



# Federal Probation

The Myth of Corporate Immunity to Deterrence:  
Ideology and the Creation of the Invincible Criminal

*Francis T. Cullen  
Paula J. Dubeck*

Racism, Sexism, and Ageism in the Prison Community

*Ann Goetting*

Sentence Planning for Long-Term Inmates

*Timothy J. Flanagan*

Profiles in Terror: The Serial Murderer

*Ronald M. Holmes  
James E. DeBurger*

Computers Can Help

*Sylvia G. McCollum*

FBI Fort Worth Substance Abuse Evaluation:  
A Pilot Study

*Jerome Mabli  
Karen Nesbitt  
Steven Glick  
Jaclyn Tilbrook  
Barbara Coldwell*

Probation Officers

*Peter Horne*

Custody: The Emerging Crisis  
in Prisons?

*Paul Gendreau  
Marie-Claude Tellier  
J.S. Wormith*

The Criminal

*Gad Czudner*

Prisoner-Speak: Analysis of Probationers'  
Needs and Attitudes

*G. Frederick Allen*

100590  
-100598  
865001

SEPTEMBER 1985

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

L. RALPH MECHAM  
Director

DONALD L. CHAMLEE  
Chief of Probation

EDITORIAL STAFF

LORENE LAKE  
Probation Programs Specialist  
Editor

KAREN S. HENKEL                      ETTA J. JOHNSON  
Associate Editor                      Editorial Secretary

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WILLIAM E. AMOS, ED. D., Professor and Coordinator, Criminal Justice Programs, North Texas State University, Denton

J.E. BAKER, Federal and State Corrections Administrator (Retired)

RICHARD A. CHAPPELL, Former Chairman, U.S. Board of Parole, and Former Chief, Federal Probation System

ALVIN W. COHN, D.  
Director of Justice Services

JOHN P. CONRAD, Director

DANIEL GLASER, Professor  
University of Southern California

SUSAN KRUP GRUBER, Director  
Administrator, Administrative Office of U.S. Courts

M. KAY HARRIS, Associate  
Justice, Temple University

PETER B. HOFFMAN, Director  
Parole Commission

BEN S. MEEKER, Chief Probation Officer (Retired), U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois

LOYD E. OHLIN, PH.D., Professor of Criminology  
Harvard University Law School

MILTON G. RECTOR, President Emeritus, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Hackensack, New Jersey

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

100590-  
100598

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Federal Probation

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

WALTER S. REID, Director, U.S. Parole Commission (Retired), U.S. Department of Justice

Federal Probation is published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and is edited by the Probation Division of the Administrative Office.

All phases of preventive and correctional activities in delinquency and crime come within the fields of interest of FEDERAL PROBATION. The Quarterly wishes to share with its readers all constructively worthwhile points of view and welcomes the contributions of those engaged in the study of juvenile and adult offenders. Federal, state, and local organizations, institutions, and agencies—both public and private—are invited to submit any significant experience and findings related to the prevention and control of delinquency and crime.

Manuscripts, editorial matters, books, and communications should be addressed to FEDERAL PROBATION, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544. See inside back cover for information about manuscript preparation and submission.

Subscriptions may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, at an annual rate of \$11.00 (domestic) and \$13.75 (foreign). Single copies are available at \$3.50 (domestic) and \$4.40 (foreign).

Permission to quote is granted on condition that appropriate credit is given to the author and the Quarterly. Information regarding the reprinting of articles may be obtained by writing to the Editors.

FEDERAL PROBATION QUARTERLY.

Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D.C. 20544

# Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME XLIX

SEPTEMBER 1985

NUMBER 3

## This Issue In Brief

**The Myth of Corporate Immunity to Deterrence: Ideology and the Creation of the Invincible Criminal.**—Commentators frequently assert that the criminal law is ineffective in deterring corporate crime because either (a) the public will not support sanctions against businesses or (b) companies are too powerful to be swayed by existing legal penalties. Authors Francis T. Cullen and Paula J. Dubeck suggest, on the contrary, that studies reveal the public favors the use of criminal sanctions against offending corporations and such sanctions will ultimately diminish future illegality.

**Racism, Sexism, and Ageism in the Prison Community.**—A survey of literature suggests that blacks, women, and the elderly experience differential treatment in prison and that such treatment is somewhat in concert with that afforded them in the outside community, according to Professor Ann Goetting of Western Kentucky University. She concludes that such discrimination is likely to persist in the institutional setting until such time it is no longer tolerated in society at large.

