



Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

December 1997, NCJ-164267

Characteristics of Adults on Probation, 1995

By Thomas P. Bonczar
BJS Statistician

On December 31, 1996, State and local probation agencies supervised more than 3 million adult U.S. residents or about 1 in every 62 persons age 18 or older. Since 1990 the Nation's probation population has grown an average of 3% per year. Probationers account for the largest share of adults under correctional supervision (58%), including persons held in jails and prisons and those on parole.

Results from the first national survey of adults on probation under the supervision of State and local agencies indicate that 58% had been convicted of a felony; 39% of a misdemeanor, and 3% of other infractions. When the survey was conducted at the beginning of 1995, more than 453,000 adults were on probation for a violent offense; 757,000 for a property offense; 561,000 for a drug offense; and 815,000 for a public-order offense.

Using a nationally representative sample, a two-part survey was conducted to collect detailed information on adults on probation. Results from a sample of 5,867 administrative records are presented here. Data from personal interviews with probationers will be the subject of a future report.

Highlights

	Percent of adults on probation		
	Total	Felony	Misde- meanor
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %
Offense			
Violent	17.3%	19.5%	13.5%
Property	28.9	36.6	18.2
Drug	21.4	30.7	7.6
Public-order	31.1	12.1	59.6
Criminal history			
None	49.9%	49.2%	52.1%
Priors	50.1	50.8	47.9
Juvenile	9.0	10.3	5.6
Adult	45.1	45.1	44.3
Type of sentence			
Probation only	49.8%	45.7%	54.8%
Split	50.2	54.3	45.2
Jail	37.3	36.5	38.3
Prison	15.3	20.6	9.0
Special conditions			
Any	98.6%	98.4%	98.9%
Fees/fines/costs	84.3	84.2	85.1
Drug testing	32.5	43.0	17.1
Drug/alcohol treatment	41.0	37.5	45.7
Employment	34.7	40.9	27.3
Community service	25.7	27.3	24.0
Contact in last 30 days			
None	28.3%	23.8%	34.8%
Any ^a	71.7	76.2	65.2
Office	59.2	63.0	53.4
Field	11.9	15.3	6.8
Telephone	18.1	18.0	18.1
Number of probationers ^b	2,620,560	1,491,670	991,161

^aMore than 1 type of contact possible.

^bExcludes persons supervised by a Federal probation agency, those only on parole, persons on presentence or pretrial diversion, and absconders. See *Methodology*, page 11.

- In 1995 an estimated 1.5 million felons and 1 million misdemeanants were under the supervision of State and local probation agencies.
- Drug trafficking (15%) and possession (13%) were the most common offenses among felons; driving while intoxicated (35%) and assault (11%) among misdemeanants.
- Half of all probationers had a prior sentence to probation or incarceration — 30% to jail or prison and 42% to probation.
- Drug or alcohol treatment was a sentence condition for 41% of adults on probation; 37% had received treatment. Drug testing was required of 32%.
- About three-quarters of the felons and two-thirds of the misdemeanants had been contacted by a probation officer in the last month.
- Since entering probation, nearly 1 in 5 had a formal disciplinary hearing. Of these, 38% had been arrested or convicted for a new offense, 41% had failed to report or absconded, and 38% had failed to pay a fine or restitution.

Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995

The 1995 Survey of Adults on Probation, conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), was the first national survey to gather information on the individual characteristics of probationers. The first component of this survey consisted of a review of the administrative records of 5,867 adult probationers, providing detailed information on current offenses and sentences, criminal histories, levels of supervision and contacts, participation in treatment programs, and disciplinary hearings and outcomes.

Administrative records were drawn from 167 State, county, and municipal probation agencies nationwide. Offices providing direct supervision were selected from 16 strata defined by government branch (executive or judi-

cial), level (State or local), and region (Northeast, Midwest, South, and West). Offices were selected with probabilities proportional to the number under supervision. (See *Methodology* on page 11 for additional detail.)

Only adults with a formal sentence to probation who were not considered absconders were included in the records check. Excluded were persons supervised by a Federal probation agency, those only on parole, persons on pre-sentence or pretrial diversion, juveniles, and absconders.

Systematic samples of probationers were drawn by BJS from rosters prepared by each agency. A probation officer or other person familiar with the agency's records collected the data. An overall response rate of 87.4% was achieved. Estimates for the entire population were generated based on

the original probabilities of selection and a series of adjustments for nonresponse.

Nearly 2 of 5 probationers convicted of a violent or drug offense

In 1995, 17% of the adults on probation had been sentenced for a violent offense and 21% for a drug offense (table 1). The remainder were nearly equally split between property offenders (29%) and public-order offenders (31%).

The most frequent offense among probationers was driving while intoxicated (17%). Four other offenses — including larceny/theft (10%), drug possession (10%), drug trafficking (10%), and assault (9%) — accounted for an additional 39% of the adult probation population.

Table 1. Most serious offense of adults on probation, by severity of offense, 1995

Most serious offense	Total ^a	Severity of offense ^b	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Violent offenses	17.3%	19.5%	13.5%
Homicide	.7	1.0	.2
Sexual assault	3.6	5.6	.4
Robbery	1.9	3.2	0
Assault	9.2	7.6	11.1
Other violent	2.0	2.1	1.7
Property offenses	28.9%	36.6%	18.2%
Burglary	5.8	9.7	.3
Larceny/theft	9.9	11.1	8.5
Motor vehicle theft	1.4	2.0	.4
Fraud	7.2	9.6	4.2
Stolen property	1.7	2.3	.9
Other property	2.7	1.9	3.8
Drug offenses	21.4%	30.7%	7.6%
Possession	9.8	13.1	4.6
Trafficking	9.7	15.4	1.6
Other/unspecified	1.9	2.3	1.4
Public-order offenses	31.1%	12.1%	59.6%
Weapons	2.3	2.5	2.1
Obstruction of justice	2.2	1.3	3.3
Traffic	4.7	.9	10.2
Driving while intoxicated	16.7	5.2	35.2
Drunkenness/morals	2.1	.5	4.5
Other public-order	3.0	1.7	4.3
Other	1.3%	1.0%	1.2%
Number of probationers	2,595,499	1,479,904	988,033

^aExcludes 25,061 probationers (1% of all adults on probation) for whom information on the most serious offense was not reported.

^bBased on 2,543,925 probationers for whom information on most serious offense and severity of offense is known. Excludes 75,988 probationers sentenced for an offense other than a felony or a misdemeanor.

