

Summer 1959

Pre-Service Training

Alfred C. Schnur

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Alfred C. Schnur, Pre-Service Training, 50 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 27 (1959-1960)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

PRE-SERVICE TRAINING

ALFRED C. SCHNUR

Dr. Schnur is Associate Professor in the School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, where he is in charge of the curriculum in correctional administration and Chairman of the Graduate Committee. Formerly, he was Associate Warden (classification, training and treatment), Minnesota State Prison. He has been a member of the sociology faculties of Ohio State (1955-1956); University of Mississippi (1949-1955); Miami University (1945-1949); and University of Wisconsin (1941-1945). The author offers a "core correctional curriculum in this article."—EDITOR.

Tremendous variations in correctional purposes and practices exist in the United States. There may well be almost as many different approaches to corrections as there are correctional field and institutional agencies. Consensus regarding correctional objectives is yet to be achieved. Much evaluation of practice remains to be done before standardization of practice can be expected to emerge. To a lesser degree, the same can be said for the collegiate pre-service training programs that purport to prepare personnel for corrections. As the variation in correctional purpose and practice is reduced through evaluation and consensus, a concomitant effect can be expected in the personnel training programs.

Knowledge and know-how that is specifically criminological and correctional can now be secured in many departments of sociology, of sociology and anthropology, of psychology, of criminology, of police science, and in schools of criminology, of police administration and public safety, of public administration, and only rarely in schools of social work. Bachelor's master's and doctor's degrees can be earned in many of them. Almost all of the schools of social work claim that they are preparing persons to be social workers in corrections but only a few offer even one course in criminology or corrections. Many of the other academic disciplines offer only one or two courses. Some offer more, but only a few seem to have a comprehensive curriculum. Most of what is now being done in academic correctional training is being done by sociologists either in departments of sociology or in other departments. The orientation is primarily sociological but is not limited to sociology. The archives of criminology and corrections at the college level have been kept by sociologists. Almost all of the criminological and correctional research has been done by sociologists. Nearly every text that is used in

criminological and correctional instruction has been written by a sociologist, whether it is used in sociology departments or in others. Sociologists have been the principal developers, preservers, and transmitters of the criminological and correctional heritage at the academic level.

ASSUMPTIONS

For the purpose of training correctional personnel it is assumed that the goal of corrections is to prevent recidivism by preparing men for release from all legal supervision as rapidly and economically as possible, as useful, law-abiding, self-supporting, self-sufficient, independent citizens who will not contribute to the commission of crime by others—men who obey the law because they want to and not because they are afraid not to.

For the purpose of this paper it is also assumed that a companion personnel problem of major significance has been adequately answered. Although answering it is beyond the scope of this paper since we are immediately concerned with what should be taught and not with who should be taught, the problem should be recognized here. What kind of person should a candidate for a correctional career be? What qualities and abilities independent of any kind of correctional curriculum should he possess? How are persons to be recognized as not fit for correctional work, no matter what the training? What identifies the persons who are problems in themselves, to themselves, and to others?

A third assumption is that experience is not enough for correctional work. Although most of our present day correctional administrators and personnel have probably learned most of what they know and use after they have been employed, this is not sufficient justification for corrections to rely on this means of preparation in the future. Educa-

tion for corrections should go into partnership with these people and formalize what they have learned that is reliable and effective in achieving correctional objectives in ways that others can learn, so that beginners can benefit from their own experience more quickly. Physicians and lawyers had a long history of learning outside of school, but their training was brought inside school to shorten the time required and to increase proficiency.

