



RESEARCH ARTICLE

A Forensic Responsibility: The Examination of Decision-Making Strategies and Problem-Solving Skills of Probation Officers

Mehmet Aykut Erk, Sunay Fırat*

Abstract:

Introduction: Since working with the offenders that are in the probation process requires a detailed assessment, probation personnel should be able to produce logical solutions for the problems that may occur in the process. Probation personnel play a key role in whether the offenders are convicted or not. The fact that their decisions can influence the future of the offenders explains why they have such a key role in the probation process. Therefore, probation personnel have an important responsibility to fulfill since their decision can affect the judicial process of the offenders.

This study was conducted to assess decision making strategies and problem-solving skills of the probation personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana.

Methods: In this study, 83 personnel working for the Department of Probation constituted the sample group of this study, while 87 personnel working for other public institutions constituted the comparison group. Sociodemographic Data Form, Decision Strategies Scale (DSS) and Problem Solving Inventory (PSI) were applied to the participants and the results were analyzed.

Results: When the PSI total score and DSS sub-scale score averages of the sample group were compared to the comparison group, male probation personnel's problem-solving skills total score and indecisiveness sub-scale point averages showed a statistically significant difference compared to the personnel from the comparison group. Similarly, a statistically significant difference was found between the married probation personnel and married comparison group personnel. When the logical decision making sub-scale score averages of the participants were analyzed, a statistically significant difference was found between the probation personnel with a job tenure of 1-5 years and the personnel from other public institutions ($p<0,05$).

Discussion and Conclusion: It is worth noting that the probation personnel can have a serious impact on the lives of the offenders with their problem-solving and decision-making skills. The findings obtained in this study suggest that focusing on this situation will be beneficial in terms of providing a better service to convicts in the probation process and reducing the crime rates.

Keywords: Probation Officer, Problem-Solving Skills, Decision-Making Strategies

Öz:

Amaç: Denetimli Serbestlik sürecinde hükümlülerle çalışmanın titiz bir değerlendirme gerektirdiği, dolayısıyla süreç sırasında personelin, oluşan problemlere mantıklı çözümler üretebilmesi önemlidir. Özellikle personelin, hükümlülerin mahkûmiyet kararlarını ve bir bireyin bundan sonraki yaşamını çok ciddi etkileyebileceği, hükümlülerin hayatına dair kilit rolleri olduğu unutulmamalıdır. Bu nedenlerle denetimli serbestlik sürecinde personelin sorumluluğu adli sürecin seyrini etkilemesi bakımından oldukça önemli hale gelmektedir.

Bu çalışma, çok önemli adli bir sorumluluğu yerine getiren Adana Denetimli Serbestlik Müdürlüğünde görev yapan Denetimli Serbestlik personelinin karar verme stratejileri ve problem çözme becerilerinin değerlendirilmesi amacıyla yapılmıştır.

Yöntem: Denetimli Serbestlik Müdürlüğüne bağlı olarak çalışan 83 personel çalışma grubunu, diğer kamu kurumlarında çalışan 87 personel ise karşılaştırma grubunu oluşturmuştur. Bireylere Sosyodemografik Veri Formu, Karar Stratejileri Ölçeği (KSÖ) ve Problem Çözme Envanteri (PÇE) uygulanmış ve sonuçları analiz edilmiştir.

Bulgular: Denetimli Serbestlik Müdürlüğü personelinin cinsiyetine göre Problem Çözme Envanteri toplam puanı ve Karar Verme Stratejileri alt boyutları puan ortalamaları karşılaştırma grubuna göre değerlendirildiğinde; erkek personelin problem çözme becerileri toplam puanı ve kararsızlık alt boyut puan ortalamaları, evli personelin karşılaştırma grubundaki evli personele göre, hizmet yılları açısından 1-5 arası hizmet veren Denetimli Serbestlik personelinin diğer kamu personellerine göre mantıklı karar verme alt boyut puan ortalamaları açısından aralarında istatistiksel olarak anlamlı bir farklılık tespit edilmiştir ($p<0,05$).

Tartışma ve Sonuç: Denetimli serbestlik personelinin sağlıklı birer çalışan olması, hükümlülerin problemlerini çözme becerileri ve verecekleri kararlar ile onların yaşamını çok ciddi bir şekilde etkilemesi bakımından önemli görevleri olduğu unutulmamalıdır. Bu durumun denetimli serbestlik sürecinde olan hükümlülerin daha iyi hizmet almasının sağlanması açısından da konunun önemli olduğu düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Denetimli Serbestlik Personeli, Problem Çözme Becerileri, Karar Verme Stratejileri

DOI: 10.17986/blm.1337

Mehmet Aykut Erk: Uzm. Psk., Çukurova Üniversitesi, Bağımlılık ve Adli Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adli Bilimler Anabilim Dalı Adana, Türkiye

Eposta: maykuterk@gmail.com

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4362-2729>

Sunay Fırat: Doç. Dr., Çukurova Üniversitesi, Bağımlılık ve Adli Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adli Bilimler Anabilim Dalı, Adana, Türkiye

Eposta: sunayfirat@gmail.com

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9960-0836>

Acknowledgement:

* Corresponding Author

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest regarding the content of this article.

Support Resources

The authors report no financial support regarding content of this article.

*Sorumlu Yazar/Corresponding Author:

Ethical Declaration

Ethical approval was obtained from Çukurova University Non-Interventional Clinical Research Ethical Committee with the date 2019 and number 96-35, and Helsinki Declaration rules were followed to conduct this study.

Received: 18.09.2019

Revised: 22.10.2019

Accepted: 21.04.2020

1. Introduction

Probation is an alternative punishment and execution system that the suspect, defendant or offender is inspected and monitored, and all necessary services, programmes, and resources are provided for the mentioned to be rehabilitated and adaptation (1). In this programme, counseling is provided considering the individual differences in various subjects, such as putting themselves into the victim's shoes, retrieve the loss, develop moral reasoning; contributions they can make to the society and the country they live in (using a way of different paths, from paying taxes on time to taking the role that they keep the young ones away from drugs), and improvement in anger management skills (2).

Personnel working at Probation Directorates perform their duties based on respect to human dignity and honesty, privacy, and neutrality principles, in accordance with law no. 5402 named Probation Centres and the Law of Protective Commissions (1). Education, informing and awareness of the personnel running this rehabilitation process are crucially important because after the probation process, the offenders will have serious societal roles (3-5). For these reasons, the individuals that work at the Directorates of Probation are psychological counselors/psychologists and social workers (health and supporting health services class), sociologists (technical services class) and qualified probation personnel who were trained in different fields of professions by a teacher from different areas (2). In the probation system, experts are responsible for observing the rehabilitation process of the offenders and informing the case officer orally, or written if necessary, about the offender's situation. Counseling for the evaluation of risks and needs of the offenders and preparation of probation plans, evaluate and make plans and check the convenience of them when it is necessary, prepare a social survey report are among the duties of experts. Officials, on the other hand, are responsible for preparing the probation plan, supervise and monitor the offender's behaviors in public, taking part in the preparation of a list of services, corporate training, and program list, and work protocol (6).

When it is considered that the ultimate aim of the probation services is to reintroduce the offenders included in the system and to reduce/prevent their possibility of committing the crime again, the approach and attitude of the probation personnel towards the offender become more important. Thus, it is also expected from the probation personnel to make decisions that can positively affect the offender's process, as well as their approach towards the offender who has been under the "Probation" or "Treatment and Probation" is important (7). Nonetheless, some

offenders who have been delivered "Probation" continue the process with electronic tagging. Many problems may occur during the tagging process due to the acute problems caused by the offenders. The ways followed by the personnel while dealing with the crises, solutions to the problems, and making decisions on the possible new situations becomes crucial (8,9). It is reported in the studies conducted, especially in this field, that experts with training and practices in the multidisciplinary team during the probation process are reported to highly contribute to the offenders in the framework of human rights (10,11).

