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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Are probation officers effective in helping juvenile offenders eliminate law violating attitudes? It is not yet known, but probation administration is based on the following assumptions:

1) offenders desire to be law abiding,
2) however, they need a growth-producing relationship to become law abiding,
3) the officer-client relationship is capable of being a growth-producing relationship,
4) rapport is fundamental to that relationship,
5) from that relationship the client will grow, that is, he will modify his attitudes and behavior to be law abiding.

Therefore, rapport is of crucial importance. James Drever in his *A Dictionary of Psychology* defines rapport as, "In a general sense, relationship based on a high degree of community of thought, interest, and sentiment" (Drever, 1960, p. 234). Rapport should be an attribute of the probation officer-client relationship. Requisite to the establishment of rapport is attraction to the relationship. Rapport in the relationship will not result unless both members of the relationship desire this outcome. It is only when a relationship is characterized by strong attraction of the members that attitude and behavior change in the offenders will result.
The following statements are representative of the general philosophy of probation administration and the assumptions stated above. The late Charles Chute and Marjory Bell state in their now classic book, *Crime, Courts, and Probation*:

"Case work is the major task of the probation officer or counselor, the service around which the entire system is built. . . . It is based on the assumption that the well-being of the individual and society go hand in hand. It implies belief in the value of each individual personality and its power of growth, and acknowledges responsibility, though limited, for the direction of such growth. As social case work, it involves the use of the probation worker relationship to strengthen the efforts of the individual toward rehabilitation" (Chute and Bell, 1956, p. 162).

In regards to establishment of this relationship, they stress the importance of rapport:

"The first interview with the offender is of crucial importance, as it may condition the relationship of the whole supervision. It should establish friendly rapport" (Chute and Bell, 1956, p. 166).

From his experience as a probation officer for a number of years and from having some degree of exposure to literature on probation, the writer came to realize the importance of the establishment of rapport if a probation officer was to be effective. He was also well aware of the necessity of the client's attraction to the relationship as the prerequisite for rapport. Resulting from this concern was the realization that one could not adequately measure the client's degree of attraction to the relationship. Not being able to assess this variable, one could not be sure 1) whether it existed, 2) how great it was, 3) whether it could be improved, and 4) whether it varied with certain social-psychological variables of the offender.
Since leaving probation work the writer has continued to ponder the question of how to measure the client's attraction to the officer-client relationship. Industry can evaluate the attraction of the consumer to their product on the basis of sales volume. Movie and television producers can determine the attraction of the populace toward their product on the basis of box office sales or viewer surveys. Politicians can determine the attraction of voters toward themselves or their ideas on the basis of the votes they receive. Psychiatrists can determine the attraction toward the therapeutic relationship on the basis of the client's continuation of the relationship. Yet the question remains: "How does the probation officer determine the clients' attraction toward their relationship?" The client is not free to discontinue the relationship. Since his freedom may be at stake, he is inhibited in his frank expression. In addition, probation officers may rationalize their inability to determine their effectiveness in order to protect their own egos.

Further, the writer became aware while a probation officer, and especially as a supervisor, that not all officers had the same degree of success in eliciting from their clients a strong attraction to the relationship. Moreover, it appeared that some officers could elicit a positive attraction from one type of client and another officer from a different type of client. Even here, it was difficult to determine the strength of the attraction. It was also observed that many individuals with extensive knowledge of "case work technique" were among the least successful in establishing rapport or eliciting an attraction toward the relationship. This knowledge is extremely impressionistic, and has only
increased the writer's concern in measuring the effectiveness of the technique of probation.

Many probation officers have believed because of their education, training, case work techniques, and probation officer role that they are successful in rehabilitating offenders. Daniel Glaser in *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*, suggests that the logic of these probation officers may have been somewhat faulty. After extensive research, he states, "Parole officers or case workers were more often designated the most disliked than the most liked staff members, but like the teachers, chaplains, and clinical staff, their overall selection as either most liked or most disliked was not great" (Glaser, 1964, p. 134). Although this part of his research was directed toward institutional treatment personnel, one might find some value in generalizing his data for those who are treatment personnel in the community. Further, of the post-release success cases in his sample, four-and-one-half percent credited institutional case workers for their success, while fifty-four percent credited their work supervisors (Glaser, 1964, p. 143).

Ruth Cavan in her textbook, *Juvenile Delinquency*, states that from the meager data available, fifteen to thirty percent of juvenile offenders violate their probation (Cavan, 1962, p. 292). Unfortunately, we do not have any reliable data to inform us as to how many commit new offenses after discharge from probation. Moreover, there is no way of knowing if the seventy to eight-five percent who do successfully complete their probation periods would not have been successful even if they had not been placed on probation. This data suggests that there is a critical need for research of the effectiveness of present programs which purport to help
offenders to help themselves live a law-abiding life.

The attraction to the officer-client relationship by the client appears to be crucial to any success. To quote the old cliche, "You can lead a horse to water, but you can't make him drink." You can force a client and an officer together in a relationship, but it cannot be assumed that a law abiding attitudinal change in the client will occur.

To state the matter explicitly: In the treatment of juvenile offenders, it is assumed that there is a strong attraction of the probationer to the probation officer-client relationship. It is assumed that by this process a probationer will change his attitudes to become law abiding. Therefore, the research undertaken here is to determine:

1) whether probationers are attracted to the officer-client relationship,
2) if so, the degree of attraction,
3) whether officers vary in their ability to establish a relationship to which probationers are attracted,
4) how social-psychological attitudes of probationers are associated with attraction to the officer-client relationship.

It is hoped that by gaining information regarding these questions, a greater understanding of the variables crucial to rehabilitation of delinquent offenders will be gained. It is hoped that with this knowledge, rehabilitation may be made more effective.
CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

This writer's orientation to research which is reflected in this thesis is stated in the work of Merton: "Within any branch of science, idle curiosity may serve as its own justification, but only for a time. The scientist may regard his deep interest in a question as reason enough for pursuing it. But sooner or later, if the question and its answers are to become part of the science rather than remaining a personal hobby, they must be shown to be relevant to other ideas and facts in the discipline."

"Here the case is made for a question by indicating that its answers will help men achieve values other than knowledge itself: values of health, comfort, safety, efficiency, and the like" (Merton, 1959, p. xx).

Although the problems stimulating this research are of an applied orientation, no apologies need be made as long as the design and findings are related to as general a level as possible. In this chapter an effort is made to review the history of the concepts or phenomena in all relevant areas (regardless of the framework whether pure research, applied research, or practical experience). Knowledge must be gathered from all three areas, evaluated, and integrated to provide new insights.

There are two main concerns in this investigation. The first is the theoretical antecedents of the crucial concepts. This material will be presented by first tracing the development of the main concepts and then summarizing with a statement of the current use of these constructs. The second is the consideration of the cultural antecedents in probation
administration. The history of probation administration will be examined by tracing two main trains of thought: 1) the development of social work and 2) the development of adult and juvenile probation services. The chapter will be concluded by a summary of the current status of probation administration.

The Development of the Concepts "Primary Group" and "Socialization"

Although the concepts "primary group" and "socialization" are seldom referred to in case work or probation administration literature, they would seem to be central to such work. An explicit definition of primary group and the implicit definition of socialization is presented by Charles Horton Cooley: "By primary groups I mean those characterized by intimate face-to-face association and cooperation. They're primary in several senses, but chiefly, in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individuality in a common whole, so that one's self, for many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group." The primary group according to him, is one "characterized by intimate, face-to-face association and cooperation." Socialization to Cooley is, "... the social nature and ideals of the individual." He associated the two concepts by implying that socialization was the outgrowth of the primary group relationship. "... They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual" (Cooley, 1909, pp. 23-24).
Although Cooley was probably the first to focus both on the small intimate group and the resulting socialization process and certainly the first to state the relationship explicitly, he was not the first individual to be oriented to these topics.

European interest in the small intimate group

Ferdinand Toennies in Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, published in 1887, dealt entirely with comparing the small rural community based on personal, emotional attraction in the members (primary group) and large urban centers based on contractual arrangements between members. In 1908, Georg Simmel published his Soziologie in which he demonstrated a keen interest in intimate relationships as reflected in a number of hypotheses. Also about this time Frederick Le Play saw the importance of intimate groups, particularly in the extended family and neighborhood group. Concurrently, the noted French sociologist, Emile Durkheim, attended to intimate relationships of small groups and the importance of these groups to the individual's psychic well-being. He noted that without the sense of belonging to a small intimate group, anomie resulted (Shils, 1951, p. 45).

American concern for the topic of socialization prior to 1900

W. I. Thomas seems to be the first American to pay attention to this topic. According to Clausen, he dealt with it exclusively in his first article "The Scope and Method of Folk-Psychology" (1896). He discussed the subject, though he did not use the word "socialization" (Clausen, 1968, p. 26). In the same year, E. A. Ross in his paper "Social Control" used the notion as referring to the molding of the in-
individual's feelings and desires to suit the needs of the group. However, he did not formally give the term the status of a concept (Clausen, 1968, p. 23). The following year this was done by Giddings: "Socialization is conceived as the development of a social nature of character—a social state of mind—in the individuals who associate" (Clausen, 1968, p. 22).

**Primary group and socialization topics from 1900-1920**

It was Cooley who in 1899 first focused simultaneously on the primary group (defining it explicitly) and on the occurrence of socialization. John A. Clausen has observed, "... more than any other early writer in the fields of sociology and social psychology, he recognized the crucial importance of the primary group relationship for the development of personality" (Clausen, 1968, p. 26).

However, Cooley was not the only individual to be concerned about the relationship between the primary group and the socialization process, both W. I. Thomas and Robert Park having similar concerns. None of these men, however, used the term "socialization" even though Gidding's *Theory of Socialization* had been published in 1897.

Another individual interested in the subject of socialization was George H. Mead, though he did not use the term "socialization." However, beginning in 1903, he discussed extensively in his class in social psychology at the University of Chicago, the socialization process and attitudes as the vehicle of socialization (Clausen, 1968, p. 28). His book, *Mind, Self, and Society*, published in 1934 posthumously by a number of his students, stands today as a classic on the socialization process.
Another important figure was Ernest Burgess who in 1916 dealt explicitly with the concept of socialization. His interest resulted in his dissertation in 1916 entitled *The Function of Socialization in Social Evolution* (Clausen, 1968, p. 23).

**Primary groups and socialization topics from 1920-1930**

The decade from 1920 to 1930 was marked by a continuation of interest in the topics by Cooley, Thomas, and Mead. Also Park and Burgess teamed up with an interest in both primary groups and socialization. Florian Znaniecki joined W. I. Thomas and focused on empirical research in *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America* (published in 1920).

During the decade the topics were related to delinquency causation notions by Thrasher in *The Gang* (published in 1927) and Shaw and MacKay in *Delinquency Areas* (published in 1929). These were followed in the 1930's by a number of Shaw's biographies of delinquents and criminals. These men attempted through empirical research to show that delinquent attitudes are learned through the primary group of a delinquent gang.

**The topics of primary groups and socialization 1930-1940**

During the decade from 1930-1940 little concern with the relationship of primary groups and socialization was demonstrated. However, during this decade an abundance of interest developed around the topic of socialization. Cooley, Thomas, and Mead had spent three decades in focusing on socialization. This attention resulted in a proliferation of students of socialization, as well as an increased interest on the part of some of the individuals already concerned in the area. Shaw continued with his life histories of delinquents and criminals. John
Dollard in 1935 contributed to the method of studying socialization by his publication of *A Criteria for the Life History*. And of course in 1934, Mead's *Mind, Self and Society* was published (Clausen, 1968, p. 24). Developing in the late 1920's and flourishing by the mid 1930's, a wide-spread interest in culture and personality from a multiple disciplinary approach was apparent. The topic of socialization was fundamental to this orientation, "By the mid-1930's there were so many evidences of interdisciplinary influence that it is not feasible to trace lines of influence within a single discipline" Clausen has stated (Clausen, 1968, p. 24). It was at this time also that the concept of socialization and the behavior that we now know as socialization were joined together as we now accept them. From 1940 until the present time, the concept of socialization has belonged to many of the relevant disciplines: sociology, psychology, social psychology, child psychology, developmental psychology, personality psychology, anthropology, and child development (Clausen, 1968, pp. 24-42).

The topic of primary group from 1930 to present

Interest in the primary group by sociologists waned somewhat during the decade of the 1930's. However those from other disciplines pursued the topic. The work of Elton Mayo in 1933 with his study of primary groups in industry resulted in *The Human Problems of Industrial Civilization*. In making his investigation Mayo was struck by the importance of the primary group relationship within the industrial setting as it affected the group morale and the group's production rates. This work of Mayo's, plus his later book published in 1944, *Teamwork and Labor Turnover in the Aircraft Industry of Southern California*, added valuable
empirical knowledge on the dynamics of the primary group. Mention should also be made of Roethlisberger and Dickson's *Management and the Worker* with the same orientation published in 1934 (Shils, 1951, pp. 47-51).

From another intellectual heritage, Jacob Moreno began focusing on small groups as therapy for mentally ill people. An Austrian psychiatrist, he had had a long-time interest in the release of spontaneity in individuals as a means of therapy. Moreno operated under the hypothesis that the prescribed social relations of small groups within schools, reformatories, hospitals, and the like were not the same as those of self-selected groups. He developed sociometric tests in order to assess this discrepancy. One limitation of these tests is that "Neither the degree of intensity, nor the content of the choice (other than its positive or negative quality) can be presented in such a diagram" according to Shils. However, the sociometric test is important as an attempt to add an empirical measurement dimension to the study of primary groups (Shils, 1951, p. 52). Moreno's research and therapy resulted in experimentation in sociodrama and psychodrama, with the goal of reducing rigidity of personality and releasing inhibited tendencies. His interest in the primary group continues through the institute which he founded (Shils, 1951, p. 54).

An interest in primary groups also evolved from the Gestalt psychology heritage with Kurt Lewin. His first major works published in this country are as follows: *A Dynamic Theory of Personality; Selected Papers* (1935); *Principles of Typological Psychology*, (1936); *The Conceptual Presentation and the Measurement of Psychological Sources*, (1938).
Lewin had a major concern with the primary group, its structures, and processes. He established the heritage of group dynamics, still a popular subject matter. In 1945 he formed the Research Center for Group Dynamics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1948, after his death, the Center was transferred to the University of Michigan where it remains today (Martindale, 1960, p. 503). Although Lewin was a Gestalt psychologist, he is claimed now by the fields of sociology, psychology of personality, and social psychology. His interest and endeavors not only stimulated a resurrection of sociological concern for the primary group, but it also provided a theoretical and empirical contribution. His work, the work of his colleagues, and, since his death, the work of the Institute, have continually attempted to expand theory and research interests simultaneously (Clausen, 1968, pp. 54-58).

Interest in the subject of primary groups also developed from a therapeutic interest, primarily evolving from psychoanalysis. This Group Therapy, as it is called, developed in mental hospitals initially as a result of the scarcity of qualified personnel. It has, however, added little to our knowledge of the psychodynamics of the primary group and it has seemed to draw very little from social psychological theory or empirical findings.

Since 1951 the Research Center for Group Dynamics under the leadership of Darwin Cartwright and Ronald Lippett has been profuse in its research in group dynamics. Their major area of interest has been in the interdynamics of the primary group. The sections of their textbook entitled Group Dynamics perhaps will suggest the areas of concern as stated

From a different heritage, the work of George Homans should be mentioned. Homans studied five empirical primary groups in order to analyze and synthesize some of the elements common to primary groups. His work *The Human Group* (published in 1950) has stimulated a great deal of interest in the primary group, resulting in extensive publications, dialogue, and research undertakings (Martindale, 1960, pp. 476-484).

At this date, there are a number of sociological and social psychological-oriented individuals who are identified with small group research and group dynamics. This interest is primarily with an empirical orientation. There is also an interest in the primary group as a means to effect therapy from Moreno's work. Unfortunately, there does not seem to be much mutual exchange of ideas, theories, or research findings (Shils, 1951, p. 59).

**Summary**

To summarize the above historical interest in the phenomena of primary group and socialization: there were in the late 1800's some individuals interested in primary group behavior and others in the topic
of socialization. In the beginning of the 1900's some individuals had an interest in both—namely, Cooley, Thomas and Parks, and to a lesser extent, George Herbert Mead. After the 1930's interests became separated, one group of individuals intensified their interests in socialization, another focused on the maintenance of the primary group.

Presently, there are two groups interested in the primary group field. One has a group dynamics and small group research orientation. These individuals are dedicated primarily to empirical research, though to a lesser extent with the importance of the combination of empirical research and theory. The other group is concerned with the therapeutic value of the primary group. These therapists attend to the topics of psychodrame, sociodrame, group psycho-therapy, and group counseling. Shils pointed out in 1951, "Neither the psychiatric and social work variants, or group analysis, nor those forms carried on by Moreno under the names of sociodrame and psychodrame, have thus far contributed very much to an explicit theory of group structure" (Shils, 1951, p. 59). In a general review of recent literature it seems to this writer that Shils' declaration is still justified. These two interest groups seem to be operating, to a large extent, as closed systems. At least, they seem to be insulated from each other.

In the area of socialization, the concept and phenomena seems to be viewed as justly shared by all the relevant disciplines: anthropology, sociology, social psychology, personality, psychology, child psychology, child development, and education.

Anticipating the next section of this paper, it is important to point out that neither the empirical nor theoretical material dealing with
the primary group phenomenon and the socialization phenomenon has made much of an impact in the helping services of social work or probation administration. Shils points out that the only works that have been used is The Gang (published in 1927) and Clifford Shaw's life histories of delinquents, which entered into the armory of juvenile court workers, probation officers, etc., in the United States (Shils, 1951, p. 47). The result of these studies was primarily to inform the workers of the importance of primary group affiliation in delinquent gangs as a socializing influence for deviant behavior.