Table 2. Characteristics of adults on probation, by severity of most serious offense, 1995

Characteristic	Total	Severity of offense	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Sex			
Male	79.1%	79.1%	78.4%
Female	20.9	20.9	21.6
Race/Hispanic origin			
White non-Hispanic	58.3%	55.4%	61.8%
Black non-Hispanic	27.9	30.8	24.5
Hispanic	11.3	11.2	11.4
Other	2.4	2.6	2.3
Age			
17 or younger	.5%	.5%	.5%
18-24	26.4	27.6	24.7
25-34	36.8	36.6	37.0
35-44	24.7	24.6	25.2
45-54	8.4	8.2	8.7
55 or older	3.2	2.6	3.9
Marital status			
Married	26.2%	26.8%	24.7%
Widowed	.9	.9	.9
Separated	7.0	6.9	7.8
Divorced	14.5	14.6	13.4
Never married	51.4	50.8	53.2
Education completed			
8th grade or less	7.5%	8.0%	7.0%
Some high school	34.9	37.6	30.4
High school graduate/GED	39.9	37.6	43.2
Some college or more	17.7	16.8	19.5
Number of probationers	2,620,560	1,491,670	991,161

Note: Estimates are based on complete data for sex, race/Hispanic origin and reported data on marital status (82%) and on education (81%).

Felons more than half of all adults on probation

Of the 2.6 million adults formally sentenced to probation in 1995, an estimated 1.5 million had been convicted of a felony (58%). Of these, half had been convicted of a violent (20%) or drug offense (31%). Drug trafficking was the single most frequent offense among felons on probation (15%). This was closely followed by drug possession (13%), larceny/theft (11%), and burglary (10%).

In contrast, 60% of the estimated 1 million misdemeanants on probation had been convicted of a public-order offense — 35% for driving while intoxicated, 10% for another traffic offense, and 5% for drunkenness or morals offenses. An estimated 14% of probationers convicted of a misdemeanor had committed a violent offense (nearly all of whom were convicted of assault); 18% a property offense; and 8% a drug offense.

Women and non-Hispanic whites make up comparatively high percentages of adult probationers

In 1995 women constituted 21% of the probation population, or twice as large a share as among the jail and parole populations (10% each), and more than 3 times the share of women in prison (6%) (table 2).

	Percent female, 1995
Probation	21%
Jail	10
Prison	6
Parole	10

Unlike the Nation's jail and prison population, a majority of probationers were non-Hispanic whites (58%).

	Percent of offenders		
	White	Black	Hispanic
Probation, 1995	58%	28%	11%
Jail*	37	41	18
State prison*	35	46	17
Federal prison*	38	30	28

*Based on surveys of jail inmates conducted in 1995-96, and State and Federal inmates in 1991.

Non-Hispanic whites accounted for a larger share of misdemeanants than felons (62% compared to 55%). Non-Hispanic blacks constituted 28% of all probationers (31% of felons and 25% of misdemeanants). Hispanics, who may be of any race, comprised 11% of both felons and misdemeanants.

Slightly more than half of all probationers never married (51%), and 58% had completed at least high school or a GED. Felons (54%) were somewhat less likely than misdemeanants (63%) to have completed high school or a GED.

Types of offenses vary among men and women and blacks, whites, and Hispanics on probation

Men were more likely than women to be sentenced for a violent offense (19% compared to 10%), but nearly as likely to have been sentenced for a drug offense (22% of men and 20% of women) (table 3). Among men,

Table 3. Most serious offense of adults on probation, by sex, race/Hispanic origin, and age, 1995

Most serious offense	Sex		Race/Hispanic origin			Age			
	Male	Female	White	Black	Hispanic	24 or younger	25-34	35-44	45 or older
Violent offenses	19.4%	9.5%	16.5%	17.1%	19.4%	16.5%	17.0%	17.4%	20.3%
Homicide	.6	.9	1.0	.3	.3	1.4	.6	.9	1.1
Sexual assault	4.3	.6	4.9	1.2	2.4	1.8	3.0	3.8	9.1
Robbery	2.0	1.4	1.0	3.1	2.4	3.1	1.3	2.0	.7
Assault	10.3	5.1	7.6	11.0	11.6	9.0	10.3	8.7	7.1
Other violent	2.2	1.5	2.0	1.6	2.7	2.2	1.8	2.0	2.3
Property offenses	25.3%	42.6%	29.9%	28.6%	23.8%	38.7%	27.0%	22.9%	24.7%
Burglary	6.6	2.8	6.3	5.5	4.3	10.4	5.2	3.5	2.2
Larceny/theft	8.2	16.5	10.0	10.9	8.4	13.6	9.3	8.2	7.2
Motor vehicle theft	1.5	.8	1.1	1.0	2.7	2.5	1.4	.7	.1
Fraud	3.7	20.8	7.4	7.4	5.6	4.6	7.9	7.7	10.3
Stolen property	2.0	.8	2.0	1.3	1.5	3.0	1.4	1.3	1.0
Other property	3.2	.9	3.2	2.5	1.3	4.6	1.8	1.6	3.8
Drug offenses	21.7%	20.1%	17.0%	30.9%	23.1%	19.7%	23.9%	23.2%	13.4%
Possession	10.3	8.0	8.1	13.4	10.9	8.0	10.7	11.2	8.1
Trafficking	9.7	9.7	7.8	14.2	9.7	10.2	10.8	9.8	4.7
Other/unspecified	1.7	2.4	1.1	3.4	2.4	1.5	2.3	2.2	.6
Public-order offenses	32.3%	26.5%	35.6%	22.2%	30.4%	22.1%	31.5%	35.7%	40.7%
Weapons	2.8	.7	1.8	3.2	2.5	3.9	2.3	.9	1.8
Obstruction of justice	2.3	1.7	2.1	2.4	2.1	2.6	2.7	1.3	1.4
Traffic	4.7	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.2	5.5	4.6	3.2
Driving while intoxicated	17.4	14.2	21.2	7.7	17.3	7.1	16.4	22.7	27.7
Drunkenness/morals	2.0	2.5	2.0	2.3	1.6	1.5	2.0	2.7	2.3
Other public-order	3.1	2.8	3.9	1.6	2.2	2.7	2.6	3.5	4.3
Other	1.3%	1.3%	1.0%	1.2%	3.2%	3.1%	.6%	.7%	.8%
Number of probationers	2,057,405	538,094	1,521,161	717,389	295,243	700,261	957,412	641,015	296,811

Note: Excludes an estimated 25,061 probationers (1% of all adults on probation) for whom information on type of offense was not reported.

driving while intoxicated was the single most frequent offense (17%), followed by assault (10%), drug possession (10%), and drug trafficking (10%). Women most frequently were sentenced to probation for property offenses (43%), particularly fraud (21%) and larceny/theft (17%). Fourteen percent of women on probation were convicted of driving while intoxicated, only slightly below the percentage for men.

