

REHABILITATION PROCEDURES FOR MINNESOTA OFFENDERS UNDER
PROBATIONARY SUPERVISION

by

Jason Denis

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master of Science
Degree With a Major in

Vocational Rehabilitation

Approved: 2 Semester Credits

Investigation Adviser

The Graduate College University of Wisconsin-Stout December, 1999

Abstract

Name: Denis, Jason J.

Title: Rehabilitation Procedures for Minnesota Offenders Under Probationary Supervision.

Graduate Major: Vocational Rehabilitation

Research Advisor: Dr. Robert Peters

Date: 3/00 **No. of Pages:** 50

Name of Style Manual Used in this Study: APA Style

This particular study aims at identifying what is being done to rehabilitate criminal offenders. More specifically, those on probation since the majority of offenders (two-thirds) are under this form of community-based corrections. In addition, the goal of this study is to describe the rehabilitative programs that are currently in place. It is said that a good study produces more questions than answers. Therefore, once the programs have been identified evaluation can begin. Are the programs sufficient? Who is taking advantage of them? How can they be improved? If they are not being used, why? Who is taking advantage of them? Should additional programs be developed/implemented? What kinds of areas should they be in? These are all questions that can be more closely looked at when the actual programs that are in place are recognized and evaluated.

The subjects used in this study were the twenty-five county probation directors of Minnesota. The names and addresses of these twenty-five men and

women were obtained from Ron Fry at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, who in turn had received it from Michael MacMillan, who was director of the Wright County Court Services in Minnesota at the time. Mr. MacMillan is also a graduate of Stout. The purpose of this descriptive study was to gather data about the elements of rehabilitation programs for offenders under probationary supervision in the state of Minnesota.

Table of Contents

Title Page.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Table of Contents.....	
Chapter One: Introduction	5
Background	5
Problem Statement	8
Description of the Remainder of the Thesis.....	8
Definition of Terms.....	9
Chapter Two: Literature Review.....	10
Introduction.....	10
History of Corrections.....	10
Philosophical Models of Rehabilitation.....	13
Criticisms/Defenses of Rehabilitative Ideals	15
Future Trends in Corrections	20
Chapter Three: Methodology.....	22
Subjects.....	22
Instruments.....	22
Survey Questions	23
Procedure	24
Analysis of Data.....	24
Limitations	25
Chapter Four: Data Analysis and Results	26
Conclusion	31
Chapter Five: Conclusions	32
Discussion.....	32
Limitations 43	
Bibliography	47
Survey Cover Letter.....	48
Survey	49

Chapter 1

Introduction

Since the beginning of corrections in this country there has been a controversy on what the institution's primary focus should be. The three reasons for imprisonment have always been: (1) to punish; (2) to deter; and (3) to rehabilitate. For the most part the pendulum of this argument has swung between punishment and rehabilitation. The State Legislature has always stated rehabilitation as its main penological goal, but this is only on paper, the reality of corrections is much different. In practice, the reform of offenders has been given very little effort.

During the last couple of political campaign seasons the American public has been bombarded with sound bites and slogans that reinforce their worst fears. This combined with the tremendous amount of sensationalistic media coverage by both columnists and talk shows, has led the citizens of this country to believe that our society is rapidly decaying threatening the very existence of any kind of civilized future. As a result, the public has been frightened into adopting a simplistic viewpoint on crime with an even more simplistic solution: Lock them all up (Ivanka, 1997).

This apparent desire to lock up the entire criminal element in costly prisons simply will not work. "Crime is not something that

can we eliminate by creating a criminal underclass that is incarcerated and forgotten” (Ivanka, 1997, p. 20) More than 5 million American adults are under some kind of correctional supervision, with just over 1.5 million in jails or prisons, more than at any other time in our history (Ivanka, 1997). With the rise in young adult and juvenile crime the worst is expected to rise as the new century approaches. So isn't "locking them up" working? The numbers clearly speak for themselves and the answer is a resounding "NO".

While there seems to be a great deal of information on the prevalence of crime in this country, there is very little in the way of understanding, and even less in the way of solutions. The people of this Nation need to stop wasting their time and efforts looking for people to blame. Americans need to start looking at the reasons, the underlying issues, behind those spiraling crime figures. "Research data clearly shows no correlation between the incidence of crime and the rate of incarceration" (Ivanka, 1997, p. 21). Basically, this means that crime has swelled in our country despite the high levels of imprisonment. People insist that others take responsibility for their actions, yet there is a great deal of proof that many segments of society share an element of blame: broken families, failed schools, failed churches/temples and the failure of community support mechanisms. The majority of convicts one day

will be released into society, a society people want to keep safe. People putting their heads in the sand and ignoring these men and women will only ensure recidivism. Correctional workers need the support of families, schools, and churches to truly have a chance to rehabilitate the criminal element. Isn't it time to start focusing on what they are going home to? To focus on the transition from corrections to mainstream society? It is time to focus the energies of this country on being creative and discovering what else can be done besides "locking them all up".

Everyone agrees that society has a right to be protected from those individuals who behave in a destructive manner. The argument is not to abandon the elements of punishment or control completely, the argument is to focus primarily on rehabilitating these individuals before they are on the streets again. It is in the best interest of society to rehabilitate offenders so that it will not be burdened by the necessity of forever supporting them (Roos, 1972). Temporary protective separation and rehabilitation are the means to the end goal of constructive re-integration into society (Roos, 1972). Furthermore, this system of rehabilitation will then be less expensive in the long run.

The advantages of this more efficient, less expensive correctional rehabilitation model was apparent to the state of Washington back in the 1960s when they developed the Federal

Offenders Rehabilitation Program, or FOR. The report of this study indicated that offender populations are ample resources for potential vocational rehabilitation clients and that a substantial percentage can be “rehabilitated” according to current vocational rehabilitation measurements (State of Washington Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1969). It would seem from this particular study that there is a place for vocational rehabilitation in corrections. With this in mind it would perhaps be useful to see what kinds of programs are available to vocationally rehabilitate offenders as well as other aspects of rehabilitation (i.e. substance/alcohol abuse, etc.). This discussion of vocational, and general education problems points to the need for a renewed commitment to intervention directed at an offender’s successful readjustment to society at large (Rosenthal, 1993). Clearly, America is at the end of an incarceration movement. As a result, rehabilitation is now ready to be at the forefront of corrections. It is time to attempt to slow the epidemic recidivism rate that is currently plaguing the criminal justice system in America. Rehabilitation issues for the 1990s and beyond will continue to concentrate on vocational and educational programs. These programs continue to draw mainstream support. They produce both practical skills and work ethics in offenders. Another common theme in corrections is substance abuse counseling for alcohol and

drug problems. These are efforts that will continue into the 21st century.

