

OCCUPATIONS

The
Vocational Guidance Magazine

GUIDANCE IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS

WALTER M. WALLACK and HOWARD L. BRIGGS

Times have changed since the phrase, "crime and punishment," comprehended the science—if it was a science—of penology. There is a new concern for the individual as a human being—a human being before he enters the prison or reformatory walls, a human being while he remains an inmate, a human being after he leaves, and a human being to be understood in relation to his social environment in all these situations. The quotation marks are being taken away from the word "reformatory," at least in a good many instances. Especially significant is the progress that has been made in recognizing education as a primary and vital objective in the treatment of the offender. Not only education, but education as guidance—or guidance as education. It is still a new idea, and a newer one in actual practice, for the old order passes slowly. In New York State some remarkable educational experiments are taking place under enlightened leadership in the Department of Correction. Important contributions to plans and projects have been made by Governor Lehman's Commission for the Study of Educational Problems of Penal Institutions for Youth. In this article two of the men most closely associated with these developments present facts and suggestions that will be as vitally interesting to educators and guidance workers as to penologists.

NO MORE important challenge is likely to be issued to the guidance field than that which comes from the penal institution. Today this challenge remains almost unanswered. Of course, there have been sporadic attempts to introduce guidance philosophy and techniques into penal work, but the effort thus far has been necessarily limited in scope. In the New York State penal system there has recently been developed some experience which indicates rather

definitely the need and value of guidance activities in correctional work. Moreover, this experience has given some insight as to the trends guidance work may have to follow if it is to become effective. It is our purpose here to discuss some of the viewpoints resulting from recent experience.

The prisoner stands as a first-rate illustration of what can happen to an individual in the absence of social and educational guidance. Many writers have

attempted to make a type of the prisoner. We shall try to avoid falling into that error. Yet we cannot dodge the fact that often a prisoner is a person whose emotional training has been bad; whose mental and physical health is generally below par and who, in his weakened state, has had to face life in an environment wherein he could find no strengthening props. After all, the prisoner today is usually just a weaker member of the large unknown and uncaught criminal element of our population. Nearly all of us can agree that this criminal element represents the weakest point in our social structure so far as its "human material" is concerned. The criminal, caught or uncaught, it is now becoming more reasonable to believe, is most frequently an individual who has often needed bolstering up, not only at critical moments in his life, but also from its very beginning. Usually, there has been no bolstering, but, worse than that, the few existing props which might have supported the proper development of his behavior pattern have been uncereemoniously and thoughtlessly kicked out from under him. After such experience he is more than ever in need of the kind of guidance which will lead him into approved social conduct, and the kind of counsel which will develop his insight toward willing acceptance of such guidance.

Richard C. Cabot, referring to a Massachusetts reformatory inmate group of 510 youths, wrote: "What sort of person is the average inmate? He is already a criminal, and comes usually from a family including other criminals, a large illiterate, and impoverished family, living in a congested city area. He is American born, of foreign parentage. In 60 per cent of the cases he comes from a broken home. In 80 per cent of the cases he leaves the home before he is 18 and begins to wander from place to place, working irregu-

larly for short periods at unskilled, low-paid jobs, which he has left school at 14 or 15 to pick up. By his sixteenth year his delinquencies have begun. These boys have been arrested nearly four times each before they were sent to the reformatory."¹ The foregoing statement certainly indicates the absence of constructive social guidance during the developmental period of conduct patterns in the lives of the Massachusetts reformatory's inmates. Without doubt the same statement could be made with equal truth about the inmates of other institutions. Furthermore, Dr. Cabot's picture of these inmates supports our contention that, objectively, guidance procedure in prisons must concern itself with hope for two primarily important outcomes: (1) the development of appreciations leading to acceptable social conduct evaluated properly in contrast with unacceptable social conduct; and (2) a pointing of the way toward attainment of the means or tools required for such conduct. With these objectives reached, some of the props needed by many prisoners will have been provided.