Among non-Hispanic probationers, blacks (31%) were nearly twice as likely as whites (17%) to be under supervision for a drug offense. Among Hispanic probationers nearly a quarter had been convicted of a drug offense. White (21%) and Hispanic (17%) probationers were also more than twice as likely as black probationers (8%) to be under supervision for DWI. Nearly equal percentages of whites and blacks were on probation for violent and property offenses.

DWI accounts for more than a quarter of probationers over age 44

Convictions for driving while intoxicated bore a strong relationship to age, increasing steadily from 7% of those under age 25, to 28% of those age 45 or older. DWI was the single most frequent offense among probationers in each age group 25 or older. Among those under age 25, larceny/theft (14%), drug trafficking (10%), and burglary (10%) were the most common offenses.

The relative frequency of other types of offenses also varied by age. Sexual assault increased from 2% of those under age 25 to 9% of those age 45 or older. Drug trafficking steadily declined with advancing age, from 10% of probationers under age 25 to 5% of those 45 or older.

Half of all probationers have at least one prior sentence

Half of all adults formally sentenced to probation had a prior sentence to probation or incarceration, 45% as an adult and 9% as a juvenile (table 4).

About 30% of probationers had previously been sentenced to incarceration, while 42% had previously been sentenced to probation.

About a third of felons and a quarter of misdemeanants had a prior criminal history which included incarceration. The percentage of felons having a juvenile record of incarceration was more than double that of misdemeanants (5% to 2%).

Violent offenders on probation the least likely to have a prior sentence

Violent offenders (45%) on probation were less likely than property (51%) or public-order offenders (55%) to have had a prior sentence to probation or incarceration (table 5). Nearly half of all drug offenders had a prior sentence. Among all probationers violent offenders had the lowest percentage (37%) with a prior sentence to probation, and public-order offenders, the highest (45%). Led by those with traffic violations, public-order offenders also had the highest percentage of persons with a prior sentence to prison or jail (34%).

Table 4. Prior sentences of adults on probation, by sex, race/Hispanic origin, and severity of current offense, 1995

Prior offense	Total	Severity of current offense	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Probation			
None	58.3%	57.6%	60.9%
Prior sentence*	41.7	42.4	39.1
Juvenile	6.8	8.0	4.0
Adult	36.8	36.7	35.6
Incarceration			
None	69.7%	67.9%	73.3%
Prior sentence*	30.3	32.1	26.7
Juvenile	3.7	4.7	1.7
Adult	27.2	28.1	25.5
Probation or incarceration			
None	49.9%	49.2%	52.1%
Prior sentence*	50.1	50.8	47.9
Juvenile	9.0	10.3	5.6
Adult	45.1	45.1	44.3
Number of probationers	2,179,214	1,331,995	746,464

Note: Excludes 441,346 probationers (17% of all adults on probation) whose prior conviction status was not known. See *Methodology* and Appendix table 3 for discussion of coverage of criminal history data.
*Detail may add to more than total because some probationers had prior sentences as both an adult and a juvenile.

Table 5. Most serious current offense, by prior sentences of adults on probation, 1995

Most serious current offense	Total	Prior sentences			
		None	Any type	Probation	Incarceration
Total	100	49.9%	50.1%	41.7%	30.3%
Violent offenses	100%	55.3%	44.7%	36.8%	28.5%
Sexual assault	100	63.6	36.4	31.8	22.7
Assault	100	52.9	47.1	40.3	28.4
Other violent	100	44.5	55.5	41.8	40.3
Property offenses	100%	48.8%	51.2%	43.0%	30.2%
Burglary	100	45.1	54.9	45.5	34.6
Larceny/theft	100	53.5	46.5	38.1	26.6
Fraud	100	52.6	47.4	40.8	23.1
Drug offenses	100%	51.3%	48.7%	40.6%	28.4%
Possession	100	50.9	49.1	39.7	29.9
Trafficking	100	52.8	47.2	40.0	27.0
Public-order offenses	100%	45.1%	54.9%	45.4%	34.1%
Traffic	100	33.5	66.5	54.2	45.4
Driving while intoxicated	100	48.7	51.3	40.6	30.7

Note: Excludes an estimated 458,704 probationers (18% of all adults on probation) for whom information on current offense or prior conviction status was not known.

Sexual assault offenders (36%) were the least likely to have had a prior sentence of any type. The most likely to have had a prior sentence were probationers convicted of traffic offenses (67%), ahead of those convicted of driving while intoxicated (51%).

Presentence investigations focus on the most serious offenders

A large portion of probation officers' work is assisting the courts by preparing presentence investigation reports (PSI's). PSI's involve examining records that document the offense and the defendant's criminal history. Other information often comes from consulting with the arresting officer and others who have had contact with the defendant.

Among adults on probation, PSI's were completed more often for felons (64%) than misdemeanants (19%) (table 6). Probationers whose most serious offense was a public-order offense were the least likely to have had a PSI (29%). Those with a past sentence to prison or jail had a greater chance of having a PSI (59%) than those with no prior sentence (49%).

Table 6. Presentence investigation reports and recommendations, by current offense severity and prior sentences of adult probationers, 1995

	Number of probationers ^a	Percent of probationers with —		
		Completed presentence investigation report	Probation recommended ^b	Presentence report and recommendation for probation ^c
Total	2,496,600	47.2%	35.5%	79.6%
Severity of offense				
Felony	1,429,140	63.9%	48.1%	77.7%
Misdemeanor	941,646	18.9%	15.5%	87.1%
Most serious offense				
Violent	433,565	57.3%	38.9%	72.4%
Property	715,084	53.9%	42.0%	82.1%
Drugs	528,953	56.6%	43.6%	80.3%
Public-order	767,873	29.2%	22.9%	83.0%
Prior sentence				
No prior sentence	1,063,628	49.1%	39.1%	84.4%
Probation or incarceration	1,049,878	54.1%	38.8%	75.4%
Probation	906,544	53.0%	37.1%	73.9%
Incarceration	611,951	58.7%	42.5%	74.6%

^aExcludes 123,960 probationers (nearly 5% of all adults on probation) for whom information on PSI completion was not provided.

^bBased on 2,377,850 probationers for whom PSI completion status (recommended, not recommended, no recommendation) was known.

^cBased on 1,060,452 probationers for whom a PSI was completed.

4 out of 5 probationers with a PSI recommended for probation

Among those probationers for whom a PSI was prepared, 80% had received a recommendation for probation. Although this percentage is evidence that courts accept the PSI findings, this survey does not contain data on persons sentenced to jail or prison. Those data are needed to accurately measure the extent to which courts follow PSI recommendations.

