

1947

Methods of Selecting Prison Personnel

D. E. Lundberg

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

D. E. Lundberg, Methods of Selecting Prison Personnel, 38 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 14 (1947-1948)

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.

METHODS OF SELECTING PRISON PERSONNEL

D. E. Lundberg

Dr. Lundberg is a member of the Division of Psychology of Cornell University. During the war he served as a naval officer instructing trainee officers and aboard an aircraft carrier. His major field of interest is personnel administration. He believes that general psychological principles and techniques can be adapted to the problems of correctional administration. This paper is an attempt to adapt such principles and techniques to the selection of correctional officers.—EDITOR.

In the selection of the prison guard a critical question immediately presents itself: What is a "good" guard—a naive query at first glance, but sophisticated enough upon inspection. Before any effective program of selection can be set up this question must have an approximate answer.

The "good" guard is defined variously by the warden, the educational director, and the industrial director, as well as the lay public. To the warden the "good" guard is the good "jail man", who can take a group of inmates outside and bring all back; he is courageous; he is a leader by force of personality and "guts". To the educational director he is one who understands human nature and the principles of motivation; he is the "good-influence", understanding, and versed in the tools of tuition. To the industrial director the good guard is the mechanic who knows his trade and can relay his knowledge to the inmate and maintain production. The public's definition probably includes reforming, punishing, and keeping the prisoner locked up.

That this is not an academic problem was emphasized recently in an appeal by 400 Criminal Hospital Attendants in New York State to be reclassified Prison Guards.¹ The appeal claimed the two jobs were essentially the same—the detention and custody of criminals. Significantly, the State Classification Board declined the appeal on the grounds that the job of Prison Guard differs from that of Criminal Hospital Attendant in that guards "must by previous experience and training be equipped to assist by education, example and advice, in the rehabilitation and in the readjustment of social attitudes of prisoners who need not overcome mental illness." An editorialist² declared that the difference in function of the two jobs was based more on theory than on fact and that the rehabilitative duties ascribed to the guards were effected by teachers, not guards.

¹ "Civil Service Leader" Vol. 7 No. 33. April 30, 1946, New York City.

² Ibid.

The ambiguity as to the function of the guard is further reflected in State Civil Service announcements; some states make no mention of the guard's rehabilitative function; others, while silent in this regard, include questions in their selection examinations which indicate this function as one of the duties expected. The Federal Bureau of Prisons is perhaps most explicit and states clearly that along with the custodial and supervisory duties the guard will "assist with the work of rehabilitative agencies organized for instructional training, discipline and instruction of inmates."

This confusion as to the function of the guard is often referred to society, and the statement made that until society itself can make up its mind what it expects of the prison, little can be accomplished. Some criminologists speak of "the protection of society" as the purpose of prison and expand this explanation to include some form of non-physical punishment and reformation.³ Some writers declare that the intent of the law clearly expresses one motive for imprisonment: societal revenge.⁴ If this be the purpose, the more confused and haphazard the administration, the more effective the penology.

Several writers believe that until classification procedures are more scientific, the prison can have small curative value. Lindner points out that many "criminals" have no need of rehabilitation, that their unlawful acts do not involve a personality malfunction, and that the true "criminotic" has a serious personality disorder which can be treated only by professionally trained persons. He avers that to "treat" those who need no treatment in the same fashion as those who are personality deviants of the most serious type is so much nonsense.⁵ Wilson and Pescor similarly believe that "prisons" should be only for those "criminals" who are dangerous to themselves and others.⁶

Recognizing the imprint of societal attitudes and the need for adequate classification procedures, a residual responsibility remains for penal administrators: influencing the public to understand the purpose and problems of the prison. The fact that the purpose of imprisonment is vague in the mind of the public allows the administrator a certain latitude of action; and this action, if properly carried out and properly publicized can act for the education of the public.

³ For a representative statement see Gill, H.B. *Prison Officer Training*. U. S. Office of Education. Misc. 2309. 1940. p. 10.

⁴ A forceful statement of this idea: Waite, John B., "Revenge Costs Too Much", *Harpers Magazine*, May 1946, pp. 466-472.

⁵ Lindner, Robert. *Stone Walls and Men*, The Odyssey Press. New York, 1946.

⁶ Wilson, J. G. and Pescor, M. *Problems in Prison Psychiatry*, Coxton Printers. Caldwell, Idaho, 1939.

The perfectionistic notion that the present penal structure be uprooted and discarded is not likely to come as a radical change but will probably be introduced gradually as a result of altered attitudes—these attitudes may be changed by careful, factual propaganda. It is not happenstance that 39 states have some form of indeterminate sentence. One of the first steps which penal administration can make in this direction is to insist that appropriate methods and standards be employed in the selection of penal personnel.

It is to be recognized that where selection of prison personnel by civil service methods obtain, the standards and methods of selection are largely controlled by a civil service board, often separate from the agencies for which the personnel are to be employed.⁷ These boards, however, generally consider the qualifications for personnel suggested by penal administrators and often collaborate with the administrators to devise tests for purposes of selection.

Salaries, established by state legislators often prove critical in a selection program; and while an attractive wage plan can never in itself secure the most qualified employees, a poor wage plan can subvert an otherwise effective program. In many states salary plans cripple any attempt at scientific selection. It is true also that given an attractive wage plan, a selection program will not succeed unless positive recruitment is carried on. Posting announcements of employment opportunities in public buildings is, at best, a form of passive recruitment. Paid newspaper advertisements stating the desired qualifications, radio advertisements, descriptive pamphlets and even short movies sent to schools and military separation centers, and more frequent examinations held at places convenient to applicants may prove effective in securing desirable candidates.⁸ One aim of recruitment is to interest a great many more candidates than can be employed and so to have a large selection ratio.⁹

Emphasizing the role of the guard as an agent of rehabilitation and less as a jailer would interest a different type of ap-

⁷ Where selection is not controlled by civil service or its equivalent, selection methods are so unsystematic and subjective that any gain to the administrator by being able to select his personnel is usually negated by his lack of knowledge of selection methods and by political factors.

⁸ On this subject see White, Leonard D., *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, MacMillan, New York, 1939, Chap. XX.

