PROBATION REVOCATIONS BASED ON TECHNICAL VIOLATIONS: DO PROBATION OFFICERS CONTRIBUTE TO HIGHER RATES?

by

AMANDA KENT

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN CRIMINOLOGY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON
August 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my professors and advisors that I have encountered throughout my career at the University of Texas at Arlington. Without their guidance and knowledge, this thesis could never have been completed. I would like to thank my family as if it were not for their persistence, I would never have attempted, let alone completed, my degree. To my friends whom I have met throughout the years, thank you for being understanding of the fact that I could not be there for many engagements during my career as a Graduate Student. Finally, to Sam, you have been the most supportive throughout my ups and downs and the motivation that I have needed to complete this task. For that, I will always be grateful.

July 20, 2009

ABSTRACT

PROBATION REVOCATIONS BASED ON TECHNICAL VIOLATIONS:
DO PROBATION OFFICERS CONTRIBUTE
TO HIGHER RATES?

Amanda Kent, M.A.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2009

Supervising Professor: Rhonda Dobbs

A recent report by The Pew Center on the States (2009) indicated that 1 in 31 adults are under the control of the correctional system nationwide. In Texas, it is reported that 1 in 22 adults are under the control of the correctional system, in prison, jail, on probation or parole (The Pew Center on the States, 2009). The prisons in Texas and throughout the nation are becoming overcrowded which presents a problem for administrators and the public alike. Texas has experienced an increase of 310% in their prison population between 1985 and 2005 and it is expected to grow another 9% by 2012 (The Pew Center on the States, 2007). With the influx of inmates in prison, alternatives, such as probation, offer another route. Probation, as a criminal sanction, can assist in keeping the prison population down by keeping those offenders in the community but imposing rules, or conditions, to their freedom. Approximately 4.2 million offenders were on probation at year end 2006, an increase of 30% since 1995 (Glaze & Bonczar, 2007). An increase of offenders on probation also means an increase in probation officer caseloads. Probation officers are not only responsible for keeping the public safe but also provide assistance to the various problems that offenders face. This daily contact, constant monitoring and the various other tasks that must be performed by a

probation officer could contribute to burnout, among other things. A burned out probation officer can experience a range of behaviors from a lack of motivation to complete paperwork to an "I don't care" mentality. An officer that doesn't care about their offenders could also be more inclined to revoke an offender for a minor infraction of their conditions of probation. They may see the offender as one less burden on their caseload. While the actions of a burned out probation officer faced with the option of revoking an offender are speculative, it could be reasonable to assume that this could occur. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the relationship, if any, of burnout and the decision to revoke an offender based on technical violations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... iii

ABSTRACT..... iv

LIST OF TABLES..... vii

Chapter Page

1. INTRODUCTION..... 1

2. LITERATURE REVIEW..... 5

2.1 History of Probation and the Probation Officer..... 5

2.2 Modern Day Probation and the Probation Officer..... 8

2.3 What is Burnout?..... 12

2.4 Causes of Burnout..... 19

3. METHODS..... 32

4. ANALYSIS..... 41

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION..... 86

APPENDIX

A. SURVEY..... 96

REFERENCES..... 103

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION..... 107

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Gender, Age and Race.....	37
3.2	Education and Experience.....	38
3.3	Rank, Job Description and Caseload Size.....	40
4.1	Risks to the Community.....	43
4.2	Action Taken by Probation Officer once Technical Violation Presented.....	44
4.3	Recommendation to the Court.....	44
4.4	Probation Officer's Perceptions.....	46
4.5	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk; "I love my job.".....	48
4.6	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk; "I love my job.".....	48
4.7	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk; "I love my job.".....	48
4.8	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk; "I love my job.".....	49
4.9	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action; "I love my job.".....	50
4.10	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action; "I love my job.".....	51
4.11	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action; "I love my job.".....	51
4.12	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action; "I love my job.".....	52
4.13	Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation; "I love my job.".....	54

4.14 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation; "I love my job." 54

4.15 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation; "I love my job." 55

4.16 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation; "I love my job." 56

4.17 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job." 57

4.18 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job." 57

4.19 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job." 58

4.20 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job." 58

4.21 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action; "I am burned out by my job." 59

4.22 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action; "I am burned out by my job." 60

4.23 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action; "I am burned out by my job." 61

4.24 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action; "I am burned out by my job." 61

4.25 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job." 63

4.26 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job." 64

4.27 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job." 64

4.28 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job." 65

4.29 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 66

4.30 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 67

4.31 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 67

4.32 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 67

4.33 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 68

4.34 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 69

4.35 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 70

4.36 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 71

4.37 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 73

4.38 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 73

4.39 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 74

4.40 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation;
"I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." 75

4.41 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk;
"I often think about quitting my job." 76

4.42 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk;
"I often think about quitting my job." 76

4.43 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk;
"I often think about quitting my job." 77

4.44 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk;
"I often think about quitting my job." 77

4.45 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action;
"I often think about quitting my job." 78

4.46 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action;
"I often think about quitting my job." 79

4.47 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action;
"I often think about quitting my job." 80

4.48 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action; "I often think about quitting my job."..... 80

4.49 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."..... 82

4.50 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."..... 83

4.51 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."..... 83

4.52 Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."..... 84

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A recent study conducted by The Pew Center on the States (2009) reported America now has more than 7.3 million adults under some form of correctional control (i.e. probation, parole, prison and jail inmates). Approximately 25 years ago, 1 in every 77 adults were under some form of correctional supervision, however today it is reportedly 1 in 31 adults (The Pew Center on the States, 2009). In 1982, approximately 28% of offenders were behind bars, however in 2007 the numbers increased to 31% (The Pew Center on the States, 2009). According to Sabol, Couture and Harrison (2007), the state prison population increased by 2.8% in 2006 compared to 1.5% from 2000 to 2005. The percentage increase may seem minimal, however the actual number of those in prison at year end 2000 was slightly over 1.2 million and with the 2.8% increase in 2006, that number grew to slightly over 1.3 million people (Sabol, Couture, & Harrison, 2007). The large number of prisoners that are incarcerated in state prison systems leads to institutional overcrowding. In order to attempt to reduce the number of offenders entering prison, states throughout the nation as well as worldwide utilize the probation system.

Probation is not a new phenomenon, as it has existed for numerous years. With the influx of new inmates in prisons and the lack of available resources, the probation system is viewed by many as a form of criminal punishment for the crime that was committed but without the incarceration aspect. The number of offenders under probation supervision exceeds the number of those that are incarcerated in prisons or jails. According to Glaze and Bonczar (2007), the number of people that were on probation by the end of 2006 was slightly over 4.2 million offenders. This represents an increase of approximately 30% of the probation population since 1995 when the prison population was around 3 million offenders (Glaze and Bonczar,

2007). Noticeably, the use of probation is not only more frequent, but has in fact surpassed that of the prison system.

If the use of probation is for the avoidance of prison sentences, deterrence of new crimes and/or to help the offender, how useful is this alternative? While the answer to this question is difficult, research estimates that one fourth to one half of those placed on probation actually complete it successfully (Bork, 1995; Taxman & Cherkos, 1995). This estimate is troubling because the remainder of those that do not complete probation successfully are revoked and sentenced to some form of prison sentence.

In order for an offender on probation to have their probation revoked, that offender must violate a condition of his or her probation. A violation can occur in many ways and Cohen (1995) states that violators are generally classified as those that commit a new offense or commit technical violations. According to Piar (2003), if a violation occurs, the offender will be charged with the violation followed by a hearing to determine if the conditions were in fact violated. Piar (2003) further notes that “if the state can prove that the terms of probation were violated, then the probation can be revoked, and what began as conditional liberty can become a term of incarceration" (p118). Revocation rates would appear to be a concern because one of the many purposes of probation is to avoid prison. While it would seem reasonable to assume an offender that commits another offense would likely be revoked, those with technical violations are slightly more difficult to determine. According to Glaze and Bonczar (2007), of the 2.2 million offenders that were released from probation, only 57% completed probation successfully while the remaining offenders were incarcerated. Of those that did not complete probation successfully, 9% committed a rule violation or technical violation whereas 4% committed a new offense (Glaze and Bonczar, 2007). In Texas, for the same year, 54% of the 23,202 offenders that returned to prison were due to a technical violation (The Pew Center on the States, 2007). What is interesting is the idea that offenders on probation appear to be revoked more frequently for breaking a rule of probation rather than committing a new offense. Gray, Fields, & Maxwell

(2001) conducted a study examining probation violations by examining the rates and timing of technical violations versus new offenses. The study showed that while probation violations were prevalent, the majority of these were technical violations (Gray, Fields, & Maxwell, 2001).

The issue of prison overcrowding may not seem important to the common citizen but the financial implications would likely generate some interest. According to Stephan (2004) the cost of incarceration in state prisons is approximately $22,000 per inmate in 2001. More recently, the average daily cost among 34 states was approximately $79 per day per inmate or $29,000 per year per inmate. In 1996, the total cost of incarceration for state prisons was approximately 24 billion dollars, which includes the $91 contribution that citizens pay (Stephan, 2004). Since 1996, the total cost as well as resident contribution has gone up and in 2001, the total amount was approximately 29.5 billion dollars with resident contribution at $104 (Stephan, 2004). This number is a conservative estimate, as the total costs are reflective of inmates only. It should be noted that these numbers do not include the building of prisons, cost of maintenance, or employees. While the number of offenders on probation that are revoked may appear on the low end, the financial repercussions can be far reaching.

Since Stephan's (2004) study, the financial burden is still rising. According to The Pew Center on the States (2009) "in FY2008, states are estimated to have spent more than 47 billion of general funds on corrections, a 20-year jump of 303 percent" (p.11). Correctional funding outpaced elementary and secondary education (205 percent), higher education (125 percent), transportation (82 percent) and public assistance (9 percent) (The Pew Center on the States, 2009). Eight States were able to contribute financial information for the past 25 years and it was found that 88% of the increase in state spending was spent towards prisons (The Pew Center on the States, 2009). In light of this information, reducing the prison population may be a suitable financial option. Paparozzi & Demichele (2008) suggest a reduction in inmate population by 10% to 50% would reduce the number incarcerated by approximately 43,000 to 289,000 respectively. Furthermore, these same reduction amounts would also reduce the costs

and the nation would save approximately $98 million (10%) to slightly over $3 billion (50%) (Paparozzi & Demichele, 2008).

While the goal may be to reduce the prison population, the reality is that people still commit crimes and deserve the proper punishment. Probation and Parole departments have been found to be far less expensive to the public. The average costs for offenders in the community ranged from $3.42 per day for probationers to $7.47 per day for parolees or approximately $1,250 to $2,750 annually respectively (The Pew Center on the States, 2009). The amount of money saved on correctional systems, by not only utilizing probation and parole departments but lowering the revocation rates, could be placed in other programs that would be of assistance for other issues throughout the country.

While numerous studies exist comparing revocation rates for technical violations and new offenses as well as the probation officers that monitor these offenders, there is no research that exists examining how probation officer characteristics influence technical violation rates. The examination of probation officer characteristics can be slightly overwhelming, therefore the focus will be on job satisfaction and burnout. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the perceptions of Tarrant County adult probation officers in relation to the likelihood of recommending revocation to the court when a technical violation has occurred.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 History of Probation and the Probation Officer

As previously stated, the concept of probation is not a new phenomenon in the United States or throughout the world. Probation as we know it today was formed by those that believed the harsh punishments that occurred did not fit the crimes that were committed. By examining the history of the criminal justice system, one can see the lack of separation between church and state. The Benefit of Clergy was utilized by those that committed crimes as a way of avoiding some of the harshest penalties of its time (Vanstone, 2004; Sieh, 2006). The Benefit of Clergy exempted clergy men, and eventually all persons, from the jurisdiction of the secular courts (Sieh, 2006). Sieh (2006) explains, "The offender was put on trial and instead of finding the person guilty or innocent, the court simply made no judgment at all" (p. 31). According to Grinnell (1941) the bishop's clerk would serve as a modern day probation officer by providing an opinion to the court on the eligibility of the offender's claim. Once sufficient proof was provided, the offender would never be punished for the crime they had committed.

While the Benefit of Clergy is no longer a function within the court system, another form of sentencing that was introduced as an alternative to prison is still seen today. Judge Peter Oxenbridge Thacher implemented the use of recognizance frequently when sentencing persons for crimes committed. According to Lindner (2007), the definition of recognizance is an obligation on the defendant who either promises to do something or refrain from something over a period of time and to report to court at any given time for the disposition of the case. In other words, the offender would be released without a sentence and during a time frame implemented by the Judge, the offender was to behave in a certain way deemed by the court. Should the offender violate the court's rules, the offender would face incarceration. During this time, as is

the case today, the Judge would only apply this method to those that generally fell into a certain criteria. Instead of incarcerating a juvenile or first-time offender, Judge Thacher would defer the sentence pending the good behavior of the offender (Lindner, 2007). The Judge's actions, or lack thereof, on numerous cases that came through his court certainly paved the way for the probation system today. Due to the Judge's sentencing practices, Massachusetts passed legislation by 1836 that "permitted the release of minor offenders upon their recognizance at any stage of the proceedings, with the understanding that the defendant would exhibit future good behavior" (Lindner, 2007, p. 37). Eventually, more legislation was enacted and as time progressed, the formation of the modern day probation system evolved.

Judge Thacher's use of recognizance had many elements that are similar to probation today with one exception: the supervision of the defendant. During the time when the offender was released on recognizance, that offender was never monitored and it was likely difficult to tell if the offender was actually being "good." It is believed by most people that the first person to ever monitor an offender's behavior was John Augustus. Augustus, a very religious man, initiated his voluntary probation work in 1841 when he requested a Judge to suspend the sentence of a common drunkard for three weeks and requested that the defendant be released to him. (Sieh, 2006; Lindner, 2007). Augustus bailed the man out of jail, made him sign a pledge of sobriety and by the end of the three week period, the defendant made such a dramatic change that he was hardly recognizable (Lindner, 2007). While supervision of the offender is an essential aspect of probation today, it was not the only thing that Augustus contributed to this particular field.

Augustus bailed certain offenders out of jail and monitored their behaviors but he also contributed more to the quality of life by addressing the needs of the offender. He helped them secure jobs, housing and schooling as well as assisted them with their personal problems (Lindner, 2007). He utilized the pledge for those he bailed out of jail, kept detailed records of all those he supervised, and provided the name "probation" for the work he did (Lindner, 2007). Augustus' contribution to this particular field was eventually recognized by the State of

Massachusetts in the form of a formal probation statute. According to Lindner (2007), in 1878, Massachusetts became the first state to pass a probation statute that required the Mayor of Boston to appoint a suitable person to attend court proceedings, investigate cases of the defendants that committed misdemeanors, and recommend probation to such persons that might be reasonably expected to be reformed without the use of incarceration or other form of punishment.

Probation departments throughout the United States today may never have been formed without the significant contributions of Judge Thacher and John Augustus. Judge Thacher recognized the punishments of young and/or first-time offenders were not suitable for prison and generated the knowledge that was needed to show others that something other than the formal punishment should be done. John Augustus appeared to have recognized those that committed crimes as misguided people that essentially need to be guided again with some form of assistance. It seems likely that probation would have been created regardless of the contributions of these two individuals, but the Criminal Justice system owes a debt of gratitude for their ideas.

Since Augustus, the probation system has gone through numerous challenges and changes. The Medical Model emerged in the 1930s and assumed that crime could be traced to certain environmental, biological, or psychological forces (Wodahl & Garland, 2009). Probation was already viewed as a way to rehabilitate the offender and the Medical Model fit easily with the same ideals. The result of the medical model in corrections was the use of trained professionals as well as a casework style of supervision (Wodahl & Garland, 2009). As time progressed, the type of supervision that was envisioned was rarely carried out. Throughout the early to mid-1900s, probation was routinely investigated by external sources and the results of those investigations were generally negative (Wodahl & Garland, 2009). The public also viewed probation negatively as it was criticized as being too soft on crime (Rothman, 1980). Probation continued, regardless of the criticisms, and reemerged in the late 1950s and 1960s due to the failing promises of rehabilitation within the confines of institutions (Wodahl & Garland, 2009). It

was during this time frame that intermediate sanctions, such as intensive supervision, halfway houses and electronic monitoring, emerged (Wodahl & Garland, 2009).

Probation, as well as the entire correctional system, was once again attacked during the 1970s. According to Burrell (n.d.), the idea of rehabilitation was viewed as ineffective and ultimately abandoned due to the largely political atmosphere of the “get tough on crime” movement in the 1970s. Research on rehabilitation in the correctional system showed no effect on recidivism (Wodahal & Garland, 2009). The rehabilitative promise that was developed decades ago was soon replaced by retribution and incapacitation. The idea of eliminating probation as a form of punishment was soon realized as impossible. "Legislative mandates undertaken in many jurisdictions such as mandatory minimums, punitive-orientated sentencing guidelines, three-strikes laws, and the abolishment of parole succeeded almost immediately in accomplishing their objectives - offenders were being sent to prison in record numbers" (Wodahal & Garland, 2009, p. 97S). Probation continued to move forward as prison overcrowding became an obvious concern, however the objectives changed from rehabilitation to surveillance and control as the primary function (Wodahal & Garland, 2009). Furthermore, the development of “what works” literature, the success of drug courts that relieved the frustration of the revolving door for this population and the development of reentry initiatives all created the necessary drive to keep probation and its practices from disintegration (Burrell, n.d.).

2.2 Modern Day Probation and the Probation Officer

There are various definitions of probation. Farrall (2002) attempts to give a broad understanding of what probation is:

- A sentence which takes place in the community rather than in prison.
- A form of help in that guidance or ‘treatment’ is available.
- A form of punishment in that the offender has to comply with various conditions.
- A deterrent to further offending in that further offending could result in additional or harsher forms of punishment (p.72).

