

A COMPARISON OF COLLEGE STUDENT,  
SUCCESSFUL, AND DIFFICULTY  
PRONE PROBATIONERS

By

LINDA JO ALBERTY

Bachelor of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1969

Master of Science  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma  
1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
December, 1977

Thesis  
1977D  
A 334C  
cap. 2



A COMPARISON OF COLLEGE STUDENT,  
SUCCESSFUL, AND DIFFICULTY  
PRONE PROBATIONERS

Thesis Approved:

*Wm. P. Ewens*

Thesis Adviser

*Clayton A. Morgan*

*Frank E. Van Sanford*

*Dan Wesley*

*Norman N. Deehan*

Dean of the Graduate College

1003703

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, thanks are due to my generous committee. Especially to Dr. W. Price Ewens, chairman and chief supporter since 1971, to Dr. Frank McFarland whose friendship is most delightful, to Dr. Clayton Morgan who inspires confidence even while absent, and to Dr. Dan Wesley who has always been a cornerstone of support.

To the doctors of various kinds and fields who have applied all sorts of bandages at appropriate times: Bowers, Brobst, Gruninger, Hampton, Harriman, Johndrow, Key, Kiser, Kroll, McHale, Palmer, Sandhu, Silverstein, Tout, Turner, Tyler, and Weiner, thank you. To Judges R. L. Hert and Ray Lee Wall because they care, thanks.

Kindest gratitude is owed the staff of the O.S.U. Computer Center and particularly to Eldean Bahm, and also to Pat Goff of the Graduate College and Dean Durham.

To the families who have stood by me, especially my parents, Billy P. and Ruth Wade White, who have gone well above and beyond the call of duty and whose encouragement through the years has been essential, thank you. To two grandmothers and very special ladies, Eva and Carrie, whose images I carry with me, and to my sister, Susan, who has never failed me, and to various aunts, uncles, and cousins whose interest has helped in so many ways, thank you. For their support and encouragement thanks are given my friends in Stillwater Writers.

Gratitude is held for my friends Beverly, Charlene, Jenny, Kay, and Sharon, and my Indian godfather Dick Kenny who were always there

when I needed them. Thanks are due my dear friends Rosalie Broyles and Jim whose counsel and friendship were there in every crisis and who certainly helped in the accomplishment of this educational goal.

Those who worked to allow the final production of the thesis and to whom I am indebted are: Margaret Driskill, Vernon Hopson, Bonnie Schaefer, and most importantly, Kay Nettleton.

Perhaps the whole inspiration of this work lies in my wonderful son, Warren, who has made many sacrifices, and invested so much in his mom's education. If, in the future he is able to be as good to himself as he has been to me, he will indeed accomplish great things.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	3
Purpose of the Study. . . . .	4
Scope and Limitations of the Study. . . . .	4
Assumptions Basic to the Study. . . . .	5
Definition of Terms . . . . .	5
II. REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE. . . . .	7
History and Development of Probation. . . . .	7
A Cost Comparison . . . . .	11
Probation as a Community Safety Measure . . . . .	12
Characteristics of Probationers . . . . .	14
Summary of Related Studies. . . . .	21
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	23
Objectives of the Study . . . . .	23
The Study Population. . . . .	25
Development of the Questionnaire. . . . .	26
Collection of the Data. . . . .	29
Analysis of the Data. . . . .	30
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	32
Types of Offenses Committed by Probationers . . . . .	32
Sexual and Racial Composition of Study Groups . . . . .	35
Age and Prior Record of Study Groups. . . . .	36
Items Relating Means of Support and Employment. . . . .	43
Family and Personal History of Probationers . . . . .	50
Family Educational History of Probationers. . . . .	64
Items Related to Criminal Justice . . . . .	73
Educational Data on College Student Probationers. . . . .	81
Comments of Probationers on Criminal Justice. . . . .	82
Role of Educational Institution in Students'	
Legal Problems. . . . .	84
Summary of Significant Between Group Differences	
On Items. . . . .	85

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	89
Overview of the Investigation . . . . .	89
Summary of the Results. . . . .	90
Conclusions . . . . .	96
Weaknesses of the Study . . . . .	98
Recommendations . . . . .	98
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	100
APPENDIX. . . . .	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Types of Offenses Committed by Probationers. . . . .	33
II. Sex and Race of Probationers . . . . .	35
III. Probationers' Present Age, Age When on Probation, Age at First Arrest. . . . .	37
IV. Number of Juvenile Arrests and Juvenile Probations for Probationers . . . . .	39
V. Number of Adult Felony Charges and Number of Felony Charges in Last Five Years of Probationers . . . . .	41
VI. Military Service Record and Family Criminal Record of Probationers. . . . .	42
VII. Past and Present Living Arrangements and Means of Support of Probationers at Time of Crime . . . . .	44
VIII. Present Work Status and Employment Level of Probationers . .	47
IX. Probationer's Time on Present Job and Ever Held a Job a Year . . . . .	48
X. Adequacy of Salary and Present Job Satisfaction for Probationers . . . . .	50
XI. Birth Order and Family Size of Probationers. . . . .	51
XII. Who Reared Probationer and Mother's Role in Home . . . . .	53
XIII. Welfare, Abuse, and Parental Conflict History of Probationers. . . . .	54
XIV. Number of Marriages of Probationer's Parents . . . . .	56
XV. Whether Probationers Got Along with Their Mother or Father. . . . .	57
XVI. Probationer's Mother or Father Still Living. . . . .	58
XVII. Father's Professional Level. . . . .	59



Table	Page
XVIII. Marital Status, Marital Satisfaction, and Number of Times Married of Probationers. . . . .	61
XIX. Religious Preference. . . . .	63
XX. Psychological History and Presence of Physical Disability in Probationers. . . . .	64
XXI. Educational Level of Probationers' Parents. . . . .	65
XXII. Educational History of Probationer. . . . .	68
XXIII. Drug History of Probationer . . . . .	71
XXIV. Arrest and Search Circumstances of Probationers . . . . .	74
XXV. Jail Time, Retainment of Attorney, and Method of Plea . . . . .	75
XXVI. Type Sentence Received and Satisfaction With Attorneys' Representation . . . . .	78
XXVII. Evaluation of Court, and Success Probability. . . . .	78
XXVIII. Aliases, Tatoos, and Voting History of Probationers . . . . .	80
XXIX. Comments of Probationers on Criminal Justice. . . . .	83
XXX. Student Comments on Educational Institution Involvement in Student Legal Problems . . . . .	85
XXXI. Summary of Between Group Differences Significant at 0.05 Level . . . . .	86

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Crime has been with us as long as society itself, and the resulting penal process may now be considered an integral part of our society. As early as 2100 B.C., Hammurabi had set a societal standard for handling criminals based on his "eye for an eye" philosophy (Sandhu, 1974).

In present day society, as crime continues to increase, the problem of successful rehabilitation of criminals becomes more meaningful and relevant to each citizen because, like it or not, members of the culture hold a vested interest in those designated by law to be criminals. Either as victims or taxpayers, citizens at large are directly or indirectly affected by the activities of criminals. As victims, citizens often experience physical and psychological abuse, as well as financial loss; as taxpayers, citizens are required to bear the tremendous financial burden of attempting the rehabilitation of the criminal, or in providing for the isolation of the offender.

Alternatives to prison are now generally administered by the state, but such was not always the case. Prisons in America had been erected by 1830, whereas probation was not begun until 1841. The concept of probationary sentences, however, was not initiated by the state but began in the private business sector. John Augustus, a Boston cobbler, offered to take charge of a drunkard whom he saw being jailed after

conviction by a court. Augustus obtained permission and took the man home and taught him the trade of shoemaking. Soon the drunkard showed signs of reform. This, then, was the humble beginning of treatment of the offender in the community--of probation. Encouraged by his first success, Augustus continued his work and he and his friends helped to accomplish the rehabilitation of over 2,000 offenders over a period of twenty years in Boston (Sandhu, 1974).

From this early beginning, the concept of probation has changed and today it is not only a humanitarian act; probation is a process designed to assure the criminal's adjustment in the community following sentencing. Presently, the demand for professional probation officers has surpassed the usage of volunteers from the community, and the supervision of probationers has been largely taken over as a state function.

The majority of sentences handed down by the courts today are of a probationary nature. Probation provides for the supervision of the offender in the community although he is still subject to the court's authority.

It has been said it currently costs as much to send an individual to prison as it would to send him to college for an equal amount of time. It appears clear, therefore, that the successful rehabilitation of the offender through probation is more beneficial to society than is the punishment of the criminal in prison, which is usually only a temporary period of isolation.

Sandhu (1974) reports that society erroneously feels safer when the offender is isolated and removed from the scene. Supposedly, when the criminal comes out of prison, he will have learned to behave better. Sandhu feels that today there is some realization that the culture

enjoys only a false sense of security since most offenders will return to society eventually--and many will be more angry, predatory, socially handicapped and disabled, outdated in skills, and less employable and capable of rehabilitation than when they were sent away.

One can see advantages to accomplishing the successful rehabilitation of the offender while leaving him in the mainstream of society.

#### Statement of the Problem

Most of today's prisons are known to be such crowded, undesirable places that it seems reasonable to assume that a criminal given a "last chance" to reform, i.e., a probationary type sentence, would make every effort to reform and cease and desist his criminal activities, under threat of possible incarceration. But this is not the case. Many probationers fail to comply with the rules and conditions of their probationary sentences and are eventually put away to serve time in prison. Herein lies the problem.

Since probationers are generally placed under the same rules and conditions of probation by the courts, the failure of some probationers and the success of others, would appear to be attributable to the individual's characteristics and attitudes. It would appear, then, that the characteristics and attitudes of different groups of probationers might be ascertained, and compared, to determine whether there are significant differences between them. If differences can be found, these differences could permit the probation officer to intensify his delivery of services to probationers found to have characteristics and attitudes similar to those who have tended to have difficulty while on probation. Hopefully, delivery of appropriate supervision and services

to difficulty prone probationers would serve to ward off predicted failure.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain selected individual characteristics and attitudes of successful, difficulty prone, and college student probationers. Through the analysis of particular data, secured from three groups, it is further proposed to draw conclusions and provide better services to future probationers, on the basis of characteristics which are found to be significantly different between the college student, successful, and difficulty prone groups of probationers.

The question to be answered by the study is whether there are significant differences in the attitudes and histories of college students who are on probation, probationers who successfully complete their probation, and probationers who have difficulty.

#### Scope and Limitations of the Study

The study population was limited to probationers who were living in non-metropolitan areas. A sample of twenty-five was randomly selected for each of the three groups. Due to the small population, the sample of twenty-five was deemed adequate to be representative of the study population. When generalizing conclusions of the study in comparison with urban groups, the reader may wish to exercise a certain amount of caution; however, it is presumed results of the study might well serve as a basis for conducting similar studies in different demographic settings.

### Assumptions Basic to the Study

The following assumptions were accepted by the investigator:

1. That the accomplishments of the objectives would yield pertinent data which would differentiate between the study groups and permit comparisons between them.
2. That sufficient rapport existed to give reasonable confidence that probationers' responses were reliable and valid and that the instrument measures what it purports to measure.

### Definition of Terms

Since crime is with us in our daily activities, most citizens possess a general knowledge concerning criminal justice; however, the following list of selected terms is specifically defined for the convenience of the reader or researchers who may wish to duplicate the study:

1. Probationer - for the purpose of this study, a probationer is an individual who received a deferrment of sentence or a suspended sentence for a felony offense.
2. Deferred Sentence - a legal process which allows a defendant (usually on first offense) to enter a plea of guilty; the court then defers sentencing for a period of time (usually one or two years) during which time the defendant is put on probation. At the end of the time, if the client has been "good," he is allowed to withdraw the guilty plea and enter

a plea of not guilty, at which time charges are dismissed and no felony record exists because the record has been expunged.

3. Suspended Sentence - involves a felony conviction and criminal record for the defendant. The sentence is suspended, that is, it is served in the community as probation instead of in prison.
4. Successful Probationer - a probationer who is not having difficulty meeting his rules of probation.
5. Difficulty-Prone Probationer - a probationer who is in danger of not being able to successfully complete his probation; he may be in non-compliance with the rules of probation or may have new charges pending against him.
6. Felony - a crime for which maximum punishment always includes time to be served in the state penitentiary; a crime for which one can lose some of his constitutional rights if found guilty.
7. Rules and Conditions of Probation - a set of rules governing a probationer's behavior. The rules are generally good behavior requirements which require the probationer to work, report to an officer, and not to break any laws; these rules are compiled at the discretion of the court.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to present background information for the study. Used in the search of literature for this paper were: textbooks, journal articles, government documents, materials from state agencies, and research studies in the field. Extensive use of the ERIC computer search of literature was also made. Many experts were interviewed in the course of compiling the questionnaire used in the study. These included professors in the area of corrections, officers of the court, members of the judiciary, law enforcement officers, and persons under the supervision of the criminal justice system. The major areas covered in the review of literature are the history and development of the criminal justice system as it pertains to probation, existing research on the attitudes of histories of probationers, and research concerning construction of a questionnaire.

#### History and Development of Probation

One can view criminal justice, in terms of punishment, as having begun with "the original sin." Reportedly, Christian society came about as the result of Eve's invitation to Adam, and his acceptance, to eat of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, the one and only act which was against the law. After eating of the apple, the couple was cast from



paradise as punishment; as time passed society was burdened with the formulation of laws for the punishment of those who broke the rules.

The criminal justice process continued to be harsh and irreversible from Biblical times until the Middle Ages. Physical punishments were cruel and included such atrocities as the stoning of offenders, tearing off of limbs, and burnings; later came the Inquisition, and such punishments as the wearing of the Scarlet Letter followed. The comparably humane practice of imprisonment was not yet popularly accepted.

While early Christianity did exert somewhat of a softening influence upon the severe penalties administered to criminals, according to Bromberg, the Inquisition of the Middle Ages set progress back considerably and further advances were not made until the enlightenment of the Renaissance period. Bromberg (1965) reports:

Witchhunting underwent a decline in the early 1700's: intellectualism, the growing world of sciences, . . . the civilization of the eighteenth century - all contributed to modify punishment for crime, and paved the way for handling the criminal as an individual (p. 27).

Pidgeon (1942, p. 84) feels that the roots of probationary sentences reach far back into Anglo-Saxon history in Medieval England when the practice of judicial reprieve involved withdrawing a sentence for a period of time. She points out: "Probation was adopted after the criminal code became less severe and vindictive and after the social sciences had begun to exert their influence."

As early as 1821, Livingston, an American attorney, had constructed a code of far-reaching reforms for prisons, including readjustment programs for those discharged from prison, and crime prevention through education. The Louisiana legislature failed to adopt the program, but

Bromberg (1965) feels the publication of Livingston's recommendations helped bring about more humane practices in the criminal justice system.

Robinson (1971, p. 78) reports that progressive measures in criminal justice programs in the latter part of the nineteenth century resulted from the desire for humane treatment of criminals. The criminal was no longer regarded as an evil person who willingly chose to engage in criminal activities; instead, he was seen as having been socially determined to take deviant roles. The retributive and familiar slogan, "Let the punishment fit the crime," was replaced by a new principle, "Let the treatment fit the needs of the offender."

Alexander and Staub (1956, p. 4) view justice in a much broader context. They feel that when injustice becomes the focus of the popular masses and is viewed in the context that "This might happen to any one of us," the identification leads to reforms. Indeed, the French Revolution is noted to have begun with the storming of the Bastille.

Carter, McGee, and Nelson (1975) agree that the concept of probation is of recent origin in terms of the total history of the treatment of offenders and is a distinctly American correctional innovation.

Ancel (1971) reports that as early as 1901 judges were criticized for concerning themselves more with the nature of the criminal act rather than with the personality of the offender. At that time it was proposed that the criminal's personality should have great influence on whether a suspended sentence was granted or refused.

Pidgeon (1942, p. 83) cautions that probation not be viewed strictly as the mercy or leniency of the court, but rather, as a form of treatment chosen since there is reason to think society can be protected while the needs of the offender are met. ". . . probation

implies constructive treatment. . . . it is preventative in nature. . . . probation permits a normal family life in the community and avoids the bad effects of prison."

