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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origin and Development

John Augustus, known as the father of probation, became interested in reforming individuals in 1841. In court one morning, John Augustus observed a man who was going to be sentenced to a house of correction for being a drunkard. Augustus found out from the man that he did not want to be sentenced and would stop drinking if not sent away. With permission of the courts, Augustus bailed the man out, but with the stipulation that the man was to return in a few weeks for sentencing. Upon the man's return, the judge noted that the man was sober and reduced the sentence to a fine rather than jail.

Augustus continued his informal probation work, but he exercised keen discretion in the selection of probationers. Time proved Augustus to be a shrewd judge of character; according to the records, most of the charges changed for the better.¹ Even today, selection of the proper persons to place on probation is one of the most important aspects of probation work.

A good and detailed investigation must be made.\(^1\)

The legal authority of probation officers was first enacted in 1878 in Massachusetts when it was required of the city of Boston to appoint a probation officer. Then in 1890, the Massachusetts legislature enacted a general law requiring the criminal courts in the state to appoint probation officers. By 1900, there was a general trend toward legislation dealing with probation.\(^2\)

According to Felkenes, probation today is felt to be the most practical method of treating large numbers of selected offenders. Placing a person on probation developed from the power of the court to suspend the sentence of a convicted individual. It became a device that the court used when it was reluctant to impose the full sentence for an offense because it felt that the person could still function in the community although under the supervision of the courts. The person who performed the supervision became known as the probation officer. Under the early system, probation supervision was very difficult to carry out effectively except in the area of the particular court’s jurisdiction. As a rule, probation officers were untrained; probation became a device whereby fines were collected on an installment basis; and the probation policies

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 25.

varied from county to county.¹

Roles of Probation Officers

1. **Disciplinarian**--The task of a disciplinarian is to subject to authority those under his control, impose loss of privilege when the need arises, enforce a system of rules, and train to obedience. The law requires the probation officer to instruct his probationer in the rules and conditions of enforced observance of these conditions, and to return the probationer to court if he persistently violates such rules or conditions.²

2. **Counselor**--The function of a probation officer as a counselor is to give advice, to instruct as to duty or interest, to admonish or caution when behavior requires, to exhort or persuade as changing situations dictate, and to reprimand or dissuade under other circumstances. At practically every step of the treatment relationships from beginning to end, probation officers perform one of these tasks; in fact, they are essential to his whole program.³

3. **Educator**--The mission of the teacher or educator is to show others how to walk in the ways of truth. In this sense every probation officer is an educator. By example,

¹Ibid., p. 278.
³Ibid., p. 35.
by precept and by long continued and patient instruction, he seeks to implant knowledge and habits of right thinking and right acting.¹

4. Social Case Worker—Finally, the probation officer not only must administer discipline, or counsel and advice, and influence behavior, but he must of necessity individualize these tasks in an orderly, intelligent manner. There is little value in desiring to persuade a probationer to better behavior unless one understands the technique of interviewing, knows the psychology of human nature, and utilizes the resources of his community and the ways of relating probationers' needs to such resources. Probationers need not only change their attitudes and improve their habits but must be assisted economically, made aware of health problems, guided and advised with respect to social and recreational activities. Moreover, we should not forget that all their basic urges and desires must be motivated spiritually before they can achieve much in the way of character improvement.²

The probation officers make investigations, submit written reports, evaluate findings, and recommend dispositions of cases. They are advisors and consultants to both the court and to the probationer. The probation officers assist the offender on an individual basis in order to modify his behavior and attitudes so that the individual may take his rightful

¹Ibid., p. 36.
²Ibid., op. cit.
productive place in society. The probation officer makes
visits to the offender's home, maintains personal contacts,
and provides other kinds of assistance to encourage the in-
dividual as well as to keep informed about his conduct and
environment. He assists in obtaining employment and even
interviews prospective employers towards the end.