It is required a meticulous evaluation to be able to work with the offenders on their probation process. Many studies aimed to determine the importance of the experts' ability to produce reasonable solutions to the problems occurring in the process. It is indicated that the decisions made by experts and other personnel working on the probation process help offenders to have a qualified process. Thus, they will not commit the crime again and their social adaptation to society will be affected positively (12,13). According to another study, the offenders' crime rate has been detected, and "what it will work" is researched according to the risk level on effectively benefiting for problem-solving and rehabilitation process. While the rate of turning into crime is 46% in the literature, it is shown that this rate reduces in the %64 when trained personnel come up with an advanced approach to the offender (14-16).

According to Yıldız and Tiryaki (2015), it is believed that probation personnel have great faith in the Probation System. Thanks to this system, the offenders are more beneficial to themselves and society without drifting apart from their social environment (17). During this process, the offenders are acknowledged with various psychosocial practices about their criminogenic needs, their adaptation to the process and if they tend to commit the crime again (7) with the help of the counseling services, and raised awareness and the possibility of committing the crime again is aimed to be reduced (17).

It is estimated that within the scope of the probation system that has been implemented with the help of the 2005 legislations, in Turkey, approximately 5.895.327 "Treatment and Probation Provision (TCK 191)" were confirmed, which was covered by 409.968 children and 5. 485.359 adults between 2013-2018 (18). In such cases where intense and high numbers of files are included in the process, how the probation personnel react to the situation may also affect their further decisions on the individual's condition. As for making new decisions and practicing them fully, the individual's problem-solving skills become involved. Thus, it becomes more important than the relationship between individuals' problem-

solving and decision-making strategies is evaluated. It must not be forgotten that, especially for the offenders who have been included in the process for substance use or possession and the personnel (experts and officials) working in the electronic tagging team, the personnel's approach to the crises that can happen, and the quality of the decisions made may seriously affect the offender's conviction and an individual's life afterward. The personnel have a key role on the offender's lives. Therefore, reducing the possibility of the offender to commit the crime again and the adaptation of them to society becomes extremely important in the responsibility of the probation personnel.

This study aims to evaluate the decision-making strategies and problem-solving skills of the probation personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana, fulfilling a very important legal responsibility.

2. Materials And Methods

The content of this study, which is a depictive study, is formed by the study group, which included 109 personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and volunteered for this study, and the comparison group, which included 103 civil servants (e.g., principal, teacher and official) working at high schools affiliated with the Ministry of Education (at public institutions). However, 26 of the personnel from the study group and 16 civil servants from the comparison group who were on the leave or were on an assignment in another institution or filled the application form incorrectly could not be included in the present study. Thus, 83 Probation personnel and 87 personnel working at other public institutions, who filled the form completely, accepted to take part in this study on a voluntary basis and they were included. The civil servants who were determined as the comparison group were matched using the crosstab method with the individuals' age, gender and level of education in the study group.

In the data collecting process, face-to-face meetings were held with the civil servants who accepted to take part in this study, and they were asked to fill the sociodemographic data collecting form and the other two forms. This process was organized as a face-to-face meeting not to halt the workflow. Filling the forms approximately took 15 minutes.

In the statistical analysis of the data, SPSS 22.0 package programme were used and all analyses in this study were completed in the confidence interval of 95%.

All the necessary permissions and approval were taken from the Ministry of Justice General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses with the help of the documents prepared in the format that the institution deman-

ded to be able to conduct this descriptive study. After the necessary permits were taken, the data were collected and then, after it was turned into an essay, this study was sent to the Directorate to take the second necessary permits to be able to be published.

Data Collecting Tools

Sociodemographic Data Collecting Form

Sociodemographic data collecting form was prepared to collect sociodemographic data of the Probation personnel, such as age, level of education, marital status, number of children, the period of service and compassion towards the job.

Decision Strategies Scale (DSS)

Individuals in the decision-making process under an experience or a problem may use different strategies, such as following their intuitive feelings, postponing deciding, being fatalist, overthinking the decision, and avoiding taking risks (19). According to Kuzgun (1993), the strategies that individuals are using in the decision-making process are composed of four categories:

-Impulsive Decision-making: Deciding without enough consideration on the options.

-Logical Decision-making: Deciding by gathering information on every option and examining the advantages and disadvantages of the options.

-Indecisive Decision-making: Changing their decisions often.

-Independent Decision-making: Self deciding without getting affected by other's opinions (19).

DSS is a Likert scale with 40 items designed by Kuzgun (1993) to investigate the decision-making types of individuals. The scale has four different subscales as impulsive decision-making, logical decision-making, independent decision-making, and indecisive decision-making, and each subscale includes 10 items. The scale is calculated with scores between 1-5 and it can be scored at least 10 and most 50 based on each subscale. When the scores are added to the subscales, it is thought to be more easily adopted the decision-making style related to that subscale (19).

The Cronbach alpha coefficients of the DSS subscales were as follows: impulsive: 0.74, logical: 0.72, independent: 0.72, Indecisive: 0.70. To test its validity, the scale was administered to groups whose decision-making strategies were predicted to be different, and the distinctiveness of the scale was observed. For this purpose, the tool was administered to high school students to observe the difference between genders for the decision-making strategies, to adults to determine the difference between them and young, and to doctors, lawyers, officers and theatre

artists who face decision-making situations frequently to observe the differences between them. The findings showed that the tool validated these groups as expected. As a result of the reliability and validity studies of it, DSS is the first and the only scale in Turkey developed for the determination of decision-making strategies of individuals (19).

Problem Solving Inventory (PSI)

PSI is a scale developed for the individual to perceive themselves on the determination of their own problem-solving skills (20). It was developed by Heppner and Petersen (1982) and adaptation studies to Turkey were conducted by Şahin, Şahin and Heppner (1993). It is a Likert scale composed of 35 items and calculated with the scores between 1-6. In the scale, the numbers mean as follows: “1”: I always act this way, “2”: I usually act this way, “3”: I often act this way, “4”: I sometimes act this way, “5” I rarely act this way, “6”: I never act this way. When scoring, items numbered 9,22, and 29 were excluded from scoring. Items numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 21, 25, 26, 30 and 34 are the reversely scored items. It can be scored at least 32 and most 192 based on the scale. An increase in the total scores shows that the individuals perceived themselves as inadequate in terms of problem-solving skills (20-22).

Ethical Declaration

Ethical approval was obtained from Çukurova University Non-Interventional Clinical Research Ethical Committee with date 2019 and number 96-35, and Helsinki Declaration rules were followed to conduct this study.

3. Results

Table 1. Sociodemographic variables of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in this study as a comparison group

Variables	Study Group (n=83)	Comparison Group (n=87)
	N (%)	N (%)
Gender Female	23(27,7)	27(31,0)
Male	60(72,3)	60(69,0)
Age Group 23-34	25(30,1)	30(34,5)
35-41	40(48,2)	36(41,4)
42-63	18(21,7)	21(24,1)

Level of Education	1(1,2)	1(1,1)
Primary School	3(3,6)	1(1,1)
High School	5(6,0)	6(6,9)
Associate Degree	65(78,3)	66(75,9)
Bachelor's Degree	9(10,8)	13(14,9)
Graduate		
Position Civil	68(81,9)	77(88,5)
Servant	15(18,1)	10(11,5)
Expert		
Marita Status Single	14(16,9)	24(27,6)
Married	68(81,9)	62(71,3)
Divorced	1(1,2)	1(1,1)
Number of Children Childless	25(30,1)	30(34,5)
One child	21(25,3)	18(20,7)
Two children or more	37(44,6)	39(44,8)
Period of Service	13(15,7)	1(1,1)
Less than 1 year	43(51,8)	22(25,3)
1-5 years	8(9,6)	31(35,6)
6-10 years	19(22,9)	33(37,9)
11 years or more		
Compassion for the Job I don't like it	15(18,1)	3(3,4)
I like a little	23(27,7)	20(23,0)
I like it	38(45,8)	43(49,4)
I love it	7(8,4)	21(24,1)
Wish to Keep Working at the Same Institution I want	46(55,4)	60(69,0)
I don't want	37(44,6)	27(31,0)