Given this definition, the offender is essentially given an opportunity to avoid a prison sentence by being placed on probation and complying with the terms and conditions of that probation.

According to the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) (1987), the purpose of probation is to assist in reducing crime by probationers, or offenders on probation, in the community. Accordingly, in order for this to be achieved, probation departments assist courts in decision making processes and enforcing court imposed conditions as well as provide services and programs to offenders, just to name a few (APPA, 1987). Probation departments can be multifaceted in order to address the goals of the system. In other words, probation officers that monitor probationers are generally required to ensure enforcement of conditions while assisting the offender in a rehabilitative aspect in order to possibly prevent him or her from committing further crimes.

Probation officers are faced with a myriad of responsibilities and can take on many different roles as they supervise offenders. According to the U.S. Probation and Pretrial Service (2003), the role of the probation officer is simply to investigate and supervise offenders whom the courts have conditionally released to the community on probation. While the role of a probation officer includes the monitoring and investigating of the offender, other research indicates additional roles of a probation officer.

Whitehead (1989) reported five categories that define what the job of a probation officer entails: traditional, historical, philosophical, practice and statute. The supervision of offenders in the community is the traditional definition while “historically, supervision has connoted a philanthropic volunteer who is altruistically concerned about persons who would otherwise be behind bars” (Whitehead, 1989, p.38). The philosophical approach involves one-on-one casework between a trained social worker and a willing client, but in practice contact is made between the officer and the client in the office, residence, place of employment, on the street, or in jail (Whitehead, 1989). “By statute, supervision means that the probationer has consented to abide by a set of conditions” (Whitehead, 1989, p.38). The job of the officer is therefore to monitor the offender’s compliance with these conditions (Whitehead, 1989).

A study conducted by Burton, Latessa & Barker (1992) examined state legal codes dictating the statutory tasks required of probation officers and found that officers are generally obligated to perform approximately twenty-two legislatively mandated tasks when dealing with offenders on probation. Some of the tasks performed by probation officers were the following:

1) Supervision of offenders

2) Writing of pre-sentence investigation reports

3) Investigating cases of existing offenders on probation

4) Maintain accurate records

5) Discuss conditions with offenders (Burton, Latessa, & Barker, 1992)

Interestingly, the issue of rehabilitation also appeared on some state legal codes, but the number of states having this form of statute was relatively small, at only 15 states (Burton, Latessa, & Barker, 1992). Some states required that probation officers provide the assistance of entering rehabilitation, counseling services and referrals for medical, social and vocational services however, the number of states was again small (Burton, Latessa, & Barker, 1992). In light of this knowledge, it would appear that states view the tasks performed by probation officers as one of an enforcement standpoint. It is important to recognize that this study was conducted in 1992 and 15 years have passed since this study was published.

In 2003, a study conducted by Purkiss, Kifer, Hemmens, & Burton, Jr. examined the statutory analysis of the role of probation officers. This research stemmed from the previous one conducted in 1992 and examined any changes that occurred in ten years. The results of this examination yielded similar findings as the one conducted in 1992. Specifically, “Probation officers are more likely to be statutorily mandated to perform law enforcement tasks, rather than rehabilitative tasks; however, the number of rehabilitation-oriented tasks has increased” (Purkiss et. al., 2003. p. 23). This shows that states are recognizing that probation officers should not solely focus on the enforcement aspects of the job. While the current results yielded very little change in direction, some states showed dramatic changes since 1992. In 1992, Delaware had only three functions of the probation officer but this number increased over the

span of 10 years to fourteen, including three functions that were rehabilitative in nature (Purkiss et. al., 2003). While some states have little to no rehabilitative statutes, this research shows promise that states are recognizing the possibility that a dual role for probation officers exists.

While the goals of any probation department would likely influence the decisions made by the officers, the perceived role, the actual attitudes and stressors of the officers may influence the recommendation of revocation. Numerous studies exist that examine how probation officers view their responsibilities. Sigler (1988) suggested a role conflict between supervision and treatment characterizes this occupation. Essentially, the two main roles that are generally presented in this field are rehabilitative/treatment oriented or supervision/law enforcement oriented, however it has been suggested that a possible third role may exist. Ohlin, Piven and Pappenfort (1956) suggested that officers could assume one of the following orientations: welfare, punitive or protective. While welfare and punitive mirror that of the rehabilitative and law enforcement orientations, protective appears to incorporate both orientations into one. “An agent with a protective orientation would vacillate between striving to protect the community and striving to assist the offender; the officer would shift focus from the offender to the community and vice versa” (Ohlin et.al., 1956, p.215).

Van Laningham, Taber and Dimants (1966) examined how probation officers viewed their job responsibilities. Surveying randomly selected probation officers throughout the nation, they concluded that there is a lack of agreement about the job of a probation officer, however they were able to find three main aspects that were generally approved by the officers of the study: “referring probationers to appropriate community resources for help, providing probationers with fairly direct advice and guidance for day-to-day living, and acting as a social consultant to the court” (Van Laningham, Taber & Dimants, 1966, p.107). Interestingly, the law enforcement role of probation officers is largely absent in this study.

Since the role of a probation officer can be vague and it appears that there is no "cookie-cutter" job description, one can see that a conflict could appear. An officer that initially takes the role of the social worker may feel pressured to conform to a law enforcement

approach by the department while an officer that is focused on a law enforcement perspective may also feel pressured to find more resources for the offender's problems rather than taking legal actions for a simple violation. An officer that is faced with these conflicts may also face issues concerning numerous offenders that they see regularly. In light of these conflicts, it is reasonable to ask whether these conflicts could create job stress and/or job dissatisfaction among probation officers today.

2.3 What is Burnout?

Numerous research has been conducted on the topic of burnout however, finding a universal definition of the term is unrealistic. The various definitions that do exist contain some similar components, but they also vary on certain aspects. Burnout is a relatively new phenomena, first recognized in 1974 by Herbert Freudenberger. A closer examination of burnout by Freudenberger as well as other leading researchers will be further discussed, as it is important to fully understand what burnout really means.

The concept of burnout was initially unknown as there was no "official" definition (Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter, 2001). Maslach et al. (2001) states, "Different people used the term to mean very different things, so there was not always a basis for constructive communication about the problem and solutions for it" (p. 402). The term "burnout" is a relatively new concept created by Herbert Freudenberger. According to Freudenberger (1974), the definition of burnout is "to fail, wear out, or become exhausted by making excessive demands on energy, strength, or resources" (159). This definition was coined in 1974 by Freudenberger based on his experience as a director of a free clinic where he experienced this concept first-hand. Obviously one of the many responsibilities of this position is to retain the workers that are employed in this atmosphere. Freudenberger noticed his workers would burn out after approximately a year of work and they would exhibit irritability, high emotions, and risk taking in their daily activities (Freudenberger, 1974). Other behaviors that also appeared included rigidity, cynicism, and depression and he noticed that previously dedicated workers

would spend time at work, but they would not be as productive as they once were (Whitehead, 1989).

Freudenberger (as cited in Whitehead, 1989) later broadened his depiction of what burnout is several times and in 1986 he reported burnout as a problem for many jobs and not just human service occupations.

> Burnout is a process that comes about as a consequence of a depletion of energies, as well as feelings of being overwhelmed with many issues that may confront an individual. It is a result of a person's sense of dedication and commitment to a task or job, coupled with a need to prove oneself. In time, it impacts on a person's attitudes, perceptions and judgment (Freudenberger, 1986, p. 247 as cited in Whitehead, 1989).

Another leading researcher in the field of burnout is Christina Maslach. By collecting research from numerous individuals in varying fields of work, a slightly different definition appeared. Maslach (1982) states, "Burnout is a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind" (Maslach, 1982, p. 3). Furthermore, Maslach (1982) believes that burnout is essentially a response to the emotional strain of dealing with other people, specifically those with problems. Emotional exhaustion is at the core of the burnout syndrome. When a person is emotionally involved, is overextended and overwhelmed by the demands by other people, they may begin to feel drained and that their emotional resources are depleted (Maslach, 1982). Most individuals that feel this way would likely try to fix the situation, however the results of burnout can be detrimental. According to Maslach (1982), one method often used by many is to cut back on their involvement with others so their contact with people is essentially the bare minimum to get the job done. Unfortunately, when this occurs, these emotionally exhausted individuals become bureaucrats and when they have contact with people, the assistance given is generally formed by the policy rather than the individual needs (Maslach, 1982). The transformation then leads to detached feelings towards the population.

Depersonalization, the second aspect of Maslach's (1982) burnout syndrome, is the development of a detached, callous, and possibly dehumanized response. Essentially, a depersonalized individual views the population to which they are working with in a negative light, which can manifest in many ways. Maslach (1982) further states, "The provider may derogate other people and put them down, refuse to be civil and courteous to them, ignore their pleas and demands, or fail to provide the appropriate help, care, or service" (p. 4). This negative attitude towards others can often progress towards negative viewpoints on oneself. In the third aspect of burnout, reduced personal accomplishment, providers may feel inadequate about their abilities and with this low self-esteem, depression may occur (Maslach, 1982). The response to this feeling may lead to some form of treatment however they may also leave their jobs due to their work environment (Maslach, 1982).

Cherniss (1980) believes burnout is a transactional process consisting of three stages. Basing his knowledge on previous research, Cherniss (1980) suggests the first stage, stress, involves an imbalance between resources and demand. Essentially, the provider is faced with a population that is in high demand of resources however the resources are limited. Cherniss (1980) states, "The second stage is the immediate, short-term emotional response to this imbalance, characterized by feelings of anxiety, tension, fatigue, and exhaustion (strain)" (Cherniss, 1980, p. 17). In the final stage, the attitudes and behaviors begin to change and the tendency to treat clients becomes detached and mechanical in nature (Cherniss, 1980). After the provider realizes the resources needed to fulfill the population he or she is working with, that provider begins to feel the emotional response (strain) that occurs. In order for the provider to effectively manage this strain, he or she will attempt to cope by becoming detached or rigid in their working relationships with others. Cherniss (1980) further summarizes his definition by defining burnout as "a process in which a previously committed professional disengages from his or her work in response to stress and strain experienced on the job" (p. 18).

Veninga and Spradley (1981) examined burnout and defined it as "a debilitating psychological condition brought about by unrelieved work stress, which results in depleted

energy reserves, lowered resistance to illness, increased dissatisfaction and pessimism and increased absenteeism and inefficiency at work" (p. 6-7). This definition is noticeably similar to that of other researchers however Veninga and Spradley (1981) also suggest burnout occurs through distinct stages. In the first stage, the honeymoon stage, Veninga and Spradley (1981) suggest that individuals feel a strong sense of enthusiasm regarding their jobs. Most new employees, regardless of the type of job, have some form of desire to complete the tasks that are required and do so to the best of their ability. For those that seem to experience this stage for the majority of their employment experience, Veninga and Spradley (1981) suggest that they will feel as if there is a perfect match between the individual and the job. It appears as if those that experience the honeymoon stage for longer periods of time may not succumb to the stressors that may exist which could create a burned out individual. However, two significant events take place during this phase that can have long-range consequences. "First, in spite of our enthusiasm, even enjoyable stress uses up adaptation energy" (Veninga & Spradley, 1981, p. 41). In other words, an individual that is in the honeymoon stage and may not feel the full effect of stress may likely feel the effects in the future because they may not fully understand how to handle stress. Furthermore, individuals develop methods of dealing with the stress presented to them in their work environment however, if the strategies are ineffective, the burnout process can move into the next stage (Veninga & Spradley, 1981). The honeymoon stage can make an individual great at their job, however there still appears to be some form of energy depletion and if that individual does not "stock up" this energy then they will move into the next phase of burnout.

The loss of the energy exerted in the prior stage can lead to the second stage, fuel shortage. According to Veninga and Spradley (1981), many people begin to feel a sense of loss or disappointment surrounding their job. This individual is aware that the honeymoon stage is over and what was once an exciting job is now viewed as slightly uninspiring. Symptoms begin to appear in this stage and although they can vary for each person, common symptoms such as job dissatisfaction, inefficiency at work, fatigue, sleep disturbances and escaping activities

generally appear (Veninga & Spradley, 1981). While these symptoms begin to appear in this stage, they are relatively moderate and in some cases many go unnoticed or are attributed to something other than their job.

The individual that does not deal with the symptoms presented often move into the next stage, chronic symptoms. Veninga & Spradley (1981) state, "The third stage of job burnout usually begins with a rather profound feeling that 'something is happening to me'" (p. 57). For example, an individual that experiences sleep disturbances may move into sleepless nights. This same individual not only escapes normal activities but when they are surrounded with friends and family, they may be irritable or depressed. Chronic exhaustion, physical illness, anger and depression are experienced during this phase and visits to their physicians become more common (Veninga & Spradley, 1981). When in this stage, many people attempt to reverse these feelings, however the task may be difficult and if left untreated, stage four can occur.

Veninga and Spradley (1981) believe the gateway to this stage is marked by four significant changes: "1) Your symptoms become critical; 2) You become obsessed with your frustrations; 3) You become pessimistic; self-doubt permeate your thinking and; 4) You develop an 'escape mentality'" (p. 66). This individual is experiencing chronic symptoms as mentioned previously but then begins to focus more of their energy on work concerns. The majority of their time is spent thinking about the problems they are faced with at work and how to deal with them in order to remove the chronic symptoms that exist. Eventually, this person could realize that there is no "quick fix" that can help them and they may become negative about their outlook. Finally, this person reaches a point where they just want to "run away" from it all as it appears this would be the only way to fix the problem.

The final stage Veninga and Spradley (1981) report is hitting the wall. In their research, those that were in this stage experienced a complete energy depletion, they lost control of their lives and for some, ended their careers forever. This does not mean that these individuals simply stopped working but they stopped working in the environment that caused the burnout and would likely not return to jobs that are similar.

Other researchers that have completed studies on burnout have included the concept of tedium within their research. Pines, Aronson and Kafry (1981) believe both tedium and burnout are similar regarding symptomatology but have different origins. "Tedium can be the result of any prolonged chronic pressures (mental, physical, or emotional); burnout is the result of constant or repeated emotional pressure associated with an intense involvement with people over long period of times (Pines et. al., 1981, p. 15). Furthermore, Pines et. al. (1981) also believe three basic components exist to create both tedium and burnout. Physical exhaustion, the first component, is commonly exhibited by low energy, weakness and weariness and those that are burned out report more incidents of accidents, illness and changes in eating habits (Pines et. al., 1981). In the second component, emotional exhaustion, many people experience depression, hopelessness and entrapment that could lead to serious mental health concerns (Pines et al., 1981). Finally, mental exhaustion is apparent when individuals develop negative attitudes towards one's self, work and life (Pines et. al., 1981).

Later research conducted by Pines and Aronson (1988) define burnout similarly as described in 1981 however it does not mention tedium in its definition.

> Burnout is formally defined and subjectively experienced as a state of physical, emotional, and mental exhaustion caused by long-term involvement in situations that are emotionally demanding. The emotional demands are most often caused by a combination of very high expectations and chronic situational stresses. Burnout is accompanied by an array of symptoms including physical depletion, feelings of helplessness and hopelessness, disillusionment, and the development of a negative self-concept and negative attitudes towards work, people involved in the work, and life itself (Pines & Aronson, 1988, p. 9).

Since these leading researchers developed a working definition of burnout, other researchers have followed their lead with their own ideas of what constitutes burnout. Leiter (1991) suggests that burnout is a cognitive-emotional reaction to chronic stress in the field of human services. Lee and Ashforth (1993) conducted a study analyzing the burnout process and

found that emotional exhaustion also plays a central role. Furthermore, "job and life satisfaction, time spent with clients and subordinates, and role stress were associated directly with emotional exhaustion, and direct control and social support were associated indirectly with exhaustion" (Lee & Ashforth, 1993, p. 14). Dorman and Shapiro (2004) believe burnout occurs over time and those that are burned out feel emotionally exhausted and worn out. Zellars, Hochwarter, Perrewe, Hoffman and Ford (2004) suggest that pressures, such as cutbacks or shifting priorities, contribute to burnout.

In light of the numerous definitions of burnout that have been generated throughout the years, it is obvious that many similarities appear. Maslach, Schaufeli, and Leiter (2001) believe burnout has gone through two distinct phases of development: the pioneering phase and; the empirical phase. During the first phase, the research that was developed was generally exploratory and "their primary contribution was to describe the basic phenomenon, give it a name, and show that it was not an uncommon response" (Maslach, et al., 2001, p. 399). The development of this research not only contributed to a working definition but also showed some identifiable regularities in the human service profession. Maslach, et al. (2001) states, "First, it was clear that the provision of service or care can be a very demanding and involving occupation and that emotional exhaustion is not an uncommon response to such job overload" (p. 400). The demand of those that seek assistance of some form can be overwhelming and a constant pressure to accommodate those can lead to that emotional exhaustion. "The second component of depersonalization (cynicism) also emerged from these interviews, as people described how they tried to cope with the emotional stresses of their work" (Maslach, et al., 2001, p. 400). Those that feel this emotional strain begin to develop defense mechanisms to deal with what they are experiencing, however, this also can translate into a negative rapport with the population they are serving.

Following the pioneering phase, work produced during the 1980s and 1990s shifted focus which formed the empirical phase. Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter (2001) noted, "This work was more quantitative in nature, utilizing questionnaire and survey methodology and studying

larger subject populations" (p. 401). The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) was created as a tool to measure burnout among those in the human service profession although a second version was eventually created to accommodate those in the teaching profession as it became the most utilized tool to measure burnout (Maslach, et al., 2001). The results in the 1980s showed burnout as a form of job stress but also linked job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover as other potential concepts of interest and the development of research methods and designs on how to measure burnout, combined with the new information that was generated from those tools, eventually led researchers to expand their populations to other professions (Maslach, et al., 2001). The growth of research on burnout has contributed greatly to the field of human service professions as well as other professions by shedding light on what it is, what actually happens to an individual that is burned out, what types of professions are more likely to experience it, and the demographic characteristics of individuals that are most likely to be affected. Furthermore, the complete knowledge of burnout will also assist in creating an atmosphere of prevention and treatment for professions that are more likely to experience this phenomena.

