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Using the population of Kentucky state parole officers as the focus of this thesis, work styles were studied. The work styles of twenty-eight rural parole officers were compared with the work styles of twenty-two urban officers. The Fisher Exact Statistical Test was used to test differences between these groups. Rural officers were significantly more likely than urban officers to go out of their offices to meet with their parolees. Urban officers had had a significantly greater number of parolees waiting in their offices at one time, than the rural officers had. The length of the average meeting did not differ significantly when rural and urban officers were compared. Rural officers were significantly more likely than urban officers to involve community agencies and citizens in the supervision of their parolees. The two groups of parole officers did not differ significantly in the use of group sessions. There was no significant difference between rural and urban officers on the basis of their consultation with their supervisors. Rural parole officers were significantly more likely to feel that a major portion of the parolee's success was dependent on them than the urban officers. In summary, a more informal work style was evidenced by the rural parole officers.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Probation and parole are more and more being considered as adequate substitutes for institutionalization. The reasons for this are easily discernible. First, they are less expensive methods of treatment; second, they reduce the detrimental effects which imprisonment often causes; and third, they give the offender's family back its breadwinner so that the family would not become destitute while he is away.¹

These two areas of criminology have been discussed by many writers. In Practice and Theory of Probation and Parole, Dressler defines these two forms of treatment as:

... a treatment program in which final action in an adjudicated offender's case is suspended, so that he remains at liberty, subject to conditions imposed by or for a court, under the supervision and guidance of a probation worker.²

... a treatment program in which an offender, after serving part of his term in a correctional institution is conditionally under supervision and treatment by a parole worker.³


³Ibid., p. 44. (Emphasis added).
For Richardson the definition is framed in terms of correctional objectives.

The object of parole... is to rehabilitate a criminal offender through supervision and guidance so that he will be unlikely to return to anti-social behavior.4

These definitions utilize the concepts of treatment, supervision, guidance, and rehabilitation, as underlying concerns of probation and parole. They suggest, in effect, that probation and parole are processes involving a superior person and an inferior person in interaction. How this interaction develops determines parole or probation outcome. For example, when the officer and his parolee have a good relationship and are able to communicate easily with each other, success is probable. As a developmental process, however, the content and parameters of this process have yet to be worked out.

The focus of this thesis is on differences among parole officers in their methods of treatment, supervision, and guidance, and the degree to which they are oriented toward rehabilitation of their parolees. How the officer approaches these aspects of his job will be referred to as his work style. A parole officer may exhibit different habits and attitudes toward client and job which constitute his individualistic work style. Work style stresses the role of the officer in the interactional process rather than that of the parolee. In studying work styles, the officer's

background becomes important. Background provides clues to role performance and the parole officer's concept of his job.

It is felt that certain background characteristics of the officer are more salient than others in influencing his work style. It is assumed that among the more important characteristics are his residence, place of birth, education, religious affiliation, age, sex, and race. Since the Kentucky Division of Probation and Parole consists mainly of a homogeneous work group of white males with a high school education or better, emphasis will be placed mainly on differences among parole officers stemming from their rural or urban backgrounds. The major hypothesis in this investigation is that these differing environments to which the officers have been exposed will be associated with different attitudes and ideologies which will manifest themselves in the interaction of the officers with their parolees.

The objective of the thesis, then, will be to survey the universe of Kentucky parole officers for the purpose of empirically identifying and quantifying specific background characteristics which are believed to be most influential in the interpersonal relationships between the parole officer and the parolee during the period of parole supervision.

The next chapter will review the works of several researchers who have studied the various roles of parole officers and their attitudes toward their jobs. These earlier studies provide additional insights into the differ-
entiation in work styles, which tend to characterize parole officers, and also place the present study in the context of ongoing research in this area.
CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE

Much of the recent literature in the area of probation and parole has been devoted to the various roles and techniques of the parole officer. Although none of these deals specifically with rural-urban differences between parole officers, several are pertinent to this thesis and will be discussed here. To order this material the discussion will proceed from a review of articles which describe multiple roles of the parole officer to other articles which present only a single role.

