

Spring 1965

The Problem of Educating the Correctional Practitioner

Julian Roebuck

Paul Zelhart

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

Julian Roebuck, Paul Zelhart, The Problem of Educating the Correctional Practitioner, 56 J. Crim. L. Criminology & Police Sci. 45 (1965)

This Criminology 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.

RESEARCH REPORTS

THE PROBLEM OF EDUCATING THE CORRECTIONAL PRACTITIONER

JULIAN ROEBUCK AND PAUL ZELHART*

For the past 20 years members of the field of corrections have devoted much zeal and energy to stressing the need for more trained personnel without devoting much attention to where these personnel are to come from. There is evidence of a dearth of trained personnel in certain position categories within the correctional services;¹ but, just how many and what kinds of people are required, where they are required, who is to prepare them, and how they are to be prepared remain unanswered. This paper is addressed to the last two questions: who is to prepare them, and how they are to be prepared.

THE ISSUE OF PROFESSIONALIZATION

The journal literature during the past ten years has been replete with articles on the professionalization of the correctional worker. Despite this preoccupation with professionalization there is no full agreement on just who the professional in corrections is, and there is consensus certainly neither in the field nor in the halls of academe pertaining to the process of his professionalization.² Professionalization in corrections has been alluded to as: (1) recognized professionals (physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, teachers, chaplains, etc.) engaged in correctional work; (2) the experiential process, i.e., prolonged work contacts with offenders, through which correctional personnel gain "expert knowledge"; (3) the attainment of specialized "correctional" case-work skills; (4) the acquisition of specialized managerial skills and "knowledge" in coordinating custodial,

industrial, training, and treatment objectives.³ Thus, what is meant by professionalization is unclear.

People in several occupational and professional categories utilize a variety of techniques and skills in working with offenders which they have acquired from many sources; these people include the police, jail keepers, correctional officers, chaplains, teachers, vocational instructors, psychologists, physicians, recreation directors, industrial and trade supervisors, craftsmen, administrators, maintenance men, cooks, probation officers, parole officers, prison counselors. Obviously the overwhelming majority of these people and many others who work in corrections neither draw on a specialized body of correctional knowledge nor are they products of formalized professional training. In short a cursory view of work roles in corrections reveals some professionals (physicians, psychologists, research specialists, chaplains, M.S.W.'s, etc.) and myriads of non-professionals whose vocations preclude professionalization (cooks, correctional officers, craftsmen, maintenance men, etc.). Correctional managers by virtue of their varied (if any) academic backgrounds and the nature of their duties do not qualify as professionals.⁴ Managers are not practitioners.

Hence, the question of professionalization must center on what Professor Peter Lejins has termed, "the general correctional workers," "general practitioners," engaged in the process of counseling and rehabilitating offenders,⁵ i.e., probation officers, parole officers, and prison counselors, or

* Dr. Roebuck is Associate Professor of Sociology in Louisiana State University. Mr. Zelhart received the M.A. degree in Psychology from San Jose State College. He is presently a Teaching Fellow in the Psychology Department of the University of Alberta, Canada.

¹ Arden House Conference on Manpower and Training for Corrections, Report of Council on Social Work Education, June 24-26, 1964, (mimeographed) p. 2.

² Cressey, *Professional Correctional Work and Professional Work in Correction*, 5 N.P.P.A.J. 1 (1959); Tappan, *Can the Prison System Be Professionalized?*, PROCEEDINGS AM. PRISON ASS'N 86 (1949); Jenkins, *The Professional*, 10 CAL. YOUTH AUTHORITY Q. 29 (1957); Johnson, *The Present Level of Social Work in Prisons*, 9 CRIME AND DELINQUENCY 290 (1963).

³ Johnson, *The Professional in Corrections: Status and Prospectus*, 40 SOCIAL FORCES 171 (1961); TAPPAN, CRIME, JUSTICE AND CORRECTION 561-67 (1960).

⁴ On this point the writer disagrees with Professor Elmer H. Johnson, among others, who defines correctional managers as professionals. The art of working with people, of guiding, supervising, directing, or controlling others is an art, not a profession, whether or not scientific principles are utilized in such endeavors. See Johnson, *supra* note 3, at 173-74.