Among probationers with a completed PSI, felons were less likely than misdemeanants to have received a recommendation of probation (78% compared with 87%). In addition, a lower percentage of those with a prior sentence to probation or incarceration were recommended for probation (75%) than were those without a prior sentence (84%).

Table 7. Type and length of sentence for adult probationers, by severity of current offense and prior sentence, 1995

Type and length of sentence	Total	Severity of offense		Prior sentences			
		Felony	Misdemeanor	None	Any	Probation	Incarceration
Type of sentence							
Probation only	49.8%	45.7%	54.8%	58.9%	40.4%	40.8%	32.2%
Probation and incarceration ^a	50.2	54.3	45.2	41.1	59.6	59.2	67.8
Jail	37.3	36.5	38.3	28.4	44.5	44.5	52.8
Prison	15.3	20.6	9.0	14.5	18.7	18.1	19.2
Number of probationers ^b	2,571,605	1,470,814	974,029	1,073,781	1,081,969	927,085	632,424

--Not calculated because of too few cases.

^aDetail may add to more than total because some probationers were sentenced to both jail and prison.

^bExcludes 48,955 probationers (nearly 2% of all adults on probation) for whom information on type of sentence was not reported.

Half of sentences split between incarceration and supervision

Half of the probationers received a sentence that included incarceration, sometimes called a “split sentence” (table 7). Felons were more likely to have received a split sentence (54%) than misdemeanants (45%). An estimated 1 in 5 felons on probation had received a sentence to prison on the current sentence. (Information on average length of sentence to probation is discussed in the *Methodology*, page 13.)

Repeat offenders more likely to be incarcerated

Among adults on probation, having a criminal record meant a greater chance of being sentenced to incarceration — 60% with a prior sentence received a current sentence to incarceration compared to 41% without any prior sentence. Among those probationers whose prior sentence specifically included jail or prison, more than two-thirds were again sentenced to incarceration. A sentence to probation only, or “straight probation,” was the most likely outcome (59%) for those probationers with no prior sentences.

More than a third of probationers also serve jail or prison time

While half of the probationers received a sentence that included a period of incarceration, 37% had actually served time in jail or prison. The remainder had their sentence to incarceration suspended. An estimated 35% of felons, compared to 25% of misdemeanants, had served time in a local jail; 9% of felons had served time in a prison.

Sentence served	Percent of adults on probation		
	Total	Felony	Misdemeanor
Jail or prison*	36.8%	44.2%	26.1%
Jail	31.2	35.2	25.0
Prison	5.6	9.2	--

-- Not calculated because of too few cases.
*Some probationers had served sentences to both jail and prison.

Probationers with a split sentence to jail had served an average of 3 months. The average time served in prison among probationers receiving a split sentence was 20 months.

	Time served		
	Total	Felony	Misdemeanor
Jail	3.1 mo	4.0 mo	1.1 mo
Prison	20.4	21.1	--

82% of probationers given 3 or more conditions on sentence

Almost all probationers (99%) had one or more conditions to their sentence required by the court or probation agency (table 8). Among such conditions were fees, drug testing, employment, and requirements for treatment. Seventeen percent of probationers had 1 or 2 conditions; 36% had 3 or 4 conditions, and 46% had 5 or more.

Number of conditions	Percent of adults on probation
Total	100.0%
None	1.4
1	5.7
2	10.9
3 or 4	36.1
5 or 6	28.8
7 or more	17.0

Majority pay supervision fees

A monetary requirement was the most common condition (84%) — 61% were required to pay supervision fees; 56% to pay a fine; and 55% to pay court costs. In addition, nearly a third were required to pay restitution to the victim or victims of the crime. One in ten probationers were restricted from contacting the victim or victims.

One of every four probationers were required to perform some type of community service. Two of every five probationers were formally required to maintain employment or to enroll in some type of educational or training program.

The sentences of 10% of all probationers included one or more requirements intended to monitor or in some way restrict their movement. These probationers may have been required to stay away from certain places like bars or particular businesses or may have been under electronic monitoring, house arrest, or a curfew.

Felons and misdemeanants were equally likely to be required to pay a supervision fee or court costs; felons were less likely to be required to pay a fine (47% compared to 68%). Felons were more likely than misdemeanants, however, to be required to pay victim restitution (40% to 18%); to have special restrictions on their movement (13% to 6%); and to be required to maintain employment (41% to 27%).

More than 2 of 5 adults on probation required to receive treatment for alcohol or drug abuse

More than 2 of every 5 probationers were required to enroll in some form of substance abuse treatment. An estimated 29% of probationers were required to get treatment for alcohol abuse or dependency and 23% for drug abuse. Alcohol treatment was required about twice as frequently among misdemeanants as felons (41% compared to 21%), while drug treatment was required nearly twice as frequently among felons as among misdemeanants (28% compared to 15%).

Nearly a third of all probationers were subject to mandatory drug testing — 43% of felons and 17% of misdemeanants.

Nearly 1 in 5 probationers were required to participate in other treatment programs, such as special psychiatric/psychological counseling, sex offenders program, or “other counseling” — primarily counseling for domestic violence.

Table 8. Conditions of sentences of adult probationers, by severity of offense, 1995

Condition of sentence	Total	Severity of offense	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Any condition	98.6%	98.4%	98.9%
Fees, fines, court costs	84.3%	84.2%	85.1%
Supervision fees	61.0	63.9	59.8
Fines	55.8	47.4	67.9
Court costs	54.5	56.4	54.5
Restitution to victim	30.3%	39.7%	17.6%
Confinement/monitoring	10.1%	12.9%	6.3%
Boot camp	.5	.8	.1
Electronic monitoring	2.9	3.2	2.0
House arrest without electronic monitoring	.8	1.1	.5
Curfew	.9	1.6	0
Restriction on movement	4.2	5.3	2.9
Restrictions	21.1%	24.0%	16.0%
No contact with victim	10.4	11.8	8.2
Driving restrictions	5.3	4.3	5.8
Community service	25.7%	27.3%	24.0%
Alcohol/drug restrictions	38.2%	48.1%	23.7%
Mandatory drug testing	32.5	43.0	17.1
Remain alcohol/drug free	8.1	10.4	5.2
Substance abuse treatment	41.0%	37.5%	45.7%
Alcohol	29.2	21.3	41.0
Drug	23.0	28.3	14.8
Other treatment	17.9%	16.1%	20.9%
Sex offenders program	2.5	3.9	.2
Psychiatric/psychological counseling	7.1	8.9	4.7
Other counseling	9.2	4.4	16.4
Employment and training	40.3%	45.4%	34.4%
Employment	34.7	40.9	27.3
Education/training	15.0	15.5	15.1
Other special conditions	16.5%	19.0%	12.6%
Number of probationers*	2,558,981	1,470,696	982,536

Note: Detail may not sum to total because probationers may have more than one condition on their sentences, and totals may include items not shown in the table. Excludes 61,579 probationers (2% of all adults on probation) for whom information on conditions of probation were not reported.

