Emotions in context: the marginalisation and persistence of emotional labour in probation

FOWLER, Andrew, PHILLIPS, Jake <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7606-6423> and WESTABY, Chalen

Chapter 4: Emotions in context: the marginalisation and persistence of emotional labour in probation

Andrew Fowler

Orcid.org/ 0000-0002-0164-9915

Jake Phillips

Orcid.org/0000-0002-7606-6423

Chalen Westaby

Orcid.org/0000-0002-6549-4675

Abstract

In this chapter we explore and synthesise the limited extant research on the performance of emotional labour by probation practitioners. We explore the history of emotions in probation at both the level of policy and practice, arguing that whilst emotion management has always been a core facet of probation work its importance has not been fully acknowledged. Indeed, we argue that recent years has seen a marked marginalisation of emotions in policy terms due to the changing nature of what probation is 'for' and how its main purpose- the rehabilitative endeavour – is legitimated in late modernity. We then provide an overview of the – albeit limited – recent research which has explored probation practice through the lens of emotional labour, exploring what emotions are managed, to what end and how this impacts on probation workers.

Keywords: probation, history of probation, emotions, probation practice, emotional labour

Introduction

In this chapter we explore and synthesise the limited extant research on the performance of emotional labour by probation practitioners. We begin by providing a chronological account of the appearance and disappearance of descriptions of emotions in probation practice. In doing so we show how emotions can be seen to be inherent to probation work since the earliest accounts of probation work in the 19th century. We map the emotional labour expectations that would be associated with such work as well as consider how emotions are displayed by practitioners from this time until the last quarter of the 20th century.

We then track how the latter part of the 20th century and early 21st century saw the use - or at least acknowledgement - of emotion work in probation fall out of favour in probation policy in particular. In turn, we argue that this has led to a marginalisation of the use of emotion in probation practice with which comes certain ramifications for practitioners, who perform emotional labour as a core element of their work nonetheless. We then explore the small body of knowledge in the field to highlight the important role played by emotional labour in probation practice. We suggest that the performance of emotional labour in probation has the potential to impact upon the wellbeing of probation practitioners - although there is currently little evidence to support this hypothesis - and argue that support and training should be seen as vital in combatting these potential adverse effects.

How do we understand emotional labour?

Notwithstanding the introduction to the concept of emotional labour contained in the introduction to this volume, it is necessary to establish the way in which we have operationalised the concept of emotional labour in the course of our own research and in this

chapter. Hochschild argues (1979) that social psychology overlooked emotions as governed by social rules and introduced terms like 'emotion work, 'feeling rules' and 'emotion management' to offer an interactionist account of how workers induce or inhibit emotion to make them appropriate to a particular workplace ‘situation. Hochschild argues that social psychology can be split into the organismic and interactive accounts of emotion. The former explains emotion as a visceral response to a stimulus, as capacities to be triggered whereas the interactionist account proposes that social situations influence emotion, guide and contribute to the management of emotion. In this chapter Hochschild's (1979: 561) definition of 'emotion work' will be adopted:

> …the act of trying to change in degree or quality an emotion or feeling.

This is used synonymously with 'emotion management' or to work or manage a feeling or emotion. The three types of emotion work Hochschild offers are cognitive, bodily and expressive. The ‘cognitive’ is where someone tries to change the feelings they associate with an image or idea, the ‘bodily’ is where someone tries to alter their physical symptoms of an emotion and ‘expressive’ is the attempt to change expressive gestures in relation to inner feelings. They are theoretically distinct but could occur together. In this analysis, the focus is on the bodily and expressive types of emotion work.

A history of emotion work in probation practice

Schnell (2005, cited in Plamper, 2017: 5) suggests that historical research into emotions involves two contrary positions: firstly, that human feelings have remained the same and means of expressing them change; and secondly, that each emotion has its own history determined by historical changes (). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to enter this debate. However, this socially constructed view of emotion implicit in Schnell's latter understanding of emotions is a helpful way of understanding the use of emotion in probation work.

Therefore, whilst the use of emotion is present in the early descriptions of the probation role the description of those emotions must be understood within that particular historical context.

The work of Police Court Missionaries of the nineteenth century is often cited as the 'origin of probation work'. Police Court Missionaries were the first people appointed by the Church of England Temperance Society (CETS) to work in the court and offer support to people sentenced by Magistrates (McWilliams, 1983). This represented the theological, Christian motivations and values that informed future probation work, (McWilliams, 1983) and is best described by a Police Court Missionary at the time.