II

To some readers the viewpoints expressed in this article may seem too sentimental. It can only be said that experience in dealing with prisoners shows that tempered sentiment plays an important part. Although we believe that there cannot be successful guidance of prisoners, nor perhaps of other people, unless the procedure is compounded from cold statistical facts, and other facts perhaps less cold; from intricate record forms and the other more or less complicated gadgets generally attached to guidance work (probably to make it look scientific), sentiment acts as

¹ Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor T. Glueck, *500 Criminal Careers*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1930, Foreword, p. xii.

the vital catalytic agent. If we were asked to suggest the "why" of a gross error in guidance work today, we would say that it was the consequence of too little sentiment, too little seasoned, subjective judgment, and too much pseudo-scientific dressing. When wise guidance workers really get into penal work, they will see that theirs is a task which must be humanized, a task destined in years to come not to be done scientifically in the strict sense, but yet to be performed somewhat sympathetically or philosophically in the light of numerous sciences. Those who interview prisoners, study their case histories, talk with their relatives and friends, and see their former environmental settings, are convinced of this.

In prisons there is little place for a guidance technique which attempts to reduce human personality to simple arithmetical terms or to complicated statistical formulae. We have seen enough to believe that an effective technique will be flavored strongly with such human qualities as imagination, intuition, and tempered sympathy. Of course, there will be an attempt at clinical approach for the purpose of gathering and weighing facts by which individual problems may be identified. Doubtless, many such derived facts could be called concrete and be utilized in the construction of very pretty graphs. But good guidance work will likely come as a result of interpretation of facts in the simple terms of seasoned subjective judgment free from numerical gymnastics, and studied in close proximity to the individual.

The prison inmate presents some very definite "attitude" problems distinct and apart from those to be found in most guidance situations. He not only has been conditioned by a combination of heredity and environmental circumstances before entering the prison, but he also rapidly becomes institutionalized from the day

that he is apprehended for his first offense. In a prison, tradition is strong. The new prisoner is "wised up" the first day he enters its portals. He develops a strong class consciousness. The police, the courts, and the staff of the institution are on one side of the fence and he and his fellow prisoners are on the other. His only protection lies, apparently, in adhering to the code of his social group in order that they may collectively face a common enemy. He soon learns who are the "right guys" and builds up a protective barrier of close-mouthed silence against the hated "stool pigeon" and "rat." Tradition rules that it is unwise for a prisoner to be seen talking to a prison official without an inmate witness to prove that he is not "ratting." He is told that guards are not to be trusted and is immediately suspicious of every innovation introduced by the staff. He gives no information to the "enemy" which might be used against one of his own group.

He justifies his attitudes by believing that everyone has a "racket," an opinion which, unfortunately, can be backed up by his own intimate knowledge of crooked politics, business, and, in many cases, legal procedures. This is exemplified in the following comment of an inmate regarding a Crime Prevention Conference: "Those guys don't want to stop crime; they have too soft a racket; that's why sentences are so long." Thus the criminal is prone to justify himself on the assumption that the rest of the world is selfish and hypocritical while he is honest at least.

The "wise" inmate therefore tries to do his bit as comfortably as possible, attempts to secure the most desirable prison jobs, and gets as much for as little effort as he can. That is prison tradition.

A good example of inmate conditioning is found in the following outburst of confidence upon the part of a prisoner: "Those

intelligence tests don't mean anything in prisons. After the police and the lawyers get through with you, a guy feels that everything is going to be used against him. You can bet I answered those questions as slowly and as carefully as I could; I was not taking any chances on being trapped. When I answered that question about which firm manufactured guns, I underlined a typewriter company."

Not until we break through this barrier of defensive self-justification and mistrust can a real program of rehabilitation be started. Society is a mechanism very much out of gear, and the average offender against our laws can be saved from its meshes only by an honest effort to interpret the causes back of his attitudes. He will and does respond, in the majority of cases, to a sincere program of guidance.