In 1957, Meeker investigated the various roles the officer plays.¹ First, he examined the officer’s administrative role which includes preparing the presentence investigation, the supervision of clients, and maintenance of their records. He also examined the officer’s other roles which involve obtaining data for the presentence investigation. Here the officer must devote his time not merely in determining "what the offender did," but "why he did it, and whether he is a suitable risk for release in the free

community.″² Often when the officer first interviews the offender initial stages of treatment have begun. If the officer aims to achieve maximum rapport with a prospective parolee, he must begin the treatment process as soon as possible.

Sometimes it is also necessary, Meeker continues, for the officer to play the role of law enforcement officer or "policeman." More specifically, the law includes this mandate: "Any probation officer having reason to believe that a probationer has violated his probation may arrest him without warrant."³ The probationer or parolee should regard his conditions of parole not as punishment but as contributing to his rehabilitation. If these conditions are continually broken the officer has the discretionary power to refer him to the Parole Board and recommend revocation of his parole.

The probation officer has a responsibility to fulfill and must use authority occasionally and take on a police role, in the event of serious violation of probation, but this policing function should be kept in the background and be used as sparingly as conditions permit.⁴

The last role the officer plays—that of caseworker and counselor—is his most important obligation. It is through this role that the needs of the client are fulfilled,

²Ibid., p. 99.

³Kentucky, Revised Statutes (May, 1956), chapter 439.300.

whether it be helping him find a job or counseling him about family problems. It is his duty to attempt to rehabilitate the offenders.  

Lloyd Ohlin and associates have a similar classification of roles but claim that some officers have tendencies to fit more into one role than another. The "punitive officer" role is comparable to Meeker's law enforcement officer role. The "punitive officer" serves to protect the community and society against the recurrence of the offender's crime; the "welfare worker's" role is similar to that of the caseworker or counselor role. This "welfare worker's" role is primarily concerned with doing whatever can be done to provide for the parolee's well-being and to rehabilitate him. The "protective agent" is the officer whose main concern fluctuates between the offender and the community.

Dressler, on the other hand, discusses role in terms of "techniques" of probation and parole. He describes five of these "techniques:"

1. Manipulative techniques are used when the offender in some way alters the environment of the offender. This involves such things as job-finding, home finding, and improvement of community life. The focus of this technique is not for the officer to solve the parolee's problems for him, but to help alleviate his environmental conditions so that it will be easier for him to solve his own problems.

---

5Meeker, pp. 99-106.

2. Executive techniques come into effect when the officer serves as a source of referrals for community agencies.

3. Guidance techniques of the parole officer include his ability to advise and help the parolee to help himself.

4. Counseling techniques are advantageous to the officer, but he seldom possesses the knowledge and training which are needed for counseling.

5. Group work techniques come into effect when the officer allows several parolees to discuss and help each other with their problems. As a rule the officer tries, if possible, to stay out of the discussion and let the parolees talk about their problems to elicit understanding and solution from the group members.7

In 1960, Hardman referred to the following roles of the probation officer: employment agent, vocational counselor, marital counselor, psychoanalyst-junior grade, school counselor (when juveniles are involved), dream interpreter, sheriff-deputy grade, father confessor, and moralist. All of these roles are limited by what he regards as the "function of the probation officer," which for him "is to help the offender comply with the order of the court."8 Thus, Hardman believes that for the officer to do anything other than that which the court requests him to do is exceeding the limits of his authority. He should bring other community agencies (employment agencies, marriage counselors, welfare workers, and others) into the realm of his supervision rather than


attempting to provide for these things on his own, especially when he is not qualified to do so. He feels that basically the officer's role is that of authority expert; that is, he must know how and when to use the authority which the court has vested in him.  

More closely related to the topic of this thesis is a typology used by Johnson. It is a three-fold occupational typology which has been adapted specifically to probation and parole officers: (1) The "familistic" emerges when the clients and the officer form a family-type relationship in which the officer performs the fatherly function and the client acts in the role of the son. This ideology is based on emotion and necessitates a similarity of backgrounds and socialization between the offender and the officer; (2) the "paternalistic ideology" puts the parole officer in the role of protector or superior of the parolee. Here moral aspects as well as the legal ones are stressed. The officer takes the role of policeman and moralist in order to emphasize his superior position; and (3) the "contractual ideology" is based primarily on instrumental functions, minimizing the expressive ones. Both officer and parolee perform their roles as they are expected without the intervention of emotions.

---

9Ibid., pp. 3-8.