On sentencing, Halleck notes that even though our primary concern might be punishment, trying to make the punishment fit the crime rather than the criminal does not make sense. "All men may be equal before the law in terms of their guilt, but no two men respond the same way to punishment. Some men would find thirty days in prison as agonizing as others would find thirty months." Halleck (1967, p. 344) also adds that, "Many first offenders are so ashamed and humiliated after they are apprehended and legally designated as criminals that further punishment is often superfluous."

Kadish (1962, p. 17) notes that individualized treatment is a great ideal in sentencing but, in corrections, it ". . . has resulted in vesting in judges and parole and probation agencies the greatest degree of uncontrolled power over the liberty of human beings that one can find in the legal system."

Writing in 1967, Seymour Halleck reviews the traditional viewpoint of punishment and responsibility in American corrections. He feels that punishment in America is severe and our prison sentences are longer than those imposed in most other countries. Correctional techniques are comparatively harsh and we have executed more people for non-treasonous behavior than any other country in the world.

Referring to the recent press toward community treatment, Sullivan (1971) states that:

. . . corrections is being asked to totally reverse its direction and this is difficult. Rather than seeking increasingly sure ways of 'holding' offenders, corrections now must find improved ways of 'letting-go'. And modern trends and information indicate that, instead of training to establish greater managerial control by adding to existing patterns of deprivation, we should increase opportunities and rewards even when offenders do not demonstrate they deserve them, but only that they need them (p. 3).

Of the twenty-two recommendations made by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in 1967, eight encouraged expansion of community based treatment for offenders. Placing the criminal on probation allays many of the bad effects of prison and thus increases the likelihood of success.

#### A Cost Comparison

Certainly to be considered in, if not directly responsible for, present day society's interest in suspended sentences is the cost of otherwise maintaining an offender in prison. Galvin (1971) reports that operational costs of American correctional programs are about \$6 billion a year. And although probationers comprised two-thirds of those under supervision, only about one-fifth of the available funding was spent for probationer programs.

The United States Chamber of Commerce reported in 1972 that it was 14 times less expensive to maintain an offender on probation than in prison. The national average cost of maintaining a probationer at that time was 38¢ per day, while prison-building costs averaged about \$20,000 per bed.

In his biting criticism of the penal system, the Honorable Judge David Bazelon (1972) reports that in West Virginia, \$13,000 was being

spent on each inmate. He then asks whether the correctional problem would not better be handled by letting the inmates out of the institution and giving them \$13,000 per year. He makes the accusation that the only function that the research and rehabilitation programs serve is to provide staff with jobs.

### Probation as a Community

#### Safety Measure

In their discussion of rhetoric and reality in corrections, Morris and Hawkins (1970, p. 22) note that the President's Commission Task Force Report on Corrections has stated that: "The ultimate goal of corrections under any theory is to make the community safer by reducing the incidence of crime." Unfortunately, this is a broad enough philosophical statement to lead to the development of many theories of crime which might as easily conflict with each other as not.

A supervising officer is faced with the realization that his duty is the protection of society. But how is society best protected? Should he emphasize short or long term rehabilitation goals? To call for revocation of an offender who has failed to comply with the rules and conditions of his probationary sentence may temporarily reduce the crime rate by taking the offender out of circulation, but in the long run, the prison experience may serve as a training ground for crimes of a more serious nature. As a result, the officer is constantly faced with conflict. How can society best be protected? By recommending another chance for an offender and hoping that this will lead to his eventual reform, or by requesting revocation and hoping that the prison experience will be a deterrence to future crime? Ultimately, the

officer knows that if there is any way rehabilitation can be accomplished without imprisonment, this is the best way, and yet the officer must carry on his conscience the crimes committed by those whom he has been able to persuade the court to give (often unwarranted) leniency in the hope of reforming them.

Any information the officer might be able to gain with reference to which probationers are the best risks may be helpful to him in making special requests to the court. Not only would he then be able to temper his requests with responsibility and better judgment, but he also would be able to provide better quality services to the probationers most in need.

Research in probation could perhaps play an important role in providing useful information to serve the probation officer. But now, just as most of the money is spent in penal institutions, most of the research in corrections is conducted on captive prison populations. Officers in the field are perhaps just as much to blame for this lack of research as anyone. Taylor and McEachern (1966, p. 18) note that the role of research is not well embraced by probation departments: "In most departments, research, when it is thought of at all, is considered little more than an exotic intrusion rather than as the normal and necessary basis for forming decisions."

The lack of enthusiasm over research projects may not be so much a result of overt uncooperativeness on the part of officers as a result of their lack of time. Carter, McGee, and Nelson (1975) report that a standard case load size of fifty units has been generally established and that one pre-sentence investigation is equal to five supervised cases. This standard was first proposed by Charles Chute

of the National Probation Association in the 1920's but current officer case loads often exceed two hundred.

Regarding probationers under supervision, Bromberg (1965, p. 1) feels that ". . . no clear distinction now exists in the potential or actual criminal population." Bromberg (1965) further states that

. . . 'treatment' and 'rehabilitation' lead directly to the need to know more about the person being treated: Who is the criminal? What are his potentialities, assets, physical, and social background, liabilities, aims, and goals (p. 35)?

Answers to these questions attempted in the present study may lead to information helpful to the probation officer in his daily work.

### Characteristics of Probationers

#### Revocation by Offenses

Perhaps the most definitive statistics concerning success and non-success of probationers relate to the crimes with which they were charged; this is a relatively unambiguous factor since it is a matter of public record rather than one of personal judgment.

In 1964, Davis studied over 11,000 cases in California. There, the highest rate of revocation was in the forgery and check offense group, while the lowest rate was in manslaughter and manslaughter by vehicle groups. He notes in most studies of either probationers or parolees, forgery and check offenses are invariably among the high recidivism group while homicide and sex offenses are among the lowest.

Glaser and O'Leary (1966) agree that crimes involving taking another's property by stealth or deception without the use of force are generally associated with recidivism; this includes forgery, theft, and burglary. Robbery and narcotic crimes had average rates. Lower

recidivism was again associated with crimes of violence, including rape, assault, and homicide. Auto theft is usually treated in a category of its own and, in most jurisdictions, auto thieves have the highest rate of revocation of any particular group. Burglars, forgers, and narcotic users are most likely to be revoked for offenses similar in nature to those for which they were originally sentenced; sex offenders and murderers were least likely to repeat the same offense.

Landis, Mercer, and Wolff (1969) concurred with the previous researchers. They found more probationary failures had committed auto theft, forgery and check offenses. Successes were most likely to have committed general theft, burglary, robbery, or to receive stolen property.

#### Revocation and Prior Record

Aspects of the offender's prior criminal record have also been related to the success or failure probability while on probation. Using chi square to test his data, Davis (1964) noted the differences in rates of revocation by age were significant. He affirms that, with increasing age, criminal conduct seems to diminish; however, Glaser and O'Leary (1966) note the younger a person was when his crime began, the more likely he is to continue in it. They also note the longer the span of prior criminal acts, the more likely the criminal behavior will be extended in the future. Landis, Mercer, and Wolff (1969) noted those who also had a history of disciplinary action while in the service were more likely to fail on probation. Sandhu (1974) writes that the rate of recidivism is highest for offenders under age twenty, and that another factor associated with failure is the onset of criminal



activity prior to age eighteen. Glaser (1969) notes that generally the older a man when he is released from prison, the less likely he is to return to crime.

Glueck and Glueck (1959) also report the earlier delinquency's onset, the greater the chances of misbehavior during probation. In 1974, Sandhu reports that persons who had four previous convictions were generally high recidivists. Scarpitti and Stephenson (1968) report that when recidivism occurs it is usually during the first year of the probationary sentence.

#### Recidivism by Sex of Offender

In 1964 Davis reported on sex differences and revocation rates. Only about ten percent of the group was female (a typical proportion). His report shows women are much more likely to complete probation successfully than men; however, he also notes that women had less chance of being revoked for new crimes than did men. He attributes this to a generally more lenient attitude towards women in the justice system.

Sutherland (1955, p. 111) notes, "The male sex has a great excess of crimes in all nations, all communities within a nation, all age groups, all periods of history for which organized statistics are available and all types of crime . . ."

#### Recidivism by Race

In their discussion of race as related to recidivism, Glaser and O'Leary (1966) noted Negroes have a higher rate for arrest, conviction, and being imprisoned than whites, but most research shows little

difference in the revocation rates of the two groups. They think the higher arrest rates might be attributed to the likelihood that blacks experience conditions of low income, high unemployment, poor education, and residence in slum areas where crime rates are high, an assumption that leaves the question unanswered as to why violation rates would not also be higher. They speculate this might be attributed to a more careful selection of Negroes for parole than whites. The same authors note that in the Southwest persons of Mexican descent have violation rates similar to those of whites while American Indians have an average or higher than average rate of parole violation.

Mays, in his discussion of the racial factor in crime in 1963, notes with regard to race:

On its own it is probably a neutral factor, and it is only when combined with other things, such as racial discrimination and residence in an underprivileged neighborhood, that it even appears to have any criminogenic significance (p. 150).

#### Employment and Recidivism

With regard to employment and rehabilitation of the offender, Sandhu (1974, p. 252) states, "From all studies, regular employment emerges as the key point in the rehabilitation of the offender." This is reflected in the requirement for working found in most rules for probationers; it is felt that if the offender has regular income from employment, he will be less likely to commit crimes for the purpose of obtaining money on which to live. Also, if the individual has forty or more hours each week occupied at work he will have less idle time in which to become involved in illegal activities.

### Recidivism and Personal History

Regarding the family situation and personal characteristics of the offender much research has been done, but a great deal of it has been with juveniles and may not be directly applicable to adult probationers. Nonetheless, one must take the existing information on juveniles and begin work with adults at that point.

The importance and acceptance of the study of the prediction of crime and delinquency by Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck might best be indicated by the fact their book contains an introduction by the Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States. The Glueck prediction tables were developed from studies which began with their work in 1925 and continued until 1959 when Predicting Delinquency and Crime was published. Over 2,000 offenders were incorporated into the study, and the authors attempted to employ only those factors which seemed to bear a significant relationship to subsequent behavior. Proper statistical tests were applied to all data.

Glueck and Glueck (1959) found the following factors were associated with likelihood of misbehavior during treatment of adult male offenders: early onset of delinquency; low industrial capacity of the offender; coming from a small family as opposed to a larger one; within the limited economic sample of the study, coming from higher economic status was associated with misbehavior; the lower the educational level of the offender's parents, the more likely he was to get into trouble.

The following generalizations were made by the Gluecks in 1959, with reference to female offenders: steady workers are less likely to

get into trouble; women meeting their economic obligations to the family are less likely to get into trouble.

Also appearing in 1959 was Origins of Crime, by William and Joan McCord, with Irving Zola. Their evaluation of 253 boys in the Cambridge-Somerville Youth Study, is reported in the following generalizations pertinent to the present study: except in cases of extremes, neither intelligence nor physical condition were related to criminal behavior; social factors, such as type of neighborhood, were not strongly associated with criminal behavior; the home atmosphere did have an important effect since uncohesive homes produced criminals and broken homes precipitated many men into criminality, particularly into crimes of drunkenness and violence; but the influence of broken homes has been overstressed; the extreme tension in quarrelsome and neglective homes is even more conducive to criminality and leads to delinquency beginning at an early age; parental absence resulted in a relatively high rate of crime, especially drunkenness.

If the father rejected his son, the son tended to imitate the father's behavior; if he was criminal, the son became criminal. This combination of paternal rejection and a deviant male model produced an extremely high proportion of criminals.

The mother's personality plays a fundamental part in the genesis of criminality: maternal love (even over-protective) generally led to low rates of crime; maternal cruelty or neglect led to high criminality and this criminality began early in life and these subjects were least likely to reform; loving-normal and loving-anxious mothers, with few exceptions, had non-criminal sons.

The son's position in the family had an effect on crime. Those

children viewed as "trouble-makers" by their parents and those boys who fell in the middle range of the birth order were likely to become criminal.

McCord, McCord, and Zola (1959, p. 167) note that their research demonstrated the falsity of several popular myths about the origins of criminality. They state that they: did not find criminality associated with residence in a slum; did not find direct relationship between criminality and disciplinary methods; the relationship must be considered in connection with parental rejection and deviant role models; found punitive harsh discipline did not prevent criminality; found that sons of passive males did not turn to criminal behavior as a means of asserting their "masculinity"; did not find that broken homes are the most conducive atmosphere in producing criminality, but that quarrelsome homes are most conducive to criminal behaviors.

Continuing, McCord, McCord, and Zola (1959) concluded:

For those new to the field of criminology; one of the most astonishing results of this research may be the finding that criminality is greatly determined by factors beyond the control of the individual. More than this, these determining factors can be analyzed. Under certain familial and social conditions, the child's choice about whether to conform to society's rules is, in very large measure, made for him (p. 172).

Reported in 1957, Toby's work agrees with McCord, McCord, and Zola in that a quarrelsome home full of conflict, tensions, and accompanying strife was more conducive to criminality than a home broken by divorce.

A glimpse into an individual family situation is illustrated in the writings of Smith, one of the murderers of the Clutter family, reported by Truman Capote (1968) in The Sociopath. Smith writes:

. . . proceeded to beat my mother. I was frightfully scared, in fact all us children were terrified. Crying. I was

scared because I thought my father was going to hurt me, also because he was beating my mother. I really didn't understand why he was beating her but I felt she must have done something dreadfully wrong. . . (p. 41).

This passage illustrates the difficulty the young child has in dealing with violence in his home situation.

Inability to evaluate a violent home situation may lead a child to thought patterns similar to those which Halleck (1967, p. 285) describes, "Most offenders do not see themselves as aggressors against society but rather as victims of society."

In reviewing the personal history of today's lawbreaker, from his criminal record to his psychological attitudes, and family background, the aim of the present study was to develop an instrument to help identify probationers having difficulty in order that preventative measures might be applied, and to obtain a descriptive profile of college students on probation.

#### Summary of Related Studies

The review of selected literature for this study has covered the history of criminal justice and development of probation to the present time.

It has been shown in terms of past criminal behavior, the age at which the person is first arrested is associated with recidivism, as is the type offense committed, number of previous convictions, and age of the offender. Studies indicate that intellect does not appear to be predictive of success or failure except in extreme cases.

In terms of an individual's personal history, a probationer is more likely to be successful on probation if employed full time, if he

comes from a non-quarrelsome home, is from a larger family, or has parents of higher educational level.

These are the broad areas with which the questionnaire and study are concerned, and in addition, open-ended critical comments concerning the criminal justice system and educational institution involvement in the legal affairs of the probationers were solicited for inclusion.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study is to ascertain and compare selected individual historical facts and attitudes of three groups: a group of college students on probation (also designated group 1), a group of successful probationers (group 2), and a group of difficulty prone probationers (group 3). A secondary purpose is to solicit open-ended critical comments concerning the criminal justice system from all the participants in the study, and to obtain comments from the college student probationers concerning their educational institutions' involvement in their legal problems. Through the analysis of particular data, secured from the three groups, it is further proposed to draw conclusions and make recommendations for future probationers, on the basis of characteristics found to be significantly different between the groups. To accomplish these purposes, the following list of objectives is deemed necessary.

#### Objectives of the Study

##### Background Information

In order to obtain a composite sociological history of the probationers in the study, it was deemed necessary to seek the following information:



1. To ascertain from probationers information about their personal histories.
2. To elicit information from probationers regarding their family histories.
3. To obtain information from probationers concerning their employment records.
4. To obtain information from probationers about their educational experiences.
5. To obtain factual information from probationers concerning their criminal records.

#### Attitudes

In addition to the above information, it was believed necessary to learn from the probationers in the study their individual feelings in regard to the following:

1. To learn the attitudes of probationers concerning their personal histories.
2. To elicit probationer's attitudes about their family histories.
3. To elicit probationer's attitudes concerning their vocations.
4. To elicit probationers attitudes on their educational experiences.
5. To elicit probationer's attitudes about the criminal justice system.
6. To solicit open-ended comments about the criminal justice system from probationers.
7. To solicit comments from college students on probation about the role of the educational institution in their legal affairs.

