

150492
150501

Federal Probation

Guiding Philosophies for Probation in the 21st Century *Richard D. Sluder*
Allen D. Sapp
Denny C. Langston

Identifying and Supervising Offenders Affiliated With Community
Threat Groups..... *Victor A. Casillas*

Community Service: A Good Idea That Works *Richard J. Maher*

Community-Based Drug Treatment in the Federal Bureau of
Prisons..... *Sharon D. Stewart*

The Patch: A New Alternative for Drug Testing in the Criminal
Justice System..... *James D. Baer*
Jon Booher

Fines and Restitution Orders: Probationers' Perceptions *G. Frederick Allen*
Harvey Treger

What Do Offenders Say About Supervision and Going Straight? *Julie Leibrich*

Golden Years Behind Bars: Special Programs and Facilities for
Elderly Inmates..... *Ronald H. Aday*

Improving the Educational Skills of Jail Inmates: Preliminary
Program Findings..... *Richard A. Tewksbury*
Gennaro F. Vito

"Up to Speed"—Results of a Multisite Study of Boot Camp
Prisons..... *Doris Layton MacKenzie*

"Looking at the Law"—Recent Cases on Probation and
Supervised Release..... *David N. Adair, Jr.*

JUNE 1994

150492-
150501

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

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

Permission to reproduce this ~~copyrighted~~ material has been granted by
Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME LVIII

JUNE 1994

OCT 14 1994

NUMBER 2

This Issue in Brief

Guiding Philosophies for Probation in the 21st Century.—What does the future hold in store for probation? Authors Richard D. Sluder, Allen D. Sapp, and Denny C. Langston identify and discuss philosophies and goals that will emerge to guide probation in the 21st century. They predict that offender rehabilitation will become a dominant theme in probation but that it will be tempered by concern about controlling offenders to ensure community protection.

Identifying and Supervising Offenders Affiliated With Community Threat Groups.—Gangs and community threat groups have placed a new breed of offender under the supervision of U.S. probation officers. Are the officers adequately trained in special offender risk-management techniques to provide effective supervision? Author Victor A. Casillas analyzes gang and community threat group issues from a district perspective—that of the Western District of Texas. He defines and classifies community threat groups generally, relates the history of gangs in San Antonio, and recommends organizational strategies for identifying, tracking, and supervising offenders affiliated with community threat groups.

Community Service: A Good Idea That Works.—For more than a decade the community service program initiated by the probation office in the Northern District of Georgia has brought offenders and community together, often with dramatic positive results. Author Richard J. Maher presents several of the district's "success stories" and describes how the program has built a bridge of trust between offenders and the community, has provided valuable services to the community, and has saved millions of dollars in prison costs. He also notes that the "get tough on crime" movement threatens proven and effective community service programs and decreases the probability that new programs will be encouraged or accepted.

Community-Based Drug Treatment in the Federal Bureau of Prisons.—Author Sharon D. Stewart provides a brief overview of the history of substance abuse treatment in the Federal Bureau of Prisons and discusses residential treatment programming within Bureau institutions. She describes in detail the

community-based Transitional Services Program, including the relationship between the Federal Bureau of Prisons, the United States Probation System, and community treatment providers.

The Patch: A New Alternative for Drug Testing in the Criminal Justice System.—Authors James D. Baer and Jon Booher describe a new drug testing device—a patch which collects sweat for analysis. They present the results of a product evaluation study conducted in the U.S. probation and U.S. pretrial

CONTENTS

Guiding Philosophies for Probation in the 21st Century	150492	Richard D. Sluder Allen D. Sapp Denny C. Langston	3
Identifying and Supervising Offenders Affiliated With Community Threat Groups	150493	Victor A. Casillas	11
Community Service: A Good Idea That Works	150494	Richard J. Maher	20
Community-Based Drug Treatment in the Federal Bureau of Prisons	150495	Sharon D. Stewart	24
The Patch: A New Alternative for Drug Testing in the Criminal Justice System	150496	James D. Baer Jon Booher	29
Fines and Restitution Orders: Probationers' Perceptions	150497	G. Frederick Allen Harvey Treger	34
What Do Offenders Say About Supervision and Going Straight?	150498	Julie Leibrich	41
Golden Years Behind Bars: Special Programs and Facilities for Elderly Inmates	150499	Ronald H. Aday	47
Improving the Education Skills of Jail Inmates: Preliminary Program Findings	150500	Richard A. Tewksbury Gennaro F. Vito	55
Departments			
Up to Speed	150501		60
Looking at the Law			67
Reviews of Professional Periodicals			73
Your Bookshelf on Review			82
It Has Come to Our Attention			87

Guiding Philosophies for Probation in the 21st Century

BY RICHARD D. SLUDER, PH.D., ALLEN D. SAPP, PH.D., AND DENNY C. LANGSTON, PH.D.*

OPINION POLLS conducted over the past several decades have consistently shown while crime is viewed as an important public concern, it has not been ranked by the majority of Americans as the most pressing problem facing the country (Maguire, Pastore, & Flanagan, 1993). Other concerns, including the economy and unemployment, have traditionally eclipsed citizens' anxieties about crime. Yet in January 1994, the public, for the first time in nearly 60 years of opinion polling, ranked crime as the Nation's most important problem (Epstein, 1994; Lacayo, 1994; Smolowe, 1994).

