

1958

Explorations in the Similarities, Differences and Conflicts Between Probation, Parole and Institutions

George H. Weber

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

George H. Weber, Explorations in the Similarities, Differences and Conflicts Between Probation, Parole and Institutions, 48 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 580 (1957-1958)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

TABLE 1

INCIDENCE OF CLUSTERS BY BODY TYPE OF PREDICTIVE TRAITS AND FACTORS IN "UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY"

	Meso- morphs	Endo- morphs	Ecto- morphs	Bal- anced	Total Cases
	%	%	%	%	
Five character traits.....	47.8	48.4	51.4	48.1	123
Five traits of temperament..	68.5	69.2	54.4	64.4	307
Five socio-cultural factors...	57.7	60.0	80.3	60.6	275

the delinquents than among the non-delinquents (14.4 percent:39.6 percent). About equal but small proportions of predominantly endomorphic boys (11.8 percent:15 percent) and of the balanced type (13.5 percent:14.7 percent) were found among the delinquents and non-delinquents.⁵

Analysis of the five traits of character structure comprising one of the three prediction tables in "Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency" (social assertiveness, defiance, suspiciousness, emotional lability and destructiveness) shows that only destructiveness is found to exert a significantly different impact on the delinquency of the physique types, being much more characteristic of delinquent mesomorphs than of ectomorphs. Of the five traits of temperament based on psychiatric findings

outline. Bone and muscle are prominent and the skin is made thick by a heavy underlying connective tissue. The entire bodily economy is dominated, relatively, by tissues derived from the mesodermal embryonic layer.

Ectomorphy means relative predominance of linearity and fragility. In proportion to his mass, the ectomorph has the greatest surface area and hence relatively the greatest sensory exposure to the outside world. Relative to his mass he also has the largest brain and central nervous system. In a sense, therefore, his bodily economy is relatively dominated by tissues derived from the ectodermal embryonic layer.

Endomorphy means relative predominance of soft roundness throughout the various regions of the body. When endomorphy is dominant the digestive viscera are massive and tend relatively to dominate the bodily economy. The digestive viscera are derived principally from the endodermal embryonic layer."

There is still a fourth body type—one in which endomorphy, mesomorphy and ectomorphy occur in about equal proportion. This is called the balanced type.

Any reader who is interested in a more detailed breakdown of body types (13 in all), is referred to "Unraveling" (Chapter XV) especially Table XV-1, p. 193.

⁵ UNRAVELING JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, *op. cit.*, Table XV-1, p. 193.

(adventurousness, extroversiveness, suggestibility, stubbornness and emotional instability), only emotional instability was found to vary in its influence on the delinquency of the physique types, being more highly associated with the delinquency of mesomorphs as compared with its role in the delinquency of boys of predominantly ectomorphic physique.

In contrast to these findings, four of the five sociocultural factors comprising a predictive device generally called the Social Prediction Table (discipline of boy by father, supervision of boy by mother, affection of mother for boy, and family cohesiveness) were found to play a selective role in the delinquency of the body types, having more to do with impelling *ectomorphs* to delinquency than mesomorphs and/or endomorphs.⁶ The fifth factor is affection of father for boy.)

Thus it will be seen that the efficacy of the first two of the three predictive tables developed in connection with "Unraveling" is largely independent of body build, but that the third table (encompassing interpersonal family factors) would appear to have an even greater prognostic power in the case of ectomorphic boys than when applied to boys irrespective of body build.

The actual incidence among the delinquents of the four physique types of the clusters of (a) the five character traits, (b) the five traits of temperament and (c) the five sociocultural factors which were found in "Unraveling" most markedly to distinguish delinquents from non-delinquents, is shown in table 1.

There is clearly a *greater* concentration of the cluster of five predictive sociocultural factors among ectomorphic delinquents (80.3 percent) than among juvenile delinquents of other body types. It is evident also that there is a lesser concentration among the delinquent ectomorphs of the cluster of the five predictive traits of temperament. But the combination of five traits of character structure does not vary significantly in incidence among the delinquents of the four body types.

The contrast revealed between the ectomorphs and the other physique types would suggest that the exogenous factors of unharmonious family life are even more highly associated with the delinquency of ectomorphs than with that of the other physiques; and that the endogenous traits of

⁶ PHYSIQUE AND DELINQUENCY, *op. cit.*, Tables 95, 98, 103, and 104.

temperament have less of a bearing on the delinquency of ectomorphs than on the other body types.

