Probation Officer Roles: A Statutory Analysis

Ming-Li Hsieh
Moana Hafoka
Youngki Woo
Jacqueline van Wormer
Mary K. Stohr
Craig Hemmens
Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology
Washington State University

PROBATION OFFICERS HAVE long faced enormous challenges in their work, including large caseloads, limited resources, offender management difficulties, and criticism of high recidivism rates and the related threat to public safety (Lutze, 2014; Lynch, 2001; Simon, 1993). The latter two issues—offender management and recidivism—were highlighted during the 1970s and 1980s as public support for rehabilitation as the primary goal of corrections was waning and the "get tough" approach gained prominence (Gleicher, Manchak, & Cullen, 2013; Lutze, 2014). The result was an increased emphasis on law enforcement at the expense of offender rehabilitation in the latter part of the twentieth century. By the early 2000s, however, the pendulum had begun to shift somewhat, as researchers, the public, and legislators bemoaned the costs, both social and financial, of the "get tough" approach. Numerous studies have found that retributive strategies and intensive supervision probation have not achieved reductions in recidivism (Gendreau, Goggin, Cullen, & Andres, 2000; Hyatt & Barnes, 2014; Lowenkamp, Flores, Holsinger, Makarios, & Latessa, 2010; MacKenzie, 2000; Petersilia & Turner, 1993).

At the same time, rehabilitation programming has experienced a renaissance as researchers have uncovered treatment approaches and protocols that when combined with risk assessment and case management, are related to lower rates of recidivism (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a; Taxman, 2002). Nevertheless, as recently as 2008, Skeem and Manchak (2008, p. 221) noted that this retributive doctrine which utilizes control-oriented "surveillance has been the dominant model of probation supervision," whereas the "treatment model is difficult to find" in practice in institutions and agencies across the states. According to Taxman (2008), the role of probation officer has been in a stage of metamorphosis, where it has been recalibrated to combine rehabilitation and law enforcement roles in recognition of the need to both control and treat and as a means of handling large-scale community corrections populations. Recent figures indicate that around 4.8 million out of the 7 million people in the criminal justice system in the United States were under community supervision in 2012 (Glaze & Herberman, 2013). Probation officers who balanced the law enforcement and rehabilitation roles have been found to improve the effectiveness of supervision, reduce recidivism, and provide a promising prosocial life for offenders that includes sound coping mechanisms even under a complicated workload (Whetzel, Paparozzi, Alexander, & Lowenkamp, 2011). Such a "balanced" approach is now acknowledged by scholars as a contemporary goal for probation officers (Lutze, 2014; Miller, 2015; Skeem & Manchak, 2008; Whetzel et al., 2011).

Historically, given the variation in policies across agencies and jurisdictions, probation officers have adjusted their "images" from time to time in their search for the "best" practices in community corrections among these goals: social worker (addressing client needs and assisting in rehabilitation) (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990), peace officer (enforcing laws and rules and working with court orders) (Benekos, 1990), and "synthetic" officer (combining both) (Miller, 2015). Besides practitioners' endorsements and scholars' recognition of types of supervision philosophies and practices, little is known about these role differences from a legal perspective. This is unfortunate, as statutes potentially guide probation officer performance and highlight the functions of officer-offender interactions.

It is important to understand the statutorily mandated roles of probation officers because such awareness would further inform legislators and policymakers about the potential disjunction between the "ideology" of the law and the "reality" of the practice. To fill this gap in the literature, the current study employs a statutory analysis to examine the roles of probation officers. We identify which probation roles are statutorily mandated today and whether such requirements fit the trend of the "balanced" approach as identified by Taxman (2008).

Goals and Functions of Probation

How an offender receives probation varies slightly by state, but generally probation occurs in lieu of serving time in jail or prison, or a combination of a limited jail sentence and community supervision. Offenders serve their "term" on probation under the supervision of an assigned probation officer, generally employed by the state, county, or municipality. Probation, also referred to as community supervision, was first created in the late 1800s and spread to all states by 1956 (Petersilia, 1997). In the following decades, probation goals and functions have fluctuated between the rehabilitation model and the law enforcement model; however, as noted above, there has been a trend towards convergence of these models in the late twentieth century (Lutze, 2014; Taxman, 2008). In fact, some scholars argue that though not always acknowledged, the balanced approach describes what officers really do when supervising clients. A detailed exploration of the various roles is provided in the section that follows to create a framework for use in the statutory analysis.

Social Worker: Focusing on Rehabilitation

At its inception the primary role for probation was as a form of social work that focused on rehabilitation and securing a job and housing. The probation officer also aimed to keep offenders away from deviant others with the goal of impacting criminal behaviors. Correctional institutions aimed to rehabilitate offenders and improve their "welfare … as a condition achieved by helping him in his individual adjustment" to prevent future confinement by the criminal justice system (Ohlin, Piven, & Pappenfort, 1956, p. 215). In contrast, the Supreme Court described the role of probation as:

> … to provide a period of grace in order to aid the rehabilitation of a penitent offender; to take advantage of an opportunity for reformation which actual service of the suspended sentence might make less probable (Burns v. United States, 1932, p. 220).

In order to be successfully rehabilitated, probationers needed to receive continuous attention, counseling, programming, and the assistance provided by probation officials. The Supreme Court also depicted the rehabilitation model as a way

> … to provide an individualized program offering a young or unhardened offender an opportunity to rehabilitate himself without institutional confinement under the tutelage of a probation official and under the continuing power of the court to impose institutional punishment for his original offense in the event that he abuse this opportunity. (Roberts v. United States, 1943, p. 272)

Probation officers, however, have historically embraced the doctrine of treatment utility. Whitehead and Lindquist (1992) examined probation officers' professional orientations by using the Klofas-Toch Professional Orientation scales. This study revealed that officers were more in favor of rehabilitation and were less in favor of a punitive philosophy in community corrections. The officers reported that corrections should provide various counseling services for probationers, and believed that treatment programs are worthy of time and money rather than spending on expanded imprisonment and harsh sanctions.

Despite the fact that officers and offenders might focus differently on the rehabilitative values of both personal goals (e.g., keeping out of trouble, having a place to stay) and social goals (e.g., building social skills, enhancing positive relationships) empirically (see Shihadeh, 1979), the criminal justice system was in favor of rehabilitation-oriented probation before Martinson's (1974) "nothing works" challenges. In fact, not only do criminal justice institutions support rehabilitation-oriented functions, some scholars have found that the public supports rehabilitation and believes correctional treatment lessens the likelihood of future offending (Applegate, Cullen, & Fisher, 1997). The importance of rehabilitative goals during probation may not just be because treatment can be an effective behavior modifier, but also because probation practices seem to strengthen ties among the offender, the family, and the community in a healthy social network (Bhutta, Mahmood, & Akram, 2014).