Public anxieties about crime and violence have been fueled by media attention and political rhetoric (Kappeler, Blumberg, & Potter, 1993). In the process, enormous attention has been focused on responding to the problem by proposing measures that include hiring thousands of additional police officers, banning assault weapons, imposing strict sanctions for repeat offenders, and expanding prison capacity.

Despite all the attention paid to the justice system's response to crime, there has been little public discourse about the role that the probation system is to play in the process. On one hand, the failure to consider the future of probation is understandable since researchers, policymakers, and the public have tended to ignore this vital component of the justice system (Nelson, Ohmart, & Harlow, 1984). Conversely, however, the failure to plan for the future of probation seems a crucial oversight since about two-thirds of all offenders under correctional supervision are on probation (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1991). As the Nation augments its police forces, sanctions more offenders, and prisons experience increased overcrowding, many authorities (see, e.g., Austin & McVey, 1988; Guynes, 1988; Klein, 1988) have suggested that even more offenders will be channeled into the probation system. There is already evidence of this trend, since between 1984 and 1990 probation caseloads rose from 1.74 million persons to 2.67 million persons—a 53.4 percent increase (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1989, 1991). Hence, some scholars (Byrne, 1988, p. 1) have proposed that "probation crowding" presents more of

an immediate threat to both the criminal justice process and to community protection than does prison crowding.

Given these developments, there is a pressing need to consider thoughtfully the role that probation will play in managing crime and criminal offenders. More than anything else, there is a need to identify the philosophies that will guide probation as we prepare for the next millennium. The purpose of this article is to explore the direction that probation might take in the near future. To accomplish this, we have drawn from the probation literature and have identified apparent trends for the probation profession.

The Need for Articulating a Coherent Mission and Philosophy for Probation

If there has been a recurrent theme in the probation literature over the past few decades it has been the compelling need for the profession to articulate a distinct mission and for agencies to define their responsibilities in accomplishing that mission. Scores of critics have noted that in the absence of developing an overriding philosophy, probation's very survival is in jeopardy (Breed, 1984; Conrad, 1985, 1987; Harris, 1987; McAnany, 1984; Petersilia, 1985). Identifying the mission of probation represents a crucial, threshold issue. Both theoretically and practically, everything that an agency seeks to accomplish flows from its mission. Succinctly stated, organizational mission statements, philosophies, and goals imbue agencies with a source of legitimacy, provide employees with a sense of direction and a source of motivation, enable agencies to set goals and form guidelines, and provide the foundation to establish performance criteria (Etzioni, 1964). On a more practical level, Clear and Latessa's (1993) work suggests that organizational philosophies and priorities are important forces in shaping the actual work strategies employed by officers.

Despite the need to develop a clear-cut mission for probation, there has been considerable disagreement about the role that probation should (see, e.g., Barkdull, 1976), or can (see, e.g., Rosecrance, 1986), play in the criminal justice process. At the risk of oversimplification, authorities have proposed probation models that range from control (Barkdull, 1976) to case management (Dell'Apa, Adams, Jorgensen, & Sigurdson, 1976; Sluder, Shearer, & Potts, 1991; Whitehead,

*The authors are all with the Criminal Justice Department at Central Missouri State University. Dr. Sluder is assistant professor, Dr. Sapp is professor, and Dr. Langston is associate professor. The article is based on a paper presented at the March 1994 annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Chicago, Illinois.

1984) to offender rehabilitation (Brennan, Gedrich, Jacoby, Tardy, & Tyson, 1987; Gendreau & Paparozzi, 1993; Shicor, 1992). Yet despite all that has been written, probation continues to be plagued by an uncertain mixture of goals and philosophies that incorporates, in varying degrees, all of these elements (Clear & Latessa, 1993; Ellsworth, 1990; Sluder & Reddington, 1993). To understand where probation appears to be headed in the future, it is instructive to review briefly its historical evolution, identify predominant philosophies that seem to be guiding probation today, and then to note some of the calls that have been made for reform.

The Evolution of Probation Philosophies

From its inception, and until at least the mid-1960's, probation was guided by a casework-type philosophical ideology (O'Leary, 1987, Sluder & Reddington, 1993). Under this mandate, the purpose of probation was to identify causal factors of the offender's behavior and to intervene so that the offender could reform his or her conduct and avoid further contact with the legal system. In effect, the control of crime was to be attained through treatment (Byrne & Brewster, 1993).