The query is now partly answered, "How, if at all, does the newly established dimension of physique type in the patterning of delinquency modify the construction of and enhance the usefulness of the screening devices for identifying potential delinquents, especially of the Social Prediction Table?" Certainly, if further validations of this Table⁷ continue to show its usefulness as a means of identifying children who are likely to become persistent delinquents unless suitable therapeutic intervention occurs, there would appear to be no special need to incorporate into this already existing prediction device the knowledge gained in "Physique and Delinquency" of the clusters of the sociocultural factors that have a more pronounced influence on the delinquency of ectomorphs than on youngsters of other body builds. However, this additional knowledge should help to diversify prophylactic and therapeutic efforts in accordance with the special vulnerabilities of this physique type.

NEW PREDICTIVE CLUSTERS IN "PHYSIQUE AND DELINQUENCY"

Although there are difficulties inherent in somatotyping children at a stage sufficiently early in their lives to make preventive efforts most meaningful, it may prove desirable to construct prediction tables for each body type, using as a basis for them those clusters of traits and sociocultural factors that have been found in "Physique and Delinquency" most sharply to differentiate delinquents from non-delinquents within each predominant physique type. For example, in the case of mesomorphs, we have isolated three traits (feeling of inadequacy, emotional instability, and emotional conflicts) that in combination most sharply distinguish delinquent from non-delinquent mesomorphs. In addition to this are two aspects of the home environment—haphazard household routine and lack of family group recreations,⁸—which together most sharply distinguish delinquent from non-delinquent mesomorphs. On the basis of these five factors, a prediction table designed to spot potential delinquents among boys of pre-

⁷ For validations made to date, see articles referred to in note 2.

⁸ See *PHYSIQUE AND DELINQUENCY. op. cit.*, Chapter XV, pp. 258, 259.

dominantly mesomorphic physique could be constructed.

As regards ectomorphs, we have isolated two traits that in combination most sharply differentiate delinquent from non-delinquent ectomorphs—extreme restlessness in early childhood and receptive trends; and a cluster of four sociocultural factors—rearing in homes of low conduct standards, in homes lacking in cultural refinement, and in families lacking cohesiveness, and by fathers whose discipline of the boy is other than firm and kindly.⁹ These six traits and factors could be used in a predictive device for predominantly ectomorphic boys.

As regards endomorphs and boys of balanced type, there are no home and family factors that differentiate the delinquents from the non-delinquents.¹⁰ Therefore, the prediction tables already constructed would be most useful for them.

PHYSIQUE AND THE PREVENTION OF DELINQUENCY

Although it does not appear necessary as yet to refine the already existing prediction tables to include body build, or to construct new tables for each body type, the findings of "Physique and Delinquency" should be suggestive to those who are concerned with the more effective management of juvenile offenders and with the prevention of juvenile delinquency. As it is not the purpose of this article to discuss the implications of the findings of "Physique and Delinquency" for preventive programs, the interested reader is referred to the volume itself, especially to Chapters XI, XV, and XVI. Chapter XI, "Mesomorphs and Delinquency," contrasts boys of this body build, who represent the great majority of persistent offenders, with boys of other body builds, and indicates which traits and sociocultural factors contribute most significantly to their delinquency in contrast with other body types. Chapter XV of "Physique and Delinquency" deals with the more effective management of juvenile delinquency as a result of the knowledge gained about the differences in characteristics and environmental responses of youngsters of different body builds. In Chapter XVI are presented some hypotheses regarding physique and the etiology of delinquency, which bear further exploration regarding the role of body build in delinquency.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 259.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

EXPLORATIONS IN THE SIMILARITIES, DIFFERENCES AND CONFLICTS BETWEEN PROBATION, PAROLE AND INSTITUTIONS

GEORGE H. WEBER

The author is the Director of Diagnosis and Treatment of the Minnesota Youth Conservation Commission, and Consultant to the Governor's Advisory Committee on Correctional Institutions and Correctional Camps and Reception Study Centers.

Dr. Weber was formerly associated with the Bert Nash Mental Hygiene Clinic, at Lawrence, Kansas and the Kansas Boys' Industrial School at Topeka. His last publication in this JOURNAL was entitled, "Clinical Approach to Selecting and Training Personnel for Institutions Serving Delinquents." (See Vol. 47, Number 1, May-June, 1956.) The article published here is a revision of a paper which the author read at the annual meeting of the National Probation and Parole Association, at St. Paul, in June, 1955.—EDITOR.