This particular study aims at identifying what is being done to rehabilitate criminal offenders. More specifically, those on probation since the majority of offenders (two-thirds) are under this form of community-based corrections. In addition, this study hopes to describe the rehabilitative programs that are currently in place. It is said that a good study produces more questions than answers. Therefore, once the programs have been identified evaluation can begin. Are they sufficient? How can they be improved? If they are not being used, why? Who is taking advantage of them? Should additional programs be developed/implemented? What kinds of areas should they be in? These are all questions that can be more closely looked at when the actual programs that are in place are recognized and evaluated.

Definition of Terms

Recidivism: A relapse by past criminal offenders into criminal activity or antisocial behavior leading them back into the criminal justice system.

Rehabilitative ideal: The notion that the primary purpose of penal treatment is to effect changes in the characters, attitudes, and behavior, of convicted offenders, so as to strengthen the social defense against unwanted behavior, but also to contribute to the welfare and satisfaction of offenders (Allen, 1981).

Community-based corrections: Correctional facilities and programs dispersed throughout the open community to allow the offender the most freedom possible (Jarvis, 1978).

Probation: Conditional permission for a person who has been convicted of a felony to live on the outside, under the supervision of a probation officer, during the offenders sentence (Jarvis, 1978).

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature will begin with a historical overview of the role rehabilitation has played in corrections. The review will then follow the penological pendulum and show how it has swung along the rehabilitation--punishment continuum. Rehabilitation's survival throughout this institutions history will be presented. Following the historical overview will be an examination of the rehabilitative philosophy in relation to the correctional system. The philosophy of the rehabilitative ideal will be explored, in addition, to both the criticisms and defense of rehabilitation in the criminal justice system. Lastly, the future trends of rehabilitation in corrections will be discussed.

From the emergence of the first prison to the development of modern correctional innovations, corrections has developed in stages, each representing an attempt to incorporate a new philosophy of treatment. The first notable stage in corrections in America took place during the Colonial period. Correctional

treatment was an anomaly in America until the late eighteenth century because the colonists were pessimistic that crime could be eradicated (Bartollas, 1985). The colonists believed that severe punishment was the way to an obedient criminal. There was definitely no place for treatment or rehabilitation in corrections at this time. It was not until after the War of Independence that ideas from the Enlightenment began to change how people viewed human potential. These new ideas during this new age nurtured boundless optimism about the perfectibility of the individual and society (Bartollas, 1985). The spirit of reform was in the air and corrections was in its midst.

The next institution to be developed was the penitentiary. The penitentiary used isolation and work to morally reform the offender. The theory behind the penitentiary was that crime was the result of a bad environment. This breakdown of community life was what caused the criminal behavior in young, impressionable offenders. The American penitentiaries of the Jacksonian era (1820-1830s) failed miserably in their efforts to reform inmates (Welch, 1995). Yet, even during corrections failures, the idea of rehabilitation persisted. During the Reformatory era of the 1870s, prison administrators renewed hope in rehabilitation (Welch, 1995). It is important to note, however, that rehabilitation during the Reformatory era was not viewed in medical terms as it is today.

This particular transition in perspectives was about to take place. By the turn of the century medical technology was rapidly improving and it did not take long for prison officials to take note of the breakthrough. With this new medical approach to corrections, prisons began redeveloping programs and introducing a therapeutic staff consisting of psychiatrists, psychologists, clinical social workers, and other specialists. The role of the therapeutic staff was to facilitate the process of rehabilitation by molding the offender into a law-abiding member of society (Welch, 1995). Reformatories evolved over time in an attempt to find the right combination of ingredients, but fell short in the end. Supporters of reform soon realized that these reformatories were violent, stone-walled, fortresses, no more conducive to reform than the old style penitentiaries (Bartollas, 1985).

The next wave of optimism that swept through society was labeled the Progressive era (1900-1920s) (Bartollas, 1985). This period led to the development of individualized treatment for offenders. "The rise of community-based corrections, the use of the medical model to rehabilitate offenders, experimentation with inmate self-government, and the expansion of indeterminate sentencing all resulted from this emphasis on individualized treatment" (Bartollas, 1985, p.7). So treatment is quite obviously the focus of modern day corrections. By the end of the second

decade of the twentieth century, all the components of modern day corrections were firmly in place. The medical model was established as the solution for curing the disease of criminality. Also, community corrections, with the development of probation and parole, had become very viable options for dealing with crime therefore, competing heavily with institutionalization. Both the medical model and community corrections began to take shape and would become forever entrenched in the criminal justice system.

Ever since that period, the argument has been to what extent should the role of rehabilitation play? The rise and fall of rehabilitation in corrections is greatly documented and appears to be cyclical. Every couple of decades or so there seems to be a call for reform and rehabilitation will get recycled showing up in a new and improved form. Since the late 1960s, there has been a growing sense of alienation with rehabilitation and its results (Shichor, 1992). The many criticisms of the time led to the hard-nosed position characteristics of corrections in the 1980s. During the 1980s, the United States simply threw money at the problem of criminality. More prisons were built, more correctional staff were hired, and a seemingly indiscriminate imprisoning policy was adopted. The answer to anyone caught breaking the law appeared to be to lock them up and throw away the key. Hindsight, of course, is always 20-20, and it has become painfully clear that this

simplistic “tough on crime” stance is not the answer. Rehabilitation is now ready to take its position at the forefront of corrections.

With the historical groundwork of rehabilitation in corrections laid, it will now prove useful to examine the specifics of the rehabilitation philosophy in today’s terms. Sechrest (1979), as cited by Shichor (1992), stated that the ideal of rehabilitation focuses on individual offenders and seeks to reduce criminal activities by changing offenders’ attitudes and patterns of behavior. There are basically three models that make up the philosophy of the rehabilitative ideal. The three perspectives at the core of this eclectic philosophy are the medical model, as well as, both the reintegration and adjustment models. Before these models are discussed, however, it will prove beneficial to clarify an important point that may be bothering the reader at this time. That is, how has the penal goal of rehabilitation survived? It was clearly illustrated in the historical overview that rehabilitation in corrections has oftentimes not been a popular element. This is indeed a reasonable question to ask. According to Shichor (1992), some of the major reasons for the survival of the rehabilitative ideal and policies are the following:

(1) Rehabilitation still receives considerable public support as a major goal of the correctional system. Public opinion has not lost its faith in the ability to reform offenders.

(2) Rehabilitation is supported by many social scientists since their basic assumptions regarding human behavior seem to be compatible with rehabilitation. The rehabilitation principle holds that social and personal factors have a strong impact on crime and should be addressed in order to curtail the crime problem.