Beginning in the 1960's, questions were raised about the efficacy of the rehabilitative model in corrections. The publication of Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks' (1975; *see also*, Martinson, 1974) celebrated study suggesting that "nothing works" all but sounded the death knell for the rehabilitative ideal in corrections. In the wake of this now famous study, authorities sought to identify other workable models for probation. Some, for example, suggested that probation officers should function as "resource brokers" for offenders under supervision (Carlson & Parks, 1979; Dell'Apa et al., 1976; Task Force Report, 1967). Under this mandate, probation officers were to assess offenders' needs and then channel them to social service agencies that could address those needs. Although mentioned infrequently in the literature, the brokerage approach seems to enjoy considerable support among probation officers today (Sluder & Reddington, 1993; Sluder et al., 1991). Importantly, at the same time that probation was attempting to devise an appropriate alternative model, public support began to erode, skepticism about the ability of probation to control and rehabilitate offenders increased, and fiscal resources diminished.

Through the 1980's, a combination of factors contributed to an overcrowding crisis in prisons and jails across the Nation. With the "war" on drugs, campaigns to crack down on drunk drivers, the enactment of harsher sentencing statutes, and efforts to constrict judicial discretion in sentencing, the per capita rate of offenders under correctional supervision rose to levels

never encountered before in the history of the United States. As prison and jail populations swelled in response to the "get tough" approach on crime, even more offenders were subjected to probation supervision. Concurrently, highly publicized studies questioned whether probation was a viable sanction for felony offenders. In their study, for example, Petersilia et al. (1985a, 1985b) found that nearly two-thirds of those on felony probation were rearrested. In response, probation began to devise strategies to comport with prevailing public and political sentiments that suggested the need to protect society by closely monitoring and controlling probationers.

Popular Philosophies in Contemporary Probation

Although it would be impossible to identify any one philosophy that dominates probation today, it is possible to examine indicators of operant philosophies in contemporary probation. At perhaps the broadest level, one indicator of correctional philosophies may be found in those portions of each of the 50 states' legal codes that specify the approaches to be employed by departments when handling offenders. In their study of states' legal codes, Burton, Dunaway, and Kopache (1993, p. 181) found that "by far, the major legislated correctional goal is rehabilitation." Burton and his colleagues qualified their findings in two ways, however. First, although rehabilitation is the most commonly prescribed correctional goal, recently enacted statutes tended to incorporate punitive goals. Second, Burton et al. noted that a majority of the states prescribed multiple goals—including reintegration, punishment, custody, public protection, and deterrence—for their correctional departments. In sum, Burton et al.'s research suggests that while state codes endorsed rehabilitation as their primary goal, most also included some form of goals oriented toward offender punishment and control.

Another indicator of probation philosophies is reflected in a collection of studies that have asked probation officers what they perceive their primary responsibilities to be. If anything can be concluded from this body of research, it is that probation officers endorse dual goals. More specifically, although probation officers continue to endorse offender rehabilitation, they also express substantial support for offender control (Donnellan & Moore, 1979; Ellsworth, 1990; Glaser, 1964; Harris, Clear, & Baird, 1989; Sluder & Reddington, 1993; Sluder et al., 1991; Van Laningham, Taber, & Dimants, 1977).

A final important indicator of contemporary probation philosophies is found in the variety of probation programs implemented across the country in the past decade. A number of intermediate sanctions have been

introduced to the probation system. These programs include intensive supervised probation, house arrest, shock incarceration, boot camps, community service, restitution, and day fines (DeJong & Franzeen, 1993). Of these, the program that has perhaps attracted the greatest amount of attention has been intensive supervision probation (ISP). Petersilia and her colleagues (1985b, p. ix) noted, for instance, "We believe that ISP will be one of the most significant criminal justice experiments in the next decade." Although ISP has taken several forms, virtually all ISP programs emphasize the strict control of offenders through restricting liberty, mandatory treatment programs, and the establishment of employment requirements (Jones, 1991; Morris & Tonry, 1990). In essence, ISP programs are engineered to control offenders through strict supervision. Today, every state, plus the Federal probation system, has some form of ISP program.

Despite the popularity of ISP, questions remain about its use. First, and foremost, questions have been raised about the uncertainty of goals for ISP programs. Most ISP programs endorse formal goals that include reducing jail and prison overcrowding, employing cost-effective alternatives to imprisonment, preventing criminal behavior by probationers, and using appropriate intermediate punishments that are based in the community (Pearson, 1987; Tonry, 1990). Other than the last of these goals, Tonry (1990) and others (Byrne, Lurigio, & Baird, 1989; Morris & Tonry, 1990) have questioned whether ISP programs, in general, are accomplishing their stated mission. Many ISP programs, because of rigorous eligibility requirements, have actually widened the net by subjecting less serious offenders to more restrictive probation conditions. Because of the close offender supervision provided by ISP, offenders are much more likely to be revoked from probation and sentenced to jail or prison time (Tonry, 1990). Thus, there are indications that ISP may actually contribute to prison and jail overcrowding instead of reducing it. Doubts have also been raised about the claimed cost savings of ISP and whether ISP programs prevent crime and reduce recidivism (Byrne, 1990; Clear & Hardyman, 1990; DeJong & Franzeen, 1993; Gendreau & Paparozzi, 1993; Petersilia & Turner, 1991; Tonry, 1990).

