocate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>428.72</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to classify caseloads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>40.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>499.06</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage caseload efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>355.98</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>398.12</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in Probation and Current Issues in Probation: National, the three groups did have different perceptions of the Probation Officer's continuing education needs. Scheffe post hoc tests were conducted for each of the competencies which were perceived differently and in each case the Scheffe post hoc showed that the differences were due to the Probation
Officers perceiving the level of their needs as less than the perceptions of the Supervisors and the Chiefs. In all cases examined there was no indication that the Supervisors and Chiefs viewed the Probation Officer's needs differently.

Training Methods

Question 7 of this study is:

What are the Probation Officer's, Supervising Probation Officer's and Chief Probation Officer's preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training?

The data for this question were derived from four types of questions on the questionnaire. The questions were related to the respondent's preference for (1) locations, (2) physical facilities, (3) curriculum, and (4) program duration for basic training.

Table 17 discloses a summary of the training locations and facilities preferred by the three respondent groups for orientation, basic and advanced training. The data reflect that there is a preference by all three respondent groups for orientation training to be held at the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, D.C. While a strong two-thirds (68.6 through 80.8 per cent) of all respondent groups
TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF THE LOCATIONS AND FACILITIES PREFERRED FOR
(Orientation, Basic and Advanced) Training by United States
Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation
Officers and Chief Probation Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Facilities</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location**

**Orientation Training**
- Washington, D.C.: 68.6%, 69.5%, 80.8%
- Centralized at Regional Level: 31.1%, 29.7%, 19.2%

**Basic Training**
- Washington, D.C.: 46.5%, 50.0%, 38.5%
- Centralized at Regional Level: 50.5%, 44.1%, 57.7%
- None: 2.4%, 5.1%, 3.8%

**Advanced Training**
- Washington, D.C.: 29.1%, 17.8%, 15.4%
- Centralized at Regional Level: 69.5%, 78.2%, 84.6%
- None: 1.2%, 3.4%, 0.0%

**Facilities**

**Orientation**
- Permanent Academy Lodging Attached: 20.2%, 21.2%, 20.5%
- Permanent Academy Separate Lodging: 13.6%, 16.9%, 11.5%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location and Facilities</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilities (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Judicial Center</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Arrangements Hotels, Motels, etc.</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Academy Lodging Attached</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Academy Separate Lodging</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Judicial Center</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Arrangements Hotels, Motels, etc.</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Academy Lodging Attached</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Academy Separate Lodging</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Judicial Center</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Arrangements Hotels, Motels, etc.</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preferred Washington, D.C. as the training site, there was diversity within and among the groups so far as their preferences for a facility were concerned. Although three percent more Probation Officers preferred the Federal Judicial Center (34.4 per cent) to temporary arrangements in hotels and motels (31.4 per cent), there was an 11 per cent difference (36.4 and 25.4 per cent) in the preference among the Supervisors between the same two facilities most preferred by Probation Officers. The data indicate, however, that District Chiefs have a decided preference for the Federal Judicial Center (52.6 per cent) over their second choice which was a permanent academy with attached lodgings (20.5 per cent).

The data also indicate a slight preference by Probation Officers (50.5 per cent) and Chiefs (57.7 per cent) for basic training to be centralized at the regional level, while the Supervisors (50 per cent) preferred that it be located in Washington, D.C. Probation Officers (40.2 per cent) and Supervisors (38.1 per cent) preferred the facilities to be temporary arrangements in hotels, motels, etc., although the Chiefs (41 per cent) preferred the Federal Judicial Center for basic training.

Further examination of the data reveals that there is a strong preference by all three respondent groups for
advanced training to be held at a centralized regional location (69.5 through 84.6 per cent) in temporary facilities such as hotels or motels (62.7 through 66.7 per cent).

Tables 18 through 22 display the data revealing a comparison of United States Probation Officers', Supervising United States Probation Officers', and Chief United States Probation Officers' preferences for five selected competencies for basic training (during the first year of service) for new Probation Officers. The means were computed by assigning one to five points to each level of a five-level scale ranging from strongly agreed to strongly disagreed. One point was allowed for strongly agreed and five were allowed for strongly disagreed. The data revealed substantial agreement among the three respondent groups that all five competencies be incorporated into a basic training program for new Probation Officers. Some preference is shown, however, for certain competencies over others and the following is a listing of the competencies in descending order of preference with the most preferred listed first:

- Interviewing Techniques, Counseling and Helping Roles
- Criminal Law and Constitutional Law
- Criminal Justice System
- Psychology: Personality and Behavior Disorders
- Criminology (Causation Theory and Social Problems)
TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS', SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' AND CHIEF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' PREFERENCES FOR SELECTED COMPETENCIES FOR BASIC TRAINING (DURING FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE) FOR NEW PROBATION OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Someewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing Techniques, Counseling and Helping Roles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Probation Officer</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 19

COMPARISON OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS', SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' AND CHIEF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' PREFERENCES FOR SELECTED COMPETENCIES FOR BASIC TRAINING (DURING FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE) FOR NEW PROBATION OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminology (Causation Theory and Social Problems)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree %</th>
<th>Some-what Agree %</th>
<th>Dis-agree %</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Probation Officer</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 20

COMPARISON OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS', SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' AND CHIEF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' PREFERENCES FOR SELECTED COMPETENCIES FOR BASIC TRAINING (DURING FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE) FOR NEW PROBATION OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criminal Law and Constitutional Law</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>(0) 2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Probation Officer</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>(0) 2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>(0) 2.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS', SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' AND CHIEF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' PREFERENCES FOR SELECTED COMPETENCIES FOR BASIC TRAINING (DURING FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE) FOR NEW PROBATION OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>(0) 2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Probation Officer</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>(0) 2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>(0) 2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 22

**COMPARISON OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS’ , SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS’ AND CHIEF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS’ PREFERENCES FOR SELECTED COMPETENCIES FOR BASIC TRAINING (DURING FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE) FOR NEW PROBATION OFFICERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychology: Personality and Behavior Disorders</th>
<th>Strongly Agree %</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree %</th>
<th>NR %</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>(0) 2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Probation Officer</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(0) 2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Probation Officer</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>(0) 2.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23 reflects the data showing a comparison of the three respondent groups' preference for the duration of the basic training program (during first year of service) for new United States Probation Officers. The data indicate that all three groups preferred a two-week training program for new Probation Officers over a one-week program by an eight per cent (Probation Officers) to 13 per cent (Chiefs) margin.

**Additional Comments.** Although the respondents were provided with an opportunity to express any additional comments beyond their answers to the questions in the questionnaire, there were few replies and they were too diversified to have any significance to the study.

**Summary**

This chapter has identified and defined United States Probation Officers responding to this survey through an extensive analysis of the data on selected demographic and professional characteristics. The result is a fairly comprehensive profile of the responding Probation Officers which will be summarized in the next chapter.