III

As a case in point, let us recall a certain ex-prisoner with a crime record which was the proverbial mile in length. This record began almost in the days of infancy. Today this young ex-prisoner, whose name here will be John, is making good and the chances are more in favor of his continued good conduct than of reversion to former antisocial habits. He is standing the test of time.

John was six at the time his father died while yet a young man and just at the beginning of a promising career. The young widow was left almost destitute with two small children to support, and John was placed in an orphanage. Here the mother believed her son would be properly trained under the guidance and care which she had a right to believe would be a good substitute for that which she could not herself provide. Unfortunately, when John left the orphanage six years later there was an aversion for almost everything one might hope would

be fostered in a boy's mind if subjected to good parental care. John and other small boys were contaminated by a sex pervert among the male guardians in the institution; and the boys themselves found opportunities for frequent indulgence in homosexual practices. The sordidness of this situation appeared to be effective very directly in the development of other improper attitudes in John's mind, particularly toward religion and feminine associations.

Another detrimental condition in the orphanage was the insufficient quantity and quality of its food. It was rather easy, however, under the loose system of supervision which prevailed, for a lad with John's bold spirit to steal extra quantities from the storeroom. In time he was attracted toward possibilities of foraging outside the orphanage. His interest in thievery was thus developed. He tended always to make such activity more interesting and to require a bolder action. John discovered that he possessed marked cleverness with his hands. He could draw well and he was a good penman. Also he could tell a good story and became an expert liar. These abilities became useful to him and his companions in many ways. John's prestige rose. He learned to forge notes and passes, and his developing skill in lying and cheating became a source of great personal satisfaction. Among his companions he became something of a "big shot." By the time John was twelve years of age he was well skilled in a variety of vices and took pride in his expertness in their practice.

Discipline in the orphanage always took negative forms. "Thou Shalt Not" was the constant challenge held before the boys, and they were inspired to play a game to beat the rules. Whenever there was punishment it usually took the form of some physical cruelty with frequent

GUIDANCE IN PENAL INSTITUTIONS



A BOY AND HIS FRIEND, THE SUPERINTENDENT



THESE pictures were all taken in a reformatory. They look as if they might have been taken in a school. That is the Elmira idea. There is going forward at Elmira Reformatory in New York a most interesting and significant experiment which is part of a projected educational program for the penal system of the state. The "experiment" has already proved its worth. The "projected program" is already under way—at Elmira, where the inmates are boys and young men ranging in age from 16 to 25 years of age; at the Wallkill Medium Security Prison; at Clinton Prison, Sing Sing, and elsewhere. The principle underlying the Elmira plan is that of individual training and guidance in place of mass treatment. In the picture on this page the superintendent is seen talking things over with a new boy. In the last picture the placement class is in session. In between the boys are shown learning useful trades by doing.

beatings. In addition, there was compulsory memorization of long Biblical passages and essays on morals. Culprits had to remain for long periods in grotesque positions while their diet was restricted. Nearly all of the teachers and supervisors in the orphanage were women. Somehow John gained the impression that they were intensely religious, for he said that they were so interested in saving their own souls that they gave little thought to those of their charges. Disciplinary infractions never came to their attention unless they occurred under their very noses. In this situation the human quality of love that all young boys need did not exist. There was no sympathy—no guidance. As time went on, John accumulated a large collection of bad marks and the stamp of an incorrigible trouble maker.

During this time John did not lose all contact with his mother. However, upon her infrequent visits he never had an opportunity to talk with her alone. Moreover, she was engrossed in her own struggle to survive and perhaps that circumstance helped to weaken the mother-son relationship which was a natural outcome of John's institutionalized life. But John hated the orphanage and finally, as his mother's economic situation had improved somewhat, he persuaded her to take him to her home. His defiance of authority in the orphanage prevented any regrets because of his leaving.