10This typology was adapted from an earlier version reported by John B. Knox, The Sociology of Industrial Relations (New York: Random House, 1955), chap. 1x.

The "roles," "techniques," and "ideologies" of the parole officer which have been discussed in this chapter will be used in differentiating rural and urban parole officers. Each of these is a major constituent of the officer's work style and should be utilized in any such analysis.

Although several writers have studied various aspects of the parole officer's job, including the tendencies of some officers to emphasize certain roles, very few have offered any reasons (based on empirical data) to account for these differences. Several studies in this area (e.g. those previously cited in this chapter) have been based on "armchair philosophy." Therefore, empirical research is needed in this field to determine the type of role the officer will play in relation to his parolees. It is hoped that the findings of this thesis will help clarify the work styles of parole officers and at least suggest the influence which these styles have on the interaction between officer and parolee.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN

This chapter is devoted not only to the sample, method of data collection, questionnaire, and procedure, but also to the frame of reference in which the problem will be viewed.

Frame of Reference

Since the emphasis of this thesis is on the rural-urban difference between parole officers, it is necessary first to differentiate these concepts. Sorokin and Zimmerman have developed indices of rural-urban differentiation. Their distinction in terms of "Systems of Interaction" is:

**Rural World**

Less numerous contacts per man. Narrower area of the interaction system of its members and the whole aggregate. More prominent part is occupied by primary contacts. Predominance of personal and relatively durable relations. Comparative simplicity and sincerity of relations. "Man is interacted with as a human person."

**Urban World**

More numerous contacts. Wider area of interaction system per man and per aggregate. Predominance of impersonal casual and short-lived relations. Greater complexity, manifoldness, superficiality, and standardized formality of relations.
Man is interacted with as a "number" and "address."\(^1\)

This distinction is to some extent similar to the Gemeinschaft-Gesellschaft typology of Ferdinand Tonnies.

In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Tonnies designated as Gemeinschaft the "social order which--being based upon consensus of will--rests on harmony and is developed and ennobled by folkways, mores, and religion;" he gave the name Gesellschaft to the "order which--being based upon a union of rational wills--rests on convention and agreement, is safeguarded by political legislation, and finds its ideological justification in public opinion."\(^2\)

In Gemeinschaft communities work is regarded not as a means to an end but as an end in itself. Members of these communities enjoy the satisfaction of what they do more than the end result, whether it be the paycheck or a promotion. They are further characterized by homogeneity, intimacy, low mobility, solidarity, cooperation, sentiment, and traditional norms.

In Gesellschaft societies work is regarded as a means to an end. These societies are usually marked by heterogeneity, impersonality, high mobility, organic solidarity, contractual relationships, and rational norms.

These two distinct types of environment should produce individuals with different outlooks, behaviors, ideologies,


and subsequent work styles. For the purpose of this thesis a work style consists of the sum of the ways in which the officer relates to his parolees. It is felt that each officer's work style will be similar in some ways to those of other officers, while it will be different in other ways.

Various criteria will be used in determining a parole officer's work style.

1. One criterion to be used is that of either having the parolee come to his office for their regular meeting or going to the parolee's home or place of employment. It is hypothesized that the rural officer will tend to go out of his office to meet with his clients while the urban officer will more often schedule his parolees to come to his office.

2. Another aspect to be studied concerning the parole officer's work style is his requirement as to where the parolees should wait to see him when they arrive early. It is hypothesized that rural officers will bring the parolees directly into their offices, while urban officers will have a more formal approach and keep the parolees outside their offices until they can see them.

3. The number of parolees waiting to see the parole officer was also investigated. It is hypothesized that urban officers will have more parolees waiting at one time to see them than rural officers, since it is believed that most of their visits take place in the office.

4. The length of the average visit is another factor which tends to vary somewhat from one officer to another.
Some officers meet with their clients for only a brief session, only time enough to complete the monthly report. Other officers spend more time with the parolee, not only for the essentials, but in order to delve into the parolee's personal problems and begin or continue the rehabilitative process. It is hypothesized that the rural officer will tend to spend more time with any given parolee than the urban officer.

5. Another criterion to be used is that of the involvement of others in the supervision of the parolee. Some officers try to perform all the services which the parolee needs while others bring into the situation outside persons or agencies to help them in their supervision of the parolee. Here the hypothesis is that rural officers are more likely to involve citizens of the community in supervision of parolees. The reason for this is the predominance of primary contacts between the rural officer and personnel of other "helping agencies."

