By now most of you have been provided final budget allocations for the current calendar or fiscal year. In many states there were difficult choices made and my guess is that you did not receive one hundred percent of requested funding. Perhaps you have been required to furlough staff, forego pay increases and execute day to day priorities as if the pandemic plan you considered is now a long term reality. It remains your responsibility to “do the best you can with the tools you’ve got” and, to the degree possible, produce even better outcomes than last year. Does this sound a bit challenging? Nothing a seasoned NAPE leader cannot handle!

One effective method to keep pace with increasing demands is to create and frequently utilize Streamline Committees. These staff driven committees will eagerly offer suggestions that make operations more efficient and reduce workload. Change is readily accepted when the ideas are generated from the line workers and actually make everyone’s job easier. It is important to establish separate committees for the supervision staff positions as well as the clerical/support staff.

Here are some concrete examples of how streamlining efforts have saved time in our agency:

- Introduced ability for offender to waive both first and second level hearings for technical and criminal violation matters — average savings of two hours per hearing per parole agent (658 total hours were saved for July 2009) plus decision maker time also significantly reduced;
- Pre parole home plan investigations are only assigned for inmates who have been approved for parole/reparole release (as compared to prior practice of investigating the entire inmate docket, including 40 to 50 percent of inmates each month that ultimately receive refuse decisions) — average savings of 1.6 hours per investigation or 1,440 hours per month;
- Suspension of annual internal supervision unit audits for those units that achieved less than 10 percent deficiency ratings in every audited category (18 units met this criteria this year and will not require an audit until next year — savings of 400 total hours annually for Parole Managers/Auditors and 270 total hours per year for Unit Supervisors); and
- Numerous Information Technology suggestions from the clerical and supervision staff to conduct more business in an electronic fashion. This includes internal (agency) refinements and improved connectivity and productivity with external partners (seven initiatives are saving nearly 6,000 total hours per year).

These examples of streamlining operations (and others not listed here) are gold to be mined for executives willing to admit that we are not always the smartest person in the room. Such resource saving efforts will create increased work capacity to offset possible budget reductions.

So in these lean times, as we map the road ahead without compromising the core work functions required to achieve our respective visions and missions, let us continue to involve and listen to our most precious resources — our staff. The positive results from their input and ideas will prove to be worth the time invested.

John Tuttle
President
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MESSAGE FROM THE EDITOR

Since 1994 I have chaired the Publications Committee and have served as Editor of Executive Exchange. Serving in this capacity for these many years has been a rewarding experience. It has provided me with the opportunity to meet a lot of wonderful people and interact with some of the scholars of our profession; moreover, it has required me to keep fairly current on a variety of topics — leadership, management, correctional policy, and other subjects that are relevant to the members of the National Association of Probation Executives. Because of this, I will look back on my involvement with the production of Executive Exchange with fond memories.

It is my desire to step down from this dual position with the printing of the Summer 2010 issue. The members of the Board of Directors are seeking volunteers to assume my duties. Persons interested are encouraged to send me an email or give me a call. My email address is probation.executives@gmail.com and my telephone number is (979) 822-1273.

It is our hope we can identify my successor by the Spring of 2010 so that we can have an orderly transition. Please give me a call if you have any interest in volunteering for this position.

Dan Richard Beto
Editor
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WHAT WORKS AND WHAT’S JUST?

by

Fergus McNeill, Ph.D.

Abstract

This paper is based on a presentation entitled “What Works in Probation,” delivered to an Invitational Conference for Directors of Probation Services in Europe organised by the Council of Europe, the Conference Permanente Européenne de la Probation, and the French Ministry of Justice at the Palais de l’Europe in Strasbourg (26th-28th November, 2008). Drawing on a much more extensive and separately prepared report about the effectiveness of offender supervision (McNeill, 2009), I try to argue here that, despite the apparently technical nature of questions of effectiveness, in fact any considered and critical analysis of the empirical evidence about desistance, rehabilitation and “what works?” compel us to consider the moral character and context of criminal justice interventions.

Introduction

It is, of course, not possible to answer questions about what works in probation without thinking first about the purposes of probation. To determine “what works?” we need to first define what ends we are pursuing (Raynor, 1996). Historically, probation services in most jurisdictions have been preoccupied with the pursuit of rehabilitation — although the forms and functions of rehabilitation have changed in probation’s different eras and in the different places where it has developed (McNeill, Bracken & Clarke, forthcoming). One important and helpful analytical distinction that we can make about rehabilitation concerns whether we think of it as an end in itself or as a means. The French expression “rétablir dans ses droits” well captures the notion of rehabilitation as moral end that we should pursue — the full restoration to the formerly errant citizen of all of his rights (and responsibilities) (see McWilliams & Pease, 1990; Lewis, 2005). By contrast, contemporary penologists argue that in recent decades rehabilitation has been recast not as an end but as a means or a mechanism for reducing crime (for example, see Garland, 2001; Robinson & McNeill, 2004). One purpose of this paper is to argue that to pursue rehabilitation solely as a means of protecting the public is, paradoxically perhaps, counter-productive; to achieve safer communities we need better integrated citizens.

Moreover, although clearly it can be argued that it is necessary for probation services to ask and answer the question of what works in reducing reoffending, it is not sufficient. Probation services are not merely crime reduction agencies; they are justice agencies. In view of this, I will argue that although our haste to control crime can sometimes lead to the neglect of questions of justice, due process and legitimacy, ultimately the pursuit of justice — social as well as criminal — is the only sure path to safer communities. In this respect it is important to recognise the vital role that probation services play both in enabling constructive reparation by offenders — enabling them to pay back for their crimes — and in advocating for offenders so that they can access the social goods and resources which so often they have been denied. Of course, it is inequality (and the social injustice that it represents) that so often underlies not just crime and offending but a host of other social problems (Wilkinson, 2005; Wilkinson & Pickett, 2009).

What Works: Public Protection or Community Safety?

Although public protection has become a key priority and even a ‘meta-narrative’ for probation in some European jurisdictions (Robinson & McNeill, 2004), there are good reasons for having reservations about the term. To talk of public protection seems to make sense during times when people are insecure about the pace and scale of change in western societies. The contemporary preoccupation with risks — and, in some places at least, the obsession with finding someone to blame when risks materialise — might suggest that probation’s political position can be secured by promising to manage and reduce risks and thus to protect. Certainly at a time when offenders are increasingly vilified, this might seem a safer pitch for probation that its traditional sympathy for and commitment to the offender. However, there is a paradox at the heart of protection and there are risks with risk. Whenever we promise to protect, we confirm the existence of a threat; we legitimise and reinforce fear (Douglas, 1992). Similarly, when probation commits itself to the assessment and management of risks, it exposes itself not to the likelihood of failure, but to its inevitability. Not all risks are predictable and not all harms are preventable. Even being excellent at assessing and managing risks most of the time (assuming that this could be achieved) would not protect probation from occasional, spectacular failures and the political costs that they carry (Robinson & McNeill, 2004).

Another related problem with public protection is that it tends to dichotomise the interests of offenders and the interests of victims and communities in a zero-sum game (McCulloch & McNeill, 2007). It becomes not just a case of protecting “us” from “them,” but a case of setting our safeties and liberties against theirs. For probation that leads to another problem. It leads to a public and political pressure for more secure — for which we might read incapacitating — forms of control that serve, at least in the short term, to re-assure. But probation’s traditional mechanisms of protection — for want of a better expression — are to be found in the support of long-term change processes which provide relatively little security and reinsurance in the short-term. Thus although changed ex-offenders who have internalised and committed to the responsibilities of citizenship offer a better prospect for a safer society in the long term, change programmes and services look somewhat feeble when set against the increasingly threatening offender that communities are taught to fear.

By way of contrast, the concept of “community safety” stresses that we are all part of communities — offenders too — and that it is in our collective interests to respond intelligently and rationally to our crime problems. Moreover, in some jurisdictions at least, the recognition that tackling crime requires that we nurture the collective efficacy of communities recognises that we are also all part of the solution. In order for communities to be safer, they need to be stronger — together. In order to be stronger commu-
nities also need to be fairer — as we learn (or fail to learn) from international affairs — without justice there is no peace.

Leaving these questions aside for a moment, it is also necessary to think about who or what probation aims to protect. This might seem like an odd question given that it is obvious that probation must aim to reduce victimisation and protect communities. But here again there is an important difference between protecting potential future victims in communities through rehabilitation and risk management and providing services (including protection and support) for those who have already been victimised. In an analogous way, it might be asked whether policy-makers and practitioners are becoming too preoccupied with the offender that someone may become rather than with repairing the harms that they have already done, with the person that they are now and with their positive potential. Similarly, one can ask to what extent probation really works with communities in the present, as opposed to working with offenders on behalf of the future well-being of imagined communities. This tension between working with real victims, offenders and communities now — as opposed to working for merely imagined victims, working on offenders as bearers of imagined risks and working towards merely imagined communities — distorts discourses and practices because focusing too much on the imaginary and the anticipated permits neglect of the present and the real (see Carlen, 2008).

Developing some of these themes in a recent book, Hazel Kemshall (2008) analyses two strategies for the management of high risk offenders. The protection strategy aims to protect through the control of risk. The reintegration strategy aims to reduce risk and thus protect through integration. This mirrors the distinction between more secure short-term incapacitation based approaches and less secure, but ultimately more effective, long-term change based approaches. Kemshall’s conclusion is that, although these two approaches are underpinned by different discourses of risk, conceptions of the offender and conceptions of justice, they can and should be blended. The approach to “blended” protective integration that she advances combines strategies which aim at:

- situational crime reduction within the environment which aim to reduce opportunities to commit crime;
- public education to enhance awareness about risks and how to manage them;
- support and integration of offenders to help them and thus reduce risks (as in the Circles of Support and Accountability that are now used with sex offenders in Canada and in England and Wales);
- pro-social supervision with an emphasis on the Good Lives Model (more of which below);
- appropriate and balanced restrictions on offenders, consistent with their rights and with European standards;
- combining vigilance within communities with vigilance by statutory agencies; and
- effective partnership working (Kemshall, 2008: 133).

In line with the argument above about pursuing community safety as opposed to public protection, Kemshall stresses the need for communities to be active participants in rather than passive recipients of protection.

In the remainder of this paper, the focus will be on what Kemshall calls pro-social supervision and the role that it can and should play in the integrative approach that she commends. In so doing, this analysis deliberately privileges change-based approaches to public protection rather than restrictive approaches. This is not just because this is the traditional territory of probation practice (and of “what works?” research) but also because there are compelling moral and empirical grounds for believing that it is the better path to safer societies.

Towards Effective Offender Supervision

Most of the analysis that follows is drawn from a literature review commissioned by the Scottish Government entitled “Towards Effective Practice in Offender Supervision” (McNeill, 2009). This review explores the problem of reoffending and its roots, the nature of the process of desistance (by which people cease and refrain from offending) and two contemporary models of rehabilitation. It then goes on to develop the notion of an “Offender Supervision Spine;” meaning a clearly articulated process of supervision based on an explicit and evidence-based logic; one which can be “fleshed-out” with the necessary interventions and supports required by the individual. Two key aspects of this “fleshing-out” are the development of the human capital and of the social capital of the offender.

Figure 1 (below) presents the three necessary and sufficient pre-conditions for change, at least as argued in social casework theory over four decades ago (Ripple et al., 1964). The person doing the changing needs to be motivated. They need to have the capacity to change — meaning in this context the requisite set of skills. Human capital is another term for these personal resources that inhere within individuals. But people who want to change also need to have access to opportunities. The term social capital refers to the resources that inhere within social networks and relationships. In terms of the practice of supervision, these three preconditions entail three roles or tasks for probation staff; they need to be counsellors who can develop and deploy motivation; they need to be educators who can develop and deploy human capital; they also need to be advocates who develop and deploy social capital. Or at least, if they cannot be all of these things themselves, they need to be able to help the offender access all of these things. By way of illustration, think of the diagram as a cross section of a rope. The rope won’t be strong enough to pull the person towards change unless the strands are woven together. Someone needs to do the weaving and keep hold of the rope — especially when there is a strain in the process or an obstacle that the person needs to be pulled over (see McNeill et al., 2005).

Figure 1
The Preconditions for Change

![Diagram showing the Preconditions for Change](image-url)
But before thinking further about these three preconditions and the roles they imply for staff, it makes sense to think about the change process they exist to support; the process of desistance from offending.

Figure 2 (below) represents the fictional criminal career of a very persistent offender. The person in question commits his or her first crime at the age of 8, the offending escalates during adolescence; it peaks at 18 and plateaus until 25 after which it tails off, eventually ending at age 30. The area under the curve represents the volume of offending for which this person is responsible. Obviously, there are only two ways that criminal justice interventions can, in theory, reduce this volume. They can push the curve towards the horizontal axis, thus reducing the volume of crimes committed in each year; or, they can push the curve towards the vertical axis, thus reducing the length of the criminal career. Better still, they can do both.