Experience is potentially a good teacher, but it is neither an efficient nor a dependable teacher. Corrections cannot be sure that a person will have experiences in the right sequence and that all the lessons that experience can teach will be taught. Competency cannot be measured by the number of years of exposure to correctional problems but by what such exposure has enabled these people to do about correctional problems. Some of these people who have had twenty-five or more years of experience have merely had one year's experience repeated twenty-five times. The lessons of experience should be transmitted quickly and effectively in a proper frame of reference in proper sequence. For experience to yield maximum benefits, the individual needs to be trained to know what to look for, to know what the significance is of what he sees, and to know what to do about it.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

Consideration of several aspects of personnel recruitment and management are pertinent to the development of pre-service training programs and the recruitment of the most capable people.

Although corrections has yet to come to a consensus regarding pre-service training, some personnel processing agencies and appointing authorities have apparently done it for corrections by specifying educational preparation in such a way that unless those seeking correctional employment have one particular kind of educational union card, their application will not be accepted and they will not be admitted to the examinations. Such requirements seem premature when corrections has yet to come to its own consensus regarding pre-service training. What is important is not how the applicant secured his knowledge and ability but whether or not he has what it takes, no matter where he got it, and whether he is the kind of person that corrections wants. Such premature barriers should be lifted. If the examinations administered by personnel processing agencies and appointing authorities are valid, the unqualified will be eliminated.

Another personnel practice that promotes negative selection of personnel at every level from the entry grade positions to the top administrative positions is the notion that everybody must begin at the very bottom and crawl to the very top through a routinized succession of intermediate positions.¹ Since entry grade positions in correction at present are not particularly attractive financially or otherwise, there is good reason to feel that the most capable people are not always recruited to corrections. Corrections cannot always expect to recruit the sterling qualities it desires for the prices it can pay. It is not saying much to declare that this insures the employment of inspired and dedicated men. Even ministers are not reluctant to move on to larger parishes—they can be just as happy doing the Lord's work for more pay.

Similarly, the artificial restraints that require aging in the system as the prerequisite for advancement in it and employment above the entry grade should be removed. The best man for the job should be selected irrespective of his years of exposure to experience since mere experience is no guarantee that a particular individual can do the job better than someone else. As long as such practices are in effect, they have the consequence of freezing incompetents in the system and promoting them. Where a man ends his career should depend on his competency not his longevity, just as his compensation should depend upon his ability and not his fertility.

Another personnel practice that can prevent the employment of the best qualified is the geographical requirements for competition. All examinations should be open to all who wish to compete for them irrespective of residence. Examination performance should be the basis for selection—that particular examination and not a previous one or the grades that are secured in his educational preparation. It is not what a man was but what a man is. Were we, for example, to depend on previous rating as a basis for elimination, we as correctional people, if we were consistent, would refrain from releasing anyone from a correctional institution because he once committed a crime. Present performance, knowledge, and ability—not the past—should be the basis for selection.

In passing, it is to be wondered what the characteristic contemporary correctional employment

¹ Cf. TAPPAN, PAUL, *Can the Prison System Be Professionalized?* PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN PRISON ASSOCIATION, 1949, p. 86 ff.

practices are. To what extent are politicians, friends, relatives, and acquaintances employed within and without the framework of civil service? How many civil service job description requirements are set up with particular persons in mind with planned circumvention of the best qualified? How often is civil service a front behind which the same old tricks can be pulled? How often are persons downgraded and upgraded on the oral portion of the examination to insure the formal selection of a person already informally selected on grounds other than merit? How often is civil service used as a means of preserving incompetents in office because they have peacefully endured the system beyond the point of "no discharge"?

Civil service is no guarantee of securing the best person for the job. There are too many irrelevant restrictions on competition and too many ways of circumvention. Civil service can help to eliminate improper methods but it cannot guarantee the best. There is probably no paper plan that men of ill will cannot beat and no paper plan is necessary for men of good will. Resolution of these problems would probably have the consequence of attracting better men to both the examinations and to the pre-service training programs.