> Grasp the hand of the one you would rescue, and with him ascend the mountain, instead of standing like an inanimate and unsympathetic signpost on the plain which you consider so unsafe for him. Love is the vehicle of all the medicines of Christ. (Ayscough 1922, cited in Newton 1958: 7)

The Christian faith played a significant role in the work of Police Court Missionaries, and the fundamental principle of probation work to support clients to make positive changes was prevalent. Moreover, the use of emotion was considered critical to this task with the work of the Police Court Missionaries being characterised as 'changing behaviour by changing feeling - through conversion' highlighting the necessity of missionaries having to use emotion to affect change (Newton, 1956 in King, 1958: 7). In these early accounts, missionaries used pledges, praying, friendship, advice and admonishment, or as Newton (1956, in King 1958: 7) succinctly suggests 'persuasion, exhortation and support'. We see such examples of the importance of emotion in probation work in the commentary of Thomas Holmes (1900: 81-83) - a Police Court Missionary himself - when describing his work with a family where there is domestic abuse:

> I did not know whether to smite him or laugh [as a consequence of witnessing domestic abuse]. He was a big fellow, so I held my peace…I could have cried but I did not… He felt pleased that he did not owe me anything and I felt pleased that he should think so…so again and again, when I have been called to such homes, have I had to play the hypocrite and humour his delusion; to have done otherwise would have been madness.

An analysis of this example of 'rescue work' (see Auerbach 2015, Gard 2007, Vanstone 2004, McWilliams 1983) through the lens of emotional labour alerts us to the necessity of performing emotional labour in such circumstances. Due to the social situation, Holmes describes having to suppress the urge to cry or challenge the man's behaviour and instead engages in surface acting; displaying deference to the husband's position as 'man of the house'. This performance is required in order to build a relationship with the family, and in particular with the husband, who had recently been released from prison. Interestingly, Holmes also comments on the consequences of performing emotional labour when he refers to the need 'to play the hypocrite'. This could be regarded as an example of 'faking in bad faith' (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1989:32), which is where surface acting is used to display 'fake' emotions.

King (1958: 7) argues that the success of statutory probation in Massachusetts and the work of the Police Court Missionaries demonstrated the 'practical possibilities' of supervising people who had committed crimes. This coincided with the passing of the English Probation of Offenders Act 1907, which established a statutory probation service. Leeson (1914: 86) cites The Departmental Committee on the English Probation of Offenders Act 1907 description of the type of worker to act as a probation officer:

> The value of probation must necessarily depend on the efficiency of the probation officer. It is a system in which rules are comparatively unimportant and personality is everything. The probation officer must be picked man or woman, endowed not only with intelligence and zeal, but in a high degree with sympathy, tact and firmness.

The Departmental Committee therefore requires probation officers who are able to perform emotional labour effectively. The requirement to use feeling as a necessary part of the job was thus seen as an essential characteristic of the probation worker. The dualistic nature of the role, which often characterises probation work today (see Trotter 2006, 2015) is also captured when sympathy is required but in conjunction with 'tact and firmness'. This enshrines the importance of the use of emotion in the early professionalisation of probation work.

In this 'professionalisation of feeling', Leeson further considers the dualistic nature of probation practice when he interprets the condition of the Probation of Offenders Act 1907 that requires probation officers to 'advise, assist and befriend' as meaning the development of a 'constructive friendship' (1914: 114). He maintains that a ‘constructive friendship’ is therefore one which demands the officer to not be a 'sentimentalist…nor a dictator or bully…' and that 'as well as [displaying] sympathy he must act up to his knowledge' (p.114). Thus, the probation officer has always needed to perform emotional labour with clear boundaries in mind and balance sympathy with his knowledge.

Emotion has always been present in the work of a probation practitioner. However, we should also bear in mind Schnell's (2005) second position: that emotions have their own history and are determined by historical changes. The need to strike a balance between creating clear boundaries and connecting with the probationer resonates with contemporary probation

practice. That said, 'sympathy' or 'pity' would be unlikely to feature in the description of helpful characteristics for a probation worker in the contemporary context. Gerdes (201: 233) argues that sympathy has been devolved in its level of meaning in the twentieth century to 'pity' or 'sorrow,' representing 'feeling for the other' and empathy is now used for 'feeling with the other.' The use of 'sympathy' makes visible the early philosophical and theological underpinning of how people expressed this essential characteristic of the probation worker which was akin to the later social science and psychologically informed use of the word 'empathy' (see Gerdes 2011). The use of 'sympathy' as an essential characteristic and contemporary use of 'empathy' represent an abiding commitment in probation practice to feeling as a necessary part of the job.