This chapter also examined the importance and level of understanding of 19 competencies related to the Probation
TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS', SUPERVISING UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' AND CHIEF UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS' PREFERENCES FOR THE DURATION OF A BASIC TRAINING PROGRAM (DURING FIRST YEAR OF SERVICE) FOR NEW PROBATION OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Duration</th>
<th>Per Cent Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Week</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Weeks</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three to Four Weeks</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to Six Weeks</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Six Weeks</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer's role, as perceived by the Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers, and District Chief United States Probation Officers. From these data the present continuing education needs were determined. An analysis of the differences in three respondent groups' perception of these needs disclosed that they did have different perceptions of the Probation Officer's needs which
were due to the Probation Officers perceiving their needs differently from the Supervising United States Probation Officers and Chief United States Probation Officers. Finally, an analysis of the three respondent groups' preferences for training methods was conducted and reported. The needs of the United States Probation Officers will be summarized in the next chapter, along with the appropriate recommendations to meet these needs.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The objectives of this study were to (1) identify and examine the demographic and professional characteristics of United States Probation Officers, (2) identify their continuing education needs as perceived by Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers, and Chief United States Probation Officers, (3) determine if there is a significant difference in the needs perceived by the three groups, and (4) identify the methods preferred by the three groups for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training. This chapter summarizes the general findings emanating from the analysis of the data received from the three respondent groups and described in the preceding chapter. Following this summarization nine conclusions based on this study and fourteen recommendations directed toward the implementation of appropriate action are stated. Finally, four recommendations regarding areas warranting further study are presented.
The conclusions and recommendations will contribute to the development of continuing education programs by the Federal Judicial Center and the district United States Probation Offices.

In this study it was noted that presently it is impracticable, if not impossible, for colleges and universities to provide pre-service training that is both comprehensive and relevant. Therefore, specialized training for incumbent United States Probation Officers and those entering the field will need to be provided through continuing education for the foreseeable future. This fact emphasizes the need to identify as clearly as possible the programs that are most appropriate.

To realize the objectives of this study seven basic questions were formulated and examined. These were:

1. What are the demographic and professional characteristics of the responding United States Probation Officers?

2. How important do the United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies to be to the performance of their job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?
3. How important do the immediate supervisors of the United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies in the performance of the line Probation Officer's job and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

4. How important do the District Chief United States Probation Officers perceive selected competencies to be to the performance of the line Probation Officer's job, and how high do they perceive their level of understanding to be in these competencies?

5. What are the current continuing education needs of the responding United States Probation Officers as perceived by the Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers and District Chief Probation Officers?

6. Do the perceptions of the United States Probation Officer's current continuing education needs differ among the Probation Officers, their Supervisors and District Chiefs?
7. What are the Probation Officer's, Supervising Probation Officer's and Chief Probation Officer's preference of methods for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training?

The population for this study consisted of 371 United States Probation Officers assigned to United States District Courts located in the 50 states and four territorial possessions of the United States.

The questionnaire survey method was selected and used to obtain the individual responses because of the wide geographic distribution of the population, the opportunity this method provided for more considered answers, and the questions requiring the respondents to carefully examine an extensive list of items that could not be adequately asked in personal interviews.

A closed form questionnaire was designed to provide the responding Probation Officers, Supervisors, and Chief Probation Officers an opportunity to:

1. Describe their personal characteristics, level and type of educational development as well as occupational and professional development.
2. Describe their perception regarding the importance of selected competencies related to probation work.

3. Describe their perception of their level of understanding of selected competencies related to probation work.

4. Describe their preferences for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training.

Development of the survey instrument consisted of a number of reviews and field tests by various authorities as well as extensive revisions and refinements. After a final pre-testing of several Probation Officers, no difficulty with the questionnaire in its final form was indicated.

The questionnaire and procedures of this study were designed to provide answers to the seven major questions. The results of these procedures identified the demographic and professional characteristics of the respondents; the current continuing education needs of the Probation Officers; determined the differences in the educational needs perceived by Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers, and Chief Probation Officers and preferences of the three groups for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training.
The findings presented in this study are applicable beyond the United States Probation System and the results should be considered when examining Probation Officers employed by state and local governments elsewhere in the United States.

General Findings

Three hundred thirty-one (89 per cent) Probation Officers, 118 (91 per cent) Supervising United States Probation Officers, and 78 (86 per cent) District Chief United States Probation Officers returned answer forms. The findings summarized on the following pages are presented in the order that the data were presented in the previous chapter (Presentation of the Findings).

Demographic and Professional Characteristics of the Responding Probation Officers

Personal, Educational, Occupational and Professional Characteristics (Question 1). Data received from the respondents indicated that most were male, under 35 and married. The educational level was high, with 99 per cent graduating from college and over three-fourths having
completed some graduate work or earned a graduate degree. More than one-half of the respondents majored in the social and behavioral sciences at the undergraduate level, while three-fourths of those who earned a Masters degree prior to their appointment as United States Probation Officers also majored in the social and behavioral sciences. Nearly one-half pursued graduate work after their appointment and 20 per cent earned an advanced degree. Of the 20 per cent earning an advanced degree, 18 per cent earned a Masters degree and two per cent a Doctorate. Nearly two-thirds of all the respondents now have an advanced degree. Over three-fourths of the respondents have less than six years of experience, nearly two-thirds have less than four years, while only 14 per cent have more than 10 years of service in the United States Probation System.

Nearly one-half of the respondents attended no workshops, conferences, et cetera, other than those provided within the United States Probation System over the past twelve months and at least three-fourths of them did not receive the minimum of 40 hours per year of training recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. No more than one-fourth of the respondents received the 40 hours recommended. Approximately two-thirds (63 per cent) of the respondents plan to take additional college courses and over half of this group
plan to complete another degree. Thirty-eight per cent of the entire respondent group plan to complete another degree.

An overwhelming majority (89 per cent) of the respondents are members of the Federal Probation Officers Association but very little interest is shown in other national organizations committed to the improvement of probation services. More interest is shown in state and local organizations and less than six per cent of the respondents considered themselves "very active" in any of the organizations listed. The Federal Probation quarterly is the most helpful publication to the respondents because 98 per cent of them read it and over one-third of them consider it "very helpful." No other publications could be ranked close to the Federal Probation quarterly in helpfulness. Three-fourths of the respondents do not read the Social Work Journal and three per cent rated it to be "very helpful."

Summary of the Characteristics. Having described in general terms the characteristics of the respondents to this study, a method of illustrating these characteristics is to describe the "average" respondent.

The "average" respondent is male, 37 years old, married, and has five years' service in the United States
Probation System. He has a Masters Degree with a major in one of the social sciences, plans to take additional graduate work, but is not planning to seek an advanced degree.

The "average" respondent participates in conferences and workshops external to the United States Probation System less than eight hours per year, is a "relatively inactive" or "moderately active" member of the Federal Probation Officers Association and has little interest in other organizations committed to the improvement of probation services. He reads the Federal Probation quarterly and considers it to be "somewhat helpful" to "very helpful" and does not read the Social Work Journal, American Journal of Corrections, the NCGD Journal, or the Social Services Review. Regarding his level of overall professional preparation for his work, he considers himself to be "well prepared" to handle his responsibilities.