2.4 Causes of Burnout

Burnout can occur for a variety of reasons in a variety of professions. This phenomenon is not limited to one specific profession, such as the field of human services. While it is important to fully understand the causes of burnout for all professions, previous research has focused more closely on the field of human services and therefore, will be discussed in greater detail.

Numerous studies exist on the various causes of burnout. Cherniss (1980) reported three possible sources of burnout: 1) organizational design; 2) the impact of supervisors and social support from staff and; 3) individual factors. The organizational design encompasses various aspects and structures of the job itself. Within the organizational design lies three components that Cherniss (1980) believes can be controlled by those responsible for its design. These components are role structure, power structure and normative structure.

The role structure of a human service profession is a determining factor to job stress and burnout and is defined as the way tasks and duties are allocated among specified roles (Cherniss, 1980). A human service professional may be faced with a myriad of different tasks to be accomplished during their work day. Filing paperwork, talking with clients, making referrals, updating information in the computer and answering phones may be only a handful of things that could occur in the workplace. While there may be individuals employed to answer the phones or file paperwork, the human service professional is still faced with the daily challenges of their job. Cherniss (1980) notes that, "Role overload probably is the most obvious type of conflict experienced by staff in human service programs" (p.81).

Role conflict and role ambiguity also contribute to professional burnout (Cherniss, 1980). A human service professional may be responsible for referring drug addicts to a rehabilitation facility that promotes a sober lifestyle by incorporating a specific religion in their teachings. That same professional may experience a conflict because they believe in a different religion or believe religion should remain separate all together. Within managing probationers, the probation officer may feel more inclined to help the offender with his/her drug problem however the policies of the department strongly promote the interest of the community first. Cherniss (1980) believes that conflict and stress are produced when the role demands are inconsistent with the professional's abilities or goals, values and beliefs.

On the other hand, role ambiguity occurs when the professional lacks sufficient knowledge or information to effectively complete the job (Cherniss, 1980). This might occur when a probation officer who is responsible for providing referrals for drug education classes is unaware of the resources that exist in the community. To make matters worse, that officer may have been employed by the department for a relatively short period of time and have no formalized training to assist them in effectively managing a caseload. This officer might feel the strain of role ambiguity which could, in turn, lead to burnout.

Decisions within an organization that impact the professional also contribute to burnout and are referred to as the power structure (Cherniss, 1980). Hierarchical decision-making,

decisions made by a supervisory person or group, can contribute to stress and burnout because it reduces the autonomy and control of the staff. For example, the probation officers for a specific department believe the allocation of funds received should be distributed to more rehabilitation facilities yet the director believes this money would be better suited towards anger management facilities. Understandably, the probation officers may feel helpless towards assisting the population. They may believe that management will not listen to what their employees have to say and they may feel the decision-making process does not include those that work with the population on a daily basis.

Management may also change a specific policy regarding how the work is done without any form of feedback from those that are affected. This change could be positive for those that are employed and create less stress and burnout however it could also be damaging as well. An example of how this could manifest in probation work is if a probation officer was required to complete the task of a home visit for his/her population but changes were made, additional personnel were hired and now specialized officers within the department complete home visits for the probation officer. Obviously, this contributes to easing the workload of that probation officer by focusing their work specifically on the office visits of those that are on probation. If, on the other hand, the change of removing the specialized officer for field visits were to occur and probation officers were once again required to conduct home visits, the outcome would likely be negative. "When a high degree of bureaucratization limits the staff person's autonomy and control over his or her working conditions, job stress and burnout occur more frequently" (Cherniss, 1980, p.101).

The third component in the organizational design is the normative structure or the goals, norms, and ideologies of the human service programs (Cherniss, 1980). Most programs and departments have a set of goals in place in order to guide the professional in their everyday activities on the job. Cherniss (1980) suggests that these goals can be very general and vague and the connection between the goals and the day-to-day operations of the professional can be small. For example, a possible goal of a probation department is to reduce the number of

unemployed probationers. In theory, this is a good idea however, in practice it may be another story. The probation officer is knowledgeable of the goal but is also forced to find a way to get their population employed which presents another task to the already busy officer.

The second source of burnout is the impact of supervision and social support from staff (Cherniss, 1980). The relationship between the professional and their coworkers can obviously have an impact on their jobs. Cherniss (1980) further notes, "Of all the social interactions that influence job stress and the coping process in human service settings, the relationship between the supervisor and the worker is especially important" (p. 113). Supervisors monitor the work of their subordinates, maintain accountability, communicate the decisions of the administration and take on the leadership role (Cherniss, 1980). A new employee looks to their supervisor for knowledge and assistance in the tasks they are responsible for. If the supervisor is not knowledgeable about the job at hand, does not communicate effectively with the new employee, and/or is not an effective leader, that employee may experience a more stressful job setting and would likely experience job burnout.

Interactions between colleagues can also contribute to burnout. Talking with colleagues about work problems can be a positive experience that can reduce tension and help the professional understand their job (Cherniss, 1980). Colleagues can assist the supervisors in training new employees on the ins and outs of the job as well as provide feedback that new employees need. Relationships among colleagues can also provide a strong form of communication when dealing with administrative policies that may be conflicting (Cherniss, 1980). In other words, a potential change of a policy in a department occurs and when professionals become aware of the changes, they may believe that it is not in the best interest of their jobs. As a collaborative group, they could effectively persuade the administration to rethink the change that may occur. A few individuals approaching the subject will not be as effective as a large group of people. Obviously, a negative relationship among peers in a work setting could have detrimental effects as individuals begin to feel the strain of this negative relationship.

Finally, Cherniss (1980) discusses individual factors that contribute to job stress and burnout. The organizational structure and relationships among supervisors and peers may be an issue to the individual professional however people differ in their vulnerability to stress and in their coping effectiveness (Cherniss, 1980). Accordingly, certain personality traits, career goals, previous experience and the amount of social support and stress experienced outside of work plays a role in burnout (Cherniss, 1980). While this information is equally as important as other contributors to burnout, it will not be discussed in depth as they were not examined in this research.

Since Cherniss' (1980) research, others have followed with their own research on the causes of burnout. Maslach (1982) reported some causes of burnout that are very similar to that of Cherniss (1980). Personality characteristics and the job setting are two subjects that contribute to burnout however Maslach (1982) also includes involvement with people as another contributor. Some aspects of working with people are similar to that of Cherniss (1980) such as role conflict, however Maslach (1982) takes this one step further and suggests that there is a shift in the professional's view of people, from positive to negative. "People are viewed in more cynical and derogatory terms, and the caregiver may begin to develop a low opinion of their capabilities and their worth as human beings" (Maslach, 1982, p. 17). The very structure of the helping profession also promotes a negative view of others within the relationship. Four critical aspects of this include: the focus on problems; the lack of positive feedback; the level of emotional stress and; the perceived possibility of change or improvement (Maslach, 1982).

Professionals employed in the helping profession are faced with individuals that have problems. In many cases, professionals only ask about negative information often believing that the cause of the problem is located in some other negative aspect of the person (Maslach, 1982). For example, a person that is on probation is visiting their probation officer and tells that officer that they are unable to find a decent job. Unfortunately, that person is also addicted to drugs and therefore, the addiction may be the root of the initial problem. Additionally, the professional rarely sees the positive aspects of those they serve. The purpose of that

professional is to assist him/her with problems however once the problem disappears, the professional never sees the impact they may have made (Maslach, 1982). “Because of this continuous and limited focus on people’s problems and flaws, it is not surprising that professional helpers begin to develop a negative and rather cynical view of human nature” (Maslach, 1982, p.19).

Lack of positive feedback is another possible cause of burnout reported by Maslach (1982). It is safe to assume that most people appreciate positive feedback from their boss or from those they serve, regardless of the industry they work in. In this case, the feedback received is generally negative or nonexistent (Maslach, 1982). In the case of the probationer visiting the probation officer, the probationer will likely inform the officer that they cannot find a job while the officer refers the probationer to an employment agency. Perhaps the probationer gets a job through that agency however the next time they report, the probationer tells the officer the income is too low. Rather than thanking the officer for the job, the officer is told that the job is not good enough. Furthermore, Maslach (1982) states, “Helpers are also on the receiving end of some very strong emotions of anger, fear, and frustration” (p. 20). The probationer could be angry for being on probation to begin with and while it is not the officer’s fault, they generally feel the brunt of the emotion. Unfortunately, all too often the professional in a human service setting is expected to provide assistance to those in need and because of that expectation, the professional is often overlooked when positive feedback is concerned.

Finally, Maslach (1982) believes another cause of burnout is linked to the level of emotional stress. If the nature of the contact is especially upsetting or depressing, the professional may develop stronger negative perceptions of their clients (Maslach, 1982). Probation officers supervising a sex offender caseload may be particularly susceptible to this aspect of burnout. While many cases of this nature could be troubling to society, the probation officer has to come in contact with these individuals on a daily basis. They know what the probationer has done to become a registered sex offender and this knowledge can be very

upsetting for many professionals. The constant exposure to this population can only enhance the likelihood of experiencing burnout.

Pines and Aronson (1988) believe those that are employed in a human service profession have three common characteristics: “1) they perform emotionally taxing work; 2) they share certain personality characteristics that made them choose human service as a career; and 3) they share a ‘client-centered’ orientation” (p.84). Similarly to Maslach (1982), the constant demand to give emotionally at work can cause burnout and stress on the job (Pines & Aronson, 1988). Professionals are constantly working with individuals that have some sort of problem and it is their job to assist that person in correcting that problem. Interestingly, when a professional feels as though they have failed a client, they may believe that it reflects their competency as a professional as well as a person (Pines & Aronson, 1988).

The personality characteristics of those that choose the human service profession are also unique. Pines & Aronson (1988) state, that most times those who choose to help others in a profession are individuals who are particularly sensitive to the needs of others. Professionals in this industry essentially have to be cognizant of the needs of others as this will assist them in being an effective worker. For example, a professional business-oriented individual may be looking for the advancement of his or her company and is not in the frame of mind of helping others as long as the bottom line is met monthly. This professional is not inclined to work in a human service setting to try and find out what problems exists for their clients. This is not to say those that are in the business industry are not helping individuals but merely are more concerned with monetary success, rather than human success. Unfortunately for those that work in the human service industry, the personality characteristics that make them effective workers can also harm them. This can be the case because “People who enter human service careers have other traits that make them vulnerable to the emotional stresses inherent to their professions” (Pines & Aronson, 1988, p. 87). A common example is Alcoholic Anonymous (AA) meetings. A recovering alcoholic attends an AA meeting led by an individual that was once an alcoholic themselves. The leader is very knowledgeable about common issues that occur when

in recovery which makes him or her very effective at their job. Unfortunately, the leader is still a recovering alcoholic and still has to face issues within their own life but also assist others in recovering as well. With the added stress, the leader of the AA meeting may feel the effects of burnout as they deal with being in recovery all day, every day.

The third cause of burnout cited by Pines and Aronson (1988), the "client-centered" orientation, which refers to the focus being on the individuals receiving the service. The professional maintains the role of helping and providing support based on the client's needs; an asymmetrical relationship exists and the needs of the professional are overlooked (Pines & Aronson, 1988). For example, a probation officer has a client that not only has legal issues but has 5 children, no formal education, is unemployed and recently received notice that their electricity is going to be turned off because they can't pay the bill. The probation officer may be facing the issue of not being able to pay a credit card bill on time, however that officer may then realize that their problem is rather minor when compared to this client and proceeds to forget about it. While this example may seem ridiculous, the reality is that the issue was never addressed and it could snowball into something greater later on. If the issues of the officer are never dealt with then the officer is susceptible to burnout on the job or perhaps something worse such as a psychological health issue.

Maslach & Leiter (1997) believe the cause of burnout is associated with several factors. Work overload, or the intensity, the complexity or the demands of the job, all impact burnout for professionals (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Many professions have become increasingly busy with everyday tasks that must be accomplished in any given day. The increases in duties contribute to the amount of time that is devoted to the job. In other words, more work for the professional requires more time at work to complete the tasks. Also, many tasks can become complicated, especially when working with individuals as no two people are exactly alike.

Another contributing factor to burnout is attributed to a lack of control (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Similar to the ideas presented by Cherniss (1980) earlier, many professionals are affected by the policies and procedures of the organizations they work for. Decisions

implemented by the administration can hinder the ability of the professional and thereby contribute to burnout. In order to possibly counter this reaction, many times organizations implement rewards to their staff.

Insufficient reward is also another contributing factor to burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Rewards can be recognition, promotions or raises in salary. In many cases, organizations do not produce revenue, especially in human service settings, and monetary rewards are rare. If a restructuring of the organization should occur, many times professionals are faced with more downsizing which also contributes to higher workloads for those employed (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). Another possibility is the lack of career advancement when downsizing occurs (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). As the organization attempts to remove positions within the organization that is not cost-effective, positions no longer exist which lower the possibilities for advancement. Finally, the downsizing also creates an atmosphere of stress for the employees as their position may be the one that is cut. “Job security is a reward in itself, as well as the means through which other rewards occur” (Maslach & Leiter, 1997, p. 47).

A breakdown of the working community is also a contributing factor in burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). If an organization experiences more work, opportunities for working with other individuals can diminish as the workload increases. The lack of group work can create various issues within any organization. Personal relationships that were once developed at work slowly deteriorate, and teamwork becomes a thing of the past (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). If no communication exists between professionals, it is likely a conflict will occur and this can only hinder the organization as well as contribute to burnout on the job.

Absence of fairness and conflicting values are the last two factors contributing to burnout (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). In order for a workplace to be considered fair, Maslach and Leiter (1997) suggest three key elements must be present: trust, openness and respect. In most professions, administrators must be able to trust their employees and vice versa. As stated previously, administrators are responsible for setting goals and policies for an organization. If a lack of trust exists between administrators and employees, the employee may become weary of

those new policies and ultimately ignore them. Being open with employees can create perceptions of fairness in the workplace, however a lack of communication can create more issues. Maslach and Leiter (1997) also suggest that too much communication can be harmful to employees. For example, if an organization is experiencing a financial shortfall, the likely course of action would be to reduce the size of the organization. If the administration were to inform the employees of what exactly is going on, employees would likely experience more stress which could then contribute to burnout. It would be reasonable to assume that some people would likely want to know this information, however, what if the organization found another way of handling the situation without layoffs? Creating stress among the employees would seem unreasonable as it could have been avoided.

Finally, conflicting values between the professional and the job also pose a threat to increasing burnout. Maslach & Leiter (1997) elaborate by stating, “Values influence everything about your relationship with work" (p. 55). Similar to that of other researchers, the values of the professional can create a conflict with the daily activities they do. Interestingly, an organization that promotes one thing but does another is also a form of value conflict (Maslach & Leiter, 1997). For example, an organization promotes to the public an image of an organization that is caring and provides an enormous amount of resources to those that are unemployed when in actuality, the organization has very limited resources and has not been able to provide much assistance to many of those that seek help. It would seem reasonable for the professionals in this atmosphere to become frustrated as they cannot effectively assist those that need help.

Later research conducted by Maslach, Schaufeli and Leiter (2001) classified burnout into two categories: situational factors and individual factors. Similar to previous research conducted on the causes of burnout, situational characteristics include job characteristics, occupational characteristics and organizational characteristics. Quantitative job demands (work overload), qualitative job demands (role conflict; role ambiguity) and the absence of job resources such as a social support system encompass the job characteristics that can contribute to burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Occupational characteristics include

the emotional challenges associated in working with other people in a caregiving role however the type of job can also contribute to burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). A study conducted by Schaufeli & Enzmann (as cited in Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter, 2001) revealed law enforcement officers had high levels of cynicism and inefficacy and low levels of exhaustion. While this is important, Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter (2001) also make note of the fact that other variables, such as gender, must be taken in to account. Specifically in the law enforcement profession, males are the dominate gender in this profession and cynisism is generally high for males (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). In light of this information, it is difficult to determine without a doubt that the law enforcement profession creates cynisism.

The organizational characteristics include the operating rules, resources and hierarchies that are within the occupation as well as its shape developed by social, cultural, and economic forces (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). The policies, available external resources and the layout of the administration can all impact the likelihood of burnout. Interestingly, outside sources, such as the community, can make an impact as well. For example, funding for many programs are regulated by the government or other providers. Unfortunately, when the money is provided to an agency, rules may also be attached which could inhibit the ability of the professional. Furthermore, cultural aspects also contribute to an organization's procedures as certain cultures may prohibit certain resources. In these cases, a client may not be given all possible resources due to funding or cultural constraints which could contribute to frustration for the professional.

Individual factors such as demographic characteristics, personality characteristics and job attitudes have also been found to contribute to burnout however these relationships are not as strong as the others mentioned (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Of all demographic variables that have been studied, age has consistantly been related to burnout and those under the age of 30 have been more inclined to experience burnout (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Gender and marital status could contribute to burnout however previous research indicates mixed findings (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). Those with higher educational

levels report higher levels of burnout, however Maslach, Schaufeli & Leiter (2001) believe that other variables such as more responsiblities or high expectations for a paticular job may not be met.