Nearly three-quarters contacted by a probation officer in last 30 days

An estimated 72% of all probationers had some type of contact with their probation officer in the 30 days prior to the survey; 61% had a face-to-face contact; 27% had been contacted by mail or by telephone (table 9). Most personal contacts occurred in the probation office (59%); fewer in the field, at an offender's home or job (12%).

In addition to face-to-face contacts and contacts by telephone or by mail, probation agencies made "collateral" contacts with other persons, such as the probationer's employers, teachers, treatment providers, police, relatives or acquaintances to gather information on those under their supervision. Overall, during the 30 days before the survey, probation agencies made one or more collateral contacts for more than a quarter of all probationers.

Felons were more likely than misdemeanants to have had an office contact in the last 30 days (63% as compared with 53%), to have had a field contact (15% compared with 7%), and to have one or more collateral contacts (31% compared to 22%).

Based on probation office classifications, nearly half of all felons and a third of all misdemeanants were currently supervised at a "medium" or "high" level. Though agencies differed in how they defined levels of supervision, a greater number of personal contacts within 30 days of the survey characterized both medium and high levels (table 10). Of probationers at a high level of supervision, 82% had a personal contact, and at a medium level, 78%, compared to 57% of those at a minimum supervision level, 35% of those unclassified, and 8% of probationers on administrative supervision.

Collateral contacts within the last 30 days were the most frequent for probationers in the highest supervision

levels, ranging from 45% of those in high supervision to 9% of those in administrative supervision.

Table 9. Level of supervision and type of contact by probation officer in last month, by severity of offense, 1995

	Total	Severity of offense	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %
Contact with probationer in last 30 days			
None	28.3%	23.8%	34.8%
Any ^a	71.7	76.2	65.2
Personal	60.7	65.0	54.1
Office	59.2	63.0	53.4
Field	11.9	15.3	6.8
Other contact	27.0	27.1	26.5
Mail	10.5	10.5	10.2
Telephone	18.1	18.0	18.1
Collateral contact in last 30 days^b			
None	27.2	31.0	22.2
One or more	72.8%	69.0%	77.8%
Level of supervision			
High	16.2%	19.8%	9.2%
Medium	26.7	29.3	24.1
Minimum	39.0	37.5	41.5
Administrative	6.8	7.2	6.2
Unclassified	9.9	4.4	17.8
Other	1.5	1.8	1.2
Number of probationers ^c	2,451,337	1,449,405	907,654

^aMore than 1 type of contact was possible.

^bCase-related contacts that do not include contact with the probationer such as verification of employment or attendance in treatment program.

^cExcludes 169,223 probationers (6% of all probationers) for whom information on number of contacts were not reported.

Table 10. Type of contact by probation officer in last month, by level of supervision, 1995

Type of contact	Level of supervision				
	High	Medium	Minimum	Administrative	Unclassified
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100%
Contact with probationer in last 30 days					
None	12.9%	14.1%	29.1%	74.5%	54.8%
Any ^a	87.1	85.9	70.9	25.5	45.2
Personal contact	81.5	78.0	56.5	7.5	35.2
Office	78.4	76.2	55.5	6.6	34.9
Field	32.6	14.5	6.3	1.1	1.8
Other contact	30.5	25.9	29.6	18.8	19.9
Mail	8.6	7.6	13.5	13.7	7.9
Telephone	23.6	20.3	18.0	5.9	12.1
Collateral contact in last 30 days^b					
None	44.9	30.3	23.2	8.6	18.5
One or more	55.1%	69.7%	76.8%	91.4%	81.5%
Number of probationers ^c	383,886	659,393	987,121	174,340	182,817

^aMore than 1 type of contact was possible.

^bCase-related contacts that do not include contact with the probationer such as verification of employment or attendance in treatment program.

^cExcludes 200,062 probationers for whom information on number of contacts or level of supervision was not reported, and an additional 32,941 probationers with other supervision levels.

More than a third of probationers in alcohol/drug treatment program

At some time since entering probation supervision, more than 60% of all probationers had participated in some type of special supervision or other program (table 11). The most common program was alcohol or drug treatment/ counseling — 33% of felons and 42% of misdemeanants had received such treatment while under their current sentence to probation.

Nearly a third of probationers had been tested for drugs at least once since entering probation. Drug testing was more common among felons (44%) than misdemeanants (17%).

Felons were more likely than misdemeanants to have participated in an

intensive supervision program (15% compared to 4%). Ten percent of felons also received psychological or psychiatric counseling, as compared with 6% of misdemeanants.

Not all of the probationers who had participated in the special supervision or treatment programs were doing so at the time of the survey. When the survey was conducted, an estimated 37% were enrolled in a treatment program, being tested for drugs, under intensive supervision, or in another type of program. A quarter of all probationers were being tested for drugs; a sixth were in an alcohol or drug treatment program. About 5% were under intensive supervision.

	Percent participating in a program at time of survey
Any program	36.8%
Intensive supervision	4.9
Confinement/monitoring	.6
Community service	.5
Drug testing	24.5
Alcohol/drug treatment	16.0
Other treatment	4.3
Counseling	5.2
Education	3.2

18% faced a disciplinary hearing after entering probation

Probationers who violate a condition of their probation, or who are arrested for a new offense, may be called before the court to review the circumstances of their violation. Such disciplinary hearings may result in the issuance of an arrest warrant for a probationer who has absconded, a sentence to incarceration, or reinstatement of probation with or without new conditions.

At the time of the survey, an estimated 18% of all adults currently on probation had experienced one or more formal disciplinary hearings after entering probation supervision. Probationers included in the survey who had served longer on a probation sentence also had more experience with disciplinary hearings. Of those who had served 36 months or more and who were still on probation (or who had returned to probation following a period of incarceration), 38% had at least one formal hearing, compared with 5% of those who had served less than 6 months.

Months served on probation	Number of probationers*	Percent of probationers who had at least one disciplinary hearing
All probationers	2,553,052	18.4%
Less than 6 months	557,238	4.8
6 to 11	594,726	11.0
12 to 23	697,545	21.8
24 to 35	344,361	26.1
36 or more	359,183	37.6

*Excludes 67,508 probationers (3% of all adults on probation) for whom information on formal disciplinary hearings or time served on probation was not available.