Tonry has raised a valid question: If ISP has failed to accomplish its stated goals, then why does it continue to be endorsed as a viable correctional approach? First, ISP strategies are in line with popular sentiments that offenders should be held accountable for their crimes. In essence, the strict supervision characteristic of ISP has provided probation with enhanced credibility. Second, ISP has provided probation employees with "more visibility, acknowledgment, and respect" (Tonry, 1990, p. 185). Finally, ISP is in line with prevailing political ideologies that endorse pun-

ishment and fiscal responsibility. As Clear and Hardyman (1990, pp. 46-47) concluded, the public relations success of ISP has been phenomenal:

While most observers had given probation up for dead only a few years ago, in its "new, improved" version it appears to have returned stronger than ever. Legislators are virtually falling over each other trying to sponsor legislation funding for intensive supervision alternatives to incarceration. The intensive supervision movement of the 1980s has helped revitalize probation, establishing it once again as a powerful cog in the machinery of justice.

In summarizing the above information, it can be said that there are mixed goals operating in contemporary probation. State statutory provisions and probation officers themselves generally support dual goals revolving around offender rehabilitation and control. Yet at the same time, the focus on various forms of intermediate sanctions reveals an orientation toward sanctioning and controlling offenders. Taking all these factors into account, what is the mission of probation likely to be in the future?

Philosophies That Will Guide Probation in the 21st Century

Although varying in degree and prominence, probation has always been characterized by a dual emphasis on reform and control (Clear & Latessa, 1993), and this will inevitably remain the case as we approach the 21st century. At the same time, however, there are many good reasons to suspect that future probation goals will contain strong themes of offender rehabilitation. Although states have embarked upon massive prison building projects during the past decade, there are questions whether they will be able to operate these facilities in the coming years, thus meaning that probation will become even more of a mainstay sanction in the future. Consider the remarks of Friel (1992, p. 60):

States which recently initiated capital expansion programs are beginning to realize that while they may be able to build capacity, they may not be able to afford to operate these new facilities. Sure, construction is expensive, but if you issue 20 or 30 year bonds to cover the cost, the bill will not come due for a generation, even though the interest paid will double or triple the cost. But operational costs must come from appropriated funds . . . The fiscal crisis for the states in the future will be operating their new prisons, not building them. . . . [In the future] We will put the worst of the worst in prison for a long time. The second tier of offenders will go to prison as well, but will serve shorter sentences, and the rest will be supervised in the community by whatever means possible.

In effect, Friel's predictions suggest that the economic strains of punitive sanctions will force the public to reassess justice policies, which, in turn, we believe, will lead to greater use of reform-oriented strategies.

A second reason why offender rehabilitation will supplant control ideologies is implicitly suggested in a recent study (Geerken & Hayes, 1993) which questions conventional wisdom about the threat felony probationers present to community safety. In the past, research has suggested that a significant proportion of those placed on probation continue to commit crime. In perhaps the most often cited study on the topic, Petersilia and her colleagues (1985a, 1985b) reported that about two-thirds of offenders released on felony probation in California were rearrested during a 40-month followup. Other studies have found recidivism rates for probationers that range from about 20 percent to more than 50 percent (see, e.g., Carlson & Parks, 1979; Geerken & Hayes, 1993). Yet in their study of arrestees in New Orleans from 1974 to 1986, Geerken and Hayes (1993) found that only eight percent of all adults arrested in that city for burglary or armed robbery involved offenders on probation. Based on their findings, Geerken and Hayes (1993, p. 561) concluded that, "Any restriction in probation and parole policy short of elimination, therefore, can only have a very minimal effect on the crime rate. Suggestions, for example, that alternatives to incarceration be reserved for less violent, property offenders . . . or that probationers be supervised more intensively . . . can therefore also have little effect." Based on the evidence from this limited study, the implementation of additional "get tough" approaches like ISP would seem to contribute little to community protection.

A third reason to suspect that rehabilitation will become a guiding correctional philosophy lies in public attitudes. On one level, even recent popular publications (see, e.g., Lacayo, 1994) have begun to question whether punitive measures are a rational approach to the country's crime problem. Perhaps most important, research questions the notion that the public has rejected offender rehabilitation in favor of offender control and surveillance. In their study of public attitudes, Cullen, Cullen, and Wozniak (1988) found that the public was reluctant to accept the idea that offenders should simply be warehoused. Based on their findings, Cullen and his colleagues (1988, p. 514) concluded:

Although citizens clearly believe that the state has the legitimate right to sanction offenders on the basis of just deserts, they also believe that criminal penalties should serve utilitarian goals. Further, the evidence indicates that among the utilitarian goals, rehabilitation is supported as much as and usually more than either deterrence or incapacitation. It thus appears that the rehabilitative ideal has withstood the many attempts to discredit it and remains firmly anchored in the American value structure.