6. The utilization of group work techniques in his supervision is another criterion on which work style of the parole officer is based. Some officers work with their clients strictly on a one-to-one basis using only casework methods, while others tend to experiment, even if only moderately, with group work tactics in an effort to get the parolees to help one another. It is hypothesized that the rural officer would be more likely to use this informal approach in the supervision of his parolees.
7. The frequency with which the officer consults with his supervisor on his cases also is a differentiating factor concerning work styles of the parole officers. Some officers need the advice of their supervisors more often than others when certain decisions are to be made. The hypothesis here is that rural officers will consult with supervisors more often than urban officers.

8. The officer's perception of the part he plays in the success of his parolees is a relevant factor to be discussed in relation to work style. Does the officer feel that a major part of his parolee's success is dependent on him or does he feel that he is only peripherally involved with his success? It is hypothesized that if the rural officer deals on a more personal, sincere basis--putting more of himself into his supervision--that when the parolee actually succeeds, he will feel more a part of his rehabilitation.

9. The officer's idea of the role which he plays in relation to his client influences his actions and tends to differentiate the officers. While some officers tend to regard themselves as a father figure or a kind of superior person, others try to be a "friend" to the parolee. Here it is hypothesized that most officers will respond that they are "friends" to the parolees; however, more urban than rural officers will indicate a more authoritative approach.

10. Social distance between the officer and his parolee is another very important factor which affects the officer's work style. The degree to which the officer allows himself to be close to his parolees tends to vary according to work
In this thesis, the work style of parole officers will be compared with that of the rural officer to test the hypothesis that the rural officer will tend more often than the urban officer to meet the parolee on a more personal level, i.e., to invite him to his home, allow him to use his first name, or to accept him as a friend.

The above hypotheses will be tested in an attempt to differentiate among parole officers on the basis of work style using their rural or urban background as the independent variable.

**Questionnaire**

W. Parker Hurley, Director of the Division of Probation and Parole, and John Taylor, Commissioner of the Department of Corrections, both of the Commonwealth of Kentucky gave their approval to the questionnaire used in this thesis.

The questionnaire consisted of questions reflecting the officer's personal and social characteristics, such as marital status, education, organizational memberships, residence, years served, and others, as well as those concerning his work style. Work style questions included: "How long, on the average, do you talk to the parolee when he meets you in your office?"; "Where do your meetings with your parolees usually take place?"; "In waiting to see you in your office, where do parolees usually wait?"; "What is the largest number of parolees you have had waiting for you in your office at one time?"; "Do you ever involve citizens in your supervision..."
of parolees?"; "Do you ever work with more than one parolee at a time?"; "What percentage of your cases require some consultation between you and your supervisor?"; "What percentage of the parolee's success, would you say, is dependent on you?"; "What role do you usually play in supervising your parolees?"; and "What types of social activities have you done with your parolees?" (See Appendix).

**Population and Data Collection**

The population used in this study consisted entirely of parole officers employed by the Commonwealth of Kentucky. No federal probation officers were included. In Kentucky the term "parole officer" applies not only to the supervision of parolees but also of probationers. Each officer's case load contains both types of clients.

At the time of the study (1971) there were seventy parole officers. Of these, sixty-eight were male and two were female. The educational status of these officers varied widely. The incoming officers are required to have at least a college degree, but many of the older officers had only a high school education. There were no black parole officers in the state.

Of these seventy officers, fifty or slightly over seventy-one percent responded to the questionnaire and were used as a basis for this study. Of these fifty, forty-nine were male and one was female. These fifty, we can assume were not unlike the rest of the officers; thus, we may infer
from the results how all of the officers would tend to respond.

Initially the questionnaire was administered to these officers at the annual meeting of the Kentucky Council on Crime and Delinquency which met in Louisville, Kentucky in September, 1971. However, since only a portion of the officers were required to attend this conference, it was not possible to reach each officer. Copies of the questionnaire were, therefore, mailed to each officer not previously responding.