⁵ Lejins, *Aspects of Correctional Personnel Training as Viewed by a College Professor*, 191 PROCEEDINGS 85TH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF CORRECTION, AM. PRISON ASS'N (1955).

classification officers. (Professor Walter Reckless also shares this point of view.⁶) These non-medical, so-called professionals are charged with urgent responsibilities, though in actual correctional settings they are assigned roles and functions in the most ambiguous and uncertain terms.⁷ Nonetheless, as probation officers, parole officers, and prison counselors, they are expected to have a specialized body of "correctional knowledge."⁸ The delineation of this body of knowledge and the educational process by which it is obtained are currently the source of controversy. There is little, if any, dispute concerning the preparation of correctional personnel, professional or non-professional, for other work roles.

THE CONTROVERSY OVER ACADEMIC PREPARATION

There has been an upward trend in the number of university and college programs geared toward pre-service training for corrections since Professor Frank M. Boolsen's surveys of 1949 and 1954.⁹ The curricular problems focus on *selection* and *integration*. The lack of uniformity of curricular practices by institutions schooling correctional workers is matched by an equally unclear demarcation of proposed academic programs in the journal literature.¹⁰ However, an examination of the literature discloses roughly four major types of pre-service, academic training for probation,

parole, and classification officers at the journeyman level by institutions granting the bachelor of arts and higher academic degrees: (1) schools of social work; (2) independent specialized corrections programs; (3) sequences of courses in criminology and corrections within departments of sociology; and (4) a series of programs indicating a variety of interests, emphases, and practices, some of which are patterned on the recognized disciplinary approach and others which utilize interdisciplinary curricula. A number of these courses of study are found within schools of public administration, social welfare, public safety, police science, psychology, and political science. A broad background in the behavioral sciences¹¹ is generally stressed, which may include some courses in criminalistics, criminology, and/or penology.¹²

Schools of Social Work

Interest in the training of social workers for corrections has grown dramatically in the past few years. Supporters of this approach include such national agencies as the Division of Delinquency Service of the United States Childrens Bureau; the Citizen Action Program of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency; and the Corrections Educational Consultant Service of the Council on Social Work Education.

The stand taken by the proponents of social work schools is that social work training, given the present state of correctional knowledge, is the most appropriate for probation and parole officers and prison counsellors. They contend that no accepted course of academic preparation has been forthcoming from persons viewing corrections as a profession. Adherents of social work envision corrections as a setting in which the skills of several professional and occupational types find expression.¹³ The work of probation, parole, and correctional classification officers is viewed as essentially clinical in nature. Therefore, clinical (social work) training is required for the "treatment man." The National Council on Crime and Delinquency defines probation and parole as

¹¹ Behavioral sciences may be considered synonymous to the social sciences in this paper, since these terms are used interchangeably in the literature and by respondents of the writers' poll.

¹² *The Training Issue*, 2 N.P.P.A.J. 193 (1956); Lejins, *supra* note 5, at 194; Fox, *supra* note 10, at 51-53; AM. CORRECTIONAL ASS'N, *op. cit. supra* note 9, at 2-10.

¹³ Burbank, *Some Problems and Issues Confronting Social Work Education in Corrections*, 10 SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION 7 (1962).

⁶ Letter received from Dr. Walter Reckless, Professor of Sociology, Ohio State University, June 18, 1963.

⁷ KORN & MCCORLE, *CRIMINOLOGY AND PENOLOGY* 509-10 (1959).

⁸ Some in the correctional field hold that "correctional knowledge" must be translated into many languages, and that there exist different kinds and levels of correctional knowledge that people must have as a minimum requirement for specific correctional assignment. See Federal Bureau of Prisons, Research and Development Division, *Defining Corrections for Training and Research Purposes*, July, 1963 (mimeographed).

⁹ AM. CORRECTIONAL ASS'N, *REPORT AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION* 3-10 (92d Annual Congress of Correction, Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 16-21, 1962). The Committee's conclusions were based on a questionnaire poll of 317 selected colleges and universities and an examination of the curricular offering of 150 college and university catalogs. See also BOOLESEN, *DIRECTORY OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES OFFERING PREPARATORY PROGRAMS FOR CAREERS IN LAW ENFORCEMENT, CRIMINALISTICS, CORRECTIONS* 1-10 (mimeo. 3d ed. 1961).

¹⁰ Fox, *The University Curriculum in Corrections*, 23 Fed. Prob. 51 (Sept. 1959); Sellin & Wolfgang, *Criminology*, in UNESCO, *UNIVERSITY TEACHING OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES* 138-54 (1957).

disciplines within the general field of public social work. This council strongly recommends training in a graduate school of social work to the correctional worker seeking professional status.