⁹ In "normal" times a large selection ratio has obtained in the states offering higher wages, e.g., according to W. M. Wallack in a paper presented to the A.P.A., New York State in 1936 had 4,666 applicants for 430 jobs. In 1940 New Jersey had 1,072 applicants and hired but 25. (Quoted in New Jersey Civil Service Publication, 1941.)

plicant. Such jobs as public school teacher, social worker, minister, and nurse, do not depend primarily upon a monetary appeal to secure recruits, but upon an appeal to the social service urge. It would be interesting to enlist as guards some of the several thousand conscientious objectors who were inmates of the Federal Penal System, or who served as attendants in mental hospitals. Some are well educated, reasonable men. They might prove ineffectual in the present penal structure, particularly in maximum security prisons where admittedly the guards' most important function is the custody and detention of inmates—on the other hand, they might prove invaluable in minimum security correctional institutions where the emphasis is supposedly rehabilitation.

The purpose of prison is to protect society by segregating those who are known to have committed dangerous antisocial acts, to attempt where possible to understand and re-direct the causes of that antisocial behavior, and in cases in which our present knowledge and psychological skills are inadequate or the antisocial determinants unchangeable, to segregate continuously, satisfying as many of the basic needs of the individual as is prudent, and requiring of the individual productive activity in quantity to recompense the state for his expense.

This requires personnel with certain prerequisite personality traits and intellectual abilities. Recruitment, selection, and placement of these personnel requires organization and research.

A recent survey of the methods of selecting the bulk of penal personnel, variously called prison guards, correctional officers, custodial officers and similar titles presents some interesting facts and may suggest a more complete program of selection.

Survey of Methods of Selection of Prison Guards

In 1941 selection of prison guards by civil service or other merit systems obtained in ten states: Connecticut, Colorado, New York, Ohio, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, and Wisconsin.¹⁰

In the survey, made possible by James M. Mitchell of the Civil Service Assembly of the United States and Canada and the various directors of state civil service bureaus, it was found that eighteen states now have made some provision for selecting prison officers by some form of merit system, the eight in addi-

¹⁰ Klinger, J. H. "Prison Officers' Training Programs" *Prison World*. Quoted in Barnes, H. E. and Teeters, N.K. *New Horizons in Criminology*, Prentice Hall, New York, 1944, p. 658.

tion to those listed by Klinger being California, Oregon, Kansas, Alabama, Indiana, Louisiana, Minnesota and Virginia.¹¹

Several of the states have not yet instituted competitive examinations for prison guards though plans are being made for such a procedure. The State of Virginia Personnel Act provides that all employees shall be selected on a merit basis, but partly because of the necessity to take almost all applicants, formal examinations have not been developed.¹² Colorado is awaiting a job reclassification study before proceeding with test development, and Louisiana, though it has developed tests for foremen, has done nothing as yet about prison officers. The Oregon State Civil Service Commission is in the beginning stages of operations and has not completed classifying prison jobs. Ohio has in the past included a written test as a part of the examination but now bases the applicant's grade upon his training, experience, a personal interview, and a physical examination. Maine and Tennessee, though they have personnel services performed by a state wide system, do not cover the position Prison Guard; Maine considers it in the non-competitive group.

¹¹ The status of Rhode Island is not known because of the failure of Director Cushman to reply to requests for information.

¹² Each state agency in Virginia has the right to select its own employees and to be the judge of the tests which should be given.

STATES HAVING STATE WIDE PERSONNEL SERVICES AND CHARACTER OF WRITTEN EXAMINATION WHERE USED IN SELECTION OF PRISON GUARDS, LOWEST GRADE

STATE

ALABAMA—120 true-false and multiple-choice items covering:

- (1) Use and care of firearms.
- (2) Ability to follow oral and written instructions.
- (3) Knowledge of methods of handling men.

CALIFORNIA—Test is primarily of the objective true-false or multiple-choice type and includes items on:

- (1) Knowledge of modern penal practices, of the laws of arrest, of first aid, and of the use and care of small firearms.
- (2) Familiarity with the purposes and methods of discipline as applied to persons under restraint.
- (3) Ability to remember names and faces.
- (4) Ability to make simple arithmetic computations.
- (5) Ability to follow directions.

COLORADO—Are awaiting reclassification procedure.

CONNECTICUT—"Multiple-choice questions designed to test the intelligence and the understanding of the applicant."

ILLINOIS—Use 100 questions of true-false and multiple-choice type. The questions cover handling and treatment of inmates, use of weapons and prison equipment, housekeeping habits, prison terms, safety measures, recreation, first aid, and simple arithmetic.

INDIANA—105 items, objective true-false and multiple-choice test. Covers:

- (1) Reading comprehension.
 - (2) Knowledge of guard work and penal terms.
 - (3) Knowledge of good supervisory practice.
-

KANSAS—

- (1) Test of observation and memory: Front view pictures and descriptions of 6 men taken from police files presented for 8 minutes, are later matched with 9 side-view pictures and recall of certain parts of the descriptions tested.
- (2) 45 items on firearms, first aid, penal terminology and "common sense" information.
- (3) 30 true-false and 15 multiple-choice items on methods of handling people. (Could be answered without penal training and experience.)
- (4) Reading comprehension-reasoning test consisting of answering questions about a seven column table of data concerning 25 inmates.
- (5) Picture identification of 12 pieces of equipment used in prison, e.g., gas gun, billy, gas grenade; and questions on care and use of firearms.

LOUISIANA—Have developed tests for Prison Foreman (production supervisors) but have not yet developed tests for Prison Guard Officers.

MAINE—Considered in the non-competitive group of jobs.

MARYLAND—Consists mainly of multiple-choice, true-false, and completion questions and covers:

- (1) General penal and correctional terms.
- (2) Practices and procedures on the lowest level.

MASSACHUSETTS—Two hour multiple-choice test including items on practical judgment, common knowledge of criminology and state penal practice, supervisory practice, attitude toward certain areas of criminology.

MICHIGAN—Standard intelligence test and an employment test designed to test:

- (1) Elementary knowledge of prison practices and terms.
- (2) Attitudes towards inmates.
- (3) Knowledge of the causes of anti-social behavior.
- (4) Knowledge of first aid.
- (5) Ability to command the respect and obedience of inmates.
- (6) Keep records, make reports, spell correctly, follow written directions and perform simple arithmetic computations.