There is much criminological and correctional research that would contribute to the continual improvement of pre-service training. This, too, is beyond the scope of this paper, but it seems necessary to mention that consensus in correction's objectives could be hastened if there were correctional research accounting systems to determine the effectiveness, implications, and consequences of all the things that are now done to, with, and for the convicted law violator from arrest to release from all legal supervision. A group of the factors involved in such analysis should include the personal characteristics, training, and experience of the personnel implementing the correctional processes. With such information, we would know more surely which correctional ends pre-service training was preparing the trainees for, what kind of personnel to recruit, and what to teach them. Whatever criminological and correctional research is done, of course, can improve the training program.

Corrections, organizationally conceived and operationally defined, is concerned with the management of the offender from the instant of conviction to the instant of release from all legal supervision. Probation, institutions, and parole are

an inseparable integrated entity that should be taught as such. Corrections is a continuous process from probation through institutions to parole. Correctional personnel involved in any one of these stages should be thoroughly acquainted and trained in the other stages. Individual members of the correctional field staff—the probation and parole counselors—must know institutions. Their cases either have been in or may go to the institution. Parole counselors must know probation. Probation officers must know parole. In many states, both probationers and parolees are on the same counselor's case load. For years, states have been integrating their parole and probation services. No state that has integrated has returned to separate systems. Institution staffs must know correctional field operations—probation and parole. Their cases may have come from probation or may go to parole. Serious thought has been given to rotating institutional and field staff.

Effective performance in corrections requires meaningful experience as well as expert knowledge. The pre-service training program can provide one thousand hours of meaningful supervised experience in law enforcement and correctional agencies through field service training or internship programs. This, obviously, is only a beginning on experience, as college graduation is only a beginning on knowledge. The inexperienced but trained pre-service graduate should be trained how to make the most out of experience when he begins correctional employment and how to add to this knowledge through self direction after graduation.

We know whatever curriculum is set up for corrections, wherever it may be, will not offer all there is to be known, or all that is needed. But we must endeavor to teach as much as we can and turn out students who know what the score is. No teacher can teach, nor can any student learn, all that is implied in the lines that follow. After all, time is limited, and human capacities, too. But as an ideal we want to develop students who know what is being done in corrections today, and the pros and cons of these operations; who know what has been tried in corrections and found wanting, or effective as the case may be; who will not be tied to an academic "party line," but who are willing to experiment; who know the relative worth of "explanations" of criminal behavior; what the pertinent criminological literature is, where to find it, how to use it and evaluate it; who can

plan for the future, but who will not upset the ox cart unless it is necessary to do so. Such people will not succumb to dry rot. They can decide for themselves when to wait and when not to wait for an official statement of policy. And we want our students to develop into persistent, dedicated, sincere men who see the big picture and are not merely narrow specialists learning more and more about less and less.

Training for corrections should be training in corrections—not in something else for something else. The correctional program should be organized around a core of correctional content courses. These should be central and be recognized as the core correctional curriculum. Other pertinent courses should be considered as the supplemental curriculum. Corrections has a longer history and a richer literature than the field that would swallow it up. Correctional work is correctional work and not a poor relative of social work awaiting annexation and loss of identity.

Peter Lejins once said: "The presently available body of criminological theory, including both positive and negative findings, so painstakingly and laboriously compiled under the egis of the discipline of sociology, is too important a possession to lose. Every effort should be made to preserve, further develop and implement it, and as a valuable scientific heritage, pass it on to the future."²

Walter Reckless has made this statement: "There is a real fallacy in the assumption that probation and parole work is a form of case work. Just because trained probation and parole officers use an individualized approach does not mean that they are case workers or that probation and parole are case work. If this is so, then the lawyer's and physician's practice is case work—which is ridiculous. To say that the doctor is a good case worker or case-works his clients is ridiculous, too. The counseling, guidance, individualized, and remedial services of a well-developed school, likewise, are not case work. The receptionist in an office is not an in-take case worker. Consequently, my assumption is that probation and parole operations client-wise are not case work; they are what they are: probation and parole work. Therefore, it seems reasonable to say that the foundation for the training of probation and parole officers is not case work but criminology, corrections, social