Another study by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation revealed that when the public was informed about various sentencing options and their costs, they supported nonincarcerative options. More specifically, subjects in the study expressed support for sentencing

options that stressed rehabilitation for a range of serious but nonviolent offenders (Castle, 1991; Doble & Klein, 1989; Farkas, 1993).

Evidence of a growing support for reformation ideologies is also evident in the academic criminal justice literature. Much of what has been written stems from dissatisfaction with the ability of the present system to respond effectively to the Nation's crime problem. Consider a sampling of conclusions in recent articles on the topic:

- Many criminal justice professionals cited the potential for intermediate sanctions for involving offenders in rehabilitative programs. With the corrections system overwhelmed by large numbers of drug-addicted offenders, many of whom are repeat offenders, and with the ever-growing inmate population outstripping even the most ambitious prison construction plans, a renewed and widespread interest in rehabilitation is emerging, even among many prosecutors (DeJong & Franzen, 1993, p. 68).
- The findings reported . . . suggest that it is time to reconsider the respective roles of rehabilitation and surveillance in [ISP] programs. . . . Up to this point, our attention has been focused on evaluating the effectiveness of increased *surveillance* in community settings. It is now time to evaluate the effectiveness of increased offender *treatment* (e.g., substance abuse, employment, and family problems) in these same community settings, both alone and in combination with closer surveillance (Byrne, 1990, p. 27).
- [ISP] programs may be important *not* for the surveillance and control afforded offenders, but for the relationships that develop as a result of closer contact. In our rush to embrace this new wave of intermediate sanctions, we have not adequately considered the implications of this basic change in the officer-offender relationship for subsequent offender recidivism. If Braswell [1989] is correct, closer contacts that lead to a strong relationship between offenders and probation officers have a greater deterrent effect than an equal number of surveillance contacts that do not involve such close interaction (Byrne, 1990, p. 32).
- An analysis of the rehabilitative ideal and the ensuing policies indicates that, in spite of the fact that currently this orientation is on the decline, it has not vanished completely. This orientation has deep historical and traditional roots in Western, especially American, culture; and the fact that the alternative penal and control approaches do not show much better results in social control contributes to the tenacity of this penal idea and policy, not only among social scientists, but in the public opinion as well (Shicor, 1992, p. 23).
- Using various alternative sanctions, correctional systems have been "turning up the heat" on probationers. But our study of these new sanctions found: no discernible improvement in the delivery of "better justice"; a doubling of the cost compared with regular probation; a reduction in public safety; an increase in the prison overcrowding problem; no effect on offender recidivism; and a belated rediscovery that only the inclusion of treatment services will have any positive effect on reducing recidivism. As to the so-called rediscovery of treatment services, it has been shown once again that ideology has little respect for evidence. From the late 1970s to 1990, about a dozen reviews have appeared in the literature indicating that treatment services can reduce offender recidivism and that punishment and sanctions cannot (Gendreau & Paparozzi, 1993, p. 34).

The above comments are consistent with recent research by Petersilia and Turner (1993). In their study

of 14 intensive supervision programs around the country, they found that offenders in ISP programs who received treatment had significantly lower recidivism rates when compared to those who did not, even when controlling for offender background characteristics.

The Emergence of Reform-Based Probation Ideology Tempered by Offender Control

We suggest that future probation goals are likely to have a strong emphasis on offender rehabilitation. This is not to say that concerns about controlling and punishing offenders will simply disappear. To the contrary, programs like ISP will continue to thrive, but there will be a more coherent "system" of punishments in the future. In their seminal work on the topic, Morris and Tonry (1990) proposed the creation of a graduated system of penalties. These authors noted the need to devise an orderly mix of alternative sanctions, suggesting that judges could select from among a selection of possible sentences to meet the needs of individual offenders. It seems inevitable that such a system will slowly become realized in probation; the philosophy driving this system will be premised upon reforming the offender, rather than simply controlling, punishing, or monitoring law breakers.

In order for such a system to work, several modifications must be made to the existing system. First, sentences must be arrayed and ranked according to their severity. Byrne (1990, p. 29), for instance, has suggested a ranked system of alternative penalties, ranging from least to most severe, that include: (1) restitution, (2) day fine with restitution, (3) community service, (4) active probation, (5) intensive probation, (6) house arrest, (7) residential community corrections, (8) split sentences, (9) jail, and (10) prison. Second, the correctional and legal systems must come to a new understanding about the use of a graduated system of alternative sanctions. In the past, alternative sanctions have functioned as a net-widening device where offenders were subjected to stricter controls than would have been the case without an array of available intermediate punishments. For the future, there is a pressing need to begin to match punishments with various types of offenders and offenses. Some scholars have suggested the need for articulating "exchange rates," where we begin to identify the number of days under various forms of community supervision that would be equal to a single day of incarceration in a traditional correctional facility (Byrne & Brewster, 1993; Morris & Tonry, 1990). For example, authorities would need to determine that "x" number of days of house arrest is equal to 1 day of incarceration or that 1 year in prison is equal to "x" number of years on ISP (Byrne & Brewster, 1993). It is worth noting that the idea of using exchange rates is compatible with offender reformation; both ideologies are premised upon a notion of individual-

ized justice where sentences are meted out on the basis of the nature of the offense and the needs of the individual offender (Shicor, 1992).