MINNESOTA—

1. Section on prison terms and practices.
2. Section on firearms.
3. Section designed to test judgment in handling various problems in inmate control.

NEW JERSEY—Includes a test of intelligence and an objective employment examination designed to test general information, judgment, and reading comprehension.

NEW YORK—

1. Observation test in which applicant answers questions concerning details of a picture after having looked at it a specified length of time.
2. Reading comprehension.
3. Knowledge of social information, penology, terms used in court or criminal procedures.
4. Test of ability to react to certain specified situations.

OHIO—Have included written tests as a part of examination in the past, but commonly base applicants' grade upon his training and experience, and a personal interview.

OREGON—Oregon State Civil Service Commission in its beginning stages of operations and will develop tests following classification procedures.

RHODE ISLAND—Information not available.

TENNESSEE—Position not covered by Tennessee Civil Service.

VIRGINIA—No formal competitive examinations constructed. Each state agency has the right to select its own employees and to be the judge of the test which should be used.

WISCONSIN—Written examination constructed to test general intelligence, knowledge of first aid, use of firearms, and elementary knowledge of crimes, misdemeanors, court procedure, probation and parole.

Intelligence and Employment Tests

It will be noted from the table that only two states, Michigan and New Jersey, regularly use a standardized mental test in selecting guards.¹³ This appears strange since mental testing of inmates is well established and certainly the administrator should know the capacities and limitations of his officers as well as he does the inmates. The Wonderlic Personnel Test, requiring but about 15 minutes to administer and easily scored, can give the administrator the approximate mental level of the candidates and present employees.

Employment tests may offer a valid substitute for more formal intelligence tests. Hubbard¹⁴ found that objective employment tests used for selecting guards correlated about .70 to .80 with the Army Alpha test and believed they offered greater appeal because of use and duties terminology.

The use of duties terminology in selection examinations is of dubious value, however, because it makes for selection of those who have been exposed to such terminology and excludes men of equal ability who have not been so exposed. Exposure to such terminology may be entirely fortuitous.

Whatever the test employed, it is almost worthless unless studies of its validity are made—studies which compare test scores with job performance and determine whether high scores predict 'good' performance, low scores poor performance. Such studies are not simple; for the common criterion of 'good job performance' are ratings made by superiors, notably unreliable.¹⁵ Reliability of rating is increased by combining ratings of several superiors who have observed the ratee. Having ex-inmates recently released rate their former guards as to their effectiveness in such critical areas as respect commanded, self control, and manner of behavior towards inmates might be worth an experiment.

The present large numbers of graduate students in Sociology and Psychology who are looking for topics for doctoral dissertations provide an opportunity for the development and validation of employment and intelligence tests. Prison officials and civil service executives might suggest to nearby universities the desirability of such studies.

¹³ Colorado used the Otis Mental Test in selecting a superintendent of their Boy's Industrial School.

¹⁴ Hubbard, Henry Furness, *A Study of Objective Employment Tests in the New Jersey Civil Service*. George Washington University doctoral dissertation, 1934.

¹⁵ For a discussion of merit rating, see Tiffin, J., *Industrial Psychology*, "Industrial Merit Rating," Prentice-Hall, New York, 1944.

The content of employment tests could cover questions dealing with the applicant's knowledge of the motivation of behavior as well as knowledge of the more common custodial and supervisory practices. An excellent type of question is the multiple-choice kind which presents the applicant with a problem situation and calls for a proper solution. The examination given in 1943 by the State of Massachusetts Civil Service for the position of correction officer included a few questions of this nature. An example of this was the question:

"A prisoner who repeatedly claims to be unable to work because of illness should: (1) be examined by a physician and by a psychiatrist; (2) be placed in solitary confinement until he changes his attitude; (3) be allowed to remain idle inasmuch as there is hardly enough employment to occupy the time of other inmates; (4) be reported at once to the Parole Board."

This type of question could be extended to include questions concerning motivation:

"If an inmate continually talks during a formation at which talking is forbidden, (1) he may be talking merely as a means of seeking attention; (2) he may be expressing his resentment towards the officer; (3) he may be unaware of his behavior; (4) he may be affected mentally."

An applicant aware of motivational factors would check all four responses.

In the development of this type of test the researcher would do well to consult leading criminologists and psychologists for suggestions. The methodology used by File in developing his test to measure supervisory quality offers valuable cues.¹⁶

The concept of intelligence is becoming more exact and the methods of testing more rigorous as experimental work proceeds. Recently L. L. Thurstone, probably the leading authority in the field of mental testing, posited twelve factors comprising the concept intelligence and urged the use of a profile on which the scores of each of the factors of intelligence be plotted graphically, rather than use a single index of mental age or intelligence quotient. "A glance at such a profile shows whether a man is generally gifted in one or two primary factors, or whether he has some conspicuous limitations."¹⁷ A doctoral study of the requirements of the job of prison guard might be able to identify the prerequisite factors necessary for good performance and devise and validate tests for testing these factors.

The need for rigorous validation studies of mental and employment tests in some cases has been partially avoided. The

¹⁶ File, Q. W. *The Measurement of Supervisory Quality in Industry*. Purdue University doctoral dissertation, June 1944. The Test "How Supervise" can be obtained from the Psychological Corporation, New York.

¹⁷ Thurstone, L. L. *The Scientific Monthly*. February, 1946. pp. 101-112.

States of Kansas, Michigan, New York, Illinois, and New Jersey incorporate a probationary period in their selection procedures during which undesirable candidates are dismissed. New Jersey¹⁸ and Michigan have an excellent opportunity for observing their guard candidates during a special training period provided most candidates, and New York,¹⁹ has in the past, done likewise. The Federal Correctional System provides an intensive, extended in-service training program, which, according to Rosenberger, indoctrinates their candidates in most phases of the Federal System, and with the aid of performance tests places the candidate in a job appropriate to demonstrated abilities and interests.²⁰

Probationary and in-service periods unless they are used as a part of a criterion for determining the validity for tests of careful initial selection do not avoid the hiring of personnel who will later be released because of inaptitude. While in-training and performance tests are a great aid in placement and result in greater efficiency, they cannot entirely replace adequate initial selection procedures.