Historical Antecedents of the Officer-Client Relationship

Having traced the heritage of the two relevant concepts, primary group and socialization, it remains to trace the development of the therapeutic or treatment relationship to its present stage of development. We will be concerned with two intellectual heritages: 1) that of social work and 2) that of probation administration. The current dynamics of the officer-client relationship has its historical roots in these two endeavors. These orientations have had a reciprocating effect on each other down through the years.

Probation administration and social work from 1840 until 1899

Probation had its beginning in 1841 with the humanitarian concern for criminal offenders of John Augustis, a shoemaker. The legal foundation for probation existed in the suspended sentence law which had been part of English law and was transported to the United States during colonization. John Augustis supervised 1,946 people during his life-
time. He maintained that only ten of this number were "ungrateful" (Chute and Bell, 1956, p. 52). The basis of John Augustis's relationship with his clients was purely humanitarian. The clients were extremely grateful for the privilege of probation, in lieu of the brutal punishment that was generally the consequence of criminal conviction. It should be added, however, that John Augustis did investigate the cases for which he requested probation. Although these investigations were quite superficial by today's standards, they did provide more knowledge than simply the given crime or the appearance of the offender. John Augustis's work was carried on after his death in 1858 by John M. Speer, also a volunteer. By 1869 visiting agents of the Board of Charity in Boston, Massachusetts assumed this responsibility. By 1877 the first probation bill was passed in the Massachusetts legislature for the city of Boston. The Chief of Police was first empowered with responsibility for the probation officers. The first-paid probation officer was Lieutenant Henry C. Hemmenway, and in 1870 he was replaced by a former police chief, Edward H. Savage, who remained in this position for 14 years (Chute, p. 61). By 1898 the legislature authorized all Massachusetts courts to appoint probation officers.

In the area of social work, up until 1880 social workers were volunteers who were oriented to give money and to communicate middle-class standards. Beginning in 1880 a strong interest in developing specialized techniques evolved. Social workers desired to establish an identity. They wished to obtain this identity based on possession of an unique expertise. They saw the area of expertise to be knowledge of the environmental conditions of clients with problems (Lubove, 1965,
Probation administration and social work from 1899 until 1910

The year 1899 was extremely important in the history of probation administration. Vermont had established a probation law which included both adults and juveniles in 1898. Then in 1899 Rhode Island had a similar law (Chute, p. 70). However, the whole area of juvenile probation began as a part of a social movement for better treatment of children. The movement culminated in the establishment of the Cook County Juvenile Court and the Illinois law providing for this in 1899. The first juvenile court law established a whole new orientation in the treatment of juvenile offenders. They were not be considered responsible for their acts. The main purpose of the court was to protect the children rather than punish them. The court was established firmly on the social work orientation of the day, which was a scientific interest in case work. This included a thorough investigation of the social and environmental factors affecting the child (Chute, p. 71).

During that same year, Minnesota established juvenile courts in its three largest counties. However, the first probation officer in Minnesota did not have an orientation toward scientific case work. His orientation was primarily in controlling the behavior of the clients through regular reporting, advice, and lectures (Keve, 1967, pp. 3-4).

The juvenile court movement was probably one of the fastest-growing social movements of the time and quickly spread throughout the United States: 1900, Denver; 1901, Wisconsin, Kansas, Washington, D.C., St. Louis, and Buffalo; 1902, Cleveland, Baltimore, and New York City; 1903, California, Colorado, Indiana, Michigan, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania
There was also an increase in adult probation with laws enacted in the following states: New Jersey, New York; and in 1903, the addition of California, Connecticut, Michigan (Chute, pp. 67-88).

Probation officers were beginning to see themselves as belonging to a unique profession by 1907. With a desire to exchange ideas and to establish a professional identity, they held their first meeting in 1907 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. One of the chief promoters of this movement was Timothy D. Hurley of Chicago, who had been chief probation officer of the Cook County Juvenile Court. At this meeting there were three officers present from Minneapolis, three from Chicago, two from Denver, and one each from Atlanta, Milwaukee, New Britain (Connecticut), Newark, Omaha, and San Francisco (Chute, p. 112). By 1909 the organization, then known as the National Association of Probation Officers, expanded its membership to include any interested individuals.

Nothing occurred during these years to affect greatly the social work movement. There was continued interest in being seen as a professional group with an area of expertise in social case work and to increase their numbers in hospitals, schools, mental institutions, and in economic assistance.

Probation administration and social work from 1910 to 1920

Between 1910 and 1920 there were no great changes in probation administration. The existing probation programs began to expand and develop their techniques. The association became stronger and interacted with the profession of general social work through joint meetings with the National Conference of Social Work.
However, in the area of social work an important innovation brought social work and juvenile probation administration closely together and altered the profession of social work greatly. In 1909 Dr. William Healy organized a Psychopathic Institute in Chicago to supplement the work of the Chicago Juvenile Court. Healy had been a professor of nervous and mental disorders at the Chicago Polyclinic, and was struck with the realization that punitive acts were not effective in handling conduct difficulties. Through his research he found that no agency in the United States provided psychological diagnosis of children demonstrating common difficulties. He therefore established the institute with the goals of providing diagnostic service to the Juvenile Court as well as research into the causes of delinquent behavior. In 1914 this institute became the official Psychopathic Clinic of the Juvenile Court (Lubove, 1965, pp. 65-66). Mary Richmand, a pioneer in social case work, singled out this combination of the psychodiagnostic clinic and the juvenile court as a basic factor in the evolution of case work (Lubove, 1965, p. 45).

As mentioned above, Mary Richmand was a pioneer in the area of social case work. From 1909 until 1928 she devoted her efforts to raising standards of case work practice while working for the Russell Sage Foundation. However, she was against establishing a professional identity among social workers by disassociation with voluntary social work. In 1915 she attempted to strike a balance between the paid social worker and volunteer service in order that the profession would have the best of each for the good of the clients. In 1917 she published her now classic book, *Social Diagnosis*. This book was devoted to presenting the
techniques of environmental and social diagnosis of clients experiencing social problems.

In 1908 a gentleman by the name of Beers, who had recovered from mental illness, wrote *A Mind That Found Itself* which initiated the mental hygiene movement which intensified the orientation of mental illness as a curable and preventable disease (Lubove, 1965, p. 73).

In 1917 Healy and his assistant, Augusta Bronner, moved from Chicago to The Judge Baker Foundation in Boston, and established another clinic to serve the juvenile court. This added momentum to the already-existing child guidance clinic movement (Lubove, 1965, p. 90).

By 1919, social work had changed its emphasis from an environmental focus to a personality focus. By this time, the volunteers that did exist were under the extensive supervision of the agency, and were expected to play only a supporting role to the professionals (Lubove, 1965, p. 79).

**Probation administration and social work from 1920 to 1930**

During the decade of the 1920's there was an increased vigor in the profession of probation. This vigor primarily resulted from the work of the National Association of Probation Officers. In 1922 Mr. Charles L. Chute was appointed Executive Secretary of the National Probation Association. Mr. Chute graduated in 1910 from the New York School of Social Work and had been secretary of the New York State Probation Commission for seven years prior to his appointment (Chute, p. 119). Mr. Chute was the first executive secretary and his appointment resulted in an increased involvement of the organization in all areas of probation.
By the end of 1922 the membership had reached 1,127. The Association began to involve itself in conducting surveys and providing consultation services throughout the United States. Early in 1922, The Community Chest of St. Paul, Minnesota, requested a critical survey of the Juvenile Court and its unsatisfactory relationships with private agencies (Chute, p. 122). There was a belief that the court was not as effective as it could be. There were also similar requests in the following year in Minneapolis, St. Louis, Kansas City, and in other cities in Missouri. With improved finances, the Association was able to appoint a full-time field consultant in 1925 in the person of Francis H. Hiller. The association also became active in assisting legislatures to establish probation and parole laws throughout the United States. There also was an increased number of conferences. In 1922 the first periodical Probation Bulletin was published for the members (Chute, pp. 124-129).

The profession of social work was in ferment over its professional identity by the beginning of the 1920 decade. Edward C. Lindeman, Professor of the New York School of Social Work, communicated this concern in 1920. Lubove states, "Lindeman feared that professionalization and bureaucratization had transformed the social worker from the 'embodiment of sentiment' into the 'symbol of technique.' Social work had become 'dehumanized' a compound of hardness, cynicism, and jargon; it had lost the enthusiasm and compassion of the past" (Lubove, 1965, p. 148).

In the schools of social work in the 1920's the primary emphasis was on teaching case work methods (Lubove, 1956, p. 148). In 1922 Mary Richmond published a small book entitled *What Is Social Case Work?* in
which she defined it as "those processes which develop personality through adjustments consciously effected, individual by individual, between men and their social environment" (Richmond, 1920, pp. 98-99).

The book dealt initially with the work of Ann Sullivan for Helen Keller. Miss Richmond devoted most of the remainder of the book to presenting cases to demonstrate case work and to discuss it from an experiential standpoint. She maintains that her personal approach to social case work was by way of social science (Richmond, 1920, p. 93). It should be stated that although Miss Richmond credited social science for her intellectual background she seldom made reference to any specific social scientist. She did, however, indicate that she read E. R. Ross's Principles of Sociology published in 1920. In discussing the relationship of society and the individual she quoted R. M. MacIver and his The Elements of Social Science (Richmond, 1920, p. 95). She also showed acquaintance with Park's and Burgess's Introduction to the Science of Sociology published in 1921 (Richmond, 1920, p. 228).

Sigmund Freud's impact on social work was notable. Social work had already been shifting its interest from the social environment to the personality through psychiatric and hospital social work. The doctor-patient relationship became the model for the case work relationship between social worker and client. Also, the child guidance movement resulted in an increased need for social workers. Freud's concepts fit in well with these existing orientations. The stage had been set for Freud by social work's interest in establishing a professional entity, a shift from social environmental factors to personality factors, and a doctor-patient relationship as the model for the worker-
client relationship. Freud's conceptual scheme provided a needed conceptualization for the new orientation. Social workers became acquainted with Freud through their association with psychiatry in the mental hospitals. His effect was minimal at first, but by 1920 had increased markedly (Lubove, 1956, pp. 86-89).

Lubove has discussed the orientation of one of the leaders of the new social work. "Miss Towle expounded an extreme Freudian view. Miss Towle observed 'we must meet the basic emotional needs of the individual through the worker-client relationship in terms of parental needs.' This relationship was essentially a 'parent-child one.' Those who came for help experienced 'deep-lying need to be guided by a parental hand' forcing the social worker to 'identify and to play in secure fashion the mature parent role in the social relationship'" (Lubove, 1956, p. 99-100). As the decades of the 1920's progressed, Freud's conceptual scheme became established in professional social work. As Lubove points out, "that a new conception of scientific case work developed, rooted in Freud and the mysteries of the psychic, personality, and emotions. The psychiatric social worker emerged as the queen of case workers, for if her point of view was relevant to all case work, then no group is better qualified by training and experience to speak for the profession" (Lubove, 1956, p. 86).

It seems that up to this point there was no great conflict between probation administration and the field of social work. Social work education was primarily the teaching of case work methods. The worker's essential focus was the social environment of the individual. The investigation of the individual's problems placed strong emphasis on the
social environment of the client. This was quite compatible with both adult and juvenile probation. Even the Chicago Psychopathic Clinic of the Juvenile Court under Dr. Healy was interested in sociological as well as psychological factors. However, the strain between probation administration and social work became apparent when social work began to eliminate the social environment in its conceptual scheme and to focus entirely on the personality of the individual. This strain became even greater when the focus was supplemented by Freud's conceptual scheme. His theories did not seem to explain the causative factors in crime and delinquency. This was especially true with adult criminality.

Probation administration and social work from 1930 to 1940

By 1930 probation administration reached the status of a profession. The Journal of the National Association of Probation Officers had expanded and had become a professional forum. The national conferences provided a means of strengthening the identification of the profession. The work of the association helped to improve probation in the United States as well as the working conditions of the probation officer. During the 1930's probation began to be utilized more extensively. Due to the increased need of probation officers, the conflict with the profession of social work, and the inability of schools of social work to graduate sufficient manpower; recruitment for probation and parole was directed to many fields. In some cases, the minimum qualification was high school graduation.

By 1930 Freud's conceptual scheme was well established in social work. In that year Virginia Robertson published her classic book on
case work entitled *A Changing Psychology in Social Case Work*. To her, case work was synonymous with mental hygiene and psycho-therapy. However, beginning in 1930, the therapeutic relationship espoused by Freud was challenged in the area of social work by the therapeutic method of Otto Rank. Lubove states this quite completely:

"Centering in the Pennsylvania School of Social Work and the Philadelphia Children's agencies and Child Guidance Clinic, functionalism was significant as an effort to adapt case work to the agency setting. Rank's theory dealt with the reality of the will and emphasized the limitations of time and responsibility in the case work relationship. Its originators believed that the practice of limited therapy adapted to the 'agency function and procedure' would eliminate the confusion caused by case workers' inability to find its place between pure therapy and public relief. Social workers would require a technique which differentiated them from the psychiatrists. The psychiatric influence had produced a case work superior to the older social diagnosis and environmentalism, but it had obscured rather than clarified the social worker's distinctive function" (Lubove, 1965, p. 115).

At this time the agency was used to shore up the client's ego strength. The agency was used as a milieu to establish a close and secure relationship with the patient. It was assumed the client's motivation to come to the agency was a prerequisite for treatment. It was felt that the warm, secure environment of the agency would be sufficient attraction to create this motivation (Lubove, 1965, pp. 115-116).

In comparing psychoanalysis with Rank's conception of the client relationship, the former utilizes the doctor-patient analogy. The client, experiencing terrific pain, would come to the doctor who would remove this pain and thus cure him. The removal of the pain was assumed to be sufficient to attract the client to the relationship even if intense pain sometimes resulted temporarily within the cure. Rank, on the other hand, hoped to be able to establish the warm therapist-client relation-
ship that would be sufficient to attract the client. While in this ego-supporting relationship, the client would be free to grow, using his creative powers. Lubove states well the position of social work in the early 1930's which seems to have established a basic philosophy of the social work profession:

"By 1930, 'specificity of function,' the image of the technically-proficient case worker, sympathetic but professionally objective in client relations, had been incorporated into the system of norms and values in the social work sub-culture. Not undiluted love of humanity, spontaneous sentiment, or undisciplined emotion and compassion, but rather a scientific trained intelligence and a skillful application of technique were the accepted norms for professional social work" (Lubove, 1956, p. 122).

By the early 1930's social work education had shifted from the teaching of case work technique to socializing the neophyte into the profession of social work. In 1932 the Association of Professional Schools of Social Work established a minimum curriculum. Fundamental to the social work profession and social work education was acculturation of the newcomers and the goal of establishing a professional identity (Lubove, 1956, p. 152).

Summary

As in social science, the areas of probation administration and social work were very active in the early 1900's in establishing a role in a new intellectual realm. But as with the other areas of social science and social service, distinct intellectual systems began to differentiate and solidify. Prior to 1930 a great deal of interaction between social work and probation administration existed; both were somewhat open systems. By 1930 the boundaries began to close and both tended to become self-contained systems. This seems to be especially
true with the profession of social work. Probation had not and still does not have a professional identity, academically speaking. Schools of social work, on the other hand, have been strong. They have agreed on a curriculum necessary for all who are educated in social work and they have concentrated strongly on acculturation of the neophyte. This has tended to insulate them from ideas, concepts, and theories from the other disciplines of the social sciences and the social services. Probation administration, on the other hand, although it has been more of an open system has not systematically sought ideas, concepts, and theories from related social sciences and social services. This may be primarily due to probation administration personnel being less interested in specific and extensive academic preparation.

The boundary maintenance problem between the profession of social work and the profession of probation is captured by the statements of Chappel. Writing in Paul Tappan's Contempory Corrections, he states, "There are those who contend that casework cannot function in an authoritative setting. Those who uphold this view realize that probationers are persons in trouble who need counsel, support, and help. They propose however that such services should be supplied by a nonauthoritarian case work agency and that probationers should be referred by the probation officer to such agencies for help." The above statement is the primary reason, it is believed, that social work has rejected probation administration. The following statement attends to the lack of trained social workers in the area of probation administration. Chappell states, "Although case-work techniques are essential, they are utilized fully in too few probation departments, both adult and juvenile. Very few probation
workers are drawn from the ranks of trained and experienced social workers because appointing authorities have not sought personnel with this kind of background" (Chappell, 1951, pp. 386-387).

Paul Keve, at a more recent date (1967), summarizes the relationship of the two systems in the past, the present, and makes a prediction for the future. He states, "The correctional field has long regarded its social work training uneasily as a kind of book learning that is somehow not practical or realistic enough for dealing with the criminal world . . . Corrections were for decades the province of practitioners and administrators who performed on the basis of experience unmodified by special education, and it is only human for such personnel to resist any trends that seem to emphasize qualifications they do not have." As to the present situation, he goes on to state, "The field of social work education has lately begun to recognize its responsibility to corrections and in the last few years has made impressive efforts to strengthen its usefulness to prospective correctional officers." In regard to the future, he states, "While the field of social work is thus assuming increased responsibility in training for corrections, it does not yet have the capability of supplying the demand for workers. The enrollment of students in graduate social work increases each year, but the jobs in corrections increase at an even faster rate." For the future, he maintains in regard to the relationship of social work to sociology and criminology, "There is a widely accepted argument that where graduate education can be made a qualification for probation and parole personnel it is social work that is the most appropriate field. Graduate studies in sociology or criminology provide relevant informational courses. But
probation and parole officers cannot be satisfied just with having knowledge about social problems; they must in addition have a technical skill in attacking such problems. The social work curriculum is ordinarily the only one that provides training in the techniques of directly helping individuals" (Keve, 1967, pp. 36-37).