**Sentence Planning for Long-Term Inmates.**—Recent sentencing law changes throughout the United States are likely to produce an increase in size and proportion of long-term prisoners in state and Federal correctional facilities. Professor Timothy J. Flanagan of the State University of New York at Albany addresses a number of issues involved in planning constructive sentences for these prisoners and discusses administrative structures for the implementation of long-term sentence planning.

**Profiles in Terror: The Serial Murderer.**—One alarming aspect of contemporary serial murder is the extent to which its perpetrators believe that violence against human beings is a normal and acceptable means of implementing their goals or motives, assert University of Louisville professors Holmes and

DeBurger. Their article describes a systematic typology of serial murders and indicates some of the general characteristics of the offender.

**Computers Can Help.**—Until recently the computer-assisted instructional options available to correctional educators were not very practical, reports Federal prisons education specialist Sylvia G. McCollum. The situation has changed sharply, however, and correctional educators can now choose

### CONTENTS

The Myth of Corporate Immunity to Deterrence: Ideology and the Creation of the Invincible Criminal .....	Francis T. Cullen Paula J. Dubeck	3
Racism, Sexism, and Ageism in the Prison Community .....	Ann Goetting	10
Sentence Planning for Long-Term Inmates .....	Timothy J. Flanagan	23
Profiles in Terror: The Serial Murderer .....	Ronald M. Holmes James E. DeBurger	29
Computers Can Help .....	Sylvia G. McCollum	35
FCI Fort Worth Substance Abuse Evaluation: A Pilot Study .....	Jerome Mabli Karen Nesbitt Steven Glick Jaclyn Tilbrook Barbara Coldwell	40
Female Correction Officers .....	Peter Horne	46
Protective Custody: The Emerging Crisis Within Our Prisons? .....	Paul Gendreau Marie-Claude Tellier J.S. Wormith	55
Changing the Criminal .....	Gad Czudner	64
The Probationers Speak: Analysis of Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes .....	G. Frederick Allen	67
Departments:		
News of the Future .....		76
Looking at the Law .....		79
Reviews of Professional Periodicals .....		82
Your Bookshelf on Review .....		86
It Has Come to Our Attention .....		90

from a wide variety of user-friendly equipment and software which includes vocational, high-school equivalency, career assessment, job search, and life-skill courses. Those interested in using computers in correctional education may benefit from the Federal prisons experience.

*FCI Fort Worth Substance Abuse Evaluation: A Pilot Study.*—Dr. Jerome Mabli, research administrator for the South Central Region of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and members of his staff, discuss the preliminary results of a pilot Substance Abuse Program Evaluation. The unit evaluated after 8 months of testing was the FCI Fort Worth STAR (Steps Toward Addiction Recovery) Unit which houses 200 inmates. The authors present a research paradigm which concentrates on cognitive-attitudinal variables and outline recommendations for future evaluation.

*Female Correction Officers.*—Author Peter Horne presents a current overview of the status of female correction officers in the American penal system, examining data and levels of utilization of females in corrections. The limited progress that female correction officers have made in working in all-male prison facilities is noted and the problems which have impeded their progress are explored. Recommendations are made and administrative strategies outlined in order to promote increased employment of females in opposite sex prisons.

*Protective Custody: The Emerging Crisis Within Our Prisons?*—The use of protective custody (PC) in North American prisons has increased dramatically over the last two decades with current rates varying from 6 percent to 20 percent of prison populations. According to authors Gendreau, Tellier, and Wormith, the increased use of PC was probably caused by changes in judicial and court-related practices, changing trends in prison populations, and liberalized institutional regulations. They express concern for equitable treatment and an acceptable quality of life in PC.

*Changing the Criminal.*—Gad Czudner describes a theoretical proposal for a way to change the criminal. The proposal is for a cognitive model with an added moral component which assumes that, only if a person is capable of feeling "bad" about doing "bad," is he able to feel "good" about doing "good." He believes that guilt can be a guide for moral behavior and that awareness of others is the key to this approach.

*The Probation Perspective: Analysis of Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes.*—Using the

theoretical perspectives of rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, and the justice model as points of reference, this study evaluated probationers' experiences and obtained their ideas as to what the mission of probation should be. Author G. Frederick Allen's findings suggest that probationers are able to conceptualize criminal sanctions as rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, and within a justice model perspective, simultaneously; and that they have useful suggestions for improving the system.