As shown in Table 1, 60 (72,3%) of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate consists of the females, while 23 (27,7%) of them consists of males. The findings showed that 40 (48,2%) of the personnel in this study group were between the age of 35-41, 25 of them (30,1%) were between the age of 23-34, and 18 of them (21,7%) were between the age of 42-63. When the level of education of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate was analysed, 65 (78,3%) personnel had bachelor's degree. The largest group of the positions (job titles) consisted of 59 (71,1%) individuals and civil servants. When the marital status of the personnel in the study group was examined, 68 (81,9%) of them were married and 14 (16,9%) of them were single. When the number of children of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate was analysed, 37 (44,6%) of them had two or more children, while 21 (25,3%) of them had one child. When the period of service of the personnel in this study group were examined, 43 (51,8%) of them were working for 1-5 years, 19 (22,9%) of them were working

for 11 years and more, and 13 (15,7%) of them were working for less than one year. Concerning the compassion towards the job of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate, the findings showed that 38 (45,8%) of them liked their job and 46 (55,4%) of them wanted to stay at the institution that they were working.

The civil servants in the comparison group, who accepted to take part in this study, consisted of 60 males (69%) and 27 females (31%). The findings showed that 36 (41,4%) of the civil servants in the comparison group were between the age of 35-41, 30 of them (34,5%) were between the age of 23-34, and 21 of them (24,1%) were between the age of 42-63. When the level of education of the civil servants in the comparison group was analysed, it was determined that 66 (75,9%) of them had a Bachelor's degree, 13 (14,9%) of them had a graduate level of educa-

tion, and six (6,9%) of them had an Associate degree. The largest group of the positions (job titles) were formed by 77 (88,5%) individuals and civil servants. When the marital status of the civil servants in the comparison group was examined, it indicated that 62 (71,3%) of them were married and 24 (27,6%) of them were single. When the number of children of the civil servants in the comparison group was analysed, 39 (44,6%) of them had two or more children, while 30 (34,5%) of them did not have children. When the period of service of the civil servants in the comparison group were examined, 33 (37,9%) of them were working for 11 years and more, 31 (35,6%) of them were working for 6-10 years, and 22 (25,3%) of them were working for 1-5 years. Concerning the compassion towards the job of the civil servants, 43 (49,4%) of them liked their job, and 60 (69%) of them wanted to stay in the institution that they were already been working.

Table 2. Score average distributions, of the study and comparison groups, depending on the gender, of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in this study as a comparison group

GENDER	Groups	Female (n=50)		Male (n=120)	
		Study group female (n=23)	Comparison group female (n=27)	Study group male (n=60)	Comparison group male (n=60)
		±S.D.	Med.[Min-Max]	±S.D.	Med.[Min-max]
Problem-solving	Study	63,78±10,57	62 [39-83]	78,70±16,88	78,50 [42-130]
	Comparison	69,62±16,78	68 [43-112]	87,40±18,19	91 [51-117]
Statistical analysis* Probability		t=-1,495 p=0,142		t=-2,715 p=0,008	
Logical Decision-making	Study	28,52±4,85	29 [17-36]	28,30±4,80	28 [19-37]
	Comparison	21,40±5,96	19 [14-36]	25,78±6,63	27 [15-38]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-3,843 p<0,001		Z=-1,919 p= 0,055	
Making Intuitive Decisions	Study	19,30±3,83	19 [13-27]	19,56±5,05	19 [11-33]
	Comparison	19,07±3,62	19 [12-27]	20,26±4,52	20 [12-30]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-0,108 p=0,914		Z=-0,944 p= 0,345	
Making Decisions Dependently	Study	20,43±3,24	20 [13-29]	21,23±2,83	21 [14-28]
	Comparison	21,40±3,02	21 [16-30]	21,81±3,32	21,50 [14-29]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-1,088 p=0,276		Z=-0,942 p=0,346	
Indecisive Decision-making	Study	16,43±3,44	15 [10-23]	17,66±3,67	17,50 [10-27]
	Comparison	24,14±4,74	26 [16-31]	21,96±6,34	20,50 [14-34]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-4,890 p<0,001		Z=-3,439 p=0,001	

****“Independent Sample-t” test (t-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups with normal distribution, while “Mann-Whitney U” test (Z-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups without normal distribution.**

As shown in Table 2, when female personnel in this study were evaluated based on the gender variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group of the civil servants working at other public institutions, the logical decision-making subscale ($Z = -3,843$; $p < 0,001$) and the indecisive decision-making subscale ($Z = -4,890$; $p < 0,001$) of female personnel were significantly different from the male personnel ($p < 0,05$). The logical decision-making score of female personnel working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly higher than the females in the comparison group, while was significantly lower than the ones in the comparison

group concerning indecisive decision-making.

When male personnel in this study were evaluated based on the gender variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group of the civil servants working at other public institutions, PSI total score ($t = -2,715$; $p = 0,008$) and indecisive decision-making subscale score ($Z = -3,439$; $p = 0,001$) of male personnel were significantly different ($p < 0,05$). The PSI total score and the indecisive decision-making subscale score of male personnel working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly lower than the males in the comparison group.

Table 3. Score distributions of the study and comparison groups, depending on the marital status, of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in this study as a comparison group

MARITAL STATUS	Groups	Single	Married
		±S.D. Med. [Min-Max]	±S.D. Med. [Min- Max]
Problem-solving	Study	72,07±19,89	75,12±16,08
	Comparison	68 [42-110] 82,36±18,71 81 [43-114]	75,50 [39-130] 81,69±19,97 81,50 [43-117]
Statistical analysis		t= -1,872	t= -2,026
Probability		p= 0,061	p= 0,043
Logical Decision-making	Study	28,07±4,89	28,43±4,80
	Comparison	28 [17-37] 24,44±7,07 24 [14-38]	28 [19-37] 24,42±6,63 24,50 [16-38]
Statistical analysis		Z= -1,568	Z= -3,525
Probability		p= 0,119	p<0,001
Making Intuitive Decisions	Study	19,27±5,05	19,54±4,69
	Comparison	19 [12-27] 20,80±4,27 21 [13-29]	19 [11-33] 19,53±4,27 19 [12-30]
Statistical analysis		Z=-0,980	Z= -0,138
Probability		p=0,332	p= 0,890
Making Decisions Dependently	Study	22,13±3,46	20,76±2,80
	Comparison	22 [17-29] 21,28±2,98 21 [14-28]	21 [13-28] 21,85±3,33 21,50 [16-30]
Statistical analysis		Z= -0,702	Z=-1,728
Probability		p= 0,489	p=0,084
Indecisive Decision-making	Study	17,93±3,61	17,19±3,65
	Comparison	19 [12-23] 23,04±5,98 23 [15-33]	17 [10-27] 22,48±5,99 21,50 [14-34]
Statistical analysis		Z= -2,465	Z= -4,990
Probability		p= 0,013	p<0,001

“Independent Sample-t” test (t-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups with normal distribution while “Mann-Whitney U” test (Z-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups without normal distribution.

When personnel in this study were evaluated based on the marital status variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group of the civil servants working at other public institutions, among the single personnel, a statistically significant difference was detected on the indecisive decision-making subscale's score average as ($Z = -2,367$; $p = 0,018$) ($p < 0,05$). The indecisive decision-making subscale of the single personnel working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly lower than the ones in the comparison group.

As shown in Table 3, when the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the marital status variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group of the civil servants working at other public institutions, among the married personnel, the PSI total score ($t = -2,076$; $p = 0,040$), the logical decision-making subscale ($Z = -3,525$; $p < 0,001$) and the indecisive decision-making subscale ($Z = -4,990$; $p < 0,001$) were significantly different ($p < 0,05$). The PSI total score average and the indecisive decision-making subscale scores average of the married personnel working at the Directorate of Probation were significantly lower than the ones in the comparison group, while their logical decision-making subscale was significantly higher.