In conclusion, the systems of social work and probation logically should be an integrated whole. Boundary maintenance has been manifest since the 1930's, but if Keve is correct, the prognosis is that they will re-establish systemic linkage if not become an integrated system.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated many areas of close systems of knowledge. It has shown that scientific concern for the phenomenon of the primary group and the concern for the phenomenon of socialization were integrated originally. However, the concerns polarized during the early thirties with one group focusing on the primary group, its structure and processes and the other group focusing on the processes of socialization. There is another schism along a different dimension; it is between the scientists who are interested in these two phenomena and the practitioners who are interested in the phenomena. There is also a chasm between the various groups of practitioners. Lastly, it has been documented that a great schism also exists between the profession of social work and that of probation.

Ideally, there should be interaction and a sharing of knowledge between the scientists concerned with the primary group phenomenon and those concerned with the socialization phenomenon. These groups of
scientists should interact and share knowledge with practitioners who need the knowledge in helping people with problems and vice versa. By the same token, the scientist and the practitioners should seek knowledge from each other. Lastly, social work, especially social work education, and probation could both profit greatly from a sharing of knowledge if not total systemic integration. (See diagram on the following page.)

In essence, it is the aim of this study to contribute to this integration of knowledge even though to a minor extent. On the theoretical level, the goal is to summarize the available knowledge on the primary group and on socialization and to examine the existence and nature of these during the case work process in a probation setting. It is hoped that one outcome of this research will be to determine how to improve case work in a probation agency.
DIAGRAM I

Desired Interaction Network of Groups Interested in the Phenomena of Primary Groups and Socialization
CHAPTER 3. HYPOTHESES

Introduction

In Probation Administration, it is assumed that a primary relationship exists between the probationer and the probation officer. It is further assumed that this primary relationship will result in "approved" socialization of the probationer. Although the practical problem instigated this research, our aim is to work within a deductive framework, starting with the general level and deducing to the more specific applied level. Specifically, the research undertaken here is to determine:

1. if probationers are attracted to the officer-client relationship;
2. the degree of attraction;
3. if officers vary in their ability to establish a relationship to which probationers are attracted, and
4. how various social-psychological attitudes of probationers are associated with attraction to the officer-client relationship.

Translating these goals into research questions:

1. are probationers attracted to the officer-client relationship?
2. if so, what is the degree of attraction?
3. do the probation officers vary in the ability to elicit a strong attraction to the officer-client relationship?
4. what are various social-psychological attitudes of proba-
tioners which are associated with attraction to the
officer-client relationship?
The first three research questions are of an exploratory nature and at­
tempt to verify the assumption that the relationship of a probationer
and a probation officer constitutes a primary group relationship.
Question four deals with the question of whether the "primary group"
is associated with socialization.

The organization of this chapter is as follows: Beginning at the
most general level, the general hypotheses that primary groupness is
associated with socialization will be presented. Attention will first
be given to conclusions of early theorists. The two concepts of concern,
primary group and socialization, will be defined nominally. The chapter
will then move to a sub-general hypothesis of a more specific nature.
The path of explication from the more general hypothesis will be pre­
sented and explicated. The concepts will then be defined. The chapter
will then move to the specific hypothesis which will be stated and
elaborated. Again the path of explication will be presented, relevant
concepts being defined nominally and operationally. Lastly, the three
exploratory hypotheses regarding the probation officer-client relation­
ship will be discussed. Diagrams will be liberally used to assist the
reader to comprehend the interrelationship of hypotheses.

General Hypothesis

The general hypothesis is: **primary groupness is related to socialization.** Ideally, it should be stated that socialization is the result
of primary groupness. The relationship of socialization to primary group
is accepted in sociology now almost as a law, there being many empirical findings to support it (Berelson and Steiner, 1964). The research design of this paper, however, prohibits specifying the exact relationship. However, it is believed that the research design used here will prepare for a more precise statement in future research. The crucial element lacking in this design is a longitudinal dimension, i.e., "the classical design." Therefore, it is necessary to use relational hypotheses without specifying the independent or dependent variables because of the design limitation of this research. However, because of extensive work in theory and research findings, direction is implied, i.e., it is implied that socialization is the result of primary groupness.

Probably the most classic statement of the relationship of primary groups and socialization was presented by Cooley in 1909. Although he did not use the term socialization, it is quite evident that he was referring to behavior that is now identified with the term socialization. He states, "By primary groups, I mean those characterized by intimate, face-to-face association and cooperation. They are primary in several senses, but chiefly in that they are fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual. The result of intimate association, psychologically, is a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, . . ." In reference to the resulting socialization process, he continues, "so that one's self, for many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group." In essence he is saying that those groups characterized by face-to-face association and cooperation are necessary for the social nature and ideals of the individual (socialization of the individual) (Cooley, 1909, pp. 23-28).
Berelson and Steiner in their inventory of scientific findings present three relevant "laws" that are similar to Cooley's statement but which are based on scientific findings. Their first "law" is:

"The less the affection, satisfaction of dependence, or want the infant and child receives (in other words, the more the reserve, neglect, or rejection), 1) the less developed is his subsequent personality likely to be and the less likely he matures (in childhood)—i.e., the more he is apathetic, unresponsive, 'vegetative,' and incapable of independent action; and 2) the less strength of character and sense of self, he is likely to have, leading even to the development of a psychopathic personality that feels no responsibility to others" (Berelson and Steiner, 1964, p. 75).

In short, Berelson and Steiner are saying the less the primary groupness of the family, the less the child will develop a humanized or socialized personality.

Another relevant law, but which is more specific, is "The more eager an individual is to become a member of a small group, the more he will conform to its norms or behavior" (Berelson and Steiner, 1964, p. 330). In other words, the more the group fulfills a given individual's psychic needs, the more he will want to belong and the more he will be socialized by it.

Still another "law" is relevant. "People in a group tend to agree with the opinions of people they like (i.e., they judge the opinion by judging the advocate); and they tend to think that the people they like agree with them and that those they dislike do not" (Berelson and Steiner, 1964, p. 336). That is, a person learns attitudes from people he likes, and the people he likes are those with whom he maintains a primary group relationship.
P. A. Sorokin, in his extensive research in love and altruism concluded, "regardless of the uncertainty and contrariety of the curative results of various psychiatric methods, on one vital point the psychiatrists seem to be in essential agreement, namely, that the main curative agent in all the diverse psychiatric techniques is the 'acceptance' of the patient by the therapist, the rapport of empathy, sympathy, kindness, and love established between the therapist and the patient" (Sorokin, 1967, p. 63).

It is believed that many psychotherapists would agree with Sorokin's statement, especially Freud and the Neo-freudians, such as Fromm, Sullivan, and Horney. (Freud, 1938), (Fromm, 1956), (Horney, 1939) and (Sullivan, 1953). Another group has also written of the importance of primary group relations for curing mental illness or socializing the patient. These include Rogers, Maslow, Rank, Moustakas and Moreno. (Rogers, 1962), (Maslow, 1962), (Rank, 1945), (Moustakas, 1959) (Moreno, 1960).

Beginning with Cooley, the relationship of the primary group and socialization has been presented as a hypothesis, stating that socialization is the result of primary group affiliation. Research findings have supported this hypothesis through the years as currently summarized by Berelson and Steiner. The hypothesis is also accepted as "law" by those who have confirmed it on the basis of their practice is psychotherapy. So from two different cognitive and empirical frameworks (the scientific and the therapeutic) comes the acceptance of the hypotheses as "law."
Primary group defined

The concepts primary group and socialization have been relatively undefined to this point. It is now important to define them explicitly on a nominal basis. As will be recalled, Cooley saw primary groups as characterized by intimate, face-to-face association and cooperation. Such a group resulted in intimate association, psychologically, and a certain fusion of individualities in a common whole (Cooley, 1909, pp. 23-24).

Shils, after an extensive review of concept utilization, derived this definition: "By primary group we mean a group characterized by a high degree of solidarity, informality in the code of rules which regulate the behavior of its members, and autonomy in the creation of these rules. The solidarity involves a close identification of the members with one another and with any symbols of the group which might have grown up. Small size and physical proximity (face-to-face relations) have at times been regarded as elements in the definition of the primary group. We regard it, however, as more appropriate to treat them as conditions affecting the formation of primary groups" (Shils, 1951, p. 44).

Gould and Kolb in A Dictionary of the Social Sciences rely heavily on the characteristics that were specified by Cooley, "1) face-to-face association; 2) the unspecialized character of the association; 3) relative permanence; 4) the small number of persons involved; 5) the relative intimacy among the participants." The quotation is borrowed from Introductory Sociology coauthored by Cooley, Robert C. Angell, and Lowell Carr in 1933 (Gould and Kolb, 1964, p. 534).
Two of the leading introductory social-psychology textbooks define it as follows: 1) Newcomb uses the same Cooley quotation as was used in the first part of this chapter (Newcomb, 1950, p. 135); 2) Krech and Crutchfield define it: "Primary group. Two or more persons in intimate, face-to-face association. The most important primary groups are the family, friendship, and work groups. They are primary in the sense of their enduring influence upon the individual" (Krech, Crutchfield, Ballachey, 1962, p. 214).


In summary, it appears that Cooley's statement made in 1909 is relied upon by contemporary writers as the best single statement of the characteristics of a primary group. In our opinion Shils' definition adds nothing to Cooley's. The only improvement would perhaps be Cooley's own efforts with the coauthorship of Angell and Carr as reported by Gould and Kolb in *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. This improvement is a systematic and explicit statement of the characteristics of a primary group. They are repeated here:

1. face-to-face association;
2. the unspecialized character of that association;
3. relative permanence;
4. the small number of persons involved;
5. the relative intimacy among the participants (Gould and Kolb, 1964, pp. 672-673).

Analyzing these characteristics, it is believed that face-to-face association, relative permanence, and the small number of persons involved are conditions necessary for the development of primary groups. This is consistent with Shils' statement (Shils, 1951, p. 44). If these are extracted, there remains only the characteristics of un-specialized character of that association and the relative intimacy among the participants.

Based on the above, this writer would take license to establish the following explicit definition of a primary group. First, it is believed necessary to think in terms of primary groups as being a continuous variable ranging from "very primary" to "not primary at all," (rather than the classic dichotomy of either primary group or secondary group). The conditions of primary groupness are small number, face-to-face relations, and relative permanence over time; another necessary condition involves a desire on the part of the individual members to join or form a primary group (though writers seldomly state this explicitly). The results of such a group are a sense of identity of the group and an awareness of non-group. The members ideally, individually experience 1) having their needs of security and emotional response fulfilled; 2) having a sense of identity, or "we-ness"; 3) valuing the relationship as an end for overcoming a presumed sense of alienation.

Socialization defined

As the reader recalls, Cooley initially discussed the subject of socialization without actually using the term. To him the primary group
was primary because it was fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual (Cooley, 1909, pp. 23-24). Probably the most complete and up-to-date statement of socialization was compiled by the Committee on Socialization and Social Structure appointed by the Social Science Research Council and published in 1968 under the title of *Socialization and Society* (edited by John Clausen). In chapter one, they quote three men: First, Elkin, "A process by which someone learns the ways of a given society or social group well enough so that he can function within it" (Clausen, 1968, p. 3). Second, Child, "The whole process by which an individual born with behavioral potentialities of an enormously wide range, is led to develop actual behavior which is confined within a much narrow range—the range of what is customary and acceptable for him according to the standards of his group" (Clausen, 1968, p. 4), and lastly, they quote Aberle, "Socialization consists of those patterns of action or aspects of action which inculcate an individual's skills (including knowledge), motives, and attitudes necessary for the performance of present or anticipated roles" (Clausen, 1968, p. 4).

Gould and Kolb in *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences* really add very little. They state, "Socialization in social-psychology denotes the process by which an individual learns to adjust to the group by acquiring social behavior of which the group approves" (Gould and Kolb, 1964, pp. 672-673).

Newcomb, in his introductory social-psychology text devotes an entire chapter to the process of socialization, and entitled it, "Acquiring Motives and Attitudes." He uses the concept in an extremely
general way and leaves it relatively undefined. In regards to socialization he states, "The process is essentially one of learning—that is, the biological organism modifies itself by responding" (Newcomb, 1950, p. 51). For Krech and Crutchfield, it is such a general concept that they do not even give any definition (Krech, Crutchfield, Ballachey, 1962).

The above has been stated to demonstrate to the reader that a great deal of concern and time has gone into the study of the socialization process. However, the phenomenon is of such a general nature that even most authoritative treatments on the subject do not precisely define the term. This writer agrees with the general nature of the behavior, but the hypothesis of interest in this thesis requires greater precision, Loomis defined it, "Socialization is the process through which the social and cultural heritage is transmitted. Through socialization each new born baby learns the skills, beliefs, ends, and norms of the society in which he is born; he internalizes the interaction and expectancy patterns which make status roles and the elements of power and rank operative in society" (Loomis, 1960, p. 34). Loomis does not define either social or cultural heritage. Here they will be treated as synonymous concepts. Social heritage is defined as the knowledge, beliefs, customs, and skills of a social group or social system.

In short to define socialization explicitly for the purpose of this paper: Socialization is the process by which the social heritage, that is, the knowledge, beliefs, customs, attitudes, and skills are transmitted by old members and received and internalized by new members of a given social system.
Summarizing the expanded concept definitions and joining them together to form a hypothesis, the formal hypothesis is: Given a small number of individuals, face-to-face relations, and relative permanence over time, plus a desire on the part of the individual members to join or form a primary group, a primary group will evolve resulting in a sense of identity of the group and an awareness of non-group. Individually, the members will experience their needs of security and emotional response fulfilled; a sense of identity, or "we-ness"; and will value the relationship as an end in itself. The primary group is the medium through which socialization occurs or the process by which the social heritage, that is, the knowledge, beliefs, customs, and skills are transmitted by old members and received and internalized by new members of a given social system.

A schematic diagram is presented herewith:

Primary group membership results in socialization

or, for this research design

Primary group is related to socialization

or diagrammed, we suggest

Primary \( \leftrightarrow \) Socialization

Sub-general Hypothesis

More specific, yet harmonious with the above-stated general hypothesis is the sub-general hypothesis of this paper. Attraction to the group is related to attitudes regarding the self and the individual's social environment such as attitudes toward others, attitudes toward values, and attitudes toward norms.
The process of explication will be presented as follows: First, the general concept of primary group will be translated into the more specific concept of attraction to the group. Next, the general concept of socialization will be redefined as the concept of attitudes regarding self and attitudes regarding social environment such as attitudes toward others, attitudes toward values, and attitudes toward norms.

A number of researchers have attempted to measure components of primary groups. Of chief concern have been attempts to measure primary groupness as Cooley defined it, a "Certain fusion of individualities in a common whole, so that one's self, for many purposes at least, is the common life and purpose of the group. Perhaps the simplest way of describing this wholeness is by saying that it is a we" (Cooley, 1909, pp. 23-24). The term of cohesion has been used for this phenomenon. Much effort has gone into attempting to define this concept nominally and operationally. (Schachter, 1952), (Albert, 1953), (Seashore, 1954), (Gross and Martin, 1952), (Keedy, 1956), (Campbell and Tyler, 1957), (Schachter, et al., 1951) or (Libo, 1953). Popularly, cohesion and cohesiveness usually refer to a we feeling, group loyalty, harmony, and coordination. For research purposes it has been more narrowly defined to refer to the valence of the group, that is, the attraction of a member to the totality of remaining members. If looked at on an individual basis, cohesion is the attraction of the group members toward the group as an object. This relationship of attraction toward the group and cohesion is well presented by Festinger, Schachter and Back, 1950). It would seem then that to measure empirically the cohesiveness of the group, one should measure the attraction toward the group as an object of each of the
members.

The reader will recall that in the definition of primary group as stated above, the element of desire to be a member of the group was fundamental to the existence of a primary group. No matter what the other conditions might be in fostering a primary group, desire is the prime requisite for the existence of a primary group (Festinger, Schachter and Back, 1950). The desire to belong to the group is deemed synonymous with attraction to the group. It is assumed that these two phrases are synonymous and vary along a continuum. It is assumed that if we can measure the individual members' attraction toward the group as an object, we can assess their desire to belong to the group and by so doing measure the quality of primary groupness. Once this is accomplished it will then be possible to talk about various groups in regard to their cohesiveness and/or primary groupness. Finally, it would be possible to state the degree to which members of the various groups obtain the psychological results of primary group membership, i.e., a sense of belonging, security, etc.

It is now necessary to move from the general concept of socialization to the sub-general concept of attitudes regarding self and social environment, i.e., attitude toward others, attitude toward values, and attitudes toward norms. The reader will recall that socialization is the process by which the social heritage is transmitted by old members and received and internalized by new members of a social system. It was noted that social heritage refers to the knowledge, beliefs, customs, attitudes, and skills of a social system. The particular concern of this paper is with the transmission of attitudes by old members to new members.
Therefore, the concern here is with only one area of socialization, that being the socialization of attitudes.

Newcomb, writing in *A Dictionary of the Social Sciences* refers to Thomas and Znaniecki, Murphy, Allport, and Krech and Crutchfield, then states his definition of attitudes: "An attitude is the individual's organization of psychological processes, as inferred from his behavior, with respect to some aspect of the world which he distinguishes from other aspects" (Gould and Kolb, 1964, p. 40). In his introductory text in social psychology, Newcomb defines it first as "The attitude is the state of readiness for motive arousal." However, he is not satisfied with this and later offers a more specific definition. "An individual's attitude towards something is his predisposition to perform, perceive, think and feel in relation to it (Newcomb, 1950, pp. 118-119). As a result of this review of attitude conceptualization, we propose the following definition: An attitude is an orientation or readiness to act or react to some aspect in the given individual's world.