Schools of social work curricula include personality theory and diagnosis; evaluation, investigation, amelioration and therapeutic interviewing; medical and psychiatric information; case recording; referral problems and methods; group work methods; community resources and their use in evaluation and treatment; and supervised field experience in a specialized agency. The M.S.W. is the preferred degree. Undergraduate training in social welfare courses is seen as the next best preparation for the correctional worker until adequate numbers of MSW's become available.¹⁴

The following criticisms of social work training for corrections have been made: (1) Social case work as generally practiced is entered into voluntarily as a permissive, non-directive, non-authoritarian relationship between case worker and client. The claim is made that this type of relationship is not possible in the non-voluntary, often directive, authoritarian setting that constitutes correctional work. (2) Traditionally social case work has dealt with the emotional or subjective needs of the client. Correctional administrators generally stress the manipulation of the offenders' external environment. (3) The social case worker attempts to apply a humanitarian philosophy of client self-determination with a tacit assumption of "sickness" or "maladjustment" of law offenders. However, the primary concern of the correctional worker must lie with the safety of the community. The correctional worker functions within a system of law which holds the individual to be responsible for his behavior. Additionally, sociological criminologists deny the "sickness assumption" which is based primarily on psychoanalytical theory. (4) Social workers are trained in generic social case work, which does not provide the substantive content of criminology and correctional knowledge

¹⁴ *Id.* at 8. The Wisconsin Division of Corrections, State Department of Public Welfare, offers a work-study program in cooperation with the School of Social Work of the University of Wisconsin for Wisconsin probation and parole agents and institutional counselors. This division strongly supports social work training for the correctional worker. See Miles, *Self-Image of the Wisconsin Probation and Parole Agent 4-6* (mimeo., Division of Corrections, State Dep't of Public Welfare, Madison, Wis., April, 1963); and *Social Work in Wisconsin* (mimeo., Wis. State Dep't of Public Welfare, Madison, Feb., 1963).

that is needed for correctional case work—theories of crime, classification of offenders, law, a knowledge of the way courts and prisons operate, etc. (5) Social workers identify with the profession of social work rather than with corrections.¹⁵

To meet some of these criticisms advocates of social work training note that social case work is not exclusively a voluntary relationship, and that social workers are able to play an authoritarian role and still help clients achieve new equilibriums.¹⁶ Admittedly, social case work concerns itself mostly with the emotional needs of the individual; however, this emphasis does not preclude a manipulation of the delinquents' environment. The curricular content of schools of social work include courses in community resources and community organization. Moreover, aggressive case work has been utilized by social workers. The New York City Youth Board and the St. Paul, Minnesota, Family-Center Unit have employed aggressive techniques in the persuasion of resistive families to accept service.¹⁷ The Division of Corrections of the Wisconsin State Department of Public Welfare, which strongly supports social work education for correctional workers, reports their experienced probation and parole agents with M.S.W. degrees have no difficulty in functioning effectively within authoritarian frameworks.¹⁸

The Council of Social Work Education, which principally sets the policy of social work training, acknowledges that schools of social work might do a better job within a generic social work framework by adding additional teaching materials from the correctional area and by introducing advanced seminars with correctional content.¹⁹ The most recent curriculum policy statement of the Council

¹⁵ On this issue see Tappan, *op. cit. supra* note 3, at 561-66; Johnson, *supra* note 2, at 292-94; Ohlin, Piven & Pappenfort, *Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole*, 2 N.P.P.A.J. 211 (1956).

¹⁶ Meeker, *Probation Is Casework*, 12 Fed. Prob. 52 (June 1948); Meeker, *Social Work and the Correctional Field*, 21 Fed. Prob. 32 (Sept. 1957); Biestek, *The Principles of Client Self-Determination*, 32 SOCIAL CASEWORK 329 (1951); Pray, *The Place of Social Case Work in the Treatment of Delinquency*, 19 SOCIAL SERVICE REV. 235 (1945); Tracey, *A Social Worker's Perspective on Social Work in Probation*, 7 CRIME AND DELINQUENCY 134 (1961); Studt, *Casework in the Correctional Field*, 18 Fed. Prob. 19 (Sept. 1954); STUDDT, TRAINING PERSONNEL FOR WORK WITH JUVENILE DELINQUENTS (1954).

¹⁷ ROBINSON, JUVENILE DELINQUENCY 498-505 (1960).

¹⁸ Miles, *supra* note 14, at 24-27.