(3) There is also strong support for rehabilitation based on moral and rehabilitation humanitarian grounds. Basically, that it is inherently the “right” thing to do.

This ends the summary of some of the major reasons, according to Shichor (1992), rehabilitation has survived as a goal in corrections. Now, the three previously mentioned models, that help make up the philosophy of the rehabilitative ideal.

Essentially, the medical model as applied to corrections assumes the offender to be physically, emotionally, and/or socially “sick.” The criminal activity then is a manifestation or symptom of the person’s illness. “Proponents of the medical model believe that crime is caused by factors that can be identified, isolated, treated, and cured” (Bartollas, 1985, p. 26). Therefore, punishment should be avoided because it does nothing but reinforce the already negative concept offenders have of themselves. Additionally, the medical model assumes that the criminal offender has no ability to exercise free will or to reason (Bartollas, 1985).

Out of growing dissatisfaction with the medical model grew the adaptation of the adjustment model in correctional rehabilitation. According to Bartollas, the adjustment model is based on the following four assumptions: (1) offenders need help, or treatment, to conform to societal expectations; (2) offenders have the capacity to live a crime-free life and, therefore, the emphasis of correctional treatment should be on the belief that offenders are responsible for their present actions; (3) offenders can be taught ways in which they can lead crime-free lives; and (4) punishment is seen only to further offender estrangement and problem behavior. Rather than focusing on the pathology, as the medical model does, the adjustment model emphasizes helping offenders make a more socially acceptable adjustment to society. Lastly, this approach discourages institutionalization.

The last model that helps make up the rehabilitative ideal is the reintegration model. The overriding assumption of the reintegration model is that offenders' problems must be solved in the community where they began (Bartollas, 1985). Thus, the community must play a role in aiding the offender with making the transition back into society. "Another assumption is that meaningful community contacts are required to achieve the objectives of reintegration" (Bartollas, 1985, p. 28). From these three assumptions it should be clear that proponents of the reintegration

model advocate community-based corrections in the rehabilitation of the criminal offender.

With the basic philosophical framework of the rehabilitative ideal discussed it would now be wise to look into some of the specific criticisms and defenses of this ideal. "The many criticisms rehabilitative philosophy has received can be grouped into three basic complaints: Its theoretical assumptions are in conflict with basic human values; it has been ineffective in reducing recidivism; and it has been a disaster in practice" (Bartollas, 1985, p. 34). Additionally, critics have seriously questioned the three basic components of the rehabilitative ideal: individualization, indeterminacy, and discretionary power (Bartollas, 1985). Individualization, or focusing on the criminal rather than the crime committed, resulted in the viewing of the offender as "sick: and, therefore, different from noncriminals. This is a product of the influence of the medical model. It is further argued, that no program imaginable is likely to reverse the offenders twenty or thirty years of antisocial conditioning.

Critics have also attacked the indeterminate sentence element of rehabilitation. Bartollas explains this flaw with the following:

The task of individually tailoring decisions to accomplish rehabilitation led

to the indeterminate sentence whereby the offender is released only

when “cured” of his or her criminality. But critics claim that a sentencing

structure that depends on the rehabilitation of offenders lacks

justice, fairness, constitutional safeguards, and reasonableness (1985).

Lastly, the critics claim that the wide discretionary powers implicit in rehabilitative philosophy has been abused on a minimum of two fronts. First, rehabilitation has been too easy on offenders and, thus, has not fulfilled the punishment element of corrections. The other problem has to do with the excessive power given to parole boards. The seemingly arbitrary manner in which these boards typically decide when inmates are ready for parole has drawn strong criticisms from prisoners, prison reformers, and the general public.

As with any controversial phenomena, there is a significant amount of research supporting both of the conflicting sides. The same is true for rehabilitation in corrections. There are studies claiming rehabilitation as having little or no affect on recidivism rates. Conversely, there exists a number of studies claiming rehabilitation as having a positive influence on recidivism rates. For years people have stood by the studies or research that best serves their purpose.

Another criticism made about rehabilitative philosophy is that it has been a disaster in practice. “First, critics claim that the rehabilitative philosophy eventually results in punishment rather than treatment” (Bartollas, 1985, p. 37). In the name of treatment, the state has justified some questionable techniques in the attempt to “rehabilitate.” Second, critics argue that the rehabilitative philosophy has resulted in a more inhumane aspect of rehabilitation as related to the fact that some offenders get worse, instead of improving. Finally, critics claim that rehabilitation does not belong in prisons in the first place. Basically, this perspective believes that prisons are dismal, inhospitable places not conducive to rehabilitation.

In defense of rehabilitation Cullin and Gilbert (1982) list four main reasons for the reaffirming of rehabilitation in corrections.

(1) Rehabilitation is the only justification for criminal sanctioning states have to care for an offender’s needs or welfare that obligates the state to care for an offender’s needs or welfare.

If the element of rehabilitation is removed, the system of corrections is left with punishment and deterrence as its only goals. This in effect dehumanizes the inmate and, therefore, all but eliminates the opportunity to transform these offenders into law-abiding citizens, which is a very attractive payoff for society.

(2) The ideology of rehabilitation provides an important rationale for opposing the conservative's assumption that increased repression will reduce crime.

Basically, this means that repressive tactics in corrections do not touch upon the real social roots of crime. Such reactive measures fail to correct the underlying issues of crime. Preventive or proactive measures are the key to really making a difference in the crime rates.

(3) Rehabilitation still receives considerable support as a major goal of the correctional system.

The public is frustrated with the crime rate but, there is existing survey data which lists rehabilitation as the prevailing ideology in corrections (Cullin & Gilbert, 1982).

(4) Rehabilitation has historically been an important motive underlying reform efforts that have increased the humanity of the correctional system.

These are four important points that help illustrate the value of rehabilitation. There is additional ammunition that can be used to shoot holes into the criticism of correctional rehabilitation. The widespread attacking of rehabilitation is really unfair since it has been given little more than lip service in American corrections. Quite frankly, rehabilitation has never been given an honest chance.

First of all, rehabilitative programs are so few that they can serve only a small minority of inmates in prison (Bartollas, 1985). Very few offenders participate in programs, and of those even a smaller percentage with identified needs participate in treatment programs related to those needs. Additionally, it is suspected that the programs are often times sabotaged by custodial staff. Bartollas (1985) further explains by commenting the following:

Staff members “forget” the days that certain inmates are to attend programs. Security staff members may recommend to prisoners that they not become involved in programs, and at times, do not even permit treatment staff to see inmates on the cellblock or in other areas of the prison (p.32).