*ERRATA:* The concluding lines of the article "The Effect of Casino Gambling on Crime" by Jay S. Albanese, which appeared in the June 1985 issue, were eliminated during the printing process. The last two paragraphs of that article should have read as follows:

As a result, states having support for the legalization of casino gambling should not fail to consider legalization due to fear of increases in serious crimes against persons and property. Based on this analysis of the Atlantic City experience, the advent of casino gambling has no direct effect on serious crime. Such finding suggests that any city which undergoes a significant revitalization (whether it be casino-hotels, theme parks, convention centers, or other successful development) that is accompanied by large increases in the number of visitors, hotels, and/or commercial activity, may experience increases in the extent of crime but a *decrease* in the risk of victimization—due to even faster increases in the average daily population of the city.

Although crimes known to the police have increased in Atlantic City since the introduction of casino-hotels, this increase has been more than offset by changes in the average daily population of the city and a general statewide increase in crime. States that follow New Jersey's example in providing a significant crime prevention effort as part of their casino legislation are also likely to experience success in introducing casino-hotels to revitalize a local economy, without an increase in the risk of victimization of its citizens. As this investigation has found, the average visitor to Atlantic City in 1982 was less likely to be the victim of a serious violent or property crime than he or she was before casinos were introduced there.

All the articles appearing in this magazine are regarded as appropriate expressions of ideas worthy of thought but their publication is not to be taken as an endorsement by the editors or the Federal probation office of the views set forth. The editors may or may not agree with the articles appearing in the magazine, but believe them in any case to be deserving of consideration.

# Computers Can Help

BY SYLVIA G. McCOLLUM  
*Education Administrator, U.S. Bureau of Prisons*

A VISIT to the exhibitors area of any conference, where educators gather, is rather like a living history lesson in changing education technology. Vendor booths used to display printed workbooks and answer sheets, audio-visual cassette tapes, slides, and, of course, 16mm. sound moving pictures. The scene has changed radically. The workbooks and audio-visual tapes are still very much in evidence but computers increasingly command attention. Computer-assisted instruction, it seems, is making a strong entry into correctional education. Vocational, high school equivalency, career assessment, job search, and life skill course materials are now available for use on a wide variety of computers. The variety of course (software) and machines (hardware) available is dazzling, as are some of the prices quoted for purchase or lease, or lease with a buy-out option to purchase. Correctional administrators need to pause and think carefully before moving toward this exciting new educational option. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has been on a long journey with computer-assisted instruction. Decisionmakers may benefit from knowing about this interesting experience and why Federal correctional administrators view computer-assisted instruction with both enthusiasm and caution.

## *A Little History*

The first attempt at computer-assisted instruction (CAI) in the Federal Bureau of Prisons was tried approximately 15 years ago at several Federal correctional institutions (FCI). The equipment consisted of a terminal, which resembled a typewriter, and a printer. The terminal was activated by a telephone line connected to a nearby university-based main frame computer. When the terminals worked, and they often didn't, the process produced loud clanging noises and it was difficult to do anything else in the same room. There were no video screens and the printouts were on rolls of paper of considerably less than the present "letter" quality. Courseware was limited to some basic mathematics and language-arts drill and practice materials. The telephone line connection cost approximately \$1,000 per month and the hardware leased for \$2,000 to \$3,000 per year, per terminal. "Down time" was a

constant problem and, therefore, effective scheduling of students was almost impossible. It was no surprise when FCI's at Ashland, Kentucky; Milan, Michigan; and others soon discontinued these costly and noisy early experiments.

## *The Allen Teaching Machine*

Another effort which began during the 1970's involved a machine, relatively simple by today's standards, and courseware developed by a teacher at the Federal prison in Lompoc, California. Known as the Allen Teaching Machine, named after the teacher, Byron Allen, it required students to push buttons to select the correct answers to questions on a display board mounted in front of them. Lights came on to indicate correct answers, and moving on to the next series of questions depended on pushing the correct answer button. Prototypes were assembled and distributed to selected Federal prisons on an experimental basis. An interesting feature of this system was a required group process. The answer console accommodated five students, and progress through the program required the correct answer from all. Courseware was developed nationally, and also locally, by both teachers and students, after brief training sessions. These machines, like the first generation of computer terminals, suffered serious mechanical difficulties, not least of which were blown fuses and similar disasters associated with old electrical systems not geared to the new equipment. This second pioneering effort was abandoned because of high costs, lack of courseware, and technical problems. An informal wait-and-see policy was adopted after these pioneering ventures.