The probation officers use three primary techniques
of supervision; they are (1) interview, (2) recording, and
(3) counseling. The principal one is the routine office
interview in which the offender is required to visit the
officer periodically, usually as a condition of probation.
Either a brief or detailed interview is conducted, depending
on the activities occurring during the interval between in-
terviews.

Some secondary techniques of probation officers in
supervision are (1) manipulation of the environment in favor
of the person seeking help (example - a probation officer
persuading an employer to rehire a discharged offender), (2)
executive techniques in which the probation officer helps in
referring people to other resources in the community for help
if their agency cannot supply the need (example - a probation
officer securing public assistance for an offender).

**Education of the Probation Officer**

"To afford proper protection to the community through
meeting adequately his responsibilities of counseling and
investigation, the probation officer must possess a high
degree of professional training, skill and experience."

In 1942 the Judicial Conference of the United States first underscored the importance of this fact by recommending to the district courts standards of qualifications for the appointment of the probation officers. Several times in the intervening years the conference has reaffirmed its position. As minimum requirements for appointment the recommended standards include graduation from a college of recognized standing plus two years of experience in correctional work or a related field or two years of graduate training in welfare work. It is preferred, however, that the officer possess a bachelor's degree in the social or behavioral sciences with emphasis on courses in crime and delinquency, and a master's degree in social work. An individual who has the baccalaureate degree but not the experience may be hired if the agency has a special training program for these people conducted by a fully trained social worker.

A probation officer is required to have a bachelor's degree in the social or behavioral sciences with emphasis on courses in the crime and delinquency field, and a master's degree in social work because probation officers make many

---

1Dorothy Tompkins, Probation Since World War II: A Bibliography (California: Institute of Governmental Studies University, 1964), p. 245.


3George T. Felkenes, op. cit., p. 286.
decisions every day that affect the lives of human beings. The probation officer must have concern for his clients and must be able to make responsible decisions about the lives and welfare of these clients. Academic courses have value in the development of the career of the probation officer. With education the probation officer will gain more job satisfaction through finding more effective and efficient ways of performing his job to help his/her clients.

The Probation Officer's Personality

The probation officer's personality and the use he/she makes of it in helping his clients is his most potent therapeutic tool. The researcher is not considering here such elements of probation work as procedures, practices, and regulations, but rather the more subjective elements—the tangibles, personal attributes, qualities of character which contribute to the effectiveness of a probation officer's service.¹

Probation work requires a mature and well balanced personality. The motive, the purpose, and the plan of the probation officer will be reflected in his day to day work. The work of a probation officer, if properly done, will reveal no doubt in the capacity of his probationer to grow.

The job of a probation officer is very important, for he is working with persons who always need help in dealing with society.

Some Cardinal Qualities of Personality

1. The ability to form and sustain wholesome interpersonal relationships. In probation work, the officer needs the capacity to identify with a wide range of people. The probation officer will work with the "white collar" criminal and the defective delinquent, the addict and the alcoholic, the homosexual and the homicidal. The degree to which the officer cares for what happens to his client, whatever the cultural background, is reflected as he proceeds with his daily tasks. When a probation officer is devoted to the cause of helping the offender summon up his own vision of a better life, to realize his own strength to achieve that better life, the achieved result will show a probation officer with a healing hand.1

2. The ability to accept responsibility for authority he carries. The probation officer who is an adult accepts authority as a condition of everyday living—a process of disciplining our individual impulses and desires for the mutual benefit of all. Probation signifies the offender is not adapting with the social demands of the community. The probation officer who represents authority must use it firmly

1Edmund Burbank and Ernest W. Goldsborough, op. cit., p. 11.
but tempered with judgment and understanding. If he has the proper measure of his own adequacy, he will not yield to his own need to superimpose his power and control over one who is in his care. He will review his essential task as helping the probationer decide on a course of action.1

3. Ability to work with aggressive persons. The probation officer, as has been well stated, must have "strength and some immunity in facing extreme aggression and hostility because some responsibilities in this field include ability to meet hazardous situations where the awareness of the need as well as the ability to take calculated risks is essential."2 The probation officer will not always find his charges obviously aggressive. Their hostility is revealed in more subtle ways. Scenes of rage or despair are often admirably staged. To acknowledge this does not in itself make it easier for the probation officer to do his job, but somehow he must learn to work with all types of aggression with a high degree of objectivity and poise.