Procedure

It has been noted that rural-urban difference would be used as a basis for comparing supervisory practices of the officers. The officers were classified rural or urban not on the basis of the location of their offices or their present residence, but on the basis of whether they had lived longer in an urban or rural community. This latter criterion is presumed to more accurately represent the type of orientation they will have. The 1970 United States Census was used as the basis for determining the population of the cities and towns cited by the officers. Instead of using the Census Bureau designation of 2500 or more to constitute an urban area, the writer used a population of 10,000 people or more to determine an urban area. Most cities under 10,000 (provided they are not dominated by a metropolis) are assumed to be more similar to one another—and even to small towns—in industry, commerce, and social relationships than they are
to cities of 10,000 population and over. This definition of rural and urban facilitates the analysis of data and the understanding of the central problem of this study. (It should be noted in this connection that the utility of a definition depends in large measure upon the way it functions to facilitate inquiry.) Since the focus in this thesis is on residential background as a correlate of present work role orientation, no claims can be made about the effects of present residence on work role. (A study of a different population having urban located officers from rural backgrounds and rural located officers from urban backgrounds, as well as the more commonly found rural located officers from rural backgrounds and urban located officers from urban backgrounds might clarify the effects of both former and present residence.) On the other hand, the fact that officers currently working in rural versus urban settings have similar work loads is evidence for similarity in role demands made by present residential location. Even if present residence of the officers were an important factor in role definition, it would still be expected that past residence was of importance in the development of role expectations.

**Statistical Test**

The method used to analyze the data was the Fisher Exact Test. This test, devised by R. A. Fisher, yields exact probabilities unlike the chi-square test which gives approx-
imate ones. According to Blalock,\(^3\) this test is superior to
the chi-square test corrected for continuity. He continues
by saying that the Fisher Exact Test is actually more con-
servative (more difficult to reject the null hypothesis)
than chi-square when the sample size is small.

\(^3\)Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Social Statistics (New York:
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, officers will be compared on the basis of the rural-urban dimension by use of various criteria relating to work style. The numbers of the tables used in this chapter correspond to the numbers of the hypotheses in Chapter III. The first four tables are concerned with basic office procedure involving the structure of the visit.

1. As can be seen in Table 1, rural officers were much more likely than urban officers to see the parolee at his home or work, while the urban officer tended to remain in his office and have his parolees come to see him. Twenty-one, or 75 percent of the rural officers went to see their parolees, while only four or 18 percent of the urban officers did so. Using the Fisher Exact statistical test, this difference yielded a probability of .00007, thus substantiating the first hypothesis which states that the rural officer will be more likely than the urban officer to go out of his office to meet with his clients.

2. In response to the question as to where the parolees usually waited for the officers when they arrived at their offices early, the findings indicate that all but one of the urban officers (95 percent as shown in Table 2) said that
### TABLE 1

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN USUAL PLACE OF VISIT AND RURAL OR URBAN BACKGROUND OF OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Visit</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>25% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parolee's home or work</td>
<td>75% (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = .00007
### Table 2

**Relationship between Type of Waiting Area and Rural or Urban Background of Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waiting Areas</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inside the Office</td>
<td>53.8% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the Office</td>
<td>46.2% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = 0.0002
their parolees did not wait inside their offices. The majority of the rural officers stated that their parolees waited for them inside their offices. This finding supports the second hypothesis; namely, that rural officers, unlike urban officers, would be much more inclined to have parolees wait inside their offices.

3. Table 3 shows that fourteen, or 67 percent, of the urban parole officers had four or more parolees waiting in their offices at one time, while only ten, or 38 percent, of the rural officers had parolees waiting. This difference yielded a Fisher Exact probability of .05 and supported the third hypothesis; that is, that urban officers would more likely have a larger number of parolees waiting at one time.

4. The length of the average meeting, as shown in Table 4, did not differ significantly when rural and urban officers were compared, but there was a slight tendency for rural officers to spend more time with their parolees. Seventeen, or 71 percent, of the rural officers spent a minimum of twenty minutes with each parolee, while only eleven, or 55 percent, of the urban officers spent that much time. Thus, hypothesis four was not proven; namely, that rural officers would spend a significantly greater amount of time with each parolee.