This, then, is the "average" respondent.

The Importance and Level of Understanding of Selected Competencies Related to the Job of United States Probation Officers

Importance and Level of Understanding Perceived by United States Probation Officers (Question 2). Data received from the respondents regarding their overall level
of professional preparation revealed that they perceive themselves to be "well prepared," but not necessarily "very well prepared."

The respondents were also asked to indicate the importance of 19 competencies to their job. The data received revealed that the respondents perceived the following nine competencies to be most important to their job now: interviewing skills, knowledge of sentencing alternatives, knowledge of investigative resources, ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports, skill in dictating evaluative reports, skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, understanding the components of the criminal justice system, and understanding criminal law.

The following nine competencies were perceived by the respondents to be least important to their job now: historical development of probation, ability to classify caseload, criminology (causation theory and social problems), current issues in probation: national, understanding constitutional law, public relations, skills as mediator and advocate, recent developments in probation, and psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders).

The respondents were then asked to indicate their present level of understanding of the 19 competencies.
The data revealed that the respondent's present level of understanding is the highest for the following nine competencies: Knowledge of investigative resources, interviewing skills, ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports, skill in dictating evaluative reports, understanding components of the criminal justice system, skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, ability to manage caseload effectively, knowledge of sentencing alternatives, and ability to classify caseload.

The following nine competencies were perceived by the respondents to be least understood at the present time: recent developments in probation, historical development of probation, current issues in probation: national, understanding constitutional law, skills as mediator and advocate, criminology (theory of causation and social problems), psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders), public relations, and ability to properly refer probationers.

Importance and Level of Understanding of Competencies Related to the Probation Officer's Job as Perceived by Supervising United States Probation Officers (Question 3). These respondents were also asked to indicate their perception of the importance of the 19 competencies to the
Probation Officer's job. The data received revealed that the Supervisors perceived the following nine competencies to be most important to the Probation Officer's job: skill in dictating evaluative reports, knowledge of sentencing alternatives, interviewing skills, knowledge of investigative resources, ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports, skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, understanding components of the criminal justice system, understanding criminal law, and ability to properly refer probationers.

The following nine competencies were perceived by the Supervisors to be least important to the Probation Officer's job: historical development of probation, current issues in probation: national, public relations, understanding constitutional law, ability to classify caseload, skills as mediator and advocate, recent developments in probation, criminology (causation theory and social problems), and ability to manage caseload efficiently.

The Supervisors were then asked to indicate their present level of understanding of the 19 competencies. The data received revealed that the Supervisor's perception of the Probation Officer's present level of understanding is the highest for the following nine competencies: knowledge of investigative resources, knowledge of sentencing
alternatives, interviewing skills, ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports, ability to properly refer probationers, skill in dictating evaluative reports, skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, ability to classify caseload, and understanding components of the criminal justice system.

The following nine competencies were perceived by the Probation Officer's Supervisors to be least understood at the present time: historical development of probation, understanding constitutional law, recent developments in probation, current issues in probation: national, skills as mediator and advocate, psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders), public relations, criminology (causation theory and social problems), and understanding criminal law.

**Importance and Level of Understanding of Competencies Related to the Probation Officer's Job as Perceived by Chief United States Probation Officers (Question 4).**

The respondents were asked to indicate the importance of 19 competencies to the Probation Officer's job. The data received reveal that the Chief Probation Officers perceive the following nine competencies to be most important to the Probation Officer's job: interviewing skills, knowledge
of investigative resources, ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports, skill in dictating evaluative reports, knowledge of sentencing alternatives, skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, understanding components of the criminal justice system, ability to manage caseloads efficiently, and ability to properly refer probationers.

The following nine competencies were perceived by the Chief Probation Officers to be least important to the Probation Officer's job: historical development of probation, current issues in probation: national, skills as mediator and advocate, public relations, ability to classify caseload, understanding constitutional law, recent developments in probation, criminology (causation theory and social problems), and psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders).

The respondents were then asked to indicate their perception of the Probation Officer's present level of understanding of the 19 competencies. The data received revealed that the Chief Probation Officer's perception of the Probation Officer's present level of understanding is the highest for the following nine competencies: knowledge of investigative resources, interviewing skills, knowledge of sentencing alternatives, ability to organize information
and dictate presentence investigation reports, understanding components of the criminal justice system, ability to properly refer probationers, skill in dictating evaluative reports, ability to classify caseload, and skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling.

The following nine competencies were perceived by the Chief Probation Officers to be least understood by the Probation Officers at the present time: historical development of probation, understanding constitutional law, recent developments in probation, current issues in probation: national, psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders), skills as mediator and advocate, public relations, criminology (causation theory and social problems), and understanding criminal law.

The Continuing Education Needs of United States Probation Officers as Perceived by United States Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers and Chief United States Probation Officers (Question 5). The data gathered in answering Questions 2, 3, and 4 provided the basis for identifying the current continuing education needs of the Probation Officers. Current needs were determined by subtracting the mean on the Level of Understanding Scale from the mean on the Importance to the Job Scale for each competency.
A group of competencies was identified by each of the respondent groups as being a present continuing education need of the Probation Officers. The following nine competencies had the highest present need as perceived by the Probation Officers: recent developments in probation, knowledge of sentencing alternatives, current issues in probation: national, understanding constitutional law, psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders), skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, understanding criminal law, ability to properly refer probationers and interviewing skills.

The following nine competencies were identified by the Probation Officers as being the least important continuing education needs at the present time: historical development of probation, ability to classify caseload, public relations, criminology (causation theory and social problems), knowledge of investigative resources, ability to manage caseload efficiently, ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports, understanding the components of the criminal justice system, skills as mediator and advocate, and skill in dictating evaluative reports.

The following nine competencies had the highest present need as perceived by the Probation Officer's
Supervisors: psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders), recent developments in probation, skill in dictating evaluative reports, skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, understanding criminal law, understanding constitutional law, interviewing skills, understanding the components in the criminal justice system, and ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports.

The following nine competencies were identified by the Probation Officer's Supervisors as being least important continuing education needs for the Probation Officers at the present time: ability to classify caseload, historical development of probation, public relations, knowledge of investigative resources, ability to properly refer probationers, current issues in probation: national, criminology (causation theory and social problems), skills as mediator and advocate, and knowledge of sentencing alternatives.

The following nine competencies had the highest present need for Probation Officers as perceived by the Chief United States Probation Officers: psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders), skill in dictating evaluative reports, skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling, ability to organize information and dictate presentence investigation reports, recent developments in
probation, understanding constitutional law, interviewing skills, ability to manage caseload efficiently, and knowledge of sentencing alternatives.

The following nine competencies were identified by the Chief Probation Officers as being the least important continuing education need to the Probation Officer at the present time: ability to classify caseload, historical development of probation, skill as mediator and advocate, current issues in probation: national, public relations, knowledge of investigative resources, criminology (causation theory and social problems), ability to properly refer probationers, and understanding components of the criminal justice system.