**Figure 2**

The Criminal Career of a Very Persistent Offender

In an ideal world, the effect of a perfect probation intervention — and with it perfect public protection — is represented by the red area under the curve. The offender gets probation at age 18 and by age 19 his or her rate of offending has reduced to 0. In the real world however, protection through change looks more like the amber area under the curve. The offender stays active until 25, but the volume of offending tails off much more rapidly than it would have without intervention — the volume of offending without any intervention is represented in the green area under the curve. Even in this less perfect midway scenario, the green area shows the significant volume of offending that can be produced by interventions which support change and slow down an offending career.

So, what do we know from those studies that have explored the ending of criminal careers, the process of desistance which we are trying to accelerate? In this paper, only the briefest of summaries can be offered (see Farrall & Calverley, 2005; McNeill, 2008; Maruna, 2001).

First of all, some have suggested that there is a difference between primary desistance, meaning a lull or crime-free gap in a criminal career, and secondary desistance, meaning a change in the way that an ex-offender sees him or herself (Farrall & Maruna, 2004). Essentially, secondary desistance is about ceasing to see yourself as an offender and finding a more positive identity; it is about successfully peeling off the criminal label that criminal justice systems are so effective at applying. Though not all researchers concur that this kind of reconstruction of identity is a necessary aspect of desistance (see Bottoms et al., 2004; Laub & Sampson, 2003), it is at least more likely to be necessary for those whose offending has been persistent and who have deeply entrenched criminal identities, but not for those whose engagements with crime and justice have been more transitory. With respect to persistent offenders, it can be argued that secondary desistance should be the holy grail of probation services because secondary desistance is about the internalisation of change and the fundamental redirection of the ex-offender’s life. As such it also represents the most secure basis of public protection because the ex-offender has changed in a lasting way, a way that will endure long after short-term controls and constraints have been removed.

Getting there, however, is very difficult. Taken together, the research suggests that the process of desistance, again focusing on those who have developed persistent offending patterns, is typically characterised by ambivalence and vacillation (Burnett, 1992, 2000, 2004). It is not an event, it is a process; a process of ‘to-ing’ and ‘fro-ing,’ of progress and setback, of hope and despair.

Theories of desistance tend to focus on the significance of aging, on related life events and social bonds, or on related narrative changes in the offender and his or her sense of self (Maruna, 2001). Most scholars now tend to stress the interplay between these three factors (Farrall & Bowling, 1999); it is not just getting older, getting married or getting a job, it is about what these kinds of developments mean and signify to offenders themselves and whether they represent compelling enough reasons for and opportunities to change the pattern of one’s life.

Given the significance of these subjectivities, it is interesting, but perhaps not surprising, that hope plays a key part in these processes (Burnett & Maruna, 2004; Farrall & Calverley, 2005). Desistance can, it seems, be provoked by someone believing in the offender; someone who perhaps carries hope and keeps it alive when the offender cannot do so for him or herself. Of course, the brutal reality is that the social circumstances of the lives of many repeat offenders suffocate hope.

Against this backdrop, Maruna (2001) describes the prognosis for many persistent offenders as “dire” (precisely because of the criminogenic backgrounds, environments and traits that they experience). Perhaps because of their experience of adversity, we know from research and practice experience that persistent offenders are very often highly fatalistic; or to use psychological terms, they have “low self-efficacy” and an “external locus of control.” They don’t feel that they determine the direction of their own lives. Rather, life happens to them. Yet Maruna (2001) discovered that, despite this background and previous outlook, desisters somehow manage to acquire a sense of “agency” — of control over their own lives.

But desistance is not just about the acquisition of new personal narrative and a new sense of personal empowerment; far less it is simply about the acquisition of the new skills that offender programmes typically focus upon. Desistance requires social capital as well as these forms of human capital (Farrall, 2002, 2004). Important ongoing studies of desistance in both Sheffield and Tubingen have suggested that for young men involved in persistent offending returning home and rebuilding ties with their parents and families is an important aspect of desisting from crime (see: www.scopic.ac.uk/SPOOCS.html).

Finally, there is some evidence that for many ex-offenders desistance is about personal redemption, not necessarily in the...
Desistance is not on them. Finally, interventions based only on human capital may be insufficient. Probation needs to respect self-determination; this means working with offenders to develop their capacities. Fourth, if desistance is about discovering agency, then interventions need to encourage and support the change process — not only through desistance research but through programmes research too — that more attention needs to be paid to the offender’s motivation and to the impact of his or her social context on the outcomes of the intervention (Farrall, 2002). Secondly, it is now well understood that there is more to effective programmes than designing them well; they need to be run well; that requires the right organisational arrangements, the right staff skills and the qualities of relationships between offenders and probation staff — both within programmes and beyond them (Raynor, 2004a, 2004b, 2008). Arguably, the delay in recognising the significance of these sorts of additional ingredients in the recipe for effective practice is a result of thinking too much about interventions or programmes and too little about the change processes that they exist to support. Desistance research, if taken seriously, would invert our priorities — recognising the change process as our central concern and considering offender programmes as but one aspect of the many means of supporting the process:

Treatment was birthed as an adjunct to recovery, but, as treatment grew in size and status, it defined recovery as an adjunct of itself. The original perspective needs to be recaptured. Treatment institutions need to once again become servants of the larger recovery process and the community in which that recovery is nested and sustained (White, 2000, in Maruna et al., 2004).

To use education as an analogy, one might ask the question whether it is more important that teachers understand how children learn and develop and how they can support these processes or to know what currently seems to be the best way to teach them? While we may want the answer to this question to be “Both!,” the former seems to be more of a priority that the latter.

**Putting Interventions in Their Place**

But there is a more revolutionary implication of the desistance perspective that we need to confront and consider. Figure 3 represents — admittedly somewhat harshly — the type of approach to offender intervention programmes that has come to the fore in the UK of late.

**Figure 3**

**Offender Interventions**

In simple terms, the idea is that the offender is put through a programme which conforms to the principles of effective practice (more of which below) and emerges as a desister; the rough edges get smoothed off in the process. It is the offender who is changed by the intervention — and much of the focus has been on how to make the intervention or programme more effective. A number of complicating factors have emerged in the practical experiences of this general approach and in the evaluation research which has sought to account for the sometimes limited impact of such programmes. First of all, researchers have learned — not only through desistance research but from programmes research too — that more attention needs to be paid to the offender’s motivation and to the impact of his or her social context on the outcomes of the intervention (Farrall, 2002). Secondly, it is now well understood that there is more to effective programmes than designing them well; they need to be run well; that requires the right organisational arrangements, the right staff skills and the qualities of relationships between offenders and probation staff — both within programmes and beyond them (Raynor, 2004a, 2004b, 2008).

Arguably, the delay in recognising the significance of these sorts of additional ingredients in the recipe for effective practice is a result of thinking too much about interventions or programmes and too little about the change processes that they exist to support. Desistance research, if taken seriously, would invert our priorities — recognising the change process as our central concern and considering offender programmes as but one aspect of the many means of supporting the process:

Treatment was birthed as an adjunct to recovery, but, as treatment grew in size and status, it defined recovery as an adjunct of itself. The original perspective needs to be recaptured. Treatment institutions need to once again become servants of the larger recovery process and the community in which that recovery is nested and sustained (White, 2000, in Maruna et al., 2004).

To use education as an analogy, one might ask the question whether it is more important that teachers understand how children learn and develop and how they can support these processes or to know what currently seems to be the best way to teach them? While we may want the answer to this question to be “Both!,” the former seems to be more of a priority that the latter.

**Figure 4**

**Programmes in Context**

Figure 4 seeks to simply convey the relationships between desistance, case management and programmes. Services, systems and practitioners need to begin by understanding the desistance process and how best to support it, and then embed the overall
intervention or case management process in this understanding, and then embed within case management the role that specific programmes may play. As a member of an accreditation panel for such programmes, I am often troubled to find programme designers making submissions on the basis that the programme is the change process. It is not; it is merely one aspect of the service required to support the change process.

Developing Human Capital

That said, if there was once a risk of ignoring the importance of change processes and supports beyond programmes (Burnett & McNeill, 2005), then there is perhaps now a risk of rejecting or dismissing the role that programmes can play. As has already been suggested in elaborating the three preconditions for change, offender programmes represent a key mechanism for developing offenders’ capacities for change by building their human capital. There is by now a considerable body of evidence about the types of programmes that seem to work best. Most probation managers will be, by now, very well aware of the principles of risk, need and responsibility; the principles that make up the RNR model (Andrews & Bonta, 2003) that continues to dominate approaches to offender rehabilitation in the English-speaking world. Ensuring that these principles (and to some extent other research evidence) are increasingly designed into programmes is the task of accreditation systems in many northern European jurisdictions. These accreditation processes and systems typically stipulate criteria around requirements that programmes have evidence-based models of change, that they have clear procedures for the selection of appropriate offenders, that they target “criminogenic” (or crime-generating) needs, that they use effective methods oriented towards the acquisition of skills, that they specify appropriate sequencing, intensity and duration of the programme, that they attend to the need to engage and motivate offenders, that they have procedures in place to ensure continuity within programmes and between programmes and other activities, and that they have measures in place to ensure that they are delivered as designed (with integrity) and are properly evaluated. Despite these efforts to design-in quality, the results to date of attempts to roll-out programmes within probation have been somewhat disappointing, in England and Wales at least (for a critical overview, see Merrington & Stanley, 2004).

This may be explained in part by the fact that in practice this list represents a very challenging menu not just for programme designers but also, more to the point, for those delivering the interventions. As medical researchers know well, an efficacious treatment in the laboratory is not necessarily effective in the real world. If the ‘cure’ is more painful or inconvenient than the ‘condition,’ the fact that it ‘works’ will not persuade many patients to undergo it.

This problem of “treatment adherence” manifests itself in offender programmes as the problem of “programme attrition,” meaning the numbers of “drop-outs” who start but don’t complete programmes (Kemshall et al., 2002; Roberts, 2004). In England and Wales, this has been a major problem, not least because there is much evidence that those who drop out fare worse in terms of reconviction than those who never start programmes (Hollin et al., 2004). That neither drop-outs nor non-starters do as well as programme completers offers limited comfort to practitioners and researchers alike, since the better outcomes for completers can too readily be attributed to a selection bias; those with the motivation to complete programmes may well have been motivated enough to change without the help of the programme. And indeed some of the evidence from some of the programmes suggests that the completers may have been lower risk offenders in the first place (Burnett & Roberts, 2004). Some commentators in England and Wales attribute these and other disappointing findings to organisational issues and implementation problems, not least problems with the tensions between, on the one hand, the political need to meet targets for getting large numbers of offenders through programmes and, on the other hand, making sure that the programmes are effectively targeted (Hollin et al., 2004; Raynor 2004a, 2004b, 2008). With hindsight we might summarise one of the key lessons of the experience of programmes in England and Wales in the English phrase: “too much haste, too little speed.” In other words, implementing programmes (or perhaps any organisational change process) too hastily will ultimately delay the delivery of the desired outcomes.

The discussion above has already alluded to some of the other lessons to be learned from this experiment. Firstly, much more attention needs to be paid to the organisational contexts of professional cultures in and through which interventions are delivered — to borrow from a biblical parable, it is as much the condition of the soil that determines to yield as the quality of the seed. Secondly, to another English expression, we need to be careful not to place all our eggs in one basket: it is unwise to rely too heavily on programmes themselves as the main mechanisms to deliver reductions in reoffending; rather we need to draw on a wider body of evidence (including desistance research) to make sure that our routine practices of case management and casework — and the key relationships between probation staff and offenders — are as effective as they can be in supporting change (Hollin et al., 2004; Raynor, 2004; Raynor, 2008).

Developing Motivation

In looking briefly at the second precondition of change, some critics have suggested that the RNR model is, in practice, somewhat weak in respect of the issue of offender motivation and that, as such, the principle of responsibility — which involves using methods that effectively engage offenders — is as yet underdeveloped. Ward and Maruna (2007) have recently argued convincingly that the Good Lives Model of Offender Rehabilitation (GLM) may address this weakness in existing approaches.

The GLM represents a relatively recent development in the field (Ward & Brown, 2004; Ward & Marshall, 2004; Ward & Gannon, 2006; Ward, Gannon & Mann, 2007). It draws on the developing field of “positive psychology” to offer a strengths-based approach to rehabilitation. In setting out the general principles of the model, Ward and Maruna (2007) articulate several basic assumptions. Essentially, the GLM assumes that people (including offenders) are predisposed to seek certain goals or primary human goods including, for example, life, knowledge, excellence in play and work, agency or autonomy, inner peace, friendship, community, spirituality, happiness and creativity. Secondary goods, such as certain types of work or relationships, provide particular ways and means for us to pursue and achieve primary goods. Because primary human goods are plural, there are many possible sources of motivation for human behaviour.
The GLM rests on the assumption that interventions should aim to promote an individual’s goods as well as to manage or reduce risk. A major aim of rehabilitative work is to enable an individual to develop a life plan that involves ways of effectively securing primary human goods without harming others. However, this is not just about tackling risk factors; it is about the holistic reconstruction of the self that requires practitioners to consider and address individual, relational and contextual factors; attending to both characteristics and environments. Similarly, risk must be understood not as an attribute of offenders but in a multifaceted and contextualised way. Finally, the approach requires an explicit focus on conceptualising a good life; taking account of strengths, primary goods and relevant environments, and encouraging and respecting individual’s capacities to make choices for themselves.

