THE EXPERIENCE OF PROBATION IN TURKEY: CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS AND EXPECTATIONS OF PROBATIONERS

Cihan ERTAN*
Meral TİMURTURKAN**
Gönül DEMEZ***
Elife KART****

Abstract

This study presents the findings of the research conducted with 2560 probationers in Turkey, Antalya between the date of September 2014 and April 2017. From the larger data of the research, this study aims to focus on the criminogenic needs, expectations from probation service of probationers as well as on the areas probationers would like to improve themselves which is related to criminogenic needs. In addition, the study seeks to illuminate the relationship of these with some demographical variables. In the light of relevant analysis, the study both presents the general portrait of probation service and probationers in Turkey, Antalya; and suggests some political priorities that may be helpful to improve the quality of probation in Turkey.

Keywords: *Probation in Turkey, criminogenic needs, expectations of probationers.*

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Düzce Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü.

** Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Mehmet Akif Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü.

*** Doç. Dr., Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü.

**** Doç. Dr., Akdeniz Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü.

Türkiye’de Denetimli Serbestlik Deneyimi: Kriminojenik İhtiyaçlar ve Denetimli Serbestlik Altındaki Bireylerin Beklentileri

Öz

Bu çalışma, Eylül 2014 ve Nisan 2017 tarihleri arasında Antalya, Türkiye’de denetimli serbestlik altında bulunan 2560 bireyle yürütülmüş olan bir araştırmanın bulgularına dayanmaktadır. Daha geniş bir araştırma verisinden hareketle bu çalışma, kriminojenik ihtiyaçlar, denetimli serbestlik altındaki bireylerin denetimli serbestlikten beklentileri ve aynı zamanda, kriminojenik ihtiyaçlarla ilintili olarak, denetimli serbestlik altındaki bireylerin kendilerini geliştirmek istedikleri alanlar üzerine odaklanmaktadır. Bununla birlikte çalışma, tüm bu odak noktalarının bazı demografik değişkenlerle olan ilişkisini aydınlatmayı hedeflemektedir. Konu ile ilgili analizler ışığında çalışma hem Antalya, Türkiye’de denetimli serbestlik hizmeti ve ondan yararlanan bireylerin genel bir tasvirini sunmakta hem de Türkiye’de denetimli serbestliğin niteliğini yükseltmeye yardımcı olabilecek bazı politik öncelikler önermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Türkiye’de denetimli serbestlik, kriminojenik ihtiyaçlar, denetimli serbestlik altındaki bireylerin beklentileri.*

INTRODUCTION

Social integration should be understood as a socialisation process in which individuals internalise the norms and values of the society where they live. That process of internalising norms and values can be successful as long as individuals are able to feel as a member of society and thus to feel commitment to it. However, this process would be a failure for some members of a society if they are being excluded from given aspects of social life such as economic, spatial, healthcare areas, housing, etc. Probation service in Turkey, like the other counterparts in the world, has emerged in order to fill the gaps between offenders and their needs that hinder the social reintegration process of offenders. As a result of the new tendencies and paradigm changings in penal system, the probation service in Turkey defines itself, its aims and duties with the phrases of “...to do educational, cultural, scientific, and social studies in order to prevent recidivism and strengthen the factors that may facilitate the reintegration of offenders into society...” (Department of Probation, N.d.). Probation has been enacted since 2005 in Turkey. Until 2016 only those who were sentenced to less than one year or were within the last year of their sentence could benefit from probation service; in 2016, however, the time

required to benefit from it has been extended to the offenders who are within the last two years of their sentences.

There are some studies approaching the probation in Turkey in terms of judicial dimension (Yavuz, 2011; Yavuz, 2012; Yavuz, 2016; Özbek, 2014; Demirbaş, 2016). In addition, it can be seen that some studies did choose probation as their research field, yet they dealt with the issue with only regard to psychiatry and management (Yazıcı et. al., 2015; Evren et. al., 2017; Yüncü et. al., 2016; Tuncer & Duru, 2011). When the literature on probation in Turkey is reviewed, it can be suggested that there are a very limited numbers of studies focusing on the subject from a sociological perspective, considering the issues of social - demography, (re)socialisation, social (re)integration, and social exclusion, in short sociologically. In this sense, this study aims to contribute to the literature and also seeks to pave the way for further studies in this field by providing sociological insight of probation in Turkey with reference to unique data concerning probation service and probationers within the system in general.