¹⁹ Burbank, *supra* note 13, at 10.

on Social Work Education advocates that schools of social work include instruction in preventive measures, the use of control and authority, decision making, analysis of social classes, sub-cultures, and community power structures and institutions.²⁰

Schools of social work, then, have demonstrated a willingness to add correctional content to their curricula, just as psychiatric, medical, and child welfare content have been added. The demands of critics from *within* and from *without* the social work field for over-specialization in "correctional" as well as other case-work areas have been resisted. Generic social work education trains social workers who may choose to work in various case-work areas. The social worker who goes into family case work does not become a "familogist," and the social worker who performs probation case work does not become a criminologist.

Independent, Specialized Corrections Programs

A number of correctional administrators and academic criminologists recommend specialized training in corrections. These partisans hold that the social work school curriculum does not adequately prepare students for careers in corrections because generic social case work is not correctional case work. Specialized correctional case work techniques may best be taught in specialized programs.²¹ Proponents of this position maintain that social work philosophy and subject matter are primarily directed toward community and mental-hospital-social-work practice. Preparation in sociology *per se* is also frowned upon because it does not include training in counseling techniques and group work or case work skills.

The goal of specialized corrections is the produc-

²⁰ Prigmore, *Correction and Social Work—The Impact of the 1962 Curriculum Policy Statement*, 9 CRIME AND DELINQUENCY 185 (1963).

²¹ Reckless, *Training of the Correctional Worker*, in CONTEMPORARY CORRECTION 40-45 (Tappan ed. 1951); Lejins, *Criminology for Probation and Parole Officers*, 2 N.P.P.A.J. 207 (1956); Lejins, *Professional and Graduate Training in Corrections*, in PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTY-NINTH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF CORRECTIONS OF THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION 35 (1959); SCHNUR, *Pre-Service Training*, 50 J. CRIM. L., C. & P.S. 27 (1959); Schnur, *Pre-Service Training*, in PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION 112 (1958); AM. CORRECTIONAL ASS'N, *op. cit. supra* note 9, at 8; A Proposal For Training in Corrections, 3-23 (mimeo, University of Southern California, March 1962); Lobenthal, *Proposals for Correctional Education and Training*, 40 PRISON J. 3 (1960).

tion of "correctional" case workers patterned on the "helping professions" capable of functioning effectively in authoritarian settings, i.e., probation and parole, institutional control, and aftercare. These case workers would also be equipped with skills relating to management, custody, maintenance, production, and surveillance. Supporters of this correctional case worker-manager curriculum claim there is available a specific body of knowledge about crime, criminals, and penology; and there are specialized techniques and skills available to the correctional worker dealing with offenders.²²

Many patrons of the specialized curriculum insist that the program be housed in an independent department of corrections, because corrections does not mesh with any one behavioral science. The proposed curricula include courses in sociology, psychology, and political science at the undergraduate level. Strong emphasis is placed on highly definitive and intensive courses in the fields of criminology and corrections at both the graduate and undergraduate levels; e.g., criminological theory, probation and parole, juvenile delinquency, offender classification, criminal and correctional law, police methods, correctional institutions, correctional and treatment management, rehabilitation and community services, after care services, and correctional research and statistics. Courses in group and individual counseling, case work, interviewing techniques, business administration, accounting, and general administration are also often suggested. Supervised field training in a correctional setting is generally seen as a must. The suggested faculty is made up of specialists in the preceding study areas. Some specialized programs also include training in the field of law enforcement.²³

Critics of the specialized correctional approach stress the lack of any accepted theory of crime supported by a consistent set of treatment skills.²⁴

²² FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, DEFINING CORRECTIONS FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH PURPOSES 1-4; Dwoskin, A Profile of the Practitioner in a Correctional Setting 9-17 (mimeo, Cal. Probation, Parole & Correctional Ass'n, May, 1963).

²³ For an example of specialized programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels see: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BULLETIN, ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY, FALL AND SPRING SEMESTERS, 1963-64, p. 57 (Berkeley, California: May 20, 1963).

²⁴ MEEKER, *Social Work and the Correctional Field*, 21 Fed. Prob. 32 (Sept. 1957); Wolfgang, *Research in Corrections*, 40 PRISON J. 37 (1960); OHLIN, *Sociology and the Field of Corrections* 52 (1936); Cressey,

The dearth of any clear and comprehensive conceptualization of treatment based upon a set of empirically grounded diagnostic models (criminal and delinquent types) is noted.²⁵ In short, "correctional knowledge" is at best limited and merely historical and descriptive in nature.