The records check survey underestimates the percentage of all persons sentenced to probation who have disciplinary hearings over the course of their sentence. Probationers who had a disciplinary hearing which resulted in revocation of their probation and who

Table 11. Participation in special supervision and other programs since entering probation, by severity of offense, 1995

Program	Total	Severity of offense	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Any special supervision or program	61.2%	62.9%	59.4%
Intensive supervision	10.1%	14.6%	4.0%
Other special supervision	5.2%	6.5%	3.2%
Detention center/confinement	.1	.2	.1
Boot camp	.7	1.2	.1
Electronic monitoring	3.5	3.9	2.6
House arrest without electronic monitoring	1.2	1.7	.6
Community service	1.1%	.9%	1.4%
Drug testing	32.3%	43.9%	16.6%
Alcohol or drug treatment	37.1%	33.4%	41.9%
Other treatment	11.4%	15.7%	5.2%
Day	5.3	7.2	2.7
Residential	4.9	6.8	2.2
Sex offender	2.7	4.1	.6
Counseling	11.6%	11.6%	12.6%
Psychological/psychiatric	8.1	9.9	5.8
Family	2.9	2.0	4.3
Life skills/parenting	1.4	1.5	1.3
Victim impact panel	.4	0	1.0
Other counseling	.6	.2	1.3
Education	7.0%	9.1%	4.0%
Basic education/GED program	5.2	7.0	2.6
Vocational/job training	2.5	3.0	1.9
Other	.4%	.3%	.6%
Number of probationers*	2,545,594	1,465,521	973,197

*Excludes an estimated 74,966 probationers (3% of all adults on probation) for whom information on participation in special supervision or treatment program was not reported.

were currently incarcerated were excluded from the survey. In addition, some probationers who had no disciplinary hearing may have had a hearing after the survey but before completing their sentence. Consequently, the percentage of all persons initially placed on probation and subsequently having a disciplinary hearing is likely to have been higher than 18%.

Disciplinary hearings more common among unemployed and those with prior sentences

Among probationers included in the survey, those who were unemployed were more likely to have had a disciplinary hearing (23%) than those who were employed (16%). Probationers who had a prior sentence to probation or incarceration were also more likely to have had a hearing than probationers with no prior sentence (23% compared to 15%).

	Percent of adults on probation with disciplinary hearing
Employment	
Employed	15.9%
Not employed	22.9
Severity of offense	
Felony	21.1%
Misdemeanor	14.8
Prior sentence	
No prior sentence	14.9%
Probation or incarceration	23.2

Failure to maintain contact the most frequent reason for hearing

Of those probationers who had experienced a disciplinary hearing, the most frequent reason was absconding or failure to contact the probation officer (41%) (table 12). This was followed by arrest or conviction for a new offense (38%), failure to pay fines or restitution (38%), and failure to attend or complete an alcohol or drug treatment program (22%). An estimated 11% of the probationers who had a disciplinary hearing had a positive drug test; 9% had failed to complete a community service requirement.

Overall, 43% of felons and 38% of misdemeanants with at least one disciplinary hearing failed to maintain

contact with a probation officer. Arrest or conviction for a new offense was somewhat more likely among felons than misdemeanants (43% compared to 31%). Failure to attend or complete a substance abuse treatment program, however, was more frequent among misdemeanants (33%) than felons (18%). Forty-three of misdemeanants and 34% of felons with a disciplinary hearing failed to pay fines or restitution.

Over 40% receive new conditions of supervision; 29% incarcerated

Among persons under probation supervision who had experienced one or more disciplinary hearings, 42% were permitted to continue their sentence, but only with the imposition of additional conditions; 29% were incarcerated in jail or prison; and 29% had their supervision reinstated without any new conditions (table 13). Nearly 1 in

Table 12. Reasons for disciplinary hearings of adult probationers, by severity of most serious offense, 1995

Reason for disciplinary hearing ^a	Total	Severity of offense	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Absconded/failed to maintain contact	41.1%	43.3%	37.6%
New offense	38.4%	43.2%	31.0%
Arrested	30.4	34.9	23.5
Convicted	13.9	15.8	10.5
Failure to pay fines or restitution	37.9%	34.1%	43.0%
Drug/alcohol violation			
Failure to attend/complete treatment program	22.5%	17.5%	33.0%
Positive drug test	11.2	14.3	5.6
Alcohol abuse	2.7	2.9	2.7
Violation of confinement restrictions			
Failure to do jail time/return from furlough	2.5%	2.5%	2.8%
Violation of home confinement	1.3	1.6	.6
Other violations			
Failure to complete community service	8.5%	9.5%	6.7%
Other	6.8	6.9	6.7
Number of probationers ^b	457,279	297,481	144,550

^aDetail adds to more than total because some probationers had more than one disciplinary hearing, while others had a single hearing with more than one reason.

^bExcludes probationers who never had a disciplinary hearing or for whom information on disciplinary hearings was not reported.

Table 13. Outcome of disciplinary hearings of adult probationers, by severity of most serious offense, 1995

Outcome of disciplinary hearing	Total ^a	Severity of offense	
		Felony	Misdemeanor
Charges not sustained	3.5%	3.7%	3.5%
Supervision reinstated			
With new conditions	41.9%	46.0%	33.9%
Without new conditions	28.6	26.8	30.5
Incarcerated	29.1%	34.4%	18.9%
Other outcomes			
Bench warrant issued/declared absconder	2.7%	1.7%	4.7%
Residential treatment/diversion order	1.6	2.1	.7
Supervision level reduced	1.6	1.7	1.7
Other	1.6	2.3	.3
Hearing not completed	24.0%	20.2%	32.4%
Number of probationers ^b	455,221	299,941	141,075

^aDetail adds to more than total because some probationers had more than one disciplinary hearing, while others had a single hearing with more than one outcome.

^bExcludes probationers who never had a disciplinary hearing or for whom information on disciplinary hearings was missing.

4 probationers had not completed a hearing. Four percent had charges that were not sustained.*

Felons who experienced a disciplinary hearing were more likely than misdemeanants to have been incarcerated (34% compared to 19%) and somewhat more likely to have had their supervision reinstated with new conditions (46% compared to 34%).

Methodology

The 1995 Survey of Adults on Probation (SAP) was conducted for the Bureau of Justice Statistics by the U.S. Bureau of the Census. It was the first nationally representative survey to collect information on the individual characteristics of adult probationers.

The SAP was a two-part survey, consisting of a records check based on the probationers' administrative records and a personal interview. Only information from the records check component — collected during December 1994 through September 1995 — are included in this report.

Sample design

The sample for the 1995 SAP records check sample was selected from a universe of 2,627 State, county, and municipal probation agencies with a total of 2,618,132 formally sentenced probationers (appendix table 1). The universe came from the 1991 Census of Probation and Parole Agencies. The sample design was a stratified two-stage selection.