In understanding the aetiology of offending, the GLM draws on strain theory (Merton, 1934) to suggest that there are two basic routes to offending — direct and indirect. The direct route refers to situations where the individual seeks certain types of good through criminal activity. The indirect route refers to situations where the pursuit of a certain good has consequences that increase the pressure to offend; for example, where the use of alcohol to relieve emotional pressure leads to a loss of control in particular circumstances. In the GLM crimogenic needs are best understood as internal or external obstacles to the acquisition of primary human goods.

In the practice model that develops from these principles and assumptions, the practitioner must balance the promotion of personal goods (for the offender) with the reduction of risk (for society). Too strong a focus on personal goods may produce a happy but dangerous offender; but equally too strong a focus on risk may produce a dangerously defiant or disengaged offender. The practitioner has to create a human relationship in which the individual offender is valued and respected and through which interventions can be properly tailored in line with particular life plans and their associated risk factors. So, although, as with RNR, interventions should be structured and systematic, they should also be shaped to suit the person in question. The language used by the practitioner and their agency should be “future-oriented, optimistic and approach goal focused” (Ward & Maruna, 2007: 127) in order to foster motivation.

In the processes of engagement and assessment, Ward and Maruna (2007) suggest that as well as addressing risk, needs and responsibility, practitioners should also assess the individual’s priorities — their own goals, life priorities and their aims for the intervention. This requires analysing the kinds of priorities implicit in their patterns of offending and also asking the person directly about what s/he values and where s/he places her efforts and energies. A more comprehensive assessment of an individual’s potential for achieving a good life involves exploring:

1. Whether there is restricted scope for meeting some primary goods perhaps because of an undue focus on others;
2. Whether some goods are being pursued through inappropriate means;
3. Whether there is conflict between the individual’s goals; and
4. Whether the person has the capacity or capabilities to enact their life plan and achieve their goals.

Individual case formulation then proceeds by exploring presenting problems and criminogenic needs and then by establishing the function of the offending — that is, the primary human goods to which it directly or indirectly relates. Once the reasons for offending, the level of risk and the flaws in the individual’s life plan have been understood, the practitioner should identify their strengths, positive experiences and expertise. Next, the effort shifts to exploring primary and secondary goods and how they might be better met. There should then follow some consideration of the individual’s environment and its likely impact on their life plan, before in the final phase of assessment the practitioner constructs an intervention plan based on all of the above considerations:

Thus, taking into account the kind of life that would be fulfilling and meaningful to the individual… [the practitioner] notes the kinds of capabilities or competencies he or she requires to have a chance of putting that plan into action. A treatment plan is then developed (Ward & Maruna, 2007, 136).

Ward and Maruna’s (2007) evaluation of the GLM presents a wealth of empirical evidence to support the theoretical frameworks, aetiological assumptions and practice focuses of the model and points to positive evaluations of a number of correctional treatment programmes based on or analogous to the GLM. However, their candid conclusion is that:

the GLM appears to function well as an integrative framework, but so far there is a paucity of specific correctional programs that have been explicitly developed with GLM in mind. Thus there is a lack of direct, compelling research evidence for GLM-inspired programs. However, this is changing rapidly and, as we write, several correctional GLM programmes are being constructed and empirically evaluated (Ward & Maruna, 2007, 171).

Beyond this issue about the existing evidence base, there are a number of questions that might be asked about the GLM. Are the primary human goods as universally pursued as the model suggests? How can practitioners manage the deep tensions that exist in contemporary societies around diverse views of what constitutes the good life and the conflicts that arise in the pursuit of very different versions of that life within communities? Do all of those offenders with whom social workers engage require the holistic reconstruction of the self that the thoroughgoing revision of a good lives plan seems to suggest? Might less intensive interventions suffice in many cases? That said, there is no reason why the GLM would not allow for varying degrees of reconstruction and revision and indeed its emphasis on tailored intervention might require this. Does the GLM perhaps underplay the extent to which crimogenic social contexts (and limited life opportunities) might make a “criminal” good lives plan logical and functional from the offender’s point of view. Finally, might a sharper focus on the importance of interventions around the familial and social contexts of offending and desistance, and on work to develop legitimate opportunities (or licit social capital — see below) also be required?

It may be that the emphasis in both the RNR model and, to a lesser extent, in the GLM model on within-individual analyses of
and responses to offending is a consequence of the psychological orientation towards offender rehabilitation that they share. That said, the GLM’s values and principles seem highly consistent both with probation’s humanistic traditions. Moreover, to the extent that one can still see probation as a form of social work (McNeill, Bracken & Clarke, forthcoming), the GLM seems congruent with social work’s broader history of engaging with ecological perspectives, with its contemporary stress on the personalisation of care and with strengths-based approaches.

**Developing Social Capital**

But since capacities and motivation are not sufficient for change, and given the criticism that both the RNR and the GLM models are too focussed on the individual level of analysis, it is necessary to turn to the last of the three preconditions of change; the development of opportunities and of social capital. We have already noted that the latter term refers to the resources that inhere in social relationships and networks characterised by shared norms and reciprocal bonds (see Putnam, 2000; McNeill & Whyte, 2007). Social capital theorists have delineated three types of social capital, two of which are most relevant here; bonding social capital refers to close ties with family and friends, bridging social capital refers to more distant ties, for example with a wider network of acquaintances and colleagues (for more detail see McNeill & Whyte, 2007, chapter 9). Unsurprisingly, research indicates not just that high crime communities have low social capital but also that persistent offenders tend to have very little social capital — or at least very little licit social capital. Their damaged ties even to kith and kin — friends and family — force them to rely on illicit and criminal networks, damaging their prospects for desistance (Webster et al., 2006). It follows that supporting desistance requires probation services to help offenders and ex-offenders, where appropriate, to repair the bonding social capital represented in family ties and to prepare for and develop ties with the new families that they form as they establish intimate relationships and become parents. However, this social capital building should also extend to the development of bridging social capital, meaning wider community ties forged with and through employers, NGOs, faith communities and so on. Both by developing their positive contributions to families and by building positive ties with communities, probation services can create channels for the generative activities that seem to be important to those desisting from crime in helping them to see themselves as positive contributors to communities rather than risks or threats to them (McNeill & Whyte, 2007).

Of course, developing the social capital of a vilified, marginalised and excluded group like offenders is far from easy in the insecure, late-modern societies in which most of us work. Indeed in some European jurisdictions we seem hell-bent on squandering our diminishing fiscal resources by imprisoning more and more offenders despite the evidence not just of the futility of such an approach but also of its high social costs, not least in terms of reconviction rates and ruined lives.

Once again, research can provide a measure of hope here. A recent study of public attitudes to punishment in two high crime communities in Sheffield, for example, led its authors to suggest that the contrasts in punitiveness between the two communities may have been accounted for by different feelings about community within them (Bottoms & Wilson, 2004). While the more punitive community felt abandoned to disorder and decay, residents in the less punitive community — despite having a similar crime rate — felt that their neighbourhood was on the up. In part, this was accounted for by differences in the policing of the communities. The researchers link their findings to the literature on reassurance policing which encourages the use of “control signals” to tackle those “signal crimes” around which anxieties about crime and disorder tend to coalesce (Innes, 2004). In a recent paper, Tony Bottoms has suggested that, like the police, probation services need to consider the signals they send to communities and neighbourhoods (Bottoms, 2008). These signals might include control and protection signals, but they might also include restitution or reparation signals and reformation or redemption signals. Other important research on public attitudes to punishment suggests that we should not neglect but rather attend closely to the emotive aspects of punishment. However, rather than surrendering to the negative feelings that underlie punitiveness, we should try to tap into the long-cherished and still strong cultural heritage of belief in redeemability which asserts the capacity of human beings to grow and change for the better (Maruna & King, 2008). It may be that the ultimate fate of probation services — perhaps even of humanity in our approaches to punishment — may depend much more on our success or failure in developing and sending restitution, reparation and redemption signals than in delivering effective public protection.

**Conclusion**

This paper aimed to suggest that on moral and empirical grounds rehabilitation should be pursued as an end and not just as a means, and that in order to think about “what works?” in controlling or reducing crime, we also need to think about “what is just?” It was argued that, in stressing our collective interests and building our collective efficacy, the concept of community safety might be more productive than the concept of public protection which tends to construct offenders as external threats to communities. I have also tried to explain why change-focussed, integrative approaches to public protection must be sustained and developed as a necessary counter-balance to restrictive approaches, though this is not to say that restrictive approaches have no place.

My preference for discourses of community, integration and change is not just a product of my own origins in social work practice — it is not just a matter of the heart. Rather my engagement with criminological research suggests clearly to me that, particularly in neo-liberal regimes, the dominance of a “risk” or “protection” discourse is very likely to frustrate its own purposes if it identifies offenders with the worst aspects of themselves, if it leads practitioners to neglect of offenders’ needs, strengths, goals and aspirations and if it reinforces a social climate that creates practical and attitudinal barriers to ex-offenders’ prospects of social mobility and of living differently.

“What works?” sounds like a technical question, but it is a question that ultimately drives us back to question not just about the kinds of probation services we want to develop and deliver but about the kinds of communities and societies to which we want to belong. My conviction, both as a citizen and an academic, is that we will be safer in a society where ex-offenders are supported to move towards better lives, than in one where the risks that they present are merely managed and surveilled, and where those risks are continually fixed and reinforced by their stigmatisation and exclusion as risk bearers.
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State Probation and AmeriCorps have joined forces in Nebraska to help rural area probationers improve their education and employment opportunities. To make this happen, Nebraska State Probation developed the Rural Improvement for Schooling and Employment (RISE) Program. AmeriCorps Members, titled RISE Specialists have joined eight probation districts across rural Nebraska to focus on teaching adult and juvenile probationers new skills.

The RISE Program began September 1, 2007, when The Office of Probation Administration applied for and received grant funding from AmeriCorps. The focus of the program was lead by a 2006 study of probation, completed by the Vera Institute focusing on Intensive Supervision in Nebraska. This study highlighted two major factors contributing to “high risk” juvenile or adult offender failure: lack of employment and education. Given this information, the RISE Program was developed to focus AmeriCorps members on organizing and facilitating employment and education groups for probationers, track success, as well as building relationships with local businesses and schools.

Nebraska State Probation is currently in its second year of administering this AmeriCorps program. AmeriCorps is a federal initiative engaging dedicated committed individuals to meet critical community needs in education, public safety, health and the environment. In return for their service, AmeriCorps members receive a living allowance and an educational award that may be used for future higher education or to repay student loans. Full-time members are eligible for additional benefits including child care and health insurance.

AmeriCorps grants are made to local and national entities, including faith-based and community organizations, higher education institutions and public agencies. AmeriCorps is coordinated by the Corporation for National & Community Service, a federal government agency. In each state, a state service commission nurtures the development of the AmeriCorps program and provides oversight for efforts in that state. In Nebraska, the state service commission is known as ServeNebraska.

Two years ago Nebraska Probation was part of a training regarding AmeriCorps grants. At first, it was difficult to imagine how AmeriCorps members could fit into Probation. But with the recent research showing a direct correlation between being employed and a reduction of recidivism, as well as the rural areas in Nebraska struggling due to lack of services, development of an AmeriCorps program that could directly focus on these two areas was exactly what Nebraska Probation needed and had been asking for.

The grant process was challenging, the Office of Probation Administration or for that matter any other government agency had not partnered with a program as specialized as AmeriCorps in the past. Just addressing AmeriCorps benefits posed a number of initial challenges — from receiving permission to carry a new insurance provider, to paying 100% of the insurance for the AmeriCorps members, and finally locating Workers’ Compensation Insurance to cover the members. Everyday seemed to bring a new barrier, but with the support of ServeNebraska the grant was received and the RISE Program came to fruition.

ServeNebraska believed the process the Office of Probation Administration followed was exactly the way they hoped interested groups would think about AmeriCorps possibilities. The most important initial considerations are clearly identifying a need and developing a strong idea of how AmeriCorps members can assist in addressing that need. In designing an AmeriCorps program it’s important that the role of AmeriCorps members does not duplicate or displace employees.

ServeNebraska appreciated the degree of thought and care that had gone into crafting the proposal for the RISE Program. They were impressed with the integration of AmeriCorps members into a strong organizational framework and the reach of the RISE program into rural and frontier Nebraska — areas in which the AmeriCorps presence had been very modest. The focus on using national service participants to increase the skills and future prospects of those on probation was seen as very innovative and had widespread appeal.