This article aims to shed light onto the conception and expectations of the offender who are under probation in Turkey, as mentioned before, based on the limited data of a larger research project carried out with 2560 probationers in Turkey, Antalya between the date of September 2014 and April 2017 which discusses the probation service in Turkey more elaborately in terms of demography, criminal history, recidivism, criminogenic needs and stigmatisation (Demez et. al., 2016; Demez et. al., 2017). That larger research project had some focuses that are different from what this study currently has. This study, as suggested before, aims only to focus on the criminogenic needs, expectations of probationers from the probation service as well as on the areas probationers would like to improve themselves which is related to criminogenic needs, while the larger research project, on what this study is based, relies on the more detailed issues such as types of offending, criminal record, income status, employment and working life.

In this descriptive study, we seek to present the profile of those who are under probation in Turkey with reference to demographical variables, criminogenic needs and expectations of the offenders related to employment, future plans, psychological support etc. From the expectation of offenders and the areas they would like to improve themselves, the study seeks to reveal their

criminogenic needs factors. These factors pointed by the probationers also indicate the relationship between social capital and criminal activity.

METHOD

This study relies on the data of a broader research project, focusing on the processes of resocialization and social reintegration of probationers, brought about with 2560 probationers between September 2014 and April 2017 in Turkey, Antalya.

The Probation Directorate of Antalya was established in 2005 under the authority of Republic of Turkey Ministry of Justice General Directorate of Prison and Detention Houses. The Probation Directorate of Antalya has a special importance for Turkish judicial system because it is among the first probation directorates that have come about as a pilot application. The fundamental objective of Probation Directorate of Antalya has been defined as to facilitate the resocialization process of offenders by providing adult and younger offenders with educational and rehabilitation programs. The institutional services that are provided for probationers can be specified as literacy course, entrepreneurship education, vocational training through which probationers can acquire abilities concerning some areas such as real estate consulting, tree trimming, hotel housekeeping etc., and sportive and artistic activities.

This study, based on the limited data from the research project mentioned, aims to shed light on some questions, which are: (1) what are the criminogenic needs of probationers in Turkey?, (2) What do probationers expect from the probation service? (3) What areas would probationers like to improve themselves in? Before commencing our discussion in terms of these questions, some demographical variables such as age, gender, and education is being given in order that social and cultural profile of the probationers in the study can be provided. Highlighting these points is significant with regard to that probation service can accord itself to meet the needs of probationers in Turkey.

The research sample consists of those who were under probation in Probation Directorate of Antalya within the dates the study was conducted. The research ethics committee approval was received before initiation of the research from the ethical committee of the institution the researchers work at. The number of those who were under probation on the date the study initiated was around 4000. Of 4000 probationers, we had to eliminate those who were

both at the beginning of their probation period and those who had several days left under probation. There were 2560 valid questionnaires even though it was determined by the statistical advisor of the project that 2500 questionnaires would be sufficient and they were analysed statistically by means of SPSS. A consent form, declaring the purpose of the research and rights of the participant was distributed before the implementation of questionnaires. The questionnaire of the study has 38 items which are multiple - choice and closed ended and were implemented by the research team. It was specifically given attention to questionnaires being carried out by the research team in terms of ensuring that probationers do not feel any pressure and thus can reveal their thoughts concerning probation services. In addition, the period of time probationers has spent under probation was also important for the reliability of the data; thus, the questionnaires started to be applied after, at least, their third month under probation, ensuring that probationers have sufficient experience of probation in order to assess given services.

DEMOGRAPHICAL VARIABLES

As it can be seen on Table a below, which informs about gender distribution of those who are under probation in Antalya Probation Directorate during the study, of 2462 people only 162 are females which means that, as it can be seen, males constitute 93% of general population of the study. It shows consistency with the general statistical data of Turkey Statistical Institute concerning the gender distribution of people who were in penal institution in 2016. According to this data, 95.8% of the people who were in penal institution are male in 2016 (Penal Institution Statistic, 2017). It should be noted that the reason the rate of women in offending is significantly lower than men has nothing to do with biological characteristics. Rather, it can be explained by pointing out the differences between men and women in terms of existing within social, public, and occupational life which, in the last instance, are more limited to women than men. For instance, according to the research by Chernoff and Simon (2000), containing a great numbers of countries including Sweden, Israel, Austria, France, ABD, Luxembourg, Norway, Kore, Zambia, Japan, Hong-Kong, Libya, Philippines, Kuwait, Malawi, Nigeria, Malaysia, Sri Lanka and Ivory Coast, there is a positive correlation between the rates of women committing crime and the development level of a country. Especially in

developed countries, in parallel with their level of education and existence in labour market, women with relatively high social status might be engaged in criminal activity, especially in financial crimes.

Table a. Gender

	N	%
Male	2300	93,4
Female	162	6,6
Total	2462	100

We have little data to give elaborate information concerning female offenders; however, depending on the data, it can be suggested that there seems to be a particular link between criminal behaviour and masculinity in keeping with theoretical ground (Bengtsson, 2016; Krienert, 2003).