So it is clear that these programs do not get the full cooperation they deserve. Finally, the lack of follow-up in the community most definitely negates the positive effects of treatment on offenders (Bartollas, 1985).

Equally effective in the defense of rehabilitation is by showing that it is a necessary part of the correctional process. What would the criminal justice system look like without rehabilitation? It is argued that the retention of rehabilitation is necessary to maintain humanitarianism in the criminal justice system (Bartollas, 1985). Society cannot continue to send

untreated offenders out onto the streets because society needs the benefits of treatment for its own protection. "Rehabilitation, in other words, serves the useful purpose of deterring property and personal crimes in American society" (Bartollas, 1985, p. 33).

Lastly, rehabilitation is far too compelling an ideal to give up. The corrections system has made some exciting strides in the last two decades that very much have an influence on rehabilitation's place. In the 1970s, the reintegration and adjustment models, described earlier, largely replaced the controversial medical model, and compulsory programs received lessening support from advocates of rehabilitation (Bartollas, 1985). Programs also became more varied, especially in community-based corrections, and the technology of interventions became more sophisticated. Furthermore, the overall quality and integrity of programs improved, and far better research methods were used to more accurately predict what interventions will work for which offenders in what circumstances.

An overview of the history of rehabilitation in corrections was initially given. Next, the future trends that will guide correctional rehabilitation into the 21st century will be explored.

Epstein (1994), Lacayo (1994), and Smolowe (1994), as cited by Sluder(1996), stated that for the first time in the nearly 60 years of public opinion polling, the public ranked crime as the

Nation's most important problem. The scope and severity of this social problem cannot be denied. The phenomena of crime is something that everyone in this country is either concerned with, or at the very least, aware of.

So, in what direction is corrections headed? Very simply, corrections is going to be community-based. The statistics already prove beyond a doubt that this is true, and it is expected to continue in this direction. More specifically, correctional rehabilitation is going to have to focus on probation. About two-thirds of all offenders under correctional supervision are on probation (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1991). As the Nation continues to sanction more offenders, augment its police forces, and prisons experience increased overcrowding, many believe that even more offenders will be funneled into the probation system. Between 1984 and 1990 probation caseloads rose from 1.74 million persons to 2.67 million persons, a 53.4 percent increase (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1991). From these statistics and other related trends in the field it is easy to see that probation will become even more of a mainstay sanction in the future.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Subjects

The subjects used in this study were the 23 County Probation Directors of Minnesota. It should be noted here that each county does not have its own director. The directors of highly populated counties may preside over one particular county, while directors in the less populated areas of the state may have a territory of three or four counties. The names and mailing addresses of these twenty-three men and women was obtained from Ron Fry at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, who had received it from Michael MacMillan. Mr. MacMillan is the director of Wright County Court Services in Buffalo, Minnesota and is a past graduate of Stout.

Instrumentation

The problem in corrections today in the United States is the high recidivism rate. Therefore, the purpose of this descriptive

study is to determine what kinds of programs are currently available to rehabilitate offenders under probation, in the state of Minnesota.

The instrument used was a 13 item survey built around the following research question: What elements are currently being used in Minnesota to rehabilitate offenders under probationary supervision? The following survey questions were developed to support the preceding research question.

Survey Questions

1. How many adult male offenders are on probation in your county? _____
2. Of those men, how many are given psychological evaluations? _____
3. How many are evaluated for learning disabilities? _____
4. How many are evaluated for psychological disorders? _____
5. How many are given alcohol and/or drug assessments? _____
6. Which of the following psychological tests are used? (check all that apply)
 - _____ WASR
 - _____ Stanford-Binet
 - _____ MMPI
 - _____ Interest Inventories
 - _____ Other
 - _____ None
7. How valuable do you think such psychological evaluations are? (circle one)

Not important 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 Extremely important
8. What methods are used to vocationally assess these offenders?(check all that apply)
 - _____ On-the-job training
 - _____ Job-shadowing
 - _____ Work samples
 - _____ Other
 - _____ None

9. Are there programs offered that identify job-seeking skills? (Those essential abilities needed to correctly locate and apply for jobs and effectively interview for them).

_____ Yes
 _____ No

10. Are there services offered that provide job-keeping skills training? (Those attributes that make good employees: good attendance, appropriate grooming and dress, getting along with supervisors and co-workers, and correctly following rules and regulations).

_____ Yes
 _____ No

11. If job-seeking/keeping skills services exist, how many of those on probation take advantage of them? _____

12. Do you feel such vocational services would/do reduce recidivism?

No, not at all 1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 Definitely

13. What do you feel is the single biggest issue/problem facing the probation system?
 (use space provided below)

Procedure

The questionnaire was sent to each of the twenty-three county probation directors in the state of Minnesota. The cover letter requested they fill out the survey to the best of their ability and send it back in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided within seven to ten days from delivery of the package. The questions once answered will help identify rehabilitation programs that are currently available to Minnesota offenders on probation.

Analysis of Data

Descriptive data relative to each question will be provided. The frequencies of responses will be developed for each question. Questions seven and twelve will have a mean and standard deviation reported for each, as well as, frequencies of responses.

Limitations

One of the limitations with this study at this point is the size of the targeted population. The population being surveyed is the twenty-three “county” probation directors of Minnesota. There are actually more than twenty-three counties in the state of Minnesota; however, some of more the less populated counties are grouped into territories in which there is only one “county” or area probation director. Typically, a response rate of approximately 10 percent or above is considered desirable with such studies. If this goal is attained, which by no means is guaranteed, a sample size of approximately 2-3 respondents will be produced on which to base appropriate conclusions.

Related to the above concern or limitation is the issue of generalization. To begin, the very design of this study limits the generalization of the conclusions to the state Minnesota alone. The ability of generalize the data to Minnesota may be threatened by

the number of respondents or the sample size. If data is received from 2 or 3 respondents, can any valid conclusion be based upon the state as a whole? The answer is probably no. Finally, Minnesota is a very diverse state with an equally diverse population. Approximately half of the population of the state of Minnesota resides in the Twin Cities Metro area, while the other half is scattered throughout the remainder of this relatively large state. Overwhelming data received from either one of these two extreme sub-populations may profoundly skew the overall results of the data and its subsequent conclusions. Such limitations should be kept in the mind of the reader as they continue through into the Data Analysis and Results of Chapter 4. They will again be revisited in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this descriptive study is to determine what kinds of programs are currently available to rehabilitate offenders under probation, in the state of Minnesota. More specifically, it was decided that the population to focus on was those on probation, since approximately two-thirds of male offenders in the corrections system are placed on this type of sanction. Additionally, it was the aim of this study to describe some of the rehabilitative programs that are currently in place within the state of Minnesota. Upon

identification of said programs it would be possible to start the important function of evaluating the strengths and/or weaknesses of the policies. Such evaluations may stimulate creative thought on how to improve the programs currently in place; thereby, reducing the recidivism rate. This study was designed to begin this process by simply attempting to identify the programs and combining this information with crucial feedback from those in the field who know the system best.