Nebraska State Probation worked hard in the final few months prior to the beginning of the grant period to make sure everything was ready for implementation. This glimmer of hope for probationers in rural areas in need of employment and educational services had become a program devoted to this goal, the RISE Program. AmeriCorps members were now a part of the probation system and during the first new employee training; the AmeriCorps members sat in a room full of other probation employees and introduced themselves as “RISE Specialists,” part of the probation system.

During the initial year of the RISE Program, Nebraska State Probation was in a time of great transition, moving the entire system towards evidence-based practices. The RISE Program was a part of this new approach of working with probationers: focusing on probationers’ skills, strengths and positive reinforcement. The system was struggling with changing the way it had done things for years to this new way. Probation officers were unsure of the program and referrals were very slow, with a little over 200 probationers in the program during the first year.

Although there were struggles and some challenges in securing understanding and appreciation of the role of AmeriCorps members throughout the probation system, probation leadership insisted they wanted the program to continue. They were seeing positive changes with the probationers in the program and knew the program would grow rapidly once the transition towards evidence-based practice was complete. This has become true. Halfway through its second year, the RISE AmeriCorps program has already surpassed the number of probationers served in the total first year. The questioning and doubt that greeted the program from some when it was launched has also disappeared. In its place are an increase in referrals and additional probation districts asking to be involved. Plus, those probation districts that are already involved are seeking to add more RISE Specialists.
ServeNebraska has seen when organizations get involved with AmeriCorps, there is often a jolt to the corporate culture. AmeriCorps members fit in a unique niche — not volunteers and not staff. This can be confusing as staff adjust and learn to respect the benefits AmeriCorps members bring. But they were very impressed with how quickly Nebraska State Probation embraced AmeriCorps as part of its operations and the desire for program expansion. Most importantly though is the impact the AmeriCorps members are having on the lives of the probationers with whom they interact under the guidance and support of skilled probation staff.

The RISE Program continues to strive and grow in Nebraska. The RISE Program is only in the second year and Nebraska is already seeing probationers increase their skills and not return to the probation system, ultimately reducing recidivism rates. Nebraska Probation statistics show 74% of the probationers who graduated March 1, 2008, or before from the RISE Program have not returned to the probation system a year after completion. As the RISE Program continues to expand in Nebraska, other rural areas will see the addition of RISE Specialists to the probation offices, as well as a new focus on helping juveniles who are struggling in high school learn skills that will help improve grades, attendance and overall performance. The future for probationers in Nebraska receiving support and skill enhancement from AmeriCorps members/RISE Specialists is as bright as the sun-RISE.

Kari Rumbaugh is RISE Program Director, Probation Administration, for the State of Nebraska.
Greg Donovan is Program Officer with ServeNebraska — the Nebraska Volunteer Service Commission.

**JOB ANNOUNCEMENT**

**Chief Adult Probation Officer**  
**Bexar County, Texas**

The district and statutory county court judges trying criminal cases in Bexar County are soliciting applications for Chief of the Community Supervision and Corrections Department, responsible for the operation of the county adult probation department and supervision of 400+ employees.

Qualifications: Graduate degree preferred in criminology; counseling; social work; psychology; business; public or nonprofit administration; or a closely related field; or a J.D. Significant administrative or managerial experience, with demonstrated leadership in a department or business. All candidates must also meet the eligibility requirements for a community supervision officer as set out in the Texas Government Code. Must successfully pass a background investigation. Required to be on call 24 hours a day, and required to work more than 40 hours per work week. Salary range is $135,000 to $170,000 per year.

Applicants must submit a résumé and short letter outlining their interest in and qualifications for this position to: Melissa Barlow Fischer, General Administrative Counsel for the Criminal District Courts, Cadena-Reeves Justice Center, 300 Dolorosa, Suite 4076, San Antonio, Texas 78205. Applications must be received by November 2, 2009.
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AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT AND COMPENSATION SATISFACTION: THEIR IMPACT ON TURNOVER INTENTION AMONG LINE PROBATION OFFICERS AND DIRECT CARE STAFF

by

Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D., Monica R. Koenigsberg, Ph.D., Christie Davidson and Dan Richard Beto

Abstract

Probation systems often fail to resolve high levels of employee turnover rates, possibly leading to a failure in promoting public safety. Since voluntary turnover can be preventable by identifying its underlying reasons and addressing identified causes, staff turnover should be a top priority for probation administrators. In response, this study comprehensively investigated the determinant factors that shape turnover intention and pay satisfaction’s influence on organizational outcomes, such as overall job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention among line probation officers, and direct-care staff across Texas. The accumulated findings indicated that compensation satisfaction, especially pay satisfaction, is a pivotal organizational influence on turnover intention and is much more important than affective commitment, overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment, and organizational justice in reducing high levels of turnover intention. Based upon the findings, policy recommendations were included in an effort to reduce and prevent high voluntary turnover problems.

Introduction

Turnover among line probation officers and direct-care probation staff impacts every aspect of organizational functioning. From increases in recruiting expenses during times of austere funding to decreased effectiveness of retained personnel due to increasing caseloads, probation personnel turnover touches everyone associated with the department, from clients to supervisors, from family members to the next victim of an improperly supervised probationer. Decreasing voluntary turnover is imperative to successfully carrying out probation’s primary public safety function.

There is much evidence of high levels of employee turnover faced by probation executives. Florida probation agencies, for example, reported a turnover rate of approximately 30% in 1995 (Simmons, Cochran & Blount, 1997). In a 2000 report, the Texas Juvenile Probation Commission reported a 19.7% turnover rate among the State’s juvenile probation officers in 1999 (Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, 2000). The Commission also reported a 31.4% turnover rate for juvenile detention and corrections officers. Additionally, despite the absence of extensive national reports addressing community correctional officer turnover, members of the National Institute of Corrections agreed that the loss of qualified officers was a major concern (National Institute of Corrections, 1994).

Voluntary turnover can be attenuated by identifying and addressing its underlying causes in many agencies. However, little research has been conducted in the area of probation agencies to empirically identify and address the underlying causes of voluntary turnover. Failure to address voluntary turnover can diminish the definitive mission of the probation system, the promotion of public safety. To that end, this study was commissioned by the Texas Probation Advisory Committee (PAC) to conduct a web-based, state-wide survey targeting all line probation officers and all direct-care staff in Texas. For the purpose of this study, direct-care staff were defined as all community supervision and corrections department (CSCD) employees who have direct contact with probationers or other clients as an assigned job duty, such as case workers, counselors, counselor interns, residential monitors, caseload technicians, and technicians assigned to the inter/intrastate caseloads while excluding other staff, such as secretaries, general clerks, computer technicians, fiscal clerks, couriers, and transportation specialists, not assigned to a caseload or to have contact with clientele as part of their regular duties. This study comprehensively investigated any determinant factors shaping turnover intention, especially the effect of pay satisfaction on turnover intention.

Literature Review

Voluntary employee turnover concerns institutional and community corrections agencies. Probation employee turnover can result in increased caseloads for remaining staff. Implications include: deterioration in supervision, low morale, increases in unnoticed violations, absconders, recidivism and increased recruitment and training expenditure (Simmons et al., 1997). Review of the organizational and criminal justice literature identifies key components studied, which are associated with turnover intention among employees: organizational commitment, job satisfaction, job stress/stressors, organizational justice, participatory climate and pay satisfaction.

As the emotional link between an employee and an organization, organizational commitment is associated with turnover intention and actual turnover (Griffeth, Hom & Gaertner, 2000). An employee committed to their organization is likely to work towards the organization’s goals and remain in the organization. Meyer and Allen (1997) identified three dimensions of organizational commitment — affective, continuance and normative commitment. Affective commitment is an employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in an organization. Employees commit to the organization because they want to. Continuance commitment is the extent to which an employee perceives high costs, including socio-economic costs, as a consequence of leaving the organization. Employees remain with the organization because they need to. Finally, normative commitment represents an employee’s feeling obligated to continue employment; employees stay with organizations because they ought to. An employee remains committed to an organization mainly out of moral obligation developed by the organization’s investment resources, such as training.

Compared to organizational commitment, job satisfaction is a link between an employee and his/her job that results from
appraisal of the job and job experiences. Employee reactions to a job that is based upon the level of congruence between the employee’s job expectations and the reality of the job is generally defined as job satisfaction (Cranny, Smith & Stone, 1992). A substantial body of literature reports that low job satisfaction has the effect of increasing turnover intention (Tett & Meyer, 1993). However, a growing body of recent theoretical and empirical research supports the notion that organizational commitment, especially affective commitment, is a better predictor of turnover intention than job satisfaction (Griffeth et al., 2000).

Job stress has been found to be positively correlated with turnover intention (Begley & Czajka, 1993). Among its various definitions, job stress can be succinctly defined as the lack of congruity between individuals and their physical or social environment (Chesney & Rosenman, 1980; Whitehead, 1987). In conjunction with the person-environment fit perspective, job stressors have been succinctly defined as “circumstances which place unreasonable or distinctive demands on an individual and are usually capable of producing emotional and psychological discomfort” (Grossi & Berg, 1991, p. 76). This indicates that conditions, situations or events are stressors and produce job-related stress. The literature suggests that role structure — role overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity — are important sources of job stress (e.g., Cherniss, 1980; Whitehead, 1987). Furthermore, dangerousness of probation jobs is found to be an additional stressor to the role structure problem (Sheeley, 2008).

Empirical research has supported important theoretical links between perceptions of organizational justice and its organizational outcomes which can include turnover. Organizational justice is related to fairness perception (Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997). If organizational injustice is perceived, one feels relative deprivation, or a feeling of discontent, which in turn may lead to a range of attitudinal and behavioral effects, including higher turnover intention or actual turnover (Hendrix, Robbins, Miller & Summers, 1998). Organizational justice conceptually includes two aspects of justice: distributive justice and procedural justice. Distributive justice is the degree of fairness in distributing rewards (Price & Mueller, 1986), while procedural justice is the degree of fairness in the procedures used for distribution (Folger & Greenberg, 1985).

Related to employee perceptions, there is substantial, empirical evidence indicating that support from supervisors is essential in allowing correctional officers to display positive, job-related attitudinal and behavioral outcomes (Jurik & Halemba, 1984). Social support is the perception of being provided with instrumental and/or emotional assistance. Social support can be obtained from both supervisors and fellow officers at the organizational level. It can function as a successful coping factor to alleviate job stress, preventing job dissatisfaction, enhancing high levels of organizational commitment and reducing turnover intention. According to Cullen and his associates (1985), successful social support at work depends on the quality of interpersonal support from supervisors and fellow officers.

Also related to employee perceptions, a perception of involvement or empowerment can affect turnover. Empirically, Moynihan and Landuyt (2008) found that a sense of empowerment reduces turnover intention. The notion of participatory climate is a response to “Reinventing Government,” borne out of the National Performance Review (NPR) which criticized malfunctions of hierarchical, centralized bureaucracies. Since bureaucratization reduces workers’ control over the means of produc-

Data Collection, Recruitment Procedures and Data Confidentiality

Lee and Beto (2008) conducted an initial pilot study that explored voluntary turnover rates among Texas line probation officers from 2004 to 2006. They sampled four adult probation departments in Texas. Based on responses from the four departments, line officers’ average turnover rate in each fiscal year was estimated to be 17-24%. Voluntary turnover rates increased steadily during the study period: 17% for FY 2004, 20% for FY 2005, and 24% for FY 2006. The findings suggest that probation agencies have not only experienced high turnover, but have failed to resolve the underlying problems associated with voluntary turnover.

Subsequently, a state-wide study was planned and presented to the PAC for consideration of funding and administrative support. Targeting all line probation officers and all direct-care probation staff in all 122 probation departments across Texas, an online questionnaire was made available for participants through Angelo State University’s survey system. The questionnaire used 137 questions for line community supervision officers and 135 questions for direct-care staff. Respondents were required to select their department from a list in order for the researcher to determine a response rate for each department. Substantial efforts were made by the PAC and department directors to elicit voluntary subject cooperation, encourage a high response rate and thus enhance the validity and reliability of the survey. Standard survey methodology, pre-announcements of the upcoming study and an encouraging cover letter were combined with a consent form. Participation was voluntary and respondents were promised confidentiality.
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Two departments had only one employee, responsible for both line-officer and director duties and thereby were removed from the total 122 departments. The survey period began March 31 and ended April 18, 2008. During the three-week survey period, a total of 108 departments responded. The individual directors from the remaining 12 departments were contacted. The non-response of the 12 departments’ employees was determined to be due to a lack of internet capacity to access the survey web site. The same questionnaire used for the web-based survey was mailed to each of the departments on April 18, 2008. Mailings included a consent form, and a cover letter emphasizing that survey participation was voluntary and that responses were collected anonymously, held confidential and would only be disclosed in the aggregated statewide report.