Peace Officer: Emphasizing Law Enforcement Practices

In the mid-1970s, treatment-focused strategies were challenged on their therapeutic effectiveness and received a surge of criticism over the failure to reduce recidivism (Martinson, 1974). The ideology of a "get tough" approach in terms of retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, intensive surveillance, and monitoring rapidly replaced the rehabilitative model as the mainstream approach for criminal justice institutions and agencies. Probation officers found themselves immersed in a role of "threats and punishment" and as "punitive officers" as first identified by Ohlin and colleagues decades before (Lindner, 1994; Ohlin et al., 1956, p. 215).

As Lindner (1994) notes, probation agencies had moved definitively towards a law enforcement-oriented model with more punitive approaches than ever before for supervision. This "control" model was embraced throughout probation agencies for many reasons, including: (1) conservative political and policy changes that swept the country; (2) the search for more effective ways to target higher-risk probation populations; and (3) as a response to escalating caseloads, especially as probation served as a spillway for prison overcrowding (Lindner, 1994).

In the 1990s Burton and associates (1992) addressed the law enforcement role of probation officers by examining the statutory requirements within the 50 states. The study identified the legally prescribed functions of probation tasks and found only 4 out of 22 statutory tasks were treatment-orientated functions. In terms of rehabilitative service, they were surprised to find that few states mandated counseling services in general (15 states), provided referral services for medical or social needs (7 states) or assisted probationers in obtaining employment (2 states). The authors concluded that most state statutes prescribed enforcement-oriented tasks and expected officers to be "enabling arrest, investigation, enforcing criminal laws and working with law enforcement agencies" and maintaining contact with courts (p. 280).

A majority of probation officers at this time appeared to embrace the enforcement model and utilize an intensive supervision approach along with other retributive strategies (Skeem & Manchak, 2008; Steiner, Travis, Makarios, & Brickley, 2011). Steiner and colleagues (2004) found that probation officers in 45 states were twice as likely to practice law enforcement-oriented tasks (e.g., surveillance, investigation, arrest, assisting law enforcement agencies and legal authorities, enforcing criminal laws) compared to rehabilitative tasks (e.g., assisting in rehabilitation, providing counseling, helping to find a job, establishing community relationships) prescribed by statutory procedures. Probation officers who reported that offender punishment and monitoring and community safety were more important goals within probation functions were more likely to work closely with the

court or releasing authority assigning sanctions than officers who believed reintegration and therapy were more important functions of their work (Payne & DeMichele, 2011).

Case Manager: Considering Risk Assessment and Individual Needs

The rise of the new penology in the early 1990s (see Feeley & Simon, 1992) has created a stronger focus on maximizing safety and minimizing dangerousness through managing offenders' needs and risks. In order to meet the goals of managing risk, Lutze (2014) indicates that there has been a shift from the dichotomous roles of probation officers towards a "case manager," who functions somewhere between social work and law enforcement. These positions are also known as "boundary spanners" (see Lutze, 2014). Depending on the circumstances, probation officers undertaking this role employ fluid treatment and surveillance strategies, dependent on a number of factors, to identify individual needs and manage their risk.

Andrews and Bonta (2010a) further indicated that correctional staff could adjust programing and case management to meet institutional goals for each individual by adopting the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) principles through applying risk assessment instruments and carefully matched intervention programs. Prior studies have demonstrated that effective probation reduces recidivism when risk and need principles are closely followed in supervision and treatment (Andrews & Bonta, 2010a; Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990; Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2011; Lutze, 2014). In other words, intensive supervision and services are provided to high-risk offenders while minimal supervision and intervention are provided to low-risk offenders.

Payne and DeMichele (2011) examined the relationship between probation philosophies and their work activities by utilizing a survey conducted by the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA). They determined that risk assessment and needs assessment were the most important strategies utilized, regardless of whether probation officers were more law enforcement-oriented or rehabilitation-oriented in their roles. Furthermore, the researchers found that risk and needs assessment were significant elements of even broader probation philosophies related to community safety, victim protection, reintegration, and individual character reformation. This is true despite the fact that these are less often discussed as outcomes than traditional law enforcement and rehabilitation model results (see Payne & DeMichele, 2011) and despite greater political movement toward punitiveness (Lutze, 2014).

Synthetic Officer: Balancing Treatment and Surveillance

In the late twentieth century, the field of community corrections has moved to providing more integrated treatment approaches, while continuing to utilize law enforcement practices (Taxman, 2008). This has been done to ease occupational dilemmas and role conflicts among correctional officials (see Ohlin et al., 1956) and as a means of implementing evidence-based practices for effective supervision outcomes (Skeem & Manchak, 2008). Purkiss and associates (2003) found support for the emergence of this "balanced" trend in their analysis of the statutory definitions of probation officer functions in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Although "probation officers are more likely to be statutorily mandated to perform law enforcement tasks rather rehabilitative tasks ... it seems that a more balanced approach to probation" has gradually increased in many states (p. 23).

The effects on offenders of officers balancing treatment and surveillance were noted by Klockars (1972: 552): "synthetic" style officers would have positive outcomes with respect to reducing the likelihood of revocation when they practice "the active task of combining the paternal, authoritarian, and judgmental with the therapeutic" rather than solely playing a role of social worker or law enforcement agent. In concert with supervision, all were synthetic strategies. He found little to no evidence that officers emphasized only rehabilitative or law enforcement models, but rather that their roles had intertwined. Reconciling the two roles as a balanced practice is a promising approach not only to eliminate role conflicts (Miller, 2015; Sigler, 1988) but also to respond to the contemporary community supervision environment regarding targeting high-risk offenders (Gleicher et al., 2013; Skeem & Manchak, 2008; Taxman, 2008).

Paparozzi and Gendreau (2005) examined the relationship between correctional officers' practice orientation and recidivism outcomes in the New Jersey Intensive Surveillance and Supervision Program (NJISSP). This study found that high-risk/high-needs offenders who were assigned to law enforcement practice-oriented officers received more technical violations and were associated with poorer outcomes compared to those offenders who were assigned to social work practice-oriented officers. In fact, Paparozzi and Gendreau (2005) further revealed that high-risk/high-needs offenders who were supervised by "balanced" approach officers were associated with significantly less revocation for new convictions or any revocation than the other two practices.