### The Study Population

The population for this study consisted of probationers under supervision in north central Oklahoma. From a population of 125 probationers, lists of successful and problematic probationers were compiled by officers. It was then determined which probationers were college students. Probationers who were unable to be knowledgeably classified as either successful or difficulty prone were excluded from the population. A sample of twenty-five successful probationers was chosen at random, and a sample of twenty-five unsuccessful probationers was chosen at random. A sample of twenty-five college students who were on probation was selected on the basis of factual data; of those who were students, none had been designated to be difficulty prone by the officers.

The questionnaire was administered personally by the investigator to insure that questions of the respondents could be answered as needed. Probationers were fully assured as to the confidentiality and anonymity of their responses and were given opportunity to decline participation although none declined to take part in the study. Precautions to assure anonymity, such as not using exact birth dates but ages, were explained to participants to reassure them the responses would remain anonymous.

The questionnaires for the different sample groups were differentiated by the following method: successful probationers received questionnaires numbered in Arabic; difficulty prone probationers were administered instruments which were lettered by page, rather than numbered; college students on probation were administered

questionnaires numbered in Roman numerals.

The instrument was administered to seventy-five participants in the late spring of 1977.

#### Development of the Questionnaire

A search of the literature in the field of corrections failed to yield many simple predictive instruments for use with probationers. Numbers of studies on prison populations have been conducted using personality tests such as the Minnesota Multi-phasic Personality Inventory, and other sophisticated instruments; however, in the present world of the officer and his probationers, few probation officers have either the professional expertise or the time to administer or interpret these tests.

The literature revealed two instruments which are rather closely related to the goals of the present study. The first is the Mal-Adaptive Behavior Record (MBR), the second is the Law Encounter Severity Scale (LESS).

The MBR is a simple instrument containing sixteen items concerning the probationers behavior or attitudes on the following areas: employment, addiction, interpersonal, physical or psychological adjustment, and legal matters. The items are rated "1" or "0" by an officer, with "1" indicating a problem in the area. Jenkins, and Barton (1974) report validity coefficients which were significant beyond the 1% level on all but one item. When that one item on physical adjustment was combined with the one on psychological adjustment, moderate validity was found.

The problem encountered with the MBR for this study is that some

sections of the instrument cannot be answered satisfactorily in the way the questionnaire for the present study was administered. The MBR also fails to ask many questions which, according to the literature, relate to areas and problems associated with the recidivism rate for probationers. Caution was exercised to include relevant items from the MBR without changing them so that generalization or duplication of the present study's conclusions would be more meaningful.

The Law Encounter Severity Scale (LESS) has been used in predicting problems for probationers. It is a simple form which takes the probationer's history of criminal activity. It contains several items which did not appear to be predictive with adults and failed to include several items which were found to be predictors of recidivism, such as age of offender, and type of offense committed. (Jenkins and Barton, 1974)

Since the above mentioned instruments seem fairly promising in terms of their content, care was taken to include similar items on the instrument used in the present study. In the field, there is a compelling need for a simple form which can be easily scored in order that the officer can make an educated prediction concerning those probationers most likely to need more of his attention. Presently, there is not the funding or personnel available to provide long psychological testing and social summaries on persons placed on probation through the court. More useful to an officer than a long narrative describing the problematic history of the probationer would be knowledge about the specific factors which differentiate those who have difficulty while on probation from those who are successful. An instrument for

determining those factors would help the officer in applying effective preventative measures.

Some of the questions for the present study were taken from instruments used in other states. Although no literature was found discussing inclusion of the questions concerning usage of aliases or presence of tatoos, it was speculated these items might reveal differences between the groups, and therefore they were included in the study.

The instrument developed covered both factual information and attitudes and also solicited open-ended criticism of the participants about the criminal justice system, and solicited from college students their comments about their educational institution's involvement in their legal problems.

Sources reviewed in depth concerning wording, construction, and administration of questionnaires were Goode (1952), Kerlinger (1964), Nye (1964), Parten (1966), and Slocum, et. al. (1956). Careful consideration was given to make the questions simple enough for persons with limited reading ability to understand, and vocabulary particular to the court was eliminated when possible. The questionnaires were personally administered so questions by respondents could be immediately answered.

After formulation, as a pre-test, the instrument was administered to a group of probationers not in the study population; their comments along with those of the author's committee chairman, and those of several professional officers who served as reviewers, led to the final revised instrument, a copy of which is in the appendix. No major problem of interpretation was reported by those who responded or by those who reviewed the instrument.

### Collection of the Data

The first of the three study groups was comprised of twenty-five probationers who were all college students; all had been designated as successful by a supervising probation officer. From a list of non-college probationers deemed successful by a supervising officer, twenty-five clients were randomly selected for group two. Twenty-five probationers who were reported as having difficulty by officers were selected for the third group.

A questionnaire was developed to determine selected background information and attitudes of probationers concerning their personal, family, vocational, educational, and criminal histories. A copy of the questionnaire appears in the appendix.

The questionnaire was administered in the late spring of 1977 to probationers in two Oklahoma counties. Participants were given the questionnaire personally and were assured at length that their responses would be anonymous and would be kept completely confidential as to individual identification. Explanation of the study was given to probationers with reference to their opportunity to provide a meaningful critique of "the system" which might lead toward desired improvements and more appropriate supervision of future probationers. They were also told that statistics would be compiled on the groups but that individual information would not be identifiable with regard to its source. It was felt that this approach would best facilitate the willingness of probationers to cooperate and thus accomplish the most valid responses possible; due to the personal method of administration a 100% return was achieved.

## Analysis of the Data

Once data were secured, item respondent counts were grouped and results were tabulated. Responses were set up for a comparison study using a chi square test for significant differences between the items, as deemed appropriate by Kerlinger (1964) under analysis of data.

A chi square test was applied to determine possible significant differences in response between the groups. Use of chi square determination for these data was deemed both appropriate and adequate.

Popham (1973) had this to say concerning such use of the test:

The Chi-Square Test. When the data from two independent samples are only nominal, then one may again use the  $X^2$  test to detect significant differences. For two samples the  $X^2$  analysis follows a pattern similar to the one-sample goodness of fit test. In the case of the two-sample application, however, the expected frequencies are not drawn from some hypothetical distribution, but directly from the actual or observed frequencies themselves.

. . . The value of  $X^2$  depends upon the disparity between the actual frequencies and the expected frequencies, with  $X^2$  becoming larger as the disparity increases. In other words, if the value of  $X^2$  is large enough to be statistically significant, there is a considerable difference between the category proportions of two independent variable groups with respect to the dependent variable (pp. 276-277).

As noted by Guilford and Fructer (1973, p. 204) in using chi square when frequencies are small, "When we apply chi square to a problem with 1 df and when any  $f_e$  frequency is less than 10, we should apply a modification known as Yate's correction for continuity." The process consists of reducing by .5 obtained frequencies greater than the expected and increasing by .5 frequencies less than expected. The .5 correction is applied to all cells and it is low expected

frequencies not low observed frequencies that determine the need for correction.

Siegel (1956, p. 46) notes that the  $\chi^2$  test for one-sample cases is inadvisable when more than twenty percent of the expected frequencies are less than five. Siegel says: "Expected frequencies sometimes can be increased by combining adjacent categories. This is desirable only if combinations can meaningfully be made." Due to the exploratory nature of the present study it was deemed desirable to combine certain response categories when statistical analysis of the data was made.

It should be noted that, for this entire study, the .05 level of significance was deemed appropriate for the type of data and comparison made. This is traditionally the level of significance seen as desirable for useage in behavioral science studies (Guilford and Fruchter, 1973).

Responses to the open-ended questions were analyzed by the investigator and experts in the field to find common threads in the responses. A tabulation of frequent comments is included in the results of the study.



## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present and analyze information gleaned from the responses received from the seventy five respondents to the questionnaire. To accomplish this purpose, questions concerning the following were asked on the questionnaire: probationers' attitudes and background information about their personal, family, vocational, educational, and criminal histories; open-ended comments regarding the criminal justice system were solicited from all participants, and open-ended comments were solicited from the college student probationers regarding their educational institution's involvement in their legal problems.

#### Types of Offenses Committed by Probationers

Table I illustrates the crimes with which the probationers in the study were charged. The various crimes were combined into two categories for chi square analysis; crimes were put into either high or low recidivism groups. In two group comparisons, chi square analysis did not reveal significant differences between the college students (also referred to as group 1), successful (referred to as group 2), and difficulty prone (also referred to as group 3) probationer groups.

One can note that the majority of the college students (13) had committed the crimes of burglary or grand larceny, 10 were serving

TABLE I  
 TYPES OF OFFENSES COMMITTED  
 BY PROBATIONERS

	High Recidivism Offenses								Low Recidivism Offenses									
	Auto Theft		Bogus Check, Forgery, Welfare Fraud		Drunk Driving		TOTAL		Possession of Drug or Culti- vation		Robbery, Burglary & Grand Larceny		Larceny of Merchandise Concealing Stolen Property		Sex Offenses, Assault and Battery, Fel. Pointing a Weapon		TOTAL	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
College Student Probationers N = 25	0	0	1	4	0	0	1	4	10	40	13	52	1	4	0	0	24	96
Successful Probationers N = 25	0	0	3	12	0	0	3	12	3	12	11	44	2	8	6	24	22	88
Difficulty Prone Probationers N = 25	3	12	3	12	1	4	7	28	1	4	11	44	3	12	3	12	18	72
TOTALS N = 75	3	4	7	9	1	1	11	15	14	19	35	47	6	8	9	12	64	85

When subjected to  $X^2$  test, differences between the three groups, and differences between all the two group comparisons, were not significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

sentences for possession of drugs with intent to distribute or for cultivation of marihuana, 1 was on probation for bogus check or forgery, and 1 was on probation for larceny of merchandise or concealing stolen property. The largest number in the successful group (11) had also committed the crimes of robbery, burglary, or grand larceny. Sex offenses, assault and battery, or feloniously pointing a weapon had been committed by 6 of the successful probationers; 3 had committed bogus check, forgery, or defrauding welfare offenses; 3 were on probation for drug offenses; 2 successful probationers had committed larceny of merchandise or had concealed stolen property. The largest number of the difficulty prone probationers (11) had committed robbery, burglary, and grand larceny. Auto theft had been committed by 3 of the difficulty prone group and by none in either of the two other groups; this trend agrees with Glaser and O'Leary (1966) and with Sandhu (1974). Bogus check, forgery, or welfare fraud had been the crime of the same number in the difficulty prone group as in the successful group--3. In the difficulty prone group 3 committed larceny of merchandise or concealing stolen property, as compared to 2 in the successful group. The difficulty prone group had committed sex offenses, assault and battery, or had feloniously pointed a weapon 3 times as compared to 6 for those in the successful, and 0 in the college student group. Driving while intoxicated had been the crime of 1 person only and he was in the difficulty prone group. Only 1 person in the difficulty prone group was on probation for a drug offense, while 3 in the successful group were, and 10 of the college students were on probation for drug related offenses. As seen in Table I, statistics in this study agree with those of Davis (1964), Glaser and O'Leary

(1966), and Sandhu (1974) in that none of the difficulty prone group had committed sex offenses, but 3 had committed assault and battery or had feloniously pointed a weapon.

#### Sexual and Racial Composition of Study Groups

Table II, presented below, illustrates the sexual and racial composition of the three groups in this study.

TABLE II  
SEX AND RACE OF PROBATIONERS

Probationers Group	SEX*				RACE					
	Male		Female		White		Black		American Indian	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student N = 25	22	88	3	12	16	64	7	28	2	8
Successful N = 25	17	68	8	32	16	64	8	32	1	4
Difficulty Prone N = 25	24	96	1	4	21	84	3	12	1	4
TOTAL N = 75	63	84	12	16	53	71	15	24	4	5

\*When subjected to  $\chi^2$  test, differences among the three groups, and differences between group 2, the successfals, and group 3, the difficulty prone probationers were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Similar to Davis' finding in 1964, this study showed a small proportion of female offenders, 16%. In agreement with Sutherland (1955) and again with Davis (1964), it was found that there was a significant

difference at the 0.05 level in the number of females found in the successful and difficulty prone groups; 32% of the successful probationers were females, whereas, only 4% of the unsuccessful group were women. For the college student group of probationers 12% were female.

Also seen in Table II is the racial composition of the groups in this study. For the entire study 71% were white, 24% black, and 5% were American Indian. No other races were represented in the study population. When the data were subjected to chi square comparison, no differences significant at the 0.05 level were found in the three group comparison, or in a comparison between any two groups. Concurring with Glaser and O'Leary's finding of 1966, it was found in this study that blacks were less likely to get into trouble once they were on probation. One can see that blacks comprised 28% of the college student group, 32% of the successful group, but only 12% of the difficulty prone group.

#### Age and Prior Record of Study Groups

Table III illustrates the average present age, and average age when placed on probation, and the age when first arrested for the probationers in this study.

The average present ages for the three groups were as follows: 22.68 years for the college students, 25.8 years for the successful probationers, and 27.08 for the difficulty prone probationers. In examining the average difference of age between the time when put on probation and the age at present, one finds that the college students had been on probation 1.28 years, while the successful probationers had been on probation 1.72 years, and the difficulty prone probationers had been on probation 1.12 years. According to Scarpitti and Stephenson

(1968) it is to be expected that people usually get into trouble during the first year of their probationary sentences. In this study, the probationers in the difficulty prone group had been on probation for less time than either the college students or the successful probationers. That is, their problems could already be identified early, on the average, as before the fourteenth month they were on probation.

TABLE III  
PROBATIONERS' PRESENT AGE, AGE WHEN PLACED ON PROBATION  
AND AGE AT FIRST ARREST

Probationer Group	Average Present Age Years	Average Age at Probation Years	Length of Time on Probation Years	Age at First Arrest*			
				Under 18		18 And Over	
				N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	22.68	- 21.40	= 1.28	2	8	23	92
Successful N = 25	25.28	- 23.56	= 1.72	7	28	18	72
Difficulty Prone N = 25	27.08	- 25.96	= 1.12	15	60	10	40
TOTAL N = 75	25.00	23.64		24	32	51	68

\* When subjected to  $\chi^2$  test, the age at first arrest comparisons between groups 1, 2, and 3 were significant at the 0.05 level; the comparisons of group 1 to group 3, and of group 2 to group 3 were also significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Sandhu (1974), Glaser and O'Leary (1956), and Glueck and Glueck (1959) agree that the younger the offender and the younger he was at his first arrest, the more likely he will have difficulty while on

probation. The finding that the younger the offender at this first arrest, the more likely he was to get into difficulty was confirmed by the present study. Concerning whether age at first arrest was before age 18, or after it, significant differences were revealed among the groups by a chi square comparison of the data. The college students differed significantly from the difficulty prone probationers, but not from the successful probationers. An important differentiation was found in that this item revealed significant differences between the successful group of probationers and the difficulty prone group. This would mean that those who eventually end up in difficulty while on probation are more likely to have been arrested first before the age of eighteen. For the whole group, 32% had first been arrested before the age of 18. Only 8% of the college students had first been arrested before the age of 18; 28% of the successful group had been arrested first previous to age 18; however, over half (60%) of the difficulty prone group of probationers had first been arrested before they were eighteen years old. This difference should serve as a warning signal to the supervising officer, then, because those who had been arrested before the age of 18 were twice as likely to be in the difficulty prone group as those who had not been arrested prior to the age of eighteen.

Presented in Table IV are data concerning the number of juvenile arrests and the number of juvenile probations for the respondents in this study. For the group as a whole, 40% reported having been arrested from 1 to 4 times as juveniles. Analysis of data on this table item revealed differences significant at the 0.05 level of significance in the three group comparison and between the college student group and the difficulty prone group; the number of juvenile arrests

was not significant at the 0.05 level when the successful and difficulty prone groups of probationers were compared. Though not significantly different at the 0.05 level, a trend of increase in the number of juvenile arrests was seen: the students had 16% arrests, the difficulty prone group had 44%, and the difficulty prone group had 60% juvenile arrests.