Some sociologists see in the establishment of specialized corrections programs attempts to create an independent academic discipline. To them knowledge of crime and criminals constitutes an area (not a discipline) of behavioral study to which several academic disciplines provide knowledge, and from which members of several academic disciplines draw data for study. Champions of the correctional approach usually deny any endeavor to create an academic discipline of corrections. They generally hold, in similar vein with schools of social work, that their programs are designed to prepare practitioners (not researchers), *to apply, not produce*, scientific knowledge about crime and criminals.

The necessity of a specialized body of treatment skills devised for the offender in an authoritarian setting is also questioned by other critics as is the feasibility of setting up an academic program designed to produce in one package a case worker and correctional manager. Granting the production of a correctional case worker-manager, censors note the high probability that such a person would either suffer role conflict in a correctional setting or apply only one set of skills depending upon his assigned work role. Furthermore, inauguration of such an inclusive curriculum would necessitate superficial treatment of the material therein, precluding thorough grounding in any or all disciplines concerned.

supra note 2, at 4-5; Lejins, *Toward Better Knowledge in Corrections*, in PROCEEDINGS OF THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION, 1958, at 424-29. Though Professor Lejins is a strong supporter of a specialized corrections program this article clearly indicates the dearth of correctional knowledge.

²⁵ Gibbons, *Some Notes on Treatment Theory in Corrections*, 36 SOCIAL SERVICE REV. 295 (1962); Cressey, *Contradictory Theories in Correctional Group Therapy Programs*, 18 Fed. Prob. 20 (June, 1954); Some tentative efforts at constructing criminal typologies have been made. See Schrag, *A Preliminary Criminal Typology*, 4 PAC. SOC. REV. 11 (1961); Gibbons & Garrity, *Definition and Analysis of Certain Criminal Types*, 53 J. CRIM. L., C. & P.S. 27 (1962); JENKINS, *BREAKING PATTERNS OF DEFEAT* (1954); Sykes, *Men, Merchants and Toughs; A Study of Reactions to Imprisonment*, 4 SOCIAL PROBLEMS 130 (1956); Roebuck, *The Negro Numbers Man as a Criminal Type: The Construction and Application of a Typology*, 54 J. CRIM. L., C. & P.S. 48 (1963).

Sequences of Courses in Criminology and Corrections Within Departments of Sociology

The correctional or crime control curricula developed by American colleges and universities which are sponsored by departments of sociology fall in this category. Professor Frank M. Boolsen's directory for 1955 lists 23 such programs,²⁶ operated on undergraduate and/or graduate levels.

Corrections programs in departments of sociology include courses in general sociology, criminology, juvenile delinquency, probation and parole, crime prevention, police administration, and psychology. Several departments of sociology in the past five years have added to this potpourri social welfare courses, public administration, correctional research methods, logic, theory and methods of counseling, field work, etc. In short, an attempt is made to school simultaneously a correctional case worker and a sociologist within a department of sociology. Some departments of sociology "shoot the moon" in a proliferation of course offerings (disciplinary and inter-disciplinary) geared to turn out a three gaited product—sociologist-case worker-correctional manager.²⁷

The authors take strong issue with this orientation. Such a hodgepodge curriculum fails to yield either sociologists or case workers, nor does it produce correctional managers. The abstract discipline of sociology is not designed to school "treatment men" or "correctional managers." Sociology has no methodology or treatment techniques to effect changes in value systems or attitudes of offenders.²⁸ Empirical sociological findings and sociological theory pertaining to criminology may certainly prove valuable to practitioners,

²⁶ Lejins, *Aspects of Correctional Personnel Training*, in PROCEEDINGS OF THE EIGHTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONGRESS OF CORRECTION OF THE AMERICAN PRISON ASSOCIATION, 1955, p. 144.

²⁷ Esselstyn, *Corrections and Sociology at San Jose State*, 14 CAL. YOUTH AUTHORITY Q. 16 (1961).

²⁸ OHLIN, *op. cit. supra* note 24, at 48-52; Professor Donald Cressey, a sociologist, suggests five principles for applying Edwin Sutherland's theory of differential association to the rehabilitation of criminals in a "group relations" situation. See Cressey, *Changing Criminals: The Application of the Theory of Differential Association*, 61 AM. J. SOC. 116 (1955). Volkman and Cressey found that these principles are being unwittingly used by Synanon, a program for rehabilitating drug addicts. See Volkman & Cressey, *Differential Association and the Rehabilitation of Drug Addicts*, 69 AM. J. SOC. 129 (1963). At best it must be remembered that Cressey's principles operate in a treatment setting where these techniques coexist with techniques based on clinical principles. In such a setting, it is impossible to verify the validity of treatment principles based on the theory of differential association.