4. Ability to work with other agencies and people. The probation officer must be able to work with other agencies and all types of people. The key person to the probation officer is the probationer. The probationer has the power to use or abuse help offered to them by the probation officer.

1Edmund Burbank and Ernest W. Goldsborough, op. cit., p. 12.

2Ibid., p. 13.
5. **Ability to Improve in Performance.** The ability to improve in performance implies change for the probation officer as he works on the job. It is not unreasonable to expect and require improvement in performance for the probation officer who expects and requires change in his offenders.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH DESIGN

Statement of the Problem

What Factors Do Influence the Effectiveness of Probation Officers in Georgia

The effectiveness of probation officers in supervising offenders is viewed in the context of social control (the use of negative and positive punishment and rewards to get people to act in conformity with group norms and expectations), specifically the penology and correctional fields.

The probation officer is one of the most vital links in the chain of persons who come in contact with offenders. When a delinquent is to appear in court, it is the probation officer who explores and studies the child's relation to his family and his environment in an attempt to find the reasons for the delinquent behavior and possible ways to help the delinquent. It is the skills, understanding, and knowledge of the probation officer who investigates and supervises the offenders in trouble.


11
Society is faced daily with masses of offenders for which decisions must be made. Therefore, the recommendations by the probation officers are a necessity in our system of criminal justice.\(^1\) The probation officers will remain a necessity until a great deal more is known about offenders in the present and new methods of treatment of offenders have been discovered and developed.

Effectiveness defined conceptually is producing or adapted to produce particular or proper results for a destined purpose.\(^2\)

The operational definition for effectiveness will be given later in the paper.

General concern is a determination of factors influencing the effectiveness of a probation officer; however, special attention will be given to the sex factor as more females are becoming probation officers. Probation has been considered by society as being a man's field and until recently the few women employed as probation officers have been assigned to supervise only female offenders.

In the criminal justice system we can observe female offenders as well as female personnel being ruled by their male counterparts. This point can be illustrated by the extensive study of correction in the United States published


by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967, a 222 page report which contained no reference to the female offender.¹

In *Sister in Crime*, the most definitive work to date on the female being excluded from the criminal justice system, Freda Adler states:

Freda Adler suggests that women's involvement in criminal behavior has existed throughout recorded history but their presence, as in many legitimate activities, may have been overlooked. Adler suggests that differential treatment of female offenders begins with the arresting officer and extends throughout the process of arraignment, hearing, trial, and sentencing. Adler notes that these differences sometimes serve the women ill, and sometimes well, but they always serve the justice system poorly.²

It was stated by Stout that in an effort to make use of staff time and ease recruitment problems, the Washington State Office of Probation and Parole began October 1965 to assign cases without reference to the sex of the officer.³ This innovation on the part of the State of Washington can be viewed, to a certain extent, as a landmark for women in probation work. Prior to this female probation officers had been unofficially assigned to an occasional male probationer to ease male officer caseloads, but this was strictly an


²Ibid., p. 104.

unofficial and temporary arrangement.