To help offenders become constructive and well-adjusted citizens, society has provided, among other things, correctional institutions and probation and parole services. These three related services have much in common; they also have some marked differences and, as is inevitable in any relationship, they have some conflicts.

Let me begin by relating an actual case, that has been modified to disguise its identity, to illustrate the kind of problem that can arise in the working together of different, but related, services.

The Regional Training School was an institution for delinquent boys between the ages of twelve and eighteen who were committed to the School by the Juvenile Courts in the State for "education and reformation". Mr. Smith was Superintendent of the School. He was appointed Superintendent in January when he succeeded the previous Superintendent, who had died unexpectedly. He was appointed to this position by The Board of Juvenile Corrections. Mr. Smith, like other superintendents of juvenile delinquency institutions in that State, was responsible to this Board for the administration of the School. Over a period of years, different state administrative boards had charge of the School. Previous to this arrangement the School had been administered by the Board of Charities.

The present Board of Juvenile Corrections also heard cases recommended for parole. The section of parole agents formed a division under this Board, as did the training schools. Previous to this, the parole agents had been attached to the schools and both had been administered by the Board of Charities.

There were no longer any parole agents attached to any of the schools. However, one parole agent, Mr. Johnson, who had been the agent in residence at the School for many years and at one time had been administratively attached to it, continued to reside at the Regional School because of his desire to remain close to the boys and because his territory covered the area immediately surrounding the institution. He was, of course, responsible to the Parole Division of the Board of Juvenile Corrections.

Although Mr. Johnson spent most of his time in the field placing and supervising boys, he did spend some time at the School conferring with their staff and interviewing boys. He held a somewhat neutral position at the School since he had no formal control over the staff or over the boys. For this reason, the staff and the boys knew that anything told him in confidence would not be passed on, where disciplinary action or other unpleasant repercussions might follow. Thus he was often consulted on matters that pertained to boys or the staff and was aware of the "institution's pulse".

Mr. Johnson was meeting with Mr. Black, the Supervisor of the Parole Division of the Board of Juvenile Corrections, at their Central Office one day in May when he was told that the Legislature, which had been in session during the preceding several months, had appropriated an increase in funds for parole services. Mr. Black stated that the details of their plans to improve their services had not been developed as yet; however, it appeared that an in-service training program would be started and that one additional parole agent supervisor would be hired. Before turning to other

matters, Mr. Black said that all the agents would be informed of the plans as they developed, but Mr. Johnson should plan on attending the in-service training work-shops at the Central Office when they were held.

When Mr. Johnson returned to the Regional State Training School that same evening, he was met by Mr. Smith, who asked him to come into his office for a few minutes and enthusiastically told him about the legislative appropriations for the School. Enough money had been appropriated so that Mr. Smith could hire some additional cottage parents and social workers. After a friendly conversation, Mr. Smith ended their informal meeting, saying, "Now maybe we'll have our boys in a little better shape when they are sent to you on parole". Mr. Johnson decided not to mention the anticipated plans of the Parole Division that Mr. Black had discussed with him thinking that the announcement of these plans should come from Mr. Black.

Several weeks later Mr. Johnson received a memorandum from Mr. Black addressed to all parole agents. It said that the Parole Division had decided to employ an in-service training instructor who would hold monthly workshops on important areas of their work. The date of the first institute was set for June 10th to 13th (the following week) and the topic to be discussed was the use of the case history method for studying the emotionally disturbed delinquent. The next week Mr. Johnson attended the institute and spent the other two days in the field. During this week five of his parolees got into trouble and as he was at the Central Office attending the Institute, the police asked the School to pick up these boys. As a matter of policy the School reported parole problems to the agents for their action. In emergencies the School was authorized to return the boys to the School if they thought it was indicated. In this instance the School picked up three of the boys and left two on their placements.

During this week, the Board of Juvenile Corrections had been meeting, acting on cases which the Training School had recommended for parole. The School had recommended thirty boys for parole, and all but seven of this number were paroled. These boys were told about the Board's decisions and all of them were anticipating leaving the School in the succeeding two weeks. It had been the custom of the parole agents to place these boys in this time.

The next few weeks were busy ones for Mr. Johnson. Several of the boys paroled by the Board were "his boys" and placements had to be completed or secured for them. Then too, the intake at the Training School began to climb when the public schools closed for the summer. These new cases were distributed among the parole agents but Mr. Johnson received several on which he was to get social histories.