e.g., social workers, psychiatrists, and clinical psychologists, as well as to "social engineers" and correctional administrators.²⁹

Practitioners could utilize sociological frames of reference supported by empirical research concerning effects upon criminal and deviant behavior of social norms; culture, sub-culture, and group relationships; and class differences; as well as the relationship of role playing and self-conception, and urbanization to such behavior. The utilization and application of sociological theory and research findings in the specific situation remains, however, the responsibility of the practitioner and not the sociologist.³⁰ Physicists are not engineers, and sociologists are not social workers. Departments of sociology which offer "nuts and bolts" programs in corrections inevitably find themselves in an ideological conflict between ideals of an abstract discipline and the tenets of an applied "helping" orientation.

The real sociological criminologist concerns himself with the phenomena of crime and criminal behavior utilizing a scientific approach for their study and analysis.³¹ The sociological criminologist, by virtue of academic preparation and theoretical orientation, is equipped to teach and conduct research on the phenomena of criminal behavior. He is ill equipped to initiate, coordinate, or maintain a program in corrections within a department of sociology.

The authors heartily endorse the education of sociological criminologists at all academic levels. However, we hasten to remind the holders of such degrees that they are not trained in an applied art. This does not gainsay the apparent success of many such graduates at various levels in the field of corrections.³² For that matter, many

²⁹ The contributions of Donald Clemmer, Walter C. Reckless, Donald Taft, Norman S. Hayner, Clarence Schrag, Donald R. Cressey, Erwin Goffman, Richard H. McCleery, Stanton Wheeler, Daniel Glaser, Gresham Sykes, Paul Tappan, Ruth Cavan, Mabel A. Elliott, Harry E. Barnes, Negley K. Teeters, Marshall B. Clinard, Clifford R. Shaw, Lloyd Ohlin, John L. Gillin, Hans von Hentig, Edwin Lemert, Thorsten Sellin, James F. Short, Marvin E. Wolfgang, among others, are cases in point.

³⁰ Clinard, *Contributions of Sociology to Understanding Deviant Behavior*, 3 BRIT. J. CRIMINOLOGY 110 (1962).

³¹ Wolfgang, *Criminology and the Criminologist*, 54 J. CRIM. L., C. & P.S. 160 (1963). Also on this point see THE EDWARD C. LINDEMAN MEMORIAL LECTURES, OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WORK, ST. LOUIS, p. 175.

³² The senior author is a product of a corrections program within a department of sociology. What case

probation and parole officers and institutional counselors have been recruited from the ranks of newspapermen, clergymen, educators, military men, correctional officers, policemen, etc. However, such occupational types, including sociologists, have not acquired academic training in case work techniques.

A Series of Miscellaneous Programs

The programs in the fourth category obviously may not be discussed as a single entity. A significant number of them are predicated on the assumption that the best preparation for work in corrections is a wide acquaintanceship with a number of behavioral sciences ("know why" courses as opposed to "know how" courses) which may include some theoretical courses in criminology. Particularized knowledge is gained through on the job training following graduation from college. Endorsers of this position note the extensive in-service orientation and training required for correctional workers. Colleges and universities following this approach would eliminate attempts at specialization and return to generic courses of study in the behavioral sciences.³³ Critics of this approach point to an increased need for specialization: in criminology, in social case work, in correctional case work, depending upon their frame of reference.

What at first blush appears to be a variant of the specialized, independent corrections program is suggested by the Professional Development Committee of the California Probation, Parole and Correctional Association, whose membership includes college professors and "practitioners" in the field of corrections in California. This committee prescribes a "core curriculum" in corrections at the undergraduate level to train probation, parole, and institutional "practioners." Case work subject matter is handled in an interdisciplinary manner and is an addition to other bachelor of arts degree requirements. The Committee suggests use of various schools or disciplines for the "housing" or coordination of the program depending upon local institutional policy. The "core curriculum" consists of nine sociology courses, including criminology, juvenile delinquency, correctional institutions, probation and parole; four psychology

work and counseling techniques he learned were acquired after graduation in a correctional setting from clinicians, i.e., psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers. They were very patient!