The resource attempting to be tapped to gain this insight was the knowledge of the twenty-three County Probation Directors of Minnesota. Any possible identifying features were removed to ensure the anonymity of the subjects being questioned. Therefore, demographic information relative to the respondents can not be reported. However, the various ranges for the specific questions can be reported to give the mean scores, which will also be reported in this chapter, more meaning. This will identify the outliers or extreme scores, which skew the results of some of the questions asked, consequently producing clarity when attempting to interpret the data.

The return ratio was 7 of 23 or 30%. This survey was based on adult, male offenders under correctional supervision in the state of Minnesota.

1. How many adult male offenders are on probation in your county/territory?

Frequencies/Responses: (1) 120, (1) 190, (1) 212, (1) 550, (1) 600, (1) 738, (1) 750

n=7 Range = 120-750 Mean = 415.86

2. How many men on probation are given psychological evaluations?

Frequencies/Responses: (1) 8, (1) 19, (1) 20, (1) 24, (1) 25, (1) 35, (1) 41

n=7 Range = 8-41 Mean = 24.67

3. How many are evaluated for learning disability?

Frequencies/Responses: (2) 0, (1) 5, (1) 6, (1) 37

n=5 Range = 0-37 Mean = 9.60

4. How many are evaluated for psychological disorders?

Frequencies/Responses: (1) 8, (1) 19, (1) 20, (1) 25, (1) 35, (1) 37

n=6 Range = 8-37 Mean = 18.78

5. How many are given alcohol and/or drug assessments?

Frequencies/Responses: (2) 50, (1) 95, (1) 200, (1) 330, (1) 400, (1) 664

n=7 Range = 50-664 Mean = 255.57

6. Which of the following psychological tests are used? (check all that apply)

n=7

Frequencies/Responses:

 2 WASR

 2 Stanford-Binet

 4 MMPI

 1 Interest Inventories

 4 Other

 0 None

Of the four that stated "Other", none specified or listed what "other" psychological tests they utilized. Two of the respondents noted that these services were contracted by outside providers. One stated "Unknown" as the answer to this question.

7. How valuable do you think such psychological evaluations are? (circle one)

**Not Important 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 Extremely
Important**

Frequencies/Ratings: 1 - 0 responses, 2 - 0 responses, 3 - 2 responses, 4 - 3 responses, 5 - 1 response. One respondent did not answer this question, which left a total of six responses for useable data to yield the Mean and Standard Deviation.

n=6 Mean = 3.33 Standard Deviation
= .72

8. What methods are used to vocationally assess these offenders?

(check all that apply)

n=6

Frequencies/Responses:

 1 On-the-job training

 0 Job-Shadowing

 1 Work Samples

 3 Other

 4 None

One listed a Job Training Program under "Other". A second respondent specified "Rehabilitation Services" under "Other".

Another indicated that they referred such services to "Employment

and Training”; however, this was not elaborated upon. One respondent checked both “Other” and “None” which resulted in throwing out that particular response due to a lack of validity. Lastly, one did not answer and stated that vocational assessments were “only completed in juvenile cases indicating a special need”.

9. Are there programs offered that identify job-seeking skills? (Those essential abilities needed to correctly locate and apply for jobs and effectively interview for them).

n=7

 6 Yes

 1 No

10. Are there services offered that provide job-keeping skills training? (Those attributes that make good employees: good attendance, appropriate grooming and dress, getting along with supervisors and co-workers, and correctly following rules and regulations).

n=7

 4 Yes

 3 No

11. If job-seeking/keeping skills services exist, how many of those on probation take advantage of them? (all answers received were given in the form of percentages).

n=4 Mean = 11.75% Standard Deviation

= 14.13%

Two respondents did not answer to this question. One did not give a specific number, but stated that several are referred but do not follow through. Two of the respondents estimated the percentage at *approximately* one percent. The other two respondents estimated the percentages to be approximately 5% and 40%.

12. Do you feel such vocational services would/do reduce recidivism?

Not Important 1-----2-----3-----4-----5 Extremely

Important

Frequencies/Ratings: 1 - 0 responses, 2 - 1 response, 3 - 2 responses, 4 - 1 response, 5 - 3 responses.

n=4 Mean = 3.86 Standard Deviation
= 1.12

13. What do you feel is the single biggest issue/problem facing the probation system?

n=6 (Some respondents gave more than one answer).

1-Substance use/abuse.

2-Motivating offenders

2-High caseloads

1-Recidivism.

1-Limited funding

This concludes chapter four and its reporting of the raw data received in response to the survey sent to the county probation directors in Minnesota. A discussion of this data, conclusions drawn from this data, in addition to limitations of this study will follow in chapter five.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this descriptive study is to determine what kinds of programs are currently available to rehabilitate offenders under probation, in the state of Minnesota. Chapter five will attempt to make possible conclusions based on the data received and reported in chapter four. These possible conclusions are meant to stimulate creative thinking from a vocational perspective in an effort to improve weak areas in the corrections system. It has been the viewpoint of this author from the beginning of this study that vocational rehabilitation can be a tremendous asset in preventing recidivism.

Conclusions on this data should be prefaced with a warning. These conclusions are going to be made based on data received from seven individuals within corrections in Minnesota. Obviously, care should be taken when making generalizations based on such a small sample. Not only that, but any conclusions made should be kept in the context that this information is specific to the state of Minnesota. Each state has its own legislation and its own way of enforcing its law. With this in mind it might now be a little easier to digest some conclusions based on data reported in chapter 4. Additional limitations will be addressed at the end of this chapter. The following paragraphs will note the survey questions, data received and conclusions drawn.

1. How many adult male offenders are on probation in your county/territory?

Frequencies/Responses: (1) 120, (1) 190, (1) 212,
(1) 550, (1) 600,
(1) 738, (1) 750.

It can be clearly seen from this information that there is a large discrepancy in the number of individuals on probation from county to county. Approximately 50% of the population in the state of Minnesota reside in the Twin Cities Metropolitan area. This population is located more or less in the central portion of the state. The other 50% of the population is scattered throughout the remainder of the state. In the same way the state of Minnesota as a whole differs from the rest of the country, so too will different counties within the state differ in the enforcement of their respective laws. Each county may differ in the nature of its problems and how they handle them. This point is emphasized from the results of this first basic question. The counties with the higher populations are going to be confronted with different problems than the counties with fewer residents. As a result, the corrections system within each jurisdiction will be forced to address different social problems. Each county is unique and is a subset within Minnesota, just as Minnesota is a subset of the larger United States.