Mr. Johnson's work continued to increase during the following weeks. The day before the second institute was to convene two farmers asked Mr. Johnson to investigate their homes as work home placements; several parents called for help in the management of their boys who were on parole; the Chief of Police of Regional City asked if Mr. Johnson could meet with his department sometime in the next several days to help them with some of the parolees, and Mr. Smith asked Mr. Johnson when he expected to get the histories on several of the newly admitted boys and when he could place the remaining boys who were given parole by the Board. With all of this work to do, Mr. Johnson wondered whether he should attend the second Institute. He telephoned Mr. Black.

Mr. Johnson: "Ted, I don't think I'd better come in for the institute tomorrow. I'm swamped with work and the pressures are building up."

Mr. Black: "What's the trouble?"

Mr. Johnson: "Boys need to be placed, histories written up, Chief Brown of the Regional City police force has asked for some help and Mr. Smith wants some boys who were paroled to be placed as soon as possible. The School needs the room for new commitments."

Mr. Black: "It sounds like its piling up on you. Can Mr. Smith give you any help?"

Mr. Johnson: "Give help? He's asking for it".

Mr. Black: "Well, I'll leave it up to you. If you feel that coming in here for three days is going to throw you way behind and make you feel uncomfortable, maybe you should pass it up. We'll work this out in the coming month—Isn't there some way of budgeting your work?"

Mr. Johnson: "Well, Mr. Smith wants the boys that have been paroled moved out and the School needs the new histories too".

Mr. Black: "Suit yourself. I'll be interested in your decision. If I don't see you tomorrow, maybe the following week".

Mr. Johnson did not attend the Institute. The following week Mr. Black sent Mr. Johnson a memo telling him that institute attendance was

mandatory and advising him to adjust his work schedule accordingly. As Mr. Johnson read the memo he began to feel discouraged. He thought he could see what Mr. Black meant, but why such a curt memo? Mr. Johnson's thoughts turned to Superintendent Smith. He surely knew the problems of work pressure and was a good guy, but it seemed that he, too, was beginning to put on the pressure. Then there were the boys—delay in getting their histories ready and delays in placing them was detrimental to them. Shorter histories and pre-parole investigations seemed a poor answer since this information was so essential to the planning of the boys' future.

As a parole agent, Mr. Johnson was convinced that service to his boys was his first responsibility. But he could see the need for further training and improving his methods of work. He wondered whether he was being too sensitive about the current situation. He continued to reflect: What was at play here? How should he proceed?

Mr. Johnson certainly had a problem—one that perhaps was not easily solved under the circumstances. But his problem serves here to indicate the need for taking stock of the relationships among three of the principal services dealing with offenders. A review of their similarities, differences and conflicts should throw some perspective upon the problems occurring between these services and provide some of the information necessary for their understanding.

SIMILARITIES AMONG THE SERVICES

What have probation, parole, and institutional services in common? They have similar responsibilities, and similar values; their services are based on similar theoretical assumptions and orientations; they employ common work methods and techniques; they face similar problems.

These are some of the common features that form the basis for the mutual interest and the cooperation that prevail among the workers in these services.

1. SIMILAR RESPONSIBILITIES

Each field has a responsibility to the offender, to society, and to itself. To the offender, these services are responsible for assisting him with his personal adjustment and his relationship to society. To society, they are responsible for its well-being and for protection from the offender. To themselves, they are responsible for the development of

a body of knowledge and skills and for transmitting it to others in their own and related services.

2. SIMILAR VALUES

The workers in these services hold many values in common. More explicitly, they appreciate and recognize the worth and dignity of the individual. They are concerned with the offender's morale and self-respect and his feelings of personal worth and courage. Probation, parole, and institutional people all emphasize trying to understand and help the offender, but they are not sentimental about their assistance to him. Rather, high value is placed on his individual responsibility, personal discipline, fair play, and uprightness.

Probation and parole agents and institutional workers hold the values of industry and efficiency, intellectual and job freedom in great respect. These values guide their day-to-day work and play a large part in the forward surge of these services today.