Personality traits have also been studied and while the results are generally mixed, a study of the “Big Five” personality dimensions found that burnout is linked to neuroticism (trait anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness and vulnerability) (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). It is also unclear whether job attitudes contribute to burnout as there appears to be limited research in this particular field. However, high expectations in the nature of the work and the likelihood of achieving success could have an impact (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). A new professional may be initially excited about their new job and the responsibilities they may be faced with. They may also be ambitious and have the expectation of being promoted however reality may set in and the organization is not what they expected and the likelihood of a promotion may disappear with time as they see how difficult it is to accomplish.

While there are no studies regarding the decisions made by probation officers and the relation to burnout were found, several studies conducted on burnout and law enforcement officers do exist. Kop, Euwema, & Schaufeli (1999) examined Dutch police officers and found that organizational stressors were more prevalent then task-related stressors and that burnout is positively related to the attitudes towards the use of violence, as well as the actual use of violence while on the job. Spano (2004) conducted a study that included burnout in relation to observational skills. Interestingly, Spano (2004) found that those who experienced more burnout were inclined to document more suspects per encounter, which contradicted his hypothesis that higher burnout would show the officer's "cutting corners" while documenting incidents. Similar to the previous study conducted by Kop, Euwema, & Schaufeli (1999), Manzoni & Eisner (2006) conducted a study on job stress, burnout, and job satisfacion among police officers in Zurich, Switzerland. It was believed that higher stress would be one of the causes to higher use of force among police officers however, this was not the case. Initially, Manzoni & Eisner (2006) conducted bivariate correlations and the results revealed that officers who applied more force

against citizens were more cynical and more emotinally exhausted. These results changed once a multivariate analysis was conducted. When Manzoni & Eisner (2006) controlled for other variables, the results were no longer significant. Martinussen, Richardsen, & Burke (2007) conducted research on burnout and police officers in Norway and found that the overall burnout level of police officers was not high when comparing it to other occupational groups sampled. Furthermore, police officers who experienced high levels of exhaustion and cynicism also experienced low job satisfaction, committment and often thought about quitting their job (Martinussen, Richardsen, & Burke, 2007).

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The population examined in this thesis involved adult probation officers employed by Tarrant County, Texas during the winter of 2008 through 2009. The Director of Tarrant County Adult Probation agreed to have this study completed within the department and provided a signed letter of approval. The population consisted of approximately 350 probation officers employed in Tarrant County, Texas, however the job titles of the officers vary. Regular probation officers consist of those that supervise offenders that have committed felonies or misdemeanors. Court officers are those that complete presentence investigation reports to present to the court as well as cases coming out of and back through the court for violations and/or terminations. Specialized caseload officers consist of officers that primarily monitor sex offenders, offenders with domestic violence cases, high risk offenders, offenders that have completed residential drug treatment, offenders with mental health concerns, offenders whose cases have been transferred to another county or state, offenders on electronic monitoring and offenders that have pending cases and have been released from jail on bond. Finally, Tarrant County also has officers that have credentials to be classified as counselors to assist with aftercare programs for those that have completed residential treatments for their drug addictions.

A survey was distributed to each potential participant through the use of the internet as this was the best way to reach all officers during the timeframe allotted. A warning email was generated and distributed to each officer notifying them of the survey. The email informed each possible participant of the purpose of the survey, knowledge that the participant may not complete the survey or refrain from answering any question without repercussions, contact information for any questions or comments regarding the survey and consent to participate in

this research. Approximately one week after notifying each officer of this survey, each officer again received notification of information regarding the survey, however an internet link was provided for each possible participant that contained a web address to complete the survey if they so chose. Those probation officers that went to the web address provided were again notified of consent to complete the survey. Those that agreed to participate indicated this by clicking a button that stated they agreed to do so.

Approximately ten days after sending the link to the survey, another email was generated as a reminder of the survey. Again, this email explained the purpose of this survey as well as an explanation of consent to participate. The link to the survey was also attached to this email. Slightly over one month after the link was initially distributed to Tarrant County Adult Probation, a final email was sent reminding each officer of the survey that included an explanation of consent to participate, the link to the survey and notification that the website would no longer be available after approximately one week.

The survey consisted of three sections. The first section presented five hypothetical probationers that the participant is currently monitoring. Each probationer was gender neutral or did not indicate whether or not the probationer was male or female. In each scenario, the participant was given the offense for which the hypothetical offender received probation, a brief criminal history and a general statement informing them of the offender's progress on probation. The participant was then asked to rank the offender's risk to the public using a 5-point Likert scale, with 1 being the lowest risk and 5 being the highest risk. The participant was then presented with a technical violation for the same hypothetical offender and was asked to provide their most likely course of action. It is important to note that the answers provided were grouped into 5 possible outcomes, however there are numerous other alternatives that exist within the department that may be used to address a violation of probation. The possible answers provided were the following: a) violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke; b) violate and request judicial review; c) consult a supervisor on the next course of action; d) wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision and; e) none of the

above. Finally, each participant was told that the same hypothetical offender with the same technical violation was then faced with a pending motion to revoke their probation and the officer was requested to testify in court, giving their recommendation. The possible recommendations provided included the following: a) revoke with maximum amount of prison time; b) revoke with minimum amount of prison time; c) continue on probation with a sanction of jail time; d) continue on probation with a sanction of modified conditions of probation not to include jail time and; e) none of the above.

The first hypothetical probationer was placed on probation for an assault that involved family violence. The probationer had no prior arrests and was participating in court ordered anger management. The technical violation presented for this probationer indicated this individual had tested positive for marijuana five times in the first 6 months of probation. The second probationer was placed on probation for possession of a controlled substance, specifically methamphetamine. Approximately five years prior to the probation case, this probationer was convicted of aggravated assault, however there are no other arrests indicated on the criminal history. Also, this probationer is married, has two children and is currently employed. The technical violation presented indicated a positive drug test for methamphetamine. It was also stated that this probationer recently became divorced and had missed a scheduled appointment with probation, however the appointment was rescheduled and the probationer reported.

The third scenario involved a probationer that had committed an unauthorized use of a motor vehicle, or vehicle theft. This probationer's criminal history included 3 prior convictions of possession of a controlled substance and one burglary of a habitation. This probationer has also recently completed all of their community service hours that were imposed as a court ordered condition. The technical violation that was presented told the participant that the probationer moved from their residence approximately one month ago. Also, the listed phone numbers for this probationer are no longer working or invalid.

The fourth scenario involved a probationer that had committed an aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon. The probationer's criminal history includes one possession of a controlled substance, 3 possessions of marijuana, 2 unauthorized uses of a motor vehicle, and 1 burglary of a building. The participant is presented with the violation of travelling to another city 3 times a month without the knowledge of the officer. The probationer's travels are confirmed by a fax that was received showing a bus ticket with the probationer's name on it. Finally, the fifth scenario involved a probationer convicted of their third DWI charge. This probationer has an interlock device, or a device that requires the driver to blow air to determine alcohol consumption, on their vehicle. The probationer's criminal history includes 4 manufacturing and delivery of a controlled substance, 2 DWIs, 1 theft of $1500, 1 unlawful possession of a firearm and 5 DWLS convictions. This probationer was recently released from the monitoring system but has tested positive 4 times for PCP and is associating with known gang members.

The second section of the survey involved a 5-point Likert scale with 9 different statements. The participant was asked to indicate how strongly they agreed or disagreed with each statement. These statements were generated with the understanding that burnout can occur when certain organizational characteristics, personality characteristics and employment attitudes are present. The first statement presented, "I am appreciated by my coworkers for the work that I do", was to determine the level of appreciation perceived by the participant's colleagues. The second statement presented was to determine whether or not they felt their caseloads were too large. The third and fourth statement examined the perceptions of their role as a probation officer. The participants were presented with "The main goal of my job is to protect the public" and "The main goal of my job is to rehabilitate the probationer." The fifth statement was created in order to see if the policies of the department prohibit the officer's ability to complete their work responsibilities. The final four statements were included in order to determine an overall perception of burnout. Each participant was provided the following: I love

my job; I am burned out by my job; I feel a lot of stress when I am at work and; I often think about quitting my job.

The third and final section of the survey asked for the demographics of each participant. The demographics included gender, age, race, education, years of experience as a probation officer, the rank of the participant, their job description and the size of their caseloads. The rank of the participant can vary and includes Community Supervision Officer I, Community Supervision Officer II, Supervisor and other. The options presented regarding their respective job description included regular probation officer, court officer, intensive supervision officer, specialized officer and other.

There were approximately 350 possible participants employed at Tarrant County Adult probation and 78 individuals completed the survey. One participant agreed to complete the survey, however that individual did not answer any questions which brought the total number of valid participants to 77. The response rate was 22%. As depicted in Table 3.1, 74% of the sample were female and 24.7% were male with one participant omitting this question. The age of the participants varied with the youngest participant being approximately 23 years old and the oldest was approximately 67 years old. Several participants failed to include their age with 7.8% of the sample not responding. Of the remaining participants, 10.4% were between the ages of 60 to 69 years old; 20.8% were between 50 to 59 years old; 16.9% were between 40 to 49 years old; 26% were between 30 to 39 years old and; 18.2% were between 20 to 29 years old (See Table 3.1).

The majority of the participants (67.5%) reported being Caucasian. The remaining participants were African American (13%), Hispanic (10.4%), Asian (1.3%), Other race (3.9%) and those that did not answer (3.9%). Those that answered "Other" were also asked to specify their race and the three that selected this answer stated they were Native American. (See Table 5.1) The majority of the participants had attained a Bachelor's degree (64.9%). The remaining participants had completed some graduate course work but did not earn a graduate degree (15.6%), and some had earned a graduate degree (19.5%) (See Table 3.2).

Table 3.1 Gender, Age and Race

	N	%
Gender		
Male	19	24.7
Female	57	74.0
Unknown	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0
Age		
20-29	14	18.2
30-39	20	26.0
40-49	13	16.9
50-59	16	20.8
60-69	8	10.4
Unknown	6	7.8
Total	77	100.0
Race		
African American	10	13.0
Asian	1	1.3
Caucasian	52	67.5
Hispanic	8	10.4
Other	3	3.9
Unknown	3	3.9
Total	77	100.0

The participants' years of experience as a probation officer varied greatly. Only one participant refrained from answering this question, while 13% reported 1 year or less of experience; 26% reported 2 to 5 years of experience; 14.3% reported 6 to 10 years; 19.5%

reported 11 to 15 years; 11.7% reported 16 to 20 years; 9.1% reported 21 to 25 years; 2.6% reported 26 to 30 years; and 2.6% reported 31 or more years of experience as a probation officer (See Table 3.2). The rank of the participants revealed a majority reporting being a Community Supervision Officer I (74%). The number of participants reporting their rank as being a Community Supervision Officer II was 3.9% and those that were Supervisors was 15.6%. Approximately 4% of the participants refrained from answering this question while 2.6% reported "Other" as their rank. Those that selected other were asked to specify what their ranks were. Those participants indicated being a Senior Court Officer within the department (See Table 3.3).

Table 3.2 Education and Experience

	N	%
Education		
Bachelor's Degree	50	64.9
Some graduate course work, but did not earn a degree	12	15.6
Graduate Degree	15	19.5
Total	77	100.0
Years of Experience		
1 year or less	10	13.0
2-5	20	26.0
6-10	11	14.3
11-15	15	19.5
16-20	9	11.7
21-25	7	9.1
26-30	2	2.6
31>	2	2.6
Unknown	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0

Additionally, all participants were asked what their job description was within the department. Regular probation officers accounted for 32.5%, court officers were 10.4%, specialized caseload officers were 26%, those that selected "other" were 24.7% and 6.5% of

the population refrained from answering this question. Those that reported being a specialized caseload officer were asked to report their job description. While 30% of those that indicated specialized caseload officer did not specify their job description, 20% indicated they worked with mental health probationers, 15% worked with those that were in or released from a drug treatment facility, 15% worked with sex offenders, 10% considered themselves as counselors, 5% reported monitoring those that are on bond and 5% reported working with those that spoke only Spanish. Those that responded with "other" were also asked to specify their job description as well. The majority of the participants indicated they were a supervisor of some kind (42.1%). Furthermore, these supervisors also varied in their job descriptions as several indicated they were bond unit supervisors and field unit supervisors. One participant indicated they were a specialized caseload supervisor and the final supervisor indicated they worked in the court services. Slightly over 20% of those that responded indicated they were training officers (10.5%) or a pre-sentence investigators for the court (10.5%). Two participants reported being an employment coach for the probationers and two participants failed to specify their job description. One participant indicated they worked in pre-trial diversion, one participant reported working in victim services and one participant reported working as an intensive day treatment officer (See Table 3.3).

Finally, all the participants were asked to report the size of their caseload, or the number of probationers they monitor per month. Of the 77 participants that participated in this survey, only 1.3% or 1 participant failed to respond to this question. Approximately 20% of those that responded indicated they monitor between 1 and 50 probationers, 18.2% of the participants indicated they monitor 51 to 100 probationers while 28.6%, indicated they monitored between 101 to 150 probationers. Finally, 13% of the participants indicated they monitor approximately 151 to 200 probations while 18.2% reported not having a caseload, or probationers, to monitor (See Table 3.3).

Table 3.3 Rank, Job Description and Caseload Size

	N	%
Rank		
CSO I	57	74.0
CSO II	3	3.9
Supervisor	12	15.6
Other	2	2.6
Unknown	3	3.9
Total	77	100.0
Job Description		
Regular Probation Officer	25	32.5
Court Officer	8	10.4
Specialized Caseload Officer	20	26.0
Other	19	24.7
Unknown	5	6.5
Total	77	100.0
Caseload Size		
1-50	16	20.8
51-100	14	18.2
101-150	22	28.6
151-200	10	13.0
I do not have a caseload	14	18.2
Unknown	1	1.3
Total	77	100.0

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

A frequency analysis was run on the first four scenarios presented to each participant. The fifth scenario was removed from the analysis due to the wording of the technical violation presented. Specifically, the offender presented initially had an interlock device, however the technical violation reported the use of an electronic monitoring device. These devices are 2 separate, and very different, forms of monitoring systems. While the responses regarding risk assessment may not have been hindered, the fifth scenario was entirely eliminated as the validity of the responses, once the technical violation was presented and the recommendation made to the court, could be effected. The responses presented in the first question of each scenario, or the risk assessment, were recoded from a scale of 1 through 5 to a scale of 1 through 3 where 1 signifies a low risk while 3 signifies a high risk to the community. All four scenarios were modified in this way to simplify responses while conducting the analysis. When asked to assess the risk of the probationer presented in the first scenario, 44.2% reported a low risk, 42.9% reported a moderate risk and 13% believed this probationer to be a high risk to the community (See Table 4.1). The technical violation was then presented with 20.8% requesting a warrant for the probationer's arrest and a motion to revoke their probation. The majority of the participants (39.0%) believed the probationer should be violated, however they requested a judicial review. No participant felt they needed to consult a supervisor for their next course of action, while 9.1% believed they should wait for the next visit by the probationer to determine the next course of action. Finally, 31.2% felt that none of the possible outcomes presented would be their most likely course of action in this particular scenario (See Table 4.2). While the majority of the participants felt they would request a warrant and a motion to revoke their probation, a different picture emerges when presented with the opportunity to actually revoke

the probationer. Approximately 2.0% reported recommending revocation with the maximum amount of prison time and 1.3% reported revocation with the minimum amount of prison time. The majority of the participants felt they would continue on probation with some jail time as a sanction (32.5%) or continue on probation with some form of sanction other than jail time (48.1%). One participant failed to respond to this particular question and 14.3% reported their recommendation as something other than the possible choices presented (See Table 4.3).

In the second scenario, 6.5% believed this probationer to be a low risk. Approximately 44% believed this probationer to be a moderate risk and 49.4% reported a high risk posed to the community (See Table 4.1). Once the participant was presented with a technical violation, only one person felt this probationer should receive a warrant and a motion to revoke their probation. Approximately 11% believed this probationer should receive a violation, however they requested a judicial review, 37.7% believed they would consult a supervisor for further action, 14.3% would wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision and 35.1% felt their next course of action was something other than the ones presented (See Table 4.2). Finally, when the participant was forced to make a recommendation based on the knowledge of the technical violation, 3.9% revoked the probationer and requested the maximum amount of prison time; 1.3% recommended revocation with a minimum amount of prison time; 39.0% would continue on probation but receive a sanction of some jail time; 45.5% would continue on probation and receive a modification of their conditions that do not include jail time; and 10.4% reported none of the options presented (See Table 4.3).

In the third scenario, 6.5% believed the probationer to be of a low risk. Approximately 14% felt the probationer was a moderate risk to the community and 79.2% of the participants felt the probationer presented was a high risk to the community (See Table 4.1). Approximately 24% would have requested a motion to revoke and a warrant for the probationer's arrest once the technical violation was presented. Furthermore, 10.4% would ask for a judicial review, 20.8% would consult a supervisor for their next course of action, 33.8% would wait for the next appointment with the probationer, and 10.4% would have done something other than what was

presented (See Table 4.2). When asked to give a recommendation regarding the pending motion to revoke, 16.9% would have recommended revocation with a maximum amount of prison time; 13.0% would revoke with a minimum amount of prison time; 36.4% would continue the probation, however include a sanction of some jail time; 19.5% would continue on probation but modify their conditions of probation; and 13.0% would do none of the options presented (See Table 4.3).

Finally, the probationer in the fourth scenario presented appears to be of the highest risk to the community, according to the participants. There were no participants that classified this probationer as either a low risk or a moderate risk. This particular hypothetical probationer was considered a high risk to the community by all participants (See Table 4.1). After the technical violation is presented, 16.9% reported their next course of action would be a warrant and a motion to revoke their probation; 31.2% would request a judicial review; 22.1% would consult a supervisor; 20.8% would wait for the next appointment before making a decision; and 9.1% would do none of the options presented. (See Table 4.2) Finally, when asked to make a recommendation to the court regarding the motion to revoke, 36.4% reported revocation with a maximum amount of prison time; 15.6% reported revocation with a minimum amount of prison time; 32.5% reported they would continue the probationer on probation, however they would recommend a sanction in the form of some jail time; 7.8% would continue on probation with a sanction other than jail time; and 6.5% would recommend something other than what was presented. Only one participant failed to make a recommendation in this section of the scenario (See Table 4.3).