psychology, and specific courses in probation and parole."³

"It is becoming progressively clear that training for correctional work cannot be satisfied merely by training for social work in general. The areas of practice in the social-work field are getting too well established to admit the jack-of-all-trades certification. Case-work courses pointing to private family and children's agency work are not specific preparation for group workers, although such courses can be a part of the curricular requirements for trained group workers. Group-work and case-work courses are not specific preparation for community-organization work, although they can be a part of the curricular requirements in a school of social work, turning out trained personnel in community organization. The best preparation for correctional workers consists in courses which contain the philosophy and practices of correctional work. Courses in related areas of social work can be a part of the requirements in a curriculum for the training of correctional workers but they cannot act as substitutes for courses in the several aspects of correctional operations. Consequently, it cannot be presumed that a person trained in case work or group work or community organization can hang out his shingle and say that his training allows him to 'double in brass,' namely, to be a trained correctional worker as well."⁴

Without the core of correctional content courses, the new employee is naive and does not start from where the last man left off but all over from the beginning. The coming generation of correctional workers should be enabled to stand upon the shoulders of past generations of correctional personnel—they should not be required by their training deficiencies to start over each time and slowly and inefficiently learn by trial and error through experience. Tested experience that has been systematized should be transmitted to new correctional workers.

Correctional workers need to have an understanding of the roles of all participants in the correctional process. Corrections is not compartmental. For each person to accomplish his own task efficiently, he must not only not interfere with but contribute to the overall effectiveness of other

² PETER LEJINS, *Training Correctional Personnel*, ALABAMA CORRECTIONAL RESEARCH, 2: 19-20, April, 1955.

³ WALTER C. RECKLESS, *Training of Probation and Parole Personnel*, PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN PRISON ASSOCIATION, 1947, p. 103.

⁴ WALTER C. RECKLESS, *Training of the Correctional Worker*, in PAUL W. TAPPAN, *CONTEMPORARY CORRECTION*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1951, p. 40.

workers. He cannot, for example, be at war with his colleagues who in discharging their responsibilities for security, custody, and discipline make it possible for their colleagues to have a climate in which they can carry out their assignments.

The correctional administrator needs to know enough about corrections to prevent empire building that would make corrections just social work, or custody, or education, religion, or the manufacture of manure spreaders and binder twine, or. . . . Corrections is all of these and more. The system must be operated by a correctional specialist who knows what he needs to know of all these specialties, how to tie all of them together to accomplish the objectives of corrections, how to prevent any one from becoming an end in itself, how to use all of them as means to an end, and how to keep them all in line to serve the overall purpose at minimum cost.

More and more of our institutions are organizing themselves in a way that one particular civilian in the institution is primarily responsible for seeing an inmate through the institution from beginning to end; for discussing what made the inmate what he is, and determining how (within the present resources) that inmate can be prevented from violating laws again. This man variously called corrections case worker, social worker, psychologist, classification officer, inmate affairs officer, parole agent, parole officer, guidance counselor, etc., must be able to use the whole institution effectively in making that man law abiding. It is not for the treatment coordinator to do all things alone. Not all men require the same management. Not all are sick and inadequate. Our prisoners are many things. Our treatment officers must know the whole institution, the whole resource picture, and what can and cannot be done in order to be effective in working with his colleagues in making the diagnoses and in planning and implementing recovery of the men.

No distinction is made here between the pre-service training for today's security, custody, and discipline and today's classification, training and treatment. It is hoped that custody men will one day be recruited from college pre-service training programs and that the roles of the treatment and custody men will tend to merge. The core correctional curriculum should be required of all correctional personnel who have impact on the convicted law violator. Of course, until significance of the security, custody, and discipline roles with regard

to constructive impact on inmates which is now recognized in words is also recognized with increased compensation, prestige, and career rewards, it is to be expected that persons entering the corrections service from the college level will gravitate to the classification, training, and treatment complement. A collegiate pre-service training curriculum for guard roles alone would not be realistic at the present and would eventually become obsolete. Security, custody, and discipline plays an important part in the pre-service training program because correctional personnel not employed in custody roles need to understand such roles if they are to do their own jobs well.