Table 4. Score distributions of the study and comparison groups, depending on the number of children, of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in this study as a comparison group

THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN	Groups	without Child	one Child	two Children or more
		±S.D. Med. [Min-Max]	±S.D. Med. [Min- Max]	±S.D. Med.[Min-Max]
Problem-solving	Study	71,92±17,15	73,90 ±19,15	76,72±15,10
	Comparison	71 [42-110] 87,06±18,15 82,50 [53-117]	72 [39-130] 75,38±17,08 74,50 [43-112]	77 [50-118] 80,89±20,90 81 [43-115]
Statistical analysis* Probability		t= -3,175 p= 0,003	t= -0,256 p= 0,800	t= -0,992 p= 0,325
Logical Decision-making	Study	28,60±4,60	29,47±5,57	27,56±4,41
	Comparison	28 [17-37] 25,10±6,74 25,50 [15-38]	30 [19-36] 21,55±5,70 19,50 [16-33]	27 [20-36] 25,23±6,92 26 [14-38]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z= -2,025 p= 0,043	Z= -3,685 p<0,001	Z= -1,281 p= 0,200
Making Intuitive Decisions	Study	18,76±4,43	19 ±3,96	20,27±5,28
	Comparison	19 [12-27] 20,96±4,98 21 [13-30]	20 [13-29] 19,44±3,12 19 [14-28]	19 [11-33] 19,28±4,09 19 [12-27]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z= -1,568 p= 0,117	Z= -0,326 p= 0,745	Z= -0,433 p= 0,665
Making Decisions Dependently	Study	21,96±3,08	19,76±2,56	21,08±2,89
	Comparison	21 [17-29] 21,50±3,29 22 [14-28]	20 [13-24] 22,38±3,07 22 [17-30]	22 [14-28] 21,51±3,27 21 [16-29]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z= -0,280 p= 0,779	Z= -2,625 p= 0,009	Z= -0,225 p= 0,822
Indecisive Decision-making	Study	17,64±3,35	16,04±3,32	17,83±3,89
	Comparison	18 [12-23] 23±5,99 23 [15-33]	16 [10-23] 24,38±5,45 26,50 [14-32]	17 [11-27] 21,56±6,06 20 [14-34]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z= -3,248 p= 0,001	Z= -4,051 p<0,001	Z= -2,551 p= 0,011

****“Independent Sample-t” test (t-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups with normal distribution while “Mann-Whitney U” test (Z-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups without normal distribution.**

As shown in Table 4, when the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the number or children with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, among the personnel without a child, a statistically significant difference was detected PSI total score ($t = -3,175$; $p = 0,003$), the logical decision-making subscale ($Z = -2,025$; $p = 0,043$) and the indecisive decision-making subscale ($Z = -3,248$; $p = 0,001$) ($p < 0,05$). The logical decision-making score of the personnel without children working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly lower than the females in the comparison group, while significantly higher than the ones in the comparison group in terms of PSI total score and the indecisive decision-making. When the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the number or children variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, among the personnel with one child, the logical decision-making subscale ($Z = -3,525$; $p < 0,001$), the de-

pendent decision-making subscale ($Z = -2,625$; $p = 0,009$) and the indecisive decision-making subscale ($Z = -4,051$; $p < 0,001$) were significantly different concerning the score averages ($p < 0,05$). The dependent decision-making and the indecisive decision-making subscale scores average of the personnel with one child working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly lower than the ones in the comparison group while their logical decision-making subscale was significantly higher. When the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the number or children variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, among the personnel with two or more children, the indecisive decision-making subscale ($Z = -2,551$; $p = 0,011$) were significantly different concerning the score averages ($p < 0,05$). The indecisive decision-making subscale scores average of the personnel with two or more children working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly lower than the ones in the comparison.

Table 5. Score distributions of the study and comparison groups, depending on the level of education, of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in the study as a comparison group

LEVEL OF EDUCATION		Study G. (n=83)	Comparison G. (n=87)	
±S.D.		±S.D.		
Median [Min-Max]		Median [Min- Max]		P
Problem-solving	High school and below	79,56±14,20 76 [59-103]	82,38±14,02 83,50 [51-95]	Z= -0,867 p= 0,423
	Bachelor's degree and above	73,96±17,01 73,50 [39-130]	81,84±20,05 81 [43-117]	Z= -2,500 p= 0,012
		Z= -0,975 p= 0,330	Z= -0,250 p= 0,803	
Logical Decision-making	High school and below	27,78±2,73 28 [24-32]	20±5,66 27 [16-32]	Z= -0,484 p= 0,673
	Bachelor's degree and above	28,43±4,99 28 [17-37]	24,27±6,83 24 [14-38]	Z= -3,883 p< 0,001
		Z= -0,404 p= 0,687	Z= -0,663 p= 0,507	
Making Intuitive Decisions	High school and below	22±5,34 21 [12-30]	18,63±3,70 18,50 [14-26]	Z= -1,551 p= 0,139
	Bachelor's degree and above	19,19±4,60 19 [11-33]	20,03±4,34 19 [12-30]	Z= -1,323 p= 0,186
		Z= -1,740 p= 0,082	Z= -0,877 p= 0,381	
Making Decisions Dependently	High school and below	20,44±2,51 20 [16-24]	20,38±5,01 19,50 [15-30]	Z= -0,437 p= 0,673
	Bachelor's degree and above	21,08±3,01 21 [13-29]	21,82±3,01 22 [16-29]	Z= -1,408 p= 0,159
		Z= -0,583 p= 0,560	Z= -1,277 p= 0,202	
Indecisive Decision-making	High school and below	18,67±3,39 19 [15-25]	20,25±4,65 20 [15-29]	Z= -0,776 p= 0,481
	Bachelor's degree and above	17,17±3,65 17 [10-27]	22,87±6,04 23 [14-34]	Z= -5,711 p < 0,001
		Z= -1,206 p= 0,228	Z= -1,089 p= 0,276	

As shown in Table 5, when the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the level of education variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, among the personnel with undergraduate and graduate degrees, the PSI total score ($Z=-2,500$; $p=0,012$), the logical decision-making subscale ($Z=-3,883$; $p<0,001$) and the indecisive decision-making

subscale ($Z=-5,711$; $p<0,001$) were significantly different ($p<0,05$). The indecisive decision-making subscale scores average of the personnel working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly lower than the ones in the comparison group while their logical decision-making subscale was significantly higher.

Table 6. Score distributions of the study and comparison groups, depending on the positions, of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in this study as a comparison group

POSITION	Groups	Civil Servant		Expert	
		±S.D.	Med. [Min-Max]	±S.D.	Med. [Min- Max]
Problem-solving	Study	75,19±17,72	74 [39-130]	71,73±11,25	73 [57-93]
	Comparison	80,12±19,75	80 [43-117]	95,40±10,59	95 [76-114]
Statistical analysis* Probability		t=-1,578 p=0,115		t=-5,336 p<0,001	
Logical Decision-making	Study	28,83±4,69	28,50 [19-37]	26,20±4,76	27 [17-33]
	Comparison	24,64±6,87	24 [14-38]	22,70±5,29	21,50 [17-29]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-3,702 p<0,001		Z=-1,589 p= 0,112	
Intuitive Decision-making	Study	19,38±4,88	19 [12-33]	20,00±4,07	22 [11-27]
	Comparison	19,20±3,90	19 [12-29]	25,20±3,35	25,50 [19-30]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-0,129 p=0,897		Z=-2,930 p= 0,003	
Making Decisions Dependently	Study	21,16±2,94	21 [13-28]	20,33±3,01	20 [17-29]
	Comparison	21,58±3,18	21 [14-30]	22,50±3,62	23 [17-27]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-0,596 p=0,551		Z=-1,480 p=0,139	
Indecisive Decision-making	Study	17,51±3,71	17 [10-27]	16,46±3,24	15 [12-23]
	Comparison	22,32±5,89	21 [14-34]	25,10±6,19	28 [15-32]
Statistical analysis Probability		Z=-4,717 p<0,001		Z=-3,239 p=0,001	
**“Independent Sample-t” test (t-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups with normal distribution while “Mann-Whitney U” test (Z-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups without normal distribution.					