In the first stage, probation agencies were stratified into 16 strata defined by government branch (executive or judicial) and level (State or local), and census region (Northeast, Midwest, South, or West). The largest 43 probation agencies were made self-representing and were selected into the sample with certainty. The remaining 2,584

*The percentages for hearing outcomes add to a total larger than 100% because some probationers reported more than one hearing or outcome.

Appendix table 1. Summary of the sample for the 1995 Survey of Adults on Probation

Type of agency and region	Census universe		Sample selections		
	Number of field offices	Number of probationers	Number of field offices	Number of offices/sites ^a	Number of probationers ^b
Total	2,627	2,618,132	165	167	5,867
Executive branch, State	1,448	1,176,429	67	85	2,744
Northeast	94	39,759	2	2	86
Midwest	321	153,469	9	8	319
South	803	873,858	50	70	2,199
West	230	109,343	6	5	140
Executive branch, local	198	411,825	24	24	910
Northeast	86	134,819	8	8	267
Midwest	52	67,781	4	4	94
South	7	19,584	1	1	22
West	53	189,641	11	11	527
Judicial branch, State	370	462,020	27	28	1,107
Northeast	41	203,294	12	13	504
Midwest	188	127,418	7	7	321
South	63	86,152	5	6	220
West	78	45,156	3	2	62
Judicial branch, local	611	567,858	47	30	1,106
Northeast	78	78,124	7	6	258
Midwest	347	223,831	19	10	371
South	42	49,120	5	3	88
West	144	216,783	16	11	389

Note: The universe file for the 1995 Survey of Adults on Probation was based on the 1991 Census of Probation and Parole Agencies. In this census agencies reported the address of their field offices and the number of adults under supervision in each office. Field offices were categorized based on the characteristics of their agencies by type (executive or judicial branch) and level of government (State or local).

^aOf 165 offices selected, 19 were out of scope, not currently supervising adult probationers, and 20 would not participate. Twenty-four selected field offices reported having additional suboffices. Of the 110 suboffices, 41 were sampled. One office represented an entire State (Massachusetts), from which a systematic sample of 210 probationers were selected.

^bOf 5,922 eligible probationers selected within 167 offices/sites, completed record check forms were received for 5,867 (or 99.1%).

probation agencies were not self-representing and were grouped within strata into 122 clusters of roughly equal size. One agency was selected from each of the 122 clusters, with probability of selection proportional to size.

Twenty-four agencies had a total of 110 additional subagencies that were not included among the 2,627 probation agencies. A total of 41 subagencies were selected, and were included in the cluster of their parent agency, resulting in an overall total of 206 agencies. Excluding 19 agencies subsequently determined to be out of scope and 20 which refused to participate resulted in a final total of 167 agencies selected.

In the second stage, Bureau of the Census field representatives visited each selected agency and systematically selected a sample of probationers using predetermined procedures. Only persons age 18 and older, who were formally sentenced to probation, who were not absconders were included in the records check. Excluded were persons supervised by a Federal probation agency, those only on parole, persons on presentence or pre-trial diversion, and juveniles. As a result, approximately 1 of every 442 probationers were selected. A total of 5,867 records checks were completed by a probation officer or other probation agency representative. The overall response rate of 87.4% represents the combination of an agency

response rate of 88.3% and a records check completion rate of 99.1%.

Based on the completed records checks, estimates for the entire population were generated using weighting factors derived from the original probability of selection in the sample. These factors were adjusted for variable rates of non-response across strata. A further adjustment was made to the 1994 yearend counts of the number of adults formally sentenced to probation.

Accuracy of the estimates

The accuracy of the estimates presented in this report depends on two types of error: sampling and nonsampling. Sampling error is the variation that may occur by chance because a sample rather than a complete enumeration of the population was conducted. Nonsampling error can be attributed to many sources such as the inability to obtain information about all cases in the sample, inability to obtain complete and correct information from the administrative records, and processing errors. In any survey the full extent of the nonsampling error is never known.

The sampling error, as measured by an estimated standard error, varies by the size of the estimate and the size of the base population. Estimates of the standard errors have been calculated for the 1995 survey (appendix table 2). These estimates may be used to construct confidence intervals around

Base of the estimate	Estimated percentages						
	98 or 2	95 or 5	90 or 10	80 or 20	70 or 30	50	
75,000	2.3	3.5	4.9	6.5	7.5	8.1	
100,000	2.0	3.1	4.2	5.6	6.5	7.0	
200,000	1.4	2.2	3.0	4.0	4.6	5.0	
300,000	1.1	1.8	2.4	3.3	3.7	4.1	
400,000	1.0	1.5	2.1	2.8	3.2	3.5	
500,000	0.9	1.4	1.9	2.5	2.9	3.1	
750,000	0.7	1.1	1.5	2.1	2.4	2.6	
1,000,000	0.6	1.0	1.3	1.8	2.0	2.2	
1,500,000	0.5	0.8	1.1	1.5	1.7	1.8	
2,500,000	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4	
2,620,560	0.4	0.6	0.8	1.1	1.3	1.4	

percentages in this report. For example, the 95-percent confidence interval around the percent of adults on probation for a drug offense is approximately 21.4% plus or minus 1.96 times 1.1% (or 19.2% to 23.6%).

These standard errors may also be used to test the significance of the difference between two sample statistics by pooling the standard errors of the two sample estimates. For example, the standard error of the difference between white and black adults on probation for drug offenses would be 2.8% (or the square root of the sum of the squared standard errors for each group). The 95-percent confidence interval around the difference would be 1.96 times 2.8% (or 5.5%). Since the difference of 13.9% (30.9% minus 17.0%) is greater than 5.5%, the difference would be considered statistically significant.

The standard errors reported should be used only for tests on all probationers. Comparisons of male and female probationers require different standard errors.

Data on prior sentences

The availability of criminal history data in probation office administrative records was more limited than other types of information collected on the

SAP records check form. Complete information on whether a probationer had a prior sentence to probation or incarceration, and whether any prior sentences they had were as a juvenile or as an adult, was available for 74% of the estimated 2,620,560 adult probationers covered by the survey. Partial information was available for 15% of probationers. No data were available for the remaining 12%.

	Percent of records, by amount of data reported on prior sentences
Complete	73.6%
Partial	14.6
No data	11.8

Overall, data on any prior sentences to probation or incarceration in a jail or prison were missing for 17% of probationers (appendix table 3). This is higher than the 12% of probationers for whom no data were available because partial data could only be used when there was an indication of a prior sentence. Partial data did not allow a prior sentence to be ruled out.