To summarize the definitions and combine in the form of a hypothesis: The attraction of a member to the group results in a given orientation or readiness to act or react to some aspect in the given individual's world, which is transmitted by old members and internalized by the given new member. Stated formally: Attraction to the group results in attitudes of the old members being transmitted and internalized by the given new member. For this research design: Attraction to the group is associated with attitudes of old members.
Diagram of general and sub-general hypotheses

General Hypothesis

Primary Group $\xleftarrow{\text{Socialization}}$ Sub-general Hypothesis

Sub-general Hypothesis $\xrightarrow{\text{Attraction to}}$ Specific Hypothesis

Attraction to the Group $\xrightarrow{\text{Attitudes}}$

Specific Hypothesis

Going from the sub-general hypothesis, the specific hypothesis

Going from the sub-general hypothesis, the specific hypothesis of this paper is: The attraction to the probation officer-client relationship is related to attitudes of probationers regarding the self and individual's social environment, i.e., attitudes towards others, attitudes toward values, and attitudes toward norms. The process of explication will be accomplished as above. The left-side of the hypothesis will be developed from sub-general to specific and then the right-side of the hypothesis will be explicated from sub-general to specific.

As stated above, the attraction to the group is the prime requisite for the existence of a primary group. The problem of this paper is concerned with a particular group and a particular setting, i.e., the primary group of the probation officer and client. A dyad is a particular type of group and is quite capable of being a primary group as in the case of a husband and wife relationship. It also has the above stated preconditions for a primary group: is small in number, it involves face-to-face interaction and is relatively permanent. Then, if there is sufficient desire on the part of the members for the relationship to become a primary group, this will occur. By determining the
attraction of the two participants to the group, it will be possible to determine the degree of cohesion and, by this means, the degree of primary groupness in the probation officer-client relationship. It is probably safe to assume that probation officers desire the officer-client relationship to be of a primary group nature. This desire is implicit in the role of the probation officer and is well communicated in the professional literature and in-service training. However, the desire of the client for the relationship to be of a primary group nature is not so clear and, therefore, needs to be tested. The attraction of the client toward the probation officer-client relationship will be tested to determine the degree of the attraction the clients possess toward the probation officer-client relationship.

The explication from the sub-general concept of socialization of attitudes in general to the socialization of attitudes regarding the self and social environment is now presented. The concern in this paper is primarily toward attitudes that foster law-abiding and psychologically-healthy behavior. The fact that the client has violated a law is the reason he is placed on probation. The client has demonstrated that in some area he has behaved in such a way that is harmful to himself or others. Because of this he has been adjudicated a delinquent juvenile and ordered to enter into a relationship with a probation officer by being placed on probation. Before an individual juvenile can be adjudicated a delinquent juvenile, it is necessary to have proved that he has violated the juvenile code. The code can be dichotomized into behavior that harms others and behavior that harms self. For example, the Wisconsin Children's Code defines one who can be adjudicated de-
linquent as 1) he has violated any state law, or any county, town, or municipal ordinance; or 2) he is habitually truant from school or home; or 3) he is uncontrolled by his parents, guardian, or legal custodian by reason of being wayward or habitually disobedient; or 4) he habitually so deports himself as to injure or danger the morals of, or health of, himself or others (Wisconsin Statutes, 1963, p. 888).

The concept of self has been a concern of social psychologists for some time. The development of the self or self concept has been of interest to many who are concerned with the broad area of socialization. It was of prime concern to Cooley (Cooley, 1909) and to George Herbert Mead (Mead, 1934). Mead has done the most extensive work with the concept, focusing extensively on the ability of the self to be both object and subject and on the process of intra-individual communication. Much concern and attention has been given to the area of development of the self concept and intra-individual communication through the school of symbolic interaction (Martindale, 1960).

Newcomb defines self by quoting William James in his *Principles of Psychology*, "'In its widest possible sense a man's self is the sum total of all that he can call his, not only his body and his psychic powers, but his clothes and his house, his wife and children, ancestors and friends, his reputation and works, his lands and horses, and his yacht and his bank account'" (Newcomb, 1950, p. 316). For the purpose of this paper, it is necessary to select one specific dimension of the self as encompassed in the above definition. In this paper, the self is defined thus: **The self is an object of evaluation for a given person by the given person.**
The individual's social environment includes all other human beings that have meaning to the individual and the products of their interaction. This use of meaningfulness does not imply a positive orientation. Meaningfulness here refers to a perceived relationship of the individual and other human beings and the products of their interaction.

In this paper there is also a concern for values of human beings which are products of interaction. A review of the literature demonstrates that there is a great deal of discrepancy and variance in the definition of the term value (Gould and Kolb, 1964). It varies from the general to specific but more importantly it varies from situation to situation. It is not necessary for our purposes to examine the term in detail. Value is defined in this paper as follows: Values are the hierarchal arrangement of an individual's or a group's goals. Goals are the ends of behavior pursued to fulfill an individual's needs. When these goals are arranged in a hierarchy of importance to the individual or the group, the goals become values.

The concept norm seems to receive a greater consensus among theorists. It is used in three significant ways: 1) Statistical standard of comparison; 2) The average or modal, i.e., most typical behavior, or attitude, etc. 3) "A standard shared by the numbers of a social group to which the members are expected to conform, and conformance which is enforced by positive and negative sanctions." This definition is provided by Kolb (Gould and Kolb, 1964, p. 473). It probably is not necessary to state explicitly the notion of positive and negative sanctions. These can be implied in the first part of the definition. Therefore, for this paper the following definition is offered: A norm is the behavior that
is prescribed by members of a social group to which the members are expected to conform.

To summarize, these concepts are arranged in the form of a hypothesis. The attraction of the clients to the officer-client relationship results in attitudes of evaluation of the client by the client, attitudes toward others, attitudes regarding the hierarchal arrangement of goals, and attitudes regarding prescribed behavior held by the probation officer.

or

The attraction of the officer-client relationship results in attitudes regarding self, others, values, and norms held by the probation officer.

For this research design

The attraction of the officer-client relationship is associated with attitudes regarding self, others, values, and norms held by the probation officer.

Diagram of Hypotheses

General Hypothesis

Primary Group ← Socialization
Sub-general Hypothesis
Attraction to
the Group

Attitudes

Specific Hypothesis
Attraction to
the Probation Officer-Client Relationship

Attitudes regarding self and social environment including attitudes toward others, values and norms
Exploratory Hypotheses

The exploratory hypotheses of this paper are along a different dimension than we have taken in the above explication. It seems logical to present these exploratory hypotheses before continuing in the explication of the relational hypotheses. The reason for the exploratory hypotheses is that there has been an implicit and accepted assumption in probation administration that a primary group relationship results when a client and probation officer are forced together by the order of the court. An extensive review of the literature on the subject resulted in no empirical data to support this assumption. Therefore, it is necessary to test the assumption. The primary reason is that there are many factors involved in probation administration that lead one to believe that a primary relationship does not always occur when the probation officer and client are placed together.

The exploratory hypotheses are: 1

1) there is an attraction for the probation officer-client relationship on the part of the client. This hypothesis states that there is a sufficient attraction toward the relationship on the part of the client to merit its being called a primary group relationship;

2) clients have a high degree of attraction for the relationship. This means that the attraction to the relationship on the part of the client is sufficiently high to impute a strong "primary groupness" to the relationship.

3) there is no significant difference between the officer-client relationship attraction scores received by the five officers.
This refers to the fact that the strong primary group-ness of the relationship is the result of the structure and philosophy of placing a probation officer and client together and not as a result of varying personal characteristics of the officers.

Hypothesis 1 will be tested by adding the scores of each respondent and dividing by the total. (These scores are obtained from the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale which will be discussed in detail later.) It was arbitrarily decided that if the numerical value of the mean score is ninety or less, there is little attraction to the officer-client relationship. In fact, if the mean score is less than sixty, it will be assumed that the clients are repulsed by the relationship. On the other hand, if the numerical value is 90 to 150, it will be concluded that the clients are attracted to the officer-client relationship.

In testing hypothesis two, if the numerical value is between 120 and 150, it will be concluded that there is a high degree of attraction for the relationship.

Hypothesis three will be tested by the application of an analysis of variance and a two tail "F" test to determine if there is a significant difference in the attraction scores between the clients of the five different probation officers.

Summary

The following diagram summarizes the hypotheses to this point.
General Hypothesis

Primary Group $\leftarrow$ Socialization $\rightarrow$

Sub-general Hypothesis

Attraction to the Group $\leftrightarrow$ Attitudes

Specific Hypothesis

Attraction to the Probation $\leftrightarrow$ Attitudes regarding self and social environment

Officer-Client Relationship $\leftrightarrow$ including attitudes toward others, values, and norms

Exploratory hypotheses

OCRA Scores

1. Greater than 90
2. Greater than 120
3. No variance between officers
CHAPTER 4. MEASUREMENT OF CONCEPTS

Introduction

The same organizational framework used above in explication from level to level of hypotheses will be utilized here. Moving from the concept of attraction to probation officer-client relation to the empirical index of measurement will be discussed first. An extensive review of the literature determined that no scale to measure this phenomena had ever been developed. Further, extensive review demonstrated that there was not in existence a scale that could be satisfactorily converted to the measurement of officer-client relationship attraction phenomenon (Buros, 1961), (Bonjean, Hill, and McLemore, 1967). A resume of the development of the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale will now be presented.

Measurement of Attraction to the Officer-Client Relationship

An extensive search of the literature was undertaken in an attempt to gain a suitable scale to measure the variable which we have termed "attraction to the probation officer-client relationship." The concepts of sociometry, cohesion, solidarity, morale, and syntality were selected as guides for the search. The first phase of the search was to review Sociological Abstracts and Psychological Abstracts. The search in these two sets of abstracts was confined to the ten-year period 1958 to 1968. It was felt that the greatest work in relevant instrument design would have been undertaken in the past ten years. In addition, it was felt that relevant work before 1958 would be liberally cited in articles published in the past ten years.
As a result of the search in Sociological Abstracts and Psychologica l Abstracts, a number of citations were obtained on sociometry. After an perusal of the indicated literature, the concept was discarded as fruitless to the aims of this research. Sociometry, it was found, deals extensively with the qualitative nature of group formation. However, it does not lend itself to the quantitative measurement of degree of cohesion, solidarity, morale, or group attraction. A review of the citations dealing with these concepts, (cohesion, solidarity, morale, and syntality) did not produce a scale that could be adapted to the needs of this research. Thus, all the scales that were obtained from our search of the literature were rejected either because they did not measure the dimension of "attraction," were far too specific, or were not adaptable to a dyadic relationship.

A further review was made of the two standard catalogs of tests, scales, and indices: Tests in Print and Sociological Measurement: An Inventory of Scales and Indices. This search netted one scale, The Study of Group Morale by Bernard Goldman. We requested a copy of the scale from the author. Upon receiving the scale, we found it to be based on these four criteria:

1. A group will tend to be cohesive when there are opportunities present for satisfying individual motives related to group activities.

2. A group will tend to be cohesive when opportunities are present to satisfy the need for interpersonal actions.

3. The more attitudes held by members of the group are alike, the more cohesive the group will be.
4. Cohesiveness exists in a group where the leaders are respected for the particular qualities valued by its members and where the dependence of the group upon a leader is welcomed rather than resented (Goldman, 1957).

The author then developed a scale of twenty items, using Edward's modifications of procedures from Thurstone and Likert (Goldman, 1957). He started with 300 items. After employing selection techniques, twenty items remained in the scale, four items relating to individual motives, five relating to homogeneity of attitude, seven relating to interpersonal relations, and four relating to leadership. An examination of the individual items determined that some were completely inappropriate to our task and the remaining items would have had to be reworked extensively for use in a dyad relationship. Of those that could be reworked for a dyadic setting, a rewording would be required for the specific situation of the probation officer-client relationship. Although it was not possible to use the scale as published, it did provide an excellent model for a suitable scale and some relevant material for item construction.

Even though an extensive search provided only one scale that was remotely applicable, it did result in a multitude of data regarding the phenomena of concern here. The search for instruments to measure the phenomenon resulted in the knowledge to evaluate the central concepts of sociometry, cohesion, solidarity, morale, and syntality. This knowledge became invaluable in attempting to understand the phenomenon of interest.

It perhaps is of value to summarize the conclusions regarding these concepts. Although cohesion, solidarity, and morale have at times been
used by theorists and researchers synonymously, the relevant disciplines have matured to the level that differentiation is now desirable. The term morale connotes a feeling of positive affect by group members because of group membership (Albert, 1953). Cohesion connotes a positive attraction of group members to each other (Albert, 1953). Solidarity is used to describe a group in which the members have strong attraction for each other. Syntality is explicitly defined by Raymond Cattell as the personality of the group (Cattell, 1948). It appears that cohesion came closest to the subject of this research. However, it was felt that cohesion implied reciprocating positive attraction while we are concerned with one member of the dyad. Therefore, attraction was substituted for cohesion. Because the probation officer and client meet under somewhat restricted circumstances, it was deemed appropriate to substitute relationship for the more general concept group.

Therefore, with a sufficiently precise term defining the phenomenon nominally, the task remained to define it operationally with a measurement instrument. As stated above, Goldman's scale entitled *A Study of Group Morale* was an excellent model. It was determined that his definition of morale and the concept "attraction to relationship" were very similar on a nominal basis, suggesting that a similar scale would operationally define the concept "attraction to probation officer-client relationship." Dr. Goldman states, "Studies attempting to define morale have led to the rather widely accepted conclusion that group cohesion has to do in a large measure with the attraction a group holds for its individual members. The more attracted individuals are towards a group, the more cohesive that group will be" (Goldman, 1957).
Another definition of cohesion, formulated by Newcomb, has as its central core the concept of the attractiveness of the group for the individual members. Goldman chose this formulation of the concept of group cohesiveness—"a formulation which is operational and lends itself readily to the construction of scale items"—as a working hypothesis for which to construct a scale. Newcomb suggests five criteria of group cohesiveness. They are, "1) satisfying individual motives, 2) satisfactory interpersonal relations, 3) shared task involvement, 4) social reinforcement and effectiveness, and 5) satisfaction with leadership" (Goldman, 1957). The first four criteria of Newcomb's were seen to be dimensions of the probation officer-client relationship that were of relevance to the present project. From an analysis of the phenomenon of the probation officer-client relationship, the resulting interest was to measure, 1) the degree of security provided by the relationship, and 2) the degree of value perceived by the client in the relationship. The sense of security provided by the relationship seems close to Newcomb's criteria 2 and 3 (satisfaction of interpersonal relations and shared task involvement). The sense of service provided by the relationship is similar to Newcomb's criteria 1 (satisfying individual motives). Newcomb's criteria (social reinforcement and group effectiveness) is related to the combination of the two dimensions of the probation officer-client relationship, the degree of security provided and the value perceived.

Therefore, in the construction of a scale to measure the attraction of the probation officer-client relationship, Bernard Goldman's scale entitled *A Study of Group Morale* was used as a model. As many items as
possible from his scale were selected and adapted for this research (15 of his 20). However, as stated before, of those items that were selected, some had to be reworded for the specific situation of the officer-client relationship and/or because of the dyadic nature of the relationship. Below are listed, first, Goldman's items and second, the revisions made for this research.

Most of my associates would help me here if I needed it. My probation officer would help me if I needed help.

The leader of this group is out for his own advancement; he doesn't care about me. My probation officer is out for his own good; he didn't care about me.

The leader of this group can always be relied upon to do the right thing. My probation officer could always be relied upon to do the right thing.

I just tolerate the people I associate with. I just would say what my probation officer wanted me to say.

All my associates in this group are a dull lot and don't think seriously about important issues. My probation officer was square and didn't think about important things.

I would never make friends with any of my associates here. I would never want my probation officer as a friend.

The leader of this group is out to help me as much as he can. My probation officer was out to help me as much as he could.

I seldom pay attention to what other people say; I believe in making my own decisions. I seldom paid attention to what my probation officer said; I believe in making my own decisions.

I feel that I have made some lasting friends among my associates in this group. I feel that I have made a lasting friend in my probation officer.

I feel that I can ask advice of my associates in this group. I feel that I could have asked my probation officer for advice.
Most of my associates in this group are stubborn, no amount of argument will change them. My probation officer was stubborn, no amount of argument would change him.

The leader of this group got ahead because of his connections, not because of his ability. My probation officer got his job because he has connections, not because of his ability.

Sometimes I like what I am doing here, but most of the time I hate it. Sometimes I like coming here, but most of the time I hated it.

Most of my associates would risk their own security if it were necessary for the good of all. My probation officer would risk his own neck if it were necessary to save mine.

I believe that most of my associates would stab me in the back if it meant they could get ahead that way. I believe that my probation officer would stab me in the back if it meant he could get ahead that way.

The 15 additional items of the OCRA Scale were developed by the following process on the following basis. As discussed above, the writer has had a long-time interest in the probation officer-client relationship. Over the years he has had a deep concern for various dimensions of the officer-client relationship. He has discussed this concern continuously with colleagues. When it became necessary to develop the scale for this research, he attempted to list explicitly all the attitudes that were indicative of attraction to the officer-client relationship. These attitudes were discussed with two colleagues in probation work. One colleague is an ex-probation officer and a graduate student in sociology and the other colleague is the supervisor of the five officers involved in this project. He holds a masters degree in sociology specializing in criminology and has been a juvenile probation officer and a probation supervisor for ten years. Additional items were solicited as well as
revisions and deletions made of some that had been developed. Items too similar to Goldman's items were eliminated. Finally, he submitted the items again to the two colleagues. The final result was a list of 15 items. These 15 items derived as explained above, plus the 15 items revised from Goldman's scale, provided the 30-item Likert type scale that is used in this study (Appendix A).