As shown in Table 6, when the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the positions at work variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, among the personnel working as an official, the logical decision-making subscale ($Z=-3,702$; $p<0,001$) and the indecisive decision-making subscale ($Z=-3,239$; $p=0,001$) were significantly different ($p<0,05$). The indecisive decision-making subscale scores average of the officials working at the Directorate of Probation was significantly lower than the ones in the

comparison group while their logical decision-making subscale was significantly higher. When the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the positions at work variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, among the personnel working as an expert, PSI total score ($t=-2,715$; $p=0,008$), the intuitive decision-making subscale ($Z=-2,930$; $p=0,003$) and the indecisive decision-making subscale ($Z=-3,439$; $p=0,001$) were significantly different ($p<0,05$). The PSI total score ($t=-2,715$; $p=0,008$), the intuitive decision-

making subscale and indecisive decision-making subscale scores average of the experts working at the Directorate of Probation were significantly lower than the ones in the comparison group.

As shown in Table 7, when the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the service years variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, PSI total scores of the personnel working for 6-10 were significantly different ($p < 0,05$). Accordingly, the personnel working at the Directorate of Probation had better problem-solving skills than the ones in the comparison group. Besides, when the comparison group was evaluated by themselves based on the service years variable, there was a statistically significant difference between service year groups ($F = 7,744$; $p < 0,001$). According to comparisons made using the Bonferroni correction, carried out to determine the group that this significant difference derived from, there was a statistically significant difference between the PSI total scores of the personnel working for 6-10 years and the ones working for 1-5 years and more than 11 years ($p < 0,001$).

When the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the service years variable with DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, the logical decision-making subscale score averages of the personnel working for 1-5 years were significantly different ($Z = -2,127$; $p = 0,033$). When the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the service years variable with DSS subscale score averages regarding the comparison group, the indecisive decision-making subscale score averages of the personnel working for 1-5 years ($Z = -2,455$; $p = 0,014$), 6-10 years ($Z = -3,033$; $p = 0,002$) and 11 years and more ($Z = -3,558$; $p < 0,001$) were statistically significant. Besides, when the comparison group was evaluated by themselves based on the service years variable, there was a statistically significant difference between service year groups ($F = 3,498$; $p = 0,019$). According to comparisons made using the Bonferroni correction, carried out to determine the group that this significant difference derived from, any significant difference among the groups could not be found ($p > 0,05$).

As shown in Table 8, when the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the compassion towards the job variable with PSI total score and DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, PSI total scores of the personnel who answered, "I don't like it" ($t = -2,202$; $p = 0,003$), "I like it a little" ($t = -3,041$; $p = 0,004$) and "I like it" ($t = -2,177$; $p = 0,031$) were significantly different.

Accordingly, the personnel working at the Directorate of Probation had better problem-solving skills than the ones in the comparison group. Besides, when the comparison group was evaluated by themselves based on the compassion towards the job variable, there was a statistically significant difference between compassion towards the job groups ($F = 7,945$; $p < 0,001$). According to comparisons made with the Bonferroni correction, carried out to determine the group that this significant difference derived from, that there was a statistically significant difference between the PSI total scores of the personnel who answered, "I like it a little" and the ones who answered, "I like it" and "I love it" ($p < 0,001$).

When the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the compassion towards the job variable with DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, the logical decision-making subscale score averages of the personnel who answered, "I like it" ($t = 3,682$; $p = 0,008$), "I like it a little" ($t = 3,017$; $p = 0,033$) and "I love it" ($t = 3,045$; $p = 0,008$) were significantly different ($Z = -2,127$; $p = 0,033$). Besides, when the comparison group was evaluated by themselves based on the compassion towards the job variable, there was a statistically significant difference between compassion towards the job groups ($F = 4,346$; $p = 0,007$). According to comparisons made with the Bonferroni correction, carried out to determine the group that this significant difference derived from, that there was a statistically significant difference on the verge between the logical decision-making subscale score average of the personnel who answered, "I like it" and the ones who answered, "I like it a little" and "I don't like it" ($p = 0,062$). When the personnel in this study were evaluated based on the compassion towards the job variable with DSS subscale scores regarding the comparison group, there was a statistically significant difference in the indecisive decision-making subscale score averages of all groups. Besides, when the comparison group was evaluated by themselves based on the compassion towards the job variable, there was a statistically significant difference among the groups ($F = 9,537$; $p < 0,001$). According to comparisons made with the Bonferroni correction, carried out to determine the group that this significant difference derived from, there was a statistically significant difference on the verge between the indecisive decision-making subscale score average of the personnel who answered, "I don't like it" and the ones who answered, "I like it" ($p = 0,010$).

Table 7. Score distributions of the study and comparison groups, depending on the period of service, of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in this study as a comparison group

	PERIOD OF SERVICE	Study G. (n=83)	Comparison G. (n=87)	
		±S.D. Median [Min-Max]	±S.D. Median [Min- Max]	
Problem-solving	Less than 1 year	72,92±11,44 73 [55-92]	77,50±2,12 77,50 [76-79]	Z = -0,681 0,496
	1-5 years	75,35 ±19,57 73 [39-130]	80,81±16,26 82 [43-111]	Z = -1,509 0,131
	6-10 years	75±18,36 69,50 [57-110]	93,22±19,85 102 [51-117]	Z = -2,227 0,025
	11 years and more	73,74±12,66 76 [50-93]	72,18±16,25 74 [43-111]	Z = -0,333 0,739
		F= 0,087 p= 0,967	F= 7,744 < 0,001	
Logical Decision-making	Less than 1 year	30,15±4,43 30 [24-35]	29,50±0,70 29,50 [29-30]	Z = -0,172 0,863
	1-5 years	28,58±4,94 29 [19-37]	25±7,18 26 [15-38]	Z = -2,127 0,033
	6-10 years	25,25±4,59 26,50 [17-31]	22,51±6,43 20 [15-38]	Z = -1,329 0,184
	11 years and more	27,95±4,40 27 [23-36]	25,54±6,60 27 [14-36]	Z = -0,972 0,331
		F= 1,865 p= 0,142	F= 1,605 p= 0,194	
Intuitive Decision-making	Less than 1 year	17,46±3,55 17 [12-24]	24,50±6,36 24,50 [20-29]	Z = -1,701 0,089
	1-5 years	19,98 ±4,44 19 [11-33]	19,76±3,64 20 [12-28]	Z = -0,201 0,841
	6-10 years	21±3,25 21 [16-27]	20,81±4,61 20 [13-30]	Z = -0,279 0,780
	11 years and more	19,16±3,95 18 [13-26]	18,85±4,06 19 [12-27]	Z = -0,191 0,849
		F= 1,265 p= 0,292	F= 1,966 p= 0,125	

Making Decisions Dependently	Less than 1 year	21,92±3,57 22 [17-29]	19,50±3,54 19,50 [17-22]	Z = -0,948 0,343
	1-5 years	21,12±3,01 21 [13-27]	22,14±2,95 22 [18-30]	Z = -0,943 0,346
	6-10 years	21,50±3,50 21,50 [17-27]	21,71±3,64 22 [14-29]	Z = -0,105 0,917
	11 years and more	19,95±1,90 20 [16-22]	21,51±3,03 21 [16-28]	Z = -1,760 0,078
		F= 1,339 p= 0,268	F= 0,469 p= 0,705	
Indecisive Decision-making	Less than 1 year	16,38±2,93 17 [11-20]	15,50±0,70 15,50 [15-16]	Z = -0,684 0,494
	1-5 years	18,28±3,79 18 [10-27]	21,90±5,39 21 [14-32]	Z = -2,455 0,014
	6-10 years	16,50±4,57 16 [10-23]	25±6,21 27 [14-34]	Z = -3,033 0,002
	11 years and more	16,16±2,87 15 [12-23]	21,33±5,50 20 [14-31]	Z = -3,558 < 0,001
		F= 2,153 p= 0,100	F= 3,498 p= 0,019	

4. Discussion

This study aimed to evaluate decision-making strategies and problem-solving skills of the Probation personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse.