The criminal law has been codified by male legislators, enforced by male police officers, and interpreted by male judges. The prison system has been men by men primarily for men.1

Significance of the Problem

The significance of the problem is to measure whether or not probation officers are effective in supervising and helping offenders cope with the problems of society. In today's American society one of the most perplexing social problems is that of offenders.2

The effectiveness of probation work is related to the needs of the offender. The probation officer must be concerned about the offender material needs (like finding employment or a place to live) while he attempts to determine steps necessary for the offender's normal social readjustment. The probation officer must work with the environmental forces that influence the life of the offender, striving to change the offender when change seems necessary, by bringing into play all the educational, religious, medical and welfare resources of the community and involving the offender in


relationships that tend to bring out socially acceptable re-
sponses.¹

**Review of Literature**

There is very little information on the probation officer. It appears from the literature that the study of prob-

ation officers constitutes a very insignificant area.

In order to determine the activities and the role

perceptions of juvenile probation officers, a study was made

of eighty officers working in various rural, urban, and

suburban juvenile court systems in a midwestern state. Quest-

tionnaires were distributed which sought information on the

probation officers' roles. Findings indicated an inconsis-

tency between the actual and ideal role responsibilities.

It was discovered that the probation officers with an M.S.W.

accord a higher priority to service and treatment aspects of

their responsibilities. The probation officer without an

M.S.W. did not place as high a value on therapeutically

oriented tasks.²

In a study by Jyotsna H. Shah, in which Shah looked

at the status and academic background of the probation officers,

Shah concluded that the reason for inadequate use of probation


provisions was because of the probation officers' low status and inadequate academic and professional background. The present study is similar to the Shah study in that it deals with the academic and professional background of the probation officers in order to see if the academic and professional background plays a part in the effectiveness of the probation officer in rehabilitating offenders. However, the present study includes other factors.

In a study by Richard Dembo one of the variables used was concerned with determining relationships between the probation officer's background and orientation and activities. All probation officers with four or more years in employment in the New York Division of Parole were selected to be interviewed. There were six factors explored in the study pertaining to the background attitude of the officer (place of longest residence, subject area interest, early life location, father's occupation, employment background and ethnic affiliation); only place of longest residence was found significantly related to the probation officer's background attitude toward orientation. The conclusion was that cultural life experience is critical in determining officers' views.

Lohman and Carter did a study in 1965 in which they reported four hypotheses which were tested as to probation


officers' supervision. Four levels of supervision were identified; they were (1) ideal (50 caseloads), (2) normal (100 caseload units), (3) intensive (25 caseload unit), and (4) minimum (the officers merely turned in a monthly report). The offenders, at the time of their referral to the U. S. Probation Office for the Northern District of California, were randomly assigned to these levels over a 33 month period. After the 33 month period an assessment was made of the performance of offenders in ideal, minimum, intensive and normal caseloads, and it was concluded that the number of contacts between an offender and the probation officer was unrelated to success or failure under supervision when the assignment of offenders to caseloads was made on a random basis.

In a study by Donald Beless, the primary question was what probationer and service factors were associated with engagement of probationer and probation officer in working relationships. The sample of 65 probationers was selected from the caseloads of three research social workers employed in an experimental casework service unit established in conjunction with a probation research project in a federal office. The records of each case were divided into two times: presentence and postsentence. The presentence schedule called for ratings of the probationer's motivation, capacity, and

---

environmental opportunity as well as the nature of service; postsentence schedule called for an assessment of level of engagement in the casework process. The results indicated that engagement in a working relationship with a probation officer following sentencing was partially related to whether the probationer acknowledges that he has a problem to be worked on and the degree to which he has been motivated to work with the probation officer during the presentence period. The probation officer's duties are to help probationers with their problems, but if the probationer declines help the probation officer-probationer relationship would be defined within a protective rather than a helping relationship.¹

In a study by a group of Kent probation officers, the aim of the group was to examine the problems present by persistent offenders. Persistent offenders was defined by the officers as offenders for whom present penal methods appeared ineffective. These offenders were suffering from behavior disorders. These probation officers set up a system which on one hand set definite limits and on the other hand the system was flexible enough within the limits. The system was set up whereby the offenders would earn their way to freedom by showing they were able to accept freedom and choice in a responsible way. The officers concluded that for the offenders with difficult behavior to be rehabilitated it was essential

to have the right structure. The probation officers felt that by emphasizing structure, this did not mean that they had forgotten about the need for relationships with the offenders or the real concern for the individual because the philosophy behind all penal methods is the relationships and welfare of the offenders. But for relationships to be created with the difficult offenders, it was necessary to have structure. ¹