In sum, the roles of probation officers have been observed by practitioners as: (1) shifting between conventional dichotomous roles of social workers or peace officers; (2) having a tendency towards case managers who have recognized the need to address both risk and needs in order to reduce future offending; and (3) gradually moving to synthetic officers who have balanced the two conventional narrative roles (Miller, 2015). In the meantime, a neo-synthetic officer role operated in conjunction with the RNR principles has emerged, with supervision officers expected to serve as "behavior change agents" (Gleicher et al., 2013; Skeem & Manchak, 2008; Smith, Schweitzer, Labrecque, & Latessa, 2012; Taxman, 2008). Miller (2015) indicated that even though there is a trend suggesting a balanced approach, this does not mean the rehabilitation model and the law enforcement model no longer exist in community supervision. That is, roles still vary depending on agencies and jurisdictions. The current study aims to identify which probation goals are statutorily mandated today and whether the mandates fit the trend of "balanced" as in Taxman's (2008) depiction. This study employs a statutory analysis to examine how the role of the probation officer has changed over the past 30 years. We hypothesize that the statutory prescriptions for the probation officer role are currently less law enforcement-oriented than they were when analyzed by Burton and associates (1992). Instead, we expect that the findings by Purkiss and colleagues (2003) almost 12 years ago, showing that state statutes were reflecting a more balanced approach role for probation officers, will be even more pronounced given continued innovations in community supervision, including the movement of states towards the adoption of standardized RNR tools and coordinated case management (Blasko, Friedmann, Rhodes, & Taxman, 2015; Taxman & Belenko, 2012; Taxman, Henderson, Young, & Farrell, 2014; Viglione, Rudes, & Taxman, 2015).

Methods

This study analyzed state statutory definitions of adult probation officer functions and roles

from 1992 to 2015 for all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Several procedures were employed to facilitate this task. First, to compile 30 years of data, we used two studies to represent prior legally subscribed functions in 1992 and 2002: Burton and colleagues (1992) and Purkiss and colleagues (2003), respectively.

Second, for this study we collected all legally mandated duties and tasks for adult probation officers in 2015. For the sake of consistency we used parallel data collection procedures with these two studies in the current analysis. We also replicated the data collection process described in prior studies by clarifying ambiguous statute definitions, interpreting the legal language that varies by state, and classifying different legal terminology and wording on duties (see Burton et al., 1992; Purkiss et al., 2003; Steiner et al., 2004).

Third, we sorted the prescribed tasks into three main categories: rehabilitation, law enforcement, and case management. Identifying the roles that have changed in these categories could further our understanding of how trends may potentially change in probation functions in the future (Purkiss et al., 2003; Steiner et al., 2004).

Measures

Three types of measures were adopted in the current study. These were based on the orientation of statutorily prescribed tasks: whether tasks per se had a tendency to be rehabilitation-oriented, law enforcement-oriented, or case manager-oriented functions.

Rehabilitation-Oriented Tasks. This is a social work task style (Ohlin et al., 1956) with a focus on rehabilitation functions. Briefly, the duties within a rehabilitation-oriented system were designed to assist with the offender needs, help them better adjust after release, and eliminate problems (e.g., social, psychological) and obstacles that prevent them from reintegrating in the community and society. Prescribed tasks included placement in and completion of community service programs, aid in diverse rehabilitation approaches, counseling, employment training and location, writing presentence investigation (PSI) reports.

Law Enforcement-Oriented Tasks. The role of law enforcement-oriented tasks includes an emphasis on control, enforcement, and work with courts as a peace officer to ensure public safety (Ohlin et al., 1956). Prescribed tasks include case investigation, offender scrutiny, home and work visitation, surveillance, supervision, arrest, serving warrants, collecting restitution, making referrals, keeping records, probation condition development and discussion, sentence recommendation, performing duties and assignments required by courts, assisting law enforcement agencies, enforcing criminal laws, assisting courts in transferring cases, and issuing revocation citations.

Case Manager-Oriented Tasks. Besides the above-listed tasks of rehabilitation and law enforcement-oriented techniques, case manager-oriented probation officers are involved in prescribed tasks that are related to risk assessment, identification and assessment of criminogenic needs, and individual case adjustment and management.

Analytic Plan

A "tallied" method (see Purkiss et al., 2003) was employed in this study. If the totals of rehabilitative-oriented tasks outnumbered the totals of law enforcement-oriented tasks in a given state without involving any case manager-oriented tasks, then the state was labeled as reflecting a rehabilitation-oriented role for probation officers, and vice versa. If the prescribed tasks involved some RNR principles but still presented unequal scores between law enforcement-oriented and rehabilitation-oriented tasks in a given state, this state would be labeled as a case manager-oriented state. If the totals of both types of tasks received equal scores in a given state but without any RNR principles tasks, then the state was labeled as possessing balanced or dual roles for probation officers. However, if the totals of both types of tasks received equal scores in a given state and with any RNR principles tasks, then the state was labeled as a neo-balanced state for probation officers.

Results

This study aims to explore how the roles of probation officers have changed over the past 30 years. As the results of statutory analysis presented in Table 1 show, the total numbers of the legally subscribed tasks of adult probation officers have increased over time from 22 to 23 to 26, in 1992, 2002, and 2015, respectively. Three new tasks for contemporary probation officers were identified in this study: welfare/social worker, risk/needs assessment, and individual case adjustment/care management. The increased roles demonstrate the mixed probation philosophy, the demands of multi-tasks, and expectations of what community probation could accomplish in providing service based on individual characteristics and needs.

In 2015, there are five states and the District of Columbia that did not increase total numbers of mandated tasks when compared to the year 2002. Of these, Utah held five identical functions as primary practices for probation officers (i.e., supervision, surveillance, investigate cases, arrest, perform other court duties) in both 2002 and 2015.

Even though the total number of tasks remained in the other states and the District of Columbia, they did amend functions for probation officers. The District of Columbia, for example, retained three out of four tasks and replaced writing PSI with supervision in 2015. In contrast, the other four states, Alabama, Maine, Maryland, and New Hampshire, reduced numbers of prescribed tasks. For instance, probation officers in the state of Maryland are required to practice two tasks, the investigation of cases and writing PSIs.

The majority of states (42 states) had more prescribed functions in 2015 than in 2002. Among the 50 states, probation officers in North Carolina and Arizona are charged with practicing 19 tasks (North Carolina) and 16 tasks (Arizona) in 2015, up from 8 tasks and 10 tasks in 2002, respectively. Arkansas has increased the number of prescribed duties at an astonishing rate (from 3 to 16) in the last 10 years. Similarly, Florida has also remarkably expanded the roles of probation officers in corrections (from 2 to 10). Officers moved from two focuses, supervision and surveillance, to complex dimensions in service that relate to rehabilitation, community service programs development, arrest, case investigation, sentence recommendations, maintaining contacts with courts, risk assessment, and others.