TABLE IV  
NUMBER OF JUVENILE ARRESTS AND JUVENILE  
PROBATIONS FOR PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Juvenile Arrests				Juvenile Probations*			
	No		1-4		No		1-2	
	Arrests	Arrests	Arrests	Arrests	Probation	Probations	Probations	Probations
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	21	84	4	16	24	96	1	4
Successful N = 25	14	56	11	44	23	92	2	8
Difficulty Prone N = 25	10	40	15	60	16	64	9	36
TOTAL N = 75	45	60	30	40	63	84	12	16

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, the comparison of group 1 to 3 was significantly different at the 0.05 level.  
When subjected to  $X^2$  test, the comparison of group 2 to group 3 was significant at the 0.05 level.

When comparing the number of juvenile probations of the offenders, as seen above in Table IV, important significant differences are found. The three group comparison was significantly different as well as the



comparison of group 1 to 3, and the comparison of group 2 to group 3. According to this study, the number of juvenile probations of the offenders was significantly greater for the difficulty prone group than for the college students or the successful probationers. Only 4% of the college students had been on probation as juveniles, 8% of the successful group had been on probation as juveniles, whereas in the difficulty prone or unsuccessful group of probationers, over one third, 36%, of the group reported having had 1 to 2 probationary periods as juveniles.

Table V shows the number of adult felony charges, and the number of felony charges in the last five years for the probationers in the study.

Table V shows that all the comparisons on the number of adult felony charges (other than the one they were put on probation for) were significant at the 0.05 level. The variance on this item is seen in the columns showing no other charges, and more than one other felony charge. The college students had 88% who had had no other felony charges and none with more than one other charge; 68% of the successful group had no other felony charges and only 4% had more than one other felony charge; of the difficulty prone group only 32% had no other charges against them while 36% had more than one other charge against them. This would be an item which should prove to be a good predictor of those who might be prone to difficulty while on probation. This item also shows that of the student probationers, virtually all had never had another felony charge; they truly are "first offenders."

Table V also shows the number of felony charges in the last five years for the respondents. When compared, significant differences at

the 0.05 level were found among the three groups and between group 1 and group 3, and group 2 and group 3. For this study the item seems to be a repeat of the item directly preceding it. Only 9 of the difficulty prone probationers had no other charges, while 20 of the successful group and 22 of the 25 college students had no other charges.

TABLE V  
NUMBER OF ADULT FELONY CHARGES AND NUMBER OF FELONY CHARGES IN LAST FIVE YEARS OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Number of Other Adult Felony Charges*						Number of Other Felony Charges in Last 5 Years**					
	None		One		One +		None		One		One +	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	22	88	3	12	0	0	22	88	3	12	0	0
Successful N = 25	17	68	7	28	1	4	20	80	3	12	2	8
Difficulty Prone N = 25	8	32	8	32	9	36	9	36	11	44	5	20
TOTAL N = 75	47	63	18	24	10	13	51	68	17	23	7	9

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, the three group comparison, and the comparisons of group 1 to 2, and 1 to 3, and 2 to 3 were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

\*\* When subjected to  $X^2$  test, the three group comparison, and comparisons of group 1 to 3, and of groups 2 to 3 on this item were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table VI illustrates the military service records of the probationers in the study, and shows the criminal record of the probationers' family members.

TABLE VI  
MILITARY SERVICE RECORD AND FAMILY CRIMINAL  
RECORD OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Military Service Record				Number of Family Members With Felony Record			
	Number of 25 Serving		Number Disciplined		None		One or More	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	4	16	1	25	21	84	4	16
Successful N = 25	6	24	3	50	17	68	8	32
Difficulty Prone N = 25	9	36	3	33	18	72	7	28
TOTALS	19	25	7	36	56	75	19	25

When subjected to  $X^2$  test, no comparisons between groups on the items in Table VI were significant at the 0.05 level.

Regarding military service, as seen in Table VI, only 25% of the group of 75 had been in the service. Differences between the number serving from each group were not significant at the 0.05 level. Of the 19 individuals who had been in the service, 7 had received disciplinary action; this amounted to 36% of those who had served. Differences between groups of those who had been disciplined while in the service were not significant between groups at the 0.05 level. This study does not support the work of Landis, Mercer, and Wolf (1969) who found that those who had received disciplinary action while in the service were more likely to fail on probation than those who had not.

As seen above in Table VI, when the number of family members with a felony record is considered, it is noted that 75% of the whole group

had no family members with felony charges; 25% of the probationers had some family member with a felony charge. No significant differences were found between the groups when they were compared in chi square test; family criminal histories were no more tied to those in the difficulty prone group than to those in the successful or college student group of probationers.

#### Items Relating Means of Support and Employment

Table VII illustrates the living arrangements of the probationers at the times when they committed the crimes for which they were put on probation, and living arrangements at present, and the table also illustrates the probationers means of support at the time of their crime.

Table VII shows the differences in the living arrangements of the probationers at the time they got into trouble with the law. Subgroup comparisons yielded differences significant at the 0.05 level in living arrangements between groups 1 and 2, and groups 1 and 3; the differences between the places lived of group 2, the successfuls, and group 3, the unsuccessful probationers was not significant at the 0.05 level. At this point, one begins to see a trend which holds throughout the data, and that is that the college probationers were more different from the other two groups than the successful probationers were from the difficulty prone probationers. Only 48% of the college students were living by themselves, with spouse, or parents when they got into trouble; 80% of the successful and 88% of the difficulty prone probationers were living by themselves or with spouse or parents. This meant that the majority of the students, 52% had "other" living arrangements, as compared to only 20% of the successful and 12% of the

difficulty prone probationers. This means that the college students live in different arrangements than the successful and difficulty prone groups but that living arrangement at the time the crime was committed is not a predictor of whether the probationer is eventually successful or prone to difficulty while serving his probationary sentence.

TABLE VII  
PAST AND PRESENT LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND MEANS OF  
SUPPORT OF PROBATIONERS AT TIME OF CRIME

Probationer Group	Living Arrangements*								Means of Support When Crime Was Committed**					
	When Arrested				Presently				Work- ing		Unem- ployed		Other	
	Parents, Spouse, Self	Other	Parents, Spouse, Self	Other	Parents, Spouse, Self	Other	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	12	48	13	52	15	60	10	40	4	16	1	4	20	80
Successful N = 25	20	80	5	20	21	84	4	16	18	72	5	20	2	8
Difficulty Prone N = 25	22	88	3	12	19	76	6	24	14	56	7	28	4	16
TOTALS N = 75	54	72	21	28	55	73	20	27	36	48	13	17	26	35

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, living arrangements at the time the crime was committed were found to be significant at the 0.05 level between the three groups and between groups 1 and 2, and between groups 1 and 3.

\*\*Means of support at the time the crime was committed, was found to be significant at the 0.05 level when groups 1, 2, and 3 were compared, and when groups 1 and 2, and groups 1 and 3 were compared with  $X^2$ .

Table VII shows that when the present living arrangements of the

respondents are compared no differences were significant at the 0.05 level of significance; other than leveling to less extreme distribution, the present living arrangements had not changed greatly from before.

Table VII also shows the means of support of the probationers at the time they committed their crimes. A significant difference (0.05 level) was found in the three group comparison and also between the comparison of group 1 to 2, and of group 1 to 3; but again, no difference was found between the successful and difficulty prone groups. The college students showed that 80% were "other" than working or unemployed. The successfals had 72% working and only 56% of the difficulty prone group had been working when the crimes were committed. Unemployed was listed by 20% of the successfals, 28% of the difficulty prone group, but only 4% of the college group had been unemployed.

Table VIII illustrates the present work status of the probationers in the study and also their levels of employment.

Writing in 1974, Sandhu, on page 252, notes that: "From all studies, regular employment emerges as the key point in the rehabilitation of the offender." The present study served to support Sandu's writings. Table VIII illustrates the present work status of the probationers in the study. Significant differences (0.05 level) were found in all chi square comparisons. The college students and successful probationers were the same when listing the number who were unemployed; both had 8% unemployed; however, the difficulty prone group showed 40% unemployment. Naturally, the student would tend to vary from the others by virtue of his different life style; many are supported by their families and their major responsibility is attending

classes rather than working. The successful probationers showed 92% working and only 8% unemployment; in contrast the unsuccessful or difficulty prone probationers showed an unemployment rate of 40% and only 44% employment. This difference appears to be a good indicator or predictor of difficulty on the part of the probationers in this study. The probationers in difficulty were five times as likely to be unemployed as were the successful probationers. Thus, when an officer becomes aware of an individual's unemployment, this should serve as an indicator that things may be coming to a breaking point for the difficulty prone probationer. Intervention or intensification of services to the probationers would seem to be an appropriate strategy as soon as an officer becomes aware of the unemployment of a probationer.

The employment level (when working) of the study participants is also seen in Table VIII. A comparison of the employment levels showed significant differences (0.05 level) in the three group comparison and when 1 and 2 were compared, and when groups 2 and 3 were compared, but not when group 1 and 2 were compared. The difficulty prone group had the highest number, 32% reporting unskilled work levels; 8% of the successful and 16% of the college students were unskilled. The college students showed 56% in semi-skilled jobs, as compared to 60% of the successful, and 16% of the difficulty prone group. In the skilled, management, and professional level were found 28% of the students, 32% of the successful, and 52% of the difficulty prone groups. It can be noted that the difficulty prone group had the largest number in both the unskilled, and the skilled, management, and professional positions. Perhaps this might cause a look at concern for the vocational level of the difficulty prone group for this study shows that the majority (52%)

of the difficulty prone group held skilled, management, and professional job skills when working. This means that low industrial skills were not directly associated with only the difficulty prone group for this study, but that the patterns of employment skills varied from group to group in a manner which does not easily lend itself to setting up predictors for which group a probationer would fall into if he had certain levels of job skills.

TABLE VIII  
PRESENT WORK STATUS AND EMPLOYMENT LEVEL  
OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Present Work Status*						Employment Level** When Working					
	Work- ing		Unem- ployed		Other		Un- Skill- ed	Semi- Skill- ed		Skilled Management, Professional		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	10	40	2	8	13	52	4	16	14	56	7	28
Successful N = 25	23	92	2	8	0	0	2	8	15	60	8	32
Difficulty Prone N = 25	11	44	10	40	4	16	8	32	4	16	13	52
TOTAL N = 75	44	59	14	19	17	22	14	19	33	44	28	37

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, all comparisons on present work status were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

\*\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, the three group comparison and that of 1 to 3, and of 2 to 3 groups were found to be significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Seen in Table IX are the length of the probationers' present jobs and whether or not they had ever held a job for at least a year.



TABLE IX  
 PROBATIONERS TIME ON PRESENT JOB  
 AND EVER HELD A JOB A YEAR

Probationer Group	Length of Present Job*								Ever Held a Job At Least a Year			
	Unem- ployed		Under Year		Over Year		Student		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	100	19	76	6	24
Successful N = 25	0	0	12	48	13	52	0	0	22	88	3	12
Difficulty Prone N = 25	13	52	10	40	2	8	0	0	17	68	8	32
TOTAL N = 75	13	17	22	29	15	20	25	33	58	77	17	23

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, the three group comparison on this item and the comparison of group 2, the successfuls, to group 3, the difficulty prone, was significant at the 0.05 level.

As seen in Table IX, one finds that due to the different situation of the students, length of their present job was excluded from the comparison. Statistical analysis revealed a difference at the 0.05 level when the successful and difficulty prone groups were compared. None of the successful probationers were presently unemployed. Successful probationers showed 48% employed less than a year, and difficulty prone probationers had 40% employed less than a year. The difference between the number of successful and difficulty prone probationers employed for more than one year was large and significant at the 0.05 level. Only 8% of the difficulty prone probationers had been employed at their jobs

for more than a year, but 52% of the successful probationers had had their jobs for more than a year.

Table IX also shows whether the study respondents had ever held a job at least a year. No significant differences were found at the 0.05 level when the groups were compared. For the total group, 77% had held a job at least a year and 23% had not. The successful group showed 88% had been employed at a job for a year but only 68% of the difficulty prone probationers had ever been employed at the same job at least a year.

The information in Tables VIII and IX seems to be somewhat in conflict. Perhaps more important to a probationer's success than his level of employment is his skill at maintaining employment and knowing those things which make him a desirable employee, such as showing up for work on time or calling in when ill; perhaps these skills are those lacked by the difficulty prone probationers rather than the actual job skills.

Table X shows job salary and job satisfaction of probationers.

The adequacy of salary for probationers is seen in Table X. No chi square comparisons made on this item were statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Of the total group, 84% indicated they felt their income was adequate, 16% said it had not been. About the same number in each of the three groups said their salary was not adequate.

Table X also shows the job satisfaction of the probationers. In this comparison significant differences did not exist at the 0.05 level. Of the students 5 were not satisfied with their jobs as compared to 4 of the successful probationers and 3 of the unsuccessful group. The difference on this item is again seen when we look at those answering that the item was not applicable to them because they were not working.

TABLE X  
ADEQUACY OF SALARY AND PRESENT JOB SATISFACTION  
FOR PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	<u>Adequacy of Salary Last/Present Job</u>				<u>Satisfaction with Last Or Present Job</u>					
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Not App.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	25	92	2	8	13	52	5	20	7	28
Successful N = 25	22	88	3	12	20	80	4	16	1	4
Difficulty Prone N = 25	18	72	7	28	11	44	3	12	11	44
TOTALS N = 75	63	84	12	16	44	59	12	16	19	25

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  comparison, none of the comparisons on either item in Table X were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

#### Family and Personal History of Probationers

Birth order and family size of probationers is shown in Table XI. Considered in Table XI is the birth order of the probationers. The college students 24% were first born, 40% were middle born, and 36% were last born children. In the successful group 36% were first born, 56% were middle children, and 8% were last born. Of the difficulty prone probationers, 26% were first born, 52% were middle born, and 21% were last born. Statistical comparison on this item revealed only one comparison which was significant at the 0.05 level, that of the students and the successful probationers.

TABLE XI  
BIRTH ORDER AND FAMILY SIZE  
OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Birth Order in Family*						Number Children in Family**				Average Number X
	First Child		Middle Child		Last Child		3 or Less		4 or More		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Students N = 25	6	24	10	40	9	36	12	48	13	52	3.64
Successful N = 25	9	36	14	56	2	8	4	16	21	84	5.52
Difficulty Prone N = 25	5	20	15	60	5	20	4	16	21	84	5.56
TOTAL N=75	20	26	39	52	16	21	20	27	55	73	4.90

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, only the comparison of group 1 to group 2 was significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

\*\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test the 1, 2, 3, group comparisons, and comparison of group 1 and 2, and of group 1 to 3, were all significant at the 0.05 level.

Table XI illustrates the family sizes of the seventy five study participants. Of the college students, 48% came from families with three or fewer children and 52% came from families with four or more children. For the successful probationers, 16% came from families with three or fewer children and 84% came from families with four or more children. The difficulty prone probationers also had 16% coming from families with three or fewer children, 84% from families with four or more children. Differences significant at the 0.05 level were found when comparing groups 1 and 2, groups 1 and 3, but not groups 2 and 3. Therefore, the college students on probation differed more from both

the successful and difficulty prone groups than the successful probationers varied from the difficulty prone probationers.

The average family size from which the respondents came is also seen in Table XI. For the college student probationers there was an average of 3.64 children in the family, for the successful probationers 5.52 children, and for the difficulty prone probationers family size was 5.56 children. While Glueck and Glueck (1959) found that those in their study did not, in this study the successful and difficulty prone probationers came from families of basically the same size (5.5 children), while the college student probationers tended to come from families with fewer children (3.6).

Presented in Table XII is information concerning the arrangements by which the probationers were reared and the mother's (or female's) role in the home in which they were reared.

Responses in Table XII were regrouped into those who said they had been reared by both parents and those reared by any other arrangement than both parents. Chi square comparison showed differences in the three group comparison and also when group 1, the students, was compared to group 3, the difficulty prone probationers. Of the college students on probation, 84% had been reared by both parents, 60% of the successful probationers had been reared by both parents, but only 44% of the difficulty prone probationers had been reared by both parents.

The role of the female in the home of the probationers is seen in Table XII. No differences were significant at the 0.05 level when chi square comparison of the data was made. The students had 48% with mothers who had worked while the successful and difficulty prone group of probationers had 52% mothers who worked. The results of this study

do not show that those who had mothers who worked were any more likely to be in the difficulty prone probationer group than those who had mothers who did not work.