At present, the offenders in their probation process are exposed to a risk evaluation analysis of probation personnel concerning their criminological needs, their adaptation of the process and their possibility of committing a crime again (7). With the help of these analyses performed by probation personnel, the improvements of the offender during the process, their adaptation of the process and whether they will be in the social adaptation process after the probation is ended, are determined and the convenience of their probation provision are detected. In this regard, the personnel play a key role in several decisions on the offenders and may have to solve problems that can be encountered during the probation process (23-25). In this respect, according to the results of this study, deci-

sion-making strategies and problem-solving skills between the personnel working at the probation directorate and the ones working at other public institutions are compared concerning sociodemographic variables, and as a result of the analysis, the findings show that there are statistically significant differences between them in respect to gender, department (position at work), marital status, number of children, service years and compassion towards the job.

According to the results of this study, when the probation directorate personnel are evaluated concerning the comparison group of the civil servants working at other public institutions in terms of the decision-making skills, there is a statistically significant difference between the female personnel working at the probation directorate and the ones in the comparison group in terms of logical decision-making subscale and indecisive decision-making subscale. Besides, when the male personnel working at the probation directorate and the ones in the comparison group are compared, there is a statistically significant difference in terms of problem-solving skills and indecisive

decision-making subscale score averages. Therefore, logical decision-making subscale and indecisive decision-making subscale score averages of the male and female personnel working at the probation directorate are higher than the ones' score averages in the comparison group. According to Izgar and Altınok's (2013) study conducted with the civil servants working as school principals, the findings show that there is a statistically significant difference between the decision-making scores of the female principals and the female personnel who are not principals (26). In this study, a significant difference for both the probation personnel and the comparison group is detected concerning gender variable (Table 2). Since probation services contain both the execution of court's orders and the rehabilitation of the offender, they are quite stressful practices run for multiple objects. Therefore, concerning affecting another individual's (offender) life severely, the decisions and problem-solving skills of the male and female personnel working at the Probation Directorate are more delicate and critical tasks than the ones working at other public institutions (27).

When the probation personnel are compared to the comparison group according to the marital status variable, both single and married personnel working at the Probation Directorate are determined to have a statistically significant difference with the comparison group working at other public institutions (Table 3). Regarding the single personnel, the indecisive decision-making subscale score averages of the probation personnel are detected to be lower than the ones in the comparison group. Nonetheless, PSI total scores and indecisive decision-making subscale score averages of the married probation personnel are lower, while their logical decision-making subscale score averages are higher than the civil servants in the comparison group. In this respect, taking part in the probation process, as the nature of the working area, may affect the problem-solving skills and decision-making strategies.

When the civil servants are examined according to the number of children variable and the probation personnel are compared to the comparison group, many statistically significant differences between the probation personnel and the personnel in the comparison group are determined (Table 4). It is detected that the probation personnel without children have lower PSI total score averages than the comparison group, and there is a statistically significant difference between their logical decision-making subscale and indecisive decision-making subscale score averages. Besides, the logical decision-making subscale score averages of the probation personnel are significantly higher, while their dependent decision-making

and indecisive decision-making subscale score averages are lower than the comparison group. On the other hand, when the personnel with two or more children are compared, there is a statistically significant difference between the probation personnel and the ones in the comparison group only on the indecisive decision-making subscale score averages. In some studies in the literature, conducted with the civil servants based on the number of children, it is claimed that the problem-solving skills do not alter (28). The results of this study prove the opposite. An explanation for this finding can be that the probation personnel have to be more delicate on the decisions made for offenders and solve many delicate problems since they need to make more decisions in the justice system during their communication process with the offenders (29).

When the probation personnel are compared to the comparison group according to the positions at work variable, both officials and experts working at the Probation Directorate are determined to have a statistically significant difference with the comparison group working at other public institutions (Table 6). Accordingly, the logical decision-making subscale score averages of the probation personnel are significantly higher, while their dependent decision-making and indecisive decision-making subscale score averages are lower than the comparison group. On the other hand, the experts working at the Probation Directorate can be said to have more advanced problem-solving skills than the ones in the comparison group. However, intuitive decision-making (more individual, impulsive behaviour) and indecisive decision-making of them are lower than the experts working at other public institutions. Because more structured methods/evaluations are used during the meetings with the offender, it is evaluated as an expected result that the officials, who have contact with the offenders in the probation process, show less indecisive behaviours (24). According to Izgar and Altınok's (2013) study, the individuals' who have expert status use of logical decision-making strategies may reduce their indecisive and impulsive behaviours, originated from cognitive functions, such as receiving information and analysing them (26). Similarly, in a Canadian study based on a risk-need-responsivity model, aiming to evaluate the training of probation personnel, the training is effective both on the personnel and the offenders. The results of the study also emphasize the significance of continuous skills improvement. It is also observed that the probation personnel having clinical feedback and taking part in the monthly meetings and refreshment training can show the skills learned from the training and focus better on the important problems (e.g., crime motives) in their meetings (30,31).

Table 8. Score distributions of the study and comparison groups, depending on the compassion towards the job, of the personnel working at the Probation Directorate of Adana Courthouse and the civil servants taking part in this study as a comparison group

	COMPASSION TOWARDS JOB	Study G. (n=83)	Comparison G. (n=87)	
		±S.D. Median [Min-Max]	±S.D. Median [Min- Max]	
Problem-solving	I don't like it	76,13±21,93 75 [39-130]	105±8,18 107 [96-112]	t= -2,202 0,003
	I like it a little	80,95 ±14,67 80 [42-108]	95,10±15,80 94 [53-117]	t= -3,041 0,004
	I like it	70,47±15,32 68 [48-118]	78,55±17,79 79 [43-114]	t= -2,177 0,031
	I love it	72,42±13,95 72 [54-93]	72,80±19,04 68 [48-112]	t= -0,049 0,956
		F= 2,030 0,116	F= 7,945 < 0,001	
Logical Decision-making	I don't like it	28,40±5,38 29 [19-37]	16,66±0,57 17 [16-17]	t= 3,682 0,008
	I like it a little	27,43±4,03 27 [20-36]	22,10±7,30 18 [15-38]	t= 3,017 0,033
	I like it	28,55±5,23 28 [17-37]	26,62±6,30 27 [14-38]	t= 1,484 0,211
	I love it	30,28±3,14 29 [27-36]	23,23±5,79 23 [16-33]	t= 3,045 0,008
		F= 0,675 0,570	F= 4,346 0,007	
Intuitive Decision-making	I don't like it	19,73±4,26 19 [14-26]	19±3,60 18 [16-23]	t= 0,277 0,721
	I like it a little	20,34 ±4,87 20 [11-29]	20,55±4,69 20,50 [13-29]	t= -0,138 0,893
	I like it	19,05±5,18 19 [12-33]	20,37±4,11 19 [12-30]	t= -1,275 0,092
	I love it	18,57±2,14 18 [16-22]	18,42±4,21 18 [12-27]	t= 0,116 0,810
		F= 0,453 0,716	F= 1,206 0,313	
Making Decisions Dependently	I don't like it	20,73±3,43 21 [13-27]	24,66±4,04 24 [21-29]	t= -1,770 0,120
	I like it a little	21,65±2,90 22 [16-28]	21,20±3,66 21,50 [14-26]	t= 0,451 0,854
	I like it	20,78±2,91 20,50 [14-29]	21,74±2,96 21 [16-30]	t= -14,59 0,183
	I love it	20,71±2,56 20 [17-24]	21,61±3,21 21 [17-28]	t= -0,603 0,748
		F= 0,490 0,690	F= 1,014 0,391	
Indecisive Decision-making	I don't like it	16,06±3,15 16 [10-22]	30,33±3,21 29 [28-34]	t= -7,142 0,007
	I like it a little	18,21±3,77 18 [12-27]	26,85±5,58 29 [15-33]	t= -6,005 <0,001
	I like it	17,34±3,72 17 [10-27]	20,23±4,92 18 [14-31]	t= -2,946 0,017
	I love it	17±3,51 15 [14-22]	22,47±5,63 21 [14-31]	t= -2,402 0,019
		F= 1,083 0,361	F= 9,537 <0,001	

**“Independent Sample-t” test (t-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups with normal distribution while “Mann-Whitney U” test (Z-table value) statistics are used for the comparison of two independent groups without normal distribution.