Moshe Stern did a study on a wayward girl who, in the view of professional opinion, was in need of "reeducation" within an institutional framework. The probation officer dealing with this case enabled the girl to undergo an emotional breakdown. The probation officer then assisted the girl to develop insight, to increase her powers of reality testing and to strengthen her ego support. The outcome of the treatment was reflected in a number of behavioral changes in the girl such as work stability and greater control of social conduct. The outcome was achieved by the probation officer working independently, but in coordination with the girl. The conclusion of this study was that by using the treatment described, there was a chance that the person treated was able to understand the direction in which her conduct was leading and acquired ambition for change. ² With the help of the


probation officer this study showed that the probation officer was effective in helping one rehabilitate and function in society once again.

McFarlane did a five year study on the performance of probation officers according to education and orientation. McFarlane's study indicated that the general performance of their orientation or education group showed that certain probation officers will vary in performance and growth, but the probation officers are essential in rehabilitating offenders.  

An empirical study of a random sample of 67 New Jersey probation officers was conducted by Sigler to determine what were the probation officers' perceptions of their professional role. Most of the probation officers distinguished themselves from social workers but perceived their functions as performance of a particular type of social work by helping offenders rehabilitate and function in society.

A study by Wood examined the ethnic and legal obligations of probation officers in dealing with confidential


matters contained in presentence reports in Australia. Woods emphasized that a probation officer's obligations towards the offender must always be subordinate to his legal obligations to the courts. The conclusion was that the probation officer protects the relationship with the offender by informing the offenders that the information obtained will be disclosed if the circumstances require it.

In order to measure the gap between what probation officers perceived as their occupational role and their professional role ideal in helping offenders, Linden developed a self report attitude scale based on concepts derived from the sociology of professions. Sixty U.S. probation officers participated in the study. Linden's analysis and recommendations, based on survey findings, all lead to a professionalization of probation officers as the key to meaningful change of offenders and protection of society from crime.¹

The researcher's study can be related to the studies reviewed in this chapter because the studies were dealing with the effectiveness of the probation officers in helping to rehabilitate offenders.

Most of the preceding studies show that the factors considered were positively related to the dependent variables considered. However, they utilized a different sample of population. The present study utilizes most of the factors

but on a different sample of population and a different setting, i.e., the state of Georgia.

**Hypotheses**

On the basis of the conceptual framework in this study, the thesis is concerned with the testing of the following hypotheses in respect to the effectiveness of the probation officers in rehabilitating offenders.

**Hypothesis 1**

The higher the level of education the more effective a probation officer will be. The variable education was used because academic courses have value in the development of the career of the probation officer. Probation officers must have concern for their clients and must be able to make responsible decisions about the lives and welfare of these clients.

**Hypothesis 2**

The effectiveness of a probation officer may be affected by race. The variable race was used to see whether race is a significant factor in the relationship between the probation officer and his/her ability in rehabilitating offenders. Race was used also because it is believed that one will relate better to someone of his/her race.

**Hypothesis 3**

The longer the duration in the position as a probation officer the more the effectiveness. The variable duration was
used because it is believed that the longer a probation officer spends in the position the more effective the officer's performance is.

**Hypothesis 4**

The effectiveness of a probation officer may be affected by sex. Sex is a significant factor in relationships. In a study by Herbert Kritzer and Thomas Uhlman in which they were concerned with what was the behavioral difference between male and female judges in criminal cases, they found that whatever actual difference existed, the difference was too small to show up as significant, but it does not eliminate the possibility of sex as a significant factor. Moreover, females are newcomers in the field. The study gives an opportunity to see how effective the probation are.