TABLE XII  
WHO REARED PROBATIONER AND  
MOTHER'S ROLE IN HOME

Probationer Group	Reared By*				Mother's Role			
	Both Parents		Other		Worked		Was Housewife	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	21	84	4	16	12	48	13	52
Successful N = 25	15	60	10	40	13	52	12	48
Difficulty Prone N = 25	11	44	14	56	13	52	12	48
TOTAL N = 75	47	63	28	37	38	51	37	49

\*When subjected to  $\chi^2$  test, significant difference at the 0.05 level was found in the 1-2-3 group comparison on this item and on the comparison of group 1 to group 3.

Shown in Table XIII is the welfare history, abuse or neglect history, and history of parental conflict for the probationers.

Family welfare receipt history as illustrated in Table XIII shows the group as a whole reported that 28% had at some time received welfare; this left 72% who stated that their families had never received welfare assistance. At almost 30% this may seem a high proportion, but one should note that the question asked had the respondent's family ever

received welfare. No length of time for the receipt of assistance was specified. It might have been well to ask not only whether there had been receipt of welfare assistance but, if so, for what length of time. The trend was for the number receiving welfare to increase from 21% of the student probationers, to 28% of the successuls, as compared to 36% of the difficulty prone probationers, but the differences were not significant at the 0.05 level.

TABLE XIII  
WELFARE, ABUSE, AND PARENTAL CONFLICT  
HISTORY OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Family Welfare History				Abused Or Neglected Child				Parental Conflict In Home			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	5	21	19	79	2	8	23	92	5	20	20	80
Successful N = 25	7	28	18	72	2	8	23	92	8	32	17	68
Difficulty Prone N = 25	9	36	16	64	4	16	21	84	10	40	15	60
TOTAL N = 75	21	28	53	72	8	11	67	89	23	31	52	69

When subjected to X2 test, no comparisons for any of the items in Table XIII were significant at the 0.05 level.

Answers to whether they had ever felt abused or neglected as children is seen in probationers' responses in Table XIII. The total groups showed 11% had been abused or neglected. Although the statistical comparison of the groups was not significant at the 0.05 level, it

might be well to note that the college student and successful groups both reported 8% abuse or neglect as compared to 16% abuse in the difficulty prone group.

Parental conflict in the home as seen by the probationers is seen in Table XIII. For the whole group, 37% reported that their parents had argued a lot. McCord, McCord, and Zola (1959) stated that a home which was quarrelsome is more conducive to antisocial behavior in the child than is a broken home. Although an argumentative atmosphere may have precipitated the original criminal behavior in the respondents, this study does not show a difference in the parental conflict in the college, successful, and difficulty prone groups at the 0.05 level of significance. But 40% of the difficulty prone group reported parental conflict as compared to 32% of the successfals, and 20% of the students.

Table XIV illustrates the number of times the probationers parents had each married. Chi square comparison of the two items yielded no differences significant between the groups on either item. The students reported that 76% of their mothers had been married once and 24% had been married more than once. The successfals reported 56% of their mothers had been married once while 44% had been married more than one time. The difficulty prone probationers reported that 44% of their mothers had been married once while 56% had been married more than once.

Table XIV also shows the number of times the respondents' fathers had been married; no significant differences (0.05 level) were found in the between group comparisons. Of the college students, 72% had fathers who had been married once, 28% had fathers married more than one time. For both the successful and difficulty prone probationers, 56% had



fathers who had been married once, and 44% had fathers who had been married more than one time.

TABLE XIV  
NUMBER OF MARRIAGES OF PROBATIONERS' PARENTS

Probationer Group	# Mother's Marriages				# Father's Marriages			
	Once		More Than Once		Once		More Than Once	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	19	76	6	24	18	72	7	28
Successful N = 25	14	56	11	44	14	56	11	44
Difficulty Prone N = 25	11	44	14	56	14	56	11	44
TOTAL N - 75	44	58	31	42	46	61	29	39

When subjected to X<sup>2</sup> test, none of the comparisons on any of the items between the groups was significant at the 0.05 level.

Table XIV shows the number of times the respondents fathers had been married; no significant differences (0.05 level) were found in the between group comparisons. Of the college students, 72% had fathers who had been married once, 28% had fathers married more than one time.

Table XV shows whether the groups got along with their parents.

Response to whether they got along with their mother (or the females) who reared them is seen in Table XV. No significant differences were found (at the 0.05) level between the groups when compared on this

item. Only 3 of the respondents stated they had not gotten along with their mothers. Of those three, 2, or 8% came from the successful group, and 1, or 4% came from the difficulty prone group; none of the students had not gotten along with their mothers.

TABLE XV  
WHETHER PROBATIONERS GOT ALONG  
WITH THEIR MOTHER OR FATHER

Probationer Group	Got Along With Mother				Got Along With Father					
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Not App.	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	25	100	0	0	23	92	1	4	1	4
Successful N = 25	23	92	2	8	22	88	2	8	1	4
Difficulty Prone N = 25	24	96	1	4	17	68	6	24	2	8
TOTAL N = 75	72	96	3	4	62	83	9	12	4	5

\*When subjected to  $\chi^2$  test, none of the between group comparisons on either of the above items was significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table XV also shows whether the probationers had gotten along with their fathers. For the whole group 83% said yes, 12% said no, and 5% said there had been no male figure in their home. The statistical comparison of the three groups showed no differences at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table XVI reveals whether probationers' parents were still alive.

TABLE XVI  
 PROBATIONER'S MOTHER OR FATHER  
 STILL LIVING

Probationer Group	Mother Deceased Or Living				Father Deceased or Living							
	Deceased		Within 2 Yrs.		Alive		Deceased		Within 2 Yrs.		Alive	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	1	4	1	100	24	96	5	20	1	20	20	80
Successful N = 25	5	20	4	80	20	80	3	12	1	33	22	88
Difficulty Prone N = 25	5	20	3	60	20	80	8	32	2	25	17	68
TOTAL N = 75	11	15	8	73	64	75	16	21	4	25	9	79

When subjected to statistical analysis, none of the between group comparisons on the above items was significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Whether the probationer's mother was deceased or living is seen in Table XVI. No differences were significant to the 0.05 level when the three groups were compared. Only 4% of the students had mothers who were deceased, but the successful and difficulty prone groups reported 20% of their mothers were deceased. For the total group, 15% had deceased mothers; when the raw data were reviewed it was found that the deaths of the probationers' mothers had not occurred when they were young children, indeed, 73% of the deaths of the mothers had happened within two years before the probationers had committed their crimes.

Data concerning whether probationers' fathers were deceased or living are seen in Table XVI. No significant differences (0.05 level) were found in the group comparisons on this item. For the total group,

21% had deceased fathers, but only 25% of the deaths of the fathers had occurred within two years of the time they committed the crimes for which they were put on probation.

Shown in Table XVII are the professional levels of the probationers' fathers in this study.

TABLE XVII  
FATHER'S PROFESSIONAL LEVEL

Probationer Group	Father's Professional Level*					
	Unskilled		Semi- Skilled		Skilled, Management, Professional	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student N = 25	1	4	2	8	22	88
Successful N = 25	4	16	10	40	11	44
Difficulty Prone N = 25	0	0	6	24	19	76
TOTAL N = 75	5	7	18	24	52	69

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, differences between groups 1 and 2, 1 and 3, and 1-2-3, were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table XVII shows the professional level of the probationer's fathers. When groups 1 and 2 were compared and when groups 2 and 3 were compared differences were significant at the 0.05 level of

significance. For the three groups, only 7% had fathers who held unskilled jobs, 24% had fathers with semi-skilled professions, and 69% had fathers in the skilled, management, or professional level. Oddly enough, none of the difficulty prone probationers reported fathers in unskilled work as opposed to 4% of the students and 16% of the success-fuls. The students showed 8% of their fathers in semi-skilled work and 88% of their fathers in skilled, management, and professional work. The successfals had 40% fathers in semi-skilled work and 44% in skilled, management, and professional work. The difficulty prone probationers stated that 24% of their fathers had semi-skilled jobs while 76% of their dads held skilled, management, and professional positions. Again we see that, contrary to what might be popular opinion, the difficulty prone or unsuccessful group of probationers did not come from homes with mostly unskilled fathers. Three-fourths of the difficulty prone group listed their fathers occupations as skilled or higher level and none of the difficulty prone group claimed to have fathers whose work was at the unskilled level. In agreement with what might be popular expectation, this study did show that 88% of the college students' fathers were listed at the skilled level or above.

Shown in Table XVIII are the marital status, marital satisfaction, and number of times married for the probationers in the study group. Comparing the marital status of the seventy five respondents one finds only one comparison which was significant at the 0.05 level of significance; this was between group 1 and group 3. Single, never married, was listed by 52% of the group as its marital status, 32% of the seventy five respondents were married, 11% were divorced, 1% were separated, and 4% were common law married at least a year. The students

TABLE XVIII

MARITAL STATUS, MARITAL SATISFACTION AND NUMBER OF  
TIMES MARRIED OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Present Marital Status of Probationers*										Marital Satisfaction				Number of Times Married**					
	Single		Marr- ied		Div- orced		Sepa- rated		Common Law		Yes		No		None		Once		More Than Once	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	18	72	5	20	2	8	0	0	0	0	5	100	0	0	18	72	6	24	1	4
Successful N = 25	12	48	10	40	2	8	0	0	1	4	11	100	0	0	14	56	7	28	4	16
Difficulty Prone N = 25	9	36	9	36	4	16	1	4	2	8	9	82	2	18	9	36	11	44	5	20
TOTAL N = 75	39	52	24	32	8	11	1	1	3	4	25	93	2	7	41	55	24	32	10	13

\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, only the comparison of group 1 to group 3 was significant at the 0.05 level of significance on this item.

\*\*When subjected to  $X^2$  test, only the comparison of group 1 to group 3 was significant at the 0.05 level of significance on this item.

varied when compared to the difficulty prone probationers, but not in comparison to the successful probationers.

Satisfaction with marriage is also seen in Table XVIII; no differences were significant at the 0.05 level when the three groups' satisfaction with their marriages was compared. Of the 27 probationers who were married 25 stated they were satisfied with their marriages and 2 said they were not.

The last item in Table XVIII illustrates the number of times the probationers in the study had been married. Only the comparison of group 1 to group 3 was significant at the 0.05 level. For the whole group 55% said they had never been married, 32% had been married once, and 13% had been married more than once. The college students were twice as likely to have never been married as those in the difficulty prone group; 24% of the students had been married once as compared to 44% of the unsuccessful group; only 4% of the students had been married more than once as compared to 16% in the successful and 20% in the difficulty prone group.

Table XIX illustrates the religious faiths of the probationers in the study. Chi square comparison of this data revealed no differences significant at the 0.05 level. A total of 23% of the three groups stated that their religion was "none," 6% were Catholic, 1% were Jewish, and 69% were Protestant. Speculation could be made whether the percent listing their religion as "none" might be higher than the general population and might, therefore, be illustrative of some type of alienation of feelings on the part of the probationers. In considering this response, note that wording of the question was careful to ask of what faith the participant considered himself to be, rather than

what church he attended. This was done to allow those who seldom if ever attend church the opportunity to list a religious faith even though they might not regularly attend church.

TABLE XIX  
RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

Probationer Group	Religious Preference of Probationers							
	None		Catholic		Jewish		Protestant	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student N = 25	7	28	3	12	1	4	14	56
Successful N = 25	5	20	0	0	0	0	20	80
Difficulty Prone N = 25	5	20	2	8	0	0	18	72
TOTAL N = 75	17	23	5	6	1	1	52	69

When subjected to chi square comparison, none of the comparisons in Table XIX were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table XX illustrates the psychological history and presence of physical disability for the probationers in the study.

When subjected to chi square comparison, the differences in the the psychological histories of the probationers were not significant between groups at the 0.05 level of significance. For the whole group, 37% said that they had either seen or wanted to see a psychologist or



psychiatrist at some time; 63% of the group stated they had neither seen a psychologist nor wanted to do so.

TABLE XX  
PSYCHOLOGICAL HISTORY AND PRESENCE OF  
PHYSICAL DISABILITY IN PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Ever Seen or Wanted To See A Psychologist				Presence of Physical Disability			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	8	32	17	68	1	4	24	96
Successful N = 25	7	28	18	72	1	4	24	96
Difficulty Prone N = 25	13	52	12	48	1	4	24	96
TOTAL N = 75	28	37	47	63	3	4	72	96

When subjected to chi square comparison none of the between group differences on the items in Table XX were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

When the presence of physical disability in the probationer groups was compared in Table XX the differences between the groups were not significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Only 4% of the while group reported the presence of a physical disability; there was only one person in each group who stated that he had a disability.

#### Family Educational History of Probationers

Table XXI illustrates the educational levels of the parents of the

TABLE XXI

## EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF PROBATIONERS' PARENTS

Probationers Group	Father's Education Level*								Mother's Education Level**							
	Less Than H.S.		H.S.		More Than H.S.		Don't Know		Less Than H.S.		H.S.		More Than H.S.		Don't Know	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	3	12	10	40	11	44	1	04	4	16	11	44	10	40	0	0
Successful N = 25	11	44	5	20	3	12	6	24	12	48	6	24	4	16	3	12
Difficulty Prone N = 25	13	52	3	12	2	08	7	28	9	36	7	28	2	08	7	28
TOTAL N = 75	27	36	18	24	16	21	14	19	25	33	24	32	16	21	10	13

\* \*\*When subjected to  $\chi^2$  test, the 1-2-3 group comparison and the comparison of groups 1 to 2, and of groups 1 to 3, were significant at the 0.05 level on both items in Table XXI.

probationers in the study. Fathers' educational levels were found to differ significantly at the 0.05 level between the college students' fathers and the fathers of both the successful and difficulty prone probationers, but no differences in this item were found between the successful and difficulty prone groups. Only 12% of the college students had fathers with less than a high school degree; 40% had high school degrees, and 44% of the students' fathers had more than a high school education. The students did not know their fathers' educational levels 4% of the time. The successful probationers reported 44% fathers with less than high school education and 52% of the difficulty prone group had fathers with less than high school educations. The successful probationers reported that 20% of their fathers had graduated from high school as compared to 12% of the fathers of the difficulty prone probationers. Successful probationers had 12% fathers with more than high school education as compared to 8% of the difficulty prone group. Successful probationers stated 24% did not know their father's educational level, 28% of the difficulty prone group did not know their fathers' educational level, but only 4% of the students stated that they did not know the educational level of their fathers.

At the 0.05 level, significant differences were found between group comparisons of mothers' educational levels as seen in Table XXI. Group 1 varied from groups 2 and 3; but the differences between the successful and difficulty prone groups did not prove significant at the 0.05 level. College students had 16% mothers with less than high school education, as compared to 48% of the successfals' mothers and 36% of the difficulty prones' mothers. College students reported that 44% of their moms had high school degrees while only 24% of the

successfuls and 28% of the difficulty prones' mothers had high school degrees. The college students showed that 40% of their mothers had more than a high school degree compared to 16% of the successfuls' moms and 8% of the difficulty prone group. None of the college students said they did not know their mothers' educational level, whereas 12% of the successful group and 28% of the difficulty prone probationers stated they did not know the educational level of their mothers.

The data illustrates that successful and difficulty prone probationers were less likely to know their parents' educational level than the college students. Perhaps this is due to lack of emphasis on education in the homes or less cohesive families in the successful and difficulty prone groups.