Table 4.1 Risks to the Community

	Scenario 1	**Scenario 2**	**Scenario 3**	**Scenario 4**
Low Risk (n)	44.2% (34)	6.5% (5)	6.5% (5)	0.0% (0)
Moderate Risk (n)	42.9% (33)	44.2% (34)	14.3% (11)	0.0% (0)
High Risk (n)	13.0% (10)	49.4% (38)	79.2% (61)	100.0% (77)
Total (n)	100.0% (77)	100.0% (77)	100.0% (77)	100.0% (77)

Table 4.2 Action Taken by Probation Officer once Technical Violation Presented

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Violate; Request warrant and motion to revoke (n)	20.8% (16)	1.3% (1)	24.7% (19)	16.9% (13)
Violate; Request Judicial Review (n)	39.0% (30)	11.7% (9)	10.4% (8)	31.2% (24)
Consult a supervisor on next course of action (n)	0.0% (0)	37.7% (29)	20.8% (16)	22.1% (17)
Wait for next appointment and then make a decision (n)	9.1% (7)	14.3% (11)	33.8% (26)	20.8% (16)
None of the Above (n)	31.2% (24)	35.1% (27)	10.4% (8)	9.1% (7)
Total (n)	100% (77)	100% (77)	100% (77)	100% (77)

Table 4.3 Recommendation to the Court

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Scenario 4
Revoke; Maximum amount of prison time (n)	2.6% (2)	3.9% (3)	16.9% (13)	36.4% (28)
Revoke; Minimum amount of prison time (n)	1.3% (1)	1.3% (1)	13.0% (10)	15.6% (12)
Continue on probation; sanction; jail time (n)	32.5% (25)	39.0% (30)	36.4% (28)	32.5% (25)
Continue on probation; sanction; conditions modified (not including jail time) (n)	48.1% (37)	45.5% (35)	19.5% (15)	7.8% (6)
None of the above (n)	14.3% (11)	10.4% (8)	13.0% (10)	6.5% (5)
Missing (n)	1.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)	1.3% (1)
Total (n)	100% (77)	100% (77)	100% (77)	100% (77)

Another frequency analysis was conducted on the second section of the survey. In this section, each participant was given a statement and asked to rate how strongly they agreed or disagreed using a 5-point Likert Scale. The responses were then recoded from a scale of 1

through 5 to a scale of 1 through 3 where 1 signified disagreement, 2 was uncertain or neutral and 3 was agreement. Again, this was done in order to simplify the responses while completing the analysis. The majority of the participants felt that they were appreciated by their coworkers (76.6%). Approximately 7% felt they were not appreciated by their coworkers, 13% remained uncertain and 2.6% did not respond to this statement (See Table 4.4). Slightly over half of the participants believe their caseload size was too large (53.2%), however 39% reported disagreeing with the statement "The size of my caseload is too large." Four participants were uncertain and 2.6% did not respond to this statement (See Table 4.4).

The majority of the participants felt their main job was to protect the public, with 84.4% agreeing with the statement. Approximately 10% disagreed with the statement, 3.9% remained uncertain and one participant did not answer this statement (See Table 4.4). Similarly, 84.4% of the participants also believed their main job was also to rehabilitate the offender. The remaining participants remained uncertain (3.9%), disagreed (9.1%) or failed to respond the statement (2.6%) (See Table 4.4). The majority of the participants (57.1%) also believe the policies of the department do not prohibit their ability to effectively manage the probationers they monitor. The remaining participants remained uncertain or believe the policies do prohibit their abilities with 20.8% reporting respectively. Only 1 participant did not respond to this statement (See Table 4.4).

Most of the participants reporting loving their jobs with 67.5% agreeing with this statement, however 16.9% reported disagreeing, 14.3% were uncertain and 1.3% did not answer the statement (See Table 4.4). Approximately 42% of the participants felt they were not burned out by their job, however 41.6% believed they were while 14.3% remained uncertain. Only 1 participant failed to respond to this statement (See Table 4.4). When presented with the statement "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work", 58.4% believe they do feel a lot of stress, 36.4% do not feel a lot of stress, 3.9% remained uncertain and 1.3% failed to respond to the statement (See Table 4.4). Finally, the majority of the participants (53.2%) often do not think about quitting their jobs, however many participants (33.8%) do think about quitting their jobs.

Approximately 11% remained uncertain and 1 participant did not respond to the statement presented (See Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 Probation Officer's Perceptions

	Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Missing (n)	Total (n)
I am appreciated by my coworkers for the work that I do.	7.8% (6)	13.0% (10)	76.6% (59)	2.6% (2)	100% (77)
The size of my caseload is too large.	39.0% (30)	5.2% (4)	53.2% (41)	2.6% (2)	100% (77)
The main goal of my job is to protect the public.	10.4% (8)	3.9% (3)	84.4% (65)	1.3% (1)	100% (77)
The main goal of my job is to rehabilitate the probationer.	9.1% (7)	3.9% (3)	84.4% (65)	2.6% (2)	100% (77)
The policies of the department prohibit my abilities to effectively manage the probationers I monitor.	57.1% (44)	20.8% (16)	20.8% (16)	1.3% (1)	100% (77)
I love my job.	16.9% (13)	14.3% (11)	67.5% (52)	1.3% (1)	100% (77)
I am burned out by my job.	42.9% (33)	14.3% (11)	41.6% (32)	1.3% (1)	100% (77)
I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.	36.4% (28)	3.9% (3)	58.4% (45)	1.3% (1)	100% (77)
I often think about quitting my job.	53.2% (41)	11.7% (9)	33.8% (26)	1.3% (1)	100% (77)

A cross tabulation was then conducted with the scenarios presented and four statements regarding burnout. The four statements selected were: "I love my job"; "I am burned out by my job"; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work" and; "I often think about quitting my job". While the other statements provided in the survey can play an important role in determining burnout, it was determined that these four statements indicate a stronger relationship of the participant's perceptions of their job in relation to burnout.

The first statement, "I love my job", was analyzed with the first statement in each scenario, determining the risk of each probationer. The probationer in the first scenario was convicted of a family violence assault, had no criminal history and was participating in anger management classes. Of those that reported disagreeing with the statement "I love my job", 46.2% classified the probationer as a moderate risk while 30.8% reported a high risk. Those that reported they loved their job classified the probationer as either a low risk (48.1%) or a moderate risk (40.4%) to society. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 6.571 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .160 (See Table 4.5). In the second scenario, the probationer had been convicted of possessing methamphetamines, had one prior conviction of aggravated assault, was married, had children and was employed. Of those that reported disagreement with the statement, 69.2% also classified the probationer as a high risk. Interestingly, those that reported loving their job also classified the probationer as a high risk (48.1%). The Pearson's chi-squared value of 3.268 and a Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level of .514 (See Table 4.6). In the third scenario, the probationer was convicted of a vehicle theft, had 3 prior convictions of possessing a controlled substance and 1 burglary of a habitation and recently completed community service. The majority of the participants in this scenario classified the probationer as a high risk, regardless of how they felt about their job. Approximately 92% of those that reported disagreement with the statement also reported the probationer as a high risk; 90.9% of those that were uncertain as to whether or not they loved their job classified the probationer as a high risk and; 73.1% reported loving their job but classified the probationer as a high risk to society. The Pearson's chi-squared value of 3.950 and a Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level of .413 (See Table 4.7). The probationer in the fourth scenario was convicted of aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon, had an extensive criminal history and has had their probation revoked on the two occasions where they were placed on probation. A cross tabulation for the statement "I love my job" and scenario four could not be computed as all the participants classified the probationer to be of a high risk to society (See Table 4.8).

Table 4.5 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Risk	Low	23.1% (3)	45.5% (5)	48.1% (25)	43.4% (33)
	Moderate	46.2% (6)	54.5% (6)	40.4% (21)	43.4% (33)
	High	30.8% (4)	0.0% (0)	11.5% (6)	13.2% (10)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson's Chi-Square: 6.571*
Asymp. Sig (2-sided): .160
*4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.45.

Table 4.6 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Risk	Low	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	7.7% (4)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	30.8% (4)	54.5% (6)	44.2% (23)	43.4% (33)
	High	69.2% (9)	36.4% (4)	48.1% (25)	50.0% (38)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 3.268*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .514
*4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .72.

Table 4.7 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Risk	Low	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	9.6% (5)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	7.7% (1)	9.1% (1)	17.3% (9)	14.5% (11)
	High	92.3% (12)	90.9% (10)	73.1% (38)	78.9% (60)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 3.950*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .413
*5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .72.

Table 4.8 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Risk	High	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

*No statistics are computed because Scenario 4 - Risk is a constant.

A cross tabulation was conducted for the second statement in each scenario (action) and "I love my job." The technical violation in the first scenario reported the probationer to have tested positive for marijuana five times in the first six months of probation. Of those that reported loving their job, 40.4% reported consulting their supervisor for the next course of action. Furthermore, approximately 38% of the participants that disagreed with the statement also reported consulting their supervisor. The Pearson's chi-squared value for this analysis was 6.039 and a Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .419 (See Table 4.9). In scenario two, the results reported were similar to that of scenario one. The technical violation presented reported the probationer testing positive for methamphetamines and missed a scheduled appointment however, the appointment was rescheduled and the probationer reported to their officer as directed. Approximately 40% of those that reported loving their job and 38.5% of those who reported not loving their job would also consult their supervisor for the next course of action. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 7.321 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .502 (See Table 4.10). In the third scenario, the technical violation presented reported the probationer to have moved from their residence and the officer was unable to locate the probationer. Approximately 46% of those that reported disagreeing with the statement "I love my job", and 34.6% of those that agreed with the statement would wait for the next appointment with the probationer before making a decision. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 7.773 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .456 (See Table 4.11). The technical violation presented in the fourth scenario consisted of confirmed information that the probationer was frequently travelling to

Houston without the knowledge of the officer. Those that reported disagreeing with the statement (30.8%) and those that reported agreeing with the statement (30.8%) would also violate the probationer and request a judicial review. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 7.423 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .492 (See Table 4.12).

Table 4.9 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action; "I love my job."

		I love my job			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
	Violate and request judicial review	15.4% (2)	18.2% (2)	23.1% (12)	21.1% (16)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	38.5% (5)	36.4% (4)	40.4% (21)	39.5% (30)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	23.1% (3)	18.2% (2)	3.8% (2)	9.2% (7)
	None of the Above	23.1% (3)	27.3% (3)	32.7% (17)	30.3% (23)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 6.039*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .419
*8 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.01.

Table 4.10 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action; "I love my job."

		I love my job			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.9% (1)	1.3% (1)
	Violate and request judicial review	23.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	11.5% (6)	11.8% (9)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	38.5% (5)	27.3% (3)	40.4% (21)	38.2% (29)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	23.1% (3)	18.2% (2)	11.5% (6)	14.5% (11)
	None of the Above	15.4% (2)	54.5% (6)	34.6% (18)	34.2% (26)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 7.321*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .502
*11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.

Table 4.11 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action; "I love my job."

		I love my job			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	23.1% (3)	27.3% (3)	25.0% (13)	25.0% (19)

Table 4.11 - *Continued*

	Violate and request judicial review	15.4% (2)	9.1% (1)	9.6% (5)	10.5% (8)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	15.4% (2)	27.3% (3)	21.2% (11)	21.1% (16)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	46.2% (6)	9.1% (1)	34.6% (18)	32.9% (25)
	None of the Above	0.0% (0)	27.3% (3)	9.6% (5)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 7.773*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .456
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.16.

Table 4.12 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action; "I love my job."

		I love my job			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	23.1% (3)	27.3% (3)	13.5% (7)	17.1% (13)
	Violate and request judicial review	30.8% (4)	27.3% (3)	30.8% (16)	30.3% (23)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	23.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	26.9% (14)	22.4% (17)

Table 4.12 - *Continued*

	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	23.1% (3)	36.4% (4)	17.3% (9)	21.1% (16)
	None of the Above	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	11.5% (6)	9.2% (7)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 7.423*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .492
*11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.01.

The third statement in each scenario (recommendation) was cross tabulated with the statement "I love my job." In scenario one, 46.2% of the participants that disagreed with the statement reported continuing the probationer on probation with their conditions modified to include both jail time and something other than jail time. Approximately 45% of the participants who reported loving their job would continue the probationer on probation but modify their conditions, excluding jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 9.790 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .280 (See Table 4.13). In the second scenario, the majority of those who reported disagreeing with the statement would recommend the probationer continue on probation with some jail time as a sanction (76.9%). Approximately 51% of the participants that agreed loving their job and would recommended continuing the probationer with their conditions modified, excluding jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 12.139 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .145 (See Table 4.14). In scenario three, the results were more evenly distributed however, 38.5% of those who reported disagreement with the statement would recommend continuing the probationer with a modification of jail time as a sanction. Approximately 37% of those who agreed with the statement and would continue the probation but modify their conditions to include jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 19.216 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic

significance level was .014 (See Table 4.15). Finally, in the fourth scenario, 53.8% of the participants who reported disagreeing with the statement would revoke the probationer and recommend a maximum amount of jail time. A slight majority of those who love their job also reported continuing the probationer on probation with a sanction of jail time (39.2%). The Pearson's chi-squared value was 20.899 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .007 (See Table 4.16).

Table 4.13 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.9% (2)	2.7% (2)
	Revoke: min prison time	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	46.2% (6)	18.2% (2)	33.3% (17)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	46.2% (6)	63.6% (7)	45.1% (23)	48.0% (36)
	None of the above	7.7% (1)	9.1% (1)	17.6% (9)	14.7% (11)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 9.790*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .280
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

Table 4.14 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	7.7% (1)	0.0% (0)	3.8% (2)	3.9% (3)

Table 4.14 - *Continued*

	Revoke: min prison time	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.9% (1)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	76.9% (10)	36.4% (4)	30.8% (16)	39.5% (27)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	15.4% (2)	45.5% (5)	51.9% (27)	44.7% (34)
	None of the Above	0.0% (0)	18.2% (2)	11.5% (6)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 12.139*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .145
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.

Table 4.15 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	30.8% (4)	0.0% (0)	17.6% (9)	17.3% (13)
	Revoke: min prison time	15.4% (2)	45.5% (5)	5.9% (3)	13.3% (10)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	38.5% (5)	27.3% (3)	37.3% (19)	36.0% (27)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	27.5% (14)	20.0% (15)
	None of the Above	15.4% (2)	18.2% (2)	11.8% (6)	13.3% (10)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (76)

Table 4.15 - *Continued*
Pearson Chi-Square: 19.216*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .014
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.47.

Table 4.16 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation; "I love my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	53.8% (7)	27.3% (3)	35.3% (18)	37.3% (28)
	Revoke: min prison time	30.8% (4)	0.0% (0)	15.7% (8)	16.0% (12)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	0.0% (0)	45.5% (5)	39.2% (20)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	15.4% (2)	0.0% (0)	5.9% (3)	6.7% (5)
	None of the Above	0.0% (0)	27.3% (3)	3.9% (2)	6.7% (5)
	Total	100.0% (13)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (51)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 20.899*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .007
*12 cells (80.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .73.

A cross tabulation was then conducted on each scenario and the statement "I am burned out by my job." As previously stated, 43.1% of the participants disagreed with the statement "I am burned out by my job" while 42.1% agreed (See Table 4.4). In scenario one, 50% of those who agreed being burned out by their job also classified the probationer as being a low risk. Interestingly, of those that reported not being burned out by their jobs, 45.5% classified the probationer as a moderate risk to society. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 2.970 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .563 (See Table 4.17). In the second scenario, the majority of those who reported being burned out also classified this

probationer as a high risk (68.8%). Approximately 51% of those who reported not being burned out classified the probationer as a moderate risk. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 10.958 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .027 (See Table 4.18). In scenario three, approximately 87% of the participants who reported being burned out classified the probationer as a high risk however, 72.7% of those who were not burned out also classified the probationer as a high risk to society. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 4.611 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .330 (See Table 4.19). Again, in scenario four, all of the participants classified the probationer as a high risk and a cross tabulation could not be computed as the risk was constant (See Table 4.20).

Table 4.17 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Risk	Low	42.4% (14)	27.3% (3)	50.0% (16)	43.4% (33)
	Moderate	45.5% (15)	63.6% (7)	34.4% (11)	43.4% (33)
	High	12.1% (4)	9.1% (1)	15.6% (5)	13.2% (10)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 2.970*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .563
*5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.45.

Table 4.18 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Risk	Low	6.1% (2)	18.2% (2)	3.1% (1)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	51.5% (17)	63.6% (7)	28.1% (9)	43.4% (33)
	High	42.4% (14)	18.2% (2)	68.8% (22)	50.0% (38)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 10.958*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .027
*4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .72.

Table 4.19 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Risk	Low	9.1% (3)	0.0% (0)	6.2% (2)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	18.2% (6)	27.3% (3)	6.2% (2)	14.5% (11)
	High	72.7% (24)	72.7% (8)	87.5% (28)	78.9% (60)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 4.611*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .330
*6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .72.

Table 4.20 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk; "I am burned out by my job."

		I love my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Risk	High	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (52)	100.0% (76)

*No statistics are computed because Scenario 4 - Risk is a constant.