Differences in the Perceptions of the United States Probation Officers' Continuing Education Needs Among Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers and District Chief Probation Officers (Question 6). The data related to this question were derived from responses to the importance and level of understanding of the 19 competencies previously discussed. The data reveal that for all competencies except two, i.e., recent developments in probation and current issues in probation: national, the three groups did have different perceptions of the Probation Officers'
continuing education needs. Scheffe post hoc tests were run for each of the 17 competencies which were perceived differently and in each case the Scheffe post hoc showed that the differences were due to the Probation Officers perceiving the strength of their needs to a lesser degree than the Supervisors and the Chiefs. In all cases examined there was no indication that the Supervisors and Chiefs viewed the Probation Officers' needs differently.

Training Methods (Question 7). Data received from the respondents indicated that all three respondent groups preferred that orientation training be held at the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, D.C. and that advanced training be held at a centralized regional location in temporary facilities such as motels, hotels, etc. The data also reflect, however, that the three groups are divided among and between themselves as far as locations and facilities for basic training are concerned. Further analysis revealed substantial agreement among the three groups that the following competencies be incorporated into a two-week basic training program for new Probation Officers during the first year of service:
Conclusions

The following conclusions are derived from the analysis of the data obtained from the answer forms of the responding Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers, and Chief United States Probation Officers and summarized on the preceding pages.

1. The purpose of this study has been achieved by developing answers to seven major questions that were designed to identify the continuing education needs of Probation Officers in the United States Probation System.

2. In general, United States Probation Officers responding to this questionnaire are a homogeneous group in terms of their personal and professional characteristics. They are relatively young and inexperienced as Probation Officers in the United States Probation System but well educated, with over three-fourths having completed some graduate work or received an advanced degree.
Over one-half majored in the social sciences at the undergraduate or graduate level and, thus, have training in accordance with the educational qualifications promulgated by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.

3. United States Probation Officers consider themselves well prepared in the field of probation work, but most of them also demonstrated a keen awareness of their needs for continuing education by reporting their intentions to take additional college courses.

4. Most United States Probation Officers do not belong to professional organizations, participate in external seminars, workshops, conferences, et cetera, or regularly read professional journals and periodicals. A noteworthy and singular exception is their high percentage of membership in the Federal Probation Officers Association and regular perusal of the Federal Probation quarterly, which they find to be helpful.

5. Most United States Probation Officers are not receiving the minimum amount of training (workshops, conferences, et cetera) recommended by the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (excluding on-the-job training). Forty hours per year is recommended and most United States Probation Officers are
receiving less than eight hours.

6. The Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers and Chief Probation Officers differentiated between their level of understanding and the importance of selected competencies. This facilitated the identification and ranking of the competencies in order of need and it is noted when comparing the ranking of the three groups that they are different. The Probation Officers, Supervising Probation Officers and Chief Probation Officers perceive the needs for the various competencies differently. Therefore, each group considers the need for each of the competencies to be greater, less, or the same as the other competencies.

When the Probation Officers', Supervising Probation Officers' and Chief United States Probation Officers' perceptions of each need (competency) were compared by the analysis of variance, it was found that the Probation Officers perceived their need for each one of the 17 competencies to be different (less) than that perceived by the Supervising Probation Officers and Chief Probation Officers.

7. The highly specialized, interdisciplinary, and somewhat legalistic nature of the probation related competencies
most needed by United States Probation Officers tend to support the following needs and trend:

(a) the need for an extensive and professionally oriented basic and continuing education program in the United States Probation System.

(b) a need for the development of meaningful, interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate programs in universities purporting to prepare students for careers in probation work.

(c) the need for closer links between faculty of universities purporting to prepare students for careers in probation work and experienced probation personnel.

(d) a trend away from the traditional quasi-medical "therapeutic treatment" model previously adopted by corrections toward a "justice" model for probation work.

8. Although nationally recognized standard setting commissions have been suggesting since 1967 that Probation Officers shift their emphasis from the offender (case-work) to the environment (institutional resources) with which he must come to terms, there does not appear to be a substantial movement in the United States Probation System to develop new practice roles that (a) link the
offender with the community institutions or (b) mobilize these institutions to meet the needs of the offender.

9. Neither the United States Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers, or District Chief United States Probation Officers are seriously interested in a permanent academy type facility for training.

United States Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers, and District Chief Probation Officers prefer that orientation training be held at the Federal Judicial Center in Washington, D.C. This may be attributed, in part, to the probability that new Probation Officers can best be provided with a "system" perspective of the United States Probation Service in a location near the Probation Division of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C.

The three levels of probation staff are somewhat divided between and within their respective groups concerning their preference for locations and facilities for basic training for new Probation Officers. Competencies for a basic training program have been identified and all levels of staff preferred a two-week program.

There is a strong preference by all three staff levels, however, for advanced training to be held at centralized,
regional locations in temporary facilities such as hotels, motels, etc.

**Recommendations**

The purpose of this study was to identify the predominant characteristics of United States Probation Officers, determine their continuing educational needs and ascertain their preferences for the administration of orientation, basic and advanced training. The results of this study have primary application for all personnel having responsibilities for developing training programs for Probation Officers in the United States Probation System, more specifically the staff of the Federal Judicial Center, but also have some relevance for (1) those staff members who are developing training programs for adult Probation Officers in state and local agencies as well as (2) committees and faculty engaged in the development of university programs and curriculum for pre-service students and/or in-service probation personnel.

The findings and conclusions of this study, as well as the judgment of the writer, suggest that in the interest of improving the continuing educational programs for United States Probation Officers, the following recommendations be considered:
1. Orientation training should be continued at the Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C. New Probation Officers should attend within 90 to 120 days following their entrance on duty. The duration of the training should be reduced to three days and the program should be limited to: introductions to and discussion with top administrators from the Probation Division, philosophy and goals of the system, the organization and function of various divisions of the Administrative Office, recent plans and issues of interest to all Probation Officers in the system, the United States Probation Service as a cooperative national system and the importance of inter-district cooperation.

2. The 19 probation-related competencies analyzed in this study are listed below in descending order of importance and thus reflect the rank order of the continuing education needs of United States Probation Officers. Those competencies ranked highest should be emphasized the most in development of in-service training programs or college curricula.