The amount of missing criminal history data varied for each type of prior sentence status. Differing percentages of missing data occurred for the status of having or not having a prior sentence. Twenty percent of records were missing information on prior sentence to incarceration, compared to 14% of

Appendix table 3. Missing data for prior sentences, by severity of offense, completion of presentence investigation, and level of supervision, 1995

	Prior sentences, percent missing data				
	Any type	Probation	Incarceration	Adult	Juvenile
Total missing	16.8%	14.3%	19.7%	18.9%	24.8%
Severity of offense					
Felony	10.7	7.5	12.6	12.7	16.3
Misdemeanor	24.7	23.3	29.4	26.5	35.4
Presentence investigation					
Completed	7.6	6.4	8.6	9.7	13.4
Not completed	22.3	18.0	27.0	24.4	31.1
Level of supervision					
High/medium	11.7	8.8	14.7	14.6	19.8
Minimum/administrative	16.0	14.8	17.7	17.4	23.0
Unclassified	41.3	33.4	48.6	43.4	53.1

Note: The reported statistics are in tables 4, 5, 6, and 7.

records missing data on prior sentence to probation. Twenty-five percent of all records were missing whether a probationer had a prior juvenile sentence, and 19% were missing whether there was a prior adult sentence.

The amount of missing data also varied by severity of offense, with misdemeanants registering twice as much missing data as felons for any type of prior sentence (25% compared with 11%). Large differences between misdemeanants and felons were also found for their status on each type of prior sentence. Data were missing for more than a third of misdemeanants regarding a prior juvenile sentence — nearly 20% greater than for the prior juvenile sentence status of felons (16%).

More information on prior sentences was available for probationers with a completed PSI (8% missing data compared with 22% missing data). Not having a PSI completed was strongly related to having more missing data for

each type of prior sentence. Nearly a third of the data on prior juvenile sentences was missing for probationers without a completed PSI.

Less highly supervised probationers were more likely to have incomplete prior sentence information available than were those on higher levels of supervision — 41% of data were missing for unclassified probationers, 16% for those on minimum or administrative supervision, and 12% for those on a high or medium level. The amount of missing data by level of supervision varied for each type of prior sentence. Data on prior juvenile sentence status were missing for about half of probationers whose level of supervision was unclassified.

Sentence lengths

Felons included in the SAP had an average sentence to probation of 51 months (appendix table 4). Because of the SAP sampling design, this is

longer than the average sentence to probation of felons in State courts in 1994 (40 months), as estimated by BJS' National Judicial Reporting Program (NJRP). Persons who entered probation with shorter sentences left probation more quickly, resulting in a longer average sentence length among persons remaining to be sampled for the SAP.

Among sampled felons admitted to probation within the 12 months prior to the SAP, the average probation sentence was 42 months, or about the same as the NJRP estimate of average sentence imposed in 1994. Few felons sentenced in the last year left probation supervision prior to the survey date.

Overall, probationers included in the SAP had received an average sentence to probation of 39 months. The average sentence among misdemeanants (21 months) was 2½ years shorter than that for felons.

Appendix table 4. Felony sentences of adults who entered probation, 1994, compared to sentences of adults who were on probation in 1995

Most serious current offense	National Judicial Reporting Program, 1994, felons sentenced to probation only or to probation and incarceration		Survey of Adults on Probation, 1995							
	Percent	Mean sentence length	All probationers		Felons		Admitted last 12 months		Misdemeanants	
			Percent	Mean sentence length	Percent	Mean sentence length	Percent	Mean sentence length	Percent	Mean sentence length
Total	100%	40 mo	100%	39 mo	100%	51 mo	42 mo	100%	21 mo	
Violent offenses	14%	45 mo	17.3%	48 mo	19.5%	62 mo	51 mo	13.5%	21	
Murder	**	54	.2	**	.1	**	**	.2	**	
Rape	2	56	.3	**	.5	**	**	**	**	
Robbery	3	48	1.9	60	3.2	60	**	**	**	
Assault	7	41	9.2	36	7.6	55	48	11.1	19	
Property offenses	32%	41 mo	28.9%	42 mo	36.6%	50 mo	42 mo	18.2%	20 mo	
Burglary	10	44	5.8	51	9.7	52	46	.3	**	
Larceny/theft	13	39	9.9	39	11.1	49	38	8.5	20	
Fraud	9	41	7.2	43	9.6	50	43	4.2	22	
Drug offenses	34%	39 mo	21.4%	43 mo	30.7%	47 mo	39 mo	7.6%	22 mo	
Possession	16	38	9.8	38	13.1	42	34	4.6	19	
Trafficking	18	41	9.7	49	15.4	50	42	1.6	**	
Public-order offenses	--	--	31.1%	27 mo	12.1%	48 mo	39 mo	59.6%	20 mo	
Traffic	--	--	4.7	18	.9	**	**	10.2	17	
Driving while intoxicated	--	--	16.7	28	5.2	54	50	35.2	23	
Number of probationers	429,694	429,694	2,595,499	2,543,831	1,479,904	1,461,774	500,931	988,033	956,871	

Note: Persons on probation in 1995 may have started their sentence at any time prior to the survey.

--Not available.

**Too few cases to provide an estimate.

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Jan M. Chaiken, Ph.D., is director.

BJS Special Reports address a specific topic in depth from one or more datasets that cover many topics.

Thomas P. Bonczar wrote this report under the supervision of Allen J. Beck. Christopher J. Mumola, Bonita A. Reynolds, Coliece R. Rice, Jennifer L. McGihon, and Tracy L. Snell provided statistical assistance. Tom Hester edited the report, assisted by Priscilla Middleton. Marilyn Marbrook, assisted by Yvonne Boston and Jayne Robinson, prepared the report for publication.

Allen Beck and Tom Bonczar designed the survey, developed the questionnaire and monitored data collection, production of weights, and variance estimates.

LaTerri D. Bynum, Kenneth B. Dawson, and Marita K. Perez, Demographic Surveys Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census, carried out data collection and processing under the supervision of Kathy Creighton, N. Gail Hoff, and Gertrude B. Odom. Larry Altmayer, under the supervision of Stephen T. Phillips, provided programming assistance. Denise Lewis, under the supervision of Michael Roebuck and Thomas Moore, designed the sample and weighting specifications. Cynthia Eurich, Field Division, coordinated the field operations, under the supervision of Michael McMahan.

December 1997, NCJ-164267

Data presented in this report may be obtained from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data at the University of Michigan, 1-800-999-0960. The archive may also be accessed through the BJS Web site. When at the archive site, search for data set ICPSR 2039, National Survey of Adults on Probation.

This report and many of its data, as well as other reports and statistics, may be found at the Bureau of Justice Statistics World Wide Web site: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/>