Tables 5 and 6 show the use of alternative methods in the process of supervision. The officer can try to provide the help himself for the parolee or he can bring community agencies or citizens in to aid him or he can utilize the assistance of other parolees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Parolees</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or less</td>
<td>62% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>38% (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = .05


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Visit</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural ( N=24 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 15 minutes</td>
<td>29% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 minutes or longer</td>
<td>71% (17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = .22
### TABLE 5

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE USE OF CITIZENS IN SUPERVISION AND RURAL OR URBAN BACKGROUND OF OFFICERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Citizens</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban (N=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45% (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fisher's Exact Probability = .05*
### Table 6

**Relationship between the Use of Group Sessions and Rural or Urban Background of Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Group Sessions</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71% (20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = .39
5. Table 5 indicates a much greater tendency for rural officers to involve community agencies and citizens in the supervision of their parolees. Twenty-two, or 82 percent, of the rural parole officers bring in others to help them, while only eleven of the urban officers, or 55 percent, did so. The Fisher Exact probability for this difference is equal to .05 which substantiates the fifth hypothesis regarding the role of other persons and groups in supervision of parolees.

6. As for the use of group sessions, eight, or 29 percent, of the rural officers and eight, or 36 percent, of the urban officers replied affirmatively. This left approximately two-thirds in each category who relied strictly on case work techniques. Thus there was no difference between rural and urban parole officers in the use of this particular technique, failing to support hypothesis six.

7. Consultation of the officers with supervisors is shown in Table 7. The table indicates that rural officers did not differ significantly from urban officers on this question. Sixty-one percent of the rural officers and sixty-seven percent of the urban officers said that less than five percent of their cases had to be discussed with their supervisors. Therefore, hypothesis seven was rejected.

8. How the officer perceives himself is illustrated in Tables 8 and 9. The two factors involved here include the percentage of the parolee's success which he feels is dependent on him and his perception of the role he plays. According to Table 8, rural officers tend to feel that a major por-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Cases Requiring Consultation</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% to 5%</td>
<td>61% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% or more</td>
<td>39% (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = .45
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Success</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% or less</td>
<td>30% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or more</td>
<td>70% (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = .001
### Table 9

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE OFFICER'S PERCEPTION OF THE ROLE HE PLAYS AND HIS RURAL OR URBAN BACKGROUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>61% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other answer (Big Brother, father, manager, etc.)</td>
<td>39% (11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fisher's Exact Probability = .40
tion of the parolee's success is dependent on them, while
urban officers believe that credit for this success lies
elsewhere. Nineteen, or 70 percent, of the rural officers
believe that 30 percent or more of the parolee's success
lies with them, while only five, or 24 percent, of the urban
officers felt this way. This difference yielded a probability
of .001 when the Fisher Exact Test was used, and supported the
eighth hypothesis.

9. Table 9 shows another comparison between urban and
rural parole officers. Sixty-one percent of the rural offi-
cers and sixty-eight percent of the urban officers regarded
themselves as a "friend" to the parolee. The other officers
gave such responses as "big brother," "father," "manager,"
and the like. It was hypothesized that a significantly
greater proportion of rural officers than urban officers
would regard themselves as a "friend." But this was not the
case as shown by the probability .40 in Table 9. The hypo-
thesis was rejected.

10. Both similarities and differences were described
by use of a social distance scale. This scale comprises
various activities which may or may not have taken place
during the period of the officer's supervision of the parolee.
It was used to determine the degree of "closeness" between
the officer and his parolee. Similar percentages from urban
parole officers and rural officers can be seen in Table 10
on the following items: (5) Accept him as a casual friend;
(6) Accept him as an intimate friend; (7) Call him by his
TABLE 10
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIAL ACTIVITIES OCCURRING BETWEEN THE PAROLE OFFICER AND HIS PAROLEE AND RURAL OR URBAN BACKGROUND OF OFFICER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Percentage of Officers of Rural and Urban Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural (N=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Eat with him</td>
<td>38% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fish with him</td>
<td>11% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Drink with him</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accept help from him</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accept him as a casual friend</td>
<td>71% (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Accept him as an intimate friend</td>
<td>21% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Call him by his first name</td>
<td>93% (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Had him use your first name</td>
<td>50% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Permit him to do you a favor</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Recommend his employment</td>
<td>79% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Invite him to dinner in your home</td>
<td>7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Ask his opinion of something</td>
<td>75% (21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fisher's Exact Probability = .004
**Fisher's Exact Probability = .06
first name; (10) Recommend his employment; (11) Invite him to
dinner in your home; and (12) Ask his opinion of something.
Differences occurred on these items: (3) Drink with him;
(4) Accept help from him; and (9) Permit him to do you a
favor. None of the rural parole officers had ever had a
drink with any of their parolees, while 14 percent of the
urban officers had (p < .07). Twenty-eight percent of the
urban officers had accepted some type of help from their
parolees, while none of the rural officers had accepted help
(p < .004). This is the only item that shows a statistically
significant difference between rural and urban officers.
Only 7 percent of the rural officers had permitted even one
of their parolees to do them a favor while 28 percent of the
urban officers had permitted favors (p < .06).