Table XXII shows the probationer's educational level, whether he obtained a GED certificate, the number in his graduating class, and his attitude toward school. In regard to the educational level of the probationers, differences significant at the 0.05 level were found in the three group comparison and when the students were compared to the other groups, but not when the successful and difficulty prone groups were compared. Therefore the item is not a good predictor of proneness to difficulty while on probation. None of the college students had less than high school education, 8% (still freshmen) had high school educations and 92% had more than high school education. The successful probationers reported 56% with less than high school degrees, compared to 72% of the difficulty prone group with less than high school degrees. The successful probatinners had 32% with high school degrees

TABLE XXII

## EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF PROBATIONER

	<u>Probationer's Education Level*</u>						<u>Obtained</u>		<u>Number in*</u>				<u>Probationer's Attitude**</u>					
	<u>Less</u>		<u>H.S.</u>		<u>More</u>		<u>GED</u>		<u>Graduating Class</u>		<u>Liked It</u>		<u>Neutral</u>		<u>Didn't</u>			
	<u>Than H.S.</u>				<u>Than H.S.</u>		<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Less</u>	<u>More</u>	<u>Liked It</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Like It</u>	<u>Like It</u>	<u>Like It</u>			
	N	%	N	%	N	%			N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
Students N = 25	0	0	2	8	23	92	0	0	3	12	22	88	20	80	2	08	3	12
Successful N = 25	14	56	8	32	3	12	1	15	11	44	14	56	14	56	5	20	6	24
Difficulty Prone N = 25	18	72	5	20	2	8	6	13	12	48	13	52	13	52	9	36	3	12
TOTAL N=75	32	43	15	20	28	37	7	28	26	34	49	66	47	63	16	21	12	16

\*When subjected to chi square comparison the 1-2-3 group and the 1-2, and 1-3 group comparison were significant at the 0.05 level of significance on these two items.

\*\*When subjected to chi square comparison the 1-3 group comparison for this item was significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

compared to only 29% in the difficulty-prone group. Only 12% in the successful group had more than a high school education, but only 8% of the difficulty-prone probationers had beyond high school education. As a whole, the groups had 43% with less than high school education which seems somewhat high, but 37% had above a high school education. The inclusion of the college students makes the overall picture look better. All of those with less than high school education came from the successful and unsuccessful groups, but the differences between the two groups was not significant at the 0.05 level; only 10% of those in the successful and unsuccessful groups had beyond high school education as compared to 92% of those in the college student group of probationers.

Also seen in Table XXII is whether those probationers who had not graduated from high school had gotten a GED certificate. Comparison of the data on this item was not significant at the 0.05 level of significance. None of the college students had not graduated from high school; of the 15 successful probationers who had not graduated from high school 1 had obtained a GED certificate while 6 of the 13 difficulty-prone probationers who had not graduated from high school had obtained GED certificates.

As seen in Table XXII, 34% of the respondents in the study came from high schools with less than a hundred students in their graduating classes while 66% came from schools with more than a hundred students. Comparing size of graduating classes it was found that the college students had come from larger schools, 88%, compared to 56% in the successful, and 52% in the difficulty-prone group. Significant

difference was found (0.05 level) between the college students and the other two groups.

Table XXII also illustrates the probationers' attitudes toward school. On the whole, 63% said they liked school, 21% said they did not care, and 16% said they did not like school. In the chi square comparisons between the groups, the only significant difference (0.05 level) was between the attitudes of group 1, the students, and group 3, the difficulty prone probationers. Of the college students on probation, 80% said they had liked school, as opposed to only 52% of the difficulty prone group of probationers. The differences between the attitudes of the successful and difficulty prone groups toward school were small and were not statistically significant at the 0.05 level and would not be predictors of difficulty proneness.

Shown in Table XXIII are the drug histories of the probationers in this study. Whether there had been an adult with a drug or drinking problem in the home in which the probationer was reared was not an item which revealed significant differences (at the 0.05 level) between the groups. For the whole group, 19% or 14 of the 75 probationers stated that they had been reared with an adult with a drug or drinking problem in their home.

Also seen in Table XXIII is whether the probationers themselves had ever had a drug problem. Only 7% of the entire group stated they had ever had a drug problem. The between group comparisons for this item were not significant at the 0.05 level of significance. Perhaps this 7% level may seem lower than one would speculate.

Differences significant at the 0.05 level are seen on the next item, whether the probationers had ever had a drinking problem, in

TABLE XXIII

## DRUG HISTORY OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Adult With Drug Or Drinking Problem In Home				Personal Drug Problem				Personal* Drinking Problem				Regular** Marihuana User				Crime*** Committed Under Influence			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	4	16	21	84	1	4	24	96	1	4	24	96	16	64	9	36	13	52	12	48
Successful N = 25	6	24	19	76	1	4	24	96	1	4	24	96	5	20	20	80	7	28	18	72
Difficulty Prone N = 25	4	16	21	84	3	12	22	88	32	17	68	9	36	16	64	15	60	10	40	
TOTAL N = 75	14	19	61	81	5	07	70	93	13	65	87	30	40	45	60	35	47	40	53	

\*When subjected to chi square test, significant differences (0.05 level) were found on the item between groups 1-2-3, 1-3, and 2-3.

\*\*When subjected to chi square test, significant differences (0.05 level) were found on the item between groups 1-2-3, and 1-2.

\*\*\*When subjected to chi square test, significant differences (0.05 level) were found on the item between groups 2 and 3.



Table XXIII. Of the 75 participants, 13% said they had had a drinking problem; this figure is almost double the percentage of those who had drug problems, but it is still reasonably low. When between group comparisons were made on this item, significant differences were found between the student and difficulty prone group and between the successful and difficulty prone group. This would indicate that presence of an admitted problem with drinking would be a good predictor of an individual's eventual success or failure while on probation. Only 4% each, in the successful and college student probationers reported having a drug problem but 32% of the difficulty prone probationers said they had had a drinking problem.

Next seen in Table XXIII is the regular use of marihuana by the probationers in the study. Of the entire group, 40% stated that they had smoked marihuana regularly. Between group differences were significant at the 0.05 level in the three group comparison and when the college students were compared to the successful probationers. The students reported 64% having smoked marihuana regularly, second to them were the difficulty prone probationers with 36% having smoked marihuana regularly; only 20% of the successful probationers reported having smoked marihuana on a regular basis. Regular smoking of marihuana did not turn out to be a predictor of likelihood of success or failure while on probation but it did show that a high percentage, 40%, said they had smoked it on a regular basis. One should note that this question addressed itself to whether there had been regular usage of marihuana instead of whether they had ever smoked it. This seems to be a rather high percentage of regular use of the drug. When excluding all of the

college students (where use was most prevalent) there were still 28% of the respondents who stated that they had smoked marihuana regularly.

The last item in Table XXIII shows whether the probationers had been under the influence of drugs or alcohol at the time their crimes were committed. Of all those in the study, 47% reported that they had been under the influence when they had committed their crime. When compared statistically for significant differences at the 0.05 level, it was found that the only difference between the groups was between the successful and the difficulty prone group; this item would appear to be a good predictor of the probationer's ultimate success or failure on probation. The difficulty prone probationers showed 60% under the influence while the successful probationers showed 28% having been under the influence of either drugs or alcohol when their crimes were committed. Perhaps this dependence on alcohol or drugs (often used as an excuse for committing a crime) can be tied to Halleck's statement (1967, p. 285) that, "Most offenders do not see themselves as aggressors against society but rather as victims of society."

#### Items Related to Criminal Justice

Presented in Table XXIV are items concerning the arrest and search circumstances of the probationers in this study.

Table XXIV illustrates the time and place arrested for the study participants. This item resulted from speculation that those who were not arrested at the scene or "in the act" were most likely to be accused of crimes they had not actually committed and might be those who would experience the greatest difficulty while serving a probationary sentence. The data revealed no significant (0.05 level) differences

when the groups were compared with each other. For the group as a whole, 39% had been arrested at the scene of the crime and 61% had been arrested later with a warrant.

TABLE XXIV  
ARREST AND SEARCH CIRCUMSTANCES  
OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Time and Place Arrested				Legality of Search					
	At Scene		Later		Number Searched		Legal		Illegal	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	14	56	11	44	15	60	5	33	10	67
Successful N = 25	8	32	17	68	18	72	11	61	7	39
Difficulty N = 25	7	28	18	72	15	60	6	40	9	60
TOTAL N = 75	29	39	46	61	48	64	22	46	26	54

When subjected to chi square test, none of the comparisons between the groups were significant at the 0.05 level for the items in Table XXIV.

The probationers' opinions as to the legality of the search made in connection with their arrests is seen in Table XXIV. The chi square comparisons between the groups were not significant at the 0.05 level on this item. Of the total, 64% were searched; of those, 46% felt the searches conducted had been legal and 54%, the majority, felt that they had been searched illegally. When looking at the difference in group responses, it is interesting to note that the college student and the

difficulty prone probationers had attitudes most similar on this item. Only 39% of the successful probationers felt they were illegally searched but 67% of the students and 60% of the difficulty prone group felt they had been illegally searched. Perhaps the responses to the question can serve to point out that those who are least confident in the system are the students and the unsuccessful probationers. Critics might say that the successful probationers had been made not only to conform to the system, but also to like it.

Shown in Table XXV are the length of time the probationers spent in jail, the method by which their attorney was retained, and whether they pled guilty or went to trial on their charges.

TABLE XXV  
JAIL TIME, RETAINMENT OF ATTORNEY AND  
METHOD OF PLEA

Probationer Group	Jail Time				Retainment Of*				Method of Deciding Guilt			
	Seven Or Less Days		Over Seven Days		Attorney Hired		Appointed		Pled		Had Trial	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	15	60	10	40	21	84	4	16	24	96	1	4
Successful N = 25	17	68	8	32	14	56	11	44	25	100	0	0
Difficulty Prone N = 25	11	44	14	56	11	44	14	56	25	100	0	0
TOTAL N = 75	43	57	32	43	46	61	29	39	74	99	1	1

\*When subjected to chi square test, the 1-2-3 group and the 1-3 group comparisons were different at the 0.05 level of significance.

In reviewing the raw data concerning length of time spent in jail which appears in Table XXV, several category groupings of the data were analyzed in an attempt to find significant differences between the groups, but no comparisons significant at the 0.05 level of significance were found. To those who would say that only certain groups are held in jail, the data in this study do not support their statement. It should be noted that those for whom charges were dropped or reduced to misdemeanors are not in this sample; perhaps that group would receive advantages that the group on probation did not receive. For the groups, 60% of the student group had been in jail seven days or less, 68% of the successfuls were in jail seven days or less, and 44% of the difficulty prone probationers had been in jail seven days or less. The rest of the probationers had spent more than seven days in jail.

Also shown in Table XXV is whether the probationers had retained their attorneys or let the court appoint them. Significant differences (at the 0.05 level) were found in the three group comparison and when group 1 was compared to group 3. For the whole group, 61% had retained their own attorneys. In the student group, 84% had retained their own attorneys as had 56% in the successful group and 44% in the difficulty prone group. Thus, the only group in which a majority of the subjects had court appointed attorneys was the difficulty prone group.

A revealing item is seen in terms of implications for criminal justice in Table XXV. Of the 75 probationers in this study, only 1 of them was tried to determine guilt rather than pleading guilty to the crime. Apparently plea bargaining is the overwhelming way to settle cases in

this day and time since attorneys and trials are extremely costly not only to the client but also to the state. One might be tempted to speculate how many of the accused would elect to go to trial if the court system were run on a no cost basis and no price tag were placed on justice.

Table XXVI shows the type of sentence received by the participants and their satisfaction with their attorney. In regard to type of sentence received, differences were significant at the 0.05 level when a chi square test was applied to the data when groups 1, 2, and 3 were compared and when group 1, the students, was compared to group 3, the difficulty prone probationers. The college students had 80% deferred sentences, the successful probationers showed 72% deferred sentences, and only 44% of the difficulty prone group of probationers were on deferred sentences.

Table XXVI also shows the probationers' satisfaction with the representation of their attorneys. All three groups had exactly the same responses in response to whether they were satisfied with the representation of their attorneys. For the whole group 76% or 19 in each group had been satisfied with their representation, while 6 in each group or 24% said they had not been satisfied with the representation of their attorneys. That one fourth of the probationers were not satisfied with their attorneys' representation, which was the same level of dissatisfaction for each group, might cast some doubt on the level of justice which is in operation in the criminal justice system.

Table XXVII shows the probationers' attitudes toward the courts and their evaluation of their probability of success while on probation.

TABLE XXVI  
 TYPE SENTENCE RECEIVED AND SATISFACTION  
 WITH ATTORNEYS' REPRESENTATION

Probationer Group	Type Sentence* Received				Attorney Representation Satisfactory			
	Deferred		Suspended		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Student N = 25	20	80	5	20	19	76	6	24
Successful N = 25	18	72	7	28	19	76	6	24
Difficulty Prone N = 25	11	44	14	56	19	76	6	24
TOTAL N = 75	49	66	26	34	57	76	18	24

\*When subjected to  $\chi^2$  test, the 1-2-3 group and the 1-3 group comparisons on this item were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

TABLE XXVII  
 EVALUATION OF COURT AND  
 SUCCESS PROBABILITY

Probationer Group	Felt People Are Treated Fair In Court				Felt They Would Successfully Complete Probation			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	14	56	11	44	25	100	0	0
Successful N = 25	16	64	9	36	25	100	0	0
Difficulty Prone N = 25	10	40	15	60	20	80	5	20
TOTAL N = 75	40	53	35	47	70	93	5	7

When subjected to chi square analysis none of the comparisons between the two groups were significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

Table XXVII reveals that only 54% of the respondents felt they were treated fairly by the courts, this is barely more than half of the group. Those most likely to say they had been treated fairly were in the successful group at 64%; again they had the most favorable or compliant attitude toward the system. The college students had 56% saying the courts were fair while 40% of those in the difficulty prone group felt the courts treated people fairly. Between group differences on this item were not significant at the 0.05 level when the data were subjected to chi square test.

Table XXVII also shows whether the probationers felt they would be able to successfully complete their probationary sentences. When subjected to chi square test none of the between group differences on this item were significant at the 0.05 level. Of the students and successful probationers, 100% felt they would successfully complete their sentences, while only 80% of the difficulty prone probationers (some of whom had new charges) felt they would complete their probation.

Table XVIII illustrates the miscellaneous items of the number of aliases, tatoos, and the voting history of the probationers in the study. Regarding the use of an alias, when the data on the item were subjected to chi square analysis, none of the comparisons were significant at the 0.05 level of significance. For the entire group 5% had used an alias; one college student, one successful probationer, and two difficulty prone probationers had used an alias.

Also seen in Table XXVIII is information concerning the presence of tatoos for probationers in the study. Of the entire sample, 24% had tatoos. In chi square comparison differences significant at the 0.05 level were found in the three group comparison and when group 1 was



was compared to group 3; only 4% of the students had tatoos as opposed to 44% of those in the difficulty prone group had tatoos. However, this item was not significant at the 0.05 level when the successful and difficulty prone groups were compared.

TABLE XXVIII  
ALIASES, TATOOS, AND VOTING HISTORY  
OF PROBATIONERS

Probationer Group	Used an Alias				Had Tatoos*				Voted Last Election**					
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No		Not Eligible	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Students N = 25	24	96	1	4	24	96	1	4	17	68	7	28	1	4
Successful N = 25	24	96	1	4	19	76	6	24	4	16	17	68	4	16
Difficulty Prone N = 25	23	92	2	8	14	56	11	44	4	16	18	72	3	12
TOTAL N=75	71	95	4	5	57	76	18	24	25	33	42	56	8	11

\*When subjected to chi square test, the between group comparisons on this item were significant at the 0.05 level when groups 1-2-3, and group 1-3 were compared.

\*\*When subjected to chi square test, the between group comparisons on this item were significant at the 0.05 level when groups 1-2-3, 1-2, and 1-3 were compared.

The last item in Table XXVIII reveals the voting record in the last election for the probationers. It might be considered to be a revealing indice of the probationers' alienation from general society. For the whole group, 56% said they had not voted, 11% said they were

not eligible to vote. Convicted felons are not legally allowed to vote in Oklahoma and though election boards generally have no way to determine this factor of eligibility for voters, the probationers seldom realize it. When subjected to chi square test, significant differences at the 0.05 level were found between the college student group and the successful group, and between the students and difficulty prone probationers. The successful and difficulty prone probationers had about the same voting records. Of the college students, 68% had voted in the last election; only 16% of the successful and 16% of the difficulty prone groups had voted. The college group was more vocal if voting is to be considered a method of speaking out one's viewpoint about a system. Of the students on probation 68% had voted while 16% of the successful and difficulty prone group used their votes as power in the political system.

#### Educational Data on College Student Probationers

At the time they committed the crimes for which they were put on probation the class standing of the college students was as follows: 11 were freshmen, 7 were sophomores, 2 were juniors, 4 were seniors, and 1 was a graduate student. For the whole group of twenty five students, eighteen were under classmen, nine were upper classmen, and one was in graduate school.