Table b. Participators by age

	N	%
25 and below	567	30,1
26 – 30	361	19,2
31 – 35	277	14,7
36 – 40	248	13,2
41 and above	428	22,8
Total	1881	100

It is remarkable that young offenders constitute a large part within the sample of the study (See Table b). Besides, it can also be said, based on the data from the field, these young offenders are on probation due to substance abuse. The rates of being under probation due to substance abuse increase especially for the group of aged 25 and below while it shows a meaningful decrease along with increasing age as it can be seen on the Table c below. When it is considered, in the context of the study, that most of the offenders under probation consist of young people, it can be suggested that substance abuse of young people should be one of the main agendas of probation service in Turkey.

The Experience of Probation in Turkey: Criminogenic Needs and Expectations of Probationers

Table c. Substance abuse by age

		Crime of Substance Abuse					Chi-Square/p
		NO		YES		Total	
		N	%	N	%		
AGE	25 and below	91	16.7	454	83.3	545	436.38
	26 – 30	163	48.1	176	51.9	339	0.000
	31 - 35	160	59.0	111	41.0	271	
	36 – 40	170	71.4	68	28.6	238	
	41 and above	319	79.8	81	20.3	400	
	Total	903	50.4	890	49.6	1793	

There are plenty of studies (Lochner, 2004; Lochner, 2010; Lochner & Moretti, 2004; Groot & Brink, 2010; Machin et al., 2010) highlighting the relationship between education and crime. It is commonly accepted that education has a negative effect on crime through various ways which can be sorted as: (1) education provides individuals with an opportunity for higher income that decreases the likelihood of criminal activity; (2) education can lead individuals to avoid crime by promoting patience and positively altering preferences for risk; (3) education may keep individuals from deviant peer groups and thus positively affect their social networks (Lochner, 2010: 241). However, it would be an inadequate perspective to assume that there would be a direct connection of being only low educated to criminal behaviour. For instance, Groot and Brink (2010: 288) suggested that tax fraud is more likely to be seen among the more educated while crimes such as shoplifting, vandalism and threat, assault and injury are more likely among the lower educated. Yet, although it is not the aim of this study to argue if there is a link between crime and education, it can be suggested that education has a significant influence on individuals in terms of refraining from criminal behaviours (Groot & Brink, 2010; Becker & Mulligan, 1997). Becker and Mulligan (1997: 735) argue that “schooling focuses students' attention on the future” so that they avoid the costs of the criminal behaviour they may face in the interest of future life plans.

Table d. Educational status

	N	%
Primary school	1451	59,5
High school	726	29,8
Graduated	247	10,1
Post graduated	25	1
Illiterate	37	1,5

Concerning educational status, as it can be seen on the Table d, most of the offenders significantly have a low level of education. These rates inform about both the educational status of society in general and the necessity that education should be taken into consideration in terms of crime and turning to criminal activity. It can be suggested that education is also significant with regard to social integration since it indicates class differences in a society. Social status and opportunities acquired through education relatively reduce to turn into crime of an individual. Education, along with its function for reaching job opportunities, increasing income, and thus repairing poverty, is an important structural factor that reduces social exclusion (Machin et al., 2010). It hinders the process of social exclusion in that people who are not able to have education opportunities are deprived of sources of improving their personal abilities. That is to say, generally speaking, criminal activity is negatively associated with higher level of education which means that educational status is one the main factors that underlies criminal behaviour and that is associated to other criminogenic needs.

CRIMINOGENIC NEEDS

Generally, risk factors are being referred to when it comes to criminogenic needs. However, according to Andrews et al. (1990), all needs cannot be deemed as criminogenic. Criminogenic needs can be considered as the factors which have a strong influence upon the reduction of recidivism when they are conducted (Andrews et al., 1990; Bourgon & Gutterez, 2013). In other words, it can be determined as a criminogenic need if there is a change in recidivism when a need factor is changed.

As summarized by Andrews and Bonta (2010: 58 - 60) as Central Eight, criminogenic needs can be sorted as history of antisocial behaviour (early engagement in criminal activities), antisocial personality pattern (some

The Experience of Probation in Turkey: Criminogenic Needs and Expectations of Probationers

behavioural patterns such as adventurous, impulsive, pleasure-seeking, continually aggressive, anger problems), antisocial cognition (attitudes, beliefs, rationalisations that are used to justify criminal activity), antisocial associates (relations with pro criminal others), family/marital circumstances, school/work, leisure/recreation, and substance abuse.