In the 1920's, the professionalisation of probation was given further attention through greater consideration of the training, payment and appointment of probation officers. Following a Departmental Committee report on these matters the Criminal Justice Acts of 1925 and 1926 implemented changes to standardise working conditions, qualifications and qualities that were desirable in applicants including 'sympathy, tact, commonsense and firmness' (King 1958: 15). Further to this the introduction of *The Probation Rules* of 1926 introduced a more standardised approach to probation work. Indeed, Le Mesurier (1935) offers a comprehensive account of probation work, albeit with less focus on how the emotional aspects in practice. Interestingly, Le Mesurier (1935: 124) argued that the probationer should 'leave the Court with the feeling that he can rely on help and guidance from an understanding friend'. Here we see evidence of the existence of emotional labour in the description of the probation officer's responsibilities in that the officer's purpose was to invoke a positive emotional response in the probationer on receiving a sentence.

The 1930s saw even greater development of the probation officer role with the introduction of the American inspired social casework approach underpinned by one-to-one work where

the probation worker built a relationship with the probationer. In her analysis of the social casework method, King (1958) draws a direct link between the tradition of social work and probation work, with both being informed by compassion for people's distress and an awareness of the consequences of this distress. Her work brings emotions to the fore in our understanding of probation practice, in a way which had not hitherto been seen. King (1958: 46) describes the importance of understanding people on probation 'intellectually, but with our feelings' as central to the case work approach and cites psychology and psychiatry, including the work of Freud, as a major influence at this time. In short, King argued that feelings felt subconsciously by clients as a result of their upbringing need to be worked with, as is the changing of feelings in clients to alter attitudes and behaviour. King describes the use of feeling in the social casework approach in more detail in a quote which is worth including at length:

> Apart from the general satisfaction derived from the opportunity casework gives for the worker to express their love and concern for fellow men, he should seek no special emotional gratification in individual relationships with clients. Emotional involvement of this kind restricts freedom of both participants by blinding the worker to certain aspects of his role, in particular his need for objectivity, and thus limits the amount of help he can give. For the worker, mere control of feelings by suppression is not what is required. He has to recognise and use these feelings in the client's interest. If he is preoccupied by the need to restrain his anger or appear unshocked or to control his excessive sympathy, his capacity to listen creatively to whatever the client is saying will be impaired' (1958: 52).

King (1958) captures the nuances of emotional labour in probation practice and articulates this performance perfectly in her description of casework: providing the opportunity to

express concern without the need for anything in return, to maintain what the author later calls a ‘professional relationship’. This is where the worker is objective and does not allow their emotions to cloud or impair their judgement. King also recognises the risks to merely suppressing emotion and suggests that the emotions felt by the worker should be used to ‘help the client’, and argues that the worker will reveal ‘as little or as much…as is appropriate to this end’ (p.54). This reference to self-disclosure and the use of emotion is another feature of the current supervisory relationship in probation practice (Phillips et al, 2018). King’s representation of the ‘social casework’ approach can be related to McWilliams characterisation of the pressure in probation to embrace the 'science of social work' (McWilliams 1983:129).

Whilst King focused on the importance of emotion, Biestek (1961) introduces the use of emotion as an evidence-based skill. For Biestek (1961), the relationship relies on emotional skills which involve the use of empathy over sympathy, the building of rapport and ‘transfer’ which he defines as the emotional relationship between the client and the person on probation (p. 8). Thus, the casework relationship is regarded as a ‘dynamic interaction of attitudes and emotions between the caseworker and the client’ (Biestek, 1961:12). Biestek describes the ‘permissive atmosphere’ (p. 41) in which the caseworker creates the environment for the client, as somewhere the client can express their feelings without fear of being judged, in a warm way showing the intention to help and feeling with the client. The recognition of the significance of the use of emotion as a skill to facilitate the casework relationship is clear. In practice, these ideas can be seen in St John’s (1961) observations of probation practice in which he describes the use of emotion in probation work. For example, St. John recognises the use of sympathy as a positive emotion to build trust and the negative consequences of too much sympathy which could result in gratitude that turns to resentment when the probation

officer is required to engage in a more supervisory role (1961: 69) and his account of probation work puts emotion front and centre:

> The probation officer's function is not to impose reform from without, but to arouse a desire to change, to supply incentives, to rebuild and bolster stamina; to plant the seeds of self-recovery and then allow friendship, acceptance and sympathy to germinate and fertilise them. (1961: 76)