Interest Inventories

As far as the writer has discovered there have been no attempts to investigate guard candidates' interests other than by interview. The use of interest inventories has proved to be of great value in placing veterans in appropriate training courses and employment and generally helpful in guidance work. If 'ideal' patterns of interest for Prison Guards could be found for the more common interest inventories such as the Kuder Preference Record²¹ or the Strong Vocational Interest Blank for Men,²² they could be used in selection, and more importantly, in placement of candidates. Probably Kuder or Strong would cooperate in the development of 'norms' for Prison Guard. An 'ideal' pattern of interests of a cell officer, based on surmise and not on experimental evidence is presented below (p. 23). It should be noted that interest inventories are not designed to give scores which can be used as precise pre-

18 "Selection and Training of Prison and Reformatory Officers in New Jersey", a mimeographed form issued by the New Jersey Civil Service Commission, May 19, 1941.

19 Wallack, W. M. "Training Prison Guards", American Prison Association Proceedings, 1938. pp. 168-177.

20 Rosenberger, H. T. "In-Service Training for the Federal Prison System" *School Life*. Nov. 1945, pp. 29-31.

21 Published by Science Research Associates, 1700 Prairie Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. It is readily scored by hand.

22 Published by the Stanford University Press.

dictions, but only present trends of interests which are significant when used as a part of a battery of tests.

Appendix I
Test Record and Profile Chart

Name Prison Guard (lowest grade)

Test No.	Test Name and Form (or Subtest)	Main Group	Part Score	School Achievement Test	Pre-Test Score	Standard Score Scale										Percentile Rank Scale									
						2.5	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.5	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	5	10	15	20	25	30	35	40	45	
1	Kuder Preference Record	Successful Prison																							
2	Record	Prison																							
3		Guards																							
4	Mechanical		82	50																					
5	Computational		30	30																					
6	Scientific		60	40																					
7	Persuasive		94	80																					
8	Artistic		30	10																					
9	Literary		43	40																					
10	Musical		11	30																					
11	Social Service		92	85																					
12	Clerical		48	40																					
13																									
14	Wonderlic Personnel																								
15	Test (Mental Test)		21	50																					
16																									
17	Educational Back-		10th	50																					
18	ground		grade																						
19																									
20																									
21																									
22																									
23																									
24																									

Roy M. Frost of the Kansas Industrial Reformatory is co-operating in developing interest pattern norms for correctional officers which should be published in the near future.

Education and Experience As Prerequisites.

No states nor the Federal system require high school education as a prerequisite for selection to the office of Prison Guard. The State of California requires the "equivalent to completion of the twelfth grade"—but adds the qualification "additional qualifying experience may be substituted for a maximum of six years of this educational requirement on the basis of one year of experience to one year of education." Michigan states that the completion of eight grades is desirable but not essential; Maryland and Illinois require eight grades or their equivalent, Maryland stating that high school education is desirable. Several states have no specific educational requirements but usually specify three to six years of supervisory experience as prerequisite.

The State of Kansas is an example of a state which sets no minimum educational requirements but which does assign a

weighted score for each year of school completed beyond the third grade. We show below the form used by the Department of Civil Service of Kansas in rating candidates' training and experience qualifications. Experience is rated both for relevancy and recency. "A" relevancy credit is given for experience as a prison guard, as a hospital attendant or as a prison instructor. The number of months' experience of an applicant in

C.S. 136

State of Kansas
DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE
Training and Experience
Standard Rating Scale
(3 recency; 3 relevance)

Name (KEY) _____ Date (January, 1944 exam.) _____

Examination PRISON GUARD

Identification O. _____

<i>Education</i>																	
Grammar								High				College					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6
			14	19	24	29.5	35	40	45	49.5	54	59	64	64	64	64	64

Education Rating.....

Experience									
Exp.	5 Years			5 Years			5 Years		
A:.....months.....months.....months							Prison Guard Hospital Attdt. Prison Instructor		
M factor	0.5			0.3			0.2		
Rating		
B:.....months.....months.....months							Military Service Guidance Work Teaching		
M factor	0.3			0.2			0.1		
Rating		
C:.....months.....months.....months							Policeman and Fireman		
M factor	0.2			0.1			0.05		
Rating		
							Experience Rating.....		
Rated by.....							Total Final Rating.....		
Checked by.....							Percentage Equiv.....		

any job is plotted for relevancy and recency, top credit going to "A" experience in the past five years.

Education and experience scores are totaled to make the applicant's training and experience rating, which counts 20%

of the total score; a written test counting 60% and an interview 20% complete the score.

In the last examination for Prison Guard given by the Civil Service Department of Kansas, applicants were required to make a passing rating on the written test in order to receive consideration on the other parts of the examination. In two previous examinations, however, applicants were required only to make a final passing rating. It is easy to see that in using only a total score applicants who scored zero on a particular item could still receive a passing mark and be employed. For example, an applicant could conceivably have an entirely unsuitable personality and yet receive a passing mark making him eligible for employment. Presumably this would not cause serious repercussions in the Kansas system, since during the six months probationary period such deficiencies would be noted and the candidate released. The use of a profile chart would probably eliminate the possibility of such occurrence because it obviates strict adherence to a total score method.

The Department of State Employment and Registration of Maryland has also developed a training and experience rating scale which is worth noting. On the basis of ten, a weight of three is assigned education, three to experience, and four to the written test. The minimum passing score for the written examination as fixed by law is 60. Each candidate who attains 60 or more is then given additional ratings.

It will be noticed that Maryland differentiates in selection between supervisory and non-supervisory jobs. This would appear to be highly desirable. Instead of depending upon a probationary period or in-service training to serve as a means of placement, a definite plan is followed from the outset. Unless facilities and time are available to indoctrinate candidates in all phases of guard work, it would seem that much time and expense could be saved by giving each group of candidates, supervisory or non-supervisory, specialized training. The emphasis on differentiation between these groups is also desirable in that more applicants can be accepted. Persons not meeting the qualifications for supervisory guard duties may well meet those of the non-supervisory positions. In periods when there are few applications this factor becomes increasingly important.