When the probation personnel are compared to the comparison group according to the service years variable, the personnel working at the Probation Directorate for 1-5 years have a statistically significant difference with the comparison group working at other public institutions ($Z = -2,12$; $p = 0,033$) (Table 7). According to a study conducted by Aslanyürek Zorlu (2014), the service years of probation experts and emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal success emotions are compared, and a statistically significant difference between them is detected (32). Also, in Atameriç's (2012) study conducted with the teacher, the service years of the teachers do not influence the exhaustion (33). In Demir's (2010) study on the hospital personnel; on the other hand, the result is consistent (34). Thus, a newly appointed personnel or long service years experiences, and emotions, such as emotional exhaustion, depersonalization that affects the task, which may have a negative effect on the logical decision-making process of the probation personnel are now considered to influence less.

In another study on probation experts conducted by Panknin (2007), they are reported to feel more exhaustion because of the dilemmas that they have gone through on applying laws and providing rehabilitation to the young ones and the lack of participation in their decision-making process (35). Thus, unlike the research results, the service years of the probation personnel at the Probation Directorate do not cover a long time, and this limits to commentate on how the service years of the personnel affect their problem-solving and decision-making skills.

According to the study conducted by Yücel (2019), concerning the results obtained from the probation personnel, internal job satisfaction is higher than the external job satisfaction concerning job satisfaction subscales (internal, external, general). It is also determined that emotional exhaustion and depersonalization levels of the probation personnel are high while their personal success is low regarding the exhaustion subscales (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal success) (36).

When the probation personnel are compared to the comparison group according to the compassion towards the job variable, the probation personnel are determined to have a statistically significant difference with the comparison group (Table 8). Although the probation personnel do not like their job, a significant difference between them and the comparison group is determined concerning problem-solving skills total scores, logical decision-making subscale score averages and indecisive decision-making subscale score averages. As the reason for the probation personnel's higher scores on problem-solving and decision-making strategies than the comparison group, although they do not like their jobs, being a probation

civil servant allows to influence the offenders' lives severely, that is a fragile group since it is both a theoretical and practical profession, and also, probation personnel may have an important responsibility in the eyes of the public since they have critical tasks on the criminal justice system (37,38). However, as the probation personnel who answered, "I like it" or "I love it" have higher problem solving total scores and logical decision-making subscale score averages, it is assumed that the compassion towards the job may be related to inner job satisfaction (2). The density of the job and the number of offenders seen in one day can affect the personnel's way of decision-making, as it affects their motivation. Hence, compassion towards the job may determine if a rehabilitation-oriented and fair judgment can be made during the decision-making process of the offender (39,40).

5. Conclusion And Suggestions

As the education practices on probation services around the world are examined, it can be seen that both academic and in-service training take place. For example, the Correctional Service of Norway Staff Academy have a two-year personnel training programme by NO-KUT (the Norwegian Agency for Quality Assurance in Education), accredited in 2012 (41). In the UK, a good part of probation personnel gain credits depending on the qualifications that they have preciously obtained, or since they have related degrees that requires shorter-term education, they attend a 15-month diploma programme and then, start serving in the related department (42). Personnel-oriented training has a crucial place for the development of probation services in Turkey. For this purpose, 53 training activity took place in 2014 and as a part of the training, 1.820 probation personnel, including execution and protection officials and experts, are trained within the Justice General Directorate of Prisons and Detention Houses (43). It is believed that frequent in-service training and the update of these training for the personnel working at the Probation Directorates can positively affect the decision-making strategies and problem-solving skills. There are studies in the literature directed to the effectiveness of the in-service training for the probation services. For example, in a study aiming to evaluate the training, the case formulation training package is observed to have the potential of recovery and improving rehabilitation plan for the offenders (44). In a Canadian study aiming to evaluate the probation training, based on the risk-need-responsivity model, the training is observed to have positive impacts on the offenders. The results of the study also emphasize the significance of the constant skill improvement. It is also observed that the probation personnel having clinical feedback and taking part in the

monthly meetings and refreshment training can show the skills learned from the training and focus better in the important problems (e.g., crime motives) in their meetings (30). The positive effects of the SEED training have been observed on the personnel in the UK (31).

Another practice that can contribute to the workload management of the personnel is that the personnel are distributed according to their education and experience. In the USA, the newly appointed personnel are responsible for the probation of the relatively non-dangerous offenders. Senior personnel class is a promoted position and includes the personnel working with the offenders who have convicted for substance use, the public scrutiny personnel, and the release control personnel. The release control personnel monitor the offenders released from prison while the public scrutiny personnel oversee the house detention-electronic tagging. Lastly, expert position is also a promoted position and includes violence criminals, sexual criminals, and criminals with mental issues. This practice provides personnel's workload distribution in view of the offender's risk level (45).

Improving personnel's problem-solving and decision-making skills with the help of the training and supervision for civil servants in the probation services are considered to contribute positively to a more fair and rational evaluation of the offenders, and thus, to contribute to the offenders to be successful in the rehabilitation process and the possibility of the repeat of the crime is diminished. Although there are differences in personnel training in probation services around the world, in Turkey, training of the probation personnel is considered to be very important, and personnel training and improvement are supported with the help of many in-service training.

As conclusion, it should not be forgotten that the probation personnel are healthy individuals, and they have critical tasks on the offender's lives with their problem-solving skills and decisions. Therefore, this is considered to be important in terms of the increasing productivity of the probation directorates, and also, providing better service to the offenders who are under the probation.

With the help of this study, in Turkey, as it all around the world, presentation of different practices of probation services can contribute to the future studies on preventing the offenders to turn into crime on reducing the possibility of crime and committing the crime again.

References

1. Denetimli Serbestlik Hizmetleri Kanunu No. 5402, 2005. <http://www.cte-ds.adalet.gov.tr/>. Erişim tarihi: 06.01.2019.
2. Tuncer G, Duru M. İş Doyumu Denetimli Serbestlik Şubelerinde Çalışan Personel Örneği. İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Dergisi. 2011;3(10):115-142.
3. Asthal BS. Türkiye'de Denetimli Serbestlik Hizmetlerinin Geliştirilmesi Projesi Açılış Konuşma Metinleri, İngiltere Ceza Sisteminden Sorumlu Devlet Bakanı Baroness Scotlandof Asthal'ın Konuşma Metni, Adalet Bakanlığı Yayınları, Ankara, Yayın no:2. 2006. T.C. Adalet Bakanlığı Resmi İnternet Sitesi. http://www.cte.adalet.gov.tr/dosyalar/kitap/konusma_kitap.pdf. Erişim tarihi: 19.04.2018
4. Nursal N, Ataç S. Denetimli serbestlik ve yardım sistemi (probation). Ankara: Yetkin; 2006.
5. Töngür AR. Ceza hukukunda yeni boyutlarıyla erteleme [Doktora tezi]. İstanbul: İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Hukuk Anabilim Dalı; 2008.
6. Denetimli Serbestlik Hizmetleri Yönetmeliği. T.C. Resmî Gazete, 28578, 5 Mart 2013. <http://www.resmigazete.gov.tr/eskiler/2013/03/20130305-7.htm> Erişim tarihi: 06.01.2019
7. Lurigio AJ. Probation officer decision-making. In: Bruinsma G, Weisburd D, editors. Encyclopedia of criminology and criminal justice. New York: Springer Reference; 2014. p. 3979-3988.
8. Pekel UN. Hükümlerinin denetiminde ve topluma kazandırılmasında yeni bir yöntem olarak elektronik izleme. Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi. 2012;61(4):1337-1368. https://doi.org/10.1501/Hukfak_0000001692
9. Burrell WD, Gable RS, From BF. Skinner to Spiderman to Martha Stewart: The Past, Present and Future of Electronic Monitoring of Offenders. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 2008;46(3-4):101-118. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509670802143342>
10. IFSW, 2014 Global Definition of Social Work, 2014. Mayıs 2019 tarihinde International Federation of Social Workers. Erişim tarihi: 09.11.2019. <http://ifsw.org/policies/definition-of-social-work/>
11. Kerbs JJ, Jones M, Jolley JM. Discretionary decision making by probation and parole officers. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice.2009;25(4):424-441.
12. Pappozzi M, Gendreau P. An intensive supervision program that worked: Service delivery, professional orientation, and organizational supportiveness. The Prison Journal. 2005;85:445-466. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885505281529>
13. Lowenkamp CT, Flores AW, Koutsenok I, Pearl N. Changing probation officer attitudes: training experience, motivation, and knowledge. Federal Probation. 2013; 77(2):54-58.