To understand more elaborately the obstacles people under probation face in their social life requires to determine their criminogenic needs. The issues of economic problems, family and/or entourage, and substance abuse can be considered as some of the criminogenic needs. It is critically important since those obstacles, in a sense, both constitute the factors leading delinquent people into criminal activity and keep them from social integration. However, as Wooditch et. al. suggested (2014), the individual engaged in criminal activity due to criminogenic needs may be changed for the better in time by means of supportive services and this change may have a positive effect on desistance. In addition to the structural criminogenic needs, concerning desistance, motivation of the individual to change is a significant factor as well. Further, it seems difficult to separate these two factors as if they are independent of each other. In other words, although it is significant that larger social environment should be supporting the individual's motivation of desistance, the individual should also be eager to embrace these supportive social opportunities (Healy & O'Donnell, 2008). For instance, as one of the probation workers pointed out concerning employment, even if they make some arrangements for probationers to have a job they might be somehow refusing this opportunity by not going to meet with employer or not attending work regularly. It can be seen from this example that if the personal motivation to social integration is lacking, the rehabilitative programs may not be fulfilling the aims of probation. Yet, putting the personal motivation aside, there are some significant factors making people engage in delinquency.

Table e. Reason of criminal activity

	N	%
Economical problems	516	22
Violence and abuse	67	2.9
Matter of honor	64	2.7
Substance abuse	387	16.5
Family and/or entourage	983	41.9
Other	635	27.1

As it can be seen on the Table e above, three points come into prominent: firstly, social environment and interactions; secondly, economical problems they experience; and thirdly, substance abuse. These three factors are being indicated by the participants of the study as the reasons of their criminal activity. Concerning economic problems, exclusion from labour market, unemployment, continuous poverty, low income and education, in short factors such as insufficient political, economic and social participation of individuals bring about social exclusion which can be considered as the most significant underlying factors of criminal activity. For, social exclusion is the fundamental factor that hinders social integration of individuals, causing moral alienation and harming the conscious of social solidarity. As McNeill and Dawson (2014) suggested, based on the thoughts of Durkheim, there is a direct and strong relationship between moral values of a society and consciousness of social solidarity. In other words, adherence to moral values underlies social solidarity. So, any harm to consciousness of social solidarity through social exclusion, which various criminogenic needs factors mentioned previously can induce to occur, may result in violating moral values by criminal activity.

As some researchers suggested (Simons & Robertson, 1989; Wright & Cullen, 2004; Wooditch et. al., 2014; Latessa & Lowenkamp, 2006; Kirkwood & McNeill, 2015; Silver, 1994; Peace, 2001; Healy & O'Donnell, 2008), family relations and/or entourage are closely related to criminal behaviour. Simon and Robertson (1989) found that young people who are deprived of sufficient family support and/or rejected by their families, whose families suffer from alcohol or violence issues are more likely both to be engaged in deviant friend groups and substance abuse, proving that the nature of family relations and having a

relationship with a deviant peer group are not independent factors but rather that they go hand in hand. Further, specifically for younger people, even some social settings such as schools that are regarded as improving pro-social bonding and buffering the risk of offending may pave the way to establish a bond with delinquent peers (France et. al., 2012: 100).

In addition, as it can be seen in the table, high rates of the influence of individual's family and/or entourage over criminal behavior could demonstrate that the social milieu of individuals consists of those who are involved in criminal activity. It constitutes a risk for the crime prevention mechanism and social integration of individuals. For, if an individual under probation whose previously social environment has been engaged in criminal activity gets back into this environment, it is more likely that another criminal behavior would occur again in a period of time. That is to say, it can be asserted that there might be a relationship between recidivism and social circle. However, it is quite significant that probationers put an emphasis on the network of informal relationships with friends and family. This shows that this informal network is both being referred by probationers as a criminogenic need and being located as a supportive source that they can utilize in order to deal with their other criminogenic needs rather than applying to an institution for support. It suggests that probationers in the study seek to solve their problems through their informal social networks (i.e. friends, family).

The significance of family/friends relations as a criminogenic need seems to depend on the range of age of probationers. When the correlation between age and family/friends relations is analysed, it can be seen that the percentage of those who point to the relations with family/friends as a criminogenic need is being decreased significantly as the age increases. In more detail, 55,7% of 25 and below aged; 45,3% of 26 – 30 aged; 40,8% of 31 – 35 aged; 36,2% of 36 – 40 aged; and 30,3% of 41 and above aged pointed to family/friends circle as a criminogenic need (Chi – Square/p: 66,231/0.000). Thus, as Healy and O'Donnell (2008) suggested, it can be asserted, in order to minimize the reasons of the criminal activity, that it is significant for probation and other crime prevention systems to deal also with improving social capital (family, friends group, milieu etc.) of those who have been engaged in criminal activity.

When it comes to criminogenic needs, the expectations of probationers become crucial since they supply the needs of those who are under probation so

as to avoid criminal activity as well. Therefore, the expectations of probationers offer significant information in terms of determining what needs of the individuals under probation are.