**Hypothesis 5**

The older the probation officer the more effective the probation officer will be. The variable age was used because it is believed that age maturity would affect the performance of the probation officer.

**Hypothesis 6**

The effectiveness of a probation officer may be affected by his/her sex and that of the majority of the caseload. The variable sex was used to see whether the probation officer's attitude or the client's attitude toward each other is affected by sex. However the effectiveness of the probation officer
will increase if the officer and the majority of the caseload are of the same sex.

**Definition and Measurement**

**Effectiveness** is defined operationally as a high percentage of released offenders in a 12 month period. Effectiveness will be categorized as follows:

- less than 25% .......... not effective
- 26% to 50% ............... moderately effective
- 51% to 75% ............... effective
- 75% up ................. very effective

**Education** is the knowledge, skills, or character developed by schooling. Education will be measured by the number of years of schooling completed by the probation officers.

1. 8th grade
2. 12th grade
3. 2 years of college
4. 4 years of college
5. 2 years of graduate school

**Race** will be measured in terms of ethnicity.

1. black
2. white
3. mixed (Mexican, Chinese, Italian)

**Duration** will be measured by the number of years a probation officer has been in his/her position.

1. 1 year
2. less than 5 years
3. 10 years
4. 15 years
5. 20 years
6. 25 years

**Sex** will be measured in terms of:

1. male
2. female
Age will also be measured in terms of how old the probation officers are.

1. less than 25
2. 26-35
3. 36-45
4. 46 over

Methodology

To evaluate the effectiveness of probation officers in Georgia in 1977 from January to December in supervising offenders (persons who break a law or cause displeasure) and to determine the extent of the effectiveness of the probation officers, the survey will be limited to the state of Georgia. Georgia has been chosen as the research site for this study because this site is conveniently located for the researcher who is studying in the same state.

The researcher will conduct a survey of 150 probation officers in the state of Georgia. A questionnaire will be formulated and sent to the probation officers. The survey will be distributed to the probation officers while, if necessary, other probation officers may be interviewed by the researcher using the same questionnaire.

Data Analysis

Data were collected from 150 probation officers selected from the probation departments in the Georgia area. There are 23 probation departments in Georgia. The probation departments are as follows: Bibb County Adult Probation Department,
Bibb County Juvenile Probation Department, Chatham County Juvenile Court, Clark County Juvenile Court, Clayton County Juvenile Probation Department, Cobb County Juvenile Court, Colquitt County Juvenile Court, DeKalb County Adult Probation Department, DeKalb County Juvenile Court, Dougherty County Juvenile Court, Floyd County Juvenile Court, Fulton County Adult Probation, Fulton County Juvenile Court, Glynn County Juvenile Court, Hall County Juvenile Court, Lowndes County Juvenile Court, Muscogee County Adult Probation Department, Muscogee County Juvenile Court, Newton County Juvenile Court, Richmond County Adult Department, Richmond County Juvenile Court, Troup County Juvenile Court and Whitfield County Court.

Data were analyzed so as to show the degree of effectiveness of probation officers in 1977.

The procedure used in the analysis of the data to measure effectiveness involved the computation of percentages of the number of offenders rehabilitated in 1977. These percentages were used as the basis for measuring the degree of effectiveness of the probation officers.

The effectiveness of the probation officer is believed to be affected in part by the six independent variables included in the preceding hypotheses.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The data compiled provides some insight into the background of the effectiveness of the probation officers. The data was analyzed from the questionnaires that were returned to the researcher. There were 150 questionnaires originally sent out; however, only 90 questionnaires were returned. This chapter examines the six hypotheses presented in Chapter II.