Recent developments in probation

Psychological principles (personality and behavior disorders
Knowledge of sentencing alternatives
Understanding constitutional law
Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling
Understanding criminal law
Skill in dictating evaluative reports
Interviewing skills
Current issues in probation: National
Ability to properly refer probationers
Ability to organize information and dictate PSI reports
Understanding components of cj system
Ability to manage caseload efficiently
Skills as mediator and advocate
Knowledge of investigative resources
Criminology (causation theory and social problems)
Public relations
Ability to classify caseload
Historical development of probation

The above ranking was determined by computing the weighted average need of the three respondent groups for each of the 19 competencies.
3. The Federal Judicial Center should develop, sponsor, and coordinate a basic training program in Washington, D.C., or centralized regional locations for new Probation Officers. All new Officers should participate during the first year of service for a total period of two weeks. The two weeks should be divided into two one-week sessions scheduled at least 90 days apart. Competencies that should be emphasized during the first week are:

Knowledge of basic psychological principles helpful in working with personality and behavior disorders

Interviewing techniques, counseling, and other helping roles; skills required in mobilizing community institutions to help offenders

Organizing information and dictating evaluative reports

Competencies that should be emphasized during the second week of basic training are:

Understanding the structure, processes and inter-relationships among the components of the criminal justice system (components of criminal justice system include law enforcement agencies, the prosecutor's office, the courts, probation, parole, and correctional institutions)

Criminal Law and Constitutional Law: Selected topics including due process rights of defendants and convicted public offenders; civil rights of the convicted offender

Recent developments and issues in probation and recommendations by national commissions and recognized standard setting organizations
Sources and rationale for recommending the above competencies for basic training include: (1) competencies preferred for basic training listed in Chapter IV, (2) competencies listed in Chapter IV as highly ranked continuing education needs, (3) competencies that require instructors and/or resource persons with level of expertise many District Probation Officers cannot provide, (4) omission of some highly ranked continuing education needs that can be adequately imparted at the district level, (5) competencies recommended for the first week are related skills and knowledge necessary for Probation Officers to carry out their daily responsibilities at a minimum level of efficiency and (6) inter-related competencies recommended for the second week are intended to broaden the Probation Officer's knowledge base and contribute to his efficiency and effectiveness by a more intensive familiarization with the criminal justice system and general state of the art in professional probation practice.

4. Competencies that should be emphasized the most in the development of in-service basic training programs for United States Probation Officers by probation staff at the district level are:
Knowledge of sentencing alternatives

Ability to properly and efficiently refer probationers to community resource agencies

The presentence investigation with emphasis on information resources to be contacted

How to classify and manage the caseload

Public relations

5. Recommendations 3 and 4 have linked basic training needs (competencies) to continuing education programming at two types of geographical locations, i.e., centralized and district level depending, in part, on the complexity of the particular competency and the availability of qualified faculty. In recognizing that many important competencies, including the six in Recommendation 3, are somewhat generic in nature a variety of learning resources should be made available to Probation Officers who wish to increase their skills and refresh their knowledge on a continuing basis throughout their career. It is therefore recommended that the Federal Judicial Center increase their funding to district probation offices to allow Probation Officers to attend universities, conferences, institutes, etc., which provide courses and learning experiences in the following competencies:
Knowledge of basic psychological principles helpful in working with personality and behavior disorders.

Interviewing techniques, counseling, and other helping roles; skills required in mobilizing community institutions to help offenders.

Organizing information and dictating evaluative reports.

Understanding the structure, processes and inter-relationships among the components of the criminal justice system (components of criminal justice system include law enforcement agencies, prosecutor's office, the courts, probation, parole, and correctional institutions).

Criminal Law and Constitutional Law: Selected topics including due process rights of defendants and convicted public offenders; civil rights of the convicted offender.

Recent developments and issues in probation and recommendations by national commissions and recognized standard setting organizations.

Special skills in functional role of Probation Officer as mediator and advocate between the probationer and the community.

Criminology (causation theory and related social problems).

Public relations.

Other competencies related to special needs.

6. It is suggested that the Federal Judicial Center sponsor a few experimental institutes designed to focus on the "connector" role for Probation Officers who perceive a need to sharpen their skills in mobilizing community institutions to serve probationers.
7. In consideration of the differences in the perceptions of the Probation Officers' continuing education needs (among the United States Probation Officers, Supervising United States Probation Officers, and District Chief United States Probation Officers) those responsible for developing training programs should consider alternating and/or mixing the topics (competencies) perceived to be most needed by each of the three respondent groups.

8. Funding should be increased to district probation offices to enable them to strengthen their staff development programs by (a) scheduling university faculty and other recognized speakers and learning facilitators and (b) renting meeting facilities large enough to accommodate all professional probation staff at one meeting.

9. The Federal Judicial Center should continue to develop, sponsor, coordinate, and evaluate advanced training institutes at centralized regional locations in temporary facilities, e.g., hotels, motels, et cetera. These institutes or sessions should be scheduled on a special need basis in competencies determined by regular, periodic need assessments. The duration of advanced
their endeavors to provide a modicum of professional training to these officers they may wish to consider the continuing education needs identified in Recommendation 3 as well as Recommendation 4.

13. The survey which was the basis of this study was a single inquiry. Prior to developing an extensive plan of implementation, it is advisable that a follow-up inquiry be conducted requesting the district probation staff to indicate if they are in agreement with the current continuing education needs determined in this study.

14. Consideration should be given by the Federal Judicial Center to conduct an abbreviated but similar survey at least every two years to continually update the Probation Officers' continuing education needs.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. This study dealt with United States Probation Officers. There are more state, county and city adult Probation Officers in the United States than Federal Probation Officers. A study that would parallel this study with Probation Officers employed by other levels of
government would be valuable. Training for these groups of Probation Officers is just as essential as is training for United States Probation Officers.

2. If it can be assumed that training at the management level of an organization is as important to the overall efficiency and effectiveness of the organization as it is to the practitioner, an assessment of the training needs of the Supervising United States Probation Officers and District Chief United States Probation Officers might be considered.

3. Another procedure identified by the author for determining continuing education needs was the "Delphi Technique" consisting of involving a small group of experts in the process of need selection through reviews of each other's responses. This was not necessary as the Administrative Office of the United States Courts provided a payroll printout listing the names of all United States Probation Officers. However, such a study could be conducted to determine if, through Delphi, similar results could be derived at less time and expense. A different procedure that may be useful in determining continuing education needs for Probation...
Officers would be an assessment of "client" needs of different types of probationers, e.g., property offenders, offenders who commit crimes against the person, et cetera. Activities required of Probation Officers to provide services to meet these needs could then be related to specific competencies.

4. The author is aware of two other studies which define continuing education needs as the difference between the level of understanding of a given competency or activity and the importance of that topic to the job. This method was useful in delineating those competencies warranting consideration for continuing education. Further studies in other contexts using this methodology could be conducted to refine its use and determine the benefits of this method of need identification over other methods.
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BACHELOR OF ARTS -- AN INTERDISCIPLINARY MAJOR
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BACHELOR OF ARTS -- AN INTERDISCIPLINARY MAJOR
IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE
(University of Florida, Gainesville)

Criminal Justice Courses (*Required of All Majors)

20 hours from the following:

GRJ * 301 Introduction to Criminal Justice
GRJ 401 Law Enforcement and Social Control
GRJ 403 The Courts and Criminal Procedure
GRJ 402 Process of Correction, Probation and Parole
GRJ 495 Contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice

Required Psychology Courses (2 of 3 including *)

PSY 345 Psychology of Personality
PSY 313 Social Psychology
PSY 449 Behavior Disorders

Required Sociology Courses (2 of 3 including *)

SY 321 Community Organization
SY 487 Juvenile Delinquency
*SY 486 Criminology

Required Political Science Courses (2 of 3 including *)

PCL 411 Public Administration and the Political Process
*PCL 516 Administration of Justice
PCL 557 Social Effects of Law
20 hours are strongly advised from the following (* which will apply to college requirements of 45 elective hours.)