The average number of hours the under graduate students had in college when they committed the crimes for which they were put on probation was 44.6, at the time the study was conducted the average number of college hours attained by the students was 77.2. As a whole,

on the average the under graduate students on probation had gained an average of 32.6 hours or the equivalent of two semesters full time study.

At the time the students committed the crimes for which they were placed on probation, only 8 of the students had not yet declared a college major, the other 17 had decided on a major. At the time of this study, only 1 student, or 1 of the 8 who originally had not decided on a major was still undecided of his vocational goal.

The students reported the following overall grades: 19 had an overall "C" average, 5 had an overall average of "B", and 1 had a "D" average. When the grade point averages were computed and averaged, the overall grade point average of the group was 2.2.

The vocational goals of the students included the following choices: teaching was chosen by 4 of the 25 students, occupations associated with the field of journalism and broadcasting were chosen by 3 of the students, 2 students wanted to be accountants, and 2 chose social service occupations such as social worker. The rest of the student sample, 13 in number, selected 13 miscellaneous occupations as their vocational goals.

#### Comments of Probationers on Criminal Justice

General comments of probationers about criminal justice are summarized in Table XXIX. The most vocal group on this question was the college students; they made 32 comments on the system in general. The difficulty prone group was next in number of comments with 26. As previously noted, the least vocal group again proved to be the successful probtions; they made only 13 comments on criminal justice.

TABLE XXIX

## COMMENTS OF PROBATIONERS ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Subject Matter of Comment	College Student Probationers	Successful Probationers	Difficulty Prone Probationers	Total
Subject of Comment	Number of Comments			Total
Positive, Neutral, Comments About System	2	2	1	5
Poor Jail Conditions, and Poor Food	11	0	5	16
Unfair Treatment Favoring Those Who Have Money	2	3	5	10
Need to Decriminalize Marijuana	3	0	0	3
Need for Uniform Code of Sentencing	2	2	2	6
Unfair, Too Strict Rules and Conditions of Probation	0	2	5	7
Unfair, Unjust Treatment by Attorneys, Laws, Judges, Searches, Officers, District Attorneys	9	4	7	20
Need for Speedier Trials	3	0	1	4
TOTALS:	32	13	26	71

Of the students 96% of the 25 students made comments about the criminal justice system, 72% of the 25 difficulty prone probationers made comments, but only 44% of the successful probationers had comments to make when open ended remarks were solicited.

Table XXIX shows that the largest number of comments (16) on a particular area in criminal justice were made regarding poor and inadequate jail conditions including such things as poor food, heating, and cooling in the jails. Next in volume were comments relating to the probationers feelings that money provides a real and definite advantage to those who become involved with the law, 10 comments related to the system's favoring people who have money. The next item in terms of number of comments made was the rules and conditions of probation; 7 comments regarding the unnecessary strictness of the rules were made. The need for a uniform sentencing code for the state was stressed by 6 participants in the study. Favorable and neutral comments about the system were next with 5 made. The need for speedier trials was mentioned by 4 probationers and 3 comments regarding the need for the decriminalization of marihuana were made by the group. Comments concerning various kinds of unfair and unjust treatment of arresting officers, district attorneys, judges, and laws and searches numbered 20.

#### Role of Educational Institution in Students' Legal Problems

Of the student group, 22 of 25, or 88%, made comments regarding the role of an educational institution in a student's criminal charges. A total of 22 comments were made by the students. Table XXX illustrates the comments made by the students about the role of the institution.

TABLE XXX

STUDENT COMMENTS ON EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION  
INVOLVEMENT IN STUDENT LEGAL PROBLEMS

<u>Subject of Comment</u>	<u>Number of Comments</u>			
	1	2	3	4
Neutral and positive about the court		X		
Unfair arrest and legal procedures used		X		
System favors those who have money		X		
Colleges should help get students jobs		X		
College should provide counseling				X
College should provide legal counseling			X	
College shouldn't be involved at all			X	
College shouldn't be involved in charges unless college property was involved				X
	Total Comments = 22			

An interesting contradiction is seen in that the students felt the college should not be involved in their legal problems; at the same time they felt the college should provide a place for some sort of legal counseling on the campus.

Summary of Significant Between Group Differences on Items

Table XXXI presents a list of the questionnaire items which, when subjected to chi square test, revealed between group differences significant at the 0.05 level of significance.

TABLE XXXI

SUMMARY OF BETWEEN GROUP DIFFERENCES  
SIGNIFICANT AT 0.05 LEVEL

Questionnaire Item Content	X Indicates That Between Group Comparisons Were Significant At The 0.05 Level			
	Groups Compared*			
	1-2-3	1-2	1-3	2-3
Sex . . . . .	X			X
Age at first arrest . . . . .	X		X	X
Number of juvenile arrests. . . . .	X		X	
Number of juvenile probations . . . . .	X		X	X
Number of adult felony charges besides present one . . . . .	X	X	X	X
Number of felony charges besides present one in last five years. . . . .	X		X	X
Living arrangements at time of crime. . . . .	X	X	X	
Means of support at time of crime . . . . .	X	X	X	
Present work status . . . . .	X	X	X	X
Employment level of probationer . . . . .	X		X	X
Length of time on present job . . . . .	X			X
Birth order, first/middle/last child. . . . .		X		
Family size of probationers . . . . .	X	X	X	
Who reared probationer, both parents/others	X		X	
Father's professional level . . . . .	X		X	X
Marital status of probationer . . . . .			X	
Number of times married. . . . .			X	
Father's educational level. . . . .	X	X	X	
Mother's educational level. . . . .	X	X	X	
Probationer's educational level . . . . .	X	X	X	

TABLE XXXI (continued)

Questionnaire Item Content	Groups Compared			
	1-2-3	1-2	1-3	2-3
Class size, less or more than 100 . . . . .	X	X	X	
Probationer's attitude toward school. . . . .			X	
Drinking problem of probationer . . . . .	X		X	X
Ever smoked marihuana regularly . . . . .	X	X		
Under drug/drink influence at time of crime .				X
Appointment of attorney, retained/appointed .	X		X	
Type sentence received. . . . .	X		X	
Felt he would complete probation successfully.	X			
Number of tatoos of probationers. . . . .	X		X	
Voted in last election. . . . .	X	X	X	

A summary of the data concerning college student probationers indicates that of the 25 in the study 18 were under classmen. When put on probation the average number of college hours for the group was 44.6 which had increased to 77.2 hours at the time of the study. The grade point average for the group was 2.20. The most popular vocational goal selected by the students was teacher, 4, followed by journalism and media with 3, accountant 2, and social work 2; thirteen other miscellaneous occupations were listed by the remaining respondents.

The most vocal of the three groups making comments on the criminal justice system was the student group; they made 32 comments, compared to 13 for the successful probationers, and 26 for the difficulty prone probationers. The largest number of comments concerned poor jail



conditions, next came comments concerning the unfair influence money has on the system, this was followed by 7 complaints about undue strictness of the rules and conditions of probation, need for a uniform sentencing code was expressed by 6 participants, need for speedier trial was mentioned by 4, and 3 people expressed the need to decriminalize marihuana. On varied types of unjust treatment and mistreatment 20 comments were made.

Concerning the educational institution's involvement in the probationer's legal problem, students said that the universities they attend should provide both psychological and legal counseling for the students while at the same time they should not become involved in the legal problems of the student unless the crime he committed was directly associated with the college, such as destruction of college property. Several students mentioned that the colleges should be helping students get jobs.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Overview of the Investigation

The purpose of this study was to investigate the characteristics and attitudes of college students, successful, and difficulty prone probationers on their personal, family, vocational, educational, and criminal histories in order to determine whether there existed between group differences which were significant. In addition, open-ended comments regarding the criminal justice system were sought from all probationers, and from the college students on probation, comments were solicited regarding their feelings about their educational institution's involvement in their legal problems. The subjects for the study were seventy five probationers (the number in each of the three groups was twenty five) in north central Oklahoma. In the late spring of 1977, each probationer completed a questionnaire which was designed for use in this study.

Data were analyzed for between group differences with the chi square test; the Yates correction was applied when expected frequencies were less than ten in the data. As is customary, and deemed appropriate in the behavioral sciences, the 0.05 level of significance or confidence was used in analysis of the data. On the questionnaire items between group differences comparisons were made among the three groups and then again between each of the two groups of probationers.

### Summary of the Results

For this study, chi square comparisons which were significantly different at the 0.05 level of confidence can be summarized as follows: for the three group comparisons, those comparing group 1 the students, group 2 the successful probationers, and group 3 the difficulty prone probationers, twenty five items on the questionnaire showed differences significant at the 0.05 level of significance. For the two group comparisons of group 1 the college student probationers to group 2 the successful probationers, twelve items were found to be significantly different at the 0.05 level; when group 1 the student group was compared to group 3 the difficulty prone probationers, twenty four items revealed responses significantly different between the groups; when group 2 the successful probationers was compared to group 3 the difficulty prone probationers, 11 items were seen to have responses on them which were significantly different between the groups.

It was noted earlier in the study that the college students were more different from the successful probationers and difficulty prone probationers than the successful probationers were from the difficulty prone probationers. When totaled, significant differences were found between the student probationers and the other two groups on 36 items; the successful group of probationers varied from the other two groups significantly on 23 items; the difficulty prone group varied from the other two groups on 35 items.

With regard to the questionnaire items which proved to yield significant between group differences between group 2 the successful

probationers, and group 3 the difficulty prone probationers the differences can be seen in the following discussion.

Regarding the sex of the probationers in the study, it was found that women were significantly less likely to be in the difficulty prone group of probationers than were men. They were also less likely to have gotten in trouble and been on probation in the first place.

Concerning the probationer's age at his first arrest it was found that the probationers in the difficulty prone group were twice as likely to have been arrested before age 18 than the probationers who were successful.

The number of juvenile arrests did not differentiate those in the difficulty prone and successful groups; however the number of juvenile probations did prove to be significantly different between the two groups. Of the probationers who had had probation as juveniles, 75% were designated as trouble prone.

Number of felony charges in the last five years, in the category of more than one other charge, was significantly different between the successful and difficulty prone groups of probationers. Of those who had more than one adult felony charge besides the one for which they were on probation, 90% were in the difficulty prone group of probationers.

The number of felony charges in the last five years shows that for this study, responses to this item are almost identical to those on the previous item. The probationers in the difficulty prone group were four times more likely to have committed one other and above felony crimes within the last five years.

Work status of the probationers was also an item which was

significant between the successful and difficulty prone groups. The difficulty prone probationers were five times as likely to be unemployed as were the successful probationers. The successful probationers were twice as likely as the difficulty prone probationers to be working.

The employment levels of the probationers revealed interesting between group differences with regard to the successful and difficulty prone groups of probationers. The majority of the difficulty prone probationers listed their employment level as skilled, managerial, or professional; this proportion well exceeded both the student and successful groups of probationers. However, in terms of unskilled employment level, the difficulty prone probationers were four times more likely than the successful probationers to be at the unskilled employment level.

Length of time on present job showed that only two persons in the difficulty prone group had had their job over a year while over half of the successful probationers had had their jobs a year or longer. While the majority of those in the successful group had been employed over a year the majority of those in the difficulty prone group had not had their jobs less than a year, they were simply unemployed entirely.

Perhaps contrary to what one might expect, when the probationers' fathers' professional levels were compared, the difficulty prone probationers showed none of their fathers in the unskilled level of work while over three fourths said their fathers were in the managerial, skilled, and professional area.

When replying to the item of whether or not they had ever had a drinking problem eight times as many probationers from the difficulty

prone group had had a drinking problem as in the successful group of probationers.

The last item which was significantly different between the successful and difficulty prone groups of probationers was whether the probationers had been under the influence of either drugs or alcohol at the time they committed the crimes for which they were later placed on probation. The majority of the probationers in the difficulty prone group stated they had been under the influence when they had committed their crimes, this was twice the number in the successful group which said they had been under the influence when they had committed their crimes.

When reviewing the differences between the college student group and the other two study groups significant difference existed on thirteen items when the students were compared to the successful group of probationers. When the student group was compared to the difficulty prone group significant differences were found on twenty four items.

Examining the data concerning significant between group differences it is noted that when seeking items on which the college student differed significantly from both of the other groups ten items were found.

Concerning the number of adult felony charges in the study groups, the student group had significantly fewer adult felony charges than both successful and difficulty prone probationers.

The living arrangements of the students varied significantly from those of the successful and difficulty prone probationers; the students were more likely to be living in "other" arrangements than with self;

spouse or parents; this would be due to the nature of the situation in which college students live.

The students differed significantly from both the other groups when means of support at the time of crime was considered. Largely, the students were supported by means others than themselves, this was a different situation than was found in either the successful or difficulty prone group. By the very nature of their situations, the students tend to vary on such items as support and living arrangements. These differences might be more attributable to the situation in which the student has placed himself rather than the student's preference.

The present means of support for the students also varied from the other two groups' means of support. Again, the students were supported more by their families than the other two groups. This type of item would seem to have more to do with the student's life style situation than with his likelihood of success or failure on probation.

The educational level of the student probationers' parents was different than that of the successfuls' and difficulty prone probationers' parents. Both the fathers and the mothers of the college students had higher educational levels than the parents of the successful probationers and the difficulty prone probationers.

As might be expected, the educational level of the college student probationers was significantly higher than both the successful and difficulty prone groups. Number of students in the probationer's graduating class (perhaps an indicator of home town size) also was significantly different between the student probationer and the other two probationer groups. The student probationers had almost all come from classes of one hundred or more students, whereas the successful and

difficulty prone probationers were almost as likely to come from a small school as a large one.

When probationers' attitudes towards school were compared, the college students on probation were more likely to have favorable attitudes toward the school experience than either the successful or the difficulty prone probationers.

The last item on which the college student probationers varied significantly from both the successful and difficulty prone groups was their voting history. The students were four times as likely to have voted in the last election as either the successful or difficulty prone probationers. This might be an indication that although the student probationers have many complaints about the system they still have faith in their ability to change or have an effect on the system by voting.

The data solicited from the study participants in the form of comments on the criminal justice system reveal that of the three study groups the students were the most likely to provide comments about the legal system. The difficulty prone probationers were twice as likely to make comments on the system as the successful probationers. This would lead to speculation that the successful probationers have come to accept the system without much dissatisfaction whereas the student and difficulty prone probationers were not willing to accept the system "as is" without criticism.

In order of number of comments, the areas about which the three study groups complained were as follows: poor and inadequate jail conditions and food; people with money receive favoritism; unreasonable and too strict rules and conditions of probation; need for a uniform



sentencing code; need for speedier trials; and need for decriminalization of marihuana; miscellaneous comments were made regarding unfair treatment by officers, judges, district attorneys, jailers and unfair laws and searches.

The comments of the college students on probation concerning the educational institution's involvement in their legal problems regarded the following: the need for colleges to provide both psychological and legal counseling for students who get into trouble with the law, that the college should stay out of the legal affairs of the students, that the only appropriate time for the college to become involved in the legal problems of the students is if college property was in some way damaged, that unfair and illegal methods had been used against them, that the legal system favors people who have money, and that the colleges should be more active in helping students get jobs.

### Conclusions

The results of statistical tests applied to the data collected in this study lead to the following conclusions:

1. That women probationers are very unlikely to have difficulty on probation when compared to men.
2. That probationers whose first arrest had occurred before they were eighteen years old were extremely likely to have difficulty while on probation.
3. That the number of juvenile probations, when high, was seen in probationers who had difficulty while on probation.
4. That probationers who had had more than one other charge besides the one for which they were on probation, and probationers who

had had more than one other felony charge in the last five years were likely to be prone to difficulty while on probation.

5. That those who were unemployed were five times as likely to be in difficulty as probationers who were employed.

6. That individuals who had been on their present job for more than a year were highly unlikely to be having difficulty on probation.

7. That difficulty prone probationers were much more likely to say they had had a drinking problem than were successful probationers.

8. That probationers who stated they had been under the influence of alcohol or drugs when they committed the crimes for which they were put on probation were most likely to come from the difficulty prone group of probationers.

9. That college students have different living arrangements, as a rule, than do other probationers.

10. That the means of support for college students at the times they committed their crimes and later means of support were more likely to be family than the other probationer groups.