In fact, among these expanded probation officer functions, we found that 28 states enhance the case management dimension as statutory service. In other words, these states have at least one out of two case manager-oriented functions (e.g., risk/needs assessment, and individual case adjustment) as mandatory tasks of their probation officers. Among 28 states, 11 have required full case management functions. These results are consistent with those of prior studies (Blasko et al., 2015; Lutze, 2014; Taxman & Belenko, 2012; Taxman et al., 2014) showing that states continue to move towards the adoption of standardized risk assessment tools and coordinated case management and individual needs.

Table 2 revealed legally prescribed functions of probation officers by task orientations. Three rehabilitation-oriented tasks (i.e., developing community service programs, locating

employment, writing PSIs) slightly increased since 2002, while counseling decreased from 19 states in 2002 to 9 in 2015. The statutes of almost half of states, however, include language supporting the position that assisting offenders in rehabilitation is an important task for probation officers. In 2015, a total of 6 states acknowledge probation work as involving welfare preservation and playing a role as a social worker.

In terms of law enforcement-oriented functions, we identified 18 specific responsibilities in the current study that exactly matched Purkiss and associates' (2003) statutory analysis. Contemporarily, all 50 states reported supervision as a necessary task that must be practiced by probation officers, followed in frequency by case investigations (39), arrest (34), keeping records (32), probation condition development and discussions (31), restitution collections (23), serving warrants (23), sentence recommendations (21), and performing court-related duties (20). In addition, we found that in the past 30 years most states had enhanced law enforcement-oriented functions; as of 2015, 22 states even identified the roles of their probation officers as compared to law enforcement officers who enforce the laws.

The important change that we identified in the state statutes is a shift to identifying more legally prescribed case manager-oriented functions. Risk and needs assessment is a prevalent task for probation officers in the statutes of 25 states. According to this analysis, 28 percent of states focus on individual case adjustment and tailor case plans for offenders' needs.

Overall, the major escalating trend in statutory requirements that we observed is in law enforcement-oriented functions, even though there are also marginal increases in rehabilitation-oriented functions from 1992 to 2015. The elevated trends in both rehabilitative and law enforcement-oriented functions, however, are in concert with Lutze's (2014) study, which found a shift from the dichotomous roles of probation officers towards a mixed working philosophy. This finding also implies that in the late twentieth century, the field of community corrections has integrated treatment approaches into law enforcement practices more than before (Taxman, 2008).

Table 3 breaks down the three task orientations by state. We found that no state's statute fit our classification category for the role of probation officers as purely rehabilitation-oriented or purely dual-role in 2015. However, Maryland is the only state we classified as balanced, because it truly places equal weight on the two functions of rehabilitation and law enforcement within probation tasks. Outside of Maryland, the statutes of 21 states and the District of Columbia identified them as law enforcement-oriented states that focused less on rehabilitative tasks without considering any risk assessment functions. In terms of law enforcement-oriented states, probation services in Idaho, Massachusetts, New Jersey, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and Utah operate without any statutory prescribed rehabilitation functions, and all legally mandated tasks fall under law enforcement-oriented functions.

Fifty-seven percent of states were identified as case manager-oriented in 2015. These states have both law enforcement and rehabilitation orientations, yet also either include risk assessment tasks or consider individual case management in order to address offender needs. Among case manager-oriented states, the statutes of Rhode Island and Wisconsin both place a focus on risk and needs assessment and individual case planning, and both states were more likely to associate law enforcement-oriented functions with community protection rather than associating rehabilitation-oriented functions with community protection. This finding confirmed our hypothesis that the probation officer's role is currently less law enforcement-oriented than it was 20 years ago when analyzed by Burton and associates (1992).

Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this present study was to build on past efforts in classifying changes in empirical probation supervision through a statutory analysis. Results from numerous studies have argued that the role of probation officers and the duties that they must perform have changed as correctional ideology has shifted over the past two decades. As we found through this analysis, the statutorily mandated roles of probation officers have converged its "ideology" of the law with the "reality" of the practice over the past 30 years. From 2002 to 2015, a total of 26 percent of state legislatures have increased both rehabilitation- and law enforcement-oriented functions prescribed by law, and 24 states and 37 states have increased rehabilitative and law enforcement practices, respectively. Even though state legislatures mandated probation officers to perform more peace officer tasks (18) than social worker (6) tasks, very few states define probation functions dichotomously, as either strictly a therapeutic agent or law enforcers.

This movement we uncovered is in line with Klockars' (1992) theory of the synthetic working philosophy. Frontline probation officers function as a supervision triad (see Klockars, 1972; Skeem & Manchak, 2008) and combine authoritarian, paternal, judgmental, therapeutic, and other tasks to handle probationers. This finding supports the effective supervision practice doctrine, especially when probation officers engage in a hybrid practitioner philosophy in terms of family, community, and police orientations (Miller, 2015). We maintain that rather than forcing probation officers toward one strategy or method of supervision, such a mixed-methods approach can enhance positive officer-offender interactions and result in potential better outcomes.

Moreover, the statutorily mandated functions found in the current study are consistent with empirical opportunity-focused supervision (OFS) practices identified by Miller (2014, 2015) that officers would apply in their attempts to reduce recidivism in community corrections. Officers under this mandate would not only routinely practice conventional tasks such as surveillance, monitoring, community-offender relationships development, rehabilitation, and consulting service, but would also focus on OFS practices such as individual case management plans (Miller, 2014).

In fact, we revealed that 28 states have legally prescribed case manager-oriented functions (i.e., risk and needs assessment, individual case management, and adjustment) and integrated them along with either rehabilitation- or law enforcement-oriented tasks as a new probation role in 2015. This is a considerable finding that has never been identified in the past two decades. This finding echoed Skeem and Manchak's (2008) study, which found that the models of probation supervision were no longer conventional mixed or bridged philosophies or merely seeking effective practice[1]; rather, the models of probation supervision move toward evidence-based practice (EBP) to ensure public health and safety and manage risk (Taxman, 2008).

The first step of integrating EBP into community supervision, Latessa and Lovins (2010) explained, is to take actuarial risk assessment into account in improving probation work. As this analysis has shown, state statutes reflect this recent focus on risk awareness, risk identification, risk assessment,

[1] Effective practices and research-based programs may not necessarily meet the evidence-based practices criteria with a methodological rigor and have been tested in heterogeneous populations (See Drake, 2013).

and case management planning as a trend towards a neo-balanced approach in community corrections. It appears that there is a trend among legislative bodies to support empirical probation officers' work in conjunction with the administration of RNR instruments and a tailored individual case management plan to target criminogenic needs (Blasko et al., 2015; Gleicher et al., 2013; Taxman & Belenko, 2012; Taxman et al., 2014; Viglione et al., 2015). Although the majority of states still favor law enforcement-oriented tasks within statutes, and tasks relating to such methods outweigh the number of case manager-oriented functions, our findings further confirm the movement from the new penology and its focus on actuarial justice across criminal justice institutions or penal harm (Feeley & Simon, 1992) to something akin to "penal help" (Stohr, Jonson, & Cullen, 2014). As conceived by Stohr and her colleagues, this emerging paradigm for corrections, termed penal help, focuses on rehabilitation, restorative justice, and reentry programming (the three Rs). To the extent that these state statutes have either moved away from a purely law enforcement model for community corrections and have increasingly turned to these three Rs, we may be witnessing the emergence of a penal help perspective for community corrections along with, or in concert with, a complementary managerial approach.