The development of the casework relationship and social work methods is argued to have eclipsed theological rationales and conceptualisations of probation work by the 1960s (Whitehead, 2017). Whitehead (2017: 39) characterises the period from the 1930s to the 1970s as a scientific, positivist approach to probation which becomes more about 'curing by casework to rehabilitate offenders'. This perspective borrows from the writing of McWilliams (1983, 1985, 1987) and the development of the 'non-treatment paradigm' (Bottoms and McWilliams, 1979). From this brief examination of the use of emotion in probation practice from the 19th century until the 1970s we see clear acknowledgement - in policy, legislation, conceptualisations of 'good' probation work as well as training - of the need to perform emotional labour in course of doing probation work.

The marginalisation of emotion

However, there was a shift in the focus of probation policy in the 1980s and 1990s. This came about as a result of unease about the effectiveness of probation as well as its apparent 'softness' (Garland, 2001; Robinson and Ugwidike, 2013) and continuing government focus on market principles of efficiency, cost effectiveness and economy (the role of competition) (see Ranson and Stewart 1994; Deering 2011). The resulting National Standards (Home Office, 1992) prioritised enforcement over compliance, and punishment over rehabilitation with practitioners being urged to focus on targets, performance data and accountability to the

system rather than the service user. This 'era' saw the pinnacle of the ‘technicality’ of routinised practice over the ‘indeterminacy’ of practice informed by specialist knowledge (Robinson, 2003).

This shift from ‘case worker’ to ‘case manager’ (see Burnett, 1996) in the late 1980s and 1990s, along with the prevalence of surveilling relationships and the ‘authoritative professional’ (National Probation Directorate, 2003: 7) constrained probation practitioners' opportunities to develop relationships with clients in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Indeed, as argued by Burnett and McNeill (2005: 224) policy documents in the 2000s, gave 'little hint of the support, friendliness and warmth that once characterised the supervision of offenders’. Additionally, the deliberate separation of probation from social work through, for example, the replacement of the Diploma in Social Work with specific trainee probation training, as well as the replacing of person-centred work with cognitive behavioural approaches also had an effect on the relationship between probation practitioners and clients.

Another example of the marginalisation of emotions in the field of probation can be seen in the context of the so-called 'what works' movement. The ‘What Works’ approach, which is based on the key principles of Risk, Need and Responsivity was introduced in the 1990s (see Andrews and Kiessling, 1980; Dowden and Andrews, 1999) and led to the development of Core Correctional Practice (Dowden and Andrews, 2004) and the Strategic Training Initiative in Community Supervision (Bonta et al, 2008). Both of these models of practice are underpinned by structured training, mentoring and evaluation of key skills and characteristics that are considered important for probation officers to possess. Research undertaken as part of the ‘What Works’ approach - despite its focus on interpersonal contact - missed the mark in terms of bringing emotions centre stage, most notably when it came to the lack of research into the concept of responsivity (Porporino, 2010), as well as the favouring of consistency of practice over relationship building (Mair, 2004). Furthermore, while the characteristics and

skills required for effective probation work remained the focus, the emotions required to supervise clients were not explicitly considered.

We might speculate that some of the changes in the expectations made of probation workers and their need to perform emotional labour are linked to the changing purposes of probation. Robinson's (2008) work on the shift towards late-modern forms of rehabilitation whereby rehabilitation is justified through utilitarianism, managerialism and expressive forms of rehabilitation is of particular use here. Utilitarian rehabilitation exists to 'promote the ‘greatest happiness (or, more precisely, safety) for the greatest number’, not (primarily) the individual welfare of the offender (cf. Bentham, 1823). Importantly, this implies that it is not the offender who should be the beneficiary of probation but the general public. In such a political context, one can see how explicit directions to convey, for example, empathy and kindness to people on probation becomes untenable. With regards to managerial rehabilitation, effective rehabilitative work has become synonymous with effective risk management (Garland, 2001) and is legitimated with reference to its ability to classify and treat people on probation. Such a mode of practice prioritises a so-called objective approach to measurement and management which should not be influenced by the irrationalities (rightly or wrongly) implied through the use of emotion. For example, Karstedt and Loader (2011) argue that the criminal justice system seeks to exclude emotion on the basis that emotion is likely to distort the process of justice. That historically the criminal justice process has been suspicious of emotions. Similarly, Knight (2014) argues the criminal justice system is constituted to respond to criminal behaviour in an objective rational and just manner. Thus, we see a reliance on actuarial risk assessment technologies which require little in the way of professional relationship building and work which is wholly focused on so-called criminogenic risk factors rather than the broader social contexts in which people on probation generally reside. Finally, whilst expressive rehabilitation initially sounds like it requires the