Away from the orphanage John found himself in a strange world. His new companions recognized certain differences between him and themselves. Consequently, they "took him for a ride" many times—long, painful rides they were too. He had learned to use his fists in the orphanage. This talent, put to use in retaliation, soon isolated him from the companionship of his new acquaintances

and intensified the dislike which his teachers in the public schools soon developed for him because of his "problem child conduct."

John's public school career did not last long. He was as little appreciated in this environment as he was in the orphanage. There was no attempt by any teacher to develop a sympathetic understanding of John's problems. They stamped him as an enemy and treated him as such. If IQ's mean anything, his native intelligence was higher than average. In later years he said that he had always felt that he possessed more ability to accomplish things than many of the other children. Also, he stated that he always possessed a strong desire for accomplishment. However, his habits of conduct, his failure to get along with companions or teachers, the disapproval which came to him from all persons save those of his own kind, prevented the kind of accomplishment which would have resulted in "social approval." In comparison with those children whose conduct was approved, John saw himself stamped as inferior. But in introspection he stubbornly refused to admit that he really was inferior. An emotional conflict was the inevitable outcome.

Perhaps without intending to do so, John finally began an attempt to prove to himself that he was not inferior. His conduct pattern, already well formed, shaped his course. All sorts of crooked jobs followed; forgeries, holdups, and desertion from the irksome discipline of the army. Wine, women, and gambling provided interesting diversification. A serious love affair, resulting in an unhappy marriage, served further to make women repulsive to John.

In John's case-history folder there is recorded a complex variety of measurements, observations, and suggestions, most

of which have lain dormant all along. Nowhere in the folder is there evidence of warm personal contact. Only the chill of some austere examining official is felt in that collection of observations. Physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, teachers, guidance officers, and institutional officials were all willing to look at John for the purpose of giving an opinion, but none ever attempted to personalize his suggestions by dealing sympathetically and directly with the lad.

One institutional psychiatrist made a statement about John which was something like this: "This psychopathic individual dominated by a feeling of inferiority was driven into the compensatory action which was his crime. His craving for power led him at a point of a gun to rob a driver of his car, then to tear madly along the highway, committing the hold-ups for which he was arrested." It might be of some point to add that John claimed that he was gloriously drunk when he engaged in this escapade; otherwise, he would not have been apprehended.

While John listened to the music he had to pay the fiddler. He did his "bits" in a variety of reformatories and prisons. During this time he took advantage of whatever opportunity there was for reading. He especially liked works on philosophy and treatises on psychology. Without guidance in connection with his reading, he became a very inadequate and less than half-baked philosopher, placing peculiar interpretations upon the psychological information he had absorbed. Nevertheless, John's reading created some sort of readiness for the self-examination which occurred later and which had much to do with the reshaping of his course. While in institutions he studied drafting and engineering with considerable success and much interest. During periods of freedom in the outside world he some-

times found employment as a draftsman.

One day he entered an institution where a wise official able to weigh all the scientific observations made about John utilized them in a humanized series of contacts. This official came to be the rock to which prisoner John attached himself. By this time John's attitudes and habits of action were definitely formed. He was cynical and without faith in persons or social institutions and customs. He was particularly antagonistic toward the religious faith of his fathers, doctors, the law and its officials, reformers—both professional and amateur—and women; in fact, anyone or anything meeting with social approval. These antagonisms developed more or less as a natural consequence and were perhaps compensatory. They served as a "front" used to cover up a full measure of dissatisfaction with a life full of disappointments—a life which John wanted to understand but could not. Another unfortunate circumstance which helped to contribute to John's impractical attitudes was the fact that in a surreptitious manner he had gained access to his case history folder. He knew all that was said about him and had memorized the fancy labels applied to him there.