3. SIMILAR THEORETICAL ASSUMPTIONS

The three services assume, at least tacitly, that antisocial behavior, like other human behavior, is an attempt by the individual to establish some kind of harmony between his continuously changing personality needs and the demands of his environment; that antisocial behavior is an adaptive effort even though it is a delinquent or criminal effort; and that the offender, in making such an effort, is conditioned by his life experiences and influenced by the meaning that the current situation has for him. On these premises, these three services assume that people who manifest antisocial behavior can be treated through well planned programs—programs that can responsibly engage the offender and help him cope with his problems and modify his behavior.

4. SIMILAR ORIENTATIONS

Probation, parole and institutional services have developed some effective ways of approaching their particular work problems. The workers in these services, guided by their previous experiences and by theoretical ideas, have thoroughly explored the difficulties of their work to gain intimate, first-hand knowledge about the problems facing them. By judiciously checking and sifting their observations, facts, ideas, and theoretical formulations, the people of these services make their diagnostic judgments about the problems

at hand and decide on appropriate measures for their remedy. This is their common orientation to their work.

5. SIMILAR DIAGNOSTIC AND TREATMENT METHODS

The three services use some of the same methods in attempting to understand the offender. For example, workers from each of these services take case histories. They all observe the offender in one setting or another—in the community or in the institution, in the office or on the playground and other settings. They employ the method of interviewing. Each, in some way, "tests" the offender. For example, the psychologist tests his intelligence, the probation agent tests his ability to get along in the community and the houseparent tests the offender's ability to function in different kinds of groups. All of these services make conscious use of a variety of attitudes, such as active friendliness or firmness, to help the offender. Also, all workers use available community resources for the benefit of the offender.

6. SIMILAR PROBLEMS: a. DIFFICULT WORK ENVIRONMENTS

All of these services function in environments that include pressure and tension-producing forces. For instance, probation and parole agents and institutional personnel commonly experience negative public opinions, sometimes even attacks, as offensive problems are raised by the offenders themselves or by the programs instituted for working with these offenders. The public's attitudes of unconcern and indifference to the problems of helping the offender, along with its punitive and destructive opinions, contribute further to the workers' difficult environment. Probation and parole agents may experience negative public opinions more acutely than institutional workers; however, any advantage gained by institutional workers here is offset by the problems and intense feelings of the offenders which they force on the workers.

The general public is not the only contributor to difficult work environments. The lack of interest, understanding, cooperation and, at times, the open antagonism of some community agencies towards work with the offender add to the difficulties of probation and parole agents and institutional workers. These community agencies are often harassed by their own problems of heavy case loads, inadequate finances, and antiquated

organizations. These problems, along with their jealousies and unmet needs for recognition and their narrow points of view, lead these agencies to either oppose or fail to support the work with offenders.

b. COMPLEXITY OF THE SUBJECT

Offenders, taken as a group, represent some of the most intractable personality disorders that society has produced. Their impulsive, aggressive, unpredictable, irresponsible, and antisocial behavior; their suave, clever, play-acting; and their fears, discouragements, anger, and distorted and confused pleas for love, protection, and help are only some aspects of this group's behavior that concern probation, parole and institutional workers. Likewise, the families of offenders which, to various degrees, have rejected, neglected, abandoned, or corrupted the offenders and have denied them many of their basic needs, must also be dealt with by the workers in these services. This work with the offenders and their families is a constant test of the agent's or institutional person's intellectual acumen, knowledge, ingenuity, emotional maturity, flexibility and patience.

c. LACK OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

It is important to note that advances are being made in understanding and treating the offender. A more thorough understanding of the offender's personality and the environments from which he emerges is developing from the probation, parole and institutional workers' accumulation of experience and knowledge. Improved psychological testing and case work techniques, individual, group and milieu therapy also are substantial contributors to this progress. Nevertheless, greater contributions are especially needed in the areas of theory and research. Highly abstract or philosophical theories are least needed. Instead, there is high priority on unpretentious, practical and workable theories which pertain to the different varieties of delinquent behavior and the feasible treatment methods that might be used to modify this behavior. Well-organized research guided by theoretical formulations is in demand. The collection of convenient, exciting or sensational phenomena, while interesting, contributes very little to what is needed.