³³ AM. CORRECTIONAL ASS'N *op. cit. supra* note 9, at 10.

courses; three social work courses; one course in cultural anthropology; one course in principles of public administration; one course in group dynamics; and one research course. The committee suggests the development in four year colleges in California of a "special emphasis or major in corrections" at the B.S. and M.S. levels.³⁴

The writers question this "core curriculum" on several grounds. One cannot turn out simultaneously in one package liberal arts products and correctional practitioners. The Committee's failure to designate a department in which this core curriculum is to be housed indicates the dilemma—*practitioner vs. holder of liberal arts degree*. The recommended curriculum is heavily loaded with sociology courses. Acceptance of this program by any legitimate behavioral science department is unlikely. Use of such language as "special emphasis or major in corrections" indicates the Committee's willingness to house its curriculum within an accepted discipline or a separate corrections department—any port in a storm. Such a program will not mesh with any behavioral science discipline. On the other hand it is too top heavy with sociology courses to stand alone as a separate department of corrections.

HOW CORRECTIONAL SPECIALISTS VIEW EDUCATION FOR CORRECTIONS

In an attempt to ascertain the judgment of significant contributors to the field of corrections regarding the academic preparation of probation, parole, and institutional counselors, the writers polled 141 persons by mail. This population consisted of all the contributors and consultants to the 1959 revision of the *Manual of Correctional Standards* issued by the American Correctional Association, and several persons who had published articles within the past ten years in professional journals on the academic preparation of correctional workers.³⁵ The following two questions were asked:

1. What academic training do you recommend for students preparing themselves for entrance into the correctional field at the undergraduate and/or graduate level? Specifically we have in mind here students who have

planned a career as probation officers, parole officers, and institutional classification officers and counselors.

2. What are your underlying reasons for the above recommendations?

Results of the Poll

Eighty-two percent of the polled individuals responded—115 out of 141.³⁶ It can be seen from Table I that eight responses mentioned only graduate training preference. All eight recommended the M.S.W. degree as a condition of employment. These letters expressed the view that since the correctional setting was a case work and clinical setting, case workers trained in clinical techniques were called for. The work of probation officers, parole officers, and institutional counselors was defined as social case work. This position is not uncommon among professional social workers at the M.S.W. level.

Fifty-three responses, while noting undergraduate training preferences, failed to state preferred training at the graduate level. Forty-three of these 53 preferred academic preparation in the behavioral sciences at the undergraduate level. As described in the letters, behavioral sciences were synonymous with the social sciences, among which sociology and psychology courses were assigned top priority on an equal footing. These responses did not distinguish between training programs within departments of sociology or psychology as opposed to programs in other behavioral science departments, e.g., schools of public administration, public safety, police science, and political science. These letters also stressed the importance of on the job training for the acquisition of correctional skills superimposed on a broad background of behavioral science education. They noted that persons at the B.S. level were more easily obtained than persons with higher degrees.

The remaining 37 responses in the undergraduate behavioral science category advocated graduate training: 18 prescribed the M.S.W. degree, 17 endorsed graduate training in corrections leading toward the M.S. degree, and two suggested an M.S. in the behavioral sciences. The 18 responses prescribing an M.S.W. equated the tasks of the probation officer, parole officer, and institutional counselor with professional social case work.

³⁶ One-hundred-one *Manual of Correctional Standards* contributors, seven sociologists, and seven M.S.W.'s responded.

³⁴ Dvoskin, *supra* note 22, at 16-24.

³⁵ There were 122 contributors and consultants to the *MANUAL OF CORRECTIONAL STANDARDS*. The additional 19 persons polled included ten sociologists at the Ph.D. level and nine M.S.W.'s with special interest in this area.

TABLE I
RESPONDENTS SUGGESTED ACADEMIC TRAINING FOR PROBATION OFFICERS, PAROLE OFFICERS, AND
INSTITUTIONAL COUNSELORS

Suggested Undergraduate Programs	Suggested Graduate Programs				Total
	None Required	MSW	MS Corrections	MS Behavioral Sciences	
B.S. Behavioral Science.....	43	18	17	2	80
B.S. Specialized Corrections.....	4	0	14	0	18
Social Welfare.....	1	3	0	0	4
A.B. or B.S. Degree with no stated disciplinary preference.....	5	0	0	0	5
None mentioned.....	0	8	0	0	8
Total.....	53	29	31	2	115

Source: Poll conducted by the authors during June-August, 1963.

Undergraduate training in the behavioral sciences (especially psychology and sociology) was described as the appropriate prerequisite to graduate study in a school of social work. The 17 replies supporting the M.S. in corrections outlined a specialized curriculum for the training of a correctional case worker-manager as distinct from a generic social case worker. Their rationale was the same as that found in the literature by those advocating specialized corrections programs. Comments of these 17 on the undergraduate program in the behavioral sciences leading to graduate study in corrections indicated a heavy emphasis on corrections courses. They reasoned that the aspirant correctional worker should acquaint himself with criminology, law enforcement, law, case work, and public administration early in his academic career. Two letters espousing an M.S. in the behavioral sciences supported by a B.S. in the same field viewed the correctional setting as an area of work for a generalist in behavioral science. Both respondents noted that many Borstal counselors in England are not trained in any one professional area.