It is unclear how the idea of using "exchange rates" might be translated into practice so as to avoid grave sentencing disparities. Morris and Tonry (1990) have suggested that mandatory sentencing guidelines be created that govern judges' use of intermediate sanctions. Under this approach, exchange rates would be calculated for various offenses; judges would select from among the available alternative sanctions to fit the needs of the individual offender. Yet there are serious concerns about tying the use of intermediate sanctions to mandatory sentencing guidelines. In their study of criminal justice professionals' opinions about intermediate sanctions, DeJong and Franzen (1993, p. 66) found "a widespread disliking among criminal justice officials for mandatory sentencing of any kind, not only among judges, but among most probation officials and even several prosecutors as well." The opposition to mandatory intermediate sanction guidelines is no doubt the product of professionals' experiences with the approach at both Federal and state levels. DeJong and Franzen found that criminal justice professionals attributed much of the present prison overcrowding problem to determinate sentencing; officials expressed concerns that mandatory guidelines would have the same effect by overloading any system devised for imposing intermediate sanctions.

One likely alternative to mandatory guidelines would be development of *voluntary* or *model* guidelines to guide the imposition of intermediate sanctions (DeJong & Franzen, 1993). To be effective, this approach would necessitate informing and educating the judiciary, correctional officials, and the public. This would obviously be a massive undertaking, but there are clear indications that when properly informed, the public is supportive of alternative sanctions. While a voluntary system would invariably result in sentence disparities, it is difficult to imagine that the disparities would be any greater—and would most likely be less—than they are under the present system.

Implementing a graduated penalty system would have other benefits as well. Under such an approach, offenders would also be "educated" about the consequences of continued criminality. As it stands today, there is evidence that at least some offenders perceive sentences to ISP as harsher than sentences to prison (Crouch, 1993; Petersilia, 1990). In one RAND study, offenders sentenced to prison were given the option of participating in ISP or going to prison. In the first year, one-third of those who had originally chosen the probation option changed their minds and asked to be sent to prison (Petersilia, 1990). In a subsequent study in Texas, Crouch (1993, p. 84) found that "a preference

for prison is more likely among offenders who are African-American, older, unmarried, and widely exposed to crime and institutional corrections, and who share beliefs that probation has grown stricter and that other offenders now prefer prison to probation." Implicitly, these findings suggest that at least some offenders perceive current punishment structures as inverted. Under a graduated system of penalties to which judges adhere, this phenomenon would likely disappear.

Summary and Conclusion

We acknowledge that our proposal suggesting reform-based philosophies will emerge to guide probation in the coming years is at odds with others who have written about the future of probation in America. On the fringes, writers have suggested ideas ranging from abolishing the terms "probation" and "treatment" (Pung, 1993) to reorganizing probation work so that officers would provide the court with investigative services but would no longer supervise offenders (Rosecrance, 1986).

Despite suggestions to the contrary, we believe that concerns with offender reform will command greater attention in the next decade. This prediction does not simply reflect hopeful speculation on our part but, we believe, is anchored in recurring themes in the literature. First, there are indications that, more and more, the public has begun to question current crime control strategies. Importantly, much of the criticism is based upon economic concerns. Despite pouring billions of dollars into prison construction and incarcerating a growing proportion of the population, citizen fear of crime has continued to rise. Friel (1992) has noted that about 80 percent of the cost of corrections is consumed by prisons; ironically, this component of the correctional system only handles about 25 percent of the offender population—the remainder is managed by probation, parole, and other community-based programs. Doubts have been raised about whether the public will be willing to continue to allocate a significant proportion of their tax dollars to institutional corrections. In the future, the public will not abandon the crime problem. Instead, it is likely that renewed interest will be generated in examining cost-effective programs that promise not only community protection but also hope for reforming those who have come into contact with the justice system.

Although important, economic considerations are not the only factors that support our predictions that reform-based ideologies will guide probation in the future. Research suggests that there continues to be strong public support for the idea that corrections should seek to rehabilitate offenders. Studies also suggest the emergence of a renewed and widespread

interest in offender treatment among criminal justice professionals. In addition, states' statutory provisions, although articulating multiple goals, continue to endorse offender rehabilitation as a guiding correctional philosophy.