Attention and work must also be devoted to translating what we already know generally about human ills and their treatment into specific

knowledge and help for the offender. This, of course, brings many problems to the fore. For example, how can the probation, parole and institutional workers encourage the offender to express his underlying hostility, when this is therapeutically indicated, and yet still help him keep it sufficiently under control in order to avoid serious difficulties in the community or institution? How can these workers help the offender deal with the defensiveness and anxiety which often overlie his more serious problems and still keep him in treatment—keep him from being frightened out of treatment? How can these workers help the offender assume greater responsibility for his behavior and make him more aware of his part in the problems that he experiences? How can these workers help the offender understand the relationships that prevail between his current behavior to his present environment and previous experiences and help him change his way of relating to the world without the help of long-term treatment?

d. HEAVY CASE LOADS AND LESS-THAN-ADEQUATE BUDGETS

The heavy case loads that many workers carry frequently mean inadequate services to the offender, and this contributes to the possibility of the offender continuing his delinquent ways. These heavy case loads and the inadequate budgets under which many agents and institutions frequently operate contribute to short-cuts and frequently shabby work methods. If continued, overwork and its accompanying unsatisfying results will produce weary, discouraged and resentful personnel. Evidence of these problems is shown in the average estimated ratio of 250¹ probationers per agent throughout the country; the average of approximately \$2,000.00,² excluding capital expenditures, being spent per year for each delinquent in state training schools and approximately \$1,000.00³ being spent on each prisoner in some of our better prisons.

DIFFERENCES IN PROBATION, PAROLE AND INSTITUTIONAL SERVICES

Probation and parole agents and institutional workers have many things in common; however,

¹ AUSTIN H. MACCORMICK—*The Potential Value of Probation*, FEDERAL PROBATION, March, 1955.

² Personal communication to author from the Children's Bureau, August 17, 1954.

³ RICHARD A. CHAPPELL, *The Federal Probation System Today*, FEDERAL PROBATION, June, 1950.

there are certain marked differences that form the basis for the division of labor among these services, limit the expectations that each has of the other and contribute to their inter-service conflicts. Three of the more important differences will be discussed: different job responsibilities, different foci of work orientations, and differences resulting from the professionalization of these services.

1. DIFFERENT JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

It is the responsibility of the probation agents to make case studies for the court and work with offenders under the terms imposed by the court. Parole agents give assistance to those people who are completing a portion of their sentence on conditional release from an institution. The personnel of institutions have the custody of offenders and work with them for the period of time they are retained at the institution. These responsibilities mean that probation and parole agents work with the offender in the community while the institutional people do not. It also means that probation and parole agents work with the offender during a period unlike that of institutional workers, assuming the offender runs the gamut of these three services. Also, the personality adjustment of the offender may change somewhat in the varied situations and times that workers from these services see him, making their work experiences differ considerably. Lastly, the workers are responsible to different agencies or at least distinct divisions of the same agency that have some dissimilar policies and procedures.

2. DIFFERENT FOCI OF WORK ORGANIZATIONS

Probation and parole agents and institutional workers have similar orientations to their work—that of thoroughly involving themselves in the task of understanding the offender and treating him in accordance with his individual needs and available resources. However, the settings in which they work require them to focus these orientations differently. Probation and parole agents orient their efforts with the offender to the community setting; institutional workers focus their work to the institutional setting. When probation and parole agents review a case relative to making a disposition, they of necessity make a diagnostic judgment. Probation agents must judge or diagnose the case they are reviewing to see if they should recommend to the court that the offender be placed on probation and counseled by them or perhaps referred to someone else for counseling or

sent to an institution. Parole agents will go through somewhat of a similar process for those men who are doing poorly on parole if they decide the parolee should be continued on parole or returned to an institution. If they decide to counsel the offender, they have, in all probability, concluded that the offender can be treated in a relatively unstructured setting like the community and that he will not act out his anger or problems on society at large during this period.

Institutional people focus their diagnostic efforts somewhat differently. Since they have little to say regarding who is sent to the institution, their diagnostic efforts are not focused on determining what the disposition of a case is to be. Rather, the diagnosis for them is one of understanding the clinical aspects of the case and finding some positive aspects that can be developed. Except in unusual cases, the institutional workers consider offenders for placement only after they have been in residence for a period of time and have shown improvement.

In the area of treatment, institutional workers may be able to proceed with fewer limits to their treatment than either probation and parole people because they can treat the offender in a controlled environment with many supporting institutional resources close at hand.

3. DIFFERENCES STEMMING FROM PROFESSIONALIZATION

Within the services of probation, parole and institutions there are definite signs of professionalization. Each service is developing a greater unity of interest and a common status among its members. Each is developing specialized bodies of knowledge and accompanying systems of techniques. Each is providing formal ways of passing this knowledge and techniques on to those people desiring to enter their service and each is setting much needed standards for its members.