John came into contact with his helpful prison friend during the progress of some institutional work in which both were interested. The prison official was attracted by John's ability and the glimpses of personality which he revealed at unguarded moments, and accordingly made a study of the case record. By degrees he gained John's admiration, respect, and confidence and induced him to talk frankly about himself. He interpreted much of the psychology John had read. Finally, since John liked to write, he persuaded him to write the story of his life. John thought perhaps he might

publish this story, but the prison official was not particularly concerned about that. He only wanted the writing to be a device which would help John interpret impartially all of the circumstances of his life he had thus far failed to understand. This writing task served further as a device to be used by John's counselor in developing further conversations. Many incidents came out which otherwise might not have been mentioned but which were important. Social institutions were interpreted for John. The religious counselor did his bit. Educational workers in the institution gave opportunities for wider experience in the development of John's technical skill. The psychiatrist took a personal interest and helped John discard some of the peculiar interpretations he had placed upon his own conduct. Other officials, at the suggestion of John's counselor, helped in a similar manner. The whole process was one of reorientation calculated to give insight which would result in a desire for acceptable social living while developing the skills required for such living.

Since his release from prison the last time John has married a splendid woman of good character. He has a family of his own. He is imbued with desire to give his children such opportunities as he himself missed. His skill as a draftsman is earning a living for himself and his family. He has invented a very useful device. The talents which once served John in his career of crime have been turned to constructive purpose. Since his release he has made a sincere effort to work out a new scheme of life for himself with the assistance of an intelligently human parole officer. He has never hesitated to put his foot back on the "old rock" which he found in prison whenever he has felt himself slipping. Whenever he faces a new crisis he still relies upon

the counsel and guidance of the prison officer who first helped him to untangle his problems. Apparently, John is gaining strength because his calls for counsel are becoming less frequent and there has accumulated more and more evidence pointing unmistakably toward his ultimate success.

It is significant that nearly all of the few cases of genuine reform of prisoners that the writers have yet seen have been based more than anything else upon the kind of guidance that this young man had. In each instance there has been someone in the prison who could do a more or less intelligent job of getting under the skin of the prisoner and from that beginning guide him toward the future. Of course there are many implications arising from the circumstances that we have described, such as those for the training of prisoners. One needs only to point out here that effective guidance must be concerned with a personalized technique.

IV

In developing the prison guidance program, account must be taken of the institutional service objectives. The most important of these seem to be: (1) the social reorientation of the inmate for successful participation in modern community life after release; and, (2) his vocational rehabilitation in order that he may exist as a self-maintaining member of the community group in spite of whatever limiting conditions his status as an ex-prisoner may imply.

The attainment of these two objectives requires in the institutional picture a variety of specialized services. It is not proposed to discuss these services here except incidentally in connection with the problem of prison organization for guidance.

A first step in organization is the selection of a proper person to serve as a gui-

dance director. He should be an individual whose personal characteristics are favorable to the establishment of *rapprochement* between himself and the prisoners and the institutional staff. He ought to be thoroughly trained in personnel work. He must know all of the techniques, both good and bad, now commonly employed in guidance work. His thinking cannot be confined to social guidance, vocational guidance, or any other specific element of the whole guidance task, but must embrace all elements of it. He should have deep insight into medical science, mental science, social science, and particularly educational techniques, but he had better be careful to avoid becoming a scientist himself. Or perhaps one should say that he may know in his own mind that he is really a scientist of the first water, but should be free from any of the earmarks likely to gain for himself the appellation of "scientist" from his associates. It would be well if he were the type of person whom the prisoner would know as "Dad" rather than "Doctor."

The guidance director's mind should be a veritable blotter when it comes to soaking up all that is taking place or exists in the modern world outside prison walls. He should be a genius and ingenious in translating his knowledge into patterns that will fit the complex problems that prisoners represent. He should be able to understand any prisoner's actual and potential positions in society, to evaluate them, and to suggest the *modus operandi* for carrying the individual prisoner from the actual to the potential. Therefore our guidance director must also be a first-rank trainer rather more than an educator. He will need the assistance of a staff, the members of which are nearly as competent as himself, but who may be specialists in specific elements of guidance, as, for example, the vocational field.