Expectations of Offenders Under Probation

Criminogenic needs and expectations of people under probation have a reciprocal relationship since, as was previously stated, expectations would refer to needs as well. Based on some studies (Stewart & Stewart, 1993; Dood & Hunter, 1992; Gray, 2005; Stewart, 1996; Smith & Stewart, 1997) it can be suggested that offenders' expectations with reference to their needs are about employment, to cope with psychological problems, to reach health services, housing, and to have a sufficient income.

Consistent with the prior data we mentioned, employment, which is closely related to economic problems offenders pointed to with regard to reason of their crimes, comes into prominence as one of the main factors probationers suggested. Psychological support follows the employment as the second prominent expectations of individuals, vocational courses and need for guidance follows it as the third highest expectation which actually refers to the need of being in employment (See Table f).

Table f. Expectations of offenders from probation service

	N	%
Employment	1105	48,2
Vocational course	503	21,9
Housing	163	7,1
Healthcare service	402	17,5
Psychological support	1085	47,3

Age as a demographical variable is a significant factor which has a determinative influence on the expectations of the probationers, especially in terms of employment and psychological support. As seen on Table g below, it can be stated that the expectation of employment is at the highest level within aged 25 and above of probationers who are socially supposed to be active in the

The Experience of Probation in Turkey: Criminogenic Needs and Expectations of Probationers

labour market when cross – tabulation analysis between the variable of employment and age is being done.

Table g. The expectation of employment by age

		Employment					Chi-Square/p
		NO		YES		Total	
		N	%	N	%		
AGE	25 and below	330	63.1	193	36.9	523	35.08
	26 – 30	159	46.5	183	53.5	342	0.000
	31 - 35	126	48.6	133	51.4	259	
	36 – 40	111	48.1	120	51.9	231	
	41 and above	188	48.0	204	52.0	392	
	Total	914	52.3	833	47.7	1747	

The results of the study show that almost half of the probationers expect from the service to be supportive in terms of self-reliance and promoting the idea of personal value. The need of psychological support may be associated with the other expectations of people under probation want them to be met. For instance, in the context of having a job, to exist in the legal labour market also provide individuals with either a sense of self-actualisation or being functional in the society they are a member of as well which it, in turn, would be positively influencing probationers' psychological conditions. As previous demonstrated (Durnescu, 2014; Healy & O'Donnell, 2008), providing practical assistance in terms of issues such as finance, employment, and housing may have a positive influence on the individuals under probation and thus could be supportive with regard to the process of social integration.

In the light of the expectations of probationers it should be mentioned how the probationers assess the efficiency of probation service in their everyday life. Based on the research data, it can be suggested that people under probation, in general, can see the favourable effects of probation services in terms of strengthening social bondings, social adaptation, increasing self-reliance, and acquiring awareness about social rights. However, it is asserted by majority of the probationers that probation services are not effective for the issues of

employment and working life which are the primary needs of people under probation. In addition, the result of the probationers' assessment about reaching health care services also makes the influence area of the probation services in Turkey disputable. This is critically important in many aspects and linked to other issues probationers have. For, being unemployment would bring about lack of social security, resulting in obstacle to reach health care services. Persistence of this disadvantageous social position would be effecting the social reintegration and rehabilitation process of probationers in unfavourable ways and rendering the institutional function of probation questionable. However, it should be stated that it cannot be suggesting that probation service should burden all these assignments, rather we are offering an effective and organised coordination to meet these goals.

Apart from the expectations of people under probation, when it comes to the criminogenic needs, the fields in which they would like to improve themselves become also significant. This point can also provide probation services with information which may help to structure their educational programs and social activities in most effective way.

Preferred Areas of Probationers

By preferred areas, it is meant that in what aspects of life people under probation find themselves insufficient and of what areas of their life they would like to enhance the quality. The answers given to this question would also provide information to cope with the obstacles probationers face in terms of rehabilitation and integration into society. In other words, these preferred areas of probationers, at the same time, shed light on the criminogenic needs of them which comprise antisocial peers, family issues, employment, education, leisure/recreation, and substance abuse (Bourgon & Guiterrez, 2013: 261). Rehabilitation programs, as Simons and Robertson (1989) pointed out, should be focusing on the social skills that are weaker since these problematic areas that people under probation suffer from play an important role in leading an individual into criminal activity.

The Experience of Probation in Turkey: Criminogenic Needs and Expectations of Probationers

Table h. The Areas probationers improve themselves in

	N	%
Working life	1536	71
Art	301	13,9
Family relations	943	43,6
Friendship	509	23,5
Sport	681	31,5
Other	177	8,2

As it can be seen from the Table h, the issue concerning employment and/or working life (such as being alienated by colleagues and employee, having self-confident problems) is the first prominent area where probationers would like to improve themselves. Consistent with the prior results being shared, probationers referred to - they could be considered as jointly - the relationship with family and friends that they prefer to reassess. The family and friends dimension that probationers pointed may include expectations of future such as marry and start a family as well as existing social relations. It is important because it demonstrates that they have a strong eagerness to change their life in a positive sense. For, as Wright and Cullen (2004) suggested, creating reciprocal dependency between the individual and society, social bondings constituted through marriage or employment would function as an informal social control and prevent deviant behaviour.