11. The educational level of college student probationers' parents was higher than for other probationers.

12. That college students had higher educational levels than other probationers.

13. That college student probationers tended to come from larger high schools more often than did successful or difficulty prone probationers.

14. That college students had more favorable attitudes toward school than did other probationers.

15. That college students were more likely to vote than other probationers in the study.

16. That college student and difficulty prone probationers were more likely to voice criticism toward the criminal justice system than were successful probationers.

17. That jail conditions need improvement according to the viewpoint of many probationers.

18. That many people feel that people who have a lot of money get a better break in court than those who are poor.

19. That rules and conditions of probation are often viewed as excessively strict by probationers.

20. That uniform sentencing codes, decriminalization of marijuana, and speedier trials are desirable to a number of probationers.

21. That many students feel colleges should provide legal counseling for students in addition to psychological counseling.

22. That many college student probationers feel that the educational institution should not become involved in the student's legal problems.

#### Weaknesses of the Study

A disadvantage of this study is its lack of a larger sample size in the study groups. Also to be considered as a weakness is the lack of inclusion of probationers in an urban area in the study sample.

#### Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, several suggestions may be offered. In regard to the items which differentiated the successful and

difficulty prone groups of probationers it is recommended that they be incorporated into interview information which is obtained by supervising probation officers. This should help the field officer become aware of problems new clients have which are frequently associated with difficulty prone probationers. This would allow a supervising officer to place probationers who have characteristics similar to difficulty prone probationers on maximum supervision so that services could be provided at the earliest possible moment of need.

Due to the significance of items associated with work and alcohol for difficulty prone probationers, it is recommended that officers who are specially trained or who are knowledgeable about such areas be sought or trained to handle these problems on the most professional level as is possible.

Due to the many significant differences found between the college student probationers and the other two groups, it is recommended that such methods as mail-in supervision be tried with the group to see if these probationers would respond as well as they would under personal supervision of an officer.

Duplication of this study with an instrument revised to contain questionnaire items which showed significant differences between the probationer groups is recommended for other populations of probationers under supervision and especially to probationers under supervision in urban areas.

## A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Stuart. "Some Findings from Correctional Caseload Research," Federal Probation XXXI: 55; December, 1967.
- Alexander, Franz, and Hugo Staub. The Criminal, The Judge, and The Public. Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1956.
- Ancel, Marc. Suspended Sentence. London, Heinemann Press, 1971.
- Bazelon, David. "Are They Doing Good for the Offender or Well for Themselves?" Psychologists in the Criminal Justice System. Stanley Brodsky, Editor. American Assoc. Criminal Psychologists, 1972.
- Bromberg, Walter. Crime and the Mind. New York, The MacMillan Company, 1965.
- Capote, Truman. "What Were They Like? The Clutter Family Murderers." The Sociopath. Rita Bergman, Editor. New York, Exposition Press, 1968.
- Carter, Robert and Richard McGee and E. Kim Nelson. Corrections in America. New York, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1975.
- Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Marshalizing Citizen Power To Modernize Corrections. Washington, 1972.
- Davis, George F. "Study of Adult Probation Violation Rates by Means of the Cohort Approach." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Political Science, 55, 70-84; 1964.
- Eysenck, H. J. Crime and Personality. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1964.
- Fink, Arthur. Causes of Crime. Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1938.
- Galvin, John. "Correctional Manpower." Manpower, 3;1 15-19; 1971.
- Gibbs, Jack P. Crime, Punishment, and Deterrence. New York, Elsevier Press, 1975.
- Glaser, Daniel. The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System. New York, Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1969.
- Glaser, Daniel and Vincent O'Leary. "Personal Characteristics and

- Parole Outcome." National Parole Institutes. Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Glueck, Sheldon and Eleanor. Predicting Delinquency and Crime. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1959.
- Goode, William and Paul Hatt. Methods of Social Research. New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1952.
- Guilford, J. P. and Benjamin Fruchter. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.
- Halleck, Seymour. Psychiatry and the Dilemmas of Crime. New York, Harper and Rowe, 1967.
- Hillway, Tyrus. Research and Graduate Study. Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1956.
- Jack, William. "Release on Parole to Plans With and Without Employment." American Journal of Corrections, 24, 12-16; 1962.
- Jenkins, W. O., M. C. Barton, M. D. DeVine, E. K. DeValera, J. B. Muller, A. D. Witherspoon, and J. M. McKee. "The Maladaptive Behavior Record (MBR): The Role of Maladaptive Reaction Patterns in the Analysis and Prediction of Criminal Behavior and Recidivism." Washington D.C., Manpower Administration, April 1974.
- Kerlinger, F. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York, Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, New York, 1964.
- Landis, Judson, James D. Mercer and Carole Wolff. "Success and Failure of Adult Probationers in California." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 6, 34-40; 1969.
- Mangrum, Claude. The Professional Practitioner in Probation. Springfield, Illinois, Charles Thomas Publisher, 1975.
- Mays, John Barron. Crime and the Social Structure. London, Faber and Farber, Limited, 1963.
- McCord, William and Joan Irving Zola. Origins of Crime. New York, Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Morris, Norval and Gordon Hawkins. The Honest Politician's Guide to Crime Control. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Nye, F. I. "Field Research." Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Harold Christensen, Editor. New York, Rand McNally, Inc., 1964.
- Ohlin, Lloyd, Herman Piven and Donnell Pappenfort. "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole." National Probation and Parole Association Journal, 2, 211-255; 1956.

- Oklahoma State Statutes. O.S. Section 2-401.
- Parten, Mildred. Surveys, Polls, and Samples. New York, Cooper Square Publishers, 1966.
- Pidgeon, Helen. Probation and Parole in Theory and Practice. New York, National Probation Association, 1942.
- Popham, James H. and Kenneth A. Sirotnik. Educational Statistics Use and Interpretation. New York, Harper and Rowe, 1973.
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967.
- Probation Evaluation Score Sheet, Department of Corrections, Austin, Texas.
- Reckless, Walter. The Crime Problem. New York, Appleton, 1973.
- Robinson, James. "Special Report to the California Legislature Ways and Means Committee, Select Committee on Criminal Justice. 1969." In Crime and Delinquency, pp. 67-80; January 1971.
- Sandhu, Harjit. Modern Corrections. Springfield, Illinois, Charles Thomas, Publisher, 1974.
- Selitz, D., M. Jahoda, M. Deutsch, and S. W. Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York, Holt, Rhinehart, and Winston, 1959.
- Scarpitti, Frank and Richard Stephenson. "A Study of Probation Effectiveness." Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 59, 361-369; 1968.
- Shore, Milton. "Psychological Theories of the Causes of Antisocial Behavior." Crime and Delinquency. 456-468; October, 1971.
- Short, James F. Modern Criminals. New Brunswick, New Jersey, Transaction Books, 1973.
- Siegal, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavior Sciences. New York, McGraw Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Slocum, W. L., L. T. Empey, and H. S. Swanson. "Increasing Response to Questionnaires and Structured Interviews." American Sociological Review, 21, 221-225; 1956.
- Sullivan, Clyde. "Changes in Corrections." Manpower, 3;1 1-6.
- Sutherland, Edwin and Donald Cressey. Principles of Criminology. New York, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1955.

Taylor, Edward and Alexander McEachern. "Needs and Directions in Probation Training." Federal Probation, XXX, 18-24; March, 1966.

Toby, J. "The Differential Impact of Family Disorganization." American Sociological Review, 505-512; October, 1957.

Windle, Ernest and James Marsh. Man and His Motives. New York, Exposition Press, 1954.



APPENDIX  
INSTRUMENT

1. How old were you when you were put on probation in this case?.....\_\_\_\_\_
2. What is your present age?.....\_\_\_\_\_
3. What sex are you?..... male ( ) 1  
female ( ) 2
4. What race are you?..... black ( ) 1  
white ( ) 2  
American Indian ( ) 3  
Mexican American ( ) 4  
foreign student ( ) 5  
oriental ( ) 6
5. What is your marital status?..... single ( ) 1  
married ( ) 2  
divorced ( ) 3  
separated ( ) 4  
common-law married a year or more ( ) 5  
widow or widower ( ) 6
6. How many times have you been married?..... none ( ) 1  
once ( ) 2  
state how many ( ) 3
7. When you got into trouble who were you living with?..... self ( ) 1  
roommate ( ) 2  
parents ( ) 3  
spouse ( ) 4  
grandparents ( ) 5  
specify other\_\_\_\_\_ 6
8. Who are you living with now? self ( ) 1  
roommate ( ) 2  
parents ( ) 3  
spouse ( ) 4  
grandparents ( ) 5  
specify other\_\_\_\_\_
9. Who raised you?..... both parents ( ) 1  
mom only ( ) 2  
dad only ( ) 3  
grandparents ( ) 4  
parent and step-parent ( ) 5  
specify other\_\_\_\_\_
10. How many children are in your family, including you?..... ( ) 1
11. Which number child were you?..... ( ) 1
12. How many times has your mom been married?..... ( ) 1
13. How many times has your dad been married?..... ( ) 1
14. If your mom isn't living, how old were you when she died?..... age ( ) 1  
unknown ( ) 2  
does not apply ( ) 3
15. If your dad isn't living, how old were you when he died?..... age ( ) 1  
unknown ( ) 2  
does not apply ( ) 3
16. Your mom, or the woman who raised you, did what?..... worked ( ) 1  
was a housewife ( ) 2

17. What religious faith do you consider yourself to be?..... none ( ) 1  
 tell which \_\_\_\_\_
18. What was the highest grade (1 - 16) your dad went to in school?..... ( ) 1
19. What was the highest grade (1 - 16) your mom went to in school?..... ( ) 1
20. What is the highest grade (1 - 16) you went to in school?..... ( ) 1
21. If you did not graduate from high school, did you get a  
 GED certificate?..... yes ( ) 1  
 no ( ) 2  
 graduated, does not apply ( ) 3
22. About how many students were (or would have been)  
 in your high school graduating class?..... ( ) 1
23. How did you feel about school?..... liked it ( ) 1  
 didn't care ( ) 2  
 did not like it ( ) 3  
 hated it ( ) 4
24. At the time you committed the crime for which you were put  
 on probation, what was your means of support?..... worked ( ) 1  
 unemployed ( ) 2  
 self-supported student ( ) 3  
 family-supported student ( ) 4  
 supported by spouse ( ) 5  
 specify other \_\_\_\_\_
25. What is your present work status?..... working ( ) 1  
 unemployed ( ) 2  
 supported by spouse ( ) 3  
 student or student employed for summer ( ) 4  
 specify other \_\_\_\_\_
26. Have you ever worked in the same place for at least a year?..... yes ( ) 1  
 no ( ) 2
27. How long have you had your present job?..... \_\_\_\_\_
28. When you work, what kind of work do you do or  
 what profession are you in?..... \_\_\_\_\_
29. Were you or are you able to pay your bills and get by on your last  
 or present income?..... yes ( ) 1  
 no ( ) 2
30. Are you satisfied with your present employment?..... yes ( ) 1  
 no ( ) 2  
 does not apply ( ) 3
31. What is or was your dad's profession or main line of work?..... \_\_\_\_\_
32. Has your family ever received welfare?..... yes ( ) 1  
 no ( ) 2
- 32.a Do you feel you have a physical disability?..... yes ( ) 1  
 no ( ) 2

33. Did you get along ok with your mom, or the woman who raised you?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2  
does not apply ( ) 3
34. Did you get along ok with your dad, or the man who raised you?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2  
does not apply ( ) 3
35. Have you ever see a psychologist or psychiatrist or wanted to?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
36. Did your parents argue or fight a lot?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
37. Do you feel you were an abused or neglected child?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
38. Are you satisfied with you marriage relationship?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2  
does not apply ( ) 3
39. Were you ever in the military service?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
40. Did you ever receive disciplinary action while in the service?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2  
does not apply ( ) 3
41. If you were eligible to vote, did you vote in the last election?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2  
not eligible ( ) 3
42. Was there an adult with a drug or drinking problem  
in the home where you were raised?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
43. Do you feel you have ever had a drug problem?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
44. Do you feel you have ever had a drinking problem?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
45. Have you ever smoked marihuana on a regular basis?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
46. Were you under the influence of drugs or alcohol when you  
committed the crime for which you are on probation?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
47. Other than for traffic offenses, how old were you the  
first time you were arrested?..... ( ) 1
48. How many times were you arrested as a juvenile?..... ( ) 1  
How many times were you placed on probation as a juvenile?..... ( ) 1
49. Besides the one you are on probation for, how many adult  
felony charges have you had?..... ( ) 1

- 51. For what crime were you place on probation?.....\_\_\_\_\_
- 52. What type sentence did you receive?..... deferred ( ) 1  
suspended ( ) 2
- 53. How did you get your sentence?..... pled guilty ( ) 1  
found guilty by jury ( ) 2
- 54. In connection with the crime for which you are on probation, when were you arrested?..... at the scene ( ) 1  
later, with a warrant ( ) 2
- 55. How much time did you spend in jail in connection with the crime you are on probation for?.....\_\_\_\_\_
- 56. If there was a search conducted in connection with your arrest, do you feel it was legal?.....yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2  
does not apply ( ) 3
- 57. How did you get an attorney?..... hired him ( ) 1  
the court appointed him ( ) 2
- 58. How many aliases have you used?.....\_\_\_\_\_
- 59. How many tatoos do you have?.....\_\_\_\_\_
- 60. In the last five years, how many felony charges have you had or been put on probation for, besides the one you are now on probation for?.....\_\_\_\_\_
- 61. Circle any of the following members of you family who have a criminal record: grandparent, mom, dad, spouse, brother, sister, children, step-parent.
- 62. Do you feel people are treated fairly by the courts?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
- 63. Were you satisfied with your attorney's representation of you?..... yes ( ) 1  
no ( ) 2
- 64. Do you feel you will be able to successfully complete your probation?..... yes ( ) 1  
If no, why? no ( ) 2  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
- 65. For college students only, to fill in:  
How many hours did you have when you were put on probation?\_\_\_\_\_  
How many hours have you presently accumulated?.....\_\_\_\_\_  
About what is your letter grade average in college?.....\_\_\_\_\_  
When you got into trouble, was your major dediced or undecided?\_\_\_\_\_  
What is your vocational goal?.....\_\_\_\_\_

Please discuss any aspect of the criminal justice system you would like to see changed or that you feel should be left as it is. Some areas to comment on might be: arrest, trial, pre-sentence investigations, rules of probation, the court, attorneys, or officers with which you had contact.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

For college students only: Please make any comments or criticisms concerning your college's involvement in your legal problems, or make suggestions as to how colleges might be helpful to students who get into legal trouble while in school.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

VITA

Linda Jo Alberty

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: A COMPARISON OF COLLEGE STUDENT, SUCCESSFUL, AND  
DIFFICULTY PRONE PROBATIONERS

Major Field: Student Personnel and Guidance

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Tulsa, Oklahoma, February 23, 1948, the  
youngest daughter of Billy P. and Ruth Wade White.

Education: Attended elementary grades at Union Consolidated  
School, Broken Arrow, Oklahoma. Graduated from Locust Grove,  
Oklahoma, High School by correspondence in 1966. Attended  
Northeastern Oklahoma State University at Tahlequah two  
years. Graduated from Oklahoma State University in 1969 with  
the Bachelor of Science Degree in psychology. Received the  
Master of Science Degree from Oklahoma State University in  
vocational rehabilitation counseling psychology in 1971.  
Completed the requirements for Doctor of Education degree  
from the Oklahoma State University in December, 1977.

Professional Experience: Graduate assistant in educational psy-  
chology and extension psychology instructor in 1971 and 1972  
at Oklahoma State University. Employed by the Oklahoma  
Welfare Department as a licensing service worker for  
children's day care centers, 1971 to 1973; worked as a com-  
munity services treatment officer in Corrections from 1974  
to mid-1977. Instructor of Psychology, and Director of  
Counseling and Testing at the Oklahoma Panhandle State  
University at present.

Professional Organizations: Member of Oklahoma and Southern  
Associations for Children Under Six. Past president of  
Stillwater Writers and member of the Oklahoma Writers  
Federation. Member of the American College Personnel  
Association and of the High Plains Guidance Association.