He must be expert in coordinating staff work—in part, so that the danger of specialists in the picture, particularly those who like to deal with "concrete" facts, will be minimized. The director ought to be the person who will be most helpful in suggesting the paths that institutional services should follow. The number of assistants he will need will, of course, be governed largely by the size of the institutional population. There is not enough experience yet for indicating a proper ratio between guidance workers and prisoners. This ratio must be worked out in terms of the extent of guidance work, training of institutional staff for assistance, and available institutional services.

It is important to inquire where such guidance personnel as has just been suggested can be found. The answer is that training for the kind of guidance service needed in prisons will produce it. We have already seen men at work in some of our prisons who do not fall far short of our expectations. True enough, many of these, like Topsy, have just grown. We might name a half dozen old-line prison guards who could easily have been trained at one time to become ideal guidance workers.

A further step in organizing the prison guidance program is concerned with training of the institutional personnel. The prison guard stands in a strategic position with reference to prisoner guidance. This official can do a great deal toward making or unmaking the guidance program. He is in close constant contact with prisoners. He is their chaperon both day and night. He hears their grumblings, and knows their aches and pains, as well as their brighter moments, at times when they are most likely to be themselves. The guidance director must participate in training of guards, therefore, to the extent of giving them proper concepts and attitudes

regarding their work. They must also be given instruction in the actual techniques of handling men or, better still, in dealing with the personality types restrained by prison walls.

V

Where a guidance program is in effect, it is assumed that it will function in a situation in which there prevails a definite policy, as well as some adequate means, for prisoner training. We believe that effective results are obtained only when all training and other services are integrated *purposefully* toward a *defined* objective. We do have prisons in which there exists such policy and definition, and where these are being constantly remade or reformed through regular staff meetings. The guidance director must vigorously weave his philosophy and his procedures into these meetings. The administrative staff in particular must be the object of his attention. He is the watchdog who should see that there is continuous analysis of industrial, maintenance, and service functions for the purpose of organizing and reorganizing training activities and materials toward the free community situations in which prisoners will ultimately find themselves.

Individual case histories of prisoners must be developed to serve as source material most useful to the initial stages of the guidance effort. If these histories are limited in scope, inaccurate, or difficult to synthesize and abstract, they will be of little value. However, if they are built up with due regard for the kinds of quantitative and qualitative information needed in guidance and counseling, they will be invaluable. In fact, without such case histories, guidance cannot be the plotting of a course for a prisoner, nor can counseling be an effort to develop his insight into the nature of that course and the

reasons for its choice. Anyone who attempts to say definitely at this time what information should be in a case history is likely to limit its usefulness. It should be as complete as human ingenuity can make it for the purpose of giving a total picture of its subject and the forces that have acted upon the development of his behavior pattern. Case histories can never be too long, but they can be barren and unwieldy. Too often they are thought of as manila folders in which blotter sheets, probation, parole, psychiatric, and many other reports are collected as stuffing for filing cases.

When the guidance officer has a good case history in his hands, he is partially and helpfully prepared for the subsequent personal contact that is most likely to count for something. There is no quicker way to gain the respect and confidence of a prisoner (or anyone else) than to let him learn, without seeming to do so, that another knows more about him than he knows about himself. In such a situation he is disarmed. His "front" melts away. He develops a desire to become attached to the person in whose wisdom and fairness he can believe. He knows "phonies" well because he has been one himself, and likewise have most of his friends. Let the person who possesses enough wisdom to accept the responsibility of guiding a prisoner place himself in position to have his wisdom respected if he would have his counsel heeded.