In regard to validity of the instrument: Goldman attempted to assess concurrent validity as defined by Kerlinger, "... concurrent validity is characterized by prediction to an outside criterion and by checking a measuring instrument ... against some outcome" (Kerlinger, 1965, p. 447). Dr. Goldman administered his scale to the following: 1) five groups of "Great Book" club members of varying lengths of association, 2) three University of Buffalo campus groups, 3) three University of Buffalo classroom groups, and 4) five labor union groups. He found a significant difference in the scores obtained by the members of the various groups in the predicted direction. One perhaps can legitimately question whether this validity is generalizable to the subjects of this project because of the revision of the items. It would certainly be desirable to test the validity of this instrument by using a group of clients who are known to be repulsed by the relationship. However, it is believed one can make a case for using Dr. Goldman's validity test to suggest a greater validity for the instrument than one could obtain by the use of the rational criteria alone.

For the validity of the additional 15 items one must rely heavily on content validity, to use Kerlinger's definition. He defines it as, "Content validity is the representativeness or sampling adequacy of the
content—the substance, the matter, the topics—of a measuring instru-
ment . . . Content validation consists essentially in judgment" (Kerlin-
ger, 1965, pp. 445-446). While it would be preferable to use concurrent 
validity, reliance must be on content validity in the light of time and 
cost considerations. It should be remembered that the writer had an in-
timate interest in the subject matter as a probation officer, probation 
supervisor, and currently as a criminologist. During this period he 
sought and gained the advice of very able colleagues for their judgment. 
In addition, as Kerlinger points out, "Some universes of content are more 
obvious and are easier to judge than others. . . " (Kerlinger, 1965, 
p. 446). In addition, there is one other positive rationale for a degree 
of confidence in the content validity of this measure. The attitude state-
ments that the subjects are required to respond to are very explicit, 
specific, and relevant to the subject in his role as a probation client. 
It would, of course, be highly desirable at some future time to establish 
construct validity by administering the scale in various settings with 
various experimental and control groups.

An attempt was made to determine the internal consistency of the 
scale by correlating each item to the total using a minimum item-total 
correlation coefficient as a criteria of performance. That criteria is 
defined as $r_{it} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$, where $n$ is the number of items in the scale. 
With $n = 30$, $r_{it} = .18$. The computed item-total correlations all ex-
cceeded the $r_{it} = .18$, with the exception of items 11 and 14 which cor-
related at .06 and .18, respectively, (Warren, Klonglan, and Sabri, 1969). 
These are stated as:

11. I was not able to see my probation officer as much as I wanted.

Parenthetically, the dimensions represented by these two items might be very interesting to explore. They are especially interesting in the light of their relative independence from the main dimension of this scale. Item 11 suggests that many clients wanted more contact with their officer even though they were not attracted to the relationship, and vice versa.

At any rate, 28 item-total correlations exceeded the criterion of .18 or above and one of the two items (item fourteen) was very close which suggests additivity, linearity, and reliability of the scale sufficient for this research project. (See Table 1, Appendix B.)

The coefficient of reliability ($r_{tt}$) was also used to assess internal consistency. It was used as a substitute for "split-half" correlation and believed by some to be a more satisfactory measure. It is defined as $r_{tt} = \frac{n(F)}{1 + (n-1)(F)}$ with $n =$ the number of items and $F$ the average intercorrelation among the items. (See Table 2, Appendix B.) Using this internal consistency method, a value of .94 was computed which indicates a fairly reliable measure.

An attempt was made to determine the comprehension difficulty of the questionnaire. The Fog Index was employed to provide an appraisal of readability (Gunnings, date unknown). By substituting the phrase "my probation officer" with the pronoun "he" in each of the attitudinal items, the computation of the Fog Index resulted in a readability level of six years of schooling (Gunning, date unknown). The substitution of the pronoun for the phrase was justified because the index formula uses the number of three syllable words in its equation. Due to the fact that
"my probation officer" exists in twenty-nine of the thirty items, it is believed that the subject is in reality responding to one symbol. For the purpose of computation this symbol was considered to be the personal pronoun "he." This appeared to result in a more equitable use of the Fog Index. Without the modification, the readability level is twelve years of schooling.

In an attempt to determine the clarity of the instructions, the general comprehension of the items, the existence of confusing items or words, and the time necessary for administration, a pre-test was conducted. Four clients meeting the reading level criteria were selected from the case loads of the five probation officers. The use of the questionnaire was explained to each of the clients. The client was explicitly advised of the confidential nature of the study. In addition, the respondent was advised that his help was solicited to determine if the questionnaire was clear and understandable. The questionnaire was then given to him while the writer sat off to the side inconspicuously. The client was requested to advise the researcher if he had any questions. After the client completed the questionnaire, he was asked explicitly about the instructions. All four clients answered the items in the scale without any questions. None of the four expressed any doubt about the instructions or any confusion regarding the items. By the nature of the clients' responses and by their idio-motor indicators, it was apparent that the boys were responding thoughtfully. It took the four boys an average of five minutes to complete the questionnaire. (Appendix A)
Measurement of Attitudes Regarding Self and Social Environment

Explication of the right-side of the hypotheses is now undertaken. The specific concepts of attitudes regarding the self and social environment, i.e., attitudes toward others, attitudes toward values, and attitudes toward norms are measured by the scales contained in the California Test of Personality (Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, 1953).

The writer had at one time been interested in utilizing Harrison Gough's California Personality Inventory. This intention was based on the excellent use of this inventory in research with delinquents by Dinitz and Reckless (Dinitz, Scaepitt, and Reckless, 1969). However, after careful examination of the inventory in relation to this project, it was determined this scale could not be used because: 1) it would require more than an hour to administer, and 2) its readability level was much higher than the average respondent in this project. A secondary concern was to use an index which could become a diagnostic instrument for probation offices to use regularly as an adjunct to their therapy role. In other words, it was desired to obtain an instrument which could be used for both research and diagnostic purposes. It was felt that the California Test of Personality could readily be used by probation officers, while Gough's California Psychology Inventory requires a greater sophistication in the use of psychological test and measurements than most probation officers possess.

The California Test of Personality is dichotomized into two sets of six sub-scales of attitudes. One set contains six sub-scales of attitudes toward the self. The authors use the term personal adjustment for attitudes toward the self. This set includes the sub-scales of self
reliance, sense of personal worth, sense of personal freedom, feeling of belonging, withdrawing tendencies, and nervous symptoms. The second set contains attitudes toward the individual's social environment, i.e., attitudes toward others, attitudes toward values, and attitudes toward norms. Attitudes toward the social environment are listed as social adjustment and include social standards, social skills, anti-social tendencies, family relations, school relations, and community relations.

Nominal definitions of each of these scales as stated by the authors are presented here.

**Personal Adjustment**

1. A. Self reliance. An individual may be said to be self reliant when his overt actions indicate that he can do things independently of others, depend upon himself in various situations, and direct his own activities. The self reliant person is also characteristically stable emotionally, and responsible in his behavior.

1. B. Sense of personal worth. An individual possesses a sense of being worthy when he feels he is well regarded by others, when he feels that others have faith in his future success, and when he believes that he has average or better than average ability. To feel worthy means to feel capable and reasonably attractive.

1. C. Sense of personal freedom. An individual enjoys a sense of freedom when he is permitted to have a reasonable share in the determination of his conduct and in setting the general policies that shall govern his life. Desirable freedom includes permission to choose one's own friends and to have at least a little spending money.

1. D. Feeling of belonging. An individual feels that he belongs when he enjoys the love of his family, the well wishes of good friends, and a cordial relationship with people in general. Such a person will, as a rule, get along with his teachers or employers and usually feels proud of his school or place of business.
1. E. Withdrawing tendencies. The individual who is said to withdraw is the one who substitutes the joys of a fantasy world for actual success in real life. Such a person is characteristically sensitive, lonely, and given to self concern. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable freedom from these tendencies. (High scorers have less withdrawing tendencies.)

1. F. Nervous symptoms. The individual who is classified as having nervous symptoms is the one who suffers from one or more of a variety of physical symptoms such as loss of appetite, frequent eye strain, inability to sleep, or a tendency to be chronically tired. People of this kind may be exhibiting physical expressions of emotional conflicts. (High scorers have less nervous symptoms.)

Social Adjustment

2. A. Social standards. The individual who recognizes desirable social standards is the one who has come to understand the rights of others and who appreciates the necessity of subordinating certain desires to the needs of the group. Such an individual understands what is regarded as being right or wrong.

2. B. Social skills. An individual may be said to be socially skillful or effective when he shows a liking for people, when he inconveniences himself to be of assistance to them, and when he is diplomatic in his dealing with both friends and strangers. The socially skillful person subordinates his or her egotistic tendencies in favor of interest in the problems and activities of his associates.

2. C. Anti-social tendencies. An individual would normally be regarded as anti-social when he is given to bullying, frequent quarreling, disobedience, and destructiveness to property. The anti-social person is the one who endeavors to get his satisfactions in ways that are damaging and unfair to others. Normal adjustment is characterized by reasonable freedom from these tendencies. (High scorers have less anti-social tendencies.)

2. D. Family relations. The individual who exhibits desirable family relationships is the one who feels that he is loved and well treated at home and who has a sense of security and self respect in connection with the various members of his family. Superior family relations also include parental control that is neither too strict or too lenient.
2. **E. School relations.** The student who is satisfactorily adjusted to his school is the one who feels that his teachers like him, who enjoys being with other students and who finds the school work adapted to his level of interest and maturity. Good school relations involve a feeling on the part of the student that he counts for something in the life of the institution.

2. **F. Community relations.** The individual who may be said to be making good adjustments in his community is the one who mingle§ happily with his neighbors, who takes pride in community improvements, and who is tolerant in dealing with both strangers and foreigners. Satisfactory community relations include as well the disposition to be respectful of laws and of regulations pertaining to the general welfare (Thorpe, Clark, and Tiegs, 1953, pp. 3-4). (Appendix A)

**Empirical Relational Hypotheses**

The empirical relational hypotheses will be tested by using correlation analysis and the one tail T test of significance. The five percent level of confidence will be accepted as the criteria of significance. The type of correlation, positive or negative, expected for each of the hypotheses and the rationale for this expectation will be presented below. However, it should be pointed out that a statistical test will be utilized to determine whether the data can be pooled for all five officers or whether each set of empirical hypotheses must be presented for each probation office. In short, a method will be utilized to determine if the probation officers' personal attributes affect the correlations (Ostle, 1963, p. 227) (Appendix 2, Tables 5-8).

The following are hypothesized relationships between OCRA scores and the sub-scales of set 1 of the CTP, Personal Adjustment.

**Hypothesis 1A.** There is a significant negative relationship between officer-client relationship attraction scores (hereafter referred to simply as OCRA scores) and self reliance scores. The client who is
positively attracted to the relationship will be a dependent individual. It is believed that if the client were self reliant he would feel that he would not need the relationship and would resent being forced into it.

Hypothesis IB. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and the sense of personal worth. That is to say, the individual who is strongly attracted to the relationship would feel worthy and would feel that his probation officer had faith in his success and, therefore, would enjoy the interaction.

Hypothesis IC. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and the sense of personal freedom scores. It is believed that the client attracted to the relationship would perceive the relationship as permitting freedom and perhaps the solicitation of valuable advice in utilizing the freedom to a better advantage.

Hypothesis ID. There is a significant positive relationship between the OCRA scores and feeling of belonging scores. It is believed that an individual who is strongly attracted to the relationship is one that has found meaningfulness in other relationships. He is a person who feels that he is able to get along with his teachers, employers, etc., and generalizes this to the officer-client relationship.

Hypothesis IE. There is a significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and withdrawing tendency scores. It is believed that the person who is strongly attracted to the relationship is one who has found other social relationships frustrating. Therefore, his frustrated needs have been fulfilled by the probation officer-client relationship, even though the relationship was forced in the beginning.

Hypothesis IF. There is a significant negative relationship between
OCRA scores and nervous symptoms scores. It is believed that the person strongly attracted to the probation officer-client relationship is one who has experienced a great deal of pain in social relations, resulting in anxiety which, in turn, has resulted in physical symptoms. He also has attempted to avoid interpersonal relationships. However, by being forced into a relationship with a probation officer, his frustrated needs have been fulfilled and he is, therefore, positively attracted to it.

The following are hypothesized relationships between OCRA scores and the sub-scales of the second set of the CTP, i.e., Social Adjustment.

Hypothesis 2A. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social standard scores. It is believed that the person strongly attracted to the officer-client relationship is an individual who recognizes the desirable social standards and the rights of others. He is the individual who makes a good impression on people and receives approving treatment from them.

Hypothesis 2B. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social skills scores. It is believed that the individual who is strongly attracted to the relationship is an individual who is socially skillful and likes people. He is willing to inconvenience himself to assist others. He is a person who likes social relations and receives the reciprocating treatment from others.

Hypothesis 2C. There is a significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and anti-social tendency scores. It is believed that the more anti-social the attitudes of the client, and therefore the lower his scores on the anti-social tendency sub-scale, the greater would be his
attraction to the officer-client relationship. It was believed that clients who had strong anti-social tendencies would attempt to establish a good relationship with their officers in an attempt to gain extra privileges and freedom from controls.

Hypothesis 2D. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and family relations scores. It is believed that the individual who is well integrated in the family and feels loved and well treated at home will generalize this feeling to similar primary group relations such as the probation officer-client relationship.

Hypothesis 2E. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and school relations scores. The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for the family relations sub-scale.

Hypothesis 2F. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and community relations scores. The rationale for this hypothesis is the same as for the family relations and school relations sub-scales.

Finally, all six sub-scales for set 1 regarding Personal Adjustment will be added together and correlated with OCRA scores as will be the six sub-scales of set 2 relating to Social Adjustment. In the form of hypotheses the expectations are as follows:

Hypothesis 3A. Personal Adjustment Hypothesis. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and personal adjustment scores, i.e., the greater the attraction, the better the personal adjustment.

Hypothesis 3B. Social Adjustment Hypothesis. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social adjustment
scores, i.e., the greater the attraction, the better the social adjustment. This implies that social adjustment is generalizable and individuals who possess it are attracted to primary group relationships.

Summary

To summarize this chapter, the following diagram is presented.
DIAGRAM FOR THE ENTIRE SET OF HYPOTHESES

General Hypothesis
Primary Group \(\leftarrow\) Socialization

Sub-general Hypothesis
Attraction to the Group \(\leftarrow\) Attitudes

Specific Hypothesis
Attraction to Probation \(\leftarrow\) Attitudes Regarding:
Officer-Client Relationship

Exploratory Hypotheses

Empirical Relational Hypotheses
OCRA Scores are Significantly Related to

OCRA Scores
1) Greater than 0
2) High
3) No Variance Between Officers

+ Personal Adjustment Scores
+ Self Reliance Scores
+ Sense of Personal Worth Scores
+ Sense of Personal Freedom Scores
+ Feeling of Belonging Scores
- Withdrawing Tendencies Scores
- Nervous Symptoms Scores

+ Social Adjustment Scores
+ Social Standards Scores
+ Social Skills Scores
- Anti-social Tendencies Scores
+ Family Relations Scores
+ School Relations Scores
+ Community Relations Scores
CHAPTER 5. DESIGN OF INQUIRY

Ideal Design

It is perhaps better to state first of all the ideal design that the writer had in mind but which, because of certain necessities, had to be modified. As stated in the previous chapter, the primary value of the ideal design would be that it would permit specification of the direction of the hypotheses concerning the relationship of primary groupness and socialization. It would be possible to state, for example, that association with a primary group results in the socialization process for the members of that group. The reader can see that this provides more exact knowledge than is possible in a design which can determine only if there is a relationship between the primary group and the socialization process. The knowledge gained through the latter design can just as readily suggest that socialization results in primary groupness. In other words, individuals who are socialized in groups similar to any given primary group will be more attracted to a given primary group.

At a more empirical or specific level, it is not possible to gain sufficient knowledge with the "cross-sectional" design of this project to state that attraction to the probation officer-client relationship results in socially approved attitudes regarding the self and the individual's social environment; it is only possible to determine if there is an association. It would be just as appropriate to state (with the actual design) that possession of socially approved attitudes regarding the self and social environment result in a greater attraction to the probation officer-client relationship.
To overcome this handicap, it would be necessary to execute a longitudinal design. This design would be as follows. At Time One, which would be the day the client was received on probation, he would be given by the probation officer or an intake officer the California Test of Personality. At Time Two, which would be the termination of probation (through early discharge, revocation of probation, or expiration of commitment) the client would again be given the California Test of Personality. At the same time he would also be given the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale under confidential conditions. The scores from the first administration of the California Test of Personality would then be subtracted from the scores obtained on the second administration. The difference, if any, would then be assessed as well as compared to the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scores.

The goals that could be obtained through such a longitudinal design should be mentioned. First, it would be possible to determine if the attitudes toward the self and/or social environment as measured by the California Test of Personality change during the period of probation. It is conceivable that the clients might have less socially approved attitudes as a result of his probation. This perhaps could be due to the individual's rebellion towards society for placing him on probation, or perhaps to the individual's attempting to live up to his role as an adjudicated delinquent juvenile. At any rate, there is some reason to believe that the client could acquire less socially approved attitudes.

The second goal which could be obtained would be to determine the relationship between change in attitudes toward self and/or social environment and the attraction to the officer-client relationship. It is
possible that clients who are frightened by or dislike their probation
officers are the most likely to change their attitudes toward more
socially approved ones. In other words, they might become more conform­
ing in attitudes as a result of fear.

The third goal that could be accomplished, though along a little
different dimension, would be to permit experimentation during the
probation period with different types of therapy. For example, one
group might receive no particular type of therapy, a second group might
undergo a program of behavior modification therapy, and a third group
might receive group therapy. The three groups could then be compared
with analysis of covariance to determine which therapy resulted in
the greatest amount of attitude change in the desired direction. In
short, the ideal or longitudinal design, assuming that the California
Test of Personality and the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale
are valid measurements of the individual's attitudes, would permit the
classic design of experimentation.