A cross tabulation was conducted with the second statement in each scenario (action) and the statement "I am burned out by my job." In the first scenario, 42.4% of the participants who reported they were not burned out by their job and would select an action other than the ones presented. Approximately 40% of those who reported they were burned out by their job and would consult a supervisor for the next course of action. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 6.221 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .399 (See Table 4.21). Scenario two closely resembled that of scenario one with 45.5% of the participants who reported not being burned out and would select an action other than the ones presented. Furthermore, 37.5% of those who reported being burned out and would consult a supervisor on the next course of action. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 7.458 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .488 (See Table 4.22). The results in scenario three

reported interesting results. Approximately 43% of the participants who reported being burned out by their job and would wait for the next appointment with the probationer before making a decision on their next course of action. Also, 30.3% of the participants who reported they were not burned out by their job would wait for the next appointment with the probationer prior to making a decision as well. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 11.216 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .190 (See Table 4.23). Approximately 33% of the participants in scenario four who reported not being burned out by their job and would violate the offender and request a judicial review. Finally, 28.1% of the participants who reported being burned out by their job and would violate and request judicial review. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 9.921 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .271 (See Table 4.24).

Table 4.21 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
	Violate and request judicial review	18.2% (6)	18.2% (2)	25.0% (8)	21.1% (16)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	33.3% (11)	54.5% (6)	40.6% (13)	39.5% (30)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	6.1% (2)	18.2% (2)	9.4% (3)	9.2% (7)

Table 4.21 - *Continued*

	None of the Above	42.4% (14)	9.1% (1)	25.0% (8)	30.3% (23)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 6.221*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .399
*6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.01.

Table 4.22 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	3.1% (1)	1.3% (1)
	Violate and request judicial review	12.1% (4)	9.1% (1)	12.5% (4)	11.8% (9)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	30.3% (10)	63.6% (7)	37.5% (12)	38.2% (29)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	12.1% (4)	18.2% (2)	15.6% (5)	14.5% (11)
	None of the Above	45.5% (15)	9.1% (1)	31.2% (10)	34.2% (26)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 7.458*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .488
*11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.

Table 4.23 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	18.2% (6)	36.4% (4)	28.1% (9)	25.0% (19)
	Violate and request judicial review	12.1% (4)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (4)	10.5% (8)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	24.2% (8)	36.4% (4)	12.5% (4)	21.1% (16)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	30.3% (10)	9.1% (1)	43.8% (14)	32.9% (25)
	None of the Above	15.2% (5)	18.2% (2)	3.1% (1)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 11.216*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .190
*9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.16.

Table 4.24 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	6.1% (2)	36.4% (4)	21.9% (7)	17.1% (13)

Table 4.24 - *Continued*

	Violate and request judicial review	33.3% (11)	36.4% (4)	25.0% (8)	30.3% (23)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	21.2% (7)	9.1% (1)	28.1% (9)	22.4% (17)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	24.2% (8)	18.2% (2)	18.8% (6)	21.1% (16)
	None of the Above	15.2% (5)	0.0% (0)	6.2% (2)	9.2% (7)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 9.921*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .271
*7 cells (46.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.01.

A cross tabulation was conducted with the recommendation made by the participant and the statement "I am burned out by my job." In scenario one, 51.6% of the participants who reported being burned out by the job and would recommend continuing the probationer on probation with their conditions modified, excluding jail time. Furthermore, 45.5% of those who disagreed with the statement would also continue the probationer on probation and modify their conditions, excluding jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 10.369 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .240 (See Table 4.25). The second scenario showed slightly different results with 54.5% of the participants who reported they were not burned out by their job and would recommend the probationer to continue on probation with their conditions modified, excluding jail time. Of those who reported they were burned out by their job, 50% would recommend continuing on probation with their conditions modified to include jail time as a sanction. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 9.445 and the Pearson's

chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .306 (See Table 4.26). In the third scenario, 37.5% of the participants who reported being burned out and would recommend continuing the probationer on probation with their conditions modified to include jail time. Approximately 34% of the participants reported not being burned out and would continue the probationer on probation with their conditions modified, excluding jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 14.267 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .075 (See Table 4.27). Finally, 40.6% of the participants who reported being burned out and would recommend revocation with a maximum amount of prison time in scenario four. Twelve participants (37.5%) reported they were not burned out and would continue this probationer on probation with their conditions modified to include some jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 3.352 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .910 (See Table 4.28).

Table 4.25 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	3.2% (1)	2.7% (2)
	Revoke: min prison time	0.0% (0)	9.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	36.4% (12)	18.2% (2)	35.5% (11)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	45.5% (15)	45.5% (5)	51.6% (16)	48.0% (36)
	None of the Above	18.2% (6)	18.2% (2)	9.7% (3)	14.7% (11)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (31)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 10.369*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .240
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .15.

Table 4.26 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	9.4% (3)	3.9% (3)
	Revoke: min prison time	3.0% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	30.3% (10)	36.4% (4)	50.0% (16)	39.5% (30)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	54.5% (18)	54.5% (6)	31.2% (10)	44.7% (34)
	None of the Above	12.1% (4)	9.1% (1)	9.4% (3)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (33)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 9.445*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .306
*11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.

Table 4.27 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	12.5% (4)	9.1% (1)	25.0% (8)	17.3% (13)
	Revoke: min prison time	9.4% (3)	36.4% (4)	9.4% (3)	13.3% (10)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	31.2% (10)	45.5% (5)	37.5% (12)	36.0% (27)

Table 4.27 - *Continued*

	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	34.4% (11)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (4)	20.0% (15)
	None of the Above	12.5% (4)	9.1% (1)	15.6% (5)	13.3% (10)
	Total	100.0% (32)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 14.267*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .075
*9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.47.

Table 4.28 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation; "I am burned out by my job."

		I am burned out by my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	31.2% (10)	45.5% (5)	40.6% (13)	37.3% (28)
	Revoke: min prison time	18.8% (6)	0.0% (0)	18.8% (6)	16.0% (12)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	37.5% (12)	36.4% (4)	28.1% (9)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	6.2% (2)	9.1% (1)	6.2% (2)	6.7% (5)
	None of the Above	6.2% (2)	9.1% (1)	6.2% (2)	6.7% (5)
	Total	100.0% (32)	100.0% (11)	100.0% (32)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 3.352*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .910
*9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .73.

A cross tabulation was conducted with the four scenarios and the statement "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." In the first scenario, 44.4% of the participants who reported feeling

a lot of stress at work classified the probationer as a moderate risk to society. Approximately 46% of the participants who reported disagreeing with the statement classified the probationer as a low risk to society. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 1.061 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .900 (See Table 4.29). Approximately 55% who reported feeling a lot of stress while at work classified the probationer as a high risk to society in scenario two. Furthermore, 53.6% who reported not being stressed at work classified the probationer as a moderate risk. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 2.363 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .669 (See Table 4.30). In the third scenario, 88.9% of the participants who reported feeling a lot of stress at work also classified the probationer as a high risk to society however, 64.3% of those who disagreed with the statement "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work," also classified the probationer as a high risk. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 9.304 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .054 (See Table 4.31). Once again, a cross tabulation could not be analyzed in the fourth scenario as all the participants classified the probationer as a high risk and the risk was constant (See Table 4.32).

Table 4.29 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Risk	Low	46.4% (13)	33.3% (1)	42.2% (19)	43.4% (33)
	Moderate	39.3% (11)	66.7% (2)	44.4% (20)	43.4% (33)
	High	14.3% (4)	0.0% (0)	13.3% (6)	13.2% (10)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 1.061*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .900
*4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .39.

Table 4.30 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Risk	Low	7.1% (2)	0.0% (0)	6.7% (3)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	53.6% (15)	33.3% (1)	37.8% (17)	43.4% (33)
	High	39.3% (11)	66.7% (2)	55.6% (25)	50.0% (38)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 2.363*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .669
*5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .20.

Table 4.31 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Risk	Low	7.1% (2)	0.0% (0)	6.7% (3)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	28.6% (8)	33.3% (1)	4.4% (2)	14.5% (11)
	High	64.3% (18)	66.7% (2)	88.9% (40)	78.9% (60)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 9.304*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .054
*6 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .20.

Table 4.32 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Risk	High	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

*No statistics are computed because Scenario 4 - Risk is a constant.

The second section in each scenario, action, was then analyzed with the statement " feel a lot of stress when I am at work." In scenario one, 42.2% of the participants who agreed with the statement, indicating they were experiencing a lot stress at work, reported their next course of action would be consulting their supervisor. Approximately 35% of the participants

who disagreed with the statement also reported their next course of action would be consulting their supervisor. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 6.989 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .322 (See Table 4.33). In the second scenario, those who reported feeling stress at work would consult their supervisor for their next course of action (40.0%) or would do something other than the options presented (37.8%). The majority of those who disagreed with the statement also reported consulting their supervisor for their next course of action (32.1%) or would do something other than the options presented (28.6%) The Pearson's chi-squared value was 5.325 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .722 (See Table 4.34). Of those that reported feeling stress while at work, 37.8% reported waiting for the next appointment with the probationer as their next course of action in the third scenario. Interestingly, 26.7% reported they would violate the probationer and request a warrant and motion to revoke their probation. Approximately 28% of those who reported they were not feeling a lot of stress would also wait for the next appointment with the probationer before making a decision. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 13.882 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .085 (See Table 4.35). Finally, in scenario four, the majority of those who reported disagreeing with the statement would violate the probationer and request a judicial review (32.1%). Similarly, of those who agreed with the statement, the majority (26.7%) would also violate the probationer and request a judicial review. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 5.535 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .699 (See Table 4.36).

Table 4.33 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)

Table 4.33 - *Continued*

	Violate and request judicial review	25.0% (7)	66.7% (2)	15.6% (7)	21.1% (16)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	35.7% (10)	33.3% (1)	42.2% (19)	39.5% (30)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	14.3% (4)	0.0% (0)	6.7% (3)	9.2% (7)
	None of the Above	25.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	35.6% (16)	30.3% (23)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 6.989*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .322
*6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

Table 4.34 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.2% (1)	1.3% (1)
	Violate and request judicial review	17.9% (5)	0.0% (0)	8.9% (4)	11.8% (9)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	32.1% (9)	66.7% (2)	40.0% (18)	38.2% (29)

Table 4.34 - *Continued*

	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	21.4% (6)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (5)	14.5% (11)
	None of the Above	28.6% (8)	33.3% (1)	37.8% (17)	34.2% (26)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 5.325*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .722
*9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

Table 4.35 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	21.4% (6)	33.3% (1)	26.7% (12)	25.0% (19)
	Violate and request judicial review	10.7% (3)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (5)	10.5% (8)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	25.0% (7)	0.0% (0)	20.0% (9)	21.1% (16)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	28.6% (8)	0.0% (0)	37.8% (17)	32.9% (25)

Table 4.35 - *Continued*

	None of the above	14.3% (4)	66.7% (2)	4.4% (2)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 13.882*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .085
*9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .32.

Table 4.36 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	17.9% (5)	0.0% (0)	17.8% (8)	17.1% (13)
	Violate and request judicial review	32.1% (9)	66.7% (2)	26.7% (12)	30.3% (23)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	21.4% (6)	0.0% (0)	24.4% (11)	22.4% (17)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	21.4% (6)	0.0% (0)	22.2% (10)	21.1% (16)
	None of the Above	7.1% (2)	33.3% (1)	8.9% (4)	9.2% (7)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 5.535*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .699
*8 cells (53.5%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .28.

Finally, the recommendation for each scenario was then analyzed with the statement "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work." In the first scenario, of those that reported feeling stress at work, 47.7% also reported they would continue the probationer on probation and modify their conditions, excluding jail time. Of those that reported not feeling stress, 53.6% also reported continuing the probationer and modifying their conditions, excluding jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 16.330 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .038 (See Table 4.37). In the second scenario, 42.2% of the participants who reported feeling stress at work and would continue the probationer and modify their conditions, excluding jail time. Approximately 35% who also reported feeling stress, would also continue the probationer on probation however, they would modify their conditions to include some jail time. Interestingly, the majority of the participants who disagreed with the statement would continue the probationer on probation and modify their conditions to include some jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 8.411 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .394 (See Table 4.38). In the third scenario, the majority of those who disagreed with the statement (39.3%) recommended the probationer be continued on probation and receive jail time as a sanction. Furthermore, those who agreed with the statement (31.8%) would also continue the probationer on probation with a sanction of jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 3.921 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .864 (See Table 4.39). Finally, in the fourth scenario, of those who reported feeling a lot of stress at work, 38.6% recommended the probationer be revoked and receive the maximum amount of jail time. Approximately 42% of those who disagreed with the statement recommended the probationer be continued on probation and receive the sanction of some jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 6.629 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .577 (See Table 4.40).

Table 4.37 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	0.0% (0)	33.3% (1)	2.3% (1)	2.7% (2)
	Revoke: min prison time	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.3% (1)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	39.3% (11)	33.3% (1)	29.5% (13)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	53.6% (15)	0.0% (0)	47.7% (21)	48.0% (36)
	None of the Above	7.1% (2)	33.3% (1)	18.2% (8)	14.7% (11)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 16.330*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .038
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

Table 4.38 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	6.7% (3)	3.9% (3)
	Revoke: min prison time	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	2.2% (1)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	50.0% (14)	0.0% (0)	35.6% (16)	39.5% (30)

Table 4.38 - *Continued*

	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	46.4% (13)	66.7% (2)	42.2% (19)	44.7% (34)
	None of the Above	3.6% (1)	33.3% (1)	13.3% (6)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (45)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 8.411*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .394
*11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .04.

Table 4.39 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	17.9% (5)	0.0% (0)	18.2% (8)	17.3% (13)
	Revoke: min prison time	14.3% (4)	0.0% (0)	13.6% (6)	13.3% (10)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	39.3% (11)	66.7% (2)	31.8% (14)	36.0% (27)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	17.9% (5)	0.0% (0)	22.7% (10)	20.0% (15)
	None of the Above	10.7% (3)	33.3% (1)	13.6% (6)	13.3% (10)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 3.921*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .864
*8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .40.

Table 4.40 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation; "I feel a lot of stress when I am at work."

		I feel a lot of stress when I am at work.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	35.7% (10)	33.3% (1)	38.7% (17)	37.3% (28)
	Revoke: min prison time	10.7% (3)	0.0% (0)	20.5% (9)	16.0% (0)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	42.9% (0)	33.3% (1)	27.3% (0)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	7.1% (2)	0.0% (0)	6.8% (3)	6.7% (5)
	None of the Above	3.6% (1)	33.3% (1)	6.8% (3)	6.7% (5)
	Total	100.0% (28)	100.0% (3)	100.0% (44)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 6.629*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .577
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .20.

The final statement, "I often think about quitting my job" was then analyzed with all four scenarios. Approximately 42% of the participants who often think about quitting their job classified the probationer as a moderate risk in the first scenario. The majority of those who do not think about quitting their job classified the probationer as a low risk (46.3%) however, 43.9% classified the probationer as a moderate risk as well. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 4.351 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .361 (See Table 4.41). In the second scenario, of the participants who reported quitting their job, 57.7% classified the probationer as a high risk however, the majority of those who disagree with the statement also classified the probationer as a high risk (48.8%). The Pearson's chi-squared value was 6.398 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .171 (See Table 4.42).

Scenario three showed similar results to that of scenario two as the majority of those who often think about quitting classified the probationer as a high risk (88.5%) while the majority of those who do not think about quitting classified the probationer as a high risk (78%). The Pearson's chi-squared value was 13.026 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .011 (See Table 4.43). Once again, a cross tabulation could not be conducted for the fourth scenario as all participants reported the probationer as a high risk and the risk remained constant (See Table 4.44).

Table 4.41 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Risk; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Risk	Low	46.3% (19)	55.6% (5)	34.6% (9)	43.4% (33)
	Moderate	43.9% (18)	44.4% (4)	42.3% (11)	43.4% (33)
	High	9.8% (4)	0.0% (0)	23.1% (6)	13.2% (10)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 4.351*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .361
*4 cells (44.4%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.18.

Table 4.42 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Risk; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Risk	Low	12.2% (5)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	39.0% (16)	66.7% (6)	42.3% (11)	43.4% (33)
	High	48.8% (20)	33.3% (3)	57.7% (15)	50.0% (38)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 6.398*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .171
*5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .59.

Table 4.43 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Risk; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Risk	Low	4.9% (2)	33.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	6.6% (5)
	Moderate	17.1% (7)	11.1% (1)	11.5% (3)	14.5% (11)
	High	78.0% (32)	55.6% (5)	88.5% (23)	78.9% (60)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 13.026*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .011
*5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .59.

Table 4.44 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Risk; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Risk	High	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

*No statistics are computed because Scenario 4 - Risk is a constant.

A cross tabulation was then conducted with the action taken by each participant and the statement "I often think about quitting my job." In the first scenario, of the participants that agreed with the statement 38.5% would consult their supervisor for the next course of action. Similarly, of those that do not often think about quitting their job, 36.6% would also consult their supervisor for the next course of action. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 5.102 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .531 (See Table 4.45). Scenario two revealed similar results as 38.5% of those who agreed with the statement would also consult a supervisor for the next course of action. The majority of those who disagreed with this statement would do something other than the possible actions presented (39%). The Pearson's chi-squared value was 4.394 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .820 (See Table 4.46). Approximately 34% of those who reported agreeing with the statement would wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision in the third

scenario. Similarly, 34.1% of those who disagreed with the statement would also wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 5.074 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .750 (See Table 4.47). In the fourth scenario, the majority of those that often think about quitting their job would violate the offender and request a warrant and motion to revoke their probation (30.8%) while 23.1% would violate the offender and request a judicial review. Of those that disagree with the statement, 36.6% would violate the offender and request a judicial review while 24.4% would consult their supervisor for the next course of action. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 6.534 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .588 (See Table 4.48).