Of the usable sample of 3,234 responses from 120 adult probation departments, 2,653 were obtained from line officers and 581 of all probation officers including supervisors and managers (N = 3,234) - the response rate for the 2,653 line officer group should be well over 75.4%. Table 1 offers respondent demographics.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee Classification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Officer</td>
<td>2,653 (82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct-Care Staff</td>
<td>581 (18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,264 (39.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,966 (60.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.27 yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1,520 (47.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,003 (31.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>605 (18.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>85 (2.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>1,892 (58.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently single</td>
<td>1,320 (41.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children at home</strong></td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or GED</td>
<td>402 (12.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>154 (4.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>2,231 (69.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>413 (12.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>19 (0.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure in current department</strong></td>
<td>7.31 yrs</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior employment in CJ system</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
<td>727 (32.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law enforcement</td>
<td>348 (10.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td>525 (16.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>201 (6.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*3 or more children at home

Preliminary Measurement of Variables

Along with eight individual demographic and work experience variables used, twenty-four organizational variables were measured based on a respondent’s experience over the six-month period preceding the beginning date of the survey. Turnover Intention is the main dependent variable; the remaining 23 organizational variables are independent. Guided by the previous theoretical and empirical literature, these independent variables have been theoretically and empirically demonstrated to be important correlates with turnover intention. All scale items were measured using the five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree). Cronbach’s Alpha for each additive scale ranged from 0.71 to 0.94, all above the minimal level of acceptability (α = 0.70), indicating all 24 scales may be considered to be valid and reliable.

Measurement of Variables

All responses to all twenty-four organizational variables were based on a respondent’s experience over the six-month period preceding the beginning date of the survey. Turnover Intention is the main dependent variable; the remaining 23 organizational variables are independent. A review of the literature indicates that these independent variables have been theoretically and empirically proven to be important correlates with turnover intention and actual turnover. All scale items were measured using the five-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = neither; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree). Cronbach’s Alpha (α) for each additive scale ranged from 0.71 to 0.94, above the minimal level of acceptability (α = 0.70), indicating all 24 scales are valid and reliable.

Descriptive Analyses

Turnover Intention

Understandably, there might be a reasonable suspicion that even if an employee shows an inclination to leave their employment, their intention may be influenced by the economic climate and by circumstances in the labor market, and therefore might not necessarily manifest in actual turnover. However, turnover intention has been found to be the best predictor and the most immediate precursor of the actual turnover in many studies (Griffeth et al., 2000). As the main dependent variable in this study, a respondent’s intention to leave was measured using the four items developed by Shore and Martin (1989). The respondents’ turnover intention is mixed with an overall average mean of 2.55. However, findings from Table 2 indicate that large portions of the line probation officers and direct-care staff show high levels of inclinations to leave in near future.
Table 2
Itemized Turnover Intention Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Which of the following most clearly reflects your feelings about your future with this department in the next year?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>3233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely will not leave.</td>
<td>562 (17.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I probably will not leave.</td>
<td>816 (25.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am uncertain.</td>
<td>1012 (31.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I probably will leave.</td>
<td>573 (17.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I definitely will leave.</td>
<td>270 (8.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do you feel about leaving this department?</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>3233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is unlikely that I would ever consider leaving this department.</td>
<td>207 (6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As far as I can see ahead, I intend to stay with this department.</td>
<td>1190 (36.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no feelings one way or the other.</td>
<td>500 (15.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am seriously considering leaving in the future.</td>
<td>980 (30.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am presently looking and planning to leave.</td>
<td>356 (11.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If you were completely free to choose, would you prefer or not prefer to continue working with this department?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer very much to continue working for this department.</td>
<td>747 (23.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to work here.</td>
<td>1395 (43.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't care either way.</td>
<td>363 (11.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to work here.</td>
<td>577 (17.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer very much not to continue working for this department.</td>
<td>149 (4.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How important is it to you personally that you spend your career in this department rather than some other organization?</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is very important for me to spend my career in this department.</td>
<td>748 (23.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is fairly important.</td>
<td>856 (26.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is of some importance.</td>
<td>556 (17.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have mixed feelings about its importance.</td>
<td>738 (22.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is of no importance at all.</td>
<td>332 (10.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>3227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Commitment

The literature empirically supports the contention that employees with strong affective commitment to the organization are more valuable employees for any organization. The respondents displayed an overall average of 3.17 for the level of their affective commitment to the department which is a mixed result and therefore does not support any one particular view. However, many respondents reported lower levels of emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their department. For example, 26.6% of the respondents did not want to spend the rest of their career in their current department and 29.5% did not feel a strong sense of belonging to their department.

The continuance commitment construct has two sub-dimensional constructs: high personal sacrifice and lack of alternatives (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Powell & Meyer, 2004). High personal sacrifice refers to the commitment relating to personal accumulated investments: it develops when an employee realizes that he/she would lose accumulated investments by leaving the organization and therefore the employee needs to stay with the organization. On the other hand, the lack of alternatives denotes the commitment related to an employee’s lack of employment alternatives which increase the costs associated with leaving the organization. However, compared to the average of high personal sacrifice (3.21) and lack of alternatives (3.26), the average of affective commitment (3.17) was found to be slightly lower.

The average comparison appears to indicate that the main reason why respondents are committed to their department is their awareness of the costs associated with leaving: high personal sacrifice commitment (their personal accumulated investments) and lack of alternative commitment (limited employment opportunities), rather than affective commitment (their strong emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the department). Regarding the high level of the respondents’ high personal sacrifice and lack of alternatives, for example, 49.7% of the respondents would stay with the department because too much of their life would be disrupted and 46.2% would not leave due to the scarcity of available alternatives.

Job Satisfaction

There are two measures of job satisfaction: overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with job-related specific aspects such as pay, supervision, promotion, co-workers, and the job itself. According to Griffeth et al. (2000), overall job satisfaction is a better indicator than job facet satisfaction in predicting turnover. However, the facet approach is useful to define which parts of the job produce satisfaction or dissatisfaction, as a useful tool to help an organization identify areas of dissatisfaction that it can improve (Spector, 1997). First, overall job satisfaction was assessed using the five items developed by Brayfield and Roth (1951). Based on the additive scale produced by the five items used, a moderately high level of job satisfaction (Mean = 3.52) was reported. For example, more than half of the respondents agreed that: “I like my job better than the average worker does” (56.6%); and “I feel fairly well satisfied with my job” (60.1%).

Regarding specific aspects of Job Satisfaction, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) by Spector (1997) was utilized to measure the respondents’ nine facets of job satisfaction. The JSS measures nine specific aspects of the job. The nine facets include pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards (satisfaction with rewards, not necessarily monetary, given for good performance), operating procedures (satisfaction with rules and procedures), co-workers, nature of work (satisfaction with the type of work done), and communication.

As for pay satisfaction, as one facet, this study originally employed both the four items of pay satisfaction in the JSS and the five items of pay satisfaction from the Index of Organizational Reactions developed by Dunham and Smith (1979). Dunham and Smith’s (1979) pay satisfaction scale reflects a better understanding of the nature and domain of multi-dimensional satisfaction procedures, co-workers, nature of work (satisfaction with the type of work done), and communication.
pay satisfaction than Spector’s uni-dimensional pay satisfaction scale (Williams, Malos & Palmer, 2002). Hence, the study adopted only Dunham and Smith’s pay satisfaction scale for statistical analysis.

Among the nine specific job satisfaction items, pay and promotion were identified as unsatisfied job aspects (Mean = 2.44 and 2.33, respectively). As evidence of low levels of pay satisfaction, only 10.3% reported their pay level was good, only 13.5% indicated their pay level was either adequate or more than adequate given the cost of living in their area and only 15.4% reported that their pay level had a favorable influence on their overall attitude toward their job. Similarly, regarding promotion satisfaction, only 14.1% perceived much chance for promotion in their department; 25.2% felt those who performed well on the job had a fair chance of being promoted, and 16.2% reported high levels of satisfaction with their chances for promotion. Taken together, while the respondents had moderately high levels of overall job satisfaction, pay and promotion are the parts of the job that substantially contribute to dissatisfaction.

**Job Stress**

Job stress was assessed using the five items developed by Crank, Regoli, Hewitt & Wolfe (1989). As an important source of job stress, job stressors included three role structure characteristics: role overload, role conflict, and role ambiguity. Along with the three job stressors, this study included dangerousness of the job as an additional stressor because it was found to be a significant job stressor in both institutional and community corrections agencies (Cullen et al., 1985; Sheeley, 2008). **Role overload** refers to having too much to do in the amount of time and the lack of available resources for completing workload demands, and was measured using five items developed by Peterson and his associates (1986). The other two role characteristics are **role conflict** (conflicting requests from different people) and **role ambiguity** (unclear expectations in fulfilling a role); both were measured using the nine items adopted from Lambert, Hogan, Paoline and Clarke (2005). Lastly, **dangerousness of the job** was assessed using five items adopted from Cullen, Link, Cullen and Wolfe (1989).

Respondents displayed an average mean of 3.12 for their job stress level, therefore not supporting any one particular view. However, 46.8% of the respondents reported that they were usually under a lot of pressure at work, whereas 29.9% reported that they were not under pressure. Among the job stressors, role overload (Mean = 3.09) was found to be the strongest stressor, closely followed by dangerousness of the job (Mean = 2.88) and role ambiguity (Mean = 2.77). The level of role ambiguity (Mean = 2.17) suggests that uncertainty about what actions are expected was not found to be particularly stressful. Overall, these findings suggest that role overload, such as excessive paperwork and expectations to complete job duties in too little time, substantially contribute to stress-induced role characteristics. In addition, as in a prison setting, the dangerousness of the work needs recognition as a substantial stressor in adult probation.

**Organizational Justice**

Developed by Price and Mueller (1986), five items were utilized to measure the respondents’ perceived fairness of outcome, which is **distributive justice** (perceived fairness of outcome). **Procedural justice** (fairness of the procedures in distributing outcomes) was assessed through the use of six items adopted from Lambert, Hogan and Griffin (2007). Respondents reported an average mean of 2.55 for their perceived level of distributive justice, suggesting relatively negative judgments regarding the fairness of distributing rewards, such as pay and promotion. In addition, their perceived level of procedural justice (Mean = 2.86) is considered mixed and therefore does not support any one particular view. However, 49.9% of respondents perceived that promotions are given based on who you know rather than what you know. These findings indicate a lack of fairness of distributing rewards such as pay and promotion, as well as a lack of fairness in promotional procedures.

**Participatory Management**

Both participatory climate and empowerment have been recognized as important elements of participatory management. Regarding participatory climate, developed by Slate et al. (2001), seven items were employed to measure the respondents’ perception of atmosphere for participation in decision-making in their probation department. Despite no indication of one particular view (Mean = 2.89), individual item analysis demonstrated substantial evidence that the respondents’ opinions were not sought and respected by management. For example, nearly 50% of the respondents felt they had no opportunity to have a say in the running of their agency on matters that concern them, 41.4% indicated unsatisfactory response or feedback to their input, and 53.2% did not feel involved in the writing of policies. This evidence indicates that about half of the respondents have a perception that they work in a non-participatory management environment.

Empowerment was assessed through the use of the Index of Empowerment developed by Spreitzer (1995), which is composed of 12 items. The Index of Empowerment measures four dimensions of empowerment: **meaning**, **competence**, **self-determination** and **impact**. These four dimensions, reflecting an employee’s orientation to his or her work role, were combined into an overall measure of empowerment. Respondents reported an average mean of 3.64 for their level of empowerment, suggesting they believe they have a moderately high level of empowerment in their department.

**Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) Analysis**

Descriptive analysis is useful to summarize each individual variable but it has often been regarded as too simplistic and often uninformative. Accordingly, not displayed here, hierarchical multiple regression was employed to identify which predicting variables were significant determinants of turnover intention among line probation officers and direct-care staff, respectively. In both groups, organizational variables were found to have a substantially greater contribution to make in predicting turnover intention than individual status variables. Focusing solely on the organizational variables for community supervision officers and direct-care staff, pay satisfaction, overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment and affective commitment (after controlling for the effects of individual status factors) turned out to be significant predictors of turnover intention.

Despite the important findings, however, the hierarchical multiple regression analyses used are limited in measuring only
the direct effects of the predicting variables on turnover intention, and they cannot compare a total (direct and indirect) effect for each of the significant four organizational predictors of turnover intention. Also, the main purpose of this study was to probe the causal relationship of pay satisfaction with four significant attitudinal and behavioral consequences — overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment, affective commitment and turnover intention—in the Texas probation system. Based upon this investigation, one important concern may be addressed by using SPSS Amos 16 for structural equation modeling: the role and total effect of pay satisfaction in preventing high voluntary turnover of both line probation officers and direct-care staff. Neither descriptive analysis nor regression analysis is suitable for measuring these relationships.

Compensation Satisfaction and Organizational Justice

Pay satisfaction cannot be explained by pay level itself: the multi-dimensional nature of pay satisfaction includes four correlated but distinct dimensions: pay level, benefits, pay raises, and pay structure/administration (Heneman & Schwab, 1985). Therefore, incorporation of benefits satisfaction into pay satisfaction may provide a better understanding of the nature and domain of pay satisfaction. This insight should enable the incorporated model to better predict pay satisfaction’s influence on its organizational outcomes.