It can also be suggested, as it can be seen on the table above, leisure time activities, such as sport and art, seem to be important for probationers with regard to the social integration. Probation service in Turkey, acknowledging its influence on rehabilitation, have an agenda for leisure time activities including cinema, theatre, trips, reading, sports to support reintegration of probationers into social life (Republic of Turkey Ministry of Justice, 2015). One of the probation officers claimed that (personal communication, May 30, 2017) such leisure time activities can foster prosocial attitudes and may result in the feeling

that offenders do something valuable both for themselves and society in general. For instance, as a lived experience, she told two stories from social activity they made with some of the probationers:

“one day, as a social activity, we went to a local primary school to paint its walls around the garden. There was a probationer who has been under probation for damaging public property. After the painting was completed, we were talking about the activity and he said that ‘I am here for damaging a public property and it’s weird that I’ve just beautified it. It really felt fine doing something good...”

“We organise a leisure time activity and bring our probationers and their families to see a theatre play. You can’t imagine how impressed they are... Some of them said that it was the first time they had been to the theatre.”

The quotation above demonstrated that leisure time activities should be considered as the significant component of probation services since it paves the ways for probationers to be reintegrated into society and law abiding citizens.

CONCLUSION

When it comes to the relation of demographical variables to criminal activity in Turkey, it can be seen that the tendency and rate of criminal behaviour of the young age group probationers is high; in addition, the criminal activity concerning substance abuse becomes prominent within this group. Another important point is also that there is a fundamental problem for probationers in terms of not being able to exist in the legal employment market. Thus, it becomes a necessity for probation in Turkey to organize its agenda around these basic three factors: relatively younger population, substance abuse, and employment.

It should be suggested that probation in Turkey is a new punitive sanction which is in both favour of offenders and society as it gives the people under probation a chance to reconstruct their life and to acquire awareness in spite of its deficiencies. Most of the deficiencies of it stem from some infrastructural issues such as insufficient probation officers, work overload, lack of coordination with other institutions, inadequate psychical conditions etc. Despite all, it can be suggested that the assessment of probationers about probation services is generally positive. However, it also strongly depends on the social status of probationer holds. The groups of housewives, unemployed, and workers are more likely to be satisfied with probation services. This

The Experience of Probation in Turkey: Criminogenic Needs and Expectations of Probationers

satisfaction level is also depended on educational status; that is to say, the level of satisfaction with probation services is being increased as the educational status is lower. This result makes sense when the fact is considered that they are the ones who are most in need of an institutional support regarding social integration since these groups of probationers occupy relatively more disadvantaged economical position. It is being seen, on the contrary, that as the educational and economical status increase probationers emphasise the thoughts of that probation services are ineffective and needless.

When the results being considered, it can be seen that the probationers consist of young individuals, substance abuse is quite high within this group, people significantly point to employment problems, and they are in need of psychological support. Since employment is a significant factor regarding social integration and recidivism, some arrangements should be made by the probation service with the help of other social institutions and NGOs such as guidance to employment, vocational courses etc. These supportive arrangements may have crucial effects on recidivism since they constitute an influential way to eliminate the disadvantaged social conditions which may lead people into criminal activities. The intimate relationships of the probationers in this study comes into prominence when the institutional or personal support that probationers have is considered. However, in terms of dealing with social exclusion, it seems crucial that politics of employment providing social security is being accelerated by the state, and that empowering NGOs along with probations services.