It may be that ex-school teachers, high school coaches, physical instructors, missionaries and other public service workers do not apply for the job of Prison Guard, but it is remarkable that in the rating scales noted they are given such little considera-

RATING SCALE FOR GUARD
Used by the Department of State Employment and Registration,
State of Maryland

EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE
Completion of 7th grade.....72.5	No experience, begin.....70
Completion of 8th grade.....75	
Each year high school (If no diploma deduct 1 point)	<i>Group I</i>
Day2.5	<i>Supervisory</i>
Night1.25	<i>Non-Supervisory</i>
Course5	
Each year college level	
Day4	<i>Group II</i>
Night2	
Course1	
Trades, stenographic, or vocational training of high school level	
Day3	<i>Group III</i>
Night1.5	
Course5	
Practical nursing or first aid (if complete)3	
	Limit add. experience to 8 years.
<i>Group I</i>	<i>Group II (Subject to group DISCIPLINE)</i>
Guard (penal)	Guard (other than penal)
Patrolman or policeman	Hospital attendant
Supervisor Army, Navy, Marine, Coast Guard, C.C.C.	Foreman (small gang)
Supervisor National Guard, R.O.T.C., Naval Reserve (credit 1/3 time)	Insurance agent
Manager (large store)	Assistant Manager
Foreman (factory or large business not factory)	Enrollee
	Constable or Sheriff
	Military or merchant marine other than supervisory
	<i>Group III</i>
	Meeting the public
	Insurance salesman
	Any salesman
	Clerk (selling)
	Clerk (business for self)

tion. In the Kansas scale persons who have been teachers or in guidance receive less credit than do hospital attendants. The Maryland scale makes no mention of such jobs. If a primary function of the Guard is rehabilitation of inmates, it would appear that the rating scales do not give proper weight to that function.

The two scales presented are at variance in the weights assigned to the various occupations. A foreman of a large business applying for the position Prison Guard in Kansas, would receive the lowest rating for training and experience; for a similar job in Maryland, the highest rating; Policemen and firemen applying in Kansas would be rated in group III; in Maryland in group II. It can be assumed that where formal rating devices have been drawn up in other jurisdictions, they are equally disparate.

Personality Rating

In states which do not select correctional personnel by civil service methods, it is probably safe to assume that some sort of personality rating, formal or informal, constitutes a part of the selection program. Strangely enough, several states having civil service control make no provision for the personal interview. Some probably believe that more objective methods are preferable, others that more accurate information can be had by indirect investigation; others make provisions for either holding an interview or not holding it, and weight their examinations accordingly. In New York State, for example, no oral examination is given for the lower grade guard positions, training and experience being rated from statements given in the applications.²³ The State of Michigan makes provision for an oral interview and, when given, assigns it a weight of 20% of the total score; when not given, the weight usually given to the oral interview is added to the weight of the practical written test, which then has a weight of 60%. Connecticut has an arrangement in which experience and training is weighted 4, a written test 3, and an oral test 3. The rating of 4 is always assigned to experience and training, but either the written or the oral test may be omitted and its weight added to the remaining test. On the basis of 10, California assigns a weight of 4 to a "qualifications appraisal" which includes a rating of education, experience, "personal traits and fitness, including willingness to work at night and to report for duty at any time emergencies arise, sympathetic understanding of inmates' integrity, courage, alertness, and good judgment." Candidates must pass this appraisal with a score of at least 70%. The appraisal is made either by personal interview or by evaluation of the statements on the application, supplemented by investigation of the employment record and character of the applicant.

The use of standard rating forms in the personal interview is becoming widespread in civil service jurisdictions. While they do not eliminate the "halo effect", the tendency of an appraiser to rate all traits of an individual on the basis of some particular trait(s), they do make for a more complete and reliable analysis of personality.

The Indiana State Personnel Division has a well designed rating form which attempts to increase the reliability of its use by clearly defining each trait to be rated. It has, also, a good "work knowledge" rating form.²⁴

²³ Oral examinations, however, have been given in the past.

²⁴ See p. 30 *infra*.

INDIANA STATE PERSONNEL DIVISION

Personality Rating

Check in only one column of these personality traits

	Timid or overbearing 5	Hesitant or too forward 6.5	Average 7.5	Confident 8.5	Well poised 10	SCORE
1. <i>Approach</i> : Does candidate appear calm or excitable?						
2. <i>Facial Features</i> : Does the candidate have pleasant features or does he have a disagreeable, repulsive countenance?	Repulsive 5	Unattractive 6.5	Average 7.5	Pleasant 8.5	Attractive 10	
3. <i>Grooming</i> : What is your first impression of the candidate? Is he well-groomed or slovenly; clean, attractive or unattractive in appearance and dress?	Slovenly 5	Careless 6.5	Clean and neat 7.5	Well-groomed 8.5	Excellent grooming 10	
4. <i>Voice</i> : Is the candidate's voice pleasant or irritating?	Harsh or irritating 5	Unpleasant 6.5	Clear 7.5	Pleasant 8.5	Well modulated 10	
5. <i>Speech</i> : Does the candidate mumble or talk indistinctly? Does he speak clearly and concisely? Is his vocabulary good?	Laborious; speaks with difficulty 5	Incoherent or indistinct 6.5	Easy; moderate speed, fair vocabulary 7.5	Coherent and distinct 8.5	Concise; clear excellent choice of words 10	
6. <i>Physique</i> : Does the candidate appear to have a strong constitution? Could he endure hours of standing and arduous physical labor, or does he appear weak and frail?	Probably physically unable to perform work 5	Weak, frail 6.5	Moderate physical strength 7.5	Strong 8.5	Rugged; well set-up; heavy 10	
7. <i>Diplomacy</i> : Is the candidate tactful? Could he get along well with other employees and with the inmates?	Blundering says wrong things 5	Might be tactless 6.5	Average care in dealing with people 7.5	Tactful; cautious 8.5	Diplomatic 10	

Personality Rating

Check in only one column of these personality traits

	Arrogant or condescending	Self- centered; smug	Probably normal attitude	Open- minded	Proper attitude	SCORE
8. <i>Attitude</i> : Is he resentful over his status? Is he condescending and superior acting? Is he sincere? Is he unduly opinionated or stubborn?	5	6.5	7.5	8.5	10	
9. <i>Outlook</i> : What is his outlook? Is he de- pressed and melancholic or is he zealous and animated?	5	Slightly despondent or pessimistic 6.5	Average, realistic outlook 7.5	Cheerful and animated 8.5	Enthusiastic and optimistic 10	
10. <i>Presentation of ideas</i> : Did the candidate answer questions clearly and concisely? Was he easily understood or were his answers confusing and illogical?	5	Became muddled; understood with difficulty 6.5	Had no great difficulty in presenting ideas 7.5	Put ideas over easily and well 8.5	Conveyed ideas far more in- telligently than do most people 10	

PERSONALITY RATING—Total Score.....