2. How many men on probation are given psychological evaluations?

Frequencies/Responses: (1) 8, (1) 5, (1) 6, (1) 37

It is quite obvious from this data that a very small percentage of offenders on probation are given psychological evaluations. Follow-up on to why this is so would be helpful. Is it due to budget constraints? Is it thought that psychological issues are not considered to be a factor in criminal activity? As mentioned in the review of literature section in chapter two, there exists a reintegration model that theorizes that offenders can be “taught” how to lead crime free lives. Also, it emphasizes helping offenders make socially acceptable adjustments to society. It could be argued that psychological evaluations could identify barriers in offenders thinking that lead to inappropriate behaviors. Also expressed in chapter two is the ideal that criminal behavior is the result of years of antisocial conditioning. Therefore, it would seem that there is indeed a psychological element in criminal behavior, yet it does not appear that psychological evaluations are utilized in the correctional system, at least not in Minnesota.

3. How many are evaluated for learning disabilities?

Frequencies/Responses: (2) 0, (1) 5, (1) 6, (1) 37

This data suggests that an extremely small number of individuals on probation are evaluated for learning disabilities. Again, there may be reasons for this other than they are not thought to be worth while. However, it is still important to point out the strong belief, backed by extensive literature, that many of these individuals may essentially be individuals with undiagnosed learning disabilities. Such a disability could very well have prevented them from taking advantage of the little formal training/education that was available to them earlier in life. Without such basic skills or education needed to sustain a legitimate way of life they may turn to criminal activity in an attempt to survive by any means possible. If at this level in the system these individuals were identified as having a learning deficit, perhaps basic adult education programs could be developed to assist offenders in obtaining the basic skills needed to sustain a living in an appropriate manner.

4. How many are evaluated for psychological disorders?

Frequencies/Responses: (1) 8, (1) 19, (1) 20, (1) 25,
(1) 35, (1) 37

It is evident from these responses that very few individuals on probation are evaluated for specific psychological disorders. At the inception of this question it was thought of as a reactive approach. Basically, looking for a psychological root to explain a pattern of recognized behavior in an individual. The lack of

evaluations for specific disorders might be because those in corrections may not view criminal behavior as the result of a mental deficit. It could be theorized from the results of questions 2-4 that the corrections community may not credit psychology with much validity. Criminal justice is a subset of the hard sciences in which they work with concrete entities. They deal with *clues* and *evidence* and/or work with individuals who were *observed* violating a particular law. The apparent lack of recognition that psychology receives may in part be a result of a lack of understanding. The failure to utilize a soft science such as psychology, which deals in abstract or metaphysical ideals/entities, to explain or assist in corrections may be the result of a difficulty in comprehending how the two disciplines can help each other. If this is the case, professionals in corrections may want to try and see how the problems (inappropriate human behavior) they are trying to correct are possibly the manifestations of human thinking or psychology. After all, psychology is the study of human behavior, which is what corrections seeks to control or monitor.

5. How many are given alcohol and/or drug assessments?

Frequencies/Responses: (2) 50, (1) 95, (1) 200, (1) 330, (1) 400, (1) 664

Approximately 255 individuals out of a mean of 415 offenders on probation are given such assessments (see statistics

in chapter four for further detail). This breaks down to roughly 61% of the offenders on probation receiving these assessments. From this it can be concluded that the correctional community must theorize alcohol and/or drug use to be a major contributing factor in the commission of crimes. Follow-up regarding what is being found out from these assessments would be a logical next step. Then, of the individuals given assessments and found to have a problem, what is being done to help the individuals correct their problem. Alcohol and drug abuse can be seen as a medical and/or psychological problem. The medical model, as referred to in the review of literature, suggests that the offenders are physically, emotionally, and/or socially "sick". The criminal activity then is a manifestation or symptom of the person's illness. From this rehabilitative viewpoint, the criminals flawed trait should be identified, isolated, treated, and cured. Is anything being done in Minnesota after these assessments to treat the individuals diagnosed with this disease in an effort to reduce the criminal activity it causes?

6. Which of the following psychological test are used? (check all that apply)

n=7

Responses/Choices: (2) WASR, (2) Stanford Binet, (4) MMPI, (1) Interest Inventories, (4) Other, (0) None.

In this question the respondents could answer more than once, if they happened to use one or more of the test options provided. At first glance, one might think that indeed a majority of the “big” psychological tests are used on offenders. This would seem to contradict the data received for questions two and four, in which it was reported that a very small number of offenders were given psychological evaluations to identify possible disorders. However, as one ponders this discrepancy, questions arise. Such as, what is meant by the word “used”. What were in the minds of the respondents when they were citing these various psychological tests “used”. How often does a test have to be given for it to be considered one which is “used”? Once a year? Once a week? This poses a problem and is one which could have been corrected simply by defining the word “used” in the question. This question should have been taken a step further. For example, which of the following psychological tests have been used in the last 3 months. This would have clarified the data and possible conclusions could have been drawn. At the very least, it can be concluded from this data that criminal justice professionals acknowledge the existence of such psychological tools and even have them at their disposal. At what rate they use them could not be determined due to the vague nature of the question. It appears that another limitation has been discovered in the analysis of this question. See the

conclusion of chapter 5 for additional limitations based on review of the data received.

7. How valuable do you think such psychological evaluations are?

(circle one)

**Not Important 1----2----3----4----5 Extremely
Important**

Frequencies/Ratings: 1- 0 responses, 2- 0 responses, 3- 2 responses, 4- 3 responses, 5- 1 response.

One respondent did not answer this question, which left a total of six responses for useable data to yield the Mean and Standard Deviation.

n=6 Mean=3.33 Standard
Deviation=.72

The data received indicates that all who responded thought psychological evaluations to be more important than not. However, by examining the mean it is clear that the respondents thought these evaluations to be of average importance, relatively speaking.

Again, this appears to be somewhat contradictory to what was researched and stated in the review of literature. Commonly, it is the medical model, which primarily drives policy in modern day corrections. Remember this ideal believes corrections should

utilize therapeutic staff to facilitate the rehabilitation process. This means actively using psychiatrists, psychologists, clinical social workers, and other specialists. From the data received concerning questions 6 and 7, it appears that such professionals are not being commonly utilized in the rehabilitation of the typical offender. Individuals on probation are not a “captive” audience/consumer to the extent that their counterparts behind bars are. However, they are under obligation to attend all appointments/meetings as deemed appropriate by the judicial system. With this in mind, it would seem feasible to incorporate such therapeutic sessions into the individuals’ treatment to address such issues the medical model thinks critical to “recovery”. It would appear from the data received that the Minnesota probationary system does not rate psychological evaluations and therefore, psychological methods in general as particularly relevant or important.