use of emotion, Robinson (2008) argues that this form of rehabilitation is equivalent to a push towards the remoralisation and responsibilisation of people on probation. Thus, rehabilitative work in probation becomes legitimated by the punitive potential of rehabilitation rather than on the welfarist ethos which underpinned probation work in previous eras. Thus, these broader contexts and 'purposes' of probation shape the way in which practitioners can perform emotional labour. In essence, these policy and policy contexts will have shaped the organisational display rules (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993) which dictate what emotions are considered appropriate in the field of probation. In probation this led to a distinct move away from the explicit acknowledgment of emotion in policy and training.

The persistence of emotion work

Much of the previous section focused on changes in policy and how emotions were marginalised in the field of probation, partly as a result of the changing ways in which rehabilitation came to be legitimated in the 1990s and 2000s. However, policy is rarely neatly reflected in changes in practice. Thus, in spite of the hardening of the image of probation practice at an institutional level, practitioners in the field have - probably always - relied on emotional skills to build and maintain relationships with clients. Research undertaken in the late 1990s and early 2000s highlights the importance of emotions in effective practice. In Rex's (1999) study of probation officers and probationers, probationers would commit to, and engage in a positive way, with the probation process if their probation officer showed empathy, an ability to listen, conveyed interest and understanding, and provided space for the probationer to talk. Trotter's (1996 and 2012) work has also highlighted the importance of empathy, with some indication that it is linked to lower levels of recidivism. More recently Knight's (2014: 188) work on emotional literacy exposed the often 'invisible world of emotion' which significantly impacts on interactions between probation workers and people on probation. Knight's work highlights the positive and negative exercise of emotion, where

the former can build positive relationships and the former is visible in the repressive control of offenders.

Our own research on the performance of emotional labour in probation practice has built upon the work of Knight (2014) by shedding light on the 'emotionful' in contemporary probation work. Thus data that we have generated through interviews with probation workers in the last few years has exposed the different ways in which probation workers manage their emotion and why they do so. We have also explored the ways in which emotion work is critical to effective probation practice due to the way in which it is used to create constructive, professional relationships between officers and their clients.

It is clear that, in spite of a relative neglect of the role of emotion in policy practitioners regularly use and manage emotions when interacting with a client (Westaby et al, 2019). The emotional labour required in the everyday work of probation officers is one way of exposing the values of probation work. Thus, we have explored the organisational, occupational and societal 'feeling rules' or 'display rules' that shape the display of emotion in probation. This illuminates how probation workers display emotions in different ways, through integrative, neutral and differentiating emotional displays (Wharton and Erickson, 1993) in their interactions with clients.

Practitioners talked to us about how they would engage in surface acting when working, for example, with a client who was non-compliant in that they would mask true emotions such as disappointment. Interestingly, this might be done for a range of reasons such as an awareness of the risk that expressing negative emotion would be deleterious to the professional relationship. On the other hand, emotions would be suppressed because the practitioner felt that to be neutral was the most effective way of gleaning more information about risk. We can see that the performance of emotional labour is tied closely to the aims of the service.

Importantly, we also see that the way in which practitioners talk about surface acting is linked to key aspects of being a probation 'professional', a point also highlighted in Tidmarsh's (2019: 5) recent study of professionalisation in a privatised probation providers:

> to *display* appropriate feelings, attitudes, and emotions, can be considered a crucial aspect of practitioner understandings of professionalism.

Interestingly, Tidmarsh (2019) highlights the intuitive way in which practitioners in his study knew what was, and was not, appropriate. In turn, we can link this to the occupational display rules (Ashforth and Humphrey, 1993) that are evident in the field of probation (Westaby et al 2019). Partly as a result of occupational display rules that are at play in probation we see much reference made to positive emotions such as empathy when practitioners discuss their emotion work which can be linked to the underpinning values of probation practitioners whereby rehabilitation, individualised support and help are considered key to 'quality' probation work (Deering and Feilzer, Robinson et al).