Research supports the important theoretical link between organizational justice and its organizational outcomes. Specifically, overall job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention are aspects of motivation that were found to be influenced by employee judgments regarding the fairness of outcomes and the fairness of procedures. Taken together, organizational justice (distributive and procedural justice) and compensation satisfaction (pay and benefits satisfaction) are distinct constructs but conceptually related. Thereby the relationship of organizational justice and its organizational outcomes is similar to that of compensation satisfaction and its organizational outcomes. That is, the incorporation of organizational justice into pay satisfaction provides a better understanding of the nature and realm of pay satisfaction and enables the incorporated model to better understand pay satisfaction’s influence on its organizational outcomes.

Overall Job Satisfaction, Organizational Commitment and Turnover Intention

In a causal link between job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the dominant theoretical view has assumed that an employee’s emotional state/attitude toward a specific job necessarily precedes their psychological state/attitude towards the organization (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Many empirical studies have analyzed and confirmed the causal ordering from overall job satisfaction and organization commitment, suggesting a more immediate influence of organizational commitment on turnover intention. In a causal ordering between organizational commitment and turnover intention, Meyer and Allen (1997) have reported that organizational commitment is negatively related to turnover intention, and is also an antecedent to turnover intention.

Exploring a causal link between higher sacrifice commitment and affective commitment, McGee and Ford (1987) and Meyer, Allen and Gellatly (1990) provided a theoretical explanation suggesting that an employee’s awareness of the costs associated with leaving the organization leads to a higher desire to continue to work, which in turn, may lead to a greater degree of emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in the organization. Despite a lack of empirical research to test the causal link, intuitively it appears that high sacrifice commitment necessarily precedes affective commitment. Hence, a hypothetical model to examine the causal relationship of both compensation satisfaction and organizational justice with overall satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment, affective commitment and turnover intention was developed.

Final Model

The final model provided a better fit than the hypothesized model. Results indicate that the final model best fits the data. Figure 1 presents the significant paths of the final structural model.

The effects of compensation satisfaction and organizational justice are positively correlated at 0.73. This finding indicates no causal order between the two constructs. Instead, as perceptions of organizational justice increase, compensation satisfaction increases and vice versa. As for the causal relationship of compensation satisfaction with the following four significant attitudinal and behavioral consequences — overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment, affective commitment and turnover intention, compensation satisfaction was found to have a significant direct effect on overall job satisfaction (0.36), high sacrifice commitment (0.32), affective commitment (0.08) and turnover intention (-0.30).

However, organizational justice was found to have a significant direct influence only on affective commitment. This finding suggests that perceived fairness cannot directly lead to higher levels of overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment and lower levels of turnover intention.

Table 3 summarizes structural equation modeling estimations of indirect, direct and total effects of each independent variable on overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment, affective commitment, and turnover intention. Of particular interest was a comparison of the total effects of compensation satisfaction, organizational justice, overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment and affective commitment on turnover intention. Although affective commitment had the strongest direct effect on turnover intention, compensation satisfaction had the largest total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All coefficients depicted by arrows are significant at 0.001 except when noted with * which is significant at 0.05.

The effects of compensation satisfaction and organizational justice are positively correlated at 0.73. This finding indicates no causal order between the two constructs. Instead, as perceptions of organizational justice increase, compensation satisfaction increases and vice versa. As for the causal relationship of compensation satisfaction with the following four significant attitudinal and behavioral consequences — overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment, affective commitment and turnover intention, compensation satisfaction was found to have a significant direct effect on overall job satisfaction (0.36), high sacrifice commitment (0.32), affective commitment (0.08) and turnover intention (-0.30). However, organizational justice was found to have a significant direct influence only on affective commitment. This finding suggests that perceived fairness cannot directly lead to higher levels of overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment and lower levels of turnover intention.
effect (indirect and direct) on turnover intention, more than a half of which (56.6%) is due to a relatively large direct effect (-0.30). The remaining 43.4% of compensation satisfaction had an indirect effect on turnover intention through overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment and affective commitment.

Major Findings

Results from the descriptive analyses indicate that large portions of the line probation officers and direct-care staff have high levels of inclinations to leave. Analysis of turnover intention indicated 30.3% were having serious thought about leaving in the near future, and another 11% were actively looking to leave. Among all organizational factors used, pay and promotion are the most negatively perceived work-related areas in Texas probation agencies. As evidence of low levels of pay satisfaction, only 10.3% reported their pay level was good, only 13.5% indicated their pay level was either adequate or more than adequate given the cost of living in their area and only 15.4% reported that their pay level had a favorable influence on their overall attitude toward their job.

Moreover, the average mean of organizational commitment was lower than that of overall job satisfaction, suggesting that employees in Texas probation have a stronger psychological and emotional attachment to their job and job experience than to their department. Furthermore, the average mean of affective commitment was lower than that of continuance. This suggests that the respondents are committed to their department only as far as they are aware of the costs associated with leaving, such as their personal accumulated investments and limited employment opportunities, rather than their strong emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their department.

Results from the hierarchical multiple regression analyses indicate organizational factors, rather than individual status factors, have a substantially greater contribution to associating with and predicting employee turnover intention. This suggests that the organization is the underlying cause for employee turnover intention. For both line probation officers and direct-care staff, affective commitment, high sacrifice commitment, overall job satisfaction and pay are the main predictors of turnover intention. Among the four main predictors, affective commitment has the strongest direct effect on turnover intention.

Among all individual factors, the young age group of line probation officers and the young tenure group of direct-care staff are more likely to feel inclined to leave their job. Among the nine age groups in Figure 2, high turnover intention was most prevalent among line probation officers whose ages ranged from 20 to 34 years. Surprisingly, this age range group accounts for 42.8% of the line probation officers sampled. Likewise, high turnover intention was most prevalent among direct-care staff whose tenure range was between 0-3 years. This tenure group accounts for 45.6% of the direct-care staff sampled.

Lastly, SEM analysis compared total effects (direct and indirect) of compensation satisfaction (pay and benefits), overall job satisfaction, lack of alternatives, high sacrifice and affective commitment on turnover intention. Results from the structural equation modeling indicate that the total effect (indirect and direct) of compensation satisfaction on turnover intention is much greater than the total effect of affective commitment. Taken together, these accumulated findings suggest that compensation satisfaction, especially pay satisfaction, is a pivotal organizational influence on turnover intention and is much more important than affective commitment, overall job satisfaction, high sacrifice commitment and organizational justice in reducing high levels of turnover intention. Therefore, it can be concluded that pay satisfaction is the strongest underlying cause of high turnover intention in Texas probation.

Policy Recommendations

A review of the literature suggests that present probation systems fail to resolve high levels of employee turnover rates, possibly leading to a failure in promoting public safety. Since voluntary turnover can be preventable by identifying its
underlying reasons and addressing identified causes, reducing high levels of staff turnover should be a top priority for probation administrators.

Based on these accumulated findings, policy recommendations are provided. Most importantly, probation administrators should be made aware of the transition from individual to organization factors, especially the significance of pay satisfaction, as the most influential underlying causes leading to high voluntary turnover rates. Only small portions of the line probation officers and direct-care staff sampled were satisfied with the pay they received. Therefore, probation administrators should recognize chronic, negative organizational outcomes caused by inadequate salary and should present a united front to increase compensation for probation employees. This can be an ongoing effort. Otherwise, inherent traps in the vicious cycle of low pay satisfaction, high turnover intention and high voluntary turnover, may result in the possible diminished promotion of public safety, which is the stated, ultimate mission of the probation system.

Increasing compensation is important, but on its own does not necessarily guarantee an employee’s long-term commitment to probation’s mission. From the perspective of probation managers, employees with strong affective commitment to the organization are more valuable employees. However, 3,234 respondents reported the main reason that they are committed to their department is an awareness of the costs associated with leaving — such as their personal accumulated investments and limited employment opportunities — rather than their strong emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in their department. In recognizing existing low levels of affective commitment, probation administrators should identify its underlying causes, and develop strategies which increase employee’s emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in their department. An employee who does not have an emotional connection to the organization’s mission may start thinking about leaving. Therefore, every department should have a clearly articulated mission, vision, and values that are supported and reinforced by management.

Younger personnel and those with fewer years of service are more likely to feel inclined to leave their probation jobs than older employees and those with more tenure. Among all individual variables, age was found to make the most significant contribution to the line probation officers’ turnover intention; while length of tenure made the most substantial contribution to the direct-care staff’s turnover intention. Given the highest turnover intention among younger age and tenure groups, it is highly recommended that probation administrators recognize the unique characteristics of the younger employee and devote considerable attention and resources to this new generation, who have a much lower affective commitment and much higher turnover intention than other groups.

Inevitably, the role of probation managers is extremely important in providing organizational stimulus for this new generation of employees. They can encourage feelings of belonging and establish emotional attachment to, identification with and involvement in their departments. Specifically, a concerted focus by management on developing mentoring relationships with new employees is indicated. Changing supervisory and managerial roles and styles should be made by management from a traditional, autocratic organizational climate to one of facilitating, coaching and consulting with the new generation. The older, more tenured employees would also benefit from these positive changes in supervisory and managerial roles and styles. To fulfill these important managerial roles, probation departments should devote considerable attention and resources to the selection, development, and training of managers.

Lastly, in the not too distant past, probation administrators did not experience the need to actively recruit staff. It was not uncommon to have a number of highly qualified applicants for each available position. This is no longer the case and probation departments find themselves in competition with other social service and law enforcement agencies for prospective employees from a dwindling labor pool. Probation administrators should become less passive and more active in the recruitment of new employees by attending job fairs at colleges and universities and developing close relationships with faculty members of criminal justice programs.
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A whole different probation system and structure exists to the north of England and Wales. It is these efforts in Scotland that Fergus McNeill, a senior lecturer in the Social Work Department at the University of Edinburgh, turn their attention to provide a rigorous case management approach for offenders. The structural changes in the England and Wales experience have not, as yet, lived up to their promise and a critical body of literature is emerging that again is instructive for probation leaders in North America to reflect upon. But England and Wales— are all contributing to the reframing and re-conceptualizing of probation's contribution to our penal heritage. They trace the development of probation from 1905 to the current interest in offender management. Currently, the criminal justice social worker (probation officer) strives to fulfill three interdependent core professional tasks. This chapter covers the general terrain of social inquiry reports and assessing risks and needs and the development of action plans for the offender. In terms of an ambitious effort to retool the probation service, the efforts of the National Probation Service in England and Wales stands out as a leader in attempting to base probation programming on an evidence-based platform. This effort is still on going and the merging of prison and probation into the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) is intended to provide a rigorous case management approach for offenders. The structural changes in the England and Wales experience have not, as yet, lived up to their promise and a critical body of literature is emerging that again is instructive for probation leaders in North America to reflect upon. But England and Wales is not the only effort to seek improvements in how probation can reduce the need to incarcerate and lower reoffending rates. A whole different probation system and structure exists to the north of England and Wales. It is these efforts in Scotland that Fergus McNeill, a senior lecturer in the Glasgow School of Social Work (University of Glasgow and Strathclyde) and Bill Whyte, a senior lecturer in the Social Work Department and Director of the Criminal Justice Social Work Development Centre at the University of Edinburgh, turn their attention to in a very informative and insightful review of social work and community justice in Scotland.

The authors claim two main purposes for writing this book. First they wish to make a contribution to developments occurring in Scotland around the challenge of managing offenders in the community, and secondly, it provides them an opportunity to share Scottish answers to questions about community justice in an accessible but critical introduction. The book is organized into three main sections—each section is supported by three chapters that amplify the section topic. In section one the emphasis is on analyzing the challenges currently facing community justice efforts in Scotland. The supporting chapters explore the history of social work with offenders in Scotland. The first chapter is intended as a conscious act of remembrance of probation’s beginnings. The authors do not want us to forget probation’s contribution to our penal heritage. They trace the development of probation from 1905 to the current interest in offender management. Currently, the criminal justice social worker (probation officer) strives to fulfill three interdependent outcomes: reducing the use of custody, reducing re-offending, and promoting the inclusion of the offender.

Picking up on the issue of reducing re-offending, in the second chapter the authors examine what is known about community supervision in Scotland today and in the process of this examination seek to contextualize the successes and failures of supervision by exploring the scale, nature, and extent of the problems offenders face in efforts to change their behavior. The third chapter is an exploration of the concept of desistance and how workers might support the process of desistance from crime in their supervised offenders. There is a very useful chart comparing four probation practice paradigms: the non-treatment paradigm; the revised paradigm; the “what works” paradigm; and the desistance paradigm.