Associated with these developments are the tendencies for the members of each service to associate and communicate more frequently with the members of their own service and to develop sets of values and norms of behavior specifically for their own groups. These aspects of professionalization provide definite organized entities, such as professional organizations, which can stand as a symbol and be made the focus of attention. Each service gains cohesion and strength through emphasizing its own functions. Nevertheless, in so

doing each is apt to give less attention and consideration to related groups.

POINTS OF CONFLICT BETWEEN PROBATION, PAROLE AGENTS AND INSTITUTIONAL WORKERS

Probation, parole agents and institutional workers usually function together harmoniously in their common job of rehabilitating offenders. However, conflicts may emerge in any interpersonal relationship, especially if the people involved bring divergent ideas and practices to bear on a common social problem. Conflicts between the probation and parole fields on the one hand, and institutions on the other, are usually just partial conflicts as there are many agreements between these fields.

The more persistent patterns of conflict stem from the differences over the means of achieving the ultimate goal of rehabilitation for the offender, such as the choice of service to treat the offender, program planning for the offender, the inter-service communication necessary to carry on programs and the personal aspects of the relationships between the workers divisions and agencies of the different services. Thus, conflicts may be viewed as having their sources in the following areas:

1. Choice of Service. Should the offender be worked with through probation or parole services or institutional services?
2. Program Planning. What activities should be included in the offender's treatment program if he is placed on probation? On parole? In an Institution?
3. Communication. What should the communications between these fields contain? How should the communications be used? To whom should they be directed?
4. Agency and Personality Clashes and Status Struggles. What part does agency and personal ambitious striving play in interservice conflicts?

1. CONFLICTS OVER CHOICE OF SERVICE

Probation and parole agents and institutional workers do not necessarily see eye-to-eye on the disposition of cases. Before a probation agent recommends to the judge that he commit an offender to an institution, he usually considers the offense, the positive and negative aspects of the offender's personality, his immediate environmental situation, the resources of his community and the resources of the institution. A review of these factors may show some of the positive and

negative aspects of the offender's personality, some constructive and destructive things about his environment, some available community resources, and a training school, reformatory or prison.

As there is no selective intake at institutions, many kinds of offenders are committed—the chronic offender and the first offender, the severely maladjusted person and the relatively well-adjusted person who has made a mistake. This wide range in the kinds of commitments sent to institutions raises some questions, in the minds of institutional workers, about the criteria which parole and probation workers use in deciding whether to recommend commitment or the violation of parole. In the case of the chronic offender, institutional people at times ask why commitment was not recommended earlier, at a time when the offender may have been more amenable. The recommendations of probation agents to commit offenders who have performed a criminal or delinquent act but who appear unlikely to repeat this mistake are occasionally questioned by institutional people. Institutional people also question recommendations to commit relatively well-adjusted early offenders. They challenge the advisability of probation agents recommending commitment to correctional institutions on those cases where dependency, neglect, mental deficiency, or severe emotional disturbances are the primary features in a case.

Somewhat similar questions are raised by parole and probation agents when certain offenders are recommended for release from an institution. Recommendations for parole, to the paroling authority, is usually made by institutional workers on the basis of progress while in the institution, type of offense, current level of adjustment, length of sentence, and placement prospects. Nevertheless, parole people often ask if the length of time spent in an institution by an offender, inmate pressures from within the institution, inability of the institution to cope with the management problems posed by certain inmates, or the inability of the institution to help the ward further do not play a predominant part in more than a few parole considerations.

Some of these conflicts over the choice of services are indicated by remarks made by institutional people.⁴

⁴The statements of probation, parole and institutional people were taken from the notes accumulated by the writer over a period of several years.

"Was commitment really necessary? He hasn't been delinquent long. He's fairly well-adjusted. Not a smooth operator either. Couldn't something more constructive have been worked out in the community? They have a fairly good social worker in that county who could help him".

"Our clinical people found this woman's I.Q. to be 42. She doesn't have a potential for achieving much more. She is not disturbed—not particularly delinquent. I know she doesn't belong here. I wonder if the probation people considered recommending her for commitment as a mentally defective person."

From time to time parole agents question the recommendations of the institutions to release offenders. They believe that institutions are trying to push some offenders out before their progress in the institution and readiness to adjust to outside life is indicated, or before the parole agent can secure good placements for them. The following remarks by parole agents illustrate this conflict:

"Are you seriously considering recommending him for a parole? We just brought him back as a violator a short time ago. What changes has he actually made since he has been here? What skills has he acquired? Has there been any change in his attitude?"