From time to time, between the early 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's, Federal Bureau of Prisons education staff traveled to Job Corps Centers, state prisons, and local school systems where professional journal or newspaper articles, or just rumor, suggested that a new machine-based instructional system was in use. Nothing in place during this period encouraged Bureau educators to move into computer-assisted instruction again. Some of the new hardware was vastly improved but prices continued to be prohibitive. The courseware was strictly linear in design and seemed at par with less costly workbooks. Many of the computer-based



programs in prisons and Job Corps Centers during the 1970's were supported by special Federal funding and could not have been funded, at least by prisons, out of normal operating budgets. Continued high costs and inappropriate software reinforced the Bureau's holding pattern with respect to the emerging computer technology and courseware. There were, however, other developments in audio-visual hardware and software which offered correctional and other educators instructional assistance. Video cassette recorders (VCR) and players moved relatively quickly into Federal prison classrooms during the 1970's. Early black and white monitors were soon replaced with color ones, and early Dick and Jane courseware was replaced with literacy and high school equivalency materials pioneered, in part, by the Kentucky Public Television System and commercially vendored by Cambridge and other publishers. Vocational and life skill courses soon became available in the VCR form from many sources. This was pretty much the situation when a new CAI option surfaced.

#### *Personal Electronic Transactor (PET)*

The Supervisor of Education, at FCI Milan, Michigan, requested funds from the Central Office of the Bureau to purchase three Commodore Personal Electronic Transactors to provide instruction in BASIC programmer language to inmates, and to develop and to use programs for other courses offered in Milan's education department. Plans included involving the students in the development of the instructional materials. The transactors, commonly called PET's, had a video display unit and a keyboard, and were cassette driven. In the jargon of the computer world they had 32K bytes. This means that their storage capacity was 32 thousand units; a unit being either a letter of the alphabet, a space between words, a punctuation mark, etc. Portions of the supervisor's memo which described plans for the program are particularly noteworthy in view of the current state of the art. In a memo dated November 7, 1977, the supervisor wrote:

The Commodore Personal Electronic Transactor (PET) represents a manufacturing and marketing revolution within the computer industry. Here we have an inexpensive, highly portable, stand-alone computer which eliminates the need for telephone equipment and a central computer. The cost at \$795 is less than an electronic typewriter. Contrast this to a leased educational terminal... costing \$1,600 per month in rentals.

A machine of this type can be used not only for delivery of educational materials, but also . . . can be programmed, and thus also used to train computer programmers. The theory of operation of these microcomputers is identical to that of the largest computers in existence. . . .

The printer attachment was not yet available and had to wait further developments.

#### *1981 Survey*

In 1981, while the Bureau was moving cautiously on all education related computer fronts, a private researcher, Antonia Stone, received a small private foundation grant "... to discover, through library research and telephone contact, what, if any, reportage of computer use in corrections education existed, and which facilities had existing programs." Stone met with key Bureau education administrators and personally visited a variety of Federal prisons. Her report recorded a limited use of personal computers and the growing pains which the Federal Bureau of Prisons experienced during its early experimentation with CAI. At the time of her report, only a few Federal correctional institutions were using personal computers for education purposes. In an incredibly short time after her report, Bureau educators began to examine new CAI systems which, unlike their predecessors, seemed not only affordable, but "user-friendly."

#### *An Integrated Computer System*

In the Federal system, a major change in direction began in late 1982 when the Western Regional Education Administrator for the Bureau, and the Supervisor of Education at the Federal Correctional Institution, Pleasanton, identified a system of computer-assisted instruction which they thought was sufficiently developed and cost-effective to warrant the Bureau's attention, at least on a pilot basis. A demonstration of the new equipment and software was arranged at a meeting of supervisors of education in the Western Region and the Computer Curriculum Corporation (CCC) was invited to show what its integrated curriculum assisted instructional system had to offer. The demonstration was particularly impressive since all of the courseware was contained in a minicomputer housed in a box, about the size of a small trunk, which could be accessed by 97 terminals. The terminals consisted primarily of a keyboard and a video screen which, at the time of the demonstration in 1982, provided a black and white image. The system was visual only, but a digital speech adapter provided one audio-visual module for English as a Second Language. The system included one or more printers.