In probation policy, models of effective practice and the contemporary emotional discourse in probation emotions like anger or disappointment are not discussed as frequently as empathy, praise or humour. However, we have seen evidence of the use of these less discussed emotional displays. Whilst initially considered unprofessional - as probation officers value the importance of pro-social modelling and see the risk that negative emotions can play in terms of affecting relationships - some of our participants talked about how they would sometimes feel anger towards clients who had, variously, been non-compliant or disrespectful. Whilst examples of deep acting negative emotions were rare they were performed in order to represent the officer as a human - as a citizen agent rather than state agent, again making links to how probation practitioners see their role. Deep acting does not only occur in relation to negative emotion with participants engaging in deep acting when it

came to clients who were doing well. Several participants talked about how they would genuinely be happy when someone made progress, or display genuine emotion to convey their belief in the ability of people to change.

Indeed, we have also explored (Fowler et al, 2017) the emotional labour undertaken by probation practitioners explicitly when fulfilling the building relationships aspect of Skills for Effective Engagement and Development and Supervision (SEEDS) - a programme implemented in England and Wales to encourage the engagement of offenders in their Order as well as support practitioners with the emotional demands of the job. In order to conform to this element of SEEDS practitioners get to know and understand the individual, which requires a complex understanding and performance of empathy. Participants must also develop clear boundaries by being honest, remaining emotionally detached and suppressing emotions such as disappointment and frustration. Importantly, participants describe how these expectations must be achieved at the same time leading to even more complex emotional displays, which can result in stress and burnout.

Interestingly, the lens of emotional labour sheds light on the identity of probation workers as an historical bricolage of social work, counselling, psychotherapy, and adaptation to the penal-welfare complex which has underpinned much probation work since the 1960s (Phillips et al, 2018). In probation practice self-disclosure is used to develop a constructive working relationship with clients in to change behaviour and manage risk. The management of emotion is significant in achieving the goals of the organisation, for example, public protection. The emotional displays inherent in the act of self-disclosure reveal the 'feeling rules' (Hochschild, 1983) or values of the organisation, where the probation worker seeks to express empathy or model a pro-social response to behaviour.

The impact of emotional labour on practitioners

It is clear that probation involves emotional labour. Moreover, probation requires particularly onerous forms of emotional labour due to the nature of the job. In Steinerg (1999: 151) model of different levels of human relations skills and demands around the performance of emotional labour, probation work fits the highest level in terms of complexity:

> Level E: [The job requires the incumbent to exercise] interpersonal skills in combination, creating a climate for and establishing a commitment to the welfare of clients or the public ... coaching and guiding clients through difficult emotional, attitudinal and developmental change around issues that are sensitive, controversial, and about which there is ... individual resistance. [It requires] providing comfort ... where people are in considerable pain, dying or gravely ill, angry, distraught, ..., in drug-induced states, or otherwise unpredictable, physically violent or emotional.... crowd control when crowd gets out of hand.

Probation workers also work at the highest level in terms of emotional effort:

> Level E: [Incumbents] deal regularly with highly physically dangerous and unpredictably hostile or violent people or groups. [They] may also work directly to meet the needs of people (including family members) who are facing death, through caring for or discussing this or other, comparable, extremely sensitive topics with them. (Steinberg, 1999: 153-154)

The implications of this complex, emotionally demanding work on workers' wellbeing is well documented, with high levels of emotional labour being associated with burnout and other adverse health outcomes (Yeung, Kim and Chang, 2018). There has, as yet, been no systematic study of the link between emotional labour in probation and burnout participants. However, participants in our own study talked about the relentlessness of probation work,

especially when it came to working primarily with clients who had been assessed as posing a high risk of harm (Phillips et al 2016).

One element of burnout is the process of desensitisation (Maslach, 1982) and this was also apparent in our participants' responses. This was particularly evident when it came to how workplace spillover affects probation practitioner's family lives. That said, we also saw evidence of hyper-sensitisation when it came to certain offences such as sex offending, especially when the practitioner had children (Westaby et al, 2017).

Conclusion

This chapter began by exploring the historical changes in the societal, organisational and cultural 'feeling rules' influencing the performance of emotional labour in probation practice beginning with the zealous Christian origins to the humanistic value-based view of the importance of emotions to the psychotherapeutic skills-based appreciation emergent in the 1950s. Moreover, the evidence-based literature of the 1980s and 90's reveal how the importance of emotions is neglected. On another level it represents the abiding and deep-rooted presence of emotions in descriptions of probation work in calls to convert offenders to change their feelings, the professionalisation of probation officers, the boundaries of emotion work, emotion skills and emotional literacy required to achieve the organisational goals of probation.