Table 1

Distribution of Probation Officers in Categories of Effectiveness by Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yrs. college</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 yrs. college</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 yrs. graduate school</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 1 indicate that there is a relationship between the education of the probation officers and their effectiveness. The majority of the respondents had college education. However, the probation officers with two years of graduate school education were more effective than the probation officers with four years of college education, two years of college education, and a 12th grade education. The probation officers with four years of college education were more effective than probation officers with two years of college education. The probation officers with a high school education show no effectiveness. There were no probation officers with an 8th grade education. The data show that the higher the level of education the more effective a probation officer will be.

Table 2

Distribution of Probation Officers in Categories of Effectiveness by Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21 54.0%</td>
<td>10 25.6%</td>
<td>5 12.8%</td>
<td>3 7.6%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28 55.0%</td>
<td>11 21.6%</td>
<td>9 17.6%</td>
<td>3 5.8%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data indicate that there is no relationship between race of the probation officers and effectiveness. The data show that black and white probation officers were about equal in the percentage of released offenders. Although 56 per cent of the probation officers were white, the race made no difference in the effectiveness of the probation officers in releasing offenders. The table indicates that race is not a significant factor in the percentage of released offenders. There were no probation officers in the third category.

Table 3

Distribution of Probation Officers in Categories of Effectiveness by Length of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 3 indicate that there is a relationship between duration in service by the probation officers and effectiveness. The table shows that there were only two probation
officers that had been in the position of probation officer for 20 years. Since there were only two probation officers, it can be observed that they were very effective; however, the number is too small to actually say they were very effective. The data also show that the officers that had been in the position for 15 years were more effective than the probation officers that had been in the position for 10 years, less than 5 years, or 1 year. However, there were no probation officers in the position for 25 years. The table shows that the longer the duration in the position as a probation officer the more effective the officer will be.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data in Table 4 indicate that there is no relationship between the sex of the probation officers and effectiveness. The disparity between equal sex opportunity is reflected in the fact that 67 per cent of the respondents were males and only 33 per cent were females. The data shows that male
probation officers and female probation officers were equally effective in rehabilitating offenders although female probation officers were out-numbered by the male probation officers. The data also show that the criminal justice system is being dominated by males.

According to the probation officers surveyed a large percentage of them (65 per cent) felt that more females should become probation officers in the future. One of the responses was accompanied by the following comment: "We need more probation officers nationwide; approximately 15 per cent of the probation departments' caseloads are female offenders and the percentage can be expected to increase annually. There is a definite need for more female probation officers." It was also stated by another respondent that "it makes no differences to the sex of the probation officer." The researcher interpreted this statement to mean that female probation officers are just as effective in rehabilitating offenders as male probation officers.

The data in Table 5 indicate that there is a relationship between age (years) of the probation officer and his/her effectiveness. The data indicated that 40 per cent of the probation officers were under the age of 36. The data show that the probation officers between the ages of 36 and 45 were more effective than the probation officers between the ages of 26 and 35 and those less than 25 years of age. The data show that the older the probation officer the more effective the probation officer will be.
Table 5
Distribution of Probation Officers in Categories of Effectiveness by Age (years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 over</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Distribution of Probation Officers in Categories of Effectiveness by the Predominant Caseload

Caseload Predominantly Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caseload Predominantly Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Very Effective</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Moderately Effective</th>
<th>Not Effective</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 6 indicate that there is a relationship between sex of both the probation officer, the caseload, and the effectiveness of the probation officers. The data show that male probation officers were effective in counseling male offenders, whereas female probation officers were effective in counseling female offenders. One can observe that as the effectiveness of the probation officers toward the predominant caseload increased the percentage of the probation officers that were not effective decreased. The probation officer's attitude and the client's attitude toward each other was affected by sex.
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

John Augustus became interested in reforming offenders in 1841. The legal authority of probation officers was first enacted in 1878 in Massachusetts when it was required of the Boston courts to appoint a probation officer. Then in 1890, the Massachusetts legislature enacted a general law requiring the criminal courts in the state to appoint probation officers.

It is preferred that the probation officer possess a bachelor's degree in the social or behavioral sciences, with emphasis on courses in crime and delinquency, and a master's degree in social work.