Table 4.45 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Action; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
	Violate and request judicial review	22.0% (9)	33.3% (3)	15.4% (4)	21.1% (6)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	36.6% (15)	55.6% (5)	38.5% (10)	39.5% (30)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	7.3% (3)	0.0% (0)	15.4% (4)	9.2% (7)
	None of the Above	34.1% (14)	11.1% (1)	30.8% (8)	30.3% (23)

Table 4.45 - *Continued*

	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 5.102*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .531
*6 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .83.

Table 4.46 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Action; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	2.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)
	Violate and request judicial review	12.2% (5)	0.0% (0)	15.4% (4)	11.8% (9)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	34.1% (14)	55.6% (5)	38.5% (10)	38.2% (29)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	12.2% (5)	11.1% (1)	19.2% (5)	14.5% (11)
	None of the Above	39.0% (16)	33.3% (3)	26.9% (7)	34.2% (26)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 4.394*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .820
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .12.

Table 4.47 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Action; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	22.0% (9)	22.2% (2)	30.8% (8)	25.0% (19)
	Violate and request judicial review	12.2% (5)	0.0% (0)	11.5% (3)	10.5% (8)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	19.5% (8)	33.3% (3)	19.2% (5)	21.1% (16)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	34.1% (14)	22.2% (2)	34.6% (9)	32.9% (25)
	None of the Above	12.2% (5)	22.2% (2)	3.8% (1)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 5.074*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .750
*9 cells (60.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .95.

Table 4.48 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Action; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Action	Violate and request a warrant and motion to revoke	9.8% (4)	11.1% (1)	30.8% (8)	17.1% (13)

Table 4.48 - *Continued*

	Violate and request judicial review	36.6% (15)	22.2% (2)	23.1% (6)	30.3% (23)
	Consult a supervisor for the next course of action	24.4% (10)	22.2% (2)	19.2% (5)	22.4% (17)
	Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision	19.5% (8)	33.3% (3)	19.2% (5)	21.1% (16)
	None of the Above	9.8% (4)	11.1% (1)	7.7% (2)	9.2% (7)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 6.534*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .588
*8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .83.

Finally, the four scenarios regarding recommendation were then analyzed with the statement "I often think about quitting my job." In the first scenario, of those who reported they often think about quitting their job, no participants believed they would recommend revoking the probationer while the majority (56%) reported they would continue the probationer on probation and modify their conditions, excluding jail time. Approximately 48% of those who disagreed with the statement would also continue the probationer on probation and modify their conditions, excluding jail time. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 6.601 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .580 (See Table 4.49). In the second scenario, slightly over half (53.8%) of the participants who reported they often think about quitting would recommend the probationer to be continued on probation and receive a sanction of some jail time. Furthermore, 53.7% of those who do not think about quitting reported they would continue the probationer and modify their conditions to include something other than jail time. The Pearson's

chi-squared value was 8.054 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .428 (See Table 4.50). Participants in the third scenario, who reported they agreed with the statement, recommended revoking the probationer and receive a maximum amount of prison time (26.9%) or continue the probationer and include the sanction of some jail time (26.9%). The majority of the participants who reported disagreeing with the statement recommended the probationer continue on probation and receive a sanction of some jail time (45%). The Pearson's chi-squared value was 10.557 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .228 (See Table 4.51). Finally, in scenario four, of those who reported they often think about quitting their job, 42.3% recommended the probationer be revoked and receive the maximum amount of jail time. Those that disagreed with the statement recommended revoking the probationer and receiving the maximum amount of jail time (37.5%) however, 37.5% also recommended continuing the probationer on probation with some jail time as a sanction. The Pearson's chi-squared value was 3.039 and the Pearson's chi-squared asymptotic significance level was .932 (See Table 4.52).

Table 4.49 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 1 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 1 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	2.4% (1)	11.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.7% (2)
	Revoke: min prison time	2.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	34.1% (14)	44.4% (4)	28.0% (7)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	48.8% (20)	22.2% (2)	56.0% (14)	48.0% (36)

Table 4.49 - *Continued*

	None of the Above	12.2% (5)	22.2% (2)	16.0% (4)	14.7% (11)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (25)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 6.601*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .580
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .12.

Table 4.50 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 2 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 2 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	2.4% (1)	11.1% (1)	3.8% (1)	3.9% (3)
	Revoke: min prison time	2.4% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	34.1% (14)	22.2% (2)	53.8% (14)	39.5% (30)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	53.7% (22)	44.4% (4)	30.8% (8)	44.7% (34)
	None of the Above	7.3% (3)	22.2% (2)	11.5% (3)	10.5% (8)
	Total	100.0% (41)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 8.054*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .428
*11 cells (73.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .12.

Table 4.51 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 3 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 3 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	12.5% (5)	11.1% (1)	26.9% (7)	17.3% (13)

Table 4.51 - *Continued*

	Revoke: min prison time	12.5% (5)	0.0% (0)	19.2% (5)	13.3% (10)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	45.0% (18)	22.2% (2)	26.9% (7)	36.0% (27)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	20.0% (8)	44.4% (4)	11.5% (3)	20.0% (15)
	None of the Above	10.0% (4)	22.2% (2)	15.4% (4)	13.3% (10)
	Total	100.0% (40)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (75)

Pearson Chi-Square: 10.557*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .228
*8 cells (53.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.20.

Table 4.52 - Cross Tabulation: Scenario 4 - Recommendation; "I often think about quitting my job."

		I often think about quitting my job.			
		Disagree (n)	Uncertain (n)	Agree (n)	Total (n)
Scenario 4 - Recommendation	Revoke; max prison time	37.5% (15)	22.2% (2)	42.3% (11)	37.3% (28)
	Revoke: min prison time	12.5% (5)	22.2% (2)	19.2% (5)	16.0% (12)
	Continue probation; Sanction; jail time.	37.5% (15)	33.3% (3)	26.9% (7)	33.3% (25)
	Continue probation; Sanction; conditions modified	5.0% (2)	11.1% (1)	7.7% (2)	6.7% (5)
	None of the Above	7.3% (3)	11.1% (1)	3.8% (1)	6.7% (5)

Table 4.52 - *Continued*

Total	100.0% (40)	100.0% (9)	100.0% (26)	100.0% (76)

Pearson Chi-Square: 3.039*
Asymp. Sig. (2-sided): .932
*10 cells (66.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .60.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The relationship between burnout and probation officer's perceptions are less than clear. When examining the scenarios, the risk of the offenders appeared to progressively get higher with the majority of the participants reporting either a low or moderate risk with the first scenario to all of the participants reporting a high risk for the fourth scenario. The action taken after a technical violation was presented was somewhat mixed. In the first two scenarios, the majority of the participants would consult their supervisor prior to making any decisions. The participants in the third scenario would wait for the next appointment with the probationer before making any decision while the majority of the participants in the fourth scenario would request a judicial review of the probationer from the court. It appears that the participants are more inclined to ask for assistance from either their supervisor or the court before asking for a warrant and a motion to revoke. The recommendation from the participants to the court also varies. In the first two scenarios, the majority of the participants would refrain from revoking the probationer and would impose a sanction of some jail time or modify their conditions of probation. In both of these scenarios, the majority would rather their conditions of probation be modified over some jail time. Even though the majority of the participants in the third scenario would wait for the next appointment with the probationer, which does not seem harsh, the majority of the participants would recommend to continue the probationer on probation and include some jail time.

Finally, the probationer in the fourth scenario appears to be one who committed the worst crime and would likely be monitored more closely by the participants however, only a slight majority would recommend revoking the probationer and requesting the maximum amount

of prison time. The majority of the other participants would still continue the probationer and include some jail time. It appears that the participants would try and refrain from revoking an offender based on the technical violations presented. It would also appear that the reason why they would revoke a probationer has more to do with the severity of the crime to which they are on probation.

Do burnout, stress and perceptions of the job impact the risk, action and recommendations made regarding the probationer? The answer to this question is also somewhat mixed. Initially, it was believed that burnout and stress on the job would likely impact the decision making capabilities of probation officers. After reviewing the results, a slightly different picture emerged. The majority of the participants reported they loved their job but does this impact their decisions? In the first scenario, it appears that the love of the job may have a slight impact on the risk of the offender as more participants who reported loving their job were more inclined to assess the risk as low or moderate whereas those who reported they did not love their job assessed the probationer as moderate or high. The action taken by the participants showed hardly any difference, as both those who loved their job and those who do not would consult their supervisor for the next course of action. Finally, the recommendation to the court did not appear to be impacted by the love of the job as the majority of those who both loved their job and did not love their job will still continue the probationer on probation.

The second scenario, the risk of the offender remained somewhat the same regardless of the love of the job however, more participants who reported disagreement with the statement were more inclined to report the probationer as a high risk, when compared to those who agreed with the statement. The action taken by the participant also remained similar regardless of the love of the job however, the recommendation to the court appeared to be slightly impacted. The majority of those who loved their job would continue the probationer and modify the conditions of probation and those who reported not loving their job would also continue on the probationer on probation but would impose some jail time as a sanction.

The risk in the third scenario was influenced slightly by the love of the job, as it appeared that those who disagreed with the statement would assess the probationer's risk as high. While those who reported loving their job would also assess the risk as high, there were also a significant number of participants who would classify the probationer as a moderate risk as well. The action taken by the participant was somewhat interesting as more participants who agreed with the statement would request a warrant and a motion to revoke. A significant amount of those who disagreed with the statement would wait for the next appointment with the probationer before making a decision. It appears, in this case, that those who reported not loving their job would not take a hasty action and violate the offender. It would seem that these participants would follow suit regarding the recommendation however, this was not the case. Even though the majority of the participants reported they would continue the probationer and implement some jail time as a sanction, a significant number of participants who disagreed with the statement would recommend revoking the probationer and seek the maximum amount of jail time. In this scenario, it appears that the participants who do not love their job would be somewhat more inclined to revocation.

In the fourth scenario, the risk of the probationer could not be accurately assessed since all of the participants classified the probationer as a high risk. The action taken once the technical violation was presented was somewhat mixed. Regardless of the participant's love of the job, most would request a judicial review however more participants who reported loving their job would seek advice from their supervisor whereas those who disagreed with the statement would be more inclined to request a warrant and a motion to revoke. The recommendation given to the court is the most striking as those who do not love their job would revoke the probationer and seek the maximum amount of prison time whereas those who reported they loved their job would continue the probationer on probation and implement some jail time. This analysis was statistically significant at the .01 level. It appears that a probationer on probation for a fairly serious crime would more likely be revoked by those who do not love their job.

Are probation officers who report being burned out more inclined to classify a probationer at a higher risk, take more evasive action once a technical violation is presented, and recommend revocation to the court? The answer to this is also mixed. In the first scenario, it appeared that those who reported being burned out were more likely to classify the probationer as a high risk whereas those who did not report being burned out would classify the probationer as a moderate risk. Once a technical violation was presented, the majority of those who reported being burned out would seek assistance from a supervisor. It appears that those who are burned out could either be aware of the burnout or would rather not make a decision all together and seek assistance elsewhere. Regardless of the presence of burnout, the majority of the participants would recommend continuation of probation and a modification of the conditions of probation, excluding jail time. It appears here that burnout does not impact the recommendation of the probation officer.

The risk assessment in the second scenario does appear to be significantly impacted by burnout at a .05 level. The majority of those who reported being burned out classified the probationer as a high risk, whereas those who are not burned out would classify the probationer as a moderate risk. Interestingly, the action taken after the technical violation occurs was somewhat unexpected. Even though those who reported being burned out classified the probationer as a high risk, they would seek assistance from their supervisor regarding their next course of action. Regardless of the level of burnout, the majority of the participants would still continue the probationer on probation however, if burnout is present, jail time would more likely be imposed. While burnout appears to have some impact on the risk, action taken, and the recommendation to the court in this scenario, it is not enough to revoke the probationer and send them to prison.

In the third scenario, it appears that burnout does not impact the risk assessment as the majority of the participants classified the probationer as a high risk. Burnout may have a slight impact on the action taken in this scenario. Even though the majority of the participants reported they would wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then making a decision,

regardless of the level of burnout, more participants who reported being burned out also reported they would request a warrant and motion to revoke when compared to those who are not burned out. The recommendation made to the court remained similar as the majority of the participants would continue the probationer on probation however, more participants who reported being burned out would recommend revoking the probation and recommending a maximum amount of prison time. Again, it appears that while most participants would recommend continuing on probation, the threat of revoking a probationer appears very real for those who are burned out.

In the fourth scenario, risk could not be analyzed as all participants classified the probationer as a high risk however, it appears that more participants who reported being burned out would be slightly more inclined to recommend a warrant and motion to revoke. Furthermore, while a significant number of participants would recommend revocation and a maximum amount of jail time, the majority reported they were burned out by their job. This further indicates that burnout can play a role in the decisions of probation officers when the severity of the crime is high.

Stress at work can play a role in the decisions made by probation officers as well, although the results are also somewhat mixed. In the first scenario, if the participants indicated they feel stress while at work, the risk was classified as moderate however, if they feel little to no stress then the risk was assessed as low. The appearance of stress appears to have little to no impact on the action taken once a technical violation appears as the majority of the participants would consult a supervisor for the next course of action. Furthermore, the recommendation to the court appears to have no impact as well as the majority of the participants would continue the probationer on probation.

The second scenario was similar to that of the first scenario, with some minor differences. The risk assessment of the probationer was again classified as high for those who reported stress at work while those who reported no stress classified the probationer as a moderate risk. It appears that stress can play a factor in risk assessment as those that feel

stress will classify the probationer as a higher risk to society than those who do not feel stress. The action taken in this scenario appears to not have been impacted as again we find that the majority of the participants would consult their supervisor for the next course of action. The recommendation also appears to be not effected as the majority of the participants would continue the probationer on probation.

Stress in the work place could have an impact on the risk of the probationer in the third scenario. While the majority of the participants classified the probationer as a high risk, regardless of whether or not they feel stress, more participants who reported disagreeing with the statement classified the probationer as a moderate risk. The majority of the participants would wait for the next appointment with the probationer before making a decision however, those who reported feeling stress at work would also be more inclined to request a warrant and a motion to revoke probation. Stress appears to not have a role in the recommendation to the court in this scenario as the results were fairly evenly distributed across the options.

Finally, stress in the work place could not be accurately analyzed regarding risk since all participants classified the probationer as a high risk. The action taken once a technical violation was presented did not appear to be impacted with the level of stress as the majority reported they would request a judicial review. The recommendation to the court does appear to be impacted by stress at work. Those who reported they feel a lot of stress while at work were more likely to recommend revoking the probationer with a maximum amount of prison time. Those who reported they do not feel stress were more likely to recommend the probationer to be continued with a sanction of some jail time.

Are the decisions made by probation officers impacted by the desire to quit their jobs? The answer to this question is again mixed. Those that think about quitting their job are more likely to classify the probationer as a moderate risk whereas those who do not think about quitting classify the probationer as a low risk. The action taken appears to have little to no impact as the majority of the participants would consult their supervisor for the next course of action, regardless of whether or not they think about quitting their jobs. The recommendation

made to the court also appears to have little to no impact as the majority of the participants would continue the probationer on probation.

The risk in the second scenario appears to have little impact as the majority of the participants classified the probationer as moderate to high, however several participants who do not think about quitting their jobs classified the probationer as a low risk whereas those who think about quitting did not classify the probationer as a low risk at all. The action taken could have some impact as those who reported they often think about quitting would consult their supervisor however, those who do not think about quitting would do something other than the options presented. In light of this, it is unclear as to whether or not an impact is made as there is no way of knowing what this action could be. The recommendation to the court appears to have been impacted in this scenario. While the majority of the participants would continue the probationer on probation, those who often think about quitting would impose a jail sanction while those who do not think about quitting would modify the conditions of probation, excluding jail time.

The risk in the third scenario was similar to that of the second scenario. Those who often thought about quitting their job were more likely to classify the probationer as a moderate or high risk while those who do not think about quitting also classified the probationer as a moderate or high risk but several participants also classified the probationer as a low risk. While the majority of the participants would wait for the next appointment before making a decision on the next course of action, those who often thought about quitting were more inclined to request a warrant and a motion to revoke. The recommendation to the court also appears to be impacted as the majority of those who do not think about quitting were more likely to recommend the probationer to continue on probation. Those who did think about quitting were split between revoking the probationer and recommending the maximum amount of prison time or continuing the probationer and include some jail time as a sanction.

Finally, the risk in the fourth scenario could not be effectively analyzed as all participants classified the probationer as a high risk. The action taken once a violation was

presented was also slightly impacted as those who thought about quitting were more likely to recommend a warrant and a motion to revoke whereas those who do not think about quitting would request a judicial review. The recommendation made to the court may have been impacted as well. The majority of those who agreed with the statement would recommend the probationer be revoked and receive a maximum amount of prison time. Those who do not think about quitting were split between revoking the probationer and receiving the maximum amount of prison time or continuing the probationer with some jail time as a sanction.

In summary, when examining the risk of the probationer, it was found that the risk would be slightly elevated for those who were experiencing burnout, stress, not loving their jobs or often thought about quitting their jobs. The action taken by the probation officer remains mixed. Those who reported they did not love their job were more likely to consult their supervisor for the next course of action however, this also appears to depend on the severity of the crime to which they were placed on probation as well as the technical violation presented. Those who reported they were burned out by their jobs were also more likely to consult their supervisor but this also changed once the more serious crime was presented. Those who reported feeling a lot of stress and often thought about quitting their jobs were inclined to consult a supervisor as well but, once again, this appears to depend on the nature of the crime and the technical violation presented. It appears that the probation officers often sought assistance when dealing with their next course of action however, in many cases, it was dependant on the nature of the probation case and the violation presented. Finally, the recommendations made to the court appeared relatively consistent. The majority of the participants in the first two scenarios would continue the probationer on probation even though they did not love their job, were burned out, felt a lot of stress at work or often thought about quitting their job. The third and fourth scenario were slightly different and it appears the recommendation is based off of either the nature of the probation case or the technical violation presented.