Rationale for the Design of this Inquiry

The above stated assumption provides justification for the imple­
mentation of the design even though modified from the ideal. The writer's
scarce resources compelled modification to a cross-sectional, exploratory
design. The longitudinal design, depending on the client's period of pro­
bation, could require a five-year time span, requiring a considerable
commitment from cooperating agencies as well as from the writer.

Further, it is not known if the California Test of Personality is
sufficiently sensitive for the purposes outlined above. Second, there is
not sufficient evidence available to this date to make the assumption that the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale is a valid measurement of the clients' attitudes. At the general level then, the justification for the departure from the ideal design is to test the assumption that these instruments are valid indicators of the phenomenon in question. A secondary concern is to determine if the sensitivity of the CTD instrument is adequate to permit an assessment of change over time. It is quite possible that it would be necessary to substitute another personality inventory or to construct an original inventory to accomplish the desired measurement.

It is believed that the modification of the ideal research design was amply justified because it did permit the development and evaluation of an appropriate Officer-Client Relationship Scale. Because no adequate instrument was in existence, it was necessary to construct an appropriate one. Inherent in the development of such an instrument, of course, is evaluation of that instrument.

In addition to developing the OCRA scale, it was necessary to test some previously-unproven assumptions. This included 1) the testing of whether clients actually are attracted to the officer-client relationship and, if so, to what degree, 2) to determine whether such assumed attraction to the relationship is a result of the philosophy of probation administration or whether it is due to the personal qualities of the officers.

The justifications for testing hypotheses with the modified design also include: 1) At the present time, there is no hard data to permit any assumptions regarding relationships between various attitudes toward
the self and attraction to the officer-client relationship, 2) Nor is there significant data regarding the relationships between various attitudes toward the individual's social environment and attraction to the officer-client relationship. Indeed, there is no data to suggest that any correlations exist. It is believed that the knowledge gained in this exploratory design would be invaluable in formulating hypotheses for a longitudinal design. Although the empirical relational hypotheses are presented as hypotheses to be tested, there is very little theory and insufficient data to suggest the existence and the type of correlations, 3) The last justification for the modification in design is to develop and refine the administration of the instruments and the tabulation and tentative analysis of results.

Procedure

The actual procedure in this inquiry will now be presented. As the reader is no doubt aware, conducting research in an agency whose primary goal is service to clients is difficult. Probation agencies have not been programmed, so to speak, to be research laboratories. Their primary objective is the protection of society through the rehabilitation of offenders. At a more specific level, the objective is the diagnosis of offenders and the supervision or the implementing of treatment plans for the rehabilitation of the clients. It is, therefore, quite legitimate for a probation administrator, especially one with inadequate resources, to refuse to participate in research. However, some probation administrators recognize the need (implicit though it may be with their primary objective and specific goals) for improvement of the means to accomplish their goals. Improvement of the means, of course, requires empirical
assessment of the effectiveness of present methods and experimentation in improving techniques. Exclusive concern for a given agency only results in a desire for knowledge to assist that particular agency, i.e., that which we commonly consider as knowledge provided by consulting services. If the probation administrator generalizes his concern from his agency to the profession as a whole, he will more likely be interested in using his agency as a means of providing knowledge for the improvement of the entire profession.

In reference to the current project, the administrator of a correctional field service offered his agency as a research setting. However, as a result of organizational problems at the higher levels of administration, this offer was withdrawn. These upper level administration problems placed a great deal of burden on the individual officers, making the entire staff resistant to any additional taxing of their time or energy. Because this research project had been well initiated, it was desired to implement the design in a similar agency. Fortunately, a similar agency was available and was sympathetically oriented to research even though they had not been previously approached.

Mr. Gary Ventling, Supervisor of the Boys Division, Polk County Juvenile Court, was approached. Mr. Ventling was more than willing to offer his facilities for this research project because of his own academic interest in research, of the potential contribution of knowledge to the profession, and of the value of the knowledge for staff development of his agency. Mr. Ventling elicited the support of his staff. At that time he had a staff of seven: One was an intake officer, another was phasing out his case load to become an intake officer, and
another individual was new to the agency. Thus, there were four proba-
tion officers (and the individual who was phasing out his case load) as
the officers to participate in this project.

A few personal characteristics of these officers may be of interest.
Officer 1 is 56 years old, has been with the agency eleven years, and has
a bachelor's degree in divinity. Officer 2 is thirty-three years old,
has been with the agency three years, and has a bachelor's degree in
secondary education and half the required credit hours toward a master's
degree in guidance and counseling. Officer 3 is thirty-two years old,
has been with the agency three years, and has a master's degree in
educational administration. Officer 4 is twenty-eight years old, has
been with the agency three years, and is six credits short of having a
master's degree in sociology, specializing in criminology. Officer 5
is fifty-seven years old, has been with the agency twelve years, and
has no degree (Appendix B, Table 3).

The research setting, therefore, is the juvenile court service of
Polk County, Des Moines, Iowa. It is a separate office building approxi-
mately two blocks from the court house in Des Moines. The chief proba-
tion officer serves as chief administrator and also as supervisor of
the Girls Division. Mr. Ventling is supervisor of the Boys Division,
composed of seven male probation officers and a male transportation
officer. The Boys Division is responsible for the investigation and
supervision of delinquent boys. The Girls Division is composed of six
female probation officers and is responsible for the investigation and
supervision of female delinquent cases and dependent and neglect cases
of both sexes.
The population for this research are children adjudicated delinquent and who are on probation in Polk County. The Iowa Juvenile Court specifies that a child must be between the ages of 12 and 18 to be considered a delinquent child. It defines a delinquent child as a child:

a. who has violated any state law or habitually violated local laws or ordinances except any offense which is exempted from his act by law;

b. who has violated a federal law or law of another state and whose case has been then referred to the juvenile court;

c. who is uncontrolled by his parents, guardian, or legal custodian by reason of being wayward or habitually disobedient;

d. who habitually deports himself in a manner which is injurious to himself or others (Iowa Juvenile Code, 1965, Chapter 132, Section 13).

It also defines probation as "Probation is a legal status created by court order following an adjudication of delinquency whereby a minor is permitted to remain in his home subject to supervision by the court or an agency designated by the court and subject to return to the court for the violation of probation at any time during the period of probation" (Iowa Juvenile Code, Chapter 232, Section 10).

The selection of the sample was by the following method. The criteria, as stated above, is that each subject must be an adjudicated delinquent juvenile and must have been on probation at least a period of three months. Twenty clients from each of the five probation officers were required for the statistical analysis to be of value, yet as small as possible to conserve on time and effort of the agency. The average case load of the officers was 50 clients. After eliminating those that had not been on probation more than three months and those that could not be contacted be-
cause of being outside the jurisdiction on visits, the remaining accessible case load average was from 25 to 35. The sample was selected by the administrator. He selected 20 from each officer at random, eliminating those who did not meet the criteria.

Method of Gathering Data

The specific method of collecting the data will be presented at this time. Initially, the administration of the instruments was to be provided by the supervisor of the Boys Division. However, just prior to the execution of the project an Iowa State University graduating senior was assigned to the agency as an intern student. Mr. Ventling decided that the administration of the instruments would provide the student with valuable knowledge. The knowledge gained from this activity would be consistent with the goal of his placement with that agency.

Upon coming to the office, the clients were introduced to the student, Mr. Richard Tompkins, and encouraged to cooperate. Every effort was made by the probation officer and Mr. Tompkins to convey the confidential nature of the responses and to seek the client's assistance. Mr. Tompkins used the following type of presentation.

"The officers of this agency are interested in improving their service to their clients. They feel that perhaps they cannot ask you directly as to your attitudes about probation or them, the probation officers. They realize that some clients might not want to be frank for fear of retaliation. Therefore, they have asked Mr. Deming of Iowa State University and me to help them gain this information.

"The probation officers here, also, are aware that some clients get along better with some types of probation officers and other clients with other types. Therefore, we would like to know something about your personality as well as your attitudes toward your probation officer in order to better match probation officers and clients in the future."
"Now to assure you that your responses will not be learned by your probation officer, when you have completed these two questionnaires, fold up these two dittoed answer sheets (Mr. Tompkins would hold up a OCRA questionnaire and the CTP answer sheet) and place them in the stamped envelope which is addressed to Mr. Deming at Iowa State University and place the envelope in the mail box as you leave the building."

The reader should be advised that Mr. Tompkins altered the above statement if the client indicated any uncertainty. Mr. Tompkins then read the instructions to each of the questionnaires to the client and asked if there were any questions. Then he thanked the client for his participation. Lastly, he requested that the client write his probation officer's name on the line indicated on the OCRA scale. Although the client was left to complete the questionnaires alone, Mr. Tompkins advised that he would be available just outside the office if any questions arose.

It should be stated that in six cases the probation officers had advised that the reading level of the client was not sufficient to understand completely the items in the two instruments. These six clients showed an eagerness to take the questionnaires and a willingness to have the questionnaires read to them. Provisions were made, however, for the client to respond without his answers being observed.

Upon receiving the envelopes with the OCRA questionnaire and the answer sheet to the CTP, the writer scored the questionnaires and then transferred the data to a flow sheet for computer processing.

Summary

In summary, the ideal research design for the problem investigated here would be a longitudinal study in which the clients would receive the California Test of Personality at the time of being placed on proba-
tion and the California Test of Personality again plus the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale at the time of termination, discharge, or revocation. This design would afford the opportunity to assess change in attitudes while on probation and to relate these changes of attitudes with the attraction to the officer-client relationship. It would also permit experimentation of different treatment techniques during the probation period. The design of this inquiry had to be modified because of the limitation of resources which prohibited a longitudinal study. It was felt that even with the necessary modifications, the inquiry should be conducted and would provide for a realistic basis for an estimate of the expenditure of time and money for a future longitudinal study. It would provide, also, for an opportunity to test the sensitivity of the California Test of Personality as well as to develop and evaluate the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale. In addition, it would provide knowledge as a basis for formulating hypotheses regarding the relationship of attitudes towards self and others and the officer-client relationship attraction scores. Finally, it would provide a test ground for the mechanics of administering the scales.

Cooperation was gained to pursue the research problem of this project with the Polk County Juvenile Court Probation Department, Boys Division. The five probation officers who met the necessary requirement of active case loads, agreed to participate. Officially adjudicated juveniles who had been on probation a period of three months were selected as the subjects.

A graduating senior from Iowa State University who was on intern placement with the office administered the questionnaires. Every effort
was made to convey to the client that his responses to the questionnaires would be held in confidence. Every effort was also made to gain the client's voluntary assistance. Scoring was done by hand, after receiving the mailed questionnaires, and the scores transferred to flow sheets for computer analysis.
CHAPTER 6. RESULTS

Introduction

In this chapter, a statement regarding the general data analysis procedures, an extensive presentation of the data analysis procedures for the exploratory hypotheses, and a presentation of the analysis procedures for the empirical relational hypotheses will be presented. This will include a listing of empirical relational hypotheses, the correlations, the statement regarding the results, and the revised hypotheses.

Use of the Computer

As stated in the previous chapter, the scores on the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale and the scores on the various sub-scales of the California Test of Personality were transferred to flow sheets. A standard program was used for the entire data analysis. The data was first processed for each of the groups of clients. There were five groups of clients, a group constituting the twenty respondents of each probation officer. The data was then processed on the total of 100 respondents. The standard program provided all the data for analysis of variance as well as a complete correlation matrix. The variables in the correlation matrix were:

1. scores for each item of the OCRA Scale;
2. the total of the OCRA Scale;
3. scores for each of the six sub-scales of the personal adjustment set of the CTP;
4. scores for the total for the first set of sub-scales;
5. scores for the second set of sub-scales;
6. scores for a total for the second set of sub-scales, and
7. scores for the total for the entire CTP.

Exploratory Hypotheses

As the reader will recall, in probation administration there is the assumption that if a probationer and a probation officer are placed together a primary group relationship will result. In other words, it is believed that from this forced association the client will develop a strong attraction toward the relationship. This exploratory research was undertaken to provide data for the evaluation of that assumption.

To assist in obtaining data for the evaluation of the assumption, three hypotheses were presented.

1. There is an attraction for the probation officer-client relationship on the part of the probationer.
2. Probationers have a high degree of attraction for the relationship.
3. There is no significant difference between the officer-client relationship attraction scores received by each of the five officers.

Criteria for judging the hypotheses is arbitrarily established on the basis of the mean numerical value for the scores received by the five probation officers on the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale (Chapter 3, pp. 52-53).

The average score for the 100 clients for each of the five probation officers is 120. This mean is at a point of "moderate" to "strong" attraction to the relationship. Using the arbitrary cutting points, one may say that a definite attraction to the relationship is present, though, of course, there is room for improvement. This result supports
the first hypothesis: there is an attraction for the probation officer-client relationship on the part of the probationers.

In regard to Hypothesis 2: one would need to be extremely guarded if he were to say that this one is supported. Perhaps instead of "probationers have a strong attraction for the relationship," it would be preferable to say that probationers have a slightly strong attraction for the relationship.

For Hypothesis 3: the analysis of variance "$F$" test was applied (Appendix B, Table 4) and a calculated $F = 1.25$ was obtained, which is not significant. (A value of 5.66 is required for the 5 percent level of significance.) (Ostle, 1963, p. 533) (Appendix B, Table 3). Thus, the means of scores received on the OCRA Scale by the five probation officers are not significantly different. Therefore, Hypothesis three (that there is no significant difference between the mean scores of the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale received the five officers) is supported. In conclusion, as far as these five probation officers are concerned, there is no significant difference in their ability to elicit high attraction scores (see Appendix B, Table 4).

Empirical Relational Hypotheses

A discussion of the analysis of data for the empirical relation hypotheses will be presented here. Before proceeding, it is necessary first of all to determine whether it is possible to pool the data for the five probation officers.
The following procedure was used to determine if the hypotheses could be tested by pooling the data from the five groups, or whether the probation officers' personality affected the correlations. In other words, it is necessary to test the hypothesis \( p_1 = p_2 = p_3 = p_4 = p_5 \) for each of the empirical relational hypotheses (Ostle, 1963, p. 227). Support of this hypothesis for each empirical relational hypothesis would mean that the hypotheses could be discussed at the general level. If not, it would mean that the probation officers themselves were affecting the correlations as intervening variables as it were. Should the latter be the case, it would be necessary to limit discussion only to those clients of probation officers who received a significant correlation for a given empirical hypothesis.

The first step was to construct a table of correlations between the OCRA scale and each set of the 12 sub-scales (plus the summed scores for each set of six sub-scales) on the CTP for each of the five probation officers. Finally, all of the relevant correlations are presented for the total sample of the 100 (Appendix B, Table 5). It was determined that only four correlations of the fourteen for the total sample were significant. When the hypothesis that \( p_1 = \ldots p_k \) was tested for each of the four correlations, it was determined that the hypothesis could be accepted for all four significant correlations, \( p_1 \ldots p_k \). However, because of interest, small sample size, and range of correlations, it was decided not to pool for all five probation officers (Ostle, 1963, p. 227), (Appendix B, Tables 6, 7, 8 and 9). The next step in the analysis was to refer to Table 5 of the Appendix and underline all significant probation officer correlations, using the five percent level of significance (Appendix B,
Table 5). It was determined that there was a total of eight significant probation officer correlations, though these varied greatly from officer to officer.

The original empirical relational hypotheses will now be presented first in hypothesis form, then a statement as to the group for which it is significant and finally, a revised hypothesis. To aid in comprehension, the level of significance will be eliminated in the presentation. The reader should keep in mind that all of the hypotheses were tested at the five percent level of significance.

**Hypothesis 1A:** There is a significant negative relationship between officer-client relationship attraction scores (OCRA scores) and self reliance scores.

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and self reliance scores ($H_0: p = 0$). (Null Hypotheses will hereafter be omitted to enhance readability.)

Findings: There were no significant correlations for any of the five groups. The range in correlations was from -.29 to .29.

Revised Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and self reliance scores.

**Hypothesis 1B:** There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and the sense of personal worth.

Findings: There were no significant correlations for any of the five groups. The range in correlations were from -.30 to .26.

Revised Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and a sense of personal worth scores.

**Hypothesis 1C:** There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and the sense of personal freedom scores.

Findings: There were no significant group correlations. The range was from -.29 to .05.
Revised Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and the sense of personal freedom scores.

**Hypothesis 1D:** There is a significant positive relationship between the OCRA scores and feeling of belonging scores.

**Discussion:** There were no significant group correlations. However, all the correlations were negative and the range is from -.01 to -.29. It should be noted that not only was the hypothesis not supported, but even the hypothesized direction of relationship was not supported.

Revised Hypothesis: There is no significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and feeling of belonging scores.

**Hypothesis 1E:** There is a significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and withdrawing tendency scores.

**Findings:** There were no significant correlations. The range was between -.22 to .37, which was almost significant.

Revised Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and withdrawing tendency scores.

**Hypothesis 1F:** There is a significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and nervous symptoms scores.

**Findings:** There were three high group correlations, two which are significant. The correlations are here stated in order of group: .41, .34, .45, -.03, -.07. The two significant correlations and the one near significant correlation were all positive.

Revised Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and nervous symptoms scores for two groups. (High scores on the CTP have less nervous symptoms.)

The same format will now be presented with the correlations between the OCRA scale and the six sub-scales of social adjustment.

**Hypothesis 2A:** There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social standard scores.
Findings: There was a significant correlation of .40 for one group only. The range was from -.16 to .40. Four of the five correlations were positive and above .10.

Revised Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social standard scores for one group.

Hypothesis 2B: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA and social skills scores.