*STA 320 or 310 Statistics
PSY 412 Human Conflict and Accord
PSY 413 The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations
PSY 490 Individual Work
PSY 570 Drug Use and Abuse
SY 391 Minority Groups
SY 492 Black America: Current Problems
SY 480 Primary Group Interaction
SY 481 Collective Behavior
PCL 412 Policy Conflict in American Society
PCL 325 Urban, Suburban and Metropolitan Government
PCL 401 American Constitutional Law
PCL 402 American Constitutional Law
PCL 403 American Constitutional Law
PSY 513 Theories of Social Psychology
APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF SUBJECT MATTER, METHODOLOGY AND FORMAT
SUGGESTED BY CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS
FOR FUTURE PROBATION OFFICER TRAINING COURSES
(Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. More &quot;practical&quot; and technical material. Create a training situation which will present a professional point of view on how to deal with a specific situation.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Presentence investigation. Planning; evaluation; supervision techniques, et cetera.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Review legal changes and current law.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preparation of Presentence Reports.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Keeping abreast of new methods and procedures, also disseminate new rulings and legal decisions by courts that affect probation.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inter-agency problems and cooperation.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How to supervise and understand alcoholics, drug addicts, homosexuals, compulsive gamblers, hostile probationers, wife beaters, et cetera.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Discuss interviewing techniques.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Prefer small group workshops.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Training should be given to clerical secretaries.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clarification of what rights are lost by a convicted federal felon, Youth Corrections Act.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestion</td>
<td>Number of Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Philosophy of role of probation officer.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Problems and practices in probation and parole supervision.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Administration. Preparation of reports, et cetera.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Programs have not varied over the years.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Legal problems working with juveniles, feeble-minded, sick, psychotic, et cetera.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Caseload management.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Basic information regarding probation officers' duties (include psychiatric, psychological and medical terminology), also define and delineate his role.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Public relations training.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Relationship of probation officer to judges, prison, other courts, parole board, et cetera.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Guidelines for revocation of probation; demonstration conducting a probation violation hearing.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Have refresher courses more frequently.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. New probation officer should receive orientation training ASAP.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Inmates to be on the program. Give &quot;inside&quot; information from federal prisons.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. How do we change people? Behavior modification techniques.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Discuss problem of sporadic supervision.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Discuss problem of organized crime.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Suggestion:

28. Utilize instructional talent of probation officer. 2

29. Devise a management course for probation officer. 2

30. Counseling, group and individual. Role playing; techniques, et cetera. 2

31. More question and answer sessions. 2

32. Special seminars for those having special and common problems. 2

33. Drug abuse problems. (Narcotic laws, mandatory penalties, aftercare of addicts, et cetera) 2
APPENDIX C

SURVEY AND PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE ORIENTATION TRAINING
OF NEWLY APPOINTED UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS
(Federal Probation Officers Association)
SURVEY AND PROPOSAL TO EXPAND THE ORIENTATION TRAINING
OF NEWLY APPOINTED UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS
(Federal Probation Officers Association)

By a ratio of 4/1 replies to our survey indicate that it
would be advantageous to the newly appointed Probation
Officer to receive more orientation training. Over 90 per
cent favor the two-week session as compared to lesser
session.

There was unanimous choice for a "split" orientation
training session.

By a ratio of 4/1 Washington, D.C. was the choice for the
first week of training. By a ratio of 6/1 those responding
felt that a second week of training should occur within a
year of initial training and that it should occur in a
regional setting, preferably in the vicinity of a federal
institution and preferably near a BOP/Parole Commission
Regional headquarters.

It was near unanimous that personnel attending training
sessions be of "national mix" rather than limited to a
specific geographical area. This provides for exposure to
the wide range of practices which occur in the 94 judicial
districts.

The majority of respondents felt that practically every
topic offered should be expanded with more emphasis on the
Presentence Report and Supervision. In many instances the
expansion suggested was in the form of more student par-
ticipation.

The survey indicated quite clearly that the training now
offered by the Judicial Center has qualities, is well planned,
responsive to the field, but in final analysis this is not
enough time to do as thorough a job as is felt necessary.

There was a lengthy list of topics suggested for addition to
the orientation program. In reviewing past training programs
it is noted that a good many of these topics have been con-
sidered, offered, and dropped for one reason or another.
Also, many of the topics are included in the Advanced Train-
ing Seminars and may well be properly covered in special
training programs rather than in orientation training.
APPENDIX D

ORIENTATION PROGRAM FOR UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS
RECOMMENDED BY THE FEDERAL PROBATION OFFICERS ASSOCIATION
History and Objectives of United States Probation Officer Training:

States goals and objectives should be specified and emphasis placed on need for continuing training. Discussion invited (handout listing goals and objectives).

The Federal Criminal Justice System:

An overview of the total system briefly describing investigative agencies, functions of United States Attorney, United States Magistrate, United States Court, Probation Service and other Correctional Components (Bureau of Prisons and United States Parole Commission). (Handout showing schematic of the system.)

A Philosophy of Corrections:

Crime and its extent; the broader background of deviance; the protection of society; the needs of the offender; Punishment; Retribution; Deterrence; Rehabilitation.

Ethics and The Probation Officer:

FPOA Code of Ethics -- Obligation to Court, Community and offender.

Class Discussion: Gifts, favors, professional or personal relationships, confidential information, knowledge of criminal behavior of client.

The Federal Probation System:

Introduction to Federal Probation System including history of service, present composition, statutory duties, Duties by Rule, Duties by Administrative Agreement. Future of Federal Probation System as to manpower, administrative responsibility for community services and proposed or pending legislation affecting the Federal Probation System.
The Probation Officer and The Administrative Office:

Personnel policies, procedures, regulations. Class discussion on topics relating to pay, promotion, leave, travel, parking, professional development, retirement, et cetera.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons:

Program and facilities, present and future, regionalization; furloughs; work release, prisoner coordination; use of Court documents in classification and parole planning. Availability of Bureau of Prison Film Library.

The United States Parole Commission:

Organization; general policies; salient factor scores; parole decisions and appeals, interpreting conditions of parole and M.R.; parole violations reports, preliminary hearings by P.O., revocation hearings.

Effective Inter-Office Communications:

Operational methodology to be followed in requesting and providing presentence and supervisory information between district probation offices.

The Presentence Report:

Review of publications 103-104. The presentence report as a tool in sentencing; as a tool in supervision; confidentiality and disclosure; documentation. Evaluative Summary.

Sentencing Alternatives:

The various alternatives available in sentencing will be discussed.

Supervision:

Caseload management and classification; basic techniques in case supervision; the probation officer's role and relationship to client.
Second Week

The Federal Probation System:

An up-to-date report on the Probation System as to recent legislation and developments.