It is somewhat ironic to note that much of the interest that has been generated for community corrections in the past decade is attributable to control-oriented programs—such as intensive supervision probation, house arrest, and electronic monitoring. Community corrections, including probation, has capitalized upon this exposure by emphasizing such issues as offender accountability, reduced correctional costs, and the promise to alleviate institutional overcrowding. In the process, probation has generated renewed public and political support. With this support, probation is poised, perhaps more powerfully so than was ever the case in the past, to harvest a larger share of the resources available to the justice system. Yet the irony of the situation lies in the fact that research questions the efficacy of intermediate sanctions premised solely on the control of offenders. Evaluations, for example, of traditional ISP programs suggest that they may increase probation costs, exacerbate prison overcrowding, and do little to enhance community protection. At the same time, however, research suggests that when ISP is coupled with treatment programs, recidivism rates can be substantially reduced. Thus, policymakers and probation leaders are faced with a dilemma that is as old as the probation profession itself. On one hand, members of the profession must continue to attend diligently to the control aspects of their work. Control themes have been, and will continue to be, an important part of probation work. On the other hand, offender reform strategies will emerge as a guiding force for probation during the next decade. Although ISP and related programs will continue to grow in the coming years, we suggest that most, if not all, will incorporate treatment programs.

What do these predictions mean for those who work in probation? The simplest answer is that probation will both change and remain the same. There will be change in the sense that as departments incorporate mission statements that emphasize offender reformation, agency goals, programs, and objectives will be modified to comport with this redirected orientation. Research suggests that despite past programmatic shifts, probation workers continue to support reform-based ideologies. Thus, in many ways, much about the probation profession and those who work in it will remain the same. Hopefully, those workers who support offender reform will be funneled into treatment based programs. Because there will be a greater diversity of intermediate sanctions, those workers who are oriented toward offender control will likewise find a

number of positions in the probation system that mesh with their interests.

REFERENCES

- Austin, J., & McVey, A.D. (1988). *The NCCD prison population forecast: The growing imprisonment of America*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Barkdull, W. (1976). Probation: Call it control and mean it. *Federal Probation*, 40, 3-8.
- Braswell, M.C. (1989). Correctional treatment and the human spirit: A focus on relationship. *Federal Probation*, 53(2), 49-60.
- Breed, A. (1984). Foreword. In P. McAnany, D. Thomson, & D. Fogel (Eds.), *Probation and justice: Reconsideration of mission*. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain.
- Brennan, T.P., Gedrich, A.E., Jacoby, S.E., Tardy, M.J., & Tyson, K.B. (1987). A vision for probation and court services. *Federal Probation*, 51(5), 63-70.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1991). *Probation and parole, 1990* (NCJ-133285). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1989). *Probation and parole, 1988*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Burton, V.S., Jr., Dunaway, R.G., & Kopache, R. (1993). To punish or rehabilitate? A research note assessing the purposes of state correctional departments as defined by state legal codes. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16(1), 177-188.
- Byrne, J.M. (1988). *Probation* (NCJ-104558). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Byrne, J.M. (1990). The future of intensive probation supervision and the new intermediate sanctions. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(1), 6-41.
- Byrne, J., & Brewster, M. (1993). Choosing the future of American corrections: Punishment or reform? *Federal Probation*, 57(4), 3-9.
- Byrne, J., Lurigio, A.J., & Baird, C. (1989). The effectiveness of the new intensive supervision programs. *Research in Corrections*, 2, 1-48.
- Carlson, E., & Parks, E. (1979). *Critical issues in probation: Issues in probation management* (NCJRS-057667). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Castle, M.N. (1991). *Alternative sentencing: Selling it to the public* (NCJ-129875). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Clear, T.R., & Hardyman, P.L. (1990). The new intensive supervision movement. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(1), 42-60.
- Clear, T.R., & Latessa, E.J. (1993). Probation officers' roles in intensive supervision: Surveillance versus treatment. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(3), 440-462.
- Conrad, J.P. (1987). Return to John Augustus. *Federal Probation*, 51(4), 22-27.
- Conrad, J.P. (1985). The penal dilemma and its emerging solution. *Crime and Delinquency*, 31, 411-422.
- Crouch, B.M. (1993). Is incarceration really worse? Analysis of offenders' preferences for prison over probation. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(1), 67-88.
- Cullen, F.T., Cullen, J.B., & Wozniak, J.F. (1988). Is rehabilitation dead? The myth of the punitive public. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 16, 303-317.
- DeJong, W., & Franzen, S. (1993). On the role of intermediate sanctions in correctional reform: The views of criminal justice professionals. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16(1), 47-73.
- Dell'Apa, F., Adams, W., Jorgensen, J., & Sigurdson, H. (1976). Advocacy, brokerage, community: The abc's of probation and parole. *Federal Probation*, 40(4), 37-44.
- Doble, J., & Klein, J. (1989). *Punishing criminals: The public's view*. New York: Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.
- Donnellan, M.C., & Moore, H.A. (1979). Rehabilitation and protection: The goals and orientations of probation and parole workers. *Offender Rehabilitation*, 3(3), 207-218.
- Ellsworth, T. (1990). Identifying the actual and preferred goals of adult probation. *Federal Probation*, 54(2), 10-15.
- Epstein, A. (1994, January 30). Federal government's role as a crime fighter a minor one. *The Kansas City Star*, pp. A17, A18.
- Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Farkas, S. (1993). Pennsylvanians prefer alternatives to prison. *Overcrowded Times*, 4(2), 1, 13-15.
- Friel, C.M. (1992, July 8). *Crime, justice and the paradigm shifts of the 1990s*. Presentation to the Southeast Region Summit on Violent Crime, Charlotte, NC.
- Gearken, M.R., & Hayes, H.D. (1993). Probation and parole: Public risk and the future of incarceration alternatives. *Criminology*, 31(4), 549-564.
- Gendreau, P., & Paparozzi, M. (1993). Does "punishing smarter" work? An assessment of the new generation of alternative sanctions in probation. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 5(3), 33-38.
- Glaser, D. (1964). *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Guynes, R. (1988). *Difficult clients, large caseloads plague probation, parole agencies*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Harris, M.K. (1987). Observations of a "friend of the court" on the future of probation and parole. *Federal Probation*, 51(4), 12-21.
- Harris, P.M., Clear, T.R., & Baird, S.C. (1989). Have community supervision officers changed their attitudes toward their work? *Justice Quarterly*, 6(2), 233-246.
- Jones, M. (1991). Intensive probation supervision in Georgia, Massachusetts, and New Jersey. *Criminal Justice Research Bulletin*, 6(1), 1-9.
- Kappeler, V.E., Blumberg, M., & Potter, G.W. (1993). *The mythology of crime and criminal justice*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Klein, A.R. (1988). When should we revoke parole? *Judges' Journal*, 27, 3-5, 38-40.
- Lacayo, R. (1994). Lock 'em up. *Time*, 143(6), 50-53.
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*. New York: Praeger.
- Maguire, K., Pastore, A.L., & Flanagan, T.J. (1993). *Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics, 1992*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 42, 22-54.
- McAnany, P. (1984). Mission and justice: Clarifying probation's legal context. In P. McAnany, D. Thomson, & D. Fogel (Eds.), *Probation and justice: Reconsideration of mission*. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain.
- Morris, N., & Tonry, M. (1990). *Between prison and probation: Intermediate punishments in a rational sentencing system*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, E.K., Ohmart, H., & Harlow, N. (1984). Promising strategies in probation and parole. In R.M. Carter, D.G. Glaser, & L.T. Wilkins (Eds.), *Probation, parole, and community corrections*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- O'Leary, V. (1987). Probation: A system in change. *Federal Probation*, 51(4), 8-11.
- Pearson, F.S. (1987). *Research on New Jersey's intensive supervision program*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Petersilia, J. (1990). When probation becomes more dreaded than prison. *Federal Probation*, 54(1), 23-27.
- Petersilia, J. (1985). Community supervision: Trends and critical issues. *Crime and Delinquency*, 31, 339-347.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). *Evaluating intensive supervision probation/parole: Results of a nationwide experiment*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1991). An evaluation of intensive probation in California. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 29(1), 610-658.

- Petersilia, J., Turner, S., Kahan, J., & Peterson, J. (1985a). Executive summary of RAND's study, granting felons probation: Public risks and alternatives. *Crime and Delinquency*, 31, 379-392.
- Petersilia, J., Turner, S., Kahan, J., & Peterson, J. (1985b). *Granting felons probation: Public risks and alternatives*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Pung, O.B. (1993). Let's abolish "probation" and "treatment." *Overcrowded Times*, 4(2), 3.
- Rosecrance, J. (1986). Probation supervision: Mission impossible. *Federal Probation*, 50(1), 25-31.
- Shicor, D. (1992). Following the penological pendulum: The survival of rehabilitation. *Federal Probation*, 56(2), 19-23.
- Sluder, R.D., & Reddington, F.P. (1993). An empirical examination of the work ideologies of juvenile and adult probation officers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 20(1/2), 115-137.
- Sluder, R.D., Shearer, R.A., & Potts, D.W. (1991). Probation officers' role perceptions and attitudes toward firearms. *Federal Probation*, 55(3), 3-11.
- Smolowe, J. (1994). . . . And throw away the key. *Time*, 143(6), 54-56, 58-59.
- Task Force Report: Corrections*. (1967). Washington, DC: President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice.
- Tonry, M. (1990). Stated and latent functions of ISP. *Crime and Delinquency*, 36(1), 174-191.
- Van Laningham, D.E., Taber, M., & Dimants, R. (1977). How probation officers view their job responsibilities. In D.B. Kennedy (Ed.), *The dysfunctional alliance: Emotion and reason in justice administration*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Whitehead, J.T. (1984). Probation mission reform: Implications for the forgotten actor—the probation officer. *Criminal Justice Review*, 9(1), 15-21.