Eighteen persons recommended undergraduate training in specialized corrections programs. Four of these offered no choice at the graduate level, their position being that four years of intensive training in corrections was sufficient. The remaining 14 advised specialized corrections training leading to the M.S. degree. Curriculum proposals in these 14 letters at both the undergraduate and graduate levels were loaded with corrections courses. All 18 respondents proclaimed the neces-

sity of educating a specialized case worker-manager. Following their colleagues in the literature, they placed great emphasis on "specialized correctional knowledge."

Four respondents endorsed an undergraduate program in social welfare. Three advocated an M.S.W. at the graduate level; one mentioned no graduate training preference. Reasons for this academic preference parallel the rationale cited by others in the sample championing social work training.

Five respondents proposed an A.B. or B.S. degree with no stated disciplinary preference. None of these thought that graduate training was necessary. These five stated that certain personality attributes were more conducive to success on the job than any specific training.³⁷

DISCUSSION

Responses to the poll as opposed to the literature failed to make a distinction between undergraduate sequences of courses in criminology and corrections within departments of sociology, and other behavioral science programs. These responses emphasized course work in sociology,

³⁷ The suggested academic programs generally tended to reflect the specialized training of the respondents: (1) those with social work training championed the M.S.W.; (2) the recommendations of those with legal backgrounds were split between corrections and M.S.W.'s; (3) sociologists' preferences were divided among behavioral science, social work, and specialized corrections; and (4) those with only A.B. or B.S. degrees recommended general training in the behavioral sciences.

criminology, and psychology, but failed to designate a "housing" discipline.

At this time when the professionalization of correctional workers is in vogue, it is significant to note that approximately one half of those polled in this sample do not think that graduate training is required for probation officers, parole officers, and institutional counselors. This position might reflect any of three points of view: (1) the respondents feel that specialized "correctional knowledge" may not be gained through a process of academic preparation; (2) that an undergraduate program when supplemented by practical, on the job training is adequate preparation for the correctional worker; (3) that despite what the respondents feel to be ideal training, the unavailability of a sufficient number of persons with higher academic degrees for corrections accustoms them to think in terms of other than graduate training for prospective personnel.

Of those suggesting training at the graduate level two camps of preference exist—M.S. in corrections, M.S.W. degree. The adherents of the former note the unique nature of correctional case work and management skills. Their interest lies in specialized training which they hope will lead to the production of a body of professional correctional workers. Advocates of the M.S.W. view case work as essential to the field of corrections and contend that schools of social work provide the best case work training. They view the correctional field as an area in which M.S.W.'s as well as other professionals may make contributions. However, they maintain that the work performed by parole officers, probation officers, and institutional counselors is the province of the professional social case worker.

The authors have observed from the literature and from the poll that the course-work content pertaining to case work with offenders and the clinical approach to this content are becoming

similar in specialized corrections programs at the graduate level and in schools of social work. The importance and uniqueness of case work in an authoritarian setting has now been recognized by both schools. Schools of social work have noted the necessity of utilizing correctional and sociological materials in their course content. The authors agree with Professor Paul Tappan that further fusion of social work methods and a criminological orientation is necessary.³⁸ This appears to be forthcoming. Though hiring practices vary throughout the United States an increasing number of correctional administrators look with equal favor upon the graduates of specialized corrections programs at the graduate level and M.S.W.'s.

The authors maintain that colleges and universities are not equipped to offer specialized training in corrections at the undergraduate level. Moreover the program and goals of the liberal arts approach do not mesh with a "nuts and bolts" approach. Elimination of attempts at specialization and a return to generic courses of study in which colleges and universities are qualified is called for. College graduates in the behavioral sciences may be trained in probation, parole, and institutional counselor techniques and skills by the employing agency (on the job and in-service training). At the graduate level a masters degree in corrections or in social work with correctional emphasis is recommended. Departments of sociology are not designed to train case workers or managers. Some of them are equipped to school sociological criminologists. And those that are have an important task to perform preparing students in theoretical criminology and research methodology.

³⁸ TAPPAN, CRIME, JUSTICE AND CORRECTION 566 (1960); See also KIRKPATRICK, *Personnel Needs in the Correctional Field*, 25 THE SOCIAL WORKER 13 (1957).