The second section deals with the legal context in which social work (probation) services are carried out. McNeill and Whyte draw our attention to the fact that “practice that best supports reintegration and desistance needs to be grounded within a clear understanding of the legal and policy contexts of the core professional tasks.” Chapter four under the heading of advice and service to the courts outlines the basic functions and tasks that assist the sentencing process. This chapter covers the general terrain of social inquiry reports and assessing risks and needs and the development of action plans for the offender. In chapter five the authors deal with the supervision of offenders, where the community-based supervision is bound by a policy priority that sees probation in a context of prevention and crime reduction and not as an alternative to custody. There are some
useful descriptions of the functions and tasks of the probation officer. Topics such as diversion from prosecution, compliance and enforcement in supervision, uses of restorative practices, supervision of unpaid work in the community, and supporting victims of crime are all covered. The sixth chapter deals with prison throughcare and resettlement issues, what in North America we would label re-entry issues. Releasing mechanisms and authority are discussed as are the recent changes to the law and policy regarding high risk offenders. The authors conclude this chapter with a caution regarding the new measures that are being introduced. If adequate resources are not made available there is a real risk that the intent of the new provisions will be thwarted and public protection will not be realized. It seems that the resources to back up the intent of legislation is always problematic and appears to be a universal problem!

In the third section of the book, the authors turn their attention towards effective practice. This is a very useful and important section and a real contribution to our knowledge about effective practice. The seventh chapter explores issues surrounding supervision and asks the basic question: Are we talking about offender management or change management? The authors explore the following themes: 1) engagement: building relationships that support change; 2) assessing risks, needs and strengths; 3) research-based planning and delivery of interventions; and 4) case management: managing change.

In the regard to the last point the authors identify four overlapping characteristics of case management: consistency, continuity, consolidation, and commitment. The authors also note that in terms of effective practice it is important to not only know what works but who works!

The last two chapters (8 and 9) develop the themes of human capital and social capital as they pertain to the offender’s reintegrative task. The concluding chapter brings the main arguments together and argues that the context needs to widen beyond the narrow confines of a correctional professional’s perspective. If there is to be a safer Scotland — and by extension safer communities anywhere — attention to community justice is critical. Local responsive community services promoting social welfare and social justice can and will contribute to public safety.

There are enough interesting and thought provoking ideas in the pages of this book to assist probation leaders in developing effective practices that go beyond compliance-based supervision. The appendix to this book is a very useful study guide that can be used in internal staff training sessions and the bibliography is extensive and a good guide to important references about probation.

Donald G. Evans

A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE ON MANAGEMENT


On a visit to any major bookstore one will find scores of books on the subject of management, written by authors ranging from those who are well known and respected to those who are relatively obscure and are likely to remain in that status. An interesting and valuable addition to this body of literature is Guide to Management Ideas and Gurus by Tim Hindle, the author of several best selling books on management and business. Hindle is a former business and management editor of The Economist and was the founding editor of EuroBusiness; he has also served as editor of Director magazine. In his most recent contribution to management literature, the author has produced a book that does a credible job of bringing together a collection of the major management theories and practices and identifying the most influential management thinkers.

Guide to Management Ideas and Gurus is divided into two parts. Part I Hindle provides an overview of more than 100 ideas that have significantly influenced the field of management over the past century, and in Part II he identifies 54 of the leading management scholars. The management ideas appearing in Part I are arranged alphabetically — from “active inertia” to “zero-based budgeting” — and are summarized in two pages or less. Each idea is concluded with a short list of suggested references should the reader desire additional information on a particular management concept. Similarly, the gurus listed in Part II appear alphabetically and are covered in not more than two pages. Information on each person includes: 1) year born and year died (if applicable); 2) nationality; 3) achievement; 4) notable publications; 5) notable quotations; and 6) background, which provides a brief biographical sketch. While Americans make up the majority of the management thinkers, a little over a third come from other countries.

A problem inherent in developing a “guide” — particularly one that attempts to provide a listing of the most prominent management concepts and thinkers — and a problem the author readily acknowledges, is the probability of missing an idea or overlooking someone. In my view there are a couple of omissions, but those are not significant enough to detract from an otherwise excellent management resource.

For a quick look at management concepts, and for suggestions for further reading, Timothy Hindle has made a significant contribution. Current and emerging managers in both the private and public sectors would derive benefit from reading this book.

Dan Richard Beto
ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES: ANAHEIM EVENTS

On August 22-23, 2009, the National Association of Probation Executives held its annual events, this year at the Hilton Hotel in Anaheim, California, immediately prior to the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association.

MEMBERS RECEPTION

More than 150 probation professionals gathered for the NAPE Members Reception on Saturday, August 22, 2009, at the Hilton Hotel in Anaheim, California. During this event NAPE members renewed acquaintances, met new colleagues, and discussed issues relevant to the community corrections profession.

Also attending this highly successful social event were participants in the Synergistic Leadership Program, a joint initiative of the National Association of Probation Executives, American Probation and Parole Association, and Sam Houston State University.

NAPE is fortunate to have corporate members who provide additional financial resources to support the organization. The Members Reception and the Annual Awards Breakfast were sponsored in part by Varian, NCTI, and AnyTrax, formerly known as RoboCUFF.

AWARDS BREAKFAST

During the NAPE Annual Awards Breakfast held on August 23, 2009, those in attendance heard an exclusive presentation by George M. Keiser, Chief of the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections, during which he discussed the role of the Institute in the Obama Administration.

Also during the breakfast several individuals were recognized for their contributions to the probation profession. In each of the three cases, the terms “leadership,” “innovation,” and “dedicated service” were used to describe the award recipients.

Sam Houston State University
Probation Executive of the Year Award

This year the Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award was presented to Christopher Hansen, Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the District of Nevada. This award, the Association’s oldest and most prestigious, is presented jointly by NAPE and the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University to recognize a probation executive who has given unselfishly of his or her time and talents and who has demonstrated qualities of leadership.

Hansen, who earned a bachelor’s degree and master’s degree in criminal justice from the University of South Florida and a doctorate in education from Nova Southeastern University, began his distinguished criminal justice career in 1983 when he was hired as a Probation and Parole Officer for the Florida Department of Corrections, a position he held for more than three years. While in graduate school he was employed as a Police Officer with the University of South Florida Police Department. In January 1989 Hansen was appointed as a U.S. Probation Officer in the Middle District of Florida. He was later named a Senior Probation Officer and Supervising U.S. Probation Officer, managing the Fort Meyers Division Office. In September 2003 Hansen was appointed Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the District of Nevada, headquartered in Las Vegas.

In presenting the award, NAPE President John Tuttle went through an impressive list of Hansen’s accomplishments during his tenure as Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the District of Nevada, including enhanced workforce development efforts and the creation of Collaborative Reentry Efforts and Action Toward Employment (CREATE), reinventing supervision strategies through the employment of a new risk and needs tool, and the adoption of the “Courage to Change” series of interactive journals, a cognitive behavioral approach to therapy.

In addition, the department focused on critical incidents, adopted motivational interviewing and trained officers in this technique, created the Chemical Abuse Rehabilitation Environment (CARE), a program to address stimulant addiction, and engaged academic institutions to conduct evaluations of program effectiveness.

In accepting the award, Hansen credited his employees for the successful implementation of programs and initiatives.

This award was first presented in 1989, and prior recipients include Barry Nidorf (California), Don R. Stiles (Texas and Arizona), Donald Cochran (Massachusetts), Cecil Steppe (California), Don Hogner (California), T. Vincent Fallin (Georgia), M. Tamara Holden (Oregon), Richard A. Kipp (Pennsylvania), Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. (Massachusetts), Richard E. Wyett (Nevada), Rocco A. Pozzi (New York), Ron R. Goethals (Texas), Cheryl K. Townsend (Arizona, Nevada, and Texas), E. Robert Czaplicki (New York), Robert L. Bingham (Michigan and Indiana), Gerald R. Hinzman (Iowa), James R. Grundel (Illinois), Joanne Fuller (Oregon), Tom Plumlee (Texas), and Ellen F. Brokofsky (Nebraska).
Recognized with the Dan Richard Beto Award was Thomas N. Costa, the Eastern Regional Director for the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole. This discretionary award, first presented in 2005, is given by the President of NAPE to recognize an individual for distinguished and sustained service to the probation profession. It is named after Dan Richard Beto, who served the Association as Secretary, Vice President, President, and Executive Director.

Costa, who earned a bachelor’s degree in mental health counseling at Gannon University in Erie and a master’s degree in criminal justice administration from St. Joseph’s University in Philadelphia, began his exemplary criminal justice career in 1975 with the Philadelphia Adult Probation Department, where he held various positions from Probation Officer to Associate Director. After 23 years of service with that department, he accepted a position in May 1999 with the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole as the Eastern Regional Director.

As Eastern Regional Director, Costa is responsible for the 27 field units in the Philadelphia and Chester Districts that supervises over 11,000 state parolees and special probationers. In addition, under his supervision are the parole offices located in two state correctional institutions and one in the Philadelphia County prison system.

In addition to the National Association of Probation Executives, Costa is a member of the American Probation and Parole Association, Pennsylvania Association of Probation, Parole and Corrections, the Pennsylvania Warden’s Association, American Correctional Association, and the County Chief Adult Probation and Parole Officers Association of Pennsylvania.

In presenting the award, NAPE President John Tuttle praised Costa for his more than three decades of dedicated service and for the leadership qualities he has brought to the criminal justice system in Pennsylvania.

Recipients of the Beto Award have included Beto, for whom the award is named, Christie Davidson (Texas), Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. (Massachusetts), and George M. Keiser (Maryland).

This year’s recipient of the George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership was Robert L. Thornton, Director of the Community Corrections Institute in Springdale, Washington, a company dedicated to providing training and consultation specifically designed for corrections and law enforcement agencies. This award, named in honor of George M. Keiser, Chief of the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections, is presented jointly by the Community Corrections Improvement Association (CCIA) of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and NAPE. Presenting the award on behalf of the CCIA was Gerald R. Hinzman.

Before devoting his professional activities to providing training and technical assistance to community corrections and law enforcement agencies, Thornton served in the U.S. Probation Service in the Northern District of Georgia and later in the Western District of Washington for over 27 years, first as a U.S. Probation Officer and later as a Supervising U. S. Probation Officer. During his years with the U. S. Probation Service he served as a faculty member of the Federal Judicial Center and developed and continues to provide training in enhanced supervision, officer safety skills, dealing with aggressive behavior, effective communication techniques, and management skills. He also conducts training for the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA).

Thornton, who earned a bachelor’s degree and master’s degree in social science and corrections from Western Oregon University, co-authored the 1993 National Institute of Corrections monograph, New Approaches to Staff Safety, and was the author of New Approaches to Safe Safety-Second Edition, released in March, 2003. He also authored the 2008 publication Guns, Safety and Proactive Supervision: Involving Probation and Parole in Project Safe Neighborhoods. He writes the “Spotlight on Safety” column for the APPA Perspectives magazine and has published numerous other articles on officer and staff safety.

Thornton also serves as a subject matter expert for the National Institute of Justice “Incident Commander” simulation training.
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website, the APPA On-Line Safety Training Program, and the APPA Audio Broadcast Safety Training and Firearm Interdiction Programs. He conducts agency audits for NIC and has testified as an expert witness on issues relating to officer and staff safety. He is a member of the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the American Society of Law Enforcement Trainers, Federal Probation & Pretrial Officers Association (FPPOA) and the American Probation and Parole Association, and serves as Chair of the APPA Health and Safety Committee.

In 1990 he was the recipient of the Line Officer of the Year Award for the Western Region of the United States and the 1998 recipient of the Doyle Award, presented by FPPOA in recognition of his contributions to effective offender supervision issues. He was also the 2002 recipient of the Sam Houston State University Award presented jointly by the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center and APPA “in recognition of his outstanding contributions to scholarship in community corrections,” and the 2007 Sam Houston State University Distinguished Service Award for “exceptional service and commitment to the Texas Probation Training Academy.”

Dan Richard Beto, who nominated Thornton for this award, said that “Bob Thornton had provided leadership to the probation profession through the high quality professional training he delivers and his unselfish contributions to community corrections. He is a natural for the Keiser Award.”

Prior recipients of this award include Keiser, for whom the award is named, Carey D. Cockerell (Texas), Dan Richard Beto (Texas), Donald G. Evans (Ontario), Rocco A. Pozzi (New York), John J. Larivee (Massachusetts), W. Conway Bushey (Pennsylvania), and Douglas W. Burris (Missouri).

NOMINATIONS SOLICITED

Next Spring the National Association of Probation Executives will be conducting and election for the positions of President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, two At-Large Directors, and five Regional Directors. Persons interested in serving on the NAPE Board of Directors, which is really a wonderful experience, should communicate with Christie Davidson, NAPE’s Executive Director, prior to December 31, 2009. She may be reached at (936) 294-3757 or davidson@shsu.edu.

Members who have questions about service are encouraged to contact any member of the Nominations and Elections Committee.

The committee is comprised of former Presidents, who are not seeking office, and include: Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Chair (Massachusetts); Cherie Townsend (Texas); Robert L. Bingham (Indiana); Dan Richard Beto (Texas); and Rocco A. Pozzi (New York). In addition, John Tuttle (Pennsylvania), who will be concluding his term of office as President next year, serves on the committee.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

SEVERAL NEW CHIEFS IN CALIFORNIA

Over the past several months reports of new appointments in California have been received.