"You say that you have had this woman a year and during this time she has shown little improvement so you recommend her for parole? Is this really enough for release? It seems to me we have to be a little more positive in our approach."

"From what you say he has come a long way since he was institutionalized, but let's not jump the gun on a parole recommendation. The community has to mull over the idea of parole for him a little. You know, the offense for which he was committed was pretty serious and there is still a lot of feeling about it. A premature parole might put the man under a lot of unnecessary pressure."

Institutions question the return of parolees to an institution as a violator on such basis as "general maladjustment". They see many of these cases as problems to be handled by parole agents and other available community resources. There are times when parolees are returned to institutions even though they present problems that appear to be outside the realm of institutional help. And it often happens that parole violators are returned to juvenile and young adult institutions when they have grown beyond the age which the institution actually can serve. Comments of institutional people help to make these points:

"It seems as if he was just picked up for a generally poor parole adjustment—keeping late hours, associat-

ing with questionable companions and carousing around. I'm wondering what might have been done on the outside to correct this, if it was believed to be serious."

"Well, he was returned after two years of parole. He's nineteen now, married and wise to every angle. We don't have much of a program for him and he is bad for the younger boys."

"Let's not be visionary. The boy has progressed. His adjustment on parole leaves much to be desired but he's not doing anything flagrant in the city. He was here several years and improved continuously. The community has to face up to its responsibilities in regard to this case. After all they had him during the first sixteen years of his life and they have a stake in him too. What can you do to keep him on parole?"

2. CONFLICTS OVER PROGRAM PLANNING

Each treatment service makes its diagnostic appraisal of the offender at the particular time he is their charge. Plans for him are made upon the basis of this information and the resources that are available at that particular time. Yet, when offenders are admitted or re-admitted to institutions, institutional workers may ask why certain available resources were not used for the offender while he was on probation or parole. On the other hand, probation and parole agents ask why certain institutional resources were not utilized by the institution when they had the offender with them. Although all three services admit that it is always easier to discover mistakes in retrospect, these statements about cases indicate that program planning is an area of conflict. A probation agent said:

"He stopped up to see me last week-end when he was home on pass from the school. He just seems to be sliding along, coasting until it's time to release him. Can't you get him interested in more of your institutional programs?"

An institutional worker commented:

"He was in good shape when he left. Now he's back and all confused. He needed more help than he got when he was out on parole. He only saw an agent twice during the seven months that he was on parole."

A parole agent observed:

"He's a good electrician. It's true he received some training at the institution but he was a good electrician before he went there. It's not his vocational training that needs attention, it's his personality. He can't get along with anybody. Now I've got to help place him and try to help him make a go of it."

3. CONFLICTS OVER COMMUNICATION

Effective inter-service communication is essential for the understanding and treatment of the offender. This requires that each service attempt to understand, sympathize with, and work with the other service on common problems. In other words, the channels of communication must be supported by mutual confidence and assistance and by the skills necessary for the interchange of information and ideas. However, doubts, fears, anger, and conflicts of interests sometimes prevail between services and block effective communication. Under these circumstances one service may let another know what it is doing but will not get involved in any give-and-take process. Or it may do much less than this—to the extent of nothing.

In the area of exchanging and transmitting information some inter-service memoranda and reports are incomplete and inadequate. This is true of their content as well as their distribution. At times the historical information provided by probation agents, the progress reports from institutions, or the parole placement prospects and supervisory reports from parole agents are incomplete because they are too general or circumstantial. These reports give the service receiving the material some general information about the offender; this is needed for general program planning. However, specific information relevant to the case is often lacking. If specific material is included too often, it dwells largely on the pathological or negative details of the case. Or the report may be too positive and optimistic, glossing over these negative features. This makes program planning difficult because either the recipients of such information are unable to understand the problems of the case thoroughly, or they may see the problems of the case as being outside or beyond the services of their agency.

Inadequate distribution of messages between these services also keeps workers in these different services from achieving full understanding; and the result is that they are operating with different understandings of the same situation. Occasionally agencies do not send some information to another agency because it is feared the other agency will not understand the significance of the material, will not keep it confidential, or may even use it destructively. Forgetting to include some workers, or an unawareness of whom to include in a distribution of a message, without any unconscious intent to slight, also plays a part in the failure to include