Current Legal Issues:

A review of legal issues pertinent to the work of the probation officer.

Organized Crime:

A discussion of the implications of organized crime. The treatment of organized crime or special offender in the presentence report and probation/parole supervision.

The Probation Officer and The Community:

The role of the probation officer in improvement of the components of the criminal justice system is discussed. Suggestions will be offered to line officer to help him promote a program of public relations in support of community corrections and to enlighten the public to their responsibility in the prevention and reduction of criminal behavior.

Community Resources:

Class discussion on effective referral techniques. The probation officer as a referral agent and identification of community agencies for employment, health, psychological, psychiatric, and counseling services. Also discussed is the role of the probation officer in drug aftercare programs.

Interviewing Techniques:

The probation officer will explore various methods of conducting interviews for purpose of improving personal skills and techniques.

Counseling in The Correctional Setting:

Elements of counseling as adapted to the correctional setting will be discussed. This includes special problems in correctional counseling, the counseling relationship, techniques in counseling, types of counseling and recognition of the client's basic needs and defenses.
The Presentence Report Revisited:

The philosophy, use, content and value of the presentence report will be reviewed.

Exercise in Sentencing and Treatment Problems:

The class will again divide into groups (approximately five or six to group) for purpose of reviewing a prepared presentence report. Each group will develop a sentencing recommendation and a treatment plan.

Report Writing:

Elements of good report writing will be reviewed. Consideration of grammatical and semantical error and elimination of same in producing a clear, accurate, meaningful and concise report.

Examination of Various Therapeutic Techniques

Interagency Relations:

Panel member presents his concept of interagency cooperation. Class discussion follows which may clear misunderstandings that exist.

Personnel Issues:

An opportunity for student to make inquiry as to personnel issues that have come to their attention during their first year of duty.
May 19, 1977

The U. S. Probation Office, Eastern District of Pennsylvania is conducting a study of the professional characteristics and educational needs of United States probation officers. With your help continuing education can be directed to those needs you consider to be most important.

The first purpose of this study is to give you the opportunity to reflect on your own duties and responsibilities and to determine for yourself the kinds of educational help you need to keep abreast with the field. Secondly, the Federal Judicial Center wishes to know what kinds of continuing education programs would be most appropriate to your needs. The results of the study will be used to plan future training programs.

Your name was randomly selected as a potential respondent. Please complete the inventory at your earliest convenience and return it in the enclosed, franked, self-addressed envelope. It should take you no more than 20 to 25 minutes.

The information you provide will be treated confidentially. No individual or office will be identified in any published reports. Your name is requested only to provide a means for contacting any who may delay in returning the completed inventory.

Your participation is crucial to the success of the study. The Probation Division and the Federal Judicial Center are looking for more effective ways of helping you handle the problems that occur as knowledge and skills in probation works increase, and expectations regarding your use of them expand. Please complete and return your inventory within 2 weeks. It will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne P. Jackson
The U. S. Probation Office, Eastern District of Pennsylvania, is conducting a study of the professional characteristics and educational needs of United States probation officers. With your help continuing education may be directed to those needs of probation officers which you consider to be most important to their development.

One purpose of this study is to give you the opportunity to reflect on probation officers' duties and responsibilities and to determine the kinds of educational help they need to keep abreast with the field. Secondly, the Federal Judicial Center wishes to know what kinds of continuing education programs would be most appropriate to probation needs and will use these responses to plan future programs.

The names of all supervising probation officers and chief probation officers were selected as potential respondents. Please complete the appropriate sections of the inventory at your earliest convenience and return it in the enclosed, franked, self-addressed envelope. It should take you no more than 15 to 20 minutes.

The information you provide will be treated confidentially. No individual or office will be identified in any published reports. Your name is requested only to provide a means for contacting any who may delay in returning the completed inventory.

Your participation is crucial to the success of the study. The Probation Division and the Federal Judicial Center are looking for more effective ways of helping probation officers handle the problems that occur as knowledge and skills in probation work increase, and expectations regarding the use of them expands. Please complete and return your inventory within 2 weeks. It will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Wayne P. Jackson
CONTINUING EDUCATION NEEDS OF
UNITED STATES PROBATION OFFICERS

A STUDY CONDUCTED AT THE U. S. PROBATION OFFICE
U. S. DISTRICT COURT, EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
PHILADELPHIA, PA

INSTRUCTIONS:


1. Sex
   a. Female
   b. Male

2. What is your marital status?
   a. Married
   b. Single
   c. Widowed, Divorced, Separated

3. What was your highest educational level achieved before your appointment as a U. S. Probation Officer?
   a. Some college
   b. Bachelors Degree
   c. Some graduate work
   d. Masters Degree
   e. Doctorate

4. Answer Question #4 or #5, but not both.
   What was your undergraduate major?
   a. Social work, social service
   b. Sociology
   c. Psychology
   d. Corrections/criminology

5. Omit this question if you responded to Question #4.
   What was your undergraduate major?
   a. Criminal Justice
   b. Business
   c. Education
   d. Other
6. Answer Question #6 or #7, but not both.
What was your graduate major in your Masters Degree Program before your appointment as a U. S. Probation Officer?
   a. Social Work
   b. Sociology
   c. Psychology
   d. Education

7. Omit this question if you responded to Question #6.
What was your graduate major in your Masters Degree Program before your appointment as a U. S. Probation Officer?
   a. Law
   b. Criminal Justice
   c. Business
   d. Other

8. Have you earned a Doctorate since your appointment as a U. S. Probation Officer?
   a. Yes
   b. No

9. Omit this question if your answer to Question #8 is yes.
How much additional college work have you completed since your appointment as a U. S. Probation Officer?
   a. Masters Degree and some additional work
   b. Masters Degree and no additional work
   c. One or more graduate courses; no graduate degree obtained
   d. One or more undergraduate courses; no graduate degree obtained
   e. None

10. While you were still in college did you plan to make corrections your career?
    a. Yes
    b. No
11. As a U. S. Probation and Parole Officer, how adequate do you consider your present overall level of professional preparation?

a. Very well prepared
b. Well prepared
c. Somewhat prepared
d. Little preparation
e. Poorly prepared

12. Do you plan to take additional college courses?

a. Yes
b. No

13. Skip this question if you answered no to Question #12. Do you plan to complete another degree?

a. Yes
b. No

14. How many man hours have you spent, in the past twelve months, participating in organized non-credit training programs related to probation and parole, such as seminars, workshops or conferences (excluding your own district office and programs sponsored by the Federal Judicial Center)?

a. None
b. 1-8 hours
c. 9-24 hours
d. 25-40 hours
e. over 40 hours

* * * * * * *

In Questions #15 through #19, I am attempting to determine your participation in the following professional organizations. For each organization listed mark the extent of your participation.

a. not a member
b. an inactive member
c. a relatively inactive member
d. a moderately active member
e. a very active member

15. Federal Probation Officers Association

16. American Correctional Association
In Questions #20 through #24, I am attempting to determine what journals and periodicals related to probation, parole, and corrections that you read regularly and find to be helpful in your work. For each journal or periodical listed mark how helpful it is to you, using the following scale:

- a. very helpful
- b. helpful
- c. somewhat helpful
- d. almost no help
- e. do not read it

20. Federal Probation Quarterly
21. American Journal of Corrections
23. Social Work Journal
24. Social Services Review

Following is a list of competency statements (Questions #25 through #43) expressed in terms of understanding, knowledge, skills and abilities. How do you view their importance to your job now? For each statement, respond on the separate answer sheet, using the following scale:

- a. very important
- b. important
- c. somewhat important
- d. little importance
- e. almost no importance
COMPETENCIES

25. Understanding the structure, processes and interrelationships among the components of the Criminal Justice System (Components of Criminal Justice System include law enforcement agencies, the Courts, probation, parole, and correctional institutions).