At Elmira Reformatory the procedure for inmate guidance is being developed in a way which promises splendid outcomes. The whole emphasis in this institution is being directed toward the individual inmate. This is a new philosophy for Elmira and a pioneer attempt to make such philosophy practical. A newly admitted inmate is in quarantine during the first thirty days of his incar-

ceration. During this period his case history is brought up to date and studied thoroughly by institutional officials. The inmate is also interviewed by key officials in the institution who will have anything to do with his welfare. During the quarantine period he receives individual and group instruction with reference to the aims of the institution and the opportunities offered. He is tried out in the school to see further what his training needs are. He is taken about the institution by an officer who explains the vocational opportunities provided. The important outcome of this procedure is that the inmate becomes an individual who is considered in the light of his own needs, who is known to officials as a person and not as a number, and whose career in the institution is a matter of personal concern to persons designated with responsibility for his training and progress. A wide variety of training opportunities is afforded by the new Elmira program and every effort is made to fit these opportunities to the needs of inmates. Knowing the inmates personally, humanly, and intimately is the prime consideration here, and all techniques and devices are incidental to this purpose.

VI

The functional device through which the guidance worker may attain many of his objectives is the institutional classification or assignment committee. The policy, character, and procedure of such committees are as varied among different institutions as the colors of Joseph's coat. Without attempting to say very much here about what classification policy ought to prevail, who should classify, or who should make institutional assignments, we rest on the fact that in each prison some person or some committee makes institutional assignments. The guidance func-

tion must operate as closely as possible with the making of assignments. The closer this relationship, the more likely it is that guidance objectives will be reached.

For best results there should be a classification committee composed of at least the following: guidance director, chief physician, chief psychiatrist, chief psychologist, chief sociologist, superintendent of industries, director of education, chaplains, record clerk, and the principal keeper (warden, or such other officer as may be designated to make assignments). It is possible that it would be advantageous, for special reasons, to include certain other key officials as members of the assignment board. It is assumed that the classification committee will be provided with complete case histories, and that new inmates will have passed through a receiving routine organized to facilitate proper classification. When the board meets to make assignments, all interviewing of men to be classified should have been completed and all pertinent information abstracted from each case by the guidance group.

The dominant voice on the classification board should be that of the guidance director. With the information he has received about each prisoner from all sources including examinations, interviews, case workers, and the like, he should be ready to advise the board as to a proper assignment for every inmate. The assignment must, of course, be made purposeful for treatment. Then the inmate's need of treatment, as revealed by classification procedure, will be the dominant factor in determining his place in institutional routine. And the nature of routine is of necessity determined by the institution's adequacy for providing modern treatment. Admittedly, very much of the treatment will be training of some

kind or education in the broadest meaning of that term. The officer in charge of assignment is usually the warden or principal keeper. As institutions are now organized for administration it is too much to hope that assignments will be made directly by the guidance director. For the present, it is best that he sit as a member of a board which will follow his recommendations closely. The chief reason for organizing a board to consider cases may be psychological, since the guidance director and principal keeper ought to have assimilated the preliminary details and be ready to act by the time assignments are made. The board in session does constitute a safeguard in making assignments, however, since it is in position to check decisions. Further, the classification board should not limit its activity to assignment making. It is just as important to follow the progress of an inmate after assignment as it is to see that he is properly assigned in the beginning. For follow-up work the classification board should sit regularly as a board of review.

The counseling function of the guidance group is of utmost importance. Here again, it is a case of *knowing the inmates*. Counseling comes naturally in the follow-up work, and must be related to the situation into which the prisoner will be released upon completion of his sentence. In counseling, knowing inmates, and following them through the daily routine, the guard and other officials, as already suggested, play an important part. The guard must know within reasonable limits the personal problems of the inmates he supervises, if he is to cooperate intelligently toward the attainment of individual inmate objectives. This implies, of course, well trained and intelligent guards. Moreover, it implies a different type of organization for super-

vision from that now commonly employed. Something like the practical system once developed in Germany for the segregation and supervision of inmates by designated officials who constantly supervised the same group of inmates might be desirable.