While this sheds some light on the idea that the decisions made by probation officers can be affected by the love of the job, burnout, stress and thinking about quitting the job, it

should be taken cautiously as several issues appeared during the course of this thesis. First, it is important to recognize the sample size here is relatively small. It is possible that the results of the analysis could have changed dramatically had there been more participants in this study. Second, the atmosphere of most probation offices during this process is being redirected due to the influx of inmates in Texas prisons. Many departments throughout the State are being asked to reduce the number of revocations based on technical violations as this is clogging up the prison system. It is possible that the results may have been hindered by the changes that are occurring. Additionally, the option presented in the second and third statement of each scenario, "None of the above" appeared to be vague and confusing. There are numerous options that probation officers are able to select when dealing with their clients and it was impossible to include all possible alternatives however, this statement can appear to the participants as doing nothing at all. The results may be hindered here as the participants may have interpreted the statement as such and while they may not want to select the definitive options presented, they may have done so. Finally, the nature of the technical violation could present an issue with the action taken by the probation officer. A probationer that is on probation for a more serious crime who violates their probation with a minor infraction could face something other than what the result revealed. It is difficult to say with certainty that the perceptions of the probation officer do, in fact, make an impact because the technical violations presented were different for each scenario.

Should research like this be conducted in the future, some modifications should be attempted to get more accurate results. First, the probationers in each scenario ranged from a minor probationer to one that would be considered more serious. It is recommended that the technical violations remain constant throughout all of the scenarios presented. This change could better reveal whether or not stress and burnout makes an impact on the decisions probation officers make or if it is due to the nature of the offense to which the offender is on probation for. Second, the options presented in the scenarios were somewhat limited and vague. While it would be impossible for all possible options to be presented, it is recommended

that an option indicating that something would be done, just not the ones presented, should be included to eliminate the possibility of confusion among the participants. Finally, the statements presented to each participant to determine their perceptions were somewhat difficult to interpret. Some statements were primarily focused with burnout in mind however, other statements used also focus on stress. Stress and burnout are two separate ideas and both impact a person differently. A person can be stressed about their job but not be burned out and be burned out but not necessarily stressed. It would be recommended for future studies to present statements that are geared to one perception rather than two.

From a policy perspective, this thesis can assist with probation departments in a variety of ways. The decisions that many officers make on a daily basis contribute to the rise or decline of the prison population as well as impact the costs of maintaining these prisons. An officer that is experiencing burnout could potentially assist with the rise of the prison population. While it remains inconclusive on whether or not the perceptions definitively impact the revocation rates, it appears, in some cases, that it may be sliding in that direction. This can be a concern for the State of Texas as it threatens the prison population. Probation departments can take steps toward alleviating burnout and stress among their personnel to better assist with reducing the prison population, thereby reducing the cost of the system. If probation departments reduce burnout, not only will the prison system feel the effects but also the departments themselves. A reduction in employees using sick time and missing work, lower turnover rates and effective case management could lead to a more productive department. Those on probation can also reap the rewards as they could have a stable officer that assists them in their daily issues. If the goal of any probation department is to deter a prison sentence and rehabilitate the offender into a productive citizen, the idea that reducing burnout among the probation officers appears to be an additional tool that should be utilized.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY

Section One: In this section I am interested in learning how you would supervise offenders. Please read each scenario and answer the questions that follow.

Scenario One:

You are currently supervising a probationer who was convicted of assault family violence. The probationer's criminal history indicates no prior arrests or convictions. The probationer is participating in a court ordered anger management program.

1) In your opinion, how much risk does this offender pose to the community? Please circle your answer below:

Lowest Risk				Highest Risk
1	2	3	4	5

2) For the first 6 months of probation, the offender described in the above scenario tests positive for marijuana 5 times. Please circle your most likely course of action below:

a) Violate and request a warrant and a motion to revoke
b) Violate and request judicial review
c) Consult a supervisor on the next course of action
d) Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision
e) None of the above

3) The probationer in the above scenario is faced with a motion to revoke probation. You have been called to court to testify and give a recommendation regarding the pending motion to revoke. Please circle your most likely recommendation below:

a) Revoke; maximum amount of prison time
b) Revoke; minimum amount of prison time
c) Continue on probation; sanction; jail time
d) Continue on probation; sanction; conditions modified (not including jail time)
e) None of the above

Scenario Two:

You are currently supervising a probationer who has been convicted of possession of a controlled substance: methamphetamine. The probationer has one prior conviction of aggravated assault that occurred 5 years prior to the current conviction. The probationer is married, has 2 children, and is currently employed.

4) In your opinion, how much risk does this offender pose to the community? Please circle your answer below:

Lowest Risk				Highest Risk
1	2	3	4	5

5) The probationer in the above scenario has recently become divorced and at the last meeting, tested positive for methamphetamine. The probationer was scheduled to meet with you last

week but failed to show for the appointment. The appointment was rescheduled and the probationer reports. Please circle your most likely course of action below:

a) Violate and request a warrant and a motion to revoke
b) Violate and request judicial review
c) Consult a supervisor on the next course of action
d) Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision
e) None of the above

6) The probationer in the previous scenario is faced with a motion to revoke probation. You have been called to court to testify and give a recommendation regarding the pending motion to revoke. Please circle your most likely recommendation below:

a) Revoke; maximum amount of prison time
b) Revoke; minimum amount of prison time
c) Continue on probation; sanction; jail time
d) Continue on probation; sanction; conditions modified (not including jail time)
e) None of the above

Scenario Three:

You are currently supervising a probationer that was convicted of an Unauthorized Use Motor Vehicle (Vehicle theft). The probationer has prior convictions of 3 possessions of controlled substance charges and 1 burglary of a habitation charge. The probationer has just completed court ordered community service.

7) In your opinion, how much risk does this offender pose to the community? Please circle your answer below

Lowest Risk				Highest Risk
1	2	3	4	5

8) The field work officer attempts to visit the above probationer at home but was told that the probationer moved from that residence last month. You call all listed numbers and find that the numbers you have are all invalid or no longer working. Please circle your most likely course of action below:

a) Violate and request a warrant and a motion to revoke
b) Violate and request judicial review
c) Consult a supervisor on the next course of action
d) Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision
e) None of the above

9) The probationer in the above scenario is now faced with a motion to revoke probation. You have been called to court to testify and give a recommendation regarding the pending motion to revoke. Please circle your most likely recommendation below:

a) Revoke; maximum amount of prison time
b) Revoke; minimum amount of prison time
c) Continue on probation; sanction; jail time
d) Continue on probation; sanction; conditions modified (not including jail time)
e) None of the above

Scenario Four:

You are currently supervising a probationer that has been convicted of aggravated robbery with a deadly weapon. The probationer's criminal history includes one possession of a controlled substance, 3 possessions of marijuana, 2 unauthorized uses of a motor vehicle, and 1 burglary of a building. The probationer has been placed on probation for 2 of the above offenses and has been revoked both times.

10) In your opinion, how much risk does this offender pose to the community? Please circle your answer below:

Lowest Risk				Highest Risk
1	2	3	4	5

11) You receive an anonymous phone call notifying you that the above probationer is traveling to Houston 3 times a month for unknown reasons. The allegation is confirmed by a fax received that contains a copy of a bus ticket. Please circle your most likely course of action below:

a) Violate and request a warrant and a motion to revoke
b) Violate and request judicial review
c) Consult a supervisor on the next course of action
d) Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision
e) None of the above

12) The above probationer is faced with a motion to revoke probation. You have been called to court to testify and give a recommendation regarding the pending motion to revoke. Please circle your most likely recommendation below:

a) Revoke; maximum amount of prison time
b) Revoke; minimum amount of prison time
c) Continue on probation; sanction; jail time
d) Continue on probation; sanction; conditions modified (not including jail time)
e) None of the above

Scenario Five:

You are supervising a probationer convicted of DWI 3rd and has an interlock device in their car. The probationer's criminal history includes 4 manufacturing and deliver of a controlled substance, 2 DWIs, 1 theft $1500, 1 unlawful possession of a firearm and 5 DWLS convictions. The probationer is a known gang member but has not violated any conditions.

13) In your opinion, how much risk does this offender pose to the community? Please circle your answer below:

Lowest Risk				Highest Risk
1	2	3	4	5

14) The probationer in the above scenario was released from electronic monitoring. The probationer has tested positive for PCP on 4 occasions since his release, and associating with known gang members. Please circle your most likely course of action below:

a) Violate and request a warrant and a motion to revoke
b) Violate and request judicial review
c) Consult a supervisor on the next course of action
d) Wait for the next appointment with the probationer and then make a decision
e) None of the above

15) The probationer in the previous scenario is now facing a motion to revoke probation. You have been called to court to testify and give a recommendation regarding the pending motion to revoke. Please circle your most likely recommendation below:

a) Revoke; maximum amount of prison time
b) Revoke; minimum amount of prison time
c) Continue on probation; sanction; jail time
d) Continue on probation; sanction; conditions modified (not including jail time)
e) None of the above

Section two: In the section, I am interested in learning about how you feel about your job. Please read each question and answer each according to your experiences.

16) Please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly, or are uncertain about the following statements.

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Uncertain	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
	1	2	3	4	5
I am appreciated by my coworkers for the work that I do.	1	2	3	4	5
I am appreciated by my supervisor for the work that I do.	1	2	3	4	5
The size of my caseload is too large.	1	2	3	4	5

The main goal of my job is to protect the public.	1	2	3	4	5
The main goal of my job is to rehabilitate the probationer.	1	2	3	4	5
The policies of the department prohibit my abilities to effectively manage the probationers I monitor.	1	2	3	4	5
I love my job.	1	2	3	4	5
I am burned out by my job.	1	2	3	4	5
I feel a lot of stress when I am at work	1	2	3	4	5
I often think about quitting my job.	1	2	3	4	5

Section Four: Please answer the following questions regarding your background.

17) What is your gender?
- a) Male
- b) Female

18) In what year were you born? _____

19) What is your race?
- a) African American
- b) Asian
- c) Caucasian
- d) Hispanic
- e) Other _____

20) What is your highest level of educational attainment?
- a) High school or GED
- b) Some college, but did not earn a degree
- c) Bachelor's degree
- d) Some graduate course, but did not earn a graduate degree
- e) Graduate degree

21) How many years experience do you have in the field of probation?
- a) 1 year or less
- b) 2 – 5 years
- c) 6 – 10 years
- d) 11 – 15 years
- e) 16 – 20 years
- f) 21 – 25 years
- g) 26 – 30 years

h) 31 years and over

22) What is your current rank within the department?
a) CSO I
b) CSO II
c) Supervisor
d) Other:_____

23) What is your job description?
a) Regular Probation Officer
b) Court Officer
c) Intensive Supervision Officer
d) Specialized Caseload Officer: _____
e) Other: _____

24) What is the size of your current caseload?
a) 1 – 50
b) 51 – 100
c) 101 – 150
d) 151 – 200
e) 201 and over
f) I do not have a caseload

Thank you!

REFERENCES

American Probation and Parole Association. (1987). *Probation.* Retrieved May 29, 2008, from http://www.appa-net.org/about/ps/probation_1.htm

Bork, M.V. (1995). Five-year review of United States probation data, 1990-1994. *Federal Probation, 9,* 27-33.

Burrell, W.D., (n.d.). *Trends in Probation and Parole in the States*. Retrieved June 3, 2008, from the American Probation and Parole Association Web site: http://www.appa-net.org/ccheadlines/docs/Trends_Probation_Parole.pdf

Burton, V.S., Latessa, E.J., & Barker, T. (1992). The Role of Probation Officers: An examination of Statutory Requirements. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice.* Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://ccj.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/8/4/273

Cherniss, C. (1980). *Staff Burnout: Job Stress in the Human Services.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Cohen, B. (1995). Probation and Parole Violations, 1991. *Bureau of Justice Statistics.* Retrieved May 29, 2008, from www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/ppvsp91.pdf.

Dorman, R.L., & Shapiro, J.P. (2004). *Preventing Burnout in Your Staff and Yourself: A Survival Guide for Human Services Supervisors.* Washington, D.C.: Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

Farrall, S. (2002) *Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, social context and desistance from crime.* United Kingdom: Willan Publishing.

Freudenberger, H.J. (1974). Staff Burnout. *Journal of Social Sciences. 30,* 159-165.

Glaze, L.E., & Bonczar, T.P. (2007, December). Probation and Parole in the United States, 2006. *Bureau of Justice Statistics.* Retrieved May 29, 2008, from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/ppus06.pdf

Gray, M.K., Fields, M., & Maxwell, S.R. (2001). Examining Probation Violations: Who, What, and When. *Crime Delinquency.* Retrieved May 29, 2008, from http://cad.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/47/4/537

Grinnell, F.W. (1941). The Common Law History of Probation. An Illustration of "Equitable" Growth of Criminal Law. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology.* Retrieved May 28, 2008, from http://libproxy.uta.edu:2055/stable/pdfplus/1136678.pdf

Kop, N., Euwema, M., & Schaufeli, W. (1999). Burnout, Job Stress, and Violent Behaviour among Dutch Police Officers. *Work and Stress, 13,* 326-340.

Lee, R.T., & Ashforth, B.E. (1993). A Further Examination of Managerial Burnout: Toward and Integrated Model. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14*, 3-20.

Leiter, M.P. (1991). Coping Patterns as Predictors of Burnout: The Function of Control and Escapist Coping Patterns. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12,* 123-144.

Lindner, C. (2007). Thacher, Augustus, and Hill-The Path to Statutory Probation in the United States and England. *Federal Probation, 71*, 36-41.

Manzoni, P., & Eisner, M. (2006). Violence Between the Police and the Public: Influences of Work-Related Stress, Job Satisfaction, Burnout, and Situational Factors. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 33,* 613-645.

Martinussen, M., Richardsen, A.M., & Burke, R.J. (2007). Job Demands, Job Resources and Burnout Among Police Officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 35,* 239-149.

Maslach, C. (1982). *Burnout-The Cost of Caring.* New York, NY: Prentice Hall Press.

Maslach, C., & Leiter, M.P. (1997). *The Truth About Burnout: How Organizations Cause Personal Stress and What To Do About It.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52,* 397-422.

Ohlin, L.E., Piven, H., & Pappenfort, D.M. (1956). Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole. *National Probation and Parole Officer Journal. 2*, 211-225.

Paparozzi, M., & Demichele, M. (2008). Probation and Parole: Overworked, Misunderstood, and Under-Appreciated: But Why? *The Howard Journal, 47*, 275-296.

Piar, D.F. (2003). A Uniform Code of Procedure for Revoking Probation. *American Journal of Criminal Law, 31,* 117-173.

Pines, A.M., & Aronson, E. (1988). *Career Burnout: Causes and Cures.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Pines, A.M., Aronson, E., & Kafry,D. (1981). *Burnout.* New York, NY: The Free Press.

Purkiss, M., Kifer, M. Hemmens, C. & Burton Jr., V.S. (2003). Probation Officer Functions-A Statutory Analysis. *Federal Probation, 67*, 12-23.

Sabol, W.J., Couture, H., & Harrison, P.M. (2007, December). Prisoners in 2006. *Bureau of Justice Statistics.* Retrieved May 29, 2008, from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/p06.pdf

Sieh, E.W. (2006). *Community Corrections and Human Dignity.* Boston, MA: Jones and Barlett Publishers.

Sigler, R.T. (1988). Role Conflict for Adult Probation and Parole Officers: Fact or Myth. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 16,* 121-129.

Spano, R. (2005). Potential Sources of Observer Bias in Police Observational Data. *Social Science Research, 34,* 591-617.

Stephan, J.J. (2004, June). State Prison Expenditures, 2001. *Bureau of Justice Statistics.* Retrieved May 29, 2008, from http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/pub/pdf/spe01.pdf

Taxman, F.S., & Cherkos, R. (1995). Intermediate sanctions: Dealing with technical violators. *Corrections Today, 57,* 46-57.

The Pew Center on the States. (2007, February). *Texas.* Retrieved March 16, 2009, from http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/TX%20State%20Profile%202-22-07.pdf

The Pew Center on the States. (2009, March). *One in 31: The Long Reach of American Corrections.* Retrieved March 16, 2009, from http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/PSPP_1in31_report_FINAL_WEB_2-27-09.pdf

U.S. Probation & Pretrial Service. (2003, January). *Probation Officers.* Retrieved June 01, 2008, from http://www.uscourts.gov/misc/2003-probation.PDF

Van Laningham, D.E., Taber, M., & Dimants, R. (1966). How Adult Probation Officers View Their Job Responsibilities. *Crime and Delinquency, 12,* 97-108.

Vanstone, M. (2004). *Supervising Offenders in the Community: A history of probation theory and practice.* Burlington, VA: Ashgate Publishing Company.

Veninga, R.L., & Spradley, J.P. (1981). *The Work/Stress Connection: How to Cope with Job Burnout.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Whitehead, J.T. (1989) *Burnout in Probation and Corrections.* New York, New York: Praeger Publishers.

Wodahl, E.J., & Garland, B. (2009). The Evolution of Community Corrections: The Enduring Influence of the Prison.*The Prison Journal, 89,* 81S-104S.

Zellars, K.L., Hochwarter, W.A., Perrewe, P.L., Hoffman, N., & Ford, E.W. (2004). Experiencing Job Burnout: The Roles of Positive and Negative Traits and States. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34,* 887-911.

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Amanda Kent obtained a Bachelor of Science degree at Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi and obtained a Master of Arts degree at University of Texas at Arlington. She is currently employed as a Felony court officer for Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections (Adult Probation).