The most attractive part of the package was courseware, which ranged from adult basic literacy (beginning at approximately the fourth grade level), through high school equivalency. Additionally, the courseware, two thousand hours of instruction in

all, included career development, job search and retention, and life/coping skill instruction. The system provided immediate feedback of student performance and progress to both the student and the instructor.

Between the time of the first CAI experiments at Ashland, Milan, and other Federal prisons, and the CCC demonstration in California, correctional systems had become wary of live telephone connections between computers in prisons and the outside world. The CCC integrated minicomputer system was a totally self-contained, stand-alone system which met the security requirements of a correctional setting. It provided no linkages beyond the inhouse minicomputer to which all terminals were connected. The only telephone line required was one which could be used to call an 800 number when help was needed because of computer performance.

#### *Courseware Is the Critical Variable*

Over the years, each time Bureau staff became aware of a computer-assisted instructional system, a subject matter expert was dispatched to the site involved to evaluate the courseware. Early on, it was decided that one good way to gauge courseware effectiveness was to evaluate the adult basic education (ABE) module. The Bureau's ABE specialist in the Washington, D.C., Central Office personally evaluated a variety of programs at various CAI sites which involved different hardware and courseware systems. She interviewed the instructors as well as personally worked with the programs. It was not until the CCC courseware surfaced that Bureau education staff felt they had found materials which met the Bureau's standards of effectiveness. In addition, the supervisors of education who participated in the demonstration in California had the opportunity to sit at terminals and access courseware, at random. The consensus was that hardware and software offered by CCC, and preliminary rental/purchase prices quoted, suggested that it was time for the Bureau to once again get involved in computer assisted instruction. A request for CAI proposals went out to vendors in late 1982 and, after a review of proposals by a committee of Bureau educators, the Computer Curriculum Corporation system was initiated, on a demonstration basis, in three Federal prisons: Petersburg, Virginia; Morgantown, West Virginia; and Englewood, Colorado. At the time, these three institutions were designated as Youth Corrections Act (YCA) institutions and their primary programs were educational. Subsequently, this CCC system was extended to five additional institutions: Ray Brook, New York;

Lexington, Kentucky; Leavenworth, Kansas; El Reno, Oklahoma; and Pleasanton, California.

#### *Personal Computers*

Parallel with this introduction of integrated computer assisted instructional systems, many Federal prisons bought additional personal computers and compatible software. There was no attempt to standardize the personal computers or the software purchased. The prevailing viewpoint was that the freedom to choose the most cost-effective hardware and software, on a competitive basis at the local institution level, would provide diversification and experimentation to the point where the best and the most effective systems would emerge. Experience, not fiat, would indicate whether or not a move toward standardization was desirable, and which hardware and software would represent that standard. At the time of the writing of this article, it is estimated that there are in excess of 300 personal computers in use in Federal correctional institution education departments. Brands in use include: IBM, TRS-80, Epson, Apple, Commodore, Heath/Zenith, and many others whose names may not be as familiar.

#### *The New Systems*

The computer-assisted instruction world is moving very fast. The black and white video screen is now available in color. The newest systems are audio-visual and some have replaced the keyboard with a simple touch system or the use of bar-codes and bar-code readers which automatically move the courseware forward and backward. Systems exist which permit the student to activate a zoom mechanism to more closely view a complicated piece of vocational training equipment. Courseware for an increasing number of vocational training programs is available, and some systems now even claim that they have tackled the most difficult part of the literacy continuum: grades 0-3. The development of an audio, as well as a visual, capability has helped in this most difficult instructional area. Some companies will tailor-make a curriculum specifically designed for a particular instructional or training need. However, these programs can usually be used only on that company's brand of terminal. In any case, where once educators were faced with one or two limited, expensive systems, they are now confronted with a feast of choices. It was easier to say "no" to the early systems than to select among the diverse and excellent systems now available.

### *Electronic Technician Training*

Still another program at the Federal Prison Camp, Leavenworth, involves a computer-based electronic technician training program provided by Control Data Corporation. This course, which provides 450 hours of basic electronic and related instruction, is designed to provide entry level skills for electronic technicians. In addition, Control Data's program includes job readiness and job counseling modules. The program has been in place for approximately 1 year and early reports are favorable.

Another company, National Education Corporation—Intext, offers a computer-based electronics course which uses a bar-code technology. Part of this system is being pilot tested at FCI Tallahassee.