Each candidate has an experience and training score of 70 subject to the following subtractions and additions:

If candidate is unable to write, subtract 10 points from his experience and training score.

If candidate is unable to read and write, subtract 20 points from his experience and training score.

Add 1 point for each year of education starting with the first grade.

Add 3 points for each full year of experience in related work.

Add 5 points for each full year of experience in an institution.

All scores above 100 shall be counted as 100.

Interviewer's general comments:

Experience and Training Score

	Score	Weight
Experience and Training	x 1 =
Work Knowledge	x 2 =
Personality Rating	x 1 =
Score		
Score divided by 3		
Veteran's preference		
FINAL SCORE		

Interviewer's Signature and Place of Interview.

INDIANA STATE PERSONNEL DIVISION

DateName of Applicant.....

Work Knowledge

Check in only one column for each work knowledge

	VERY POOR	POOR	AVERAGE	GOOD	EXCELLENT	SCORE
1. <i>Knowledge of safety: fire and accident prevention.</i> Does candidate understand basic fire and accident prevention measures, proper disposal of refuse, use of fire extinguishers, fire drills, etc.?	No knowledge. Might be panicky in emergencies	Vague idea of what to do in cases of fire or accident emergency	Fair idea of fire and accident prevention	Good idea of fire and accident prevention	Excellent idea of fire and accident prevention and of a guard's responsibilities	10
5	5	6.5	7.5	8.5	10	
2. <i>Knowledge of First Aid:</i> In cases of accidents and injuries of inmates and patients, would candidate know the proper first aid treatment to employ?	Would do wrong thing in cases of emergency	Inadequate	Average	Good basic understanding of principles of first aid	Excellent. Possession of first aid certificate	10
5	5	6.5	7.5	8.5	10	
3. <i>Knowledge of equipment used in position applied for:</i> Is candidate familiar with firearms, etc.?	No knowledge of equipment used	Poor knowledge of equipment used	Working knowledge of use and care	Good knowledge of use, care and maintenance	Excellent knowledge of use, care, cleaning, maintenance and repair of equipment	10
5	5	6.5	7.5	8.5	10	
4. <i>Knowledge of Record and Report Writing:</i> Could candidate fill out elementary daily work records and reports?	Can't read nor write	Vague idea; would need many instructions	Average knowledge; could learn	Good understanding of proper way to fill out reports and records	Excellent; has experience in report and record writing	10
5	5	6.5	7.5	8.5	10	
5. <i>Knowledge of Supervision and Discipline of Inmates:</i> Does candidate possess traits needed to supervise inmates properly in simple duties? Does he understand principles involved?	Probably be unable to supervise inmates properly	Inadequate conception of methods of supervision	Could learn to supervise quickly	Good knowledge of supervision	Excellent; has supervised inmates before	10
5	5	6.5	7.5	8.5	10	

WORK KNOWLEDGE—Total Score.....

STATE OF KANSAS RATING FORM FOR PRISON GUARD

Interview Rating Form for Prison Guard

Name of Candidate:

Address:

Date of Interview:

Place of Interview:

Interviewer:

Instructions: Indicate your judgment by checking (✓) the response which best expresses your evaluation. A blank space below each trait to be rated makes it possible to add pertinent remarks which are especially helpful if the candidate is unusually weak or strong in a trait.

1. *Personality:* Will the candidate work well with other employees, at the same time maintaining authority with the inmates?

Not
satisfactoryInclined to be
too friendly.
Might not
work well
with others

Average

Probably
satisfactoryVery coopera-
tive.
Would main-
tain authority

Remarks:

2. *Emotional Control:* Do you think that the candidate would appear unafraid, and retain command of any unusual situation?

Nervous, short-
temperedThoughtless,
slightly
nervous

Average

Emotionally
stableAppears to
have complete
self-control

Remarks:

3. *Alertness:* Does the candidate seem to be observant, and quick in his responses?

Not satisfac-
tory for this
type of workSlow to
respond

Average

Seems to
respond to
change readily
and replies to
questions
easilyVery keen,
unusual
perception

Remarks:

4. *Physical Appearance:* Is the candidate physically able to do the work required by this position?

Too old or
physically unfit
to do active
workProbably not
able to stand
up under
physical
requirements
of job

Average

Physically fit
and able to do
this workVery able
physically

Remarks:

5. *Attitude toward the Position:* Do you think that the candidate has a desirable attitude toward this position?

Undesirable

Questionable

Average

Good

Highly
desirable

Remarks:

TOTAL

Both Indiana and Kansas assign weights to the various traits rated and sum these to make a total score. This does not appear advisable. For example, a candidate checked on scale eight as 5, arrogant and condescending, would probably be totally unfit to perform supervisory duties of prison officer—yet he could by the total score method receive a passing mark and be hired. Assigning a total score on a personality rating scale is based on a false premise that the individual items in the rating are interchangeable. By leaving the ratings in profile form, each item may be seen in its proper relation and a candidate's weakness and strong points emphasized.²⁵

A weakness of the scales noted above lies in the fact that they are designed primarily to measure those qualities which make for good custodial performance rather than qualities which make for clinical understanding and education of the inmate. The scales appear to emphasize the qualities of foreman or military petty officers to the exclusion of factors which could make for a change of attitude in the inmate.

Interviewing Procedure and Board Personnel

The State of Michigan provides an Interviewing Board which includes a representative of the prison staff from the institution for which the selection is being made, a representative of the Michigan State Police, a representative of the Department of Corrections, and one from the Michigan State Civil Service Board. If the majority of the interviewers mark the candidate suitable for the position, he is considered as passing. In the event the majority of the Board rate a candidate unsuitable, he is recorded as having been unsuccessful in the interview and he is not considered further in the examination process. The oral interview is granted only after a candidate has passed a written test consisting of two parts, a standard intelligence test and an employment test. By using a majority opinion the Interviewing Board partially avoids the 'halo effect' and increases the reliability of rating.