The many various tests and measurements of intelligence, mechanical aptitude, performance ability, attitudes, quantitative and qualitative achievement in general education (informational and operative) have place in the guidance scheme to the extent that such data are proved by experience to be valid. The contributions of the psychologist and the psychiatrist to the prison guidance program can be very valuable, but their work is only supplemental. Today in institutional work there is a tendency to center guidance effort in these two specialists. Usually, this is not a situation for which they themselves are to be held responsible, but the tendency is to be deplored.

The utilization of "finding" or "try-out" classes, through the general shop or through rotation among existing shops, presents possibilities as a further medium for guidance before assignment to a specific vocational course. The relative values of tryout procedures will only be determined after careful research into the results obtained.

There is a great need for carefully devised and standardized institutional record forms. There should be considerable research and study of the whole question of case-history techniques. Complete and yet easily understood records and reports are necessary in order that the educational diagnostician may prescribe intelligently. A psychiatrist should not so word his report that it can be understood only by another psychiatrist. Essential to the guidance program is a constant follow-up and check on inmate progress. This re-

quires the development of a perpetual inventory-record device which should follow the inmate through institutional training and parole. Such a device would facilitate checking up throughout training, and make available details as to the success of training after release of the prisoner.

VII

What we have said here about the development of guidance work in prisons may be heresy so far as prison and school traditions are concerned. But the problem is new and difficult and doomed to fail of solution unless a procedure is constructed within the actual situation and is free from the trammels of timeworn custom. Effective guidance in prisons is bound to be far more than the simple matter of accumulating information, keeping records, and making reports. It involves all this and, in addition, the complicated factors of human relationships conditioned by the complex casual phenomena back of criminal behavior.

The work of rehabilitating the convicted criminal does not stop with the prison. He needs more than guidance, training, and assistance in getting a job. He needs firm yet sympathetic help in making after-release adjustments to job, neighborhood, and society. The best training techniques and educational practices are no more than preparation for the transition from institutional life to community life.

Prison industry at present organized offers an obstacle to the training of prisoners. That it should not be an obstacle but an aid in training is certainly evident. The difficulty now lies in the fact that the primary objective of prison industry is the production of goods for profit without thought for the improved production which could result if linked with a recognized program of vocational education.

Certainly there is little thought today in the management of prison industry for the social outcomes to which industry should contribute in the training of prisoners. Perhaps this situation is due to the fact that generally there is no person concerned in the management of prison industry who has the amount of educational training and vision which could easily shape these industries for greater social contribution in the rehabilitation of prisoners. A competent guidance director in any prison could be given authoritative relationship to the management of prison industries for the purpose of developing them for training as well as production. After all, there is no economic or social justification for the existence of prison industries out of relationship to a direct and important contribution to training. A competent guidance director would plan prison industry and production in the light of employment possibilities for inmates after release and would have authority to help inmates into employment for which they had been trained.

The problems to be met and solved in the average prison before effective guidance can result are many. Likewise, they are varied and complicated. At present the whole organization of the average prison is shaped toward ends which differ much from our guidance objectives. There must be new definitions of policy with new procedures leading toward new objectives. The barrier of threadbare tradition blocks the way at every turn. Public attitudes, staff attitudes, inmate attitudes, all cast a shadow on the picture. Prison executives, however well intentioned, are handicapped by a lack of funds, trained personnel, understanding and intelligent sympathy from public and press. The old fear-complex still prevails in dealing with the prisoner—not only

fear of him but also fear of being accused of coddling him. Many prison officials are still confused when they attempt to distinguish among coddling, punishment, and treatment, while the public scarcely worries about these distinctions. But a light which bids fair to burn brightly has been kindled.

If through a program of education and social guidance in combination with genuine opportunities for social and vo-

cational education in the prison, successful rehabilitation can be accomplished, prison sentences shortened, and second offenses reduced, the savings to society will more than reward the effort and expenditure required for such accomplishment. Who knows the economic cost of crime? One shrewd guess made by Reeve in 1931 was 18 billion dollars annually. Certainly, the social and moral cost of crime is incalculable.