14. Andrews DA, Bonta J. The psychology of criminal conduct. New Providence, NJ: Mathew Bender and Company, Inc. 5th. Edition, 2010.
15. Bonta J, Ruge T, Scott T, Bourgon G, Yessine AK. Exploring the black box of community supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 2008;47(3):248–270.
16. Bonta J, et al, 2010. The strategic training initiative in community supervision: risk–need–responsivity in the real world. Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada, User Report 2010-01.
17. Yıldız E, Tiryaki M. Denetimli Serbestlik Sisteminde Meslek Elemanlarının Eğitim ve İyileştirme Sürecinde Yaşadığı Sorunlar ve Çözüm Yolları. *Türkiye’de Denetimli Serbestlik 10. Yıl Uluslararası Sempozyumu*, 8-10 Aralık, 2015;38-144.
18. Ceza ve Tevkifevleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Denetimli Serbestlik Müdürlüklerine İnfaz İçin Gelen Karar Sayılarının Dağılımı <http://www.cte.adalet.gov.tr> Erişim tarihi: 06.11.2018.
19. Kuzgun Y. Karar Stratejileri Ölçeği: Geliştirilmesi ve Standardizasyonu. VII. Ulusal Psikoloji Kongresi Bilimsel Çalışmaları. Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği; 1993. s. 161-170.
20. Ersever HÖ. Karar verme becerileri kazandırma programının ve etkileşim grubu deneyiminin üniversite öğrencilerinin karar verme stilleri üzerindeki etkileri [Doktora Tezi]. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü; 1996.
21. Heppner PP, Petersen CH. The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. *Journal of counseling psychology*. 1982;29(1):66.
22. Şahin N, Şahin NH, Heppner PP. Psychometric Properties of the Problem Solving Inventory in a Group of Turkish University Students, *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 1993;4(17):379–396.
23. Lurigio AJ, Carroll JS. Probation Officers’ Schemata of Offenders: Content, Development, and Impact on Treatment Decisions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1985;48(5):1112.
24. Denetimli Serbestlik Bürosu Gözlem İşlemleri, 2016 http://www.megep.meb.gov.tr/mte_program_modul/moduller/Denetimli%20Serbestlik%20Bürosu%20Gözlem%20İşlemleri.pdf Erişim tarihi: Erişim tarihi: 06.01.2019.
25. Décarpes P, Durnescu I, editors. Probation and community sanctions. *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. New York: Springer Reference; 2014.
26. Izgar G, Altınok V. Okul Yöneticilerinin Karar Verme Stratejileri. *Bayburt Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*. 2013;8(2):41-55.
27. Troy A, Ogilvie J, Stewart A. Accessibility and Perceived Efficacy of Programs for the Assistance of Adult Indigenous Offenders. Griffith University, Queensland Australia: AIJA: 2010.
28. Demirtaş H, Dönmez B. Secondary School Teachers’ Perceptions About Their Problem Solving Abilities. *Journal of the Faculty of Education*. 2008;9(16):177-198.
29. Kerbs JJ, Jones M, Jolley JM. Discretionary Decision Making by Probation and Parole Officers: The Role of Extralegal Variables as Predictors of Responses to Technical Violations. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 2009;25(4):424-441.
30. Bonta J, Bourgon G, Ruge T, Scott TL, Yessine AK, Gutierrez L, Li J. An Experimental Demonstration of Training Probation Officers in Evidence-based Community Supervision. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 2011;38(11):1127-1148.
31. National Offender Management Service 2013, Analytical Summary (https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/224308/probation-views-seed-pilot.pdf) Erişim tarihi: 06.01.2019.
32. Aslanyürek Zorlu Ş. Denetimli Serbestlik Uzmanlarının Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri, [Yüksek Lisans Tezi] Hacettepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara; 2014. s. 74.
33. Atameriç A. İşyerindeki Stres Düzeyinin Çalışanların Tükenmişlik Algıları Üzerine Etkisi, [Yüksek Lisans Tezi] İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara; 2012. s. 118
34. Demir S. Ankara Üniversitesi Tıp Fakültesi Hastaneleri Çalışanlarının Tükenmişlik ve İş Doyumu Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi], Atılım Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara; 2010. s. 66.
35. Panknin S. The role of Youth Probation Officers and Their View on The Current Juvenile Justice System, [Master’s of Science Thesis]. Simon Fraser University, School of Criminology Germany; 2007, s. 7.
36. Yücel İD. Denetimli Serbestlik Personelinin ve Madde Kullanan Denetimli Serbestlik Yararlanıcılarının Rehabilitasyon Uygulamalarında Yaşadıkları Güçlüklerin Saptanması-İzmir İli Örneği. [Yüksek Lisans Tezi], Ege Üniversitesi, Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü; 2019.
37. Ada Ş, Dilekmen M, Alver B, Seçer İ. İlk ve ortaöğretim okul yöneticilerinin problem çözme becerilerinin çeşitli değişkenler açısından incelenmesi. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*. 2010;2(2):153-166.
38. Ward G, Kupchik A. What Drives Juvenile Probation Officers? Relating Organizational Contexts, Status Characteristics, and Personal Convictions to Treatment and Punishment Orientations. *Crime & Delinquency*. 2010;56(1):35-69.
39. Skeem J, Emke-Francis P, Eno Loudon J. Probation, Mental Health, and Mandated Treatment: A National Survey. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 2006;33:158–184.
40. Petersilia J, Turner S. Intensive Supervision for High Risk Offenders: Three California Experiments. Ca: RaND Santa Monica; 1990.

41. Confederation of European Probation, 2015. (http://cep-probation.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/03/CEPEuroPris_Amersfoort_Undheim.pdf) Erişim tarihi: 06.01.2019.
42. Ministry of Justice, Government Response to the Justice Committee's Report: The role of the Probation Service <http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/publications/corporatereports/MoJ/government-reponse-role-of-probation-service.pdf> Erişim tarihi: 06.01.2019.
43. Ceza ve Tevkifevleri Başkanlığı Faaliyet Raporu http://www.cte.adalet.gov.tr/menudekiler/raporlar/2014_faliyet_raporu/files/cte-faaliyet%20raporu.pdf Erişim tarihi: 06.01.2019.
44. Brown S, Hedges L, Patel G, Duggan C, The Development of a Case Formulation Training Package for Probation Staff, Forensic Psychiatry. 2013;1(2):1659.
45. Simmons C, Cochran JK, Blount WR. The Effects of Job-Related Stress and Job Satisfaction on Probation Officers' Inclinations to Quit, American Journal of Criminal Justice. 1997;21(2):214-229.