Two interviews are usually given under the Kansas system of selection, one "to measure personality and other factors that cannot be measured by the written test or by the training and experience rating" and an "employment interview which may be given by the officials of the penitentiary or reformatory to persons certified from our eligible lists." The first is given by members of the civil service technical staff or by examination

²⁵ For an example of a profile, see p. 23.

monitors, who are high school or junior college teachers or administrators.

The California State Personnel Board employs a three-man board consisting of a chairman, a member of the Personnel Board staff, a member of the Department of Corrections, and a third individual not in state service "who is well qualified in the field of penology." For the entry position of Guard I, The Minnesota Civil Service department uses an interviewing board consisting of one of the wardens of the state correctional institutions and a member of the civil service staff. In rating higher guard positions, an additional member, the District Director of the United States Secret Service, is added. The membership of the Michigan Interviewing Board includes representatives from the Department of Corrections, the prison staff for which the selection is being made, the Michigan Civil Service Commission, and the Michigan State Police.

Representing both the Civil Service Commission and the institution at which candidates may be employed appears sound, since theoretically the Commission's representative would have a somewhat academic viewpoint, the institution representative the practical standpoint peculiar to his institution. The practice of using law enforcement officers would also appear advisable, but only if these officers were known to be progressive administrative and penological thinkers. The practice of having high school and junior college teachers and administrators rate applicants as is done in Kansas might be inappropriate, unless these 'monitors' have more than the usual academic interest in penology.

Physical Requirements

Physical standards vary considerably among the states using civil service selection, and it would be expected to vary even more among those without state personnel control. Several states require the registration of finger prints. One state requires a stringent physical performance test; many state minimum height and weight standards. The states which have compulsory guard training schools have an added opportunity for observing physical fitness. Massachusetts and Maryland state 5 feet 7 inches as a minimum height standard, Wisconsin specifies 5 feet 9 inches, and allows one inch tolerance, Connecticut sets a minimum of 5 feet 9 inches and an upper limit of 6 feet 3 inches; Maryland designates 5 feet 8 inches.

Weight is usually required to meet standards of proportion to height; Massachusetts sets a minimum at 135 lbs., Connecti-

cut and Illinois at 150; Wisconsin at 160 lbs., with 10 lbs. tolerance. Connecticut has an upper limit of 210 lbs.

The State of Massachusetts Civil Service requires all applicants for the position of correctional officer to pass strength tests similar to those passed by applicants for city policemen and firemen. The applicant is required to take tests which include rope climbing, weight lifting, the standing broad jump, and the erection of a ladder and removal of a 125 lb. dummy from a platform 15 feet 6 inches in height. To pass, a candidate must have an overall average of 70%.

It is to be recognized that certain positions in a penal system require personnel who can pass a rigorous physical test such as given by Massachusetts; there are many positions, however, which do not require these standards. Maryland's practice of selecting personnel for supervisory and non-supervisory positions would appear as one method for differentiating physical requirements. Another method might be to set up different physical standards for the different types of institutions, maximum, medium, or minimum security.

Rigorous physical standards probably eliminate many personnel who would make excellent supervisory officers, and, what is more important, those less qualified physically may have a tendency to be more satisfied with their jobs than the robust. Many disabled veterans with supervisory experience could easily perform certain jobs in correctional institutions, and especially in those institutions in which the necessity for force is less needed. If such a program were instituted, it would require wide advertisement in order to reach those who because of their disabilities would otherwise never consider penal work. It would seem that force of personality in many cases would be more important than physical strength. It is true that generally people are more inclined to follow large, physically fit individuals, but in penal life where personal contact is continuous, personality characteristics probably assume greater importance than physical characteristics.

Age Requirements

During the war age requirements in states which were in especial need of recruits underwent a radical change. Illinois, for example, in 1941 designated an age range of 25 to 45 years; in 1942 this was changed to 28 to 60 years. In 1943 the lower age limit was dropped to 25 years, and in 1944 it was extended to include the age range, 21 to 65 years.

Massachusetts sets the age range at 22 to 40; Maryland 26 to 45; Connecticut, 23 to 34; Wisconsin, 25 to 50. The Federal System lets a lower limit at 21 years and specifies no upper age limit. Some of the states specify no age limits, but in requiring certain experience factors, accomplish the same results.

It would be interesting to study the effectiveness of those Guards who have been introduced into the penal system at a late age. It may well be that as agents of rehabilitation they excel the younger men. If the commonly accepted notion that age and experience is correlated with wisdom is true, the older men should be more desirable, and if a system is particularly stultifying to its personnel such men would be less affected by the system. At any rate, an experimental study should be fruitful provided adequate 'criteria of effectiveness' were set up.

Walter C. Reckless, in a paper written for presentation to the American Prison Association²⁶ advocated the use of interns training and preparing penal personnel for their jobs. If such training were offered, or better still, a year's course at one of the Universities²⁷ emphasizing personnel psychology, abnormal psychology, criminology, and sociology, the lower age limit could be reduced to 20 years, or possibly 19. Under the George Deen Act of 1936, these internships or special college courses could be financed jointly by the State and Federal governments.

Young men especially trained would acquire a professional interest in their jobs, and extension courses in psychology and related fields plus periodic seminars could do a great deal in stabilizing and up-grading prison employees. The prisons which are recently being more severely criticized than ever before could meet the challenge set by their derogators by training at least a large part of their staffs by methods suggested.

Those personnel who are untrained but entrenched in the various systems could be reached by a staff of full time specialists in penal administration who could be paid jointly by the states and the Federal government. These specialists could conduct extension courses and seminars in several states, provided each institution would set aside a month to be devoted to seminars in appropriate subjects. A few highly trained professional specialists could thus serve several states and upgrade hundreds of officers in the course of a year.

The problem caused by granting preference in civil service

²⁶ American Prison Association Proceedings, 1943.

²⁷ There are at least three Universities which could offer such a special course of training: Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio.

rating to war veterans, could also be alleviated by upgrading them in this manner, or, if all candidates were required to pass a special training course in college, those veterans who are patently unfit could be released or assigned jobs consistent with their abilities.