The benefit of the case-management-oriented role is that it supports the RNR principle, while offering more appropriately matched interventions, treatment, and programming (penal help), which has been shown in numerous studies to reduce recidivism. Even though recidivism reduction rates may vary within states where this strategy is adopted, Andrews and Bonta (2010b) indicated that programs and services that adhere closely to the RNR model could reduce the reoffending rate by up to 35 percent. Moreover, effective classification, through case-management functions, provides optimal outcomes for offenders and probation staff in terms of successful reentry, reducing caseload and positive offender-officer interaction. Such methods also benefit correctional institutions and communities at macro levels with respect to resources allocation, maximize cost-effectiveness, and minimize dangerousness and potential harm to society in the future (Latessa & Lovins, 2010; Lutze, 2014).

With the advent of actuarial justice and EBP across criminal justice institutions (Feeley & Simon, 1992), contemporary probation supervision has gradually shifted into case management-oriented functions. In this sense, we expect that more states, with the support of legislators, will recalibrate their law enforcement-oriented attention toward case management-oriented principles that administrate EBP for both rehabilitation and crime control in the near future. This is not to suggest that the rehabilitation model and the law enforcement model no longer exist or are less effective in community supervision. Instead, evidence continues to grow that a more balanced approach synthesized with the risk assessment model will continue to yield more positive outcomes than those recorded 20 years ago in community corrections.

As mentioned in the foregoing, the elevated trends in both rehabilitative and law enforcement-oriented functions are consistent with Lutze's 2014 study, which found a shift from the dichotomous roles of probation officers towards a mixed working philosophy. This finding also implies that in the early twenty-first century, state legislatures and governors have integrated community corrections treatment approaches into law enforcement practices more than before (Taxman, 2008); in so doing, they have affirmatively embraced a penal help perspective for corrections (Stohr et al., 2014).

Doing a statute analysis on any topic has its drawbacks. Statutes are merely representative of what governmental branches conceive of as best practice. They often embody compromises between parties and actors on the political stage. Actual practice, however, does not always reflect policy as prescribed by these statutes (Lipsky, 1980). The street-level bureaucrats, or probation officers in this case, who meet with clients, manage caseloads, and effectively put policy into practice, can and often do behave differently than the statute mandates.

Moreover, though a particular policy might be enacted into statute, that does not always mean it will be funded sufficiently to become practice. For example, though a state statute may require more of a treatment focus with more programming for probationers, if the funding is not allocated for new staff to work the programs or for staff to be trained in the program philosophy or for new programs to be funded generally, then the new statute is just words on paper and does not truly represent actual probation practice in a given state. Therefore, statute analysis is a useful exercise in determining what the state legislatures and governors' offices valued at a given time; however, because of funding and other political and bureaucratic considerations, the statutes governing probation work do not always reflect the practice of it.

References

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010a). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (5th ed.). New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis Group.

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2010b). Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law, 16*(1), 39-55.

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17*, 19-52.

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, J. S. (2011). The Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model: Does adding the good lives model contribute to effective crime prevention? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38*(7), 735-755.

Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology, 28*(3), 369-404.

Applegate, B. K., Cullen, F. T., & Fisher, B. S. (1997). Public support for correctional treatment: The continuing appeal of the rehabilitative ideal. *Prison Journal, 77*(3), 237-258.

Benekos, P. J. (1990). Beyond reintegration: Community corrections in a retributive era. *Federal Probation, 54*(1), 52-56.

Bhutta, M. H., Mahmood, Q. K., & Akram, M. B. (2014). Assessment of the role of probation officers in social rehabilitation of low risk offenders in Lahore-Pakistan. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research, 21*(10), 1764-1770.

Blasko, B. L., Friedmann, P. D., Rhodes, A. G., & Taxman, F. S. (2015). The parolee-parole officer relationship as a mediator of criminal justice outcomes. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 1-19. doi: 10.1177/0093854814562642

Burton, V. S., Jr., Latessa, E. J., & Barker, T. (1992). The role of probation officers: An examination of statutory requirements. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 8*(4), 273-282.

Drake, E. K. (2013). *Inventory of evidence-based and research-based programs for adult corrections* (Document No. 13-12-1901). Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.

Feeley, M. M., & Simon, J. (1992). The new penology: Notes on the emerging strategy of corrections and its implications. *Criminology, 30*(4), 449-474.

Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., Cullen, F. T., & Andrews, D. A. (2000). The effects of community sanctions and incarceration on recidivism. *Forum on Corrections Research, 12*(2), 10-13.

TABLE 1.

Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015

Functions	DC			AL			AK			AZ			AR			CA		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Surveillance				X	X		X			X	X	X	X		X			X
Investigate Cases		X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Assist in Rehabilitation				X	X							X	X		X			
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions				X	X	X			X	X					X		X	X
Counsel															X			
Visit Home/Work				X	X	X					X				X			
Arrest				X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X						
Make Referrals													X					
Write P.S.I.		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Keep Records				X	X				X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X
Perform Other Court Duties									X		X	X	X		X			
Collect Restitution						X			X			X						X
Serve Warrants				X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	X			
Maintain Contact With Court		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		
Recommend Sentences		X	X														X	X
Develop Community Service Program												X						
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies						X												
Assist Court in Transferring Cases												X						
Enforce Criminal Laws										X		X						
Locate Employment						X									X			
Initiate Revocations									X	X								
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer								X	X			X					X	X
Welfare/Social Worker									X									
Risk/Needs Assessment									X			X			X			X
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management									X			X			X			
TOTALS	**0**	**4**	**4**	**11**	**11**	**9**	**3**	**5**	**14**	**11**	**10**	**16**	**8**	**3**	**16**	**5**	**6**	**10**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.

Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	CO[b]			CT[b]			DE			FL			GA[b]			HI[b]		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Surveillance	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X				X	X	
Investigate Cases	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assist in Rehabilitation	X	X		X	X	X		X	X								X	X
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			X				X	X	X
Counsel				X	X			X		X						X	X	
Visit Home/Work																		
Arrest		X	X						X			X						
Make Referrals		X	X										X					
Write P.S.I.			X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	X	X		
Keep Records	X	X	X	X	X			X	X						X	X	X	X
Perform Other Court Duties	X	X	X					X							X	X	X	X
Collect Restitution	X	X		X	X			X	X						X			
Serve Warrants			X			X		X	X			X						
Maintain Contact With Court		X	X			X										X	X	X
Recommend Sentences			X			X						X	X	X				
Develop Community Service Program												X						
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies						X		X	X									
Assist Court in Transferring Cases																		
Enforce Criminal Laws						X			X					X				
Locate Employment								X	X									
Initiate Revocations		X	X			X			X									X
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer			X					X	X					X			X	X
Welfare/Social Worker																		X
Risk/Needs Assessment			X			X			X			X			X			X
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management									X									X
TOTALS	**8**	**12**	**15**	**9**	**9**	**12**	**3**	**14**	**14**	**4**	**2**	**9**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**9**	**10**	**12**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.

Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	ID			IL[b]			IN[b]			IA[a]			KS[a]			KY[b]		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Surveillance				X	X	X					X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Investigate Cases	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Assist in Rehabilitation						X					X			X	X			
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions				X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X
Counsel							X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	
Visit Home/Work									X						X			X
Arrest	X		X			X						X			X			
Make Referrals							X	X			X		X	X		X	X	
Write P.S.I.	X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X			X		X	X		X
Keep Records				X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Perform Other Court Duties				X	X		X	X	X				X	X	X			
Collect Restitution							X	X	X			X					X	X
Serve Warrants												X						
Maintain Contact With Court	X								X									X
Recommend Sentences	X						X	X							X			
Develop Community Service Program				X	X	X						X			X			
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies								X	X									
Assist Court in Transferring Cases					X		X	X	X									
Enforce Criminal Laws						X												
Locate Employment															X			
Initiate Revocations	X																	
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer									X		X	X						
Welfare/Social Worker																		X
Risk/Needs Assessment						X									X			X
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management						X									X			
TOTALS	**7**	**2**	**3**	**8**	**8**	**11**	**11**	**12**	**12**	**3**	**8**	**10**	**8**	**9**	**14**	**6**	**8**	**11**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.
Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	LA			ME[b]			MD[b]			MA			MI			MN		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision		X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X	X	X		X	X
Surveillance		X		X	X	X		X										
Investigate Cases			X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Assist in Rehabilitation			X		X	X		X								X	X	X
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions										X	X	X				X		
Counsel				X	X								X					
Visit Home/Work		X						X										
Arrest	X	X	X	X	X	X		X				X		X	X	X	X	
Make Referrals		X														X	X	
Write P.S.I.	X	X		X			X		X	X	X			X	X	X		X
Keep Records				X	X					X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Perform Other Court Duties										X	X	X			X			X
Collect Restitution	X			X	X	X				X		X	X		X			
Serve Warrants			X					X				X		X	X			
Maintain Contact With Court							X							X				X
Recommend Sentences										X	X	X		X	X			X
Develop Community Service Program			X													X	X	
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies																X	X	X
Assist Court in Transferring Cases																		
Enforce Criminal Laws	X	X	X															
Locate Employment																		
Initiate Revocations			X			X												X
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer		X	X					X									X	X
Welfare/Social Worker																		X
Risk/Needs Assessment						X												
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management															X			
TOTALS	**4**	**8**	**9**	**8**	**8**	**7**	**4**	**7**	**2**	**7**	**6**	**9**	**5**	**7**	**11**	**9**	**9**	**12**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.

Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	MS[b]			MO[b]			MT[a]			NE[b]			NV[b]			NH		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Surveillance	X	X		X	X					X				X	X	X	X	X
Investigate Cases	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	
Assist in Rehabilitation		X	X	X		X	X	X	X						X	X	X	
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X
Counsel	X	X		X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X				
Visit Home/Work						X										X	X	
Arrest	X	X	X				X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Make Referrals							X		X									
Write P.S.I.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Keep Records	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X			
Perform Other Court Duties					X						X	X						
Collect Restitution								X							X	X	X	X
Serve Warrants		X	X			X									X		X	
Maintain Contact With Court		X	X				X	X		X	X						X	X
Recommend Sentences						X	X	X	X			X				X	X	X
Develop Community Service Program									X			X						
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies						X												
Assist Court in Transferring Cases																		
Enforce Criminal Laws									X								X	X
Locate Employment																		
Initiate Revocations									X									
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer		X	X												X			
Welfare/Social Worker																		
Risk/Needs Assessment			X									X						
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management									X									
TOTALS	**8**	**12**	**11**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**10**	**12**	**6**	**8**	**10**	**5**	**4**	**10**	**9**	**12**	**9**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.

Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	NJ			NM[b]			NY[b]			NC[b]			ND[b]			OH		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Surveillance				X				X		X	X	X					X	
Investigate Cases	X	X	X							X	X	X	X					X
Assist in Rehabilitation				X		X	X	X		X	X	X				X		
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions	X	X	X			X	X	X	X			X				X	X	
Counsel		X					X	X	X			X					X	
Visit Home/Work								X		X	X	X			X			
Arrest			X			X			X	X	X	X		X			X	X
Make Referrals																		
Write P.S.I.	X					X	X			X		X	X			X		X
Keep Records	X	X	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X
Perform Other Court Duties									X	X			X					X
Collect Restitution	X	X	X	X			X	X	X			X					X	X
Serve Warrants			X						X	X	X	X		X	X			
Maintain Contact With Court			X									X						
Recommend Sentences				X	X				X			X						
Develop Community Service Program												X						
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies				X					X					X	X			X
Assist Court in Transferring Cases			X									X						
Enforce Criminal Laws			X	X			X	X										X
Locate Employment							X	X	X									
Initiate Revocations																		
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer		X	X					X	X						X		X	X
Welfare/Social Worker												X						
Risk/Needs Assessment												X						
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management																		X
TOTALS	**6**	**7**	**11**	**7**	**1**	**5**	**8**	**11**	**13**	**10**	**8**	**19**	**5**	**4**	**5**	**4**	**8**	**11**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.

Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	OK[b]			OR			PA[b]			RI			SC[b]			SD[b]		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision		X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Surveillance					X									X	X			X
Investigate Cases			X			X							X	X	X			
Assist in Rehabilitation			X		X								X	X	X			X
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions					X	X	X						X	X	X			
Counsel					X	X								X				
Visit Home/Work					X	X		X					X	X	X			
Arrest		X	X			X	X						X	X	X	X	X	X
Make Referrals																		
Write P.S.I.	X												X				X	
Keep Records	X				X	X						X	X	X	X			
Perform Other Court Duties					X	X									X			
Collect Restitution						X												
Serve Warrants		X	X										X	X	X			
Maintain Contact With Court			X			X												
Recommend Sentences																		X
Develop Community Service Program																		
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies									X									
Assist Court in Transferring Cases						X				X								
Enforce Criminal Laws	X														X	X		
Locate Employment																		
Initiate Revocations			X												X			
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer		X	X			X			X								X	X
Welfare/Social Worker			X															
Risk/Needs Assessment			X									X			X			
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management												X						
TOTALS	**3**	**4**	**10**	**0**	**8**	**12**	**3**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**1**	**4**	**9**	**10**	**13**	**3**	**4**	**6**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.

Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	TN			TX[b]			UT[b]			VT			VA			WA		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Surveillance		X				X		X	X			X				X		
Investigate Cases	X	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X
Assist in Rehabilitation			X		X	X						X	X	X			X	
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions							X					X	X	X	X			
Counsel										X				X				X
Visit Home/Work						X						X						
Arrest			X			X		X	X		X		X	X	X			X
Make Referrals														X			X	
Write P.S.I.	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	X	X	
Keep Records			X										X	X	X			
Perform Other Court Duties	X		X										X		X		X	
Collect Restitution								X	X			X						
Serve Warrants			X								X							X
Maintain Contact With Court							X							X	X			
Recommend Sentences						X	X								X		X	X
Develop Community Service Program												X						
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies																		
Assist Court in Transferring Cases				X											X			
Enforce Criminal Laws																		
Locate Employment												X	X	X				
Initiate Revocations																		X
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer			X															
Welfare/Social Worker																		
Risk/Needs Assessment						X						X						
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management												X						
TOTALS	**4**	**4**	**8**	**4**	**3**	**9**	**5**	**5**	**5**	**4**	**4**	**11**	**9**	**10**	**10**	**3**	**6**	**7**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 1.
Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers From 1992–2015 (Cont.)

Functions	WV			WI			WY[b]		
	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015	1992	2002	2015
Supervision	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
Surveillance	X	X		X		X		X	X
Investigate Cases	X	X	X			X	X	X	X
Assist in Rehabilitation	X	X					X	X	
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Counsel		X					X	X	
Visit Home/Work							X	X	X
Arrest	X	X	X						
Make Referrals									
Write P.S.I.	X	X	X				X		X
Keep Records	X	X	X			X		X	X
Perform Other Court Duties	X	X	X						X
Collect Restitution	X	X	X		X	X			
Serve Warrants		X	X						
Maintain Contact With Court			X		X			X	
Recommend Sentences			X						X
Develop Community Service Program									
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies									X
Assist Court in Transferring Cases									
Enforce Criminal Laws									
Locate Employment									
Initiate Revocations									
Law Enforcement/ Peace Officer									X
Welfare/Social Worker									
Risk/Needs Assessment			X			X			X
Individual Case Adjustment/ Case Management						X			X
TOTALS	**10**	**12**	**12**	**3**	**4**	**8**	**6**	**9**	**13**

Note: [a] = 2013; [b] = 2014

TABLE 2.
Legally Prescribed Functions of Probation Officers By Task Orientation from 1992–2015

Tasks	# Of States With Types of Functions		
	1992	2002	2015
Rehabilitation-Oriented Functions (6)			
Assist in Rehabilitation	17	22	22
Counsel	15	19	9
Develop Community Service Programs	2	2	10
Locate Employment	2	3	6
Write P.S.I.	42	23	25
Welfare/Social Worker	--	--	6
Law Enforcement-Oriented Functions (18)			
Supervision	43	46	50
Surveillance	19	26	19
Investigate Cases	33	22	39
Develop/Discuss Probation Conditions	24	24	31
Visit Home/Work	5	11	13
Arrest	15	24	34
Make Referrals	7	9	2
Keep Records	29	27	32
Perform Other Court Duties	12	13	20
Collect Restitution	12	14	23
Serve Warrants	4	15	23
Maintain Contact With Court	12	15	17
Recommend Sentences	8	10	21
Assist Law Enforcement Agencies	2	4	11
Assist Court in Transferring Cases	3	2	6
Enforce Criminal Laws	6	4	10
Initiate Revocations	2	1	12
Law Enforcement/Peace Officer	--	15	22
Case Manager-Oriented Functions (2)			
Risk/Needs Assessment	--	--	25
Individual Case Adjustment/Case Management	--	--	14

TABLE 3.

Trends in Probation Officer Functions By States From 1992–2015

State	# of Rehabilitation-Oriented Functions				# of Law Enforcement-Oriented Functions				# of Case Manager-Oriented Functions			
	1992	2002	2015	Change[a]	1992	2002	2015	Change[a]	1992	2002	2015	Change[a]
D.C.	--	--	0	0	--	4	4	0	--	--	0	--
Alabama	1	1	2	1	9	9	7	-2	--	--	0	--
Alaska	0	0	2	2	2	5	10	5	--	--	2	--
Arizona	0	0	3	3	10	9	11	2	--	--	2	--
Arkansas	1	0	4	4	6	3	10	7	--	--	2	--
California	0	0	1	1	4	5	8	3	--	--	1	--
Colorado	1	1	1	0	7	11	13	2	--	--	1	--
Connecticut	2	2	2	0	6	6	9	3	--	--	1	--
Delaware	0	3	2	-1	2	10	10	0	--	--	2	--
Florida	1	0	1	1	2	2	7	5	--	--	1	--
Georgia	0	0	1	1	4	5	5	0	--	--	1	--
Hawaii	1	2	2	0	7	8	8	0	--	--	2	--
Idaho	0	0	0	0	6	1	3	2	--	--	0	--
Illinois	1	1	2	1	6	6	7	1	--	--	2	--
Indiana	1	1	1	0	9	10	11	1	--	--	0	--
Iowa	0	1	2	1	2	7	8	1	--	--	0	--
Kansas	1	2	5	3	6	7	7	0	--	--	2	--
Kentucky	1	1	2	1	4	7	8	1	--	--	1	--
Louisiana	0	0	2	2	3	7	7	0	--	--	0	--
Maine	1	2	1	-1	6	6	5	-1	--	--	1	--
Maryland	0	1	1	0	3	6	1	-5	--	--	0	--
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	6	5	9	4	--	--	0	--
Michigan	1	0	1	1	4	6	8	2	--	--	1	--
Minnesota	2	2	3	1	6	7	9	2	--	--	0	--
Mississippi	1	2	2	0	6	9	8	-1	--	--	1	--
Missouri	2	1	2	1	4	6	7	1	--	--	0	--
Montana	2	2	3	1	7	8	8	0	--	--	1	--
Nebraska	0	0	3	3	5	7	6	-1	--	--	1	--
Nevada	1	1	1	0	3	3	9	6	--	--	0	--
New Hampshire	1	1	1	0	7	10	8	-2	--	--	0	--
New Jersey	0	1	0	-1	5	6	11	5	--	--	0	--
New Mexico	1	0	2	2	6	1	3	2	--	--	0	--
New York	3	3	2	-1	4	8	11	3	--	--	0	--
North Carolina	1	1	5	4	8	7	13	6	--	--	1	--
North Dakota	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	1	--	--	0	--
Ohio	1	1	1	0	2	7	9	2	--	--	1	--
Oklahoma	0	0	2	2	2	4	7	3	--	--	1	--
Oregon	0	2	1	-1	0	6	11	5	--	--	0	--
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	2	--	--	0	--
Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	--	--	2	--
South Carolina	1	2	1	-1	7	8	11	3	--	--	1	--
South Dakota	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	2	--	--	0	--
Tennessee	0	0	1	1	3	3	7	4	--	--	0	--
Texas	0	1	2	1	3	1	6	5	--	--	1	--
Utah	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	0	--	--	0	--
Vermont	1	0	3	3	2	3	6	3	--	--	2	--
Virginia	2	3	1	-2	6	7	9	2	--	--	0	--
Washington	0	1	1	0	2	4	6	2	--	--	0	--
West Virginia	1	2	1	-1	8	9	10	1	--	--	1	--
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	2	--	--	2	--
Wyoming	2	2	1	-1	3	7	10	3	--	--	2	--