Findings: There were no significant group correlations. The range was from -.29 to +.18.

Revised Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and social skills scores.

Hypothesis 2C: There is a significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and anti-social tendency scores.

Findings: All correlations were positive; two were significant. They are as follows: .48, .34, .42, .26, .12.

Revised Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and anti-social tendency scores for two groups.

Hypothesis 2D: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and family relations scores.

Findings: There was one significant group correlation at .57. This significant correlation is the only positive one; the remaining four correlations were negative. The range was -.06 to the significant correlation of .57.

Revised Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and family relations scores for one group.

Hypothesis 2E: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and school relations scores.

Findings: There was one significant positive correlation at .41. The remaining four correlations were negative. The range was -.23 to the significant positive correlation of .41.
Revised Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and school relations scores for one group.

Hypothesis 2F: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and community relations scores.

Findings: There was one significant positive correlation, .44. Three of the remaining correlations were negative and the fifth was a very small positive at .05. The range was from -.04 to the significant positive correlation of .44.

Revised Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and community relations scores for one group.

The group correlations for the combination of sub-scales and total scale will now be presented using the format as used above.

Personal Adjustment Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and personal adjustment scores.

Findings: There were no significant correlations. The range was from -.09 to .35.

Revised Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and personal adjustment scores.

Social Adjustment Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social adjustment scores.

Findings: There was one significant group correlation at .67. All correlations were positive and ranged from .07 to the significant correlation of .67.

Revised Hypothesis: There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social adjustment scores for one group.

Summary

In summary, it is seen that for these five probation officers there is an attraction by their clients to the relationship; indeed, almost a strong attraction. Although there is some variance between the mean scores
received by the five probation officers on the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale, it is not statistically significant.

It was found that there were only nine significant correlations (out of a possible total of seventy) on an individual officer basis between the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction scores and the scores of sub-scales and sets of the California Test of Personality. Although the data could be pooled and treated as a total sample, it was decided best not to because of interest, small sample size, and range of correlations. Continuing on a hypothesis-by-hypothesis basis, it was determined that the initial direction of the relationship in some cases was faulty. Some group correlations were significant, but in a direction opposite from the hypothesized one. The range between many of the group correlations was extremely great, which illustrates that probation officers affect the correlation between the attraction to his officer-client relationship and various personality variables of his clients. They effect the correlation by 1) eliciting high attraction scores from clients who possess certain attitudes or 2) by promoting certain attitudes of those clients who are strongly attracted to the relationship.
CHAPTER 7. INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

Introduction

The format for this chapter will be as follows: an interpretation of the results regarding the exploratory hypotheses will first be presented. The interpretation of empirical relational hypotheses will then be discussed. Hypotheses that were found not to have statistically significant correlations between the variables will first be presented and eliminated. Hypotheses that were not found to have significant correlations, but which had a change in direction from the hypothesized relationship will then be discussed. Hypotheses that had at least one significant correlation but of an opposite direction will be discussed. Then the hypotheses that had at least one significant group correlation in the hypothesized direction will be discussed. Finally, the interrelationship of the significant correlations of a given probation officer and his group of clients will be presented. The chapter will conclude with an appropriate summary which will relate the specific relational hypotheses to their more general counterparts.

Interpretation of Results Regarding Exploratory Hypotheses

As the reader will recall from the first chapter, it is assumed in probation administration that a primary group relationship results by forcing a client and a probation officer together. It was also stated that sufficient data did not exist to test this assumption. With the development of the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale and its application in this given research setting, it is now possible to state at least for the agency involved in this research that the assumption is
supported. The data affirm that by placing a client on probation under the supervision of a probation officer and thusly forcing a relationship, a primary-type relationship will result. In addition, it was found that the OCRA scale demonstrated that an attraction to the officer-client relationship did occur and it approached the level of a strong attraction. Assuming that an attraction to the relationship is the determining component of primary groupness, it is possible to say that the five probation officers were individually able to elicit a primary group relationship with their respective clients.

Analysis of the data proved that there was no significant difference in the ability of the officers to elicit attraction to the officer-client relationship or primary groupness. The range of mean scores for the five probation officers being from 111 to 123. Although the difference between officers was not statistically significant, one should not rule out the possibility that a significant difference could be obtained if more probation officers from more agencies were tested. The lack of variance in this agency may perhaps be due to the supervisor or to intra-agency interaction. Perhaps it is due to the general philosophy of the supervisor, his administrative procedures, or his ability to establish rapport. At any rate, for this agency there is not a significant difference between probation officers, but the possibility exists for variance if more officers and more agencies were tested.

Interpretation of Results Regarding Relational Hypotheses

Because there was no significant relationship obtained between the OCRA scale and the following sub-scales of the CTP, these items will be omitted. They are listed for identification purposes using only the re-
vised form as presented in the previous chapter.

**Personal Adjustment Set:**

Hypothesis 1A: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and self reliance scores.

Hypothesis 1B: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and sense of personal worth.

Hypothesis 1C: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and personal freedom scores.

Hypothesis 1E: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and withdrawing tendencies.

**Social Adjustment Set:**

Hypothesis 2B: There is no significant relationship between OCRA scores and social skills scores.

There is one hypothesis that although not significant for any of the groups, does merit discussion. Hypothesis 1D was originally presented as a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and feelings of belonging. The basis for this hypothesized direction is that it was assumed that the more the client felt that he belonged in other relationships, the greater the attraction he would have to the officer-client relationship, a generalizing effect as it were. The California Test of Personality defines belonging as "an individual feels that he belongs when he enjoys the love of his family, the well wishes of good friends, and a cordial relationship with people in general. Such a person will, as a rule, get along well with his teachers or employers and usually feels proud of his school or place of business," (Thorpe, Clark and Tieggs, 1953, p. 3). It appears from the data that there is a trend which suggests that the less the individual feels he belongs the greater the attraction he will have for the officer-client
relationship. This suggests that clients who have not been able to establish feelings of belonging on their own are drawn to the forced relationship with a probation officer. It would be a worthy subject of investigation to determine if they are drawn to the relationship for the very reason of not having a sense of belonging elsewhere.

A hypothesis-by-hypothesis discussion will be presented now of those hypotheses that had at least one significant group correlation in the non-hypothesized direction. It was originally hypothesized that there was a significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and nervous symptoms scores. The results of data analysis shows that there were two groups with significant positive correlations. The basis for the original hypothesis was that clients with nervous symptoms (i.e., clients who received low scores on a nervous symptoms sub-scale) would have a strong attraction to the officer-client relationship. It was assumed that they would be nervous in all relationships and would not seek out primary group relationships, but upon being forced into one, would respond with strong positive attraction. The contrary seems to be the case; clients who do not possess nervous symptoms are attracted to the officer-client relationship. At least this is the case for two of five officer-client sets of boys.

The nervous symptoms hypothesis was the only sub-scale in the personal adjustment set of six scales that contained a least one significant group hypothesis. In the six sub-scales of the social adjustment set, all but one had at least one significant group correlation. A discussion of the hypotheses that had a significant correlation but in the opposite direction of that hypothesized will be discussed first.
The original hypothesis 2C of the social adjustment set was: There is a significant negative relationship between OCRA scores and anti-social tendencies scores. The analysis of the data shows that the contrary is true. There were two significant group correlations with a relationship in the opposite direction. There is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and anti-social tendency scores. The basis for the original hypotheses was that the more anti-social the attitudes of the client (i.e., the lower his scores on the anti-social tendency sub-scale) the greater would be his attraction to the officer-client relationship. It was believed that clients who had strong anti-social tendencies would attempt to establish a strong relationship with their probation officers in an attempt to gain extra privileges and freedom from controls. Actually, the contrary was found to be true. The clients with the least amount of anti-social tendencies were more positively attracted to the officer-client relationship. In other words, clients with socially approved attitudes were significantly more attracted to the officer-client relationship for two groups of clients of the five probation officers.

All of the hypotheses that include at least one significant correlation in the hypothesized direction are in the set of the six social adjustment sub-scales. There was at least one significant group correlation for all but one (2B) of the six sub-scales.

The first hypothesis 2A was significant. There was a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social standard scores for one group. The range was from -.16 to +.40, the latter being significant. In essence then, for one group of clients, those that had a strong
recognition of desirable social standards and who understand the rights of others and appreciate the necessity of subordinating certain desires to the needs of the group are attracted to the officer-client relationship. Ideally, it would be desirable to interpret that result with direction, stating that the clients who were strongly attracted to this probation officer changed their attitudes to be more socially approved.

The 2B hypothesis is the one that proved not to be supported, which states that there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social skills scores. The 2C hypothesis was significant opposite to the hypothesized direction.

Revised hypothesis 2D states that there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and family relations scores for one group of clients. The basis for this hypothesis was clients who have good family relations generalize these relationships to other primary group relationships. For one group of clients this seemed to be the case. The range, however, was from a -.15 to the significant correlation of .57. All of the four nonsignificant correlations were negative. For one officer the better relationship with the family the greater attraction to the officer-client relationship. In the case of the other four officers, there is a tendency, although not statistically significant, for those with poor family relationship to be attracted to the officer-client relationship. Perhaps the clients are using the officer-client relationship to compensate for a poor family relationship.

Revised hypothesis 2E stated that there was a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and school relations scores for one group of clients. The range was from -.23 to a significant correlation of .41.
The four nonsignificant correlations were all negative. The same rationale for family relations applies to school relations scores, the rationale being that clients who establish good school relations will generalize these relationships to other social relations. The group possessing the significant correlation for family relations is also the group possessing the significant correlation for school relations.

Revised hypothesis 2F states that there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and community relations scores for one group. The range was from -.12 to a significant positive correlation of .44. Again it was believed that a generalizing factor was at work. The rationale was that clients who had good public relations would be attracted to the officer-client relationship.

One group had a significant correlation on the total of the six sub-scales representing the social adjustment set. This was the group that had the significant correlation for family relationship and school relationship. The revised hypothesis is stated as, "there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social adjustment scores." The rationale was, of course, the more socially adjusted the individual the more he would generalize these attitudes to the officer-client relationship and the greater reciprocating treatment he would receive from the probation officer. This would result in a positive attraction to the officer-client relationship.

A group by group statement of significant hypotheses will now be presented. Probation officer 1 obtained significant correlations in the following hypotheses: Hypothesis IF (there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and nervous symptoms scores) and
hypothesis 2C (there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and anti-social tendencies). Interpreting these combined hypotheses it appears that clients who were relatively free from anxiety and also free from anti-social tendencies had a stronger attraction to the officer-client relationship as elicited by this probation officer.

Probation officer 2 had no significant group correlations.

Probation officer 3 had significant correlations for the same hypotheses as probation officer 1. The rationale is repeated that clients who were free of nervous symptoms and free of anti-social tendencies had greater attraction for the relationship as elicited by this probation officer.

Probation officer 4 had three significant group correlations for three distinctly different hypotheses: Hypothesis 2A (there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and social standard scores); hypothesis 2D (there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and family relations scores); and hypothesis 2E (there is a significant positive relationship between OCRA scores and school relations scores). The rationale would appear that clients who possess attitudes of proper social standards, who have good family relations, and good school relations, are attracted to the officer-client relationship as elicited by this probation officer. It would be fortunate if this could be interpreted as stating that clients who are strongly attracted to this probation officer have subsequently learned social standard attitudes and have improved their relationships with their families and schools. However, this interpretation is presently untenable, since the data were obtained by a cross-sectional research design.
Probation officer Five had a significant correlation for one hypothesis. This was for hypothesis 2F (there is a significant positive relationship between all OCRA scores and community relations scores). This may be interpreted as follows: clients who have good relationships with their neighbors and other members of the community have an attraction to the officer-client relationship as elicited by this probation officer.

Summary

As stated in chapter one, the research undertaken here was to determine:

1. If probationers are attracted to the officer-client relationship;
2. If so, the degree of attraction;
3. If officers vary in their ability to establish a relationship to which probationers are attracted, and
4. How various psycho-socio attitudes of probationers are associated with attraction to the officer-client relationship.

The data permit the following observations: In this particular probation agency, the clients are indeed attracted to the officer-client relationship. Within this given agency, there is no significant difference in the ability of the officers to establish a relationship to which probationers are attracted. For four of the five groups of probationers, there are some psycho-social attitudes associated with attraction to the officer-client relationship. The relationships between the various psycho-social attitudes of probationers and their attraction to the relationship vary from probation officer to probation officer. Of the seventy correlations, nine were found significant for some probation
officers: nervous symptoms, social standards, anti-social tendencies, family relations, school relations, and community relations in certain groups.

The diagram below presents in graphic form the hypotheses that were supported.
HYPOTHESES SUPPORTED BY DATA FROM THIS PROJECT

General Hypothesis
Primary Group
Sub-general Hypothesis
Attraction to the Group
Special Hypothesis
Attraction to the Probation Officer-Client Relationship

Exploratory Hypotheses

Empirical Relational Hypotheses
OCRA Scores are
Significantly...

Socialization
Attitudes
Attitudes Regarding Self and Social Environment Including Attitudes Towards Others, Values and Norms

1) Are Greater than 90
2) Are 120 Which Approaches the Low End of the Strong Attraction Category
3) Are Not Significantly Different for the 5 Probation Officers

Personal Adjustment
Nervous Symptoms, Scores
Social Adjustment, Scores
Social Standards, Scores
Anti-social Tendencies, Scores
Family Relations, Scores
School Relations, Scores
Community Relations, Scores
CHAPTER 8. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

The greatest limitation of this research project was the lack of provision to measure change. The ideal research design would require a longitudinal study in order to determine the amount and direction of change in attitudes of the client over time, and to permit comparison of any change in the attraction to the officer-client relationship. This kind of research is extremely important at this point in time in the treatment of law violators. Some means must be established for cost accounting or evaluating different treatment programs. Paul Keve, Commissioner of Corrections for the State of Minnesota, emphasized this point at the May, 1969 meeting of the Central States Correction Association held in Des Moines, Iowa. He stated that taxpayers have a right to expect efficient expenditure of funds and only a cost accounting system will permit it. However, before a cost accounting system can be developed, it is necessary to establish some indexes of efforts and results. The merit in a longitudinal research design is that it could provide this data to a specific agency. It could also provide general conclusions by combining the data from several agencies.

Testing the Instrument

This research, although it contained many limitations, did provide an excellent opportunity to develop and examine the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale. It is believed that the scale herein developed can be used for future research with a longitudinal design, though some modifications doubtlessly should be made. For example, item 11 should possibly be removed. On the other hand, there is merit to suggest
the expansion of this item into a sub-scale in order to determine why there was not a correlation between the desire to see the probation officer and attraction to the officer-client relationship.

Because there were a number of significant individual probation officer correlations between the OCRA scale and the various sub-scales on the CTP, there is some evidence that the CTP is sufficiently sensitive to be utilized for research of this nature. It would be possible to administer the CTP, devise a treatment program for the client on the basis of his profile, and then retest him at discharge to determine the change in attitudes over time.

Research Goals

In addition to the two general proposals (research and effectiveness assessment) for future projects using a longitudinal design, there are also two sets of obtainable research goals. One set of goals would be to experiment with different treatment programs in order to evaluate the variance in the officer-client relationship attraction scores, change of attitudes, and the association between officer-client relationship attraction scores and the change of attitudes over time. The second set of research goals would be to examine the reasons for the difference in officers who were significantly different in scores received on the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale and/or the California Test of Personality. It would be valuable to determine what makes the officers "better" or "worse" than their peers. Within the field of social work and probation administration, there are opposing hypotheses. The field of social work extolls the importance of techniques of the worker in changing attitudes of clients. Implicit in probation administration is
the belief that interest in clients is the main force in changing client attitudes. These varying orientations were discussed extensively in chapter two.

Ideal Design

The ideal design would involve gaining the cooperation from as many probation offices as possible. The probation officers would give the California Test of Personality to the client upon intake. They might then elect to use an eclectic approach, or some given technique. At the termination of supervision the CTP would be administered (anonymously) to the client. The researcher, every six months, would return an analysis of the data accumulated at that time. By this means, both research and correctional needs could be served.

Summary

The results of this research project suggest the desirability of employing a longitudinal design using these instruments. The Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale should be modified somewhat. The California Test of Personality appears to be sufficiently sensitive to assess the change of attitudes over time. A longitudinal design using these instruments would provide for consulting service for a specific agency, as well as replicate general research findings. This further research should examine differences in treatment programs and attempt to determine reasons for any significant differences in the ability of officers to elicit officer-client relationship attraction scores, a change in client social-psychological attitudes, or both. At this time when the crime rate and the cost of corrections are increasing, it is necessary to
engage in cost accounting or evaluation of the techniques of corrections, both on the general level and on the specific agency level.

The following diagram of the revised hypothesis employing a longitudinal design may serve as a suggestion for future research.
DIAGRAM OF HYPOTHESIS CONFIGURATION USING A LONGITUDINAL DESIGN

General Hypothesis
Primary Group ————→ Socialization

Sub-general Hypothesis
Attraction to the Group ————→ Attitudes

Specific Hypothesis
Attraction to the Probation Officer-Client Relationship ————→ Attitudes Regarding:
- self and social environment including attitudes toward others, values, and norms
  - There is no significant difference in officer ability to effect a change in client psycho-social attitudes
  - There is no significant difference in officers in CTP remainder scores

Empirical Relational Hypotheses
High OCRA Scores ————→ Personal Adjustment
- Self Reliance
  - Sense of Personal Worth
  - Sense of Personal Freedom
  - Feeling of Belonging
  - Withdrawing Tendencies
  - Nervous Symptoms

- Social Adjustment
  - Social Standards
  - Social Skills
  - Anti-social Tendencies
  - Family Relations
  - School Relations
  - Community Relations

- There is no significant difference in officer ability to elicit an attraction to the relationship
- There is no significant difference in mean OCRA scores received by the variance officer

 OCRA Scores are significantly related to a desire change in socialization and attitudes.
CHAPTER 9. SUMMARY

In the treatment of juvenile delinquents, it is assumed that there is a strong attraction on the part of the probation client to the probation officer-client relationship. It is assumed that through this attraction a probationer will modify his attitudes to become law abiding. These assumptions are based more on common sense than on research findings. Therefore, the research undertaken here was to determine:

1. whether probationers are attracted to the officer-client relationship;
2. if so, the degree of attraction;
3. whether officers vary in their ability to establish a relationship to which probationers are attracted;
4. how various social-psychological attitudes of probationers are associated with attraction to the officer-client relationship.