8. What methods are used to vocationally assess these offenders?

(check all that apply)

n=6

Frequencies/Responses:

 1 On-the-job training

 0 Job-Shadowing

1 Work Samples

 3 Other

 4 None

From the data, we can simply conclude that the majority of respondents address vocational issues with individuals under probationary supervision. Consequently, that same majority must view vocational issues as a relevant factor in the successful rehabilitation of criminal offenders. It can also be seen that a variety of methods appear to be used to vocationally assess these individuals. Answers ranged from a Job Training Program, to Rehabilitation Services, to Employment and Training Services. Unfortunately, it is difficult to say what services these various programs may provide without specific definitions or elaboration provided. The relatively broad scope of this study fails to allow such information to be compiled. Also not known from this data is how *many* individuals received vocational assessments or job seeking/keeping skills training. However, an interesting study could evolve from this question alone. A study which seeks data to identify and examine the vocational services provided and the corresponding elements of those services.

9. Are there programs offered that identify job-seeking skills?
(Those essential abilities needed to

correctly locate and apply for jobs and
interview for them).

effectively

n=7

 6 Yes

 1 No

An overwhelming majority of the 30% who responded indicated that they offer programs, which identify job-seeking skills. It appears from this data that the Minnesota probation system acknowledges vocational issues as being possible barriers to successful rehabilitation. Literature suggests that many offenders do not have the skills needed to find legitimate employment. Knowing how to identify appropriate employment options is the first step in obtaining a job. A job provides the economic and social stability necessary to lead a crime-free existence. Employment provides much more than simply a way to pay the bills; however, this aspect should not be minimized. An individual without a steady source of income will more than likely turn to illegal activities as a means of survival. Employment also has a positive impact on self-esteem as well as establishing valuable social connections with co-workers. These relationships may reinforce appropriate behaviors or activities, which possibly will prevent a return into the corrections system. These relationships will provide positive role models for the offender as well. Such models may teach

appropriate life skills in other areas. So, it is quite clear that employment is a prime component in all peoples lives, but especially those involved in the corrections system who are looking to avoid adding to the recidivism statistics. It is also evident from this data that Minnesota probation officials are cognizant of the impact employability has on an offender's life. In an attempt to address this issue, it seems some have developed and implemented programs meant to combat such barriers.

The next question was meant to dig a little deeper into this idea. The feedback concerning question 10 may provide us with a look into how far Minnesota corrections has taken the concept of employment as a rehabilitation barrier.

10. Are there services offered that provide job-keeping skills training? (Those attributes that make good employees: good attendance, appropriate grooming and dress, getting along with supervisors and co-workers, and correctly following rules and regulations).

n=7

4 Yes

3 No

Question 10 is a follow-up to question 9. The only thing more important than knowing how to find employment is being

aware of the skills needed to *keep* a job. Four of the seven respondents indicated that such programs were available to offenders. It seems that more of the respondent's counties were aware of job-seeking skills than of job-keeping skills. Having the skills to find work is great, but of little value if the individual does not have what it takes to hold the job, which potentially could provide the economic and social stability so desperately valuable to the rehabilitation process.

11. If job-seeking/keeping skills services exist, how many of those on probation take advantage of them? (Answers were given in percentages)

n=4	Mean=11.75%	Standard
Deviation=14.13%		

This question was limited to those respondents who worked in areas that offered job seeking/keeping services, resulting in the four pieces of usable data. It can be concluded from the data received, that several offenders are referred to such services but do not follow through. In fact, less than 12% referred to these services take advantage of them. Apparently, these counties do not hold offenders accountable for following up on probation recommendations. Perhaps such "probation recommendations" should be changed to "probation requirements". Evidently, offenders are not required to commit to the referrals made by

probation officers. If such issues are deemed valuable enough to utilize vast resources for program development, offender participation should be mandatory. Until that time an evaluation of these programs and their effectiveness will be difficult.

12. Do you feel such vocational services would/do reduce recidivism?

No, not at all 1----2----3----4----5 Definitely

Frequencies/Ratings: 1 - 0 responses, 2 - 1 response, 3 - 2 responses, 4 - 1 response, 5 - 3 responses

n=4

Mean=3.86

Standard

Deviation=1.12

This is a simple subjective question, but the return could speak volumes in regards to the value placed on vocational rehabilitation in corrections. The target audience for this questionnaire, were the leaders in probation in the state of Minnesota. These respondents are players who, theoretically, can have an impact on the procedures and policies that drive this system.

Three of the five respondents indicated that they definitely thought vocational services had a positive impact in reducing recidivism. Hopefully, the correctional policy in the state of

Minnesota will begin to reflect this sentiment. Vocational rehabilitation as a discipline is a relatively new phenomena. As this discipline becomes more established it will continue to gain momentum, as it has in the last couple of decades, and begin to play a more significant role in the procedures of related systems.

13. What do you feel is the single biggest issue/problem facing the probation system today?

n=6 (Some respondents gave more than one answer).

1-Substance use/abuse

2-Motivating offenders

2-High caseloads

1-Recidivism

1-Limited funding

This final question was again a subjective one. It would seem logical that those who have an intimate knowledge of corrections would best be qualified on what the biggest issues are that are negatively effecting the corrections process in Minnesota. These are the issues that must be addressed as soon as possible. Six respondents gave eight answers to this last question. The two most common answers dealt with concerns of the high caseloads of probation officers and the motivation of offenders. It would make sense to address these issues prior to anything else. Another

answer given was limited funding, which very possibly may be related to the problem of high caseloads. The idea being that a lack of funds prevents the employment of more probation officers to handle the ever increasing caseloads. As you may recall, in the review of literature, it is documented that two-thirds of offenders are under probation. It is not too difficult to forecast that caseloads will be increasing in the future.

Additionally, the trend is towards increased community-based corrections, which will not elevate this problem anytime soon. Other answers included substance use/abuse and recidivism, which are well-documented problems in the system of corrections.

Limitations

Upon writing the conclusions of this paper, several limitations were identified. Some limitations were specifically with the instrument and others were with the overall development with the study itself and will again be reviewed as they first were in Chapter 3.

One of the limitations with this study, as mentioned in Chapter 3, is the population size. The targeted population being surveyed is the twenty-three county probation directors of Minnesota. It was clarified how there are actually more than twenty-three counties in the state, but that some of the lesser

populated counties are grouped together and one director of probationary services is assigned for the particular territory. The compounded issue of small sample size was then discussed as well as the possible impact it may have on the validity of the conclusions.