Thus the rural-urban difference used as an independent
variable helps to explain most of the differences which have
been noted in the work style of parole officers. The work
style of rural and urban officers differed mainly with
respect to usual place of visit, waiting areas, number of
parolees waiting at one time, utilization of citizens in
supervision, officer's perception of himself as part of the
parolee's success, his perception of the role he plays, and
acceptance of help or favors from parolees.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Using rural-urban difference in background as an independent variable, this study compared a sample of Kentucky parole officers in a number of important aspects of their work style. In general there were good indications that rural officers tend to approach their work with a more informal orientation than do urban officers.

As was shown from the analysis, rural officers are more likely to go to see their parolees, while urban officers tend to require the parolee to come to see them in their offices. This indicates a greater tendency for rural officers to spend more time in the "field" meeting the client in his own surroundings, thus conforming to the client's mode of living (his home, his work, and his family). On the other hand, the urban officer generally brings the parolee into his office, which might make the parolee feel a bit uneasy, since many are not used to this formal "business world" atmosphere. The rural officer, therefore, tends to meet the parolee on his own level—in surroundings that are familiar to him and where he would be most at ease to discuss his problems, his progress toward rehabilitation, and his hopes for the future.
Even though there was no significant difference between rural and urban officers in relation to the length of time which they spent with their clients, there was a tendency for rural officers to spend more time with parolees. Again this could be attributed to the more informal and personal approach which seems to be characteristic of rural officers.

A more significant relationship emerged concerning the use of citizens in supervision. Rural officers were much more likely than urban officers to utilize others in rehabilitation of parolees. This is probably related to frequency of more informal settings in rural areas and the greater likelihood that the rural officer will be acquainted with others in the community who are in a position to help the client in some way through position, knowledge, or experience. In an urban area where the day-to-day life is more complex, where secondary relationships prevail, access to others and getting them to take the time to help one's parolees is at a minimum.

Another interesting result of this study was that rural officers believe that they contribute more to their client's success than do the urban officers. Thus, rural officers view their relationships with parolees as primary rather than secondary ones. Urban officers tend to regard their parolees simply as part of an impersonal or secondary relationship. If the officer only meets with the parolee in a secondary capacity, there must be many others who have just as great an influence on the parolee as does the officer; therefore, the
officer might realize that the effect which he has on his client is very limited. Evidence for this interpretation was found in his idea that the parolee's success lies with himself.

The two items in the social distance scale involving reciprocity between the parole officers and their parolees, (4) Accept help from him and (9) Permit him to do you a favor, were more characteristic of urban officers. This finding was not anticipated. One reason for this is that rural officers are probably more "status conscious," feeling that they are superordinate to the parolee and would not accept help or favors from a subordinate. Another reason is that they may not want to put themselves in a position where they are obligated to the parolee in any way.

Thus the significant relationships which have emerged from this study indicate that rural officers tend to be more informal in their approach to the job as parole officer than the urban officer. Therefore, a more "Gemeinschaft-like" work style is evidenced by rural officers, while urban officers utilize a "Gesellschaft-like" approach to the profession of parole officer. Even though the statistics do not indicate as strong a distinction between rural and urban officers as was hypothesized, one can detect some important differences in work style with rural parole officers falling toward the more informal, personal end of the continuum and urban officers, more toward the formal, impersonal end.
In this study the residential variable has been viewed as important in shaping role orientations of parole officers in the state of Kentucky. More meaningful and more conclusive results could very probably be obtained by including parole officers from other states and Federal probation officers in the sample.
Instructions:

We are undertaking a study of work styles among parole officers. You will be asked in the following pages to answer questions concerning some of your individual work styles. Also included are some questions about your personal and social characteristics.