The prime objective of this study has been to illustrate factors that influence the effectiveness of probation officers in Georgia. To accomplish these objectives there were six hypotheses tested.

The first hypothesis was that the higher the education the more effective a probation officer will be. The researcher found after this hypothesis was tested the data indicated that the higher the education the more effective the probation officers were.
The second hypothesis was that the effectiveness of probation officers may be affected by race. This hypothesis revealed that black and white probation officers were about equal in rehabilitating offenders; therefore the probation officer's effectiveness was not affected by his/her race.

The third hypothesis was that the longer the duration in the position as a probation officer the more the effectiveness. The findings ascertained as a result of testing this hypothesis were that the longer the duration in the position as a probation officer the more effective the officer will be.

The fourth hypothesis was that the effectiveness of the probation officer may be affected by the sex factor. The researcher found that after this hypothesis was tested the data indicated that male probation officers and female probation officers were equally effective. The female probation officers and male probation officers were both 50 per cent in their effectiveness, although 67 per cent of the probation officers were males and only 33 per cent were females.

The fifth hypothesis was that the older the probation officer the more effective the probation officer will be. After the fifth hypothesis was tested the data indicated that probation officers were more effective between the age of 46 and over. Therefore, this hypothesis was supported by the data that the older a probation officer the more effective he/she will be.
The sixth hypothesis was that the effectiveness of a probation officer may be affected by his/her sex and that of the majority of the caseload. The findings ascertained as a result of testing this hypothesis indicated that male probation officers were effective in counseling male offenders, whereas female probation officers were effective in counseling female offenders.

Crime has always been with us and will always be with us and, however revamped, re-styled or re-modelled, crime will continue to exist; but the researcher will point out that one of the functions of the probation officer is to administer to the needs of past, present, and potential offenders so they are helped to conform to the patterns of behavior that society has decided.

The probation officers will remain a necessity until a great deal more is known about offenders in the present and new methods of treatment of offenders have been discovered and developed.

It is the skills, understanding, and knowledge of the probation officer which help offenders conform to norms and expectations.

Based on the result of this study it seems that the practice of utilizing female probation officers to supervise offenders of all types is a working solution to several of the personnel problems being experienced today. Female probation officers are successfully handling their caseloads
whether the offenders are male or female, black or white. Female probation officers are just as competent, efficient, and effective as male probation officers in rehabilitating offenders. Projections of increased female participation in corrections are being realized by women today not only as probation officers, but there are female supervisors and administrators also. It appears that there is a future for females in probation work and that increased female participation in the criminal justice system in general is eminent.
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APPENDIX
QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: This questionnaire was made to obtain information on the effectiveness of probation officers in rehabilitating offenders in 1977 (January-December). Some of the questions in the questionnaire ask that you check the answer by marking "X" by the appropriate space, while other questions will require that you complete a blank.

1. How many offenders were rehabilitated from your caseload? ______.

2. How many offenders on your caseload were female? ______, male? ______.

3. Your sex. Please check below.
   1. male
   2. female

4. What is your age? Check one.
   1. less than 25
   2. 26-35
   3. 36-45
   4. 46 and over

5. What were the ages of the youngest and oldest members in your caseload? youngest______, oldest______.

6. What is your relationship with the offenders?
   1. good
   2. moderate
   3. bad

7. What race are you?
   1. black
   2. white
   3. mixed (Mexicans, Chinese, Italian, etc.)

8. How long have you been a probation officer? Number of years ______.

9. Do you feel male or female offenders are more difficult to counsel? circle one
10. Do you feel more or less females should become probation officers in the future?
   1. more
   2. less
   3. no opinion

11. What is the highest level of education completed?
   1. 8th grade
   2. 12th grade
   3. 2 years of college
   4. 4 years of college
   5. 2 years of graduate school

If there are any comments you would like to make, please feel free to do so.