To conclude, it can be suggested that the probation service in Turkey should be focusing especially on these aspects of everyday life of these individuals since these problems seems to both invite social exclusion and thus constitute primary barriers for individuals in terms of social integration. Thus, if the aim of probation is to reduce recidivism, it seems to be necessary to take these mechanisms into consideration. Further, so as to deal with recidivism it is not sufficient to focus only on the individual alone, his/her social milieu should be taken into agenda by the probation service and other crime prevention systems since when the delinquent person comes back to his/her milieu leading the individual to become involved in a crime, reoffending of that individual would be almost inevitable.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, D. A.; Bonta, J. (2010). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, LexisNexis, Anderson Publishing, New Providence, NJ.
- Andrews, D. A.; Bonta, J.; Hoge, R. D. (1990) Classification for Effective Rehabilitation: Rediscovering Psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17(1): 19 - 52.
- Becker, G. S.; Mulligan, C. B. (1997) The Endogenous Determination of Time Preference, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(3): 729 - 758
- Bengtsson, T. T. (2016) Performing Hypermasculinity: Experiences with Confined Young Offenders. *Men and Masculinities*, 19(4): 410 - 428, DOI: 10.1177/1097184X15595083
- Bourgon, G.; Guterrez, L. (2013). The Importance of Building Good Relationships in Community Corrections: Evidence, Theory, and Practice of the Therapeutic Alliance. In P. Ugwudike & P. Raynor (Eds.), *What Works in Offender Compliance: International Perspectives and Evidence - Based Practice* (pp. 256 - 279) London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chernoff, N. W.; Simon, R. J., (2000). Women and Crime the World Over. *Gender Issues*, 18(3): 5-20. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-000-0015-0>
- Decarpes, P.; Durnescu, I. (2014). Probation and Community Sanctions. In G. Bruinsma; D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice* (pp. 3957 – 3963). New York: Springer Rereference.
- Demez, G.; Kart, E.; Ertan, C.; Timurturkan, M.; Cankurtaran, S.; Aktin, S. (2016). Yeniden Sosyalleşme ve Toplumsal Bütünleşme Süreçleri: Denetimli Serbestlik Altındaki Bireyler Örneği, *Destekli Projeler Veri Tabanı*, retrieved from www.UVT.ulakbim.gov.tr/Tubitak
- Demez, G.; Kart, E.; Ertan, C.; Timurturkan, M.; Cankurtaran, S.; Aktin, S. (2017). Denetimli Serbestlikte Yeniden Sosyalleşme Suç ve Dezavantajlılığın Sosyolojisi, Bağlam Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Demirbaş, T. (2016). Denetimli Serbestlik Tedbiri Uygulanarak Hapis Cezasının İnfazı (Cegtik M.105a). In D. Özyörük (Ed.), *Türkiye’de Denetimli Serbestlik 10. Yıl Uluslararası Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı* (pp. 15 - 23), Ankara: Adalet Bakanlığı Ceza Ve Tevkifevleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Atalay Matbası. Retrieved from [Http://Www.Cte-Ds.Adalet.Gov.Tr/E_Bulten/Sempozyum_E_Kitap.Pdf](http://Www.Cte-Ds.Adalet.Gov.Tr/E_Bulten/Sempozyum_E_Kitap.Pdf)

The Experience of Probation in Turkey: Criminogenic Needs and Expectations of Probationers

Department of Probation (N.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.cte-ds.adalet.gov.tr>

Dood T.; Hunter P. (1992). *The National Prison Survey 1991*, London: HMSO.

Evren, C.; Umut, G.; Bozkurt, M.; Evren, B.; Yilmaz, H. (2017) Psychometric properties of the Turkish version of Drug Use Disorders Identification Test–Extended (Turkish DUDIT-E) in substance-dependent adults under probation, *Psychiatry and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. 27(1): 70-75. DOI: 10.1080/24750573.2017.1293240

France, A.; Bottrell, D.; Armstrong, D. (2012). *A Political Ecology of Youth and Crime*, Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Gray P. (2005). The Politics of Risk and Young Offenders Experiences of Social Exclusion and Restorative Justice. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 45(6): 938-957. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azi018>

Healy, D., O'Donnell, I. (2008). Calling time on crime: Motivation, generativity and agency in Irish probationers. *The Journal of Community and Crime Justice*, 55(1), 25 – 38. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550507085676>

Kirkwood, S., McNeill, F. (2015). Integration and reintegration: comparing pathways to citizenship through asylum and criminal justice. *Criminology & Criminal Justice (CCJ)*, 15(5), 511– 526. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1748895815575618>

Krienert, J. L. (2003) Masculinity and Crime: A Quantitative Exploration of Messerschmidt's Hypothesis, *Electronic Journal of Sociology*. Retrieved from http://www.sociology.org/content/vol7.2/01_krienert.html.

Latessa, E. J., Lowenkamp, C. T. (2006). What works in reducing recidivism. *University of St. Thomas Law Journal*, 3(3), 521 – 535.

Lochner, L. (2004). Education, Work, and Crime: A Human Capital Approach. *International Economic Review*, 45(3): 811–843. DOI: 10.1111/j.0020-6598.2004.00288.x

Lochner, L. (2010). Education and Crime. In P. Peterson; E. Baker & B. McGaw (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education Volume 2* (pp. 239 - 245) Oxford: Elsevier.

Lochner, L.; Moretti, E. (2004). The Effect Of Education On Crime: Evidence From Prison Inmates, Arrests, And Self-Report. *American Economic Review* 94(1): 155–189. DOI: 10.1257/000282804322970751

Machin, S.; Marie, O; Vujic, S. (2010) The Crime Reducing Effect of Education, *CEP Discussion Paper No 979*, London School of Economics and Political Science, London.