The specific focus of this project (a strong attraction to the officer-client relationship results in favorable attitudinal change) is closely related to the hypothesis that primary group affiliation results in socialization. A review of the literature was conducted concerning these concepts (primary group and socialization). Information was sought from the areas of pure research, applied research, and practical experience. It was found that groups with a relevant concern for these concepts have been operating in closed systems of knowledge since 1930. It was found that a specific concern for the concept of primary group and the concern for the concept of socialization were originally integrated. The interests polarized during the 1930's, with one body of scientists
focusing on the processes of socialization. It was determined also, that there was a schism between the scientists who are interested in primary groups and socialization and the practitioners who are interested in these concepts. In addition there was a schism between three groups of practitioners: group therapy, group counseling, and socio-drama. It was discovered that initially probation administration and social work identified with each other. During the 1930's, however, a strain in the relationship resulted in polarization. At this time social work became committed to the conceptual orientation of Freud and on the importance of voluntary association of clients with the social work agency. In the area of corrections, the relationship between the probation client and the agency, of course, could not be voluntary. In the probation agency the relationship between client and agency was forced by the court having jurisdiction over the client. As a result of this, probation administration attempted to establish a unique professional identity.

A review of relevant literature demonstrated the need for the integration of knowledge regarding primary groups and socialization. Dialogue from these varied resources would be invaluable in pushing the frontiers of knowledge forward. It was found, however, that any real dialogue and a resulting eclectic approach has only recently been initiated. It was the aim of this study to contribute to this integration of knowledge even though on a somewhat minor basis.

A deductive framework, that is, going from the general to the specific was established to guide the research. Drawing from Cooley primarily for a definition of primary group and Cooley and Loomis for a
definition of socialization, we derived the following general hypothesis. Given a small number of individuals, face to face relations, and relative permanence over time, plus a desire on the part of the individual members to join or form a primary group, a primary group will evolve resulting in a sense of identity of the group and an awareness of non-group. Individually, the numbers will experience their need of security and emotional response fulfilled; a sense of identity, or "we-ness"; and will value the relationship as an end. The primary group is the medium through which socialization occurs or the process by which the social heritage, that is, the knowledge, beliefs, customs, and skills are transmitted by old members and received and internalized by new members of the given social system. In short, primary group membership results in socialization. Resource limitations prohibited a longitudinal study; therefore, the research does not permit the testing of the hypothesis that primary group membership results in socialization. The cross sectional design of this project permits only the testing of the hypothesis that primary group membership is associated with socialization.

It was found that attraction to the group is the primary component for existence of a primary group. Since the concern of this research project was limited to socialization of attitudes, the sub-general hypothesis was: attraction to the group is associated with the transmission of attitudes of old members.

This particular research project is concerned with the probationer's attraction to the probation officer-client relationship. This project was primarily concerned with attitudes regarding the self and the in-
dividual's social environment, i.e., attitudes towards others, attitudes toward values, attitudes toward norms. Therefore, this specific hypothesis was: The attraction of the officer-client relationship is associated with attitudes regarding self, others, values, and norms held by the probation officer.

Because of the lack of data regarding the client's attraction to the officer-client relationship, a number of exploratory hypotheses were established and tested. These included: 1) The attraction to the officer-client relationship is greater than zero, 2) The attraction is high, and 3) There is no variance between officers and their ability to illicit attraction to the officer-client relationship.

A thirty item scale was constructed to examine the concept empirically. The Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale provided the data for the exploratory hypotheses and numerical data to examine the relationship of attraction to the probation officer-client relationship and attitudes regarding the self and the individual's social environment. The California Test of Personality was used in measuring these latter concepts.

A cross section design was selected because of the prohibitive cost of a longitudinal design and this would at least provide valuable knowledge of an exploratory nature. Five probation officers of the Polk County juvenile court volunteered for this project. Twenty clients from each officer were selected at random. Under procedures assuring confidentiality they were administered the questionnaires of the OCRA scale and the CTP scale. A standard computer program was used to analyze the data for each group of clients and for the total sample of a hundred clients.
In regard to the exploratory hypothesis, it was found that 1) the clients of this agency were attracted to the officer-client relationship, 2) they had a strong attraction to the relationship, and 3) there was no significant difference in the ability of the five probation officers to elicit an attraction to the officer-client relationship. This can be interpreted, for this agency at least, as follows: By forcing a relationship between a probation officer and a probationer through placing a client on probation, a primary group will result bordering on a strong attraction of the client to the relationship. For this agency, there was no statistically significant variance in the ability of the officers to elicit an attraction to the relationship. For this agency, we must rule out the effect of the officer's personality as an intervening variable. However, the possibility of the effect of the officer's personality being nullified by the leadership of the supervisor or by the inter-officer interaction remains.

In testing the relationship between the OCRA scores and two set scores and twelve sub-scale scores of the CTA, the following results were obtained: First, an attempt was made to determine if the data from the five groups of clients could be pooled or whether the individual probation officer's personality was an intervening variable affecting the correlations. It was determined through statistical tests that the data probably could be pooled. However, we choose not to because of interest, small sample size and correlation range. On a group basis, it was found that there were no significant group correlations between OCRA scores and the following sub-scales of the personal adjustment set of the CTP: Self reliance, sense of personal worth, sense of personal freedom, feeling of belonging, and withdrawing tendencies. There was no significant correlation either
for the OCRA scores and the total set of personal adjustment scores.

The only significant group correlation in the personal adjustment set was between OCRA scores and nervous symptoms scores. Two groups of clients had significant positive correlations. This was interpreted as: Clients who do not possess nervous symptoms are attracted to the officer-client relationship for these two probationer officers.

The situation was somewhat different for the social adjustment set of sub-scales. All but one of the six had at least one significant group correlation. It was found that there was no significant correlation between OCRA scores and knowledge of social skills.

Of the relationships that were significant, it was found that there was one significant positive group correlation between OCRA scores and social standard scores. For one group of clients, those who had a strong recognition of desirable social standards and who understood the rights of others and appreciated the necessity of subordinating certain desires to the needs of the group were attracted to the officer-client relationship.

There were two significant positive group correlations between OCRA scores and anti-social tendency scores. In essence, clients with socially approved attitudes were significantly more attracted to the officer-client relationship for two groups of clients and those with less socially approved attitudes were less attracted to the officer-client relationship.

There was a significant positive correlation for one group for each of the following sub-scales: Family relations, school relations, and community relations. For one group it appeared that clients with good
family relations and good school relations generalized these relationships to other primary groups, i.e., the probation officer-client relationship. Another group appeared to generalize for community relations. However, the range of correlations was great and for the four groups for which there were no significant group correlations, the correlations were all negative. This suggests that perhaps many of the clients for the four groups were unable to get their affiliation needs fulfilled in the normal groups of school, family, and community and although not desiring a relationship with the probation officer, once forced into it, used the relationship to fulfill their affiliation needs.

Not all probation officers obtain significant group correlation and not all obtained the same combination of group correlations. Officer One obtained a significant positive correlation between OCRA scores and nervous symptoms scores and a significant positive correlation between OCRA scores and anti-social tendency scores. In interpreting these combined hypotheses, it appears that clients who were relatively free from anxiety and also free from anti-social tendencies had a strong attraction to this probation officer. Officer Two had no significant group correlation. Officer Three had the same significant positive group correlations as probation officer One. Officer Four had significant positive correlations between OCRA scores and social standard scores, between OCRA scores and family relations scores, and OCRA scores and school relations scores. It would appear that clients who possess attitudes of proper social standards, who have good family relationships, and good school relations scores, are attracted to the officer-client relationship as elicited by this probation officer. Officer Five had one significant
positive group correlation between OCRA scores and community relations scores. It would appear that clients who had good relations with their neighbors and other members of their community had an attraction to the officer-client relationship as elicited by this probation officer. It appears that although there is no significant difference in the ability of the five probation officers to elicit attraction to the officer-client relationship, they vary significantly in the types of clients they attract, repulse, or have no impact on. Their individual personalities do seem to have an impact.

Although this cross sectional study provided valuable information that was heretofore unknown, it should be considered only an exploratory study. It facilitated the development and evaluation of the Officer-Client Relationship Attraction Scale. It provided an opportunity to test the sensitivity of the California Test of Personality with delinquent boys. Finally, it provided an evaluation milieu for instrument administration procedures.

This cross sectional research raises a number of questions that can only be answered by a longitudinal study. It also suggests two avenues of interest: greater understanding of the clients and greater understanding of the probation officers. In focusing on the client it is important to identify and understand the composition of clients who are strongly attracted to the officer-client relationship and those who are repulsed by the relationship, to understand the change of various attitudes toward the self and the social environment over time, and to examine the relationship of attraction to the officer-client relationship and the change of attitudes over time.
In focusing on the probation officer it is important to identify and understand officers who elicit a strong attraction to the relationship and those who are unable to elicit an attraction. It would be valuable to compare the association between the ability to elicit a strong attraction to the relationship and the officer's ability to modify the client's attitudes over time. To accomplish the above, the longitudinal study would be required and preferably through the participation of a number of juvenile probation agencies. A CTP would be administered to the client upon reception on probation. A discharged client would be given the CTP again and the OCRA scale.

The use of these scales facilitates the classical research design permitting the insertion of any test variable and comparing the results against a controlled group. It would permit the insertion of a test variable to: 1) determine the effect on the officer-client relationship, 2) determine the effect on change of psycho-social attitudes, 3) to measure the association between officer-client relationship attraction and change in various psycho-social attitudes.
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APPENDIX A: OCRA SCALE
QUESTIONNAIRE OF ATTITUDES TOWARD PROBATION

Below are a number of statements about probation and probation officers, with which some people agree and others disagree. Please give me your opinion of your probation and your probation officer.

Please circle your choice:
SA (Strongly Agree)
A (Agree)
U (Uncertain)
D (Disagree)
SD (Strongly Disagree)

SA A U D SD 1. I believe I could be honest with my probation officer.
SA A U D SD 2. My probation officer acted as if he was too busy to see me.
SA A U D SD 3. My probation officer was more interested in catching me "messing up" than in helping me.
SA A U D SD 4. My probation officer did not help me in any way.
SA A U D SD 5. My probation officer helped me from "messing up."
SA A U D SD 6. I will be able to use the advice my probation officer gave me for the rest of my life.
SA A U D SD 7. My probation officer treats me like a man.
SA A U D SD 8. I feel good after talking to my probation officer.
SA A U D SD 9. My probation officer is wishy-washy.
SA A U D SD 10. My probation officer is firm but fair, a right guy.
SA A U D SD 11. I was not able to see my probation officer as much as I wanted.
SA A U D SD 12. I always felt nervous when I was with my probation officer.
SA A U D SD 13. My probation officer was usually interested in listening to me.
SA A U D SD 14. I never told my probation officer any of my personal problems.
SA A U D SD 15. I believe that my probation officer has ideas that are unfair.
SA A U D SD 16. My probation officer would help me if I needed help.
SA A U D SD 17. My probation officer is out for his own good; he didn't care about me.
SA A U D SD 18. My probation officer could always be counted on to do the right thing.

SA A U D SD 19. I just would say what my probation officer wanted me to say.

SA A U D SD 20. My probation officer was square and didn't think about important things.

SA A U D SD 21. I would never want my probation officer as a friend.

SA A U D SD 22. My probation officer was out to help me as much as he could.

SA A U D SD 23. I seldom paid attention to what my probation officer said; I believe in making my own decisions.

SA A U D SD 24. I feel that I have made a lasting friend in my probation officer.

SA A U D SD 25. I feel that I could have asked my probation officer for advice.

SA A U D SD 26. My probation officer was stubborn, no amount of argument would change him.

SA A U D SD 27. My probation officer got his job because he has connections, not because of his ability.

SA A U D SD 28. Sometimes I liked coming here, but most of the time I hated it.

SA A U D SD 29. My probation officer would risk his own neck if it were necessary to save mine.

SA A U D SD 30. I believe that my probation officer would "stab me in the back" if it meant he could get ahead that way.
APPENDIX B: TABLES OF QUANTITATIVE DATA AND
STATISTICAL COMPUTATIONS
Table 1. Item total correlations for OCRA scale

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.07&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.18&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>A item total correlation must exceed \( r_{it} = .18 \) to be acceptable.
Table 2. Coefficient of reliability

\[ r_{tt} = \frac{n \bar{x}}{1 + (n-1) \bar{x}} \]

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{114.2871}{435} = .33 \]

\[ r_{tt} = \frac{(30)(.33)}{1 + (29)(.33)} = .94 \]
Table 3. Characteristics of probation officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation Officer</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years with Agency</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>BA Divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>BA Secondary Education and Half MA in Guidance and Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>MA Educational Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 Credits from an MA in Sociology, Criminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>No Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Analysis of variance and test of hypothesis that there is no difference in mean OCRA scores received by the five probation officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1744.20</td>
<td>436.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33,120.55</td>
<td>348.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>34,864.75</td>
<td>352.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Officer 1 | 5,907.20 | Officer 1 | 123.80 |
| Officer 2 | 3,827.80 | Officer 2 | 121.10 |
| Officer 3 | 5,201.20 | Officer 3 | 121.80 |
| Officer 4 | 4,026.55 | Officer 4 | 121.65 |
| Officer 5 | 14,157.80 | Officer 5 | 111.90 |
| Total     | 33,120.55 | Total     | 120.05 |

Calculated $F = \frac{436.05}{348.64} = 1.25$

Tabulated $F^4_{95(.05)} = 5.66$
Table 5. Correlation coefficients between OCRA scores and sub-scales and groups of sub-scales CTP scores for each probation officer and total sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 1 Personal Adjustment</th>
<th>Total Scores Group 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 1</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 2</td>
<td>-.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 3</td>
<td>-.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 4</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 5</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set 2 Personal Adjustment</th>
<th>Total Scores Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 1</td>
<td>-.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 2</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 3</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 4</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer 5</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical value of r for one tail T test at .05 level of significance for total n = 100 with 2 d.f. is .166 (Edwards, 1957, p. 502).

Critical value of r for one tail T test at .05 level of significance for n = 20 with 2 d.f. is .378 (Edwards, 1957, p. 502).

Above table r's must exceed .166 for total and .378 for individual officers to be significant. r's in above table which are underlined indicate significant correlation coefficients.
Table 6. Test of hypothesis $p_1 = \ldots p_k$ for correlation between OCRA scores and CTP variable ID scores, feeling of belonging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Size of Sample (n)</th>
<th>n-3</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>$(n-3)z$</th>
<th>$z^2$</th>
<th>$(n-3)z^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PO$_1$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO$_2$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.244</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>4.008</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO$_3$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.159</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>2.720</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO$_4$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO$_5$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.528</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\text{Average } z = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)} = .159$$

$$\left(\text{Average } z\right) \left[ \frac{k}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)z_i} \right] = 2.150$$

Table value .95% with 4 degrees of freedom $9.49 > 1.029$

Do not reject $H_{p_1} = \ldots p_k$

*(Ostle, 1963, p. 227).*
Table 7. Test of hypothesis $p_1 = \ldots p_k$ for correlation between OCRA scores and CTP variable scores if, nervous symptoms*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$(n-3)z$</th>
<th>$z^2$</th>
<th>$(n-3)z^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0_1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>7.361</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>3.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0_2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>5.950</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>2.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0_3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>8.228</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>3.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0_4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.493</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0_5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-1.122</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>19.924</td>
<td>9.316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average $z = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)} = .234$

(Average $z$) $\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)}\right] = -4.662$

Table value .95% with 4 degrees of freedom $9.49 > 4.654$

Do not reject $H p_1 = \ldots p_k$

*(Ostle, 1963, p. 227).*
Table 8. Test of hypothesis $p_1 = \ldots p_k$ for correlation between OCRA scores and CTV variable scores $Z_C$, anti-social tendencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Size of Sample</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$n-3$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$(n-3)z$</th>
<th>$z^2$</th>
<th>$(n-3)z^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0₁</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>8.891</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>4.658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0₂</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>6.103</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>2.193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0₃</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>7.582</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>3.383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0₄</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>4.471</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>1.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P0₅</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.172</td>
<td>11.679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average $z = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 3)z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 3)} = .343$

(Average $z$) $\left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 3)z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i - 3)} \right] = 10.006$

Table value .95% with 4 degrees of freedom $9.49 > 1.673$

Do not reject $H_p = \ldots p_k$

*(Ostle, 1963, p. 227).*
Table 9. Test of hypothesis $p_1 = \ldots p_k$ for correlation between OCRA scores and CTP total scores for group 2 variables, social adjustment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Sample Size of Sample (n)</th>
<th>$n-3$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$(n-3)z$</th>
<th>$z^2$</th>
<th>$(n-3)z^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_01$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_02$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>5.083</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_03$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_04$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>13.651</td>
<td>.645</td>
<td>10.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_05$</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>1.258</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24.157</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average $z = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)} = 284$

$(Average z) \left[ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{k} (n_i-3)} \right] = -6.861$

Total value .95% with 4 degrees of freedom 9.49 > 6.263

Do not reject $H p_1 = \ldots p_k$

*(Ostle, 1963, p. 227).*