The chapter went on to explore what we know about the ways in which contemporary probation practitioners perform emotional labour. There is evidence of high levels of both surface and deep acting which are, in turn, closely tied to the aims of the organisation. There is also evidence of the potential for high levels of burnout and other adverse effects of this type of work, especially when considered in light of Steinberg (1999) model of human relation skills.

However, the overarching argument that should be taken from this chapter is the lack of knowledge around emotional labour in probation. Beyond our own work and that of Knight (2014) and Tidmarsh (2019) very little research has been conducted in this area. This is perhaps surprising when we consider the enduring nature of emotion work in probation as well as in comparison to the amount of research conducted in other areas of criminology such as the police (see Chapter 2, this volume) and prisons (see Chapter 5, this volume). Moreover, what research has been undertaken has, hitherto, focused solely on generic front-line officers. There are, in all likelihood, differences in terms of the emotional labour required for probation workers working in different contexts such as prisons, the courts and hostels especially because emotional labour is linked to the aims of the job (which differs according to context) as well as broader macro structures such as differing levels of privatisation and governance structures. It is also the case that management plays an important role in supporting staff when it comes to their emotional wellbeing, yet there is no understanding of the emotional labour required by senior probation officers in fulfilling their roles, nor any research on how best to support staff who have to deal, on a daily basis, with emotional demanding situations.

There is a link between the performance of emotional labour, the effectiveness of a service and staff wellbeing. Quite how this works in the field of probation is currently unknown. The National Probation Service in England and Wales is currently embarking on rolling out a new version of the SEEDS programme which will - in theory at least - support staff with the emotional demands of the job. This is a positive policy development which, in conjunction, with more research on this important topic should lead to healthier workers and more effective practice as well as, more broadly, a better understanding of the purpose of probation and the way in which these purposes manifest in practice.

References

Andrews, D. and Kiessling, J. (1980) Program structure and effective correctional practices: A summary of the CaVIC research. In: R. Ross and P. Gendreau (eds) *Effective Correctional Treatment. Toronto*. Canada, Butterworth, 441-463.

Ashforth, B.E and Humphrey, R.H. (1993). Emotional labor in service roles: the influence of identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(1), 88-115.

Auerbach, S. (2015). "Beyond the Pale of Mercy": Victorian Penal Culture, Police Court Missionaries, and the Origins of Probation in England. *Law and History Review*, *33*, 621–965.

Bentham, J (1823) *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Biestek, FP (1961). *The Casework Relationship*. George Allen & Unwin, London.

Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Scott, T.-L., Bourgon, G., & Yessine, A.K. (2008). Exploring the Black Box of Community Supervision. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 47(3), 248-270.

Bottoms, A.E. and McWILLIAMS, W., 1979. A non-treatment paradigm for probation practice. The British Journal of Social Work, 9(2), pp.159-202.

Karstedt, S., Loader, I., & Strang, H. (2011). Emotions, crime and justice. Oxford, U.K. ;: Hart Publishing.

Knight, C. (2014). Emotional literacy in criminal justice professional practice with offenders . Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Burnett, R. (1996). Fitting Supervision to Offenders: Assessment and Allocation in the Probation Service. Home Office Research Study, 153. London: Home Office.

Burnett, R. and McNeill, F.(2005). The place of the officer-offender relationship in assisting offenders to desist from crime. *Probation Journal*, 52(3), 221-242. https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550505055112

Deering, J. (2011). Probation practice and the new penology : Practitioner reflections. Farnham: Ashgate.

Deering, J. and Feilzer, M., 2015. Privatising probation: Is Transforming Rehabilitation the end of the probation ideal?. Bristol: Policy Press.

Dowden, C. & Andrews, D. (2004). The importance of staff practice in delivering effective correctional treatment: A meta-analytic review of core correctional practice. *International Journal Of Offender Therapy And Comparative Criminology*, 48(2), 203-214. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X03257765

Fowler, A., Phillips, J. & Westaby, C. (2017). Understanding emotion as effective practice. The performance of emotional labour in building relationships, in Ugwudike, P., Raynor, P. &Annison,. J. (eds) *Evidence-based skills in community justice: international research on supporting rehabilitation and desistance*. Bristol, Policy Press, 243-262.

Gard, R. (2007). The First Probation Officers in England and Wales 1906–14. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *47*(6), 938–954. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azm028

Garland, D. (2001). The culture of control : Crime and social order in late modernity. Oxford: Clarendon.