McNeill F.; Dawson M. (2014). Social Solidarity, Penal Evolution and Probation. *BJC The British Journal of Criminology*, 54(5): 892-907.

Özbek, M. S. (2010). Çağdaş ceza adaleti sistemlerinde alternatif çözüm arayışları ve arabuluculuk uygulaması, *Kazancı Hukuk Dergisi*. 1: 116-183. Retrieved from http://angora.baskent.edu.tr/acik_arsiv/dosya_oku.php?psn=8767&yn=17&dn=1

Peace, R. (2001). Social exclusion: a concept in need of definition?. *Social Policy Journal of New -Zealand*, 16, 17 – 36.

Penal Institution Statistic. *Turkey Statistical Institution* (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.tuik.gov.tr/PreHaberBultenleri.do?id=24676>.

Republic of Turkey Ministry of Justice. (2015). *Probation in Turkey*. Retrieved from <http://www.cep-probation.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/PROBATION-in-TURKEY.pdf>

Silver, H. (1994). Social exclusion and social solidarity: three paradigms. *International Labour Review*, 133, 531 – 578.

Simons, R. L., Robertson, J. F. (1989) The Impact of parenting factors, deviant peers, and coping style upon adolescent drug use. *Family Relations*, 38(3), 273 – 281. doi: 10.2307/585052

Smith D.; Stewart J. (1997). Probation and Social Exclusion. *Social Policy Administration*, 31(5): 96 - 115.

Stewart G. (1996). Housing, In M. Drakeford; M. Vanstone (Eds.), *Beyond Offending Behavior*. Aldershot: Arena.

Stewart G.; Stewart J. (1993). Social Circumstances of younger Offenders Under Probation Supervision, Wakefield, ACOP.

Tuncer, G.; Duru, M. N. (2011). İş Doyumu: Denetimli Serbestlik Şubelerinde Çalışan Personel Örneği, *İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi Dergisi (İAÜD)*. 10(3): 115 - 142. Retrieved from http://iaud.aydin.edu.tr/makaleler/cilt1sayi9/12_gorkem_tuncer.pdf

W. Groot & H. M. van den Brink (2010) The effects of education on crime, *Applied Economics*, 42:3, 279-289, DOI: 10.1080/00036840701604412

Wooditch, A., Tang, L. L., Taxman, F. S. (2014). Which criminogenic need changes are most important in promoting desistance from crime and

The Experience of Probation in Turkey: Criminogenic Needs and Expectations of Probationers

substance use?. *Criminal Justice Behaviour*, 41(3), 276 – 299. doi: 10.1177/0093854813503543

Wright, J. P.; Cullen, F. T. (2004) Employment, peers, and life- course transitions. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(1), 183-205. doi: 10.1080/07418820400095781

Yavuz, H. A. (2011). Ceza Adalet Sisteminde Denetimli Serbestlik (Yayımlanmamış Doktora Tezi). Gazi Üniversitesi, Kamu Hukuku Anabilim Dalı, Ankara.

Yavuz, H. A. (2012). Denetimli Serbestliğin Türk Ceza Adalet Sistemindeki Tarihsel Gelişim Süreci, *TBB Dergisi*, 100: 318-342.

Yavuz, H. A. (2016). Türkiye’de Denetimli Serbestlik Mümkün Müdür? Dünü, Bugünü Ve Yarınıyla Türk Ceza Adalet Sisteminde Denetimli Serbestlik. In D. Özyörük (Ed.), *Türkiye’de Denetimli Serbestlik 10. Yıl Uluslararası Sempozyumu Bildiri Kitabı* (pp. 15 - 23), Ankara: Adalet Bakanlığı Ceza Ve Tevkifevleri Genel Müdürlüğü, Atalay Matbası. Retrieved from [Http://Www.Cte-Ds.Adalet.Gov.Tr/E-Bulten/Sempozyum-E-Kitap.Pdf](http://www.Cte-Ds.Adalet.Gov.Tr/E-Bulten/Sempozyum-E-Kitap.Pdf)

Yazici, A. B., Yazici, E., Akkisi Kumsar, N., & Erol, A. (2015). Addiction profile in probation practices in Turkey: 5-year data analysis. *Neuropsychiatric Disease and Treatment*, 11, 2259–2263. <http://doi.org/10.2147/NDT.S89417>

Yüncü, Z.; Aydın, R.; Aydın, C.; Özbaran, B.; Köse, S. (2016) Determination of Clinical and Socio-demographical Differences of Adolescents Applying to a Treatment Center with Family Encouragement or the Decision of the Probation Office and Determination of Predictive Factors in Maintaining Soberness among Probation Cases, *Arch Neuropsychiatr*. 53: 130 - 135. DOI: 10.5152/npa.2015.8719