San Bernardino County

Michelle Scray, who has spent 23 years in the San Bernardino County Probation Department, has been appointed chief probation officer, effective March 3, 2009. Scray succeeds Jerry Harper, who retired on January 6, 2009.

Before her appointment, Scray was Harper’s second in command. Prior to that assignment, Scray worked as the deputy chief probation officer in charge of the Community Corrections and Detention Corrections bureaus, which are respectively responsible for the county’s Juvenile Hall facilities and supervision of adult probationers. Throughout her career, Scray has worked in various assignments related to the department’s field, detention, treatment, and administrative operations. She has worked as the department’s grant writer and also a member of its internal affairs bureau.

Scray received her bachelor’s degree in sociology and criminal justice from California State University, San Bernardino. She is awaiting the award of a master’s degree in criminal justice from the same campus.

San Joaquin County

In February 2009 Longtime probation department employee Patty Mazzilli took over as San Joaquin County’s Chief Probation Officer. Mazzilli worked for the department for 23 years, holding the position of assistant chief probation officer during the last three. She replaced Chris Hope, who retired in January.

Before taking a job with the department, Mazzilli worked as a group counselor at Mary Graham Children’s Shelter. She is a longtime county resident who attended San Joaquin Delta College and received her Bachelor of Science degree in criminal justice from California State University, Sacramento.

San Mateo County

A veteran probation officer and manager has taken over the San Mateo County Probation Department’s top job. Stuart Forrest will succeed interim chief Calvin Remington, who filled the position after long-time probation leader Loren Buddress retired in early January.

Forrest began his career in 1976 as a group supervisor at San Mateo County’s juvenile hall. From 1990 to 1998, he oversaw the Probation Department’s Adult Division and since 1998 has served as deputy chief.

A graduate of the University of Nebraska, Forrest holds a degree in psychology. He is a trained mediator and volunteers
with the Peninsula Conflict Resolution Center. He is also a firearms and defensive tactics instructor and a management and communications skills trainer.

Sacramento County

In August 2009 veteran probation administrator Don Meyer became the Chief Probation Officer for Sacramento County, replacing Verne Speirs, who retired in March.

Meyer started working for the Sacramento County Probation Department in 1966. He eventually rose to the rank of deputy chief before leaving in 2003 to become chief in Calaveras County. He was named Chief Probation Officer for Yolo County in 2005.

Marin County

Mike Daly, who started working for Marin County as an extra-hire deputy probation officer 20 years ago, has been selected to serve as the county’s new Chief Probation Officer, effective September 22, 2009.

Daly, 44, joined the probation department in 1990. He has served as its acting chief since March, when the department’s former chief, William Burke, retired. Burke had served as Chief Probation Officer since 2005.

Prior to serving as acting chief, Daly functioned as the department’s chief deputy, managing day-to-day operations. That included oversight of adult and juvenile probation services, juvenile hall, and mediation services.

Daly, a graduate of Sir Francis Drake High School, has a bachelor’s degree from California Polytechnic State University at San Luis Obispo and a master’s degree from Golden Gate University.

Central District of California

The U.S. District Court for the Central District of California has approved the appointment of Deputy Chief U.S. Probation Officer Michelle A. Carey to head the district’s probation office. Carey’s appointment as Chief U.S. Probation Officer will take effect November 1, 2009, upon the retirement of incumbent Lorettta S. Martin.

Chief U.S. District Court Judge Audrey B. Collins, who tapped Carey for the post, commented that Carey was “the unanimous choice of the Court from a field of outstanding candidates.” Collins said judges on the interview panel commended Carey’s “strong academic credentials and her enthusiasm for the position and the goals of probation.”

A graduate of Columbia College and Harvard Law School, Carey practiced law in New York before moving to California to join the probation office in 1997. She described the change as “one of the most rewarding career decisions of my life.”

Carey has held a number of supervisory and line probation officer positions in the Central District since her original appointment, and has served in her current position since 2006. She currently leads a probation office team to develop a re-entry program for drug offenders with the U.S. Attorney’s Office, the Federal Public Defender, and the court.

The U.S. Probation Office in the Central District is one of the largest probation offices in the federal system with over 278 officers and support staff serving 34 senior and active judges and 23 magistrate judges. The office’s jurisdiction includes seven counties in the metropolitan Los Angeles area and 13 branch offices.

NAPE MEMBERS ON THE MOVE IN TEXAS

Longtime NAPE member Tom Plumlee, Director of the Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Fort Worth, Texas, retired in June. In 2007 Plumlee, a leader in community corrections in Texas, was the recipient of the Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award presented by NAPE. Plumlee has been replaced by another NAPE member, Leighton Iles, Director of the Fort Bend County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Rosenberg, Texas.

Also retiring in June was NAPE member David Baker, Director of the Judicial District Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Huntsville, Texas. He was replaced by John McGuire, a supervisor with the Brazos County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Bryan, Texas. The Brazos County agency is an organizational member of NAPE.

EYRICK PRESENTED WITH AUGUSTUS AWARD

NAPE member Steve Eyrick, Chief Probation Officer for LaPorte County, Indiana, is the 2009 recipient of the Indiana Augustus Award. The Order of Augustus is an award presented annually by the Probation Officers Advisory Board of the Judicial Conference of Indiana to those persons in the profession of probation whose commitment and personal dedication have exemplified the ideals and philosophy of John Augustus, the “Father of Probation.” The creed of John Augustus was “To raise the fallen, reform the criminal, and so far as my humble abilities would allow, to transform the abode of suffering and misery to the home of happiness.”

Eyrick began his career as a public servant in 1984 as a deputy sheriff for LaPorte County. He became a probation officer for LaPorte Circuit Court in 1986, and has served as Chief Probation Officer for LaPorte Superior Court #4 since 1990.

Eyrick was nominated by Judge William Boklund of LaPorte Superior Court #4. In his nomination letter, Boklund wrote: “As this Court’s Chief Probation Officer, Steve is indispensable and far exceeds the duties of that position. He is an even tempered and highly knowledgeable person whose input is sought by everyone in the criminal justice system. We generally regard him in this county as the expert concerning the law of probation. Steve’s reputation for getting things done well and completely is well-known. To call him a Chief Probation Officer is an understatement. A more appropriate title might be ‘Super-Chief Probation Officer.’ I cannot think of a more fitting person to receive this honor.”

Magistrate Greta Friedman wrote in support of Eyrick’s nomination: “I think it is fairly accurate to say I may not have survived my first week on the bench but for the assistance of Mr. Eyrick. His knowledge of probation law coupled with his institutional knowledge of staff and general courthouse procedure makes him unique and invaluable. One of the qualities that I find most remarkable about Steve is his ability to see the best in his probationers. He is not cynical or apathetic in his outlook toward his clients. He encourages them, holds them accountable and enforces consequences when necessary. I cannot think of a more deserving person to receive this honor.”
Eyrick was also lauded for his work as a board member in the establishment of Harmony House, a facility providing supervised visitations and monitored exchanges for children in a safe, homelike setting. In addition, he was praised by his nominators for his grasp of technology, calling him the “go-to guy” regarding all things technological in the Michigan City Courthouse. Eyrick was instrumental in implementing a video conferencing system to link all LaPorte County courts to the county jail, instituted a scanning system for all probation files, and instituted an electronic check-in system for probationers.

TENNESSEE JURISDICTION INSTITUTES POLICE-COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS PARTNERSHIPS

As of July 2009, the Jackson Police Department and Madison County Community Corrections in Tennessee have entered into a joint collaborative partnership that will enhance the Jackson Police Department’s commitment to work with Community Corrections officials to ensure that criminal offenders in the City of Jackson maintain the conditions of their probation and supervision and the Madison County Community Corrections commitment to proactive community supervision.

Effective immediately, sworn Community Corrections Officers will operate on Jackson Police Department radio frequencies when conducting home visits inside the City.

Sworn Madison County Community Corrections Officers will also begin to ride regularly with Jackson Police Department Officers. When these Corrections Officer-Police Officer teams are working, the Jackson Police Officers will be detailed to accompany the Corrections Officers on home visits of individuals under Community Corrections supervision and to handle arrests of violators as well as serve violator warrants. They will also perform tasks such as bar checks and curfew checks looking for probationers who are violating conditions of supervision.

Community Corrections Officers will also join in on special operations and neighborhood sweeps with special attention to individuals under their supervision that fall under the special operation or reside in areas where neighborhood sweeps are being conducted.

The two agencies are committed to better sharing of information and shared access to their databases.

These Police-Corrections Officer teams will primarily conduct previously described operations in the spirit of this collaboration but while the uniformed, sworn, trained and POST certified Corrections Officers are working with Jackson Police Officers, they will assist on calls and assist Officers investigate or act on criminal or suspicious activities or activities that present a risk to public safety or hindrance to order as needed.

HORN RESIGNS IN NEW YORK CITY TO ACCEPT TEACHING POSITION

On July 31, 2009, longtime New York City Correction and Probation Commissioner Martin F. Horn resigned to accept a teaching position at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

In commenting on Horn’s resignation, New York City Mayor Michael R. Bloomberg said “Martin F. Horn has served since the beginning of our Administration as the Commissioner of the Department of Probation. In January 2003 I asked him to serve as Correction Commissioner as well, and he has become the longest-tenured City Correction Commissioner of the past 50 years.”

He added, “Marty came to our Administration after earning numerous promotions for distinguished service, having started out as a parole officer before working his way up to Secretary of the Pennsylvania state prison system. In New York City, he has used those experiences to help us make our jails the safest large city jails in the nation. Crime in the jails has dropped markedly, with far fewer escapes, suicides, homicides and inmate assaults than in previous periods. And with his support, we have kept driving down crime across the City, and kept making the safest big city in the nation even safer.”

“Marty is recognized around the nation as one of the strongest advocates of prison reform, and a champion for humane conditions and respectful treatment who understands the potential of those committed to the City’s custody. His work to create an innovative jail-based reentry program, which is defined by a remarkable degree of interagency collaboration and community participation, has been hailed as a national model and is being replicated throughout the country,” Bloomberg noted. “Marty has accepted an offer to join the John Jay College faculty as a Distinguished Lecturer in the fall 2009 semester, where he will have the opportunity to share his experience and wisdom with the next generation of criminal justice professionals — and perhaps future Correction and Probation commissioners. I thank him for his great work and wish him well.”

Horn, a NAPE member, responded by saying “I have profound respect for what Mayor Bloomberg has accomplished in making our city safer, and profound gratitude for giving me the chance to contribute to his Administration. We have dramatically changed the way the family court system responds to juveniles, replacing destructive institutionalization with community-based supervision for better outcomes. We have streamlined adult probation supervision and created a case management system that is the nation’s envy. We have made real a commitment to safety and security as the first rights of those in our jails. We have broken ground in programs that are giving offenders a chance to resume productive, law-abiding lives. And, with it all, we have made and kept New York safer. I owe my thanks and my respect to Mayor Bloomberg’s leadership and support, and also to his management team and the remarkable men and women of the Department of Correction and the Department of Probation.”
# National Association of Probation Executives

## Who We Are

Founded in 1981, the National Association of Probation Executives is a professional organization representing the chief executive officers of local, county and state probation agencies. NAPE is dedicated to enhancing the professionalism and effectiveness in the field of probation by creating a national network for probation executives, bringing about positive change in the field, and making available a pool of experts in probation management, program development, training and research.

## What We Do

- Assist in and conduct training sessions, conferences and workshops on timely subjects unique to the needs of probation executives.
- Provide technical assistance to national, state and local governments, as well as private institutions, that are committed to improving probation practices.
- Analyze relevant research relating to probation programs nationwide and publish position papers on our findings.
- Assist in the development of standards, training and accreditation procedures for probation agencies.
- Educate the general public on problems in the field of probation and their potential solutions.

## Why Join

The National Association of Probation Executives offers you the chance to help build a national voice and power base for the field of probation and serves as your link with other probation leaders. Join with us and make your voice heard.

## Types of Membership

**Regular:** Regular members must be employed full-time in an executive capacity by a probation agency or association. They must have at least two levels of professional staff under their supervision or be defined as executives by the director or chief probation officer of the agency.

**Organizational:** Organizational memberships are for probation and community corrections agencies. Any member organization may designate up to five administrative employees to receive the benefits of membership.

**Corporate:** Corporate memberships are for corporations doing business with probation and community corrections agencies or for individual sponsors.

**Honorary:** Honorary memberships are conferred by a two-thirds vote of the NAPE Board of Directors in recognition of an outstanding contribution to the field of probation or for special or long-term meritorious service to NAPE.

**Subscriber:** Subscribers are individuals whose work is related to the practice of probation.

## Membership Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>FAX</th>
<th>E-MAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE OF APPLICATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHECK**

- **Regular:** $50 / 1 year
- **Organizational:** $250 / 1 year
- **Corporate:** $500 / 1 year

Please make check payable to THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES and mail to:

NAPE Secretariat
ATTN: Christie Davidson
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296
(936) 294-3757