PRE-SERVICE CURRICULUM

When the writer undertook to discuss pre-service training, he obligated himself to spell out a specific pre-service training curriculum. There is no intent to be either presumptuous or apologetic. The pre-service curriculum to be stated subsequently represents to him what appears to be the best answer for today and the near future that is consistent with contemporary knowledge and educational resources. Much, obviously, remains to be done about understanding, predicting, and controlling human and criminal behavior and about the problems of training for corrections before the pre-service training program can be completely standardized. Different conditions and increased knowledge should affect the broad outline of pre-service training as surely as they should continuously affect the specific content of the courses in the curriculum.

If we were to wait until corrections comes to a consensus regarding its ends and determines the effectiveness, implications, and consequences of its means of attaining its ends and until the fields of human behavior and corrections are completely researched in areas pertinent to the development of a collegiate pre-service training program, we would never have a training program. There are at least two good reasons for not procrastinating. First, corrections cannot postpone its obligation to do something about the thousands who are convicted each year—whether what is done is right or wrong, intended or unintended. Since correctional agencies have to do their work now with what is now known and with what personnel it can recruit, and since they cannot wait for the millenium, it is simply being realistic for personnel trainers to do the best in developing a curriculum

that can be done in the present and carry on research to develop better curricula tomorrow. Secondly, criminology and corrections, in their long development have already contributed a rich literature of extensive knowledge that is even now too voluminous to be included in its entirety in collegiate preservice training programs at either the undergraduate or graduate level or both. A meaningful curriculum can be developed without apologies. There is no question of there being enough significant teaching material in criminology and corrections. The problem is instead to selectively compress as much of the pertinent material as possible into the correctional curriculum. There is not enough time available in either the undergraduate or graduate curriculum to transmit all of the presently available criminological and correctional heritage that is significant for effective performance in corrections. It surely cannot be done in one, two, or three courses. The core correctional curriculum identifies the minimum essentials. Today, nearly all of the 59 schools of social work apparently claim that their graduates are trained for correctional work even without their being trained in correctional work. The rare school of social work that recognizes corrections in its present correctionally sterile curricula apparently feels that it has made a great concession when it has supplemented generic social work training with one course on correctional information. Most sociology departments, on the other hand, offer at least one course in criminology and corrections. Many offer more. Such courses are the fifth most frequently offered courses in the 607 colleges studied out of 908 which offer sociology courses, according to Kennedy's.⁵ In contrast, however, at least one social work writer feels that all that is worthwhile in criminology and corrections can be covered in one course. Another social work writer considers the offering of correctional courses in schools of social work curricula evidence of a backward trend in the forward movement to more generic generics. Apparently, the generic generics movement has not been slowed, since UNESCO reports that the examination of 18 leading schools of social work to determine whether provision had been made for specialized

training in corrections revealed only four such schools which have from one to five specific course offerings. Three schools had one course. One school had five. Examination of the latest catalogs of all the 59 schools would perhaps be worthwhile to determine how many schools of social work are admitting corrections to their curricula, to ascertain how much and what kind of corrections is being taught, and to see what, according to them, is more important in training for corrections than corrections.

If schools of social work continue to claim that their programs prepare social workers for employment in corrections and if correctional agencies see fit to employ their graduates, it is to be hoped that the schools of social work, for the good of the employing correctional agencies, for the protection of society, and for the good of the convicted law violator, adopt the core correctional curriculum and supplement it with social work courses that are really relevant to corrections.