Note: [a] Change as a count number based on the year of 2002.

Glaze, L. E., & Herberman, E. J. (2013). Correctional populations in the United States, 2012 (NCJ 243936). Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Gleicher, L., Manchak, S. M., & Cullen, F. T. (2013). Creating a supervision tool kit: How to improve probation and parole. *Federal Probation, 77*(1), 22-27.

Hyatt, J. M., & Barnes, G. C. (2014). An experimental evaluation of the impact of intensive supervision on the recidivism of high-risk probationers. *Crime and Delinquency*, 1-36. doi: 10.1177/0011128714555757

Klockars, C. B., Jr. (1972). A theory of probation supervision. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 63*(4), 550-557.

Latessa, E. J., & Lovins, B. (2010). The role of offender risk assessment: A policy maker guide. *Victims and Offenders, 5*(3), 203-219.

Lindner, C. (1994). The police contribution to the development of probation: An historical account. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20*(3-4), 61-84.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-Level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lowenkamp, C. T., Flores, A. W., Holsinger, A. M., Makarios, M. D., & Latessa, E. J. (2010). Intensive supervision programs: Does program philosophy and the principles of effective intervention matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*, 368-375.

Lutze, F. E. (2014). *Professional lives of community corrections officers: The invisible side of reentry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Lynch, M. (2001). Rehabilitation as rhetoric: The ideal of reformation in contemporary parole discourse and practices. *Punishment and Society, 2*(1), 40-65.

MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). Evidence based corrections: Identifying what works. *Crime and Delinquency, 46*(4), 457-471.

Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. *The Public Interest, 35*, 22-54.

Miller, J. (2014). Probation supervision and the control of crime opportunities: An empirical assessment. *Crime and Delinquency, 60*(8), 1235-1257.

Miller, J. (2015). Contemporary modes of probation officer supervision: The triumph of the "synthetic" officer? *Justice Quarterly, 32*(2), 314-336.

Ohlin, L. E., Piven, H., & Pappenfort, D. M. (1956). Major dilemmas of the social worker in probation and parole. *Crime and Delinquency, 2*(3), 221-225.

Paparozzi, M. A., & Gendreau, P. (2005). An intensive supervision program that worked: Service delivery, professional orientation, and organizational supportiveness. *The Prison Journal, 85*(4), 445-466.

Payne, B. K., & DeMichele, M. (2011). Probation philosophies and workload considerations. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*(1), 29-43.

Petersilia, J. (1997). Probation in the United States. *Crime and Justice, 22*, 149-200.

Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1993). Intensive probation and parole. *Crime and Justice, 17*, 28-335.

Purkiss, M., Kifer, M., Hemmens, C., & Burton, V. S., Jr. (2003). Probation officer functions: A statutory analysis. *Federal Probation, 67*(1), 12-23.

Shihadeh, E. S. (1979). Peer counseling and parolees' perceptions of rehabilitative values. *The Journal of Psychology, 103*, 135-142.

Sigler, R. T. (1988). Role conflict for adult probation and parole officers: Fact or myth. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 16*, 121-129.

Simon, J. (1993). *Poor discipline: Parole and social control of the underclass, 1890-1990.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Skeem, J. L., & Manchak, S. (2008). Back to the future: From Klockars' model of effective supervision to evidence-based practice in probation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 47*(3), 220-247.

Smith, P., Schweitzer, M., Labrecque, R. M., & Latessa, E. J. (2012). Improving probation officers' supervision skills: An evaluation of the EPICS model. *Journal of Crime and Justice, 35*(2), 189-199

Steiner, B., Purkiss, M., Kifer, M., Roberts, E., & Hemmens, C. (2004). Legally prescribed functions of adult and juvenile probation officers: Worlds apart? *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 39*(4), 47-67.

Steiner, B., Travis, L. F. III, Makarios, M. D., & Brickley, T. (2011). The influence of parole officers' attitudes on supervision practices. *Justice Quarterly, 28*(6), 903-927.

Stohr, M. K., Jonson, C. L., & Cullen, F. T. (2014). Lessons learned: From penal harm to penal help. In Cullen, F. T., Jonson, C. L. & Stohr, M. K. (eds.) *The American prison: Imagining a different future* (pp. 257-268). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Taxman, F. S. (2002). Supervision: Exploring the dimensions of effectiveness. *Federal Probation, 66*(2), 14-27.

Taxman, F. S. (2008). No illusions: Offender and organizational change in Maryland's proactive community supervision efforts. *Criminology and Public Policy, 7*(2), 275-302.

Taxman, F. S., & Belenko, S. (2012). *Implementation of evidence-based community corrections and addiction treatment.* New York, NY: Springer.

Taxman, F. S., Henderson, C., Young, D., & Farrell, J. (2014). The impact of training interventions on organizational readiness to support innovations in juvenile justice offices. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 41*(2), 177-188.

Viglione, J., Rudes, D. S., & Taxman, F. S. (2015). Misalignment in supervision: Implementing risk/needs assessment instruments in probation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 42*(3), 263-285.

Whetzel, J., Paparozzi, M., Alexander, M., & Lowenkamp, C. T. (2011). Goodbye to a worn-out dichotomy: Law enforcement, social work, and a balanced approach. *Federal Probation, 75*(2), 7-12.

Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1992). Determinants of probation and parole officer professional orientation. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 20*, 13-24.

Cases Cited

Burns v. United States, 287 U.S. 216 (1932).

Roberts v. United States, 320 U.S. 264 (1943).