Also discussed in the Chapter 3 limitations was the concept of generalization. Since the targeted population of this study is limited to probation in the state of Minnesota, the conclusions drawn can only pertain to this state specifically. Finally, the somewhat unique population structure of Minnesota was reviewed as a theoretical limitation. The populations under correctional supervision within vastly different counties/territories will differ just as much as the overall populations, which reside in the socially diverse geographic locations. Following is a description of some of the limitations revealed as the author analyzed the results and attempted to draw conclusions.

Upon interpreting the data from the respondents, some weaknesses with the survey instrument became clear. Limitations within the survey can be attributed to poor design or lack of foresight, some of which may be responsible for the so called “errors” committed by the respondents. Such errors include the assumption that “Other” answers, when checked, would be specified in the margin provided. This was not noted as it should

have been. The respondents should have been prompted by the questionnaire to specify what the definition of “Other” was so they could have completed the survey more precisely, thereby providing better feedback for the purposes of the study.

Another glaring omission within this survey was that it did not specify that the questions were to address the population of “adult”, male offenders. It simply stated male offenders. Herein lies another assumption, which very likely could have yielded responses that included data based on the juveniles. This ambiguity was questioned specifically by three of the respondents. Therefore, some of the respondents may have included data on juveniles, which then would have contaminated the corresponding results and conclusions.

Another possible limitation of this survey was that some of the choices for answers may have included terms that are specific to the rehabilitation field and not familiar to the corrections professionals who completed the survey. Consequently, these terms may not have been fully understood by each respondent. These limitations were due to errors within the survey instrument itself, in addition to, errors committed by the respondents in the completion of the survey. Supposed “errors” by the respondents may be in part due to the ambiguity of the instrument. Such limitations no doubt compromise the validity and reliability of the

data obtained. All of these shortcomings relating to the survey instrument and study should be kept in mind when evaluating the usefulness of the conclusions in chapter five.

The most notable “errors” committed by the respondents comes simply from the fact that not all of the questions were answered by all of the respondents. This could have been because the question was not fully understood, which may be the result of a poor survey question. An additional reason could be that the respondent did not know the answer to the question being asked and did not want to take the time to complete the necessary research to accurately respond.

Another problem with the data received were those respondents who answered questions with “unknown”. Such answers were thrown out on a question by question basis and only “usable” answers were utilized in reporting the data. Finally, the accuracy of this data was sacrificed by the several respondents who used approximations and/or percentages when recording their answers. It is difficult to draw accurate, specific conclusions from approximations.

In hindsight, some of the terms used and not defined may have been foreign to some of the respondents. Some or all of the respondents may have “understood” the term in a different context

or relative to their field, which may be completely different than the way it was meant by the author.

These are all limitations which more than likely threaten the validity and reliability of this study and its conclusions. A notable challenge presents itself when trying to study one discipline from another perspective. Therefore, care should be taken when reviewing the usefulness of this data and the subsequent conclusions. If nothing else, hopefully this study will stimulate an interest or further study on the topic of rehabilitation in corrections.

Bibliography

Bartollas, C. (1985). Correctional Treatment. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Halls, Inc.

Cullin, F.T. & Gilbert, K.E. (1982). Reaffirming Rehabilitation. Santa Barbara: Anderson Publishing Co.

Ivanka, K. (1997, April). Shifting Gears to Rehabilitation. Corrections Today, pp. 20-22.

Jarvis, D.C. (1978). Institutional Treatment of the Offender. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Roos, R.A. (1972). A Comprehensive Program for Prison and Correction Reform.

Rosenthal, S. (1993, June). Rekindling Belief in Rehabilitation. Federal Probation (pp.84-86).

Sluder, R.D. (1994, June). Guiding Philosophies of the 21st Century. Federal Probation (pp.3-11).

State of Washington, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (1969). Federal Offenders Rehabilitation Program.

Taggarty, R. (1972). The Prison of Unemployment. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Welch, M. (1995, December). Rehabilitation: Holding its Ground in Corrections. Federal Probation (pp. 3-8).

December 1, 1998

Dear County Probation Director,

Hello, my name is Jason Denis. I am a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin-Stout in the Vocational Rehabilitation program. A requirement of the program is to design and complete a study to be presented in the form of a thesis. My chosen topic of interest is Correctional Rehabilitation. Enclosed is a simple survey that was sent out to all the County Probation-Directors in the state of Minnesota. I am hoping to identify elements currently being utilized to rehabilitate offenders in Minnesota as well as obtaining feedback on possible directions to go in the future to curb the recidivism rate.

Enclosed is a self addressed stamped envelope in which to mail the completed survey back for the purposes of analysis. At the bottom of the survey there is a question asking if you would like to know the results of the survey. No identifying information is asked so confidentiality is ensured. I hope that you can find time out of your busy schedule to fill out the survey to the best of your ability and return it to me within the next 7-10 days. Your feedback is greatly appreciated and I look forward to obtaining some interesting, and hopefully useful, data on the rehabilitation of offenders in Minnesota. Again, thank you so much for your time and effort.

Sincerely,

Jason Denis

Informed Consent- By voluntarily completing this survey questionnaire, you are consequently consenting to the release of the corresponding information.

1. How many male offenders are on probation in your county?
2. How many men on probation are given psychological evaluations?
3. How many are evaluated for learning disabilities?
4. How many are evaluated for psychological disorders?
5. How many are given alcohol and/or drug assessments?
6. Which of the following psychological tests are used? (check all that apply)

WASR

Stanford-Binet

MMPI

Interest Inventories

Other

None

7. How valuable do you think such psychological evaluations are? (circle one)

Not important

1 ----- 2 ----- 3 ----- 4 ----- 5 Extremely important

8. What methods are used to vocationally assess these offenders?(check all that apply)

- On-the-job training
- Job-shadowing
- Work samples
- Other
- None

9. Are there programs offered that identify job-seeking skills? (Those essential abilities needed to correctly locate and apply for jobs and effectively interview for them).

Yes

No

(over)

10. Are there services offered that provide job-keeping skills training? (Those attributes that make good employees- good attendance, appropriate grooming and dress, getting along with supervisors and co-workers, and correctly following rules and regulations).

Yes

No

11. If job-seeking/keeping skills services exist, how many of those on probation take advantage of them?

12. Do you feel such vocational services would/do reduce recidivism?

No, not at all 1 -----2 -----3 -----4 ----- 5 Definitely

13. What do you feel is the single biggest issue/problem facing the probation system? (use space provided below)

** Would you like the comprehensive results of this survey?

YES

NO