Gerdes, K.E. (2011) Empathy, Sympathy and Pity: 21st Definitions and Implications for Practice and Research. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 37(3), 230-241. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01488376.2011.564027?src=recsys&

Hochschild, A.R. (1983). *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of human Feeling*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Hochschild, A.R. (1979). Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, *85*(3), 551–575. https://doi.org/10.1086/227049

Home Office (1992) National Standards for the supervision of offenders in the community. London: Home Office.

Holmes, T. (1900) Pictures and Problems from London Police Courts. Thomas Nelson and Sons. London: Edinburgh, Dublin and New York

King, J.F.S. (1958). *The Probation Service*. London: Butterworth and Co. Ltd.

Knight, C. (2014). Emotional literacy in criminal justice professional practice with offenders . Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Knight, C. (2012). Social workers' attitudes towards and engagement in self-disclosure. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 40, 297-306.

Steinberg, R.J., 1999. Emotional labor in job evaluation: Redesigning compensation practices. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 561(1), pp.143-157.

Leeson, C. (1914), *The Probation System*. London: P.S. King and Son.

Le Mesurier, L. (1935), A Handbook of Probation and Social Work of the Courts. London : National Association of Probation Officers.

Mair, G. (2004). W*hat matters in probation*. Cullompton: Willan.

McWilliams, W. (1983). The Mission to the English Police Courts 1876 – 1936. *Howard Journal of Penology*, 22, 129-47.

McWilliams W (1985) The mission transformed. Howard Journal 24(4): 257–272.

McWilliams W (1987) Probation, pragmatism and policy. Howard Journal 26(2): 97–121.

National Probation Directorate (2003). Careers in the National Probation Service. London: National Probation Directorate.

Phillips, J., Fowler, A., & Westaby, C. (2018). Self-Disclosure in Criminal Justice: What Form Does It Take and What Does It Achieve?. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *62*(12), 3890–3909.

Phillips, J., Westaby, C., & Fowler, A. (2016). "It"s relentless': The impact of working primarily with high-risk offenders. *Probation Journal*. *63*(2), 182–192.

Plamper, J. (2017) *The History of Emotions*. Oxford University Press.

Porporino F.J. (2010). Bringing Sense and Sensitivity to Corrections: From Programmes to 'Fix' Offenders to Services to Support Desistance. In: Brayford J, Cowe F, and Deering J (eds), *What Else Works? Creative Work With Offenders*, Cullompton: Willan, 61–85.

Rafaeli, A., & Sutton, R. I. (1989). The expression of emotion in organizational life. In L. L.

Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, vol. 11, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1-42.

Ranson, S. & Stewart, J. (1994). *Management for the public domain : Enabling the learning society*. Basingstoke, The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Rex, S. (1999). Desistance from Offending: Experiences of Probation. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 366-383.

Robinson, G. (2003). Technicality and Indeterminacy in Probation Practice: A Case Study. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 33(5), 593-610.

Robinson, G., & Ugwudike, P. (2012). Investing in 'Toughness': Probation, Enforcement and Legitimacy. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 51(3), 300-316.

Robinson, G., Priede, C., Farrall, S., Shapland, J. and McNeill, F., 2014. Understanding 'quality'in probation practice: Frontline perspectives in England & Wales. Criminology & Criminal Justice, 14(2), pp.123-142.

St. John, J. (1961). *Probation-the Second Chance*. London, Vista Books.

Sutton, R.I., & Rafaeli, A. (1988). Untangling the Relationship between Displayed Emotions and Organizational Sales: The Case of Convenience Stores. *The Academy of Management Journal*, *31*(3), 461–487.

Tidmarsh, M. (2019). 'The right kind of person for the job'? Emotional labour and organizational professionalism in probation. International Journal of law, Crime and Justice, in press.

Trotter, C. (2012). Effective community-based supervision of young offenders. *Trends & Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 448, 1-7.

Trotter, C. (1996). The impact of different supervision practices in community corrections. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 29(1), 29-46.

Vanstone, M. (2004), 'Mission Control: The Origins of a Humanitarian Service', *Probation Journa*l, 51: 34 – 47.

Westaby, C., Fowler, A. and Philipps, J. (2019).managing emotion in probation practice: Display rules, values and the performance of emotional labour. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, in press.

Westaby, C., Phillips, J., & Fowler, A. (2016). Spillover and work–family conflict in probation practice: Managing the boundary between work and home life. *European Journal of Probation, 8*(3), 113–127.

Wharton, A.S. and Erickson, R.J. (1993). Managing emotions in the job and at home: understanding the consequences of multiple job roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 183), 457-486.

Whitehead, P. (2017). Transforming probation : social theories and the criminal justice system. Bristol: Policy Press.