When you have completed the entire questionnaire, please turn it in to the party proctoring its administration.

No names are wanted nor will the individual officer be identified in any way. When the study is completed, the data collected will be statistically treated and made available to those of you who wish to have the results.

Thank you for your cooperation,

Virginia Bess Cleveland
Western Kentucky University
HOST or he I'll be listed by chec- 

Q'll of the alterTaTlves or writing in a specific answer. When variations from this occur, directions for that particular question are given.

   a) ___ male  a) ___ White  a) ___
   b) ___ female  b) ___ Negro
   c) ___ Other

5. Formal Education:
   a) ___ not a high school graduate
   b) ___ high school graduate
   c) ___ some college
   d) ___ college graduate
   e) ___ graduate work

8. Name of college attended:
   __________________________________________

9. Specify its location (city and state):
   __________________________________________

10. Your college major(s):
    __________________________________________

11. Organizational memberships (specify number in each category):
    a) ___ professional
    b) ___ religious
    c) ___ civic
    d) ___ fraternal
    e) ___ other

12. Longest place of residence (specify city and state):
    __________________________________________
13. Length of residence there: __________________ years


15. In what city is your office? ______________________________________________________

16-17. Your father’s occupation:
   a) __ professional or technical
   b) __ farm or farm manager
   c) __ proprietor, manager, official
   d) __ clerical or sales
   e) __ craftsman or foreman
   f) __ operative
   g) __ service
   h) __ laborer
   i) __ other; specify________________

18. Age at which you began working as a parole officer: __________________ years old

19. Your father’s education:
   a) __ advanced degrees (MA, PhD, etc.)
   b) __ four year college graduate
   c) __ 1 to 3 years of college
   d) __ high school graduate
   e) __ 10 to 11 years of school
   f) __ 7 to 9 years of school
   g) __ less than 7 years

20. Average monthly caseload (including both probation and parole cases):
   __________________ cases

21. Years employed as a parole officer: __________________ years

22. Estimated number of parole revocations during the past year: __________________ revocations

23. Estimated number of probation revocations during the past year: __________________ revocations

Directions: What characteristics do you prefer your parolees to possess?
(Rank each of the possible choices in questions 24-27 in order of importance with (1) being the most favorable option, (2) the next most favorable until each blank is completed)

24. Sex:
   a) __ male
   b) __ female

25. Race:
   a) __ White
   b) __ Negro
   c) __ Other

26. Social Class:
   a) __ lower
   b) __ middle
   c) __ upper

27. Residence:
   a) __ Rural
   b) __ Urban
28. Where do your meetings with your parolees usually take place?
   a) ___ office
   b) ___ client's home
   c) ___ client's work
   d) ___ other; specify ____________________________

29. In waiting to see you in your office where do parolees usually wait?
   a) ___ inside your office
   b) ___ in an outer office
   c) ___ outside the office
   d) ___ other; specify ____________________________

30. What is the largest number of parolees you have had waiting for you in your office at one time?

   ____________________________

31. How long, on the average, do you talk to the parolee when he meets you in your office?

   ____________________________

32. Do you ever involve citizens in your supervision of parolees? (Big Brothers, or some other)
   a) ___ yes
   b) ___ no

33. Do you ever work with more than one parolee at a time, such as group sessions?
   a) ___ yes
   b) ___ no
34. Approximately what percentage of your cases require some consultation between you and your supervisors?

______________________________

35. What percentage of the parolee's success, would you say, is dependent on you?

______________________________

36. Which of the following best describes the role which you usually play in supervising your parolees?

a)  ____ Big Brother  e)  ____ Manager
b)  ____ Father  f)  ____ Stranger
c)  ____ Friend  g)  ____ Good Samaritan
d)  ____ Policeman  h)  ____ Other; specify ______

37. Which of the following have you ever done with any of your parolees? (Check as many as are applicable)

a)  ____ Eat with him  e)  ____ Accept him as an intimate friend
b)  ____ Go fishing  f)  ____ Accept him as a casual friend
c)  ____ Drink with him  g)  ____ Call him by his first name
d)  ____ Accept help from him  h)  ____ Let him use your first name
i)  ____ Permit him to do you a favor  j)  ____ Recommend his employment
k)  ____ Invite him to your home for dinner
l)  ____ Ask his opinion of something
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