Parenthetically the State of New Jersey which introduced the merit system for the recruitment and selection of prison officers in 1908, has had excellent results in its training program and lists the following as values resulting from the school:

"1. Pre-job training of this nature affords the authorities an opportunity to study the candidates at close range, learn their weaknesses, and evaluate their probable job efficiency. Men can be selected for particular jobs and undesirables weeded out before appointment to a permanent position. 2. The candidates become familiar with the work they are to do, the problems that are presented, and the techniques of administration. They acquire knowledge of definite value that can be used on the job. 3. The training leaves the selected candidate with a proper moral and psychological approach to the penal problem and his particular part of it. 4. The time and energy of busy institutional officials are saved once the trainee gets on the job. Personnel problems are reduced and the new employee is of value as soon as he is appointed to a position in the institution. 5. Older employees are challenged to do a more credible job when they are placed in competition with well trained men, and the general level of job-performance is consequently bettered."²⁸

The above values would appear to make the training school a needed adjunct to a penal system. A more complete course conducted on the college level should prove a necessary preparation.

Payment Policies and Recruitment

Any attempt to recruit a high type of personnel is of course doomed to failure if salaries inadequate to support a family are offered. Until shortly before 1942 salaries in the Alabama correction system ranged from \$40 to \$50 per month.²⁹ Few persons, no matter how high their urge to do social service would consider such a wage.

In the states which have statewide civil service, however, the salaries are considerably higher. Following the pattern of the Federal system which pays \$2482 (includes overtime pay), the States of New York, Michigan, California, and Illinois all provide an entry wage of \$2000 per annum or more. The entry wage of Massachusetts, Maryland, and Connecticut is lower,

²⁸ "Selection and Training of Prison and Reformatory Officers in New Jersey." State of New Jersey Civil Service Commission, May 19, 1941. pp. 8-9.

²⁹ Moos, M. C. *State Penal Administration in Alabama*, Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama, 1942. p. 17.

but the upper pay grade of their salary range is also more than \$2000.³⁰

These salaries, comparatively high for the qualifications required, are partially occasioned by inflation and the scarcity of recruits. It is interesting to note the rise in entry salary per month offered by Illinois for the position of Guard during the war years: 1941—\$100 with maintenance; 1942—\$109.25 with maintenance; 1943—\$120 with maintenance; and in 1945, though maintenance is not included, \$169 per month.

When States include regular pay increments for five years, opportunities for advancement to higher grades, pensions, vacations, and sick pay—for which some states have provided, increasing the pay, would not appear to be very important as an added inducement to promote interest in the work or to secure more applicants. Other factors, however, in many states counteract the pay inducement. Moreover the salary schedules noted are those of states known to be progressive as regards civil service—the others pay much less and tend to consider the guard much less professionally. Guards have traditionally been asked to work twelve or more hours per day, to live in the institution, to be on call at all times and, in short, have been subjected to treatment which tends to make them as institutionalized as the inmates, and in many prisons where repressive measures set the tone of 'rehabilitation' there is real danger for the guard.³¹ In many states guards are decidedly a submerged social group. Only recently have a few states, following the policy of the Federal System set 8 hours as the working day for guards. Each institution presents a unique complex of factors which must be considered in determining payment plans, and until hours, confinement imposed, danger involved, and the other factors are accounted for, salary schedules have little meaning.

If, however, the conditions of prison work were made more comparable to non-institutional positions and provisions made for pensions, vacations, sick leave, accident insurance, and the eight hour day, it is the writer's opinion that the salary schedules paid by the better systems would be sufficient to attract and hold capable persons.

Conclusions

1. Generally speaking, the function of the Prison Guard in our state correctional institutions is ambiguous. Both the Pub-

³⁰ Salaries as of April, 1946.

³¹ An article which emphasizes this: Fishman, J. F. "Meanest Job in the World" *American Mercury*, September, 1945. pp. 345-352.

lic and our penal administrators give lip service and partially expect the Guard to be a positive agent for the rehabilitation of inmates, yet the primary, and in some cases, the exclusive function of the guard is concerned with the detention and custody of inmates. This is reflected in the methods of selection in which no systematic attempt is made to select those persons whose abilities, personalities, and interests are such that if given favorable conditions, and adequate training, they could act as rehabilitative agents.

2. Methods of selection of the Prison Guard are generally loose and have had little experimental study of validity. Of the some 13,000 guards in this country, it is safe to say that over three fourths have been selected by unscientific methods. Of the 21 states which have state wide civil services, 17 states have or are in the process of providing standard methods of selection; 13 states regularly employ a competitive written test as a selection method. Several states 'validate' their examinations by providing a period during which the candidate is in a probationary status—only New Jersey has conducted an experimental validation of their selection methods.

3. Recruitment and selection methods are devised to select a large undifferentiated group of workers, Prison Guards. Little or no attention is given placement in the selection process. Only Maryland differentiates in their selection program between supervisory and non-supervisory positions.

Suggestions

1. In order to attract the type of personnel who with adequate training could act as agents of rehabilitation, penal personnel should be given the same considerations granted employees of the more progressive industrial concerns. These considerations include retirement pensions, accident insurance, vacation payment plans, sick leave and the eight hour working day. Pay plans as they now exist in some of the larger states and in the Federal Bureau of Prisons are adequate if the other items of a labor program are given consideration.

2. Recruitment should be directed towards securing those persons who have more than a perfunctory interest in helping others. The job of the penal worker should be treated as a profession, just as the public service professions of the public school teacher, nurse, and social worker are treated. Groups such as the Quakers, interested in public welfare, should be asked to participate in placing personnel in institutions and should be assured of official cooperation.

3. Selection of penal workers should be differentiated so that persons may be selected for specific jobs. This premises a differentiation of institutions into maximum, medium and minimum security types, each requiring a different type of personnel. Within an institution, jobs should at least be classified into the categories, supervisory and non-supervisory. Certainly the personality and capacities required for the job of wall guard differs greatly from that of a shop officer.

4. Tests for selection for the specific types of jobs should be constructed and validated. This could be done at little expense to the state by interesting graduate students of psychology and sociology in doing this work as a doctoral study. Such graduate students would also be better qualified to serve in penal administration and constitute a supply of professionally trained personnel. Communication between state correctional systems should be strengthened. One means of facilitating this would be to engage experts who could be paid jointly by State and Federal Governments as provided by the George Deen Act.

5. Batteries of tests used in selection should only supplement the other methods of selection such as the interview, the training and experience rating, and the probationary period of training. They are, however, a necessary supplement.