### *Computer Literacy*

If computers are to be used for a wide variety of purposes not only in prisons but in the world in general, and it seems pretty certain that they will, individual computer literacy will become increasingly important. The Federal Bureau of Prisons now offers computer literacy training in many institutions. These programs, which are very popular, and which are available commercially, include the following critical elements: (1) how computers work; (2) programming computers; (3) using computers to solve human problems; and (4) the social impact and history of computers.

### *Do Computers Really Help?*

One of the obvious questions asked of educators who work with computer-assisted instruction is: Do computers really help? The answer, of course, is: It depends.

To state the obvious, learning takes place in many ways and under many different circumstances. The Federal Bureau of Prisons has not attempted to measure whether or not the computer reduces the time it takes individual students to achieve higher grade levels or to master specific skills. There has been some informal record keeping which suggests that it does not. However, most instructors agree that the computer provides, in a nonjudgmental and infinitely patient manner, the drill and practice students need, in a way no live instructor can. Additionally, immediate scoring and feedback is provided so that the student, as well as the instructor, can measure whether or not learning has taken place.

Computers also seem to meet the needs of the learner who, for whatever individual reason, cannot move at the average pace of a particular class. The computer's pace depends on the individual learner, who can take as much or as little time as is required

to master the skill of a particular lesson. The computer also makes allowance for the student who may not be available at the time a class is scheduled, or who may not be as comfortable as others in a classroom situation and who prefers to interact with the information presented on an individual basis. Preliminary observations from the teachers involved in computer-assisted environments in Federal prisons indicate:

- (1) Students with poor reading skills tend to be the most reluctant to participate in CAI.
- (2) Some students will work harder on the computer than they will for a teacher.
- (3) The computer can only serve as a supplement to effective teaching; while it saves teacher time it also takes time for the teacher to manage the program.
- (4) The concern that the computers would prove to be a fad and interest would soon wane has not been the case, generally. Most students get "hooked" after a few days of success.
- (5) The computers offer variety to the students. They are motivational.

These comments were randomly selected to respond to some of the concerns that have been expressed at meetings with educators and others who are exposed to computer-assisted instructional options.

In a correctional setting the computer goes one step further and provides an instructional option for the student who must be isolated for security or discipline purposes. The personal computer, uniquely, can bring to that student the same educational options provided to the general population at terminals located in the main education areas.

In summary, the computers are providing one more instructional option to the instructor who, as always, has the difficult job of motivating a student to learn, sustaining interest, and above all, determining whether or not learning has taken place.

### *The Future*

In 1983 Federal Prison Industries, a government-owned corporation which operates under the corporate name UNICOR and which provides employment to Federal prisoners, made available \$3 million to Federal prisons to develop experimental occupational training programs. Many of the programs initiated, involved computer-related jobs: computer-assisted drafting, computer sciences, and numerically controlled machine operations. During the course of funding these new training programs concern developed regarding whether or not future job



markets could absorb the numbers of inmates and free world students being trained. In addition, concern was expressed about the security of computers being used for training purposes in prisons. In the Fall of 1984, a computer work group was appointed to address these and related issues. This group had its first meeting in October 1984 and its report was released later that year. Key recommendations relate to a Bureau policy on computer security, scope and sequence of vocational training in computer related occupations and computer course standards. These recommendations will be implemented throughout the Federal prison system during the coming year.

If anything has been learned from the Bureau's experience with computer-assisted instruction it is to move slowly and judiciously and not to select any single system at this time. It would likewise be a mistake to wait until the technology has completed its development, because, of course, that will never happen. It seems reasonable to select a system which is cost-effective and which does not require a commitment which cannot be terminated or redirected, readily, after 3 or 5 years. Three to 5 years seems to be the length of time needed to test a particular system's capability in terms of the requirements of different situations and the relative cost-effectiveness of the hardware, software, and maintenance costs.

Incidentally, maintenance costs and annual curriculum rental fees are a serious consideration in any

computer-selection process. If not careful, the education administrator can be burdened with costs which require a disproportionate share of available operating budgets. These, and any other recurring costs, need to be weighed carefully before moving toward available CAI options.

It seems almost certain that future education delivery systems will include some multimedia device, probably audio-visual computers. Correctional educators are concerned that these devices not substitute for the classroom teacher who is a critical element in the instructional process. The challenge will be to use the machine to assist in, and not to take over, the instructional process. For, in the final analysis, education consists of much more than the mastery of facts or techniques. The interchange of ideas and viewpoints invested with emotional content, and how these interchanges are conducted, are the essential ingredients of education, wherever it takes place.

#### REFERENCES

- W