26. Understanding the fundamentals of Criminal Law (Procedures of arrest and detention; court procedures; role of law enforcement agency, judge, prosecuting attorney, defense attorney; trial and sentencing procedures).

27. Understanding of Constitutional Law (especially due process rights of defendants and convicted public offenders; civil rights of the convicted offender).

28. Knowledge of historical structure, background and development of probation and parole at local, state and federal level.

29. Knowledge of criminology (theories of causation and environmental factors and social problems associated with crime).

30. Knowledge of basic psychological principles helpful in working with personality and behavior disorders.

31. Knowledge of new developments in probation and parole and recent recommendations by national commissions and recognized standard setting organizations.

32. Understanding the current issues in probation and parole on national scope.

33. Knowledge of information resources to be contacted during presentence investigation.

34. Skill in interviewing defendants and allied agency representatives.

35. Knowledge of sentencing alternatives.

36. Ability to organize information and dictate presentence reports.

37. Skill in dictating evaluative reports and making recommendations to the Court.
38. Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling of adult probationers and parolees.

39. Ability to properly and efficiently refer probationers and parolees to community resource agencies.

40. Skill in functional role of probation officer as mediator and advocate between the probationer and the community.

41. Ability to classify caseload.

42. Ability to manage caseload efficiently.

43. Ability to establish and maintain constructive public relations.

* * * * * *

Following (Questions #44 through #62) is a list of the same competency statements listed above. How do you view your present level of understanding? For each statement, respond on the separate answer sheet using the following scale:

- a. very high understanding
- b. high understanding
- c. some understanding
- d. little understanding
- e. almost no understanding

COMPETENCIES

44. Understanding the structure, processes, and interrelationships among the components of the Criminal Justice System (Components of the Criminal Justice System include law enforcement agencies, the Courts, probation, parole, and correctional institutions).

45. Understanding the fundamentals of Criminal Law (Procedures of arrest and detention; court procedures; role of law enforcement agency, judge, prosecuting attorney, defense attorney; trial and sentencing procedures).

46. Understanding of Constitutional Law (especially due process rights of defendants and convicted public offenders; civil rights of the convicted felon).
47. Knowledge of historical structure, background and development of probation and parole at local, state and federal level.


49. Knowledge of basic psychological principles helpful in working with personality and behavior disorders.

50. Knowledge of new developments in probation and parole and recent recommendations by national commissions and recognized standard setting organizations.

51. Understanding the current issues in probation and parole on national scope.

52. Knowledge of information resources to be contacted during presentence investigation.

53. Skill in interviewing defendants and allied agency representatives.

54. Knowledge of sentencing alternatives.

55. Ability to organize information and dictate presentence reports.

56. Skill in dictating evaluative reports and making recommendations to the Court.

57. Skill in one-to-one guidance and counseling of adult probationers and parolees.

58. Ability to properly and efficiently refer probationers and parolees to community resource agencies.

59. Skill in functional role of probation officer as mediator and advocate between the probationer and the community.

60. Ability to classify caseloads.

61. Ability to manage caseloads efficiently.

62. Ability to establish and maintain constructive public relations.
63. In what location would you prefer the Federal Judicial Center hold orientation training for new probation officers?
   a. Washington, D. C. area
   b. Centralized location at regional level

64. What type of training facilities do you prefer for orientation training?
   a. Permanent academy with lodging attached
   b. Permanent academy with separate lodging
   c. Existing Federal Judicial Center
   d. Temporary arrangements in hotels, motels, etc.

To each of the following questions (#65 through #69), answer according to the following scale:
   a. strongly agree
   b. agree
   c. somewhat agree
   d. disagree
   e. strongly disagree

65. The Federal Judicial Center should provide basic training, in addition to orientation training, during the first year of service for new probation officers in interviewing techniques, counseling and other helping roles.

66. The Federal Judicial Center should provide basic training, in addition to orientation training, during the first year of service for new probation officers in criminology.

67. The Federal Judicial Center should provide basic training, in addition to orientation training, during the first year of service for new probation officers in criminal law and procedures, and constitutional law pertaining to the rights of probationers and parolees.
68. The Federal Judicial Center should provide basic training, in addition to orientation training, during the first year of service for new probation officers in the criminal justice system.

69. The Federal Judicial Center should provide basic training, in addition to orientation training, during the first year of service for new probation officers in psychology of personality disorders.

* * * * * * *

70. If you answered affirmatively to at least one of the Questions #65 through #69, what, in your opinion, should be the duration of the entire basic training program you suggested (a single block of time covering areas selected)?

   a. one week
   b. two weeks
   c. three to four weeks
   d. four to six weeks
   e. over six weeks

71. In what location would you prefer the Federal Judicial Center conduct basic training?

   a. Centralized location at regional level
   b. Washington, D. C. area
   c. None

72. What type of training facilities do you prefer for basic training?

   a. Permanent academy with lodging attached
   b. Permanent academy with separate lodging
   c. Existing Federal Judicial Center
   d. Temporary arrangements in hotels, motels, etc.
   e. None
73. In what location would you prefer the Federal Judicial Center conduct advanced training?
   a. Washington, D. C. area
   b. Centralized location at regional level
   c. None

74. What type of training facilities do you prefer for advanced training?
   a. Permanent academy with lodging attached
   b. Permanent academy with separate lodging
   c. Existing Federal Judicial Center
   d. Temporary arrangements in hotels, motels, etc.
   e. None

* * * * * * *

On the back of the answer sheet, please answer the additional questions.

Thank you for your help. Please put this single answer sheet in the envelope and drop it in the mailbox.

* * * * * * *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>INSTRUCTOR</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>YOUR LAST NAME</th>
<th>LETTER BOX</th>
<th>YOUR FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LETTER BOX</th>
<th>BIRTH DATE</th>
<th>LETTER BOX</th>
<th>STUDENT NUMBER</th>
<th>LETTER BOX</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td>654321</td>
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</tr>
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<td>C</td>
<td>03/03/1980</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>DDDDDD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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*Semester: FALL/Spring.*
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ANY OTHER COMMENTS:

*Your name is requested only to provide a means for contacting anyone who may delay in responding. All data will be treated confidentially. No individual will be identified in any reports.
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