The writer is much more concerned with seeing that the core correctional curriculum about to be presented becomes a part of the training for correctional work than he is with whether it is housed in a school of social work, a school of correctional administration, or elsewhere. It is the content of the curriculum and not its academic location that is important. Since criminology and corrections require a multi-disciplinary approach, many Americans and Europeans feel that they should be located in their own separate academic house to prevent their being captured and swallowed up by one particular discipline. Such an arrangement would provide a facility for pre-service, in-service, adaptive, and advanced training as well as a research center.

The core correctional curriculum described here is to be understood as being neither finally fixed in all details nor as being merely an idealistic dream proposal—the core correctional curriculum, along with all of the supplemental curriculum, is in operation in at least one school, except for 120 classroom hours. (Eighty of these hours are presently involved in a series of university committees and await further administrative action before becoming a part of the school's curriculum. Faculty are available and are prepared to teach the courses if and when the hours are finally approved. Only forty of the hours remain to be started on their way for approval.) This is an undergraduate curriculum. The graduate curriculum presumes its completion or its equivalent. It

⁵ RAYMOND KENNEDY AND RUBY JOE KENNEDY. *Sociology in American Colleges*. AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW. (October, 1942), pp. 661-675.

See also, LAWRENCE PODELL, MARTIN VOGELFANGER AND ROBERTA ROGERS. *Sociology in American Colleges: Fifteen Years Later*. AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW (February 1959, pp. 87-95).

is an advanced version of the core curriculum. The core is a working minimum, and is to be understood as being sensitive to changes in conditions, to the needs of corrections, and to the advancement of knowledge.

The pre-service training program is divided into two groups of required courses. One group, consisting of specific criminology and corrections courses, will be referred to as the core correctional curriculum. The other group, comprising pertinent courses from a variety of disciplines, will be identified as the supplemental correctional curriculum. Only course titles and number of classroom hours are enumerated below since the course titles are self-explanatory. Since hours are easily converted into either quarter credits or semester credits, classroom hours are used to indicate the amount of time to be devoted to the study of particular subjects.

The courses in the core correctional curriculum with the number of classroom hours are:

	<i>hours</i>
1. Criminology	50
2. Probation and Parole Administration	80
3. The Administration of Correctional Institutions:	
Classification, Training, and Treatment	40
4. The Administration of Correctional Institutions:	
Security, Custody, and Discipline	40
5. Clinical Corrections	40
6. Review and Evaluation of Correctional Research	40
7. Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency	40
8. Field Service Training (Supervised Experience in Law Enforcement and Correctional Agencies.)	1000
9. Critical Review of Field Service Training	20

The supplemental correctional curriculum represents a multi-disciplinary approach to the understanding and control of human behavior and

crime and insures a broad liberal education. It consists of the following minimum requirements:

1. Ninety hours should be concerned with English composition and public speaking.
2. The natural sciences should have 120 hours allotted to them.
3. Two hundred forty hours should be spent in integrated social science courses and/or in the study of the introductory courses in psychology, political science, economics, anthropology, sociology, and geography.
4. An additional 140 hours in psychology should be devoted to such subjects as the psychology of personality, abnormal psychology, and legal and criminal psychology.
5. At least an additional 80 hours should be occupied in political science, particularly in a state and local government course and in parliamentary procedure.
6. One hundred twenty hours should be used in courses in the humanities.
7. To prepare the student to consume and do research properly, a one-hundred hour sequence should be followed. Philosophy courses in logic and/or principles of right reason should be succeeded by courses in research and statistics.
8. Sixty hours will be absorbed by courses in health, physical education, and recreation. First aid, boxing, wrestling, and police defense tactics should be included.
9. One hundred hours should be utilized in courses in criminal law and evidence and in interrogation and case preparation.
10. A minimum of thirty hours of instruction in social psychology should be provided.
11. A course in personnel relations will account for thirty hours.
12. Approximately 140 hours will be expended in such social work courses as introduction to the field of social work, mental and emotional hygiene, interviewing, and the social workers in corrections.