

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

A STUDY OF TASK DISCREPANCY AND JOB SATISFACTION:

THE CASE OF THE WINNIPEG JUVENILE

PROBATION OFFICER

by

DEREK JOHN KNIPE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA

October, 1977



A STUDY OF TASK DISCREPANCY AND JOB SATISFACTION: THE CASE
OF THE WINNIPEG JUVENILE PROBATION OFFICER.

by

Derek J. Knipe

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the degree of

Master of Social Work

© 1977

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this dissertation, to
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this
dissertation and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this dissertation.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
dissertation nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I first of all would like to take this opportunity to extend a special note of appreciation and thanks to the thirty-two probation officers whose participation and co-operation made this study possible.

I would also like to thank my principal advisor, Dr. Barry Trute for his guidance and patience in directing the author from the beginning to the final stages of this thesis. Other persons whose co-operation, interest and assistance was greatly appreciated include Professor J. Van der Krabben, School of Social Work; Dr. J. Nickels, Department of Psychology; and Mrs. I. Kruk, Manitoba Probation Services.

And finally, I would like to convey my thanks for the encouragement and support received by my fellow students, friends and family throughout the duration of this study.

Derek Knipe, B.S.W.
Winnipeg, 1977.

A STUDY OF TASK DISCREPANCY AND JOB SATISFACTION:

THE CASE OF THE WINNIPEG JUVENILE

PROBATION OFFICER

ABSTRACT

This study considered the multi-task function of the Winnipeg Juvenile Probation Officer together with its particular impact on the level of job satisfaction of probation line staff in the field.

It was found that the more discrepant probation officers become in the carrying out of work related tasks, in terms of what they believe they should be doing in their job as opposed to what they actually find themselves doing, the more likely they will experience lower levels of job satisfaction. Furthermore, task discrepancy accounted for the major proportion of the explained variation in job satisfaction.

This study raises fundamental questions concerning the very nature of the probation function in contemporary juvenile corrections.

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1 - Multiple Regression Analysis:
Discrepancy Score with Administrative
and Community Scores.
- Table 2 - Distribution of Respondents by Age
- Table 3 - Distribution of Respondents by Experience
- Table 4 - Distribution of Respondents by Education
- Table 5 - Distribution of Respondents by Salary
- Table 6 - Job Satisfaction Scores by Low,
Moderate and High Categories
- Table 7 - Distribution of Raw Discrepancy Scores by
Low, Moderate and High Categories
- Table 8 - Distribution of Weighted Discrepancy Scores
by Low, Moderate and High Categories
- Table 9 - Multiple Regression Analysis:
Job Satisfaction with R Discore,
Age and Salary
- Table 10 - Multiple Regression Analysis:
Job Satisfaction with Weighted Discrepancy
Score, Age and Salary
- Table 11 - Job Satisfaction by Education
- Table 12 - Job Satisfaction by Age
- Table 13 - Job Satisfaction by Salary
- Table 14 - Multiple Range Test
Duncan Procedure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AREA	1
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE (PART I)	
A. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	
Studies Relevant to Problem Area	9
B. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PROBATION	
A Brief Overview of the Development of Probation in the United Kingdom and America	18
C. POPULAR MISCONCEPTIONS OF PROBATION	29
D. JUVENILE PROBATION: AN OPERATIONAL VIEW	38
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE (PART II)	
THEORY AND MEASUREMENT OF JOB SATISFACTION	54
HYPOTHESIS	64

CHAPTER

PAGE

III. METHODOLOGY

A. POPULATION	65
B. MEASURES	
Demographic Face Sheet	66
Task Questionnaire	67
Brayfield and Rothe Job Satisfaction Index	73
Other Measures	74
C. QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTRATION	76

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

A. DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLE	81
B. DISTRIBUTION OF JOB SATISFACTION SCORES	84
C. DISTRIBUTION OF DISCREPANCY SCORES	85
D. MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS	
Job Satisfaction With Raw Discore, Age and Salary	88
Job Satisfaction With Weighted Discore, Age and Salary	89
E. CROSSTABULATION ANALYSIS	
Job Satisfaction by Education	91
Job Satisfaction by Age	93
Job Satisfaction by Salary	93

CHAPTER

PAGE

F. ONE WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	94
G. OTHER FINDINGS	96
H. GENERAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	98
V. STUDY CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	99

APPENDICES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Sir Winston Churchill once said that the mood and temper of the public in regard to the treatment of crime and criminals is one of the most unflinching tests of the civilization of any country.¹ At this point in the history of Canadian corrections it would appear that this country is being subjected to such a test. Over the past thirty months, Canadians from coast to coast have witnessed through the media the forcible seizure of federal penitentiaries and provincial gaols by the inmate populations housed therein and the subsequent confinement of prison personnel. Public reactions to such incidents are predictable and not surprising. The scanning of local news reports reveal a fairly consistent and diverse range of opinion taken from the general populace in terms of what action should or should not be taken in the curtailment and prevention of crime and delinquency.² From the traditional study of penology to our more "progressive" notions of correctional practice, a voluminous amount of material has been published on the subject of processing criminal and delinquent offenders. However, despite the amount of literature published,

¹ Crime and its Treatment in Canada. Foreword.
ed. by W. T. McGrath. Macmillan of Canada 1965. Toronto

² "Fox Wants Abductors Charged" Friday, October 29, 1976 pp 1
"Prisoners Take Second Hostage" Thursday, October 28, 1976
"Guards Freed After Convicts Win Demands" Saturday, November 6, 1976
"Prison System a Failure Fox Says" Monday, November 8, 1976
"Cut Court Power Over Juveniles: Lawyer" Thursday, October 28, 1976 pp 3
(taken from The Winnipeg Free Press).

studies conducted, university courses offered, reality in the field of corrections dictates that society is not much further ahead in effectively dealing with "acting out" delinquents and "old lags" than it was at the beginning of this century. Raymond states that it would be accurate to suggest that society's response to offenders has become more humane over the years¹ however further qualifies this by stating that it cannot be assumed that because man's response to criminals has become more humane, he is punishing them less and treating them more.² Numerous writers have pointed out that society expects the correctional process to achieve two goals: punishment and treatment.³ The question is, can these two goals be attained by the same process or by an individual representing this process? The failure of most correctional systems is manifested quite clearly at the incarceration end of the criminal justice system. It becomes less clear in terms of either failure or success when one views the systems designed to screen out offenders from entering the prison scene. How often have we listened to the continuum of condemnation that our correctional process is a dismal failure, that prisons should be abolished, that more prisons should be built or what we need are more half-way houses, more probation officers, more programs and the list goes on and on. There is an old saying that could quite aptly be applied to

¹ Raymond, Frank B. "To Punish or to Treat". Social Work Volume 19, May 1974 pp 311

² Ibid.

³ Seliger, Stephen G. "Toward a Realistic Reorganization of the Penitentiaries" Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science. Volume 60 March 1969

corrections today, in that we cannot see the trees for the forest. In operant terms one would caustically state something to the effect that all workers, be they prison officer or social worker, appear to desperately need a time out in order to re-align their aims and to re-define the specific function of their job. Essentially, this is the issue that this study will attempt to address; to re-define and clarify one of those trees struggling in a maze of correctional ideology by examining the actual job content of one particular area in corrections, the probation process. The focal area of study will center exclusively around the probation service in Winnipeg, Manitoba; an average sized, mid-western Canadian city, with specific reference to the multi-task function of the juvenile probation officer working within the Juvenile Justice System of this city.

Field practice and observation over a period of two years led this writer to postulate that probation officers involved in juvenile corrections in the city of Winnipeg have evolved into a professional role that defies definition or description. An historical review of the literature clearly points out that the function of the probation officer has been traditionally linked with the juvenile and criminal court system however has grown from a reasonably clearly defined court function to that of a rather complex all encompassing socio-legal service. In the field of juvenile corrections, this assertion is particularly evident when one examines the varying number of tasks the probation officer carries out in his day to day work. A task in this sense is simply defined as those work related activities carried out by an official of the juvenile court (probation officer) with regard to the assessment and supervision of those juveniles brought before

the court. This is not to infer that the juvenile probation officer in Winnipeg is no longer inextricably tied to the juvenile court but may be as equally tied to a number of other work settings in his or her general work situation. It is within these settings that a multitude of tasks arise that may not particularly reflect the traditional function of the probation officer.

It was further postulated that probation officers in Winnipeg do not appear to demonstrate a great deal of satisfaction when dealing with the system designed to process juvenile offenders. Over the past four to five years it has been quite evident that probation officers have witnessed a relatively large number of their colleagues with varying years of experience and levels of education leaving the service in order to secure employment in allied or other areas of the civil service. If probation officers are not deriving a sufficient degree of job satisfaction from within their general work situation, resignation is certainly one method in which to deal with an unsatisfactory situation.

If this is in fact the case, what factors are involved in the work situation of the probation officer that contributes to low job satisfaction? It should be noted at this point that the writer has purposely avoided using the terms low job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction as interchangeable phenomena. The reason for this is that there are two schools of thought in the study of industrial psychology that address this issue quite differently. The traditional

point of view assumes that the same dimensions in a job such as wages, recognition, promotion, etc. are capable of producing either satisfaction or dissatisfaction: a high amount of the dimension produces satisfaction whereas a low amount of the dimension produces dissatisfaction. The Herzberg theory challenged the traditional point of view by arguing that certain dimensions in the work situation (termed satisfiers) are capable of producing satisfaction but play an extremely small part in producing dissatisfaction while on the other hand other dimensions in the work situation (termed dissatisfiers) are capable of producing dissatisfaction but do not generally lead to satisfaction. In other words, according to Herzberg the same dimensions cannot be used to measure both satisfaction and dissatisfaction as they are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Herzberg's theory has not held up very well under subsequent independent research¹ but nevertheless is given credit for its contribution by highlighting the multi-dimensionality of satisfaction. The Herzberg two factor theory in the measurement of job satisfaction will be discussed more thoroughly in the following chapter. For the purposes of this study, job satisfaction will be viewed from the point of high satisfaction to low satisfaction and will acknowledge a separation from the term dissatisfaction as posited by Herzberg.

¹ Burke, Ronald J. "Are Herzberg's Motivators and Hygienes Unidimensional" Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 50. August 1966 pp 317-321

As earlier indicated, probation officers in Winnipeg do not appear on the surface to demonstrate very high levels of job satisfaction when dealing with the system designed to process juvenile offenders. Within this system, a myriad of tasks have evolved as a result of the probation officer moving from his traditional primary setting, the courtroom to other probation settings such as the department in which he is employed and the community in which he is deployed. Are the tasks that emanate from these various settings incompatible to the very nature of the probation function and thereby confuse primary responsibilities and undermine long-term objectives? More specifically, do the multitude of tasks probation officers carry out from one setting to another serve to confuse their primary function and consequently result in lower levels of job satisfaction? It was the feeling of the writer mostly through observation and experience that probation officers in Winnipeg often find themselves carrying out tasks inconsistent with what they believe their job should entail and conversely not carrying out those tasks consistent with what they believe is a part of their responsibility as a probation officer. From either perspective, a gap or discrepancy may be evident in terms of what probation officers believe they should or should not be doing in contrast to what they are actually doing. As chapter two will more clearly illustrate, probation officers are not only legal officials of the juvenile court system but engage equally in a host of social work related tasks quite independent from the legal sphere. Are there tasks in either sphere

inconsistent or incongruous to the responsibility of the probation officer? And further, does this incongruity or discrepancy have any relationship to job satisfaction? Task congruency simply refers to the extent to which probation officers indicate that the tasks they are actually carrying out in the assessment and supervision of juveniles brought before the court correspond to what they believe those tasks should be. In other words, the higher the degree of correspondence or congruency between the ideal perceptions of task relevancy in relation to their real perception of actual task performance, the higher probation officers will score on an independent measure of job satisfaction. Conversely, the larger the discrepancy or gap between what probation officers feel they should be doing as opposed to what they are actually doing, the more likely they will score lower in job satisfaction.

The original idea behind this study was conceived under the general theme of what happens to probation officers in the field. It appeared to the writer that the amount of dissatisfaction evident among line workers in probation not only reflected the commonly discussed issues of salary and organizational policy, but went much further into the very nature of the probation function. The suspected incongruity of expectation in terms of what the Juvenile Court and Department of Corrections believe probation officers should be doing in contrast to what probation officers believe they should be doing would most certainly constitute a separate study in itself. Therefore, as a

starting point it was felt for the purposes of an exploratory study it would be most appropriate to begin by studying how probation officers see themselves carrying out the probation function.

The basic rationale behind a study of this nature is the fact that there appears to be a consistent and substantial rate of staff turn-over within the service. If probation officers are not deriving a sufficient degree of job satisfaction from their work, is this a function of task incongruity? Secondly, if these assertions are proven to be significant, the results of this study may prove useful in helping probation officers on the line perceive more clearly some of the dynamics and dimensions of their work situation.

Unfortunately, there has been a minimal amount of research directed toward the problem area alluded to in this study. What research evidence is available, relates at best quite indirectly to the central hypothesis. Nevertheless, there is an abundance of available literature that addresses not only the probation process in terms of its historical development and function within the criminal and juvenile justice system but also a wealth of information on the concept and measurement of job satisfaction. As such, much of this information will be used throughout this thesis as it relates to the questions that continue to arise in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature (Part I)

A. Theoretical Framework

A great deal of the available literature directed toward the discussion of various probation issues tends to examine the probation process from an eclectic perspective. Studies that have been carried out in the past concerning either the role perceptions of probation officers or their loyalty toward certain components of the probation process usually begin by placing role orientations along a continuum ranging from law enforcement to social casework.

One article suggests that probation is a clearly defined court service with legal implications.¹ Another source suggests that probation is a social service with a heavier emphasis being placed on its social rather than its legal orientation.² The more recent studies tend to suggest that it is quite common for probation officers to synthesize these orientations by addressing themselves equally to the legal and social work function of their work role.³ It is within this typology that task incongruity may be most prevalent among probation officers today.

¹ Blake, Marilyn "Probation is Not Casework" Federal Probation Volume 12, June 1948 pp 54

² Meeker, Ben "Probation is Casework" Federal Probation Volume 12, June 1948 pp 51

³ Klockars, Carl "A Theory of Probation Supervision" Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science Volume 63, December 1972 pp 552

Brennan and Khinduka conducted a study that attempted to link tasks with role perceptions and in turn correlate these results with professional role socialization.¹ These authors hypothesized that each incumbent of a position in a bureaucracy has to perform a number of tasks that are incongruous with his conception of what constitutes the "role bundle" for that position.² Their most striking finding was the marked gap between what probation officers were actually doing as opposed to what they thought they should be doing.

In this study, tasks were categorized into three phases: pre-adjudication, adjudication and post-adjudication. In all three phases the discrepancy between what probation officers thought they should be doing as opposed to what they were actually doing was quite evident. An interesting finding in the post-adjudication phase revealed that probation officers were actually assuming more role responsibilities than they deemed appropriate. This finding lends support to the underlying assumption in this study that probation officers' responsibilities may be straying into areas that are not relevant to their function. It is interesting to note that these authors focused solely on the juvenile probation officer in a mid-western state in America, a denominator consistent with this study.

¹ Brennan, William C. and Khinduka, Shante K. "Role Discrepancies and Professional Socialization: The Case of the Juvenile Probation Officer" Social Work Volume 15. April 1970 pp 87

² Ibid.

The second half of Brennan and Khinduka's study dealt primarily with the professional role socialization of probation officers in terms of their education. According to their results, M.S.W. probation officers tended to be much clearer about their appropriate role definitions and rejected most of the activities they felt were primarily legal. They further concluded that non-M.S.W. juvenile probation officers lacking graduate social work education do not place as high a value on therapeutically oriented tasks as they do on tasks of a legal nature. These authors suggest that identification with a professional subculture defines for its members their main tasks, responsibilities and what is clearly outside their jurisdiction. They further state that the fact that non-M.S.W. probation officers tend to believe that legal responsibilities are more a part of their role could suggest that they, more than M.S.W. probation officers consider lawyers to be possible role models.

Another author suggests that the adoption of the authoritarian-legal role could be construed as a means in which to cover up the officer's fear of the inter-personal counselling experience.¹ One wonders however whether this fear is in fact a reflection of the lack of therapeutic skills as implied by Arcaya or rather, the eventual recognition and acceptance by many officers that the inter-personal counselling experience is simply not a terribly meaningful component in the probation process. In social work practice, with

¹ Arcaya, Jose "The Multiple Realities Inherent in Probation Counselling" Federal Probation Volume 35, December 1973 pp 59

particular reference to the field of corrections, there is no conflict that appears more frequently than the conflict surrounding authority. Hardman states that authority conflict lies at the root of more delinquency than any other inter or intrapersonal conflict.¹ This author states that the degree to which the probation officer can be helpful to a client with authority conflict is a function of the degree to which the officer understands and accepts his own feelings around authority and the skill with which he uses his delegated authority.² Quite often probation officers feel that the authority delegated to them by the court is inconsistent with their efforts at trying to establish a therapeutic casework relationship. This is a common feeling expressed by many probation officers especially those new to the field of corrections and is certainly acknowledged in much of the probation and early casework literature.³

A recent study (1971) indirectly addressed this issue among a population of some one hundred probation officers in Louisiana.⁴ In this study, Raymond operationalized the concepts of treatment

¹ Hardman, Dale "The Function of the Probation Officer"
Federal Probation Volume 24, September 1960 pp 10

² Ibid. pp 10

³ Authority in Social Work: Concept and Use
ed. by Yelaja, S. H. 1971 University of Toronto Press
pp 103 from Hardman, Dale "Authority in Casework - a bread
and butter theory."
National Probation and Parole Journal. Volume V July 1959

⁴ Raymond, Frank "To Punish or to Treat"
Social Work Volume 19 May 1974 pp 305 - 312

and punishment. In the probation process, authority and punishment could be viewed as interrelated concepts in that the authority of the probation officer at least at face value could mean the imposition of punishment should he feel compelled to execute that authority delegated to him by the court.

Punishment was defined as

- - - - - the infliction of pain, loss or other unpleasant consequence on an offender; it is intentionally administered by authority in response to a crime and is presumed to serve some purpose.¹

Treatment was defined as

- - - - - any process carried out by a correctional worker that involves the offender and is for the purpose of achieving the ultimate goal of law-abiding behaviour on the part of the offender.²

A great deal of the available literature on criminology and corrections tend to place the concepts of punishment and treatment at the opposite ends of the same continuum. Raymond hypothesized that if the traditional viewpoint was correct, probation officers would show a high negative correlation in their attitude toward punishment and treatment. In contrast to the traditional viewpoint, Raymond proposed that the data obtained measuring the attitudes of probation

¹ Ibid. pp 307

² Ibid.

officers would reveal little or no correlation. The strength of association between these two concepts was measured by a Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation which in this case revealed a slight inverse relationship of -0.23 significant beyond the $.05$ level. This statistic gave little support to the traditional viewpoint however substantiated the proposed one by demonstrating empirically that a probation officer's attitude toward treatment cannot be reliably predicted with any degree of certainty his attitude toward punishment. In short, punishment and treatment according to this study are not polarized concepts existing at the extremities of the correctional continuum, but are in fact separate, independent phenomena that co-exist side by side. This conclusion was reached as a result of the latter part of the study which demonstrated that experienced probation officers view punishment and treatment as having almost equal value and as possibly existing simultaneously. The findings further indicated that as the inexperienced probation officer continues on the job, his attitudes toward punishment and treatment change to the point where he places almost equal value on these concepts in a manner similar to his more experienced colleagues. In contrast to Brennan and Khinduka's study of eighty mid-western probation officers, Raymond concluded that the amount of education an officer has makes no difference in his attitudes toward punishment and treatment. Raymond's research further concluded that not only was education an insignificant variable, but also the type of education as well.

Carl Klockars in an article entitled "A Theory of Probation Supervision" states that the first and broadest component of the theory of probation supervision is the working philosophy of the officer — the way he sees his job and duties and secondly, the organizational context in which the officer finds himself.¹

Klockars states that most observations suggest that probation officers fall within the typology yielding the thesis that probation is casework² to its antithesis that probation is not casework.³ At the probation is not casework pole, officers are found to place heavy emphasis on the legal authority and enforcement aspects of their role. Hardman states that the primary function of any probation officer is to ensure that the offender comply with the order of the court and to execute that authority delegated by the court as consistently and fairly as possible.⁴

Along this continuum, Klockars suggests that there are those probation officers who could be classified as time servers. He states that their conduct is departmentally oriented where policy rules and regulations are upheld without question and methodically carried out.

¹ Klockars Op. Cit. pp 550

² Meeker Op. Cit. pp 51

³ Blake Op. Cit. pp 54

⁴ Hardman Op. Cit. pp 4

These individuals, Klockars suggests would probably find the greatest comfort and satisfaction in the setting or department in which they are employed.

At the other end of the continuum is the probation officer who sees his job primarily as a therapeutic change-agent and therefore acts accordingly to the values and principles of his profession. It is within this framework that the probation officer places the greatest emphasis on "social work" intervention and the tasks and responsibilities that accompany this perspective.

Klockars then states that the final officer type in this classification is distinguished by his recognition of both the treatment and law enforcement components of his role. This synthesis however often gives rise to the classical dilemma of corrections; the attempt to address two apparently incompatible roles.¹ The treatment-control dilemma is clearly a fundamental issue arising from the experiences of most probation officers who do address themselves equally to the legal and treatment aspects of probation work. However does this fusion or synthesis of roles resolve the dilemma of the probation officer as a treatment-control agent of society such as what Raymond concluded from this study of Louisiana probation officers or

¹ Authority in Social Work: Concept and Use ed. by Yelaja, S. H. 1971 University of Toronto Press pp 210 from Ohlin, Lloyd E. et al. "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole" National Probation and Parole Journal, July 1956

does it in fact confuse job responsibilities and facilitate ambivalence toward the whole working concept of probation? It is this particular issue that gives rise to the problem area posed in this study.

In Winnipeg, it is self-evident that probation officers working within juvenile corrections perform a host of multi-functional, inter-dependent tasks in the assessment and supervision of those juveniles brought to the attention of the court. In order to resolve the classical correctional dilemma, it has been suggested by one author that the synthetic model has been adopted to equally address the treatment and law enforcement or legal functions of probation work. Have certain tasks evolved in response to the development of this model and do these tasks fall within the boundaries of sound probation practice? If this model is leading probation officers astray as suggested in the opening comments of chapter one, what effect if any does this have on the level of job satisfaction as expressed by probation officers working within the Juvenile Justice System?

B. Historical Development of Probation

Probation is an essentially modern method of dealing with offenders and as such derives from the broader social and cultural trends of the modern era. As indicated in the previous chapter, the development of probation and related measures constitutes an integral part of the more general movement away from the traditional punitive and repressive approach toward the substitution of more humanitarian and utilitarian considerations in the treatment of delinquent and criminal offenders.¹

The legal machinery from which probation originated derives from the practical extension of the English Common Law.² The idea that man is innocent until proven guilty allowed the individual to remain at large pending certain conditions such as bail or sureties to the date of his trial. The practice of "binding over" alleged offenders to the date of their trial paved much of the way for the inception of probation in that convicted offenders were once again bound over by the court under certain conditions until a final period of time elapsed. The precise stage when the principle of binding over combined with probation is buried in history, however, the English have made some rather desperate attempts to trace this system as far back as 895 A.D.

¹ Probation and Related Matters (New York: A United Nations Publication. 1951) pp 15

² Ibid. pp 16

According to the National Association of Probation Officers in Great Britain, Athelstone, an Anglo-Saxon king made his mark on legal reform when he enacted that:

" men should slay none other than fifteen winter's man, and provided that, if his kindred will not take him nor be surety for him, then swear he as a bishop shall teach him, that he will shun all evil and let him be in bondage for his price. And if often that he steal let men slay him or hang him, as they did to his elders."¹

In England and America, probation developed out of various methods for the conditional suspension of punishment.² Among some of the early precursors of probation are the so-called benefit of clergy, judicial reprieve, release of an offender upon his own recognizance and the provisional release on bail. These systems developed in order that some provisions were available to the court whereas the mechanical application of harsh and repressive criminal laws could be avoided in certain cases. The benefit of clergy originated in the early medieval period as a device whereby ordained members of the clergy convicted under secular law were permitted to escape the severe penalties of the early English criminal law. In practice it was primarily a device to avoid capital punishment. The benefit of clergy was abolished in England by statute in 1827.³

¹ Handbook for Probation. National Association of Probation
London. 1935 pp 19

² Op. Cit. Probation and Related Matters pp 16

³ Ibid. pp 17

In America, this device was used both before and after its abolishment in England however was eventually ruled out by statute or judicial decision in all American jurisdictions because of its unequal application and rather dubious legal standing. The judicial reprieve was a temporary suspension of the execution of sentence by the presiding judge to allow the convicted person time to apply for a pardon or under such circumstances where the judge felt the evidence was contrived and thus not satisfied with the verdict. Even though the judicial reprieve was only a temporary suspension, it often resulted in the abandonment of the prosecution finale, speaking to sentence.

The recognizance is a legal device deeply embedded in English common law. It originated as a measure of preventative justice and as such required those persons of whom there was suspicion that future misbehaviour would probably occur, enter into an agreement with the crown that such misbehaviour would not occur in acknowledgment of a personal debt to the crown such as a bond or surety. The principles governing the use of the recognizance as a measure of preventative justice were laid down in an act of 1360 by Edward III.¹ With the passing of time the recognizance came to be used almost exclusively with reference to criminal proceedings rather than a measure of preventative justice. The recognizance principle soon after evolved into an important piece of legal machinery during criminal proceedings especially with respect to youthful and petty offenders the imprisonment of whom did not appear warranted.

¹ Ibid. pp 18

The middle of the nineteenth century marked a significant awakening of the public conscience in all spheres of social welfare including those found guilty of crimes. John Howard¹ (1726-1790) and Elizabeth Fry² (1790-1845) were among the first to draw critical attention to the state of English prisons and to the whole problem of the treatment of criminal offenders in that country. The establishment of borstals (juvenile reformatories) and approved schools were heralded in those days as major break throughs in penal reform by emptying the prisons of England of its children. Charles Dickens, the monolithic giant of the nineteenth century novel unceasingly assailed the social injustices of English law during that period and was without doubt indirectly responsible for the momentous change that began to occur throughout the United Kingdom especially with respect to penal reform and criminal justice.

The rudimentary beginnings of the probation system can also be traced back to this period. In the first half of the nineteenth century, it was more or less left open to the court in many cases, to merely dismiss a charge with a caution. The probation system however implied something more in the minds of many persons in that it required the exercise of some form of accountability to the court during the offenders period of proof. It also demanded some form of

¹ Howard, D. L. John Howard: Prison Reformer (New York, Archer House Inc. 1963)

² Pitman, E. R. Elizabeth Fry (New York, Greenwood Press 1969)

assistance which would help the individual re-direct his energies in a more socially acceptable manner. This honor it would appear belongs to some Warwickshire magistrate of whom it is recorded as early as 1820, "that in suitable cases a sentence of one day imprisonment would suffice on condition that he be returned to the care of his parent or master to be more carefully watched and supervised in the future."¹

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, many voluntary societies began to send missionaries to the Police Courts of London to help those people in trouble with the law. In 1879, the Summary Jurisdiction Act was amended to allow magistrates to discharge those persons convicted of such trifling petty offences conditionally on his giving security with or without surety and to appear for sentencing when called upon. Contingent upon these discharges, magistrates requested that the police court missionary give advice and try to help the offender mend his ways.

In 1887 a private member's bill was introduced in the British House of Commons that proposed to give magistrates the power to conditionally release upon probation those first offenders liable to imprisonment but worthy of some sort of alternative disposition. This piece of legislation known as the First Offender's Bill eventually received Royal Assent, however, its scope was somewhat

¹ Handbook for Probation. National Association of Probation Officers pp 22

limited. The main weakness of this act was that it failed to set up any administrative machinery through the court for the supervision of such persons and secondly was limited to those persons convicted of an offence punishable by not more than two years imprisonment. The Act of 1887 was seen by many as a progressive break-through in legal reform but failed to satisfy those advocates who appreciated the importance of a probation system and the difference between legally authorized and informal supervision.¹

In 1906, Sir Howard Vincent introduced a bill which provided for the appointment of probation officers to the criminal courts. This bill was eventually withdrawn, however it provided the momentum for a further more specific bill to be introduced in 1907. This bill, known as the Probation of Offenders Act repealed Section 16 of the Act of 1879 (Summary Jurisdiction Act) and the whole of the Act of 1887. This legislation provided for a much more effective system of supervising those persons on probation and further stimulated the establishment of local probation services throughout the United Kingdom.

It is interesting to note that the early developmental legislation in England was in fact preceded by events in America with respect to the use of probation as a judicial disposition. Sir Howard Vincent who supported the First Offenders Bill in 1887 in the British House of Commons, stated that:

¹ Ibid. pp 24

"It is no new experiment which we are seeking to introduce. What we propose has worked amongst our own race and under a similar system of jurisprudence to our own and for eight years past with great success. I believe that legislation of this kind is in operation in some American states, Massachusetts for instance."¹

It was in 1841 that a Boston cobbler by the name of John Augustus began a sustained service to the Boston Courts by acting as a surety for those offenders who agreed to undergo supervision. Much of Augustus' work centered around the common drunkard however soon after began to stand bail for juvenile offenders, petty thieves and prostitutes. By 1869, various statutes regulating the release of offenders on probation of good conduct with sureties were passed in the state of Massachusetts. One law provided for the appointment of a visiting agent to be attached to the Board of State Charities which empowered the agency to investigate and take charge of delinquent children brought before the court.² So successful was this early experiment that in 1878 the state legislature authorized the city of Boston to appoint a probation officer for adults and two years later, legislation was extended to cover every city and town in the state. Therefore, from an historical perspective, the tiny New England state was the first to enact actual probation legislation and in turn provide the stimulus for such measures to be introduced in Great Britain and later, Canada.

¹ Ibid. pp 23

² Crime and its Treatment in Canada W. McGrath pp 224

Apart from the development of probation in Massachusetts, probation in North America generally evolved as an integral function of the Juvenile Court. Prior to the establishment of the Juvenile Court, there was a fairly consistent development of reformatory schools for young persons coupled with a variety of services for children considered dependent, neglected or destitute. The Courts of Chancery in England had long assumed the responsibility of protecting the rights of state wards however more often than not, succeeded in inflicting more injustices and generating more unhappiness among those young persons than they ever cared to admit.¹ In any event the delinquent child over seven years of age was not given any special consideration and was subsequently treated in the same manner as any other offender.

In Canada in 1894, some five years prior to the establishment of the first Juvenile Court, the Ontario Children's Aid Societies managed to obtain a federal enactment providing for trial in camera of youthful offenders under the age of sixteen, with further provision that their incarceration prior to sentence be separate and apart from adults.² This enactment applied to the whole of Canada with further stipulations that any boy or girl charged with an offence in Ontario not be proceeded against until a comprehensive study had been undertaken by the Children's Aid Society in order to

¹ Dickens, Charles Bleak House Dell Publishing Co., Inc. New York © 1965 by Edgar Johnson

² Manitoba Probation Service Training and Procedures Manual, Section 1 - 2. pp 3

evaluate the home environment and needs of the child. This legislation provided the basic framework for the inception of Canada's first Juvenile Act, commonly referred to as The Juvenile Delinquents Act of Canada (1908). This Act was revised considerably in 1929 and to this day remains as the juvenile counter-part to the Criminal Code of Canada.

The Winnipeg Juvenile Court was first established in 1909 and was in fact the first Juvenile Court in Canada. In 1919 the first probation officer in Manitoba was appointed to that court in order to carry out social enquiries into the lives of delinquent children. In 1947 the first probation officer outside of Winnipeg took up similar duties in Brandon which ten years later was followed up by the appointment of the first adult probation officer to serve the Winnipeg City Magistrate's Court.¹ In 1962, juvenile and adult probation were integrated under the direction of a Chief Probation Officer which soon-after paved the way for the appropriation of public funds in order to develop a separate probation and foster-group home program for difficult to manage delinquent adolescents. The Manitoba Corrections Act, enacted in 1966 resulted in a much closer integration of services within the Juvenile Justice System than that was possible prior to this particular Act.² The

¹ Ibid. pp 5

² Ibid.

probation officer under the Manitoba Corrections Act suddenly became the thread throughout the whole juvenile justice process. The assertion that this Act provided for a closer integration of services within the gamut of the juvenile justice system is to this day self-evident. However, has this integration of service resulted in a clearer definition of probation objectives or has it in fact confused the line worker as to what the very nature of his job should entail. Traditionally speaking, the probation process usually began following conviction or pleas of guilt and just prior to sentencing. Probation intervention in this sense usually began by serving the selective function through a pre-sentence enquiry. Through the process of selection it would be more or less decided whether the offender would benefit from probation or some alternative disposition. However, under the framework of the Juvenile Justice System, the probation officer's responsibilities begin shortly after a juvenile's release from the custody of the police authorities. In Winnipeg, every juvenile who is taken into police custody on suspicion of juvenile delinquency is referred to the juvenile authority whether he remains in custody or not. This simply means that all juveniles in this broad category are ultimately referred to a probation officer whose responsibility it is to process the case via a judicial hearing or non-judicial

interview. It is under this organizational framework that the juvenile probation officer may find himself engaging in work tasks that in his belief appear inconsistent with his personal perception of what the probation function should entail. Should probation officers discuss an alleged delinquency with a juvenile prior to his initial court appearance? Should probation officers be the ones responsible for requesting that juveniles be released or not released from custody? Should probation officers openly support or oppose representations made by crown attorneys or defence lawyers? Should probation officers be engaging in family counselling sessions or drafting treatment plans that involve the removal of juveniles from their natural homes? These and a multitude of other tasks too numerous to mention somehow find themselves under the cloak of probation officer task responsibility. If this in fact is the case, what is the function of the probation officer and what is probation?

C. Some Popular Misconceptions of Probation

One of the most common mistakes surrounding the term probation is the confusion that exists between the concepts of probation and parole. By recognizing that probation and parole do share a great deal in common, they differ in at least one fundamental respect: how and when one becomes eligible for one service or another.¹ The main difference is that the parolee has been committed to a correctional centre and has served part of his time in an institution and part outside, while the probationer serves all of his time on the outside. Probation is a judicial disposition arrived at within a court of law while parole is an administrative decision arrived at within a governmental bureaucracy. Generally speaking, this is a universal distinction recognized by most western nations however there are exceptions to this rule.

Under the Criminal Code of Canada section 637(1)(a) provides for the binding over of a person convicted of an indictable offence in addition to any sentence that is imposed upon him.² In layman's terms, Canadian law provides for a sentence of imprisonment to be followed by a period of probation which for the most part is inconsistent with the theory and definitions governing this function. The

¹ Dressler, David Probation and Parole (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951) pp 13

² Op. Cit. "Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections" pp 294

Canadian Committee on Corrections (Ouimet Report 1969) considered that these provisions under the Criminal Code were not consistent to good probation practice and consequently stated in their report that the imposition of probation following a period of imprisonment is more within the domain of the parole authority.¹ In the United States, the use of probation in a manner similar to the above was ruled illegal by a state supreme court when a lower court judge committed an offender to a penitentiary for two years and ordered that he be released on probation after serving six months. The higher court ruled that the district court was in fact ordering the offender paroled in which it had no jurisdiction. They further indicated that such a disposition was contradictory in principle as probation was to be used as a system for keeping offenders out of prison.² It is interesting to note that it was a judge in this instance who misunderstood the concept of probation and as such suggests that this is not an error exclusively characteristic of the general public. The Ouimet Report (1969) further stressed that confusion often arises when an inmate whose prison sentence is followed by probation is then granted parole. They concluded

¹ Toward Unity: Criminal Justice and Corrections, "Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections" (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969) pp 293

² Sutherland, E. H. and Cressey, D. R. Criminology (8th ed.; New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1970) pp 463

that the imposition of probation following a term of imprisonment is inconsistent with sound probation practice and therefore recommended that it be deleted from the criminal code. A further difference between probation and parole lies in the fact that probation very frequently involves the extension of the power of the court over the future conduct of the offender, while in the case of parole, it is not the court but administrative authorities who exercise authority over the released offender.¹ In Canada, section 92 of the British North America Act gives to the provinces exclusive authority to legislate relative to the administration of justice in the province. Since probation is a judicial disposition, it falls under the administration of justice and as such becomes a provincial responsibility. Parole however relates to the execution of a sentence already imposed and therefore under the British North America Act becomes a federal responsibility.

Another common misconception of probation is that it is a legal device to escape punishment. This idea is a carry over from the old days that justice should be blind, in that, for every offence there should be mandatory punishment. This negative interpretation of justice rests on the assumption that deterrence is of primary

1

Probation and Related Measures Department of Social Affairs,
United Nations (New York: United Nations Publications, 1951) pp 10

importance and therefore over-rides all other considerations in the administration of justice. If such was the case, machines could more effectively impose sentence and probably at much less cost than a judge or magistrate. However by taking into account the unique set of circumstances surrounding the commission of an offence, the character of the convicted person and a host of other factors, the court then has the opportunity to consider alternative forms of sentencing. This premise is based on the ideal, that in some cases it is of paramount importance for the court to find some satisfactory alternative to the harsh and admittedly destructive penalties imposed by the criminal code.¹ The Ouimet committee in 1969 adopted the criteria that no law should give rise to social or personal damage greater than it was designed to prevent.² It is in this context that probation must be viewed as a constructive alternative in the administration of justice and not just as a legal device to escape punishment.

Another misconception held by many persons is that probation is a form of leniency. Leniency in this sense is being interpreted in a negative manner and unwisely linked with probation. The view

¹ The Probation Service ed. by Joan F. S. King M.B.E. on behalf of National Association of Probation Officers. (London, Butterworths Co. 1964 2nd ed.) pp 1

² Toward Unity: Criminal Justice and Corrections, "Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections" (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969) pp 12.

that is being presented here is that probation is a "pat on the head" or a benevolent disposition utilized by an irresponsible judge at the expense of the larger community. It is unlikely that any probation officer would realistically attempt to debate that probation is equivalent to imprisonment, however one could establish an argument that probation, by its very nature, could exert just as many, if not more demands on the offender in lieu of being carted off to gaol at an enormous expense to the community. Probation for properly selected offenders places them in a position for a period of time where they are required by law to assume much more personal responsibility than they had in the past. The handling of this responsibility is observed by the probation officer over that period and is commonly referred to as supervision. It must be recognized here that it is not the person himself who is being supervised but the degree of responsibility that he is prepared to demonstrate in the community. Any attempt to physically supervise the offender would amount to no more than legal babysitting which is hardly the function of any profession, let alone probation. Therefore, when one takes into account the emphasis placed on responsibility in this context, probation is not simply a lenient gesture made by the court, but rather a well-thought out plan to correct or improve an unproductive situation. This assertion however is contingent upon how well the order is enforced and how well probation services are organized within its jurisdiction.

Another misconception held by various individuals involved in the correctional process is that probation is a form of punishment. F. Lovell Bixby suggests that probation is punishment of the same order as imprisonment, but of a lesser degree.¹ Bixby states that a person placed on probation is deprived of a measure of freedom allowed the rest of us in that he must secure permission to travel from the jurisdiction, report changes in his job and address and maintain regular contact with the probation officer. It is questionable however if the restriction of freedom is of the same order as punishment as Bixby seems to be implying. If a judge when delivering sentence, was to say to the offender that he was going to be punished by being placed on probation, the goals of this process would be irreparably thwarted. If the purpose of probation is to protect society through the rehabilitation of the offender then probation cannot be viewed as punishment. Dressler states that probation is an attempt to help those selected offenders, through the services of agencies designed for that purpose, to solve those difficulties that made them criminal.² However if the probation process was to follow a punishment orientation, it would be highly

1 Bixby, Lovell F. "Probation is Not Freedom". Federal Probation Volume 24 June 1962 pp 47

2 Dressler, David Probation and Parole (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951) pp 4

unlikely that the probationer would gain insight into his present difficulties let alone the probation officer whose duty it would be to foster such insight. As an example, if probation officers and judges in juvenile court use probation with placement as a veiled threat if any further delinquent activity occurs, it is very unlikely that foster home placement would succeed in the event that such action proved to be necessary. Most juveniles viewing placement by the probation officer as a form of punishment would most certainly sabotage any efforts directed toward the curtailment of his delinquent behaviour. In conclusion it is not only dangerous to view probation from this perspective but defeats the very premise upon which probation was founded; that of helping those selected offenders modify or change their behavioural patterns under a period of supervision in order that they no longer engage in delinquent activity.

Another commonly accepted misconception is that probation is a type of policing device. Lewis Diana¹ asked twenty select probation officers to define probation in their own words and to indicate what it consisted in practice. The following are two verbatim replies to this initial question.

¹ Diana, Lewis "What is Probation" Journal of Criminal Law Criminology and Police Science Volume 51 1960 pp 199

"Probation is putting a threat over the child's head. Authority puts weight back of probation. We're the policemen back of the agencies."

"What it simmers down to is police work. There is no planning, but giving supervision to prevent violations or repetition of delinquent behaviour."

This notion tends to vitiate the helping process in the probation function and further tends to rest on a rather pessimistic assumption that the probationer will violate and therefore really deserves to be in gaol. It further would contribute to the probation officer not acknowledging the probationer's need for help. The policing procedure idea also implies that the magical potion behind a probation order will somehow frighten the offender back to the norm. The following is probably one of the most candid statements addressing this issue and most assuredly would raise the eyebrows of any probation officer in Canada let alone Winnipeg. Dressler, in his earlier volume states:

"The officer must develop techniques that the private social worker abhors, techniques of the police officer. He must learn to trail people, keep their homes under surveillance, arrest men and women, lock them up and he must for his own welfare learn how to take care himself in a scuffle. Knowledge of the best way to kick in a door or trip up a

recalcitrant may spell not only the difference between apprehension of a malefactor in his escape, but the life or death of an officer. Handcuffs are hardly the tools of the caseworker in a treatment situation, but they are the tools of the probation officer about to close a case."¹

It is interesting to note that most of these misconceptions are based on terms that have been negatively and conceptually equated with the term probation. For the most part, the history of corrections has been one of the most negative aspects in the civilized development of western man and therefore it is not surprising to find that the more constructive approaches, such as probation, are viewed in a like manner. In whatever aspect probation is perceived, whether it is leniency, police work, legal devices to escape punishment, it is the negative side that seems to conjure or fit the public equation.

Now that some of the more popular misconceptions of this term have been discussed, we will proceed to analyze from a theoretical perspective exactly what the probation process involves and how this concept is carried out with particular reference to the field of juvenile corrections.

1

Dressler, David Probation and Parole (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951) pp 13

D. Juvenile Probation: An Operational View

In 1960 Lewis Diana submitted an article to the Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science in commemoration of its fifty years of publication entitled "What is Probation".¹

This article is one of the more extensive overviews of the literature addressing the probation function and appears to be one of the first real efforts directed toward an explanation of this function. Diana suggested that probation came about as a societal reaction to the various abuses associated with the imprisonment of children. As a result, a great deal of sentiment became associated with the beginnings of juvenile probation. Together with the goals of rehabilitation and reform, this sentiment formed the nucleus of probation as an administrative process mostly concerned with the rendering of concrete services such as medical treatment, effecting school transfers and helping the offender seek employment. Diana's research revealed that between 1902 and 1920 thirty percent of the probation writers claimed this to be the major framework of the probation process. The claim that probation was primarily an administrative process was given support by the National Conference of Social Work in 1919 who summed up in their report that the office of the probation officer is administrative.² They further stated that the probation officer may have his

¹ Diana, Lewis "What is Probation" Journal of Criminal Law Criminology and Police Science Volume 51 1960 pp 189

² Parsons, H. C. Probation and Parole; Report of the Sub Committee, National Conference of Social Work. (1919) pp 113

authority beyond the court however accountability to the court is, in the final analysis the foundation of the probation service.

However, over the past forty years the literature tends to suggest that probation is a form of social casework treatment more than anything else. One of the more widely read definitions of social casework is that it is a process used by certain human welfare agencies to help individuals cope more effectively with their problems in social functioning.¹ Biestek explains the casework relationship on the basis of seven needs of the client. Biestek states that the caseworker is sensitive to, understands and appropriately responds to these needs and that the client is somehow aware of the caseworker's sensitivity, understanding and response.² Casework thus attempts to formalize, standardize and professionalize the display and exercise of warmth, sympathy, respect and understanding all of which are considered to be basic elements in the therapeutic treatment of an individual. With respect to the probation process, Lippman states that casework is the essential ingredient in the treatment of delinquency.³

¹ Perlman, Helen Social Casework, A Problem Solving Process
(Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957) pp 4

² Biestek The Casework Relationship
(Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1957) pp 17

³ Lippman, Walter "The Role of the Probation Officer in the Treatment of Delinquency in Children" Federal Probation,
Volume 12 (1948) pp 36

Crystal suggests that probation could be viewed as family casework not only in the treatment of the individual probationer, but the entire family as well.¹ Palmieri declares that probation is essentially a casework service and a method of treatment which is no longer an ideal but a reality.² These authors however tended to be rather vague about what they actually meant by casework in probation. Much of the problem of course lies within the traditional mould that casework was simply a diluted process of psychoanalysis. Diana suggests that too many correctional workers in the past became dependent on the fanciful interpretations of psychoanalysis to explain away difficult behavioural problems and also provided the momentum to create problems where none existed. The point being made here is that a problem-focused orientation negates the range of possibilities that could give rise to delinquent behaviour without having to delve into the intra psyche processes of an individual. In other words any attempt to explain probation casework in a Freudian sense would indeed be an inaccurate gesture.

Probation has been conceptually defined as that legal process whereby individuals convicted of criminal offences are not committed to an institution or fined but rather as a result of their court

¹ Crystal, David "Family Casework in Probation" Federal Probation Volume 13 (1949) pp 47 - 53

² Palmieri, Henry "Probation is Treatment" Federal Probation Volume 13 (1949) pp 20

hearing are released under an order of supervision subject to legally sanctioned conditions. The authority of the court is delegated to a court official known as the probation officer whose responsibility is to ensure that the probationer comply with the conditions set down by the court. The probationer is therefore placed in a captive subordinate role that demands that he comply with the conditions as supervised by the delegated authority. Implicit in this arrangement is that somehow the probationer will benefit from the experience of being on probation and refrain from further deviant activity. This idea is most commonly translated through a particular casework format. What exactly does this format involve?

Probation casework for most practical purposes appears to revolve around two specific methods; the integration of services and the appropriate use of authority. These two methods constitute the means in which to implement the primary function of the probation officer most commonly referred to as supervision.

The integration and co-ordination of various social and medical services should they be of any use to the offender is undoubtedly one of the most important aspects in probation casework. Hardman states that it is extremely important that the probation officer recognize his limitations and in turn be an effective person in

organizing the services of a community in dealing with the many problems faced by the probationer. Hardman sums up his point as follows:

"We can't do the job alone; the more we attempt it alone, the greater our chances of failure. The more we acquire and use a team of experts, the better our success. Further, let us not underestimate the psychological value of this team approach to the probationer; a person who is convinced that the world is against him, that no one cares if he lives or dies and now finds himself involved with a half dozen persons all intently working in his interest. Mathematically, this has six times the therapeutic value of one person."¹

Many practical criticisms would most assuredly be raised in this regard, as this seemingly viable and simple model usually ends up as a non-entity in the reality of the correctional world. This "integrator of service" would not only have to evaluate the effectiveness and appropriateness of the service but also ensure that such collateral help does happen as it should and that it is not allowed to falter if and when the going gets rough as it usually does in juvenile corrections. There can be nothing more frustrating to the probationer than a number of people indicating they can provide service with the end result amounting to zero. Mathematically, this could result in x times the number of future

¹ Hardman, Dale "The Function of the Probation Officer"
Federal Probation Volume 24 (1960) pp 3



offences especially when dealing with juvenile offenders. Hardman's point is that probation officers often engage in activity that falls beyond the scope of their work role. Hardman insists that the primary function of the probation officer is to assist the probationer comply with the order of the court to the best of his ability. What is often overlooked however is that we are not the best vocational counsellors, educationalists, ministers or police officers and have no business attempting to perform such tasks. The social work adage that "you cannot be everything to everyone" certainly supports the position taken by Hardman and should at least be considered as a vital issue by probation officers in the field of corrections.

A second and equally important component in probation casework involves the appropriate use of authority. Probation officers quite simply must be experts in the use of authority. Dressler suggests that when social workers, in an out of corrections use the word authority, they usually mean something analogous to "reality", the reality situation presented to everyone of us.¹ Authority in the probation process must mean certain things if it is to be used intelligently and must coincide with the reality situation. For example, a probation officer has the right and obligation to insist that a probationer obey the law but does not have the authority to insist that he obtain a university degree. Hardman

¹ Dressler, David Probation and Parole (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951) pp 121

states that authority conflict lies at the root of more delinquency than any other inter or intrapersonal conflict.¹ This author states that the degree to which the probation officer can be helpful to a client with authority conflict is a function of the degree to which the officer understands and accepts his own feelings around authority and the skill with which he uses his delegated authority.² In the probation setting, the proper understanding and appropriate use of authority is the most important tool of the probation officer. Hardman suggests in an analogical sense that the probation officer must become as intimately familiar with the concept and use of authority as a turret-lathe operator would with his machinery. The probation officer must know the limits of his authority and must realize that like a machine, can be a destructive force when misused, however can turn out a useful product when used properly. The use of authority in the probation process must follow some basic principles in order to maximize its effectiveness as a treatment tool.

Foremost in any probation setting, the authority of the probation officer must be made explicitly clear to both the probation officer and his client. The probation officer as an official of the court

¹ Op. Cit. Hardman, Dale "The Function of the Probation Officer."
pp 10

² Authority in Social Work: Concept and Use. ed. by Yelaja, S. H. (University of Toronto Press, 1971) pp 103 from Hardman, Dale. "Authority in Casework—a bread and butter theory." National Probation and Parole Journal. Volume V July 1959

and as a representative of a governmental department must have the authority delegated to him clearly defined both in an institutional (legal) and administrative (departmental) sense.¹ The worst probation officer is not one who abuses his authority by throwing his weight around, but one who fails to define his authority leaving it unclear and nebulous in the mind of his charge. This failure is often the result of the failure of the court and department in defining the authority of the probation officer and secondly, occurs as a result of the probation officer failing to seek this definition. The ambiguity that often surrounds the authority of the probation officer frequently necessitates the offender taking some form of action in order to clarify it for himself. This is especially true with juvenile offenders.

Secondly, it is important that the probation officer claim only the authority that has been delegated to him by the court. When probation officers claim to have authority in areas which they do not, the final result will be a game of who can outbluff whom. Such situations are not therapeutic and only reinforce the offender's perception that authority is inconsistent, irrational and unfair. In probation, the testing of an officer's authority is often a test

¹ Authority and Social Work: Concept and Use. ed. Yelaja, S. H. pp 90 from Tufts, Edith. Social Work Papers. Volume 8. 1961

of his honesty. When probation officers are found to be bluffing, they no longer will be able to work effectively with their clients nor gain their respect.

The third principle is that whenever authority is used, it should be used openly and honestly. Whenever an officer makes a referral or submits a recommendation or report concerning a client, the client should be the first to know about it, if at all possible. Hardman states that for a person who perceives authority as deceitful and hypocritical, such action can become a new and therapeutic experience.¹

The final principle suggests that the exercise of authority by the probation officer should be made with a clear understanding of the probationer's total needs as a person. Rather than taking on a retributive effect, the appropriate use of authority should be seen as a reconstructive force. As an example, it is common practice not only in probation but in other areas of social casework to transfer and in some instances close a file following the placement or committal of a juvenile to whatever resource is available. For many officers and clients alike, such action is a welcome relief. However, the question is, should this in fact happen? Should the use of authority with whatever impending consequences prevail, remain as the final recollection the probationer has of the officer and his authority? The writer suggests not. The exercise of authority and the conviction

¹ Hardman. Supra. Note at pp 7

to stand by the decision reached can mark the beginning of a new and positive relationship rather than end an old, exhausted and negative experience.

Quite often probation officers feel that because of the authority inherent in their status as an official accountable to the court, they are often the unfortunate victim of a double-bind situation. They feel that the authority of their work role is inconsistent with their efforts of trying to establish a therapeutic casework relationship and therefore is a phenomena to be avoided at all costs. As a result, it is not uncommon for probation officers to overlook violations of probation and the various indicators pointing to recidivism simply for the sake of preserving the casework relationship. One author sardonically suggests, "therapeutic for whom". The error here of course is that these officers do not realize that the appropriate exercise of their authority is very much a part of therapy in probation casework and as such cannot be avoided. Any evasion of responsibility in this context will not serve to preserve the casework relationship but most certainly provide the impetus to destroy it.

Therefore, when one asks what is probation and what does it involve, the answer becomes somewhat more manageable and clear. Probation, in an operational sense is a legally sanctioned judicial disposition that binds together an official of the court with an

offender in a one to one relationship that may involve the practical administrative component of social casework such as the mobilization of community resources and secondly, the consistent, expert and delicate use of authority in a situation cloaked with this phenomena. This is one of the two major functions of the probation officer, most popularly known as supervision and is the bread and butter of what probation counselling is made.

The second inter-dependent function that the probation officer is required to perform is in actuality the first step in the probation process and is referred to as selection. Dressler states that poor selection can render supervision and treatment ineffective and jeopardize the community as well.¹ The selection of offenders for probation supervision usually is the result of the recommendation incorporated at the end of a pre-disposition report. Often when the court has made a finding of delinquency, the judge may request additional information concerning the offender's background before imposing sentence. This request is carried out in the form of a social enquiry into the personal and family life of the offender. The results of such an enquiry usually determine whether the probation officer feels that the subject would be a suitable candidate for probation.

With regard to the juvenile system, the pre-disposition report is the most crucial tool in the hands of the juvenile court judge. These

¹ Dressler, David. Theory and Practice of Probation and Parole.
(New York: Columbia University Press, 1969) pp 106

reports may range from a brief two page synopsis of the juvenile's social environment to a lengthy and comprehensive eight to twelve page social study. These reports attempt to define the problems at hand, what resources are available in the community to deal with them and what the most appropriate court disposition would be in order to facilitate the mobilization of these resources. Keve states that no single instrument in the juvenile justice system so neatly typifies the modern correctional philosophy as does the pre-disposition report.¹ Jane Ives states that few officers indicate problems in the collection of information for these reports, but rather centered their concern on the balancing of factors favorable or unfavorable to the offender's adjustment to the community.²

For example, if the pre-disposition report revealed that the offender is extremely dangerous, habitually violent towards others, hardened in crime and in contempt of all social norms it is unlikely that such an individual would benefit under probation supervision. However another report may reveal that the offender's involvement with the police was a direct result of mixing with the wrong crowd and unintentionally being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Even though the differential factors in these cases render obvious conclusions, most probation officers are faced with considerably

¹ Keve, Paul W. "The Professional Character of the Pre-Sentence Report" Federal Probation June 1962. Volume 26. pp 51

² Ives, Jane. "The Essential Task of the Probation and Parole Officer" Federal Probation Volume 26. March 1962. pp 42

more complicated situations where such cases are not so clearly polarized and where selection is much more difficult. Dressler states that it is generally accepted that probation should be used in those cases offering greatest hopes of readjustment in terms of age, mental-emotional status and attitude toward society.¹ He further asserts that it is for those least hardened in crime and is intended for those offenders willing and anxious to accept probation conditions as an alternative to committal to an institution. Dressler in his more recent volume carries this point further by suggesting that probation is not only for those least hardened in crime but can also be considered for those who genuinely appear motivated to make changes in their lives. Dressler further makes a distinction between those individuals not in need of supervision (who could make it on their own) and those who would likely recidivate without the intervention of probation services.

It is interesting to note that in an historical sense, probation was in fact the highly selective alternative that could be used in the disposition of a case rather than the more common alternative of fines or institutionalization. This walk or fall concept essentially still applies in the adult criminal court setting however is no longer applicable to the juvenile justice system. Under juvenile law and social policy in Manitoba, probation in the traditional sense

¹ Dressler, David. Probation and Parole. 1951 pp 37

is not the highly selective process of choosing the motivated repentant first offender but virtually the mainstay process in dealing with all juvenile referrals whether they are placed on probation or not. Probation in the juvenile system not only involves the traditional function of selection and supervision but includes a matrix of legal, medical, community and social services aimed at redirecting the lives of juveniles in trouble with the law. A significant number of referrals, approximately thirty-five per cent are diverted away from the juvenile court setting via a non-judicial disposition while still a larger percentage appear before the court with their charges being adjourned sine die (indefinitely).¹ The remaining number of referrals constitute formal findings of delinquency in court and for the most part are placed under probation supervision as a formally recorded disposition. It is in this vein that the probationer may be returned home under supervision or be placed outside his natural home into a treatment centre, foster home, group home or institution. The point being made here is that the most frequent formal type of action taken with the Juvenile Court is the imposition of a probation order with whatever appendages are attached thereto. The option of committal to a training school or transfer to an ordinary court is not being purposely set aside but acknowledged as simply the exception rather than the rule. The suitability of many juveniles

¹ Winnipeg Probation Districts and Central Intake Unit
Daily Statistics Sheets: April through November 1976

for probation status in Manitoba is no longer a crucial issue.

If the selective function in the juvenile probation process takes any form at all, it is the balancing of factors in terms of whether a child should be returned home with a view of adjourning the charge indefinitely (sine die) or by taking the more drastic action of placing him on probation.

How different this sounds from the days when probation was seen as a device by the courts as a means to avoid the more harsh and destructive penalties of the law! How odd that the probation order has now become the mainstay measure in the hands of the Juvenile Court. So once again this rather elusive concept re-appears which leaves one wondering, what is probation or more specifically, what is probation in the juvenile system? Is it evolving into that ultimate form of court action whereby probation officers and judges who once would have warned of committal now threaten the juvenile with a foster home? It was pointed out earlier that to view probation as punishment is not only erroneous but would serve to defeat the very premise upon which probation was conceived. As provocative an issue as this may appear to be, it is unfortunately quite apart from the central theme of this thesis however was felt important enough to mention as a basis for future discussion and perhaps even further study.

At this point, it is not difficult to see that juvenile probation insofar as it applies to Winnipeg can be viewed from many different perspectives. The manner in which probation officers see their duties and carry out their work tasks is not only contingent upon the organizational framework in which they find themselves but also dependent upon the reality of their field demands. This combination of organizational expectations, professional values and the reality of a field situation tend to shape what tasks probation officers believe relevant to their work role and conversely those that are not. This in turn was felt to have some bearing on the level of job satisfaction as expressed by Winnipeg juvenile probation officers. The measurement of job satisfaction is in itself a separate field of study and will therefore be more thoroughly discussed in the following section.

Review of the Literature (Part II)

The terms job satisfaction, employee attitudes and company morale are often used interchangeably by managers and workers alike when making reference to how individuals feel about their jobs. Vroom states that job satisfaction and job attitudes both refer to the affective orientation on the part of individuals towards their work role.¹ Positive attitudes toward the job are conceptually equivalent to job satisfaction while negative attitudes are equivalent to job dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction, job attitudes and morale are typically measured by means of interviews or questionnaires in which workers are asked to state the extent to which they feel happy or unhappy with the various components of their work role. The degree with which a person is satisfied with his job can be inferred from his responses to various questions that describe his feelings about his job. Vroom suggests that there has been little standardization of job satisfaction measures as most researchers tend to "tailor-make" an instrument for the particular population they are studying.² Two major exceptions are the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index (1951)³ and the Kerr Tear Ballot (1948)⁴ scales both

¹ Vroom, Victor Work and Motivation (New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1964. pp 99)

² Ibid. pp 100

³ Brayfield, A. H. and Rothe, H. F. "An Index of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 35 October, 1951

⁴ Kerr, W. A. "On the Validity and Reliability of the Job Satisfaction Tear Ballot" Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 32, 1948

of which have had repeated and extensive use in the field of industrial psychology. For the purposes of this study, the Brayfield-Rothe scales were adopted for reasons that will be shortly explained. Job satisfaction is therefore operationally defined as the extent to which line workers within the Winnipeg Probation Service respond positively to the Brayfield-Rothe Job Satisfaction Index.

There are two major approaches to the measurement of job satisfaction.¹ The first approach is to collect information about general satisfaction concerning membership in an organization while the other is to collect information about specific dimensions of satisfaction such as recognition, supervision, pay etc. The Brayfield-Rothe scales are a commonly accepted measure of job satisfaction that was designed along the general approach with its main emphasis being placed on the individual's attitude towards his work. Therefore, their approach pre-determined the methodology in their design, that of attitude scaling. Brayfield and Rothe felt that their index should cover "overall" job satisfaction rather than measure specific aspects of the job situation. They further felt that it should be applicable to a wide variety of jobs, sensitive to variations in attitude and finally that the items should be of such a nature (interesting, realistic and varied) that the scale would evoke co-operation from both management and employees.² Therefore, items

¹ Vroom. Op. Cit. pp 99

² Brayfield and Rothe. Op. Cit. pp 307

referring to specific aspects of a job were eliminated since an overall attitudinal factor was desired. The fact that Brayfield and Rothe's index of job satisfaction was constructed to measure general attitudinal factors cannot be over-emphasized in terms of its importance for the study being proposed. Since these scales reflect a general measure of attitude with no reference to any specific dimension such as pay or promotion, it can be safely concluded that it also bears no reference to task congruency. Therefore, the scales that intend to measure task congruency and job satisfaction will in fact measure separate, independent phenomena, a crucial factor in any test of association.

Vroom states however, that if we consider job satisfaction as the valence (positive outcome) of a work role to its occupant, it then becomes clear that there could be different valences associated with different properties of the work role.¹ For example, a study of job satisfaction within a textile factory may reveal that the workers are very satisfied with their supervisors, indifferent toward company policy and very dissatisfied with their wages. The examination of specific dimensions in the job situation leads us to the second approach in the measurement of job satisfaction.

The Herzberg two factor theory challenged the traditional point of view that job satisfaction was an unidimensional phenomenon by demonstrating that certain factors in the work situation termed

¹ Vroom Op. Cit. pp 101

satisfiers are capable of producing satisfaction but play an extremely small part in producing dissatisfaction. Herzberg's study of 200 engineers and accountants produced two basic kinds of data. The men interviewed reported job conditions that resulted in satisfaction or dissatisfaction, however also reported specific kinds of feeling experiences that accompanied these job conditions.¹ The data indicated that when discussing happy episodes they tended to use such words as accomplishment, responsibility, recognition and growth and when talking about dissatisfaction they tended to use such words as anger, disgust, anxiety, frustration and insecurity. From the data Herzberg concluded that positive feelings tend to have motivational significance while unhappy episodes resembled states of emotional tension. The trend in the data analysis tended to support the idea that different kinds of feeling words accompany different states of job satisfaction. Further evidence pointed out that the cluster of job conditions that produced happy states appeared significantly different from the collection that produced unhappy states. For example, good organization of work was not reported as producing motivationally significant feelings accompanying satisfaction, however, poor organization of work was frequently reported as producing emotional tension accompanying dissatisfaction.² Herzberg concluded that factors

¹ Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man
(Cleveland, World Publishing Co. 1966)

² Hackman, Ray. The Motivated Working Adult
(American Management Association Inc. 1969 pp 127)

producing satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job were quite independent from one another. Herzberg further pointed out in his conclusions that positive job feelings have motivational significance while dissatisfying episodes are more emotional in nature. From this conclusion Herzberg stated that the elimination of job conditions that produce dissatisfaction will in all likelihood end the dissatisfaction but will have little or no motivational significance for the man involved. Hackman states that if a man works at 40% efficiency, but for a time is working at 30% because of job irritants, eliminating the irritants may return him to the forty per cent level but will not move him beyond that point.¹

According to Herzberg, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are discrete, multi-dimensional fields that are not necessarily found at the opposite ends of a continuum. Such extrinsic factors as administrative policy, working conditions, salary and job security were labelled as maintenance or hygiene factors and were found to contribute far more to job dissatisfaction than job satisfaction. Conversely, the more intrinsic factors such as achievement, recognition, the work itself and responsibility were found to relate more directly to job satisfaction and as such were referred to as motivators. Rush states that the motivators (satisfiers) or job content factors as opposed to job context are more conclusive to motivation because they provide the intrinsic rewards of self-esteem and the opportunity for self-actualization.² Rush continues by suggesting that the nature of these rewards

¹ Ibid. pp 127

² Rush, Harold M. F. Job Design for Motivation. A Research Report from the Conference Board. The Conference Board, Inc. © 1971
New York

are crucial to the comprehension of these two concepts. The extrinsic reward is generally found in the job situation or environment and is usually given by others. Such examples are promotions, financial rewards and working conditions. The intrinsic rewards tend to stem directly from the individual's performance while he in turn gives them to himself. The sense of achievement or the feeling of using one's abilities effectively to accomplish a task generally tends to raise the level of one's self-esteem.

This theory of motivation is consistent with the model postulated by Maslow. The Maslow theory assumes that all behaviour is motivated, that man is a wanting animal and that he wants things because he needs them.¹ The Maslow theory groups human motivational goals into a hierarchy of needs. Rush states the relevance of this need hierarchy to job design and its relation to motivation may be seen in terms of the extrinsic and intrinsic rewards associated with job performance.² The extrinsic rewards correspond with the lower level physiological, safety and belongingness needs while the internal or intrinsic rewards are represented by the need for esteem and self-actualization by performing work that is in itself rewarding and meaningful.

¹ Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality
(New York: Harper and Row, 1970, 2nd ed.)

² Rush. Op. Cit. pp 7

Herzberg's theory was heralded as a major accomplishment in the study of job satisfaction and has in turn been the subject of considerable controversy. Much of the criticism surrounding the two factor theory focuses centrally around Herzberg's methodology most commonly referred to as the semi-structured critical incident interview. Respondents were asked to describe incidents that led to marked increases or decreases in their job satisfaction, the duration of these changes and their impact on the individual's job performance. According to Herzberg, studies using this technique consistently yielded results in which motivators were cited primarily as sources of satisfaction and hygienes as sources of dissatisfaction.¹

However Vroom in his book Work and Motivation offered a plausible explanation describing why Herzberg obtained the results that he did using the critical incident method. Vroom states:

"Even if such research were to perfectly replicate the Herzberg findings on widely different populations, their inference concerning a qualitative difference between satisfiers and dissatisfiers could not be unequivocally accepted. It is still possible that obtained differences between stated sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction stem from defensive processes within the individual respondent. Persons may be more likely to attribute the causes of satisfaction to their own achievements and accomplishments on the job. On the other hand, they may be more likely to attribute their dissatisfaction not to personal inadequacies or deficiencies, but to factors in the work environment, such as supervision or company policy."²

¹ Herzberg Op. Cit. pp 92 - 129

² Vroom Op. Cit. pp 129

In response to Vroom's explanation, a number of researchers set forth to determine the validity of Vroom's criticism of the critical incident technique in the study of job satisfaction.

Bobbit and Behling hypothesized that respondents who are led to believe that their responses to a critical incident instrument may affect their futures within the organization for which they work will cite motivators as sources of satisfaction more frequently than respondents led to believe that their responses will have no effect upon their futures.¹ They further hypothesized that those individuals who are led to believe that their responses may affect their futures within the organization will cite hygienes as sources of dissatisfaction more frequently than respondents led to believe that their responses will have no effect on their future. These authors found that neither Hypothesis One nor Two was supported by the results of this study which therefore cast substantial doubt upon the validity of Vroom's alternate explanation of the results obtained by Herzberg using the critical incident technique.

However, the following year another study was carried out in Sheffield, England that supported the explanation posed by Vroom. Wall in his introductory remarks stated that:

¹ Bobbit H. R. and Behling O. "Defence Mechanisms As an Alternate Explanation of Herzberg's Motivator Hygiene Results." Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 56 1972 pp 24 - 27

"The two factor theory has been subjected to a large amount of criticism much of what has been focused on its methodology. Of special importance is the suggestion that Herzberg's original results are a function of interviewees responding in an ego-defensive manner."¹

Wall therefore hypothesized that individuals high on ego-defensiveness are more likely than individuals low on ego-defensiveness to attribute their satisfying experiences in their work role to motivators rather than hygiene factors and secondly, individuals high on ego-defensiveness are more likely than individuals low on ego-defensiveness to attribute their dissatisfying experiences at work to hygiene factors rather than to motivation.² Ego defensiveness was measured by using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale.³ This scale was administered at the end of each interview to ensure that the interviewer could not inadvertently guide the subject into giving responses which confirmed the hypothesis. Wall found that the higher the individual's social desirability score the more he tended to respond in a manner predictable from Herzberg's two factor theory. These results support Vroom's suggestion that Herzberg's results are in part a product of ego-defensive processes within individuals.

¹ Wall, Toby D. "Ego Defensiveness as a Determinant of Reported Differences in Sources of Job Satisfaction and Job Dissatisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 58 1973 pp 125 - 128

² Ibid. pp 126

³ Crowne, D. P. and Marlowe, D. The Approval Motive. (New York, Wiley, 1964)

Paul F. Wernimont acknowledged the controversy surrounding the unidimensional versus the two factor theory of job satisfaction and concluded that an analysis based on logic and semantics would be more appropriate than the seemingly never ending quest for a solution through empirical research.¹ Wernimont states that extrinsic factors in the job situation must be viewed as the causes of intrinsic factors. Wernimont claims:

"For any given individual, "feelings about" (about company policies, about working conditions, etc.) are the causes of "feelings of" (of recognition, of responsibility, etc.)²

This author concluded that the relationship among job satisfaction variables can be more effectively studied and research findings more effectively explained when the entire system is viewed in its holistic perspective.

The study and measurement of job satisfaction is a complex field and the subject of varying interpretations. This review of the literature is by no means a complete analysis of the available published research, but does highlight the major issues affecting this subject.

¹ Wernimont, Paul F. "A Systems View of Job Satisfaction" Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 56, 1972 pp 173 - 176

² Ibid. pp 173

Summary and Hypothesis

This chapter attempted to deal with the historical, theoretical and operational aspects of the probation process as they apply to the probation officer in the field. The literature shows that probation is not a clearly defined concept in either its theoretical or operational sense and as such may lead to ambiguities in the job situation of the probation officer. It was felt that if this ambiguity existed in the job situation of the probation officer, it would probably manifest itself through some sort of discrepancy. For the purposes of this study, it was hypothesized that the extent of the discrepancy between what probation officers believe they should be doing as opposed to what they are actually doing could be a valid predictor of job satisfaction.

In conclusion, the major hypothesis of this study is as follows:

The larger the discrepancy between what probation officers believe they should be doing as opposed to what they are actually doing in the carrying out of their day to day tasks, the lower their job satisfaction.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

A. Population

In order to explore the problem area identified in the previous two chapters, a population of thirty-two probation officers involved in juvenile corrections in the city of Winnipeg were tested between November 25th and December 9th, 1976. The population that participated in this study represented eighty-nine percent of the total population of probation officers in the Winnipeg area.

Senior probation officers, probation officers involved only in adult corrections and probation workers were excluded from the total population for the following reasons. Senior probation officers fulfill a supervisory role within each of the six participating districts and the central intake unit. Since their work responsibilities include a number of supervising tasks and functions, it follows that their overall work situation would vary considerably from that of the line worker. This does not suggest that the Senior Probation Officer would be unable to respond to the scales accurately, but does suggest that they would probably respond to them from a different perspective, that of a supervisor. It was felt that this reasoning would be most applicable to the job satisfaction measures. The same reasoning also applied to the probation worker. It was felt that in order to maintain some semblance of internal consistency within such a select population, it was necessary

that this group represent a common occupational level. Further, as this study focused solely on the job content of the juvenile probation function, the exclusion of probation officers in the adult system was self-evident.

The Winnipeg probation service is divided into six probation districts and one central intake unit located in the Manitoba Youth Centre. A seventh district is responsible only for adult probation functions. The central juvenile district located at 442 William Avenue as well as the central intake unit are responsible only for juvenile probation functions. The remaining five districts handle both juvenile and adult caseloads. In view of the fact that probation officers in these districts deal with both adult and juvenile probationers, a control variable, "caseload distribution" indicating the proportion of juvenile to adult cases carried by each worker was included in this study to determine whether or not it had any controlling effects on the data obtained.

B. The Measures

I. Demographic Data Face Sheet (Appendix IA)

Respondents reported their sex, approximate age, years of experience as a probation officer, education and salary. This information was gathered in order to determine whether these demographic variables had any influence on the dependent measure, job satisfaction.

II. Task Questionnaire (Appendix IB)

The probation officer task questionnaire was the major independent measure used in this study. It was constructed by the writer in order to measure the concept of task discrepancy as defined in chapter one. This scale is a questionnaire of fifty-one items describing some of the various work tasks and activities that probation officers carry out in their day to day work. Each item in the task questionnaire consisted of three parts. Part (a) requested that probation officers respond to how often they believed they should engage in a certain task while part (b) requested that they respond to how often they actually engaged in that particular task. Part (c) then requested that they rank that task in terms of its importance. The following example demonstrates how task discrepancy was measured:

As a part of your responsibility as a probation officer:

a) How often do you believe that you should discuss alleged delinquencies with juveniles prior to their initial court appearance.

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

b) How often do you actually discuss alleged delinquencies with juveniles prior to their initial court appearance.

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

If a respondent checks "always" for parts (a) and (b) of the sample question, this would indicate a measure of low discrepancy. In numerical terms, if we subtract "always from always" or "one minus one" the remainder

is zero. However a different respondent may check "always" in part (a) and "never" in part (b). When we translate these nominal terms into numerical values we find that "never minus always" or "five minus one" equals four. This would be an example of high discrepancy since there appears to be a large discrepancy between what one believes they should be doing as opposed to what they are actually doing. The range on the discrepancy scale (eliminating the negative signs) is from zero to four and falls into the following categories:

- 0, 1 (low discrepancy)
- 2 (moderate discrepancy)
- 3, 4 (high discrepancy)

As indicated, part (c) requested that each respondent rank every task in terms of its overall level of importance. For example,

In terms of your overall work responsibilities as a probation officer, how would you rank this task in terms of its level of importance.

1. Very Low
2. Low
3. Moderate
4. High
5. Very High

The purpose of introducing this measure into the task questionnaire was to allow the researcher to assign an appropriate weighting to each discrepancy measure (discore). For example, if certain tasks were found to be either highly congruent or highly discrepant this measure would allow those tasks ranked as important a distinguishing numerical feature from those rated as unimportant. Since certain tasks may prove to be either highly congruent or highly discrepant it was felt that those tasks ranked as important would have more of a mathematical impact on the overall statistical analysis.

If it was found that task x had a discrepancy reading of four and was ranked as a rather unimportant task while task y had a discrepancy reading of one and was ranked as important what affect would these differences have on the mathematics of the analysis? It was decided that by multiplying the raw discore by the importance rating a weighted discore could be obtained. In our example task x would have a weighted discrepancy of four (Raw Discore x Importance = $4 \times 1 = 4$) while task y would have a weighted discrepancy of five (Raw Discore x Importance = $5 \times 1 = 5$). It can now be seen that the impact of the highly discrepant task x would have minimal impact on the overall weighted discore as its contribution is not only minute in comparison to what it could be but is also over-shadowed by the weighted scores representing high congruency. In other words since task x was rated low in terms of its level of importance its mathematical contribution has been limited in terms of its effect on the overall discrepancy score.

If task x had been ranked as important, a weighted discrepancy score of twenty would have been computed and therefore would have caused a more powerful mathematical impact on the overall statistical analysis. This particular component in the task questionnaire served the function of reducing the numerical impact of those tasks ranked as unimportant and boosting those rated as important.

Idem 1 Task Sub-Scales

An attempt was made by the writer to classify the fifty-one tasks in the task questionnaire into three spheres of activity: court, department and community. Kuder-Richardson reliability co-efficients

suggested that the scale measuring departmental tasks was not reliable in terms of its homogeneity and its reproducibility. As a result of these checks, the departmental scale was collapsed with the court scale to form a new administrative scale. The rationale behind this step was that conceptually, court tasks and departmental tasks are relatively well structured in terms of the authority that defines the limits and goals of each task. Compiling caseload statistics, attending forensic sessions and the carrying out of various court related tasks are examples of work related activities categorized under the administrative sphere. Community tasks were designated as those work activities that probation officers would more or less carry out in the field. The planning and implementation of family counselling sessions or the enforcement of a probation order are examples of community tasks.

It was recognized that the manner in which these tasks were categorized could be the subject of methodological criticism. There were no panel of judges utilized to decide on which sphere each task should fall nor any external study to support such a classification. The rationale used was simply to classify these tasks on the basis of the operational location from which they would be normally carried out. This rationale was spawned by the desire of the researcher to avoid the issue of classifying tasks in terms of "treatment" or "control"; terms that simply defy classification.

Kuder-Richardson reliability checks were then run on parts (a) and (b) of both the administrative and community scale. The Kuder-Richardson coefficients are reported as follows:

Administrative Scale

part a - K.R. = .56

part b - K.R. = .68

Community Scale

part a - K.R. = .66

part b - K.R. = .72

Idem 11 Adminsc + Commsc = Raw Discore

As indicated, reliability checks resulted in the court and department scales being collapsed into a new administrative scale. However, in the initial stage of the analysis of data, it was found through multiple regression analysis that approximately 91% of the variation in the total discrepancy score was being accounted for by the administrative scale. Table 1 illustrates what happened under standard multiple regression when the total discrepancy score was used as the dependent variable against the administrative and community scores.

TABLE 1 Multiple Regression
Analysis: Discore with
Adminsc. and Commsc.

Dependent Variable: Discrepancy Score (Raw Discore)

<u>Indep. Variables</u>	<u>Simple r</u>	<u>R. Square</u>	<u>RSQ Change</u>	<u>Beta</u>
Adminsc.	0.95149	0.90533	0.90533	0.68785
Commisc.	0.85274	1.00000	0.09467	0.40519

This table shows that both the administrative and community scores are highly related to the total discrepancy score. Further, the correlation between the administrative and community scores was found to be .65 which may suggest that these scales are measuring common factors and as such should not be treated as independent scales. It also seemed that the application of the community score did not contribute any additional explanation to the variance in the total raw discrepancy score when it was considered in conjunction with the administrative score. This observation was confirmed by the RSQ change in that the community score appeared to account for only 9% of the remaining variation in job satisfaction. Since these two scales are highly correlated to the total discrepancy score it would appear that the remaining 91% of the community contribution score is identical to that of the administrative score. With these results it appeared that the task questionnaire could not be divided into the proposed categories resulting in the collapse of the administrative and community scale into one major discrepancy measure. Therefore, for the remainder of this study, task discrepancy will simply refer to the total discrepancy score derived from the task questionnaire of each respondent. A distinction will also be made throughout the

remainder of this study between the raw discrepancy and the weighted discrepancy scores. Kuder-Richardson reliability coefficients were computed for parts a and b of the entire task questionnaire.

Part a - K.R. = .59

Part b - K.R. = .76

III. Brayfield and Rothe Job Satisfaction Index (Appendix II)

This study used the Brayfield and Rothe Index of job satisfaction as a method in which to operationalize how one feels about their job. This scale was the second major measure used in this study. Chapter one and two pointed out that the study and measurement of job satisfaction is an intricate and complex issue racked with conflicting research evidence and considerable controversy. There are a number of reasons why the writer chose this method however for the sake of brevity will allude to the primary reason.

The Brayfield and Rothe measures were designed to give an "overall" job satisfaction index rather than address specific aspects of the job situation. As this study was designed to explore the relationship between two concepts it was important to establish conceptual and operational independence between these two variables. As the Brayfield and Rothe scales were designed to reflect variations in attitude toward the work situation and not to refer to any specific job dimension it

would be reasonable to conclude that it bears little to no reference to task discrepancy.

Brayfield and Rothe reported an odd-even product moment reliability coefficient of .77 which was then corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula to .87. Evidence on the validity of this test was corroborated by a comparison of scores between two groups of adult night school students enrolled in personnel psychology. It was found that those students who were employed in occupations consistent with their night school education, ie. personnel work, achieved higher scores on this index than those who were not so employed. Brayfield and Rothe therefore reported a reliable and valid index.

IV. Other Measures

1. Marlowe-Crowne Scale of Social Desirability (Appendix III)

The Marlowe-Crowne test of social desirability was the third and final scale used in this study. This scale was not used as a major measure in this study but more as a methodological check for socially desirable response patterns. These authors defined social desirability as the need for subjects to obtain approval by responding in a culturally appropriate and acceptable manner.¹ It was felt that since the format

¹ Crowne, D. P. and Marlowe, D. "A New Scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology" Journal of Consulting Psychology Volume 24, 1960. pp 353

of this study requested that individuals respond to what they thought they should be doing as opposed to what they are actually doing the issue of socially desirable response determinants could have a confounding influence on the data. Further, since the researcher was known to most of the respondents, it was felt that the inclusion of this scale was necessary.

Social desirability scales were originally designed along the statistical deviance model of personality inventories in order to address the issue of non-test relevant response determinants. Marlowe and Crowne noted that items drawn from the M.M.P.I. in the construction of a social desirability scale may not only be characterized by their scaleability of social desirability but also may be characterized by their content which in a general sense, has pathological implications.¹

Therefore the major objective in the development of the Marlowe-Crowne social desirability scale was the elimination of pathology relevant item content. After reviewing a number of personality inventories and selecting those items devoid of abnormal implication a new scale of thirty-three items was constructed. These authors reported an internal consistency coefficient of .88 for the final form of this scale using the Kuder-Richardson formula. A number of correlational tests were run between this scale and former social desirability scales. Marlowe and Crowne report a general tendency for these scales to be associated.

¹ Ibid. pp 350

2. Caseload Distribution (Appendix IV)

Information pertaining to the adult-juvenile distribution of cases per respondent was collected to check for any relationships between this variable and the major measures of task discrepancy and job satisfaction.

C. Questionnaire Administration

The first step in the implementation of this study was to secure permission from the Ministry of Corrective and Rehabilitative Services in order to gather data from probation officers in the field. After submitting the research design accompanied by the three questionnaires, approval to carry out this study was granted. A general memorandum was then circulated to all probation officers advising that the writer would be interested in collecting data relating to the probation function and job satisfaction. Following the circulation of this memo, the writer then proceeded to make appointments with Senior Probation Officers in order to attend their next scheduled unit meeting. During this period, the writer had arranged a pre-test session with a group of six federal parole officers formerly employed by the probation service in Winnipeg. The main purpose of this session was to test the task questionnaire in terms of its clarity and to identify and revise any ambiguous items. Four other social workers, formerly employed as probation officers were also tested for basically the same purpose. These pre-test sessions provided the writer with the opportunity to practice administering the

questionnaires and also provided the writer with a time framework in order to advise senior probation officers how much of their staff's time would be required.

It is interesting to note that with respect to the job satisfaction results, the scores attained by the pre-test respondents corresponded quite closely to an independent question¹ requesting the subjects rate their general level of job satisfaction as a probation officer in Winnipeg. The relatively high correspondence between the index of job satisfaction and an independent rating provides further evidence supporting the reliability and to some extent the validity of the Brayfield-Rothe scales.

Following the pre-test, the writer attended seven district meetings with each of the seven participating probation units. The purpose behind these meetings was threefold.

First of all, these meetings provided the opportunity for both respondents and researcher to engage in a general dialogue concerning the nature of the study and what would be expected from each party. To the writer's surprise, there were few questions and even fewer concerns. Secondly, it was in the opinion of the writer that by making personal contact with all of the possible respondents prior to the administration of the questionnaires, the response in terms

¹ An independent question, apart from the Brayfield-Rothe index was introduced as the final item at the end of the session asking probation officers to rate their general level of job satisfaction.

of the number of persons would in all likelihood be higher. Due to the relatively small total population (n=36) it was felt that the handling of this issue was crucial to the study. The eighty-nine per cent turn out at least demonstrated that this procedure did minimal harm. And finally, these meetings provided the opportunity to set up group appointments suitable to all respondents within each unit in order that the questionnaires could be administered in groups.

The questionnaires were therefore administered to groups of probation officers over a three week period. Each respondent received a brown envelope containing one copy of each of the three questionnaires (Appendix IA, IB, II, III). The probation officer task questionnaire was administered verbally by the writer and was the first measure to be completed. The job satisfaction and Marlowe-Crowne scales followed in that order.

Just prior to the administration of the task questionnaire, probation officers were asked to respond to the items from their own personal point of view as a probation officer working in the Winnipeg Juvenile System. They were asked not to interpret this question as what some external or outer force thought they should do but rather what they believed they should do from their own experience and typical field situation (Appendix V). The

reasoning behind this instruction was to ensure that probation officers interpret and subsequently respond to the questionnaire with some degree of consistency. Further, it was evident to the writer that the very nature of the format of this questionnaire could lead to a mis-understanding with respect to the purpose of this study. Since probation officers were being asked to respond to what they believed they should be doing as opposed to what they were actually doing it followed that some officers might interpret this format as a means to determine how many probation officers are doing their job and how many are not according to some external measuring stick. As this obviously was not the intent of the study, all respondents were assured prior to the administration of these scales that such an interpretation was not the case. The reason that this issue was made very clear rested on the fact that a number of officers queried the writer on the exact hypothesis of the study. Since this information could not be divulged for methodological reasons, it was decided that rather than say nothing and raise possible suspicion, respondents would be advised in exact terms what was not under study.

Upon completion of the data collection phase, the job satisfaction and social desirability scales were marked. All of

the variables in the three questionnaires were assigned a column computer card number with all values from every response being placed above its corresponding column number. These values were then transcribed onto computer data sheets and soon-after keypunched onto computer cards. All further transformations and computations were calculated by using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences¹ program analysis. The particular statistical procedures that were chosen will be explained in Chapter IV along with the statistical results obtained by the use of these programs.

1 Nie, N. H. Hull, C. H. Jenkins J. G. Steinbrenner, K. Bent, D. Statistical Package For The Social Sciences 2nd ed. © 1970, 1975 by McGraw-Hill Inc. New York.

CHAPTER IV

Data Analysis and Results

A. Distribution of Respondents by Demographic Variable

A population of thirty-two probation officers participated in the study. The demographic distribution of this population was broken down into the following tables.

TABLE 2 BY AGE (N=32)

<u>AGE</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>RELATIVE FREQUENCY</u>	<u>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY</u>
21 - 25	7	21.9%	21.9%
26 - 30	14	43.8	65.6
31 - 35	5	15.6	81.3
36 - 40	3	9.4	90.6
40 >	3	9.4	100.0

As table two illustrates, two-thirds of the line staff involved in juvenile probation are thirty years of age or younger. Forty-four per cent are between the ages of twenty-six and thirty with the next most populous group falling between the ages of twenty-one and twenty-five.

TABLE 3 BY EXPERIENCE (N=32)

EXPERIENCE	N	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY
6 mos.	3	9.4%	9.4%
6 - 12 mos.	2	6.3	15.6
1 - 2 yr.	7	21.9	37.5
2 - 5 yr.	12	37.5	75.0
5 - 10 yr.	4	12.5	87.5
> 10 yr.	4	12.5	100.0

This table shows that slightly more than one third of the probation officers involved in juvenile corrections had two years or less experience with the probation service, while seventy-five per cent have five or less years of experience. The highest proportion of probation officers were found to be in the two to five year category.

TABLE 4 BY EDUCATION (N=32)

EDUCATION	N	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY
B. A.	15	46.9%	46.9%
B. A. (H)	2	6.3	53.1
B. S. W.	8	25.0	78.9
Graduate Degree	7	21.9	100.0

Table four shows that approximately fifty per cent of juvenile probation officers are B. A. graduates, while slightly less than eighty per cent have completed undergraduate programs in either Arts or Social Work.

TABLE 5 BY SALARY (N=32)

SALARY	N	RELATIVE FREQUENCY	CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY
\$12,000	5	15.6%	15.6%
13,000	6	18.8	28.5
14,000	4	12.9	47.3
15,000	6	18.8	66.1
16,000	4	12.9	79.0
17,000	1	3.1	82.1
18,000 >	6	18.8	100.0

All respondents were asked to give a general indication of their gross annual salary. The salaries reported above are therefore approximate figures rounded to the nearest thousand dollars and as such do not represent exact salaries.

This table shows that slightly less than half of the line staff in juvenile probation earn approximately fourteen thousand dollars or less while two thirds earn fifteen thousand dollars or less.

B. Distribution of Job Satisfaction Scores

The Brayfield and Rothe job satisfaction index reports that the possible range of scores may vary from eighteen to ninety with an undecided or neutral point of fifty-four. In this study it was found that the job satisfaction scores of probation officers varied from forty-five to eighty-one with a mean of 68.7 and a standard deviation of 8.0. It was found that only 9.4% (n=3) of the respondents scored near or below the established neutral point while 34.4% (n=11) scored between the neutral point and the mean. These figures indicate that close to 90% (n=29) of the probation officers scored well above the undecided point of job satisfaction. These scores were then divided into approximate thirds (according to the cumulative frequency distribution of cases) in order that high, moderate and low categories could be established to test for differences between these groups. There was no concrete reason for choosing thirds over halves or quarters other than it appearing to be a reasonable division in accordance with the population size. It must be noted that this classification of job satisfaction scores is not intended to suggest that those probation officers who fall into the lower category are in fact low in job satisfaction but simply refers to those respondents who scored lower on this scale in relation to their colleagues.

Table 6 illustrates the distribution of probation officers into low, moderate and high categories in relation to their scores on the Brayfield and Rothe job satisfaction index.

TABLE 6 JOB SATISFACTION SCORES BY LOW
MODERATE AND HIGH CATEGORIES (N=32)

JOB SAT.	SCORE	N	RELATIVE FREQ.	CUMULATIVE FREQ.
Low	45-66	10	31.3%	31.3%
Moderate	67-70	8	25.1	56.3
High	71-81	14	43.7	100.0

C. Distribution of Discrepancy Scores

I. Raw Discrepancy Scores (R Discore)

The minimum-maximum range of discrepancy per item may vary from zero to four. As this scale consists of fifty-one items, the cumulative discrepancy per case could range from 0 to 204. In this study, it was found that the range of raw discrepancy scores varied from three to forty-eight. Since this scale was designed solely for the purposes of this study, a neutral point was not established.

When one views the maximum score possible and the maximum score obtained, it would appear that a general trend toward task congruency occurred. However, since the major statistical program

used to test this theory treated all of the data as continuous, the seemingly wide gap between the possible and obtained maximum discrepancy score did not interfere with the analytical plan. The same recognition that was noted in the job satisfaction scores also applied to the discrepancy scores in that those individuals who scored in the higher ranges of discrepancy are not to be viewed as individuals high in task discrepancy in the absolute sense but rather as those respondents who scored higher in task discrepancy than their colleagues according to this particular scale.

Table 7 illustrates the distribution of raw discrepancy scores into low, moderate and high categories.

TABLE 7 DISTRIBUTION OF RAW DISCORES BY
LOW, MODERATE AND HIGH CATEGORIES (N=32)

RAW DISCORE	N	RELATIVE FREQ.	CUMULATIVE FREQ.
Low 3-17	11	34.4%	34.4%
Moderate 18-24	10	31.2	65.6
High 25-48	11	34.4	100.0

II. Weighted Discrepancy Scores (W Discore)

The range of weighted discrepancy scores varied from 10 to 175. As table 8 indicates, the weighted discores slightly boosted the high raw discore category by approximately 3% (n=1) at the expense of the low raw discore category. Table 8 illustrates the distribution of weighted discrepancy scores into high, moderate and low categories.

TABLE 8 DISTRIBUTION OF WEIGHTED DISCORES
BY LOW, MODERATE AND HIGH CATEGORIES (N=32)

W DISCORE	N	RELATIVE FREQ.	CUMULATIVE FREQ.
Low 10-44	10	31.3%	31.3%
Moderate 45-73	10	31.3	62.6
High 74-175	12	37.4	100.0

D. Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was used to examine and evaluate the contribution that task discrepancy and the various demographic factors had in explaining the amount of variation in job satisfaction.

TABLE 9 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
JOB SATISFACTION WITH R DISCORE, AGE
AND SALARY

Dependent Variable - Job Satisfaction

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	SIMPLE R	R. SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	BETA
R Discore	-0.52974	0.28062	0.28062	-0.40372
Age	-0.19805	0.34722	0.06660	-0.69552
Salary	0.28430	0.53513	0.18791	0.64551

Table 9 shows that approximately twenty-eight per cent of the variation in job satisfaction can be explained by the raw discrepancy score. Salary accounted for approximately eighteen per cent while age accounted for six per cent. In total, 53.5% of the variance in the dependent measure i.e. job satisfaction can be explained by these three variables. This provided the first indication that job satisfaction is a function of task discrepancy in that a correlation of -0.53 was revealed between these two variables.

TABLE 10 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS
JOB SATISFACTION WITH WEIGHTED DISCREPANCY
SCORE, AGE AND SALARY

Dependent Variable - Job Satisfaction

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	SIMPLE R	R. SQUARE	RSQ CHANGE	BETA
W Discore	-0.61569	0.37907	0.37907	-0.46589
Age	-0.19805	0.43322	0.05415	-0.62712
Salary	0.28430	0.57438	0.14115	0.57452

Table 10 shows that approximately 38% of the variation in job satisfaction is explained by the weighted discrepancy score. It is interesting to note that the explained variance in job satisfaction increased 10% when the weighted discrepancy score was used as opposed to the raw score. This suggests that those tasks high in discrepancy and ranked as important tend to have a more significant impact on job satisfaction than those tasks high in discrepancy and ranked as unimportant. It follows then that the relationship between job satisfaction and task discrepancy was considerably strengthened when using the weighted discore. The Pearson's r in this instance was boosted from -0.53 to -0.62. In total, table 10 illustrates that 57.5% of the variation in job satisfaction is explained by w discore, age and salary which is an increase of 4% over table 9.

These results support the hypothesis that as probation officers grow more discrepant in the carrying out of work related tasks within the field of juvenile corrections the more likely they will experience lower levels of job satisfaction. This negative relationship supports the hypothesis that as task discrepancy increases, job satisfaction decreases and conversely when task discrepancy decreases, job satisfaction in turn will increase.

E. Crosstabulation Analysis

A crosstabulation is a joint frequency distribution which may be accompanied by certain tests of statistical significance. For the purposes of this study, significance levels of $p < .05$ will be considered as statistically significant.

Through multiple regression analysis it was determined that task discrepancy accounted for much of the variation in the job satisfaction scores obtained in this study. The results also suggested that age and salary played a significant part (approximately 19%) in explaining the variance in job satisfaction.

The job satisfaction and weighted discrepancy scores along with the variable salary were then divided into high, moderate and low categories. Education and age were originally classified into ranges and were therefore not divided into these categories.

TABLE 11 JOB SATISFACTION BY EDUCATION

	B. A.	B.S.W.	MASTER'S
Low	9 (28.0)	1 (3.0)	0
Moderate	3 (9.4)	2 (6.3)	3 (9.4)
High	5 (15.6)	5 (15.6)	4 (12.5)

Chi Square = N.S.

In this table please note that two B.A. Honors respondents were collapsed under the general B.A. category.

Even though this table did not prove to be statistically significant, there appear to be at least two interesting features that warrant discussion.

First of all, 90% (n=9) of the respondents who scored in the lower category of job satisfaction were at the Bachelor of Arts level of education. This figure represented 56% of the total B.A. population in comparison to 13.5% of the total number of B.S.W.'s and 0% of the total number of respondents with a graduate degree.

Secondly, it was found that 62.5% of the total number of B.S.W.'s and 57.1% of the total number of M.S.W.'s scored in the higher range of satisfaction in comparison with 31% of the total number of B.A.'s. These findings were also consistent along the moderate range of satisfaction where individuals with social work degrees seemed to fare better insofar as job satisfaction is concerned.

These comments however are not to be construed as an argument in total support of social work education for probation officers. It is common knowledge that those individuals in possession of social work degrees earn higher salaries, tend to have more promotional opportunity and perhaps even feel somewhat more occupationally mobile than their B.A. counterparts in view of their affiliation with a particular profession. The point being made here is that these extrinsic factors in the job situation could easily lead to varying degrees of job satisfaction regardless of the content of one's education and the impact it may have on the delivery of probation services.

TABLE 12 JOB SATISFACTIONBY AGE (N=32)

	21 - 25	26 - 30	31
Low	2 (6.3)	3 (9.4)	5 (15.6)
Moderate	2 (6.3)	4 (12.5)	2 (6.3)
High	3 (9.4)	7 (21.9)	4 (12.5)

Chi Square = N.S.

This table shows that the distribution of respondents scattered rather evenly across the various categories. The largest number of respondents in any one category fell in the high range of satisfaction and were between the ages of 26 to 30. The next highest group fell in the lower range of satisfaction and were in the category of 31 and over. This finding may suggest that the approximate age of thirty may be a critical point in terms of whether an individual decides to remain or leave the probation service.

TABLE 13 JOB SATISFACTIONBY SALARY (N=32)

	\$12, 13,000	\$14, 15,000	\$16,000
Low	4 (12.5)	4 (12.5)	2 (6.3)
Moderate	4 (12.5)	1 (3.1)	3 (9.4)
High	3 (9.4)	5 (15.6)	6 (18.8)

Chi Square = N.S.

Once again the distribution of respondents scattered rather evenly across this table. It is noted that the largest category of respondents fell in the high range of satisfaction as well as the higher salary range. It is also noted the number of respondents in the high satisfaction range progressively grew larger as their salaries increased. This trend may suggest that probation officers tend to experience higher levels of job satisfaction as their salaries increase.

F. One Way Analysis of Variance

Under this procedure, the weighted discrepancy score (independent variable) was divided into high, moderate and low categories while the dependent measure, job satisfaction was allowed to remain continuous. The analysis of variance was employed as it was suspected that the differences in job satisfaction may not be consistent over the range of independent scores. A Duncan's test of differences was used in this program to test the means of the dependent measure as they related to each of the three categories of weighted discrepancy and thereby determine whether there are any statistically significant differences between these means.

It was found that those probation officers who fell in the higher range of weighted discrepancy scored significantly lower $p < .01$ on job satisfaction than those officers who scored in the moderate and lower ranges of task discrepancy. The same F score $p < .01$ was obtained when the raw discrepancy scores were used. This statistical procedure demonstrated that the mean of the job satisfaction score of those officers who scored in the high discrepancy range remained outside the 95% confidence interval of the two remaining groups. According to the F score, this result could have occurred by chance one out of a hundred times and is therefore considered as statistically significant.

TABLE 14 MULTIPLE RANGE TEST

DUNCAN PROCEDURE

GROUP	N	MEAN	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	95% CONF. INT. FOR MEAN
Group 01	10	72.2	63.000	81.000	67.93 to 76.46
Group 02	10	71.3	64.000	81.000	67.86 to 74.73
Group 03	12	63.5	45.000	73.000	57.74 to 69.42

Homogenous Subsets

Subset 1

Group 03 - 63.5

Subset 11

Group 01 - 72.2

Group 02 - 71.3

This table illustrates that the mean of subset 1 which is the high discrepancy group is not consistent with the means of subset 11 consisting of the moderate and low discrepancy groups.

G. Other Findings

I. Social Desirability

It has long been acknowledged that the possible need of test subjects to respond in a culturally or socially acceptable manner is an important factor that should be addressed in most empirical studies. In view of the fact that the researcher was known to most of the subjects involved in this study, the issue of social desirability could not be avoided.

Pearson correlation coefficients were computed using the data obtained from the Marlowe-Crowne scale of social desirability. The following correlations were obtained when the raw discore, weighted discore and job satisfaction score were run against the Marlowe-Crowne score

	CROWNE
DISCORE	-0.0942
W DISCORE	-0.1003
JOB SAT.	-0.0128

These correlations suggest that social desirability response determinants had no affect on the results obtained in this study.

II. Caseload Distribution (Appendix IV)

It was mentioned in chapter three that five out of the seven probation units tested carried mixed juvenile and adult caseloads. It was felt that the proportion of juvenile to adult or adult to juvenile cases per officer may be a determining factor in task discrepancy and job satisfaction. As a result, data were obtained on the distribution of adult-juvenile cases per respondent. Pearson correlation coefficients revealed that no relationship existed between this variable, job satisfaction or task discrepancy.

Caseload Distribution

JOB SAT.	.0921
W DISCORE	.0535
R DISCORE	-0.0942

III. Job Satisfaction (Appendix IV)

The final question in this study asked probation officers to rank their general level of job satisfaction as a probation officer in Winnipeg. These data were correlated with the Brayfield and Rothe job satisfaction scale with a resulting Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.72. This correlation suggests that the Brayfield and Rothe scales measured what they were supposed to measure insofar as this study was concerned by reflecting the general attitudinal level of job satisfaction as expressed by the subjects under study.

H. General Summary

The statistical results obtained as a result of this study support the hypothesis that those probation officers who become more discrepant in terms of what they believe they should be doing in their job as opposed to what they are actually doing, the more likely they will demonstrate lower levels of job satisfaction. This is particularly true of those tasks that probation officers ranked as important.

Multiple regression analysis demonstrated that weighted task discrepancy explained 38% of the variance in job satisfaction. The Pearson's r revealed a relatively strong negative linear relationship of -0.62 . Under multiple regression, salary and age were found to be the next most important factors contributing to the variation in job satisfaction. The Pearson's r between salary and job satisfaction showed a weak relationship of 0.28 .

The analysis of variance revealed that the group of probation officers who fell in the category designated as high discrepancy and low job satisfaction were significantly different ($p < .01$) from those officers who fell in the moderate and low discrepancy groups. This finding suggests that the theory postulated speaks more to the issue of discrepancy and job satisfaction than congruency and job satisfaction.

CHAPTER V

Study Conclusions and Discussion

A. Task Discrepancy and Job Satisfaction

It was suggested in chapter one that probation officers involved in juvenile corrections may be engaging in a number of work related activities and tasks that may not necessarily correspond to their personal perception of what the probation function involves. This chapter further indicated that this incongruity could be manifested by a discrepancy reading between what probation officers believe they should do as part of their work responsibility and what actually occurs in the field. It was then hypothesized that a relationship may be found between the degree of task discrepancy and the level of job satisfaction of probation officers.

The results of this study lend considerable support to the above hypothesis. It was found that the more discrepant a probation officer becomes in his work, the lower he will be in his level of job satisfaction. This was particularly true of those tasks high in discrepancy and ranked as important.¹ It was found that task discrepancy (weighted) accounted for 38% of the variation in job satisfaction out of a total explained variance of 57%. This finding clearly suggests that task discrepancy was an important factor in the present study and in turn may be a major determinant in the measurement of job satisfaction across various occupations and professions.

¹ It should be noted that even though a correlation was established between these two variables, this may not necessarily reflect a causal relationship, e.g., task discrepancy may be dependent on job satisfaction rather than job satisfaction being dependent on task discrepancy. However, the author feels that the original interpretation, i.e., job satisfaction being dependent on task discrepancy is more plausible.

The most striking finding occurred when the thirty-two probation officers were divided into high, moderate and low discrepancy groups. The one way analysis of variance showed that the group of probation officers who were high in task discrepancy were significantly lower in job satisfaction ($p < .01$) than the remaining number of respondents who were in the moderate and low discrepancy range. It was further observed that there were no statistical differences between the moderate and low discrepancy groups.

This finding suggests that high task discrepancy appears to be more clearly associated with lower levels of job satisfaction than low task discrepancy is to higher levels of job satisfaction. This is primarily because one cannot make any clear distinction between the low and moderate discrepancy groups as they relate to higher and moderate levels of job satisfaction. Since it was found that there were no significant differences between the low and moderate discrepancy groups, it appears that low discrepancy and high job satisfaction may not share the same type or strength of relationship as high discrepancy and low job satisfaction. The conclusion reached here is that high task discrepancy appears to speak more clearly to the whole issue of job satisfaction than task congruency. This is an important finding as it opens a new area for further research especially with respect to the Herzberg theory of job satisfaction.

Implications for the Herzberg Theory

If task discrepancy speaks more to the issue of job satisfaction than task congruency, this suggests that task congruency/discrepancy may not be a uni-dimensional factor in the measurement of job satisfaction.

Herzberg's theory rests on the belief that job satisfaction cannot be viewed nor treated as a uni-dimensional phenomenon. According to Herzberg, certain factors (hygienes) in the job situation predictably lead to dissatisfaction however have very little to do with satisfaction while other factors leading to high satisfaction (motivators) relate minimally to feelings of dissatisfaction. The results of the present study support the notion that task discrepancy should fall into the category representing dissatisfaction.

However if task discrepancy contributes more to work "dissatisfaction", in the Herzberg sense, then task discrepancy accordingly would have to be viewed as an extrinsic or hygiene factor in the job situation of the probation officer. The problem however is that the definition of task discrepancy as it has been conceived and operationalized appears to fall more into the intrinsic category of job satisfaction. By asking how often one believes they would do something as opposed to what they are actually doing seems to resemble more of a psychological, intrinsic dimension within the individual rather than an external or extrinsic condition of a work setting. Although the present study was not designed to reveal this possible contradiction, the results obtained indicate that further research into this area is warranted.

B. Salary and Job Satisfaction

It was found that salary when associated with the discrepancy score accounted for approximately 14% of the variance in job satisfaction. A correlation $r = 0.28$ ($p < .05$) was computed between these two variables. This is an admittedly weak correlation but does indicate that as probation officers are paid more, their job satisfaction increases. It was further noted that a correlation of -0.32 was computed between salary and the weighted discrepancy score. This correlation suggests that those probation officers who are in the lower salary range seem to become more discrepant in their work which in turn may lead to lower levels of job satisfaction. (see footnote on page 99)

In chapter one, it was argued that the apparent level of probation officer job dissatisfaction reflected a more powerful and less obvious dimension in the job situation that the more commonly discussed issues of salary and organizational policy. It was suggested that this dimension could be traced right to the very nature of the probation function. As this study pointed out, salary is an important factor but may tend to over-shadow a less obvious and more powerful dimension in the area of job satisfaction. The results of this study show that salary may be the visible tip of an iceberg while task discrepancy looms ominously beneath the surface.

It was indicated in chapter one that juvenile probation officers in Winnipeg appear to have evolved into social work generalists in the broadest sense of the word. The probation officers' training and procedures manual states that the juvenile probation function is the thread that ties together the entire juvenile justice and correctional systems in this province. However, should the job situation of the probation officer reflect the enormous scope of tasks and activities that are presently being carried out by probation officers in this city?

It is the feeling of the writer that the juvenile probation officer is an overly extended line worker whose responsibilities and tasks are becoming increasingly less clear. As the job situation of the juvenile probation officer continues to expand, their core area of expertise, that of professional assessment and supervision may wear very thin. If the discrepancy continues to increase in terms of what is actually happening in the probation process as opposed to what probation officers believe should be happening in this process job satisfaction will most likely continue to decline. This in turn may contribute to a deterioration in the quality and delivery of service to juveniles and their families.

As such, it may be time to reconsider the task structure of the juvenile probation officer in terms of providing a more concise delineation of their responsibilities within the entire area of the juvenile justice and correctional system. Probation officers are not crown attorneys, defence lawyers, Children's Aid workers, administrators or police officers but a group of individuals belonging to a service with a unique history coupled with an important and viable service function in the field of corrections. It is only when this service function has been more clearly defined, in both its theoretical and operational aspects, will the juvenile probation officer be more effective in the carrying out of probation objectives and in turn experience higher levels of satisfaction in a very complex and demanding job.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arcaya, Jose "The Multiple Realities Inherent in Probation Counselling", Federal Probation Volume 36 December, 1973.
2. Armstrong, T. B. "Job Content and Context Factors Related to Satisfaction for Different Occupational Levels", Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 51 1971.
3. Bates, Sanford "When is Probation Not Probation", Federal Probation Volume 24 December, 1960.
4. Biestek, F. P. The Casework Relationship (Chicago, Loyola University Press, 1957).
5. Bixby, Lovell F. "Probation is Not Freedom", Federal Probation Volume 26 June, 1962.
6. Blake, Marilyn "Probation is Not Casework", Federal Probation Volume 13 June, 1948.
7. Bobbit, Jr. H. R. and Behling, Orlando "Defense Mechanisms as an Alternate Explanation of Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Results", Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 56 1972.
8. Brayfield, A. and Rothe, H. "An Index of Job Satisfaction", Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 35 October, 1951.
9. Brennan, W. C. and Khinduka, S. H. "Role Discrepancies and Professional Socialization: The Case of the Juvenile Probation Officer", Social Work Volume 15 April, 1970.
10. Burke, R. J. "Are Herzberg's Motivators and Hygienes Unidimensional", Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 50, August, 1966.
11. Crowne, D. P. and Marlowe, D. The Approval Motive (New York, Wiley & Sons Inc. 1964).

12. Crowne D. P. and Marlowe D. "A New Scale of Social Desirability Independent of Psychopathology", Journal of Consulting Psychology Volume 24 1960.
13. Crystal, David "Family Casework in Probation", Federal Probation Volume 13 1949.
14. Diana, Lewis "What is Probation", The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science Volume 50 1959-1960.
15. Dressler, David Probation and Parole (New York, Columbia University Press, 1951).
16. Dressler, David Practice and Theory of Probation and Parole (New York, Columbia University Press, 1969 2nd ed.).
17. Fink, Arthur E. "Authority in the Correctional Process", Federal Probation Volume 24 September, 1961.
18. Hackman, Ray The Motivated Working Adult American Management Association, Inc. 1969.
19. Hardman, Dale "The Function of the Probation Officer", Federal Probation Volume 24 September, 1960.
20. Herzberg, Frederick Work and the Nature of Man (New York: John Wiley and Sons. 1966).
21. Howard, D. L. John Howard: Prison Reformer (New York, Archer House Inc. 1963).
22. Ives, Jane "The Essential Task of the Probation and Parole Officer", Federal Probation Volume 26 March, 1962.
23. Keve, Paul W. "The Professional Character of the Pre-sentence Report", Federal Probation Volume 26 June, 1962.

24. Klockars, Carl B. "A Theory of Probation Supervision", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science Volume 63 December, 1972.
25. Lippman, Walter "The Role of the Probation Officer in the Treatment of Delinquency in Children", Federal Probation Volume 12 1948.
26. Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality (New York: Harper and Row, 1970, 2nd ed.).
27. Meeker, Ben "Probation is Casework", Federal Probation Volume 12 1948.
28. Nie, N. H. et al Statistical Package For the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company 1975 2nd ed.).
29. Palmieri, Henry J. "Probation is Treatment", Federal Probation Volume 13 1949.
30. Perlman, Helen H. Social Casework: A Problem Solving Process (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1957).
31. Pitman, E. R. Elizabeth Fry (New York: Greenwood Press 1969).
32. Raymond, Frank "To Punish or to Treat", Social Work Volume 19 May, 1974.
33. Rheiner, Alexander "The Period of Probation", Federal Probation Volume 24 September, 1962.
34. Seliger, Stephen G. "Toward a Realistic Reorganization of the Penitentiaries", Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science Volume 60 March, 1969.

35. Sutherland, E. H. and Cressey, D. Criminology
(8th ed.; New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1970).
36. Vroom, Victor H. Work and Motivation
(New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc. 1964).
37. Wall, Toby D. "Ego-Defensiveness As A Determinant of
Reported Differences in Sources of Job Satisfaction and
Job Dissatisfaction", Journal of Applied Psychology
Volume 58, 1973.
38. Wernimont, Paul F. "A Systems View of Job Satisfaction"
Journal of Applied Psychology Volume 56, 1972.
39. Yelaja, Shankar A. Authority and Social Work: Concept
and Use (Toronto: University of Toronto Press 1971).

OTHER SOURCES

1. Crime and Its Treatment in Canada
edited by W. T. McGrath (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada 1965)
2. Dickens, Charles Bleak House
(New York: Dell Publishing Co. Inc. 1965)
3. Manitoba Probation Service Training and Procedures Manual
170 Doncaster Street, Winnipeg, Manitoba
4. National Association of Probation Officers A Handbook of Probation edited by Mrs. L. LeMesurier O. B. E.
47 Whitehall, London S. W. 1
5. Parsons, H. C. "Probation and Parole"; Report of the Sub-Committee, National Conference of Social Work (1919)
6. Probation and Related Matters United Nations
Department of Social Affairs (New York: United Nations Publications, 1951)
7. The Probation Service edited by Joan F. S. King M. B. E.
on behalf of the National Association of Probation Officers
(London: Butterworths, 1964; 2nd edition)
8. Toward Unity: Criminal Justice and Corrections,
"Report of the Canadian Committee on Corrections",
(Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1969)

APPENDIX I A

DEMOGRAPHIC FACE

FACE SHEET

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

As indicated in my introductory remarks, complete anonymity of responses by each respondent will be strictly observed throughout the course of the study. It is important however to gather such data as sex, age etc. as such factors, sometimes referred to as "intervening variables" may have some effect upon the general data collected. Would you mind answering the following questions?

A. Sex of Respondent

1. Male
2. Female

B. Age Range of Respondent

- | | |
|------------|------------|
| 1. 20 - 25 | 5. 41 - 45 |
| 2. 26 - 30 | 6. 46 - 50 |
| 3. 31 - 35 | 7. over 50 |
| 4. 36 - 40 | |

C. Years of Experience as a Probation Officer

1. less than six months
2. six months to a year
3. one to two years
4. two to five years
5. five to ten years
6. more than ten years

D. Education

1. Bachelor of Arts
2. Bachelor of Arts (Honors)
3. Bachelor of Social Work
4. Master of Arts or Social Work
5. Other (Please specify)

E. Please give an indication of your general gross annual salary.

APPENDIX I B

PROBATION OFFICER

TASK QUESTIONNAIRE

PROBATION OFFICER TASK QUESTIONNAIRE

1. As a part of your responsibility as a probation officer:

a) how often do you believe that you should discuss alleged delinquencies with juveniles prior to their initial Court appearance

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

b) how often do you actually discuss alleged delinquencies with juveniles prior to their initial Court appearance

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

c) In terms of your overall work responsibilities as a probation officer, how would you rank this task in terms of its level of importance.

1. Very High 2. High 3. Moderate 4. Low 5. Very Low

2. As a part of your responsibility as a probation officer:

a) how often do you believe that you should advise parents of juveniles of Court dates

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

b) how often do you actually advise parents of juveniles of Court dates

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

c) In terms of your overall work responsibilities as a probation officer, how would you rank this task in terms of its level of importance

1. Very High 2. High 3. Moderate 4. Low 5. Very Low

3. As a part of your responsibility as a probation officer:

a) how often do you believe that you should ensure that parents and juveniles attend Court as previously advised by either yourself or the Presiding Judge.

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

b) how often do you actually ensure that parents and juveniles attend Court as previously advised by either yourself or the Presiding Judge.

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

c) In terms of your overall work responsibilities as a probation officer, how would you rank this task in terms of its level of importance.

1. Very High 2. High 3. Moderate 4. Low 5. Very Low

4. As a part of your responsibility as a probation officer:

a) how often do you believe that you should explain the legal necessity for parents presence in Court for plea and disposition with regard to a juvenile case.

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

b) how often do you actually explain the legal necessity for their presence in Court during plea and disposition.

1. Always 2. Most of the time 3. Sometimes 4. Rarely 5. Never

c) In terms of your overall work responsibilities as a probation officer, how would you rank this task in terms of its level of importance.

1. Very High 2. High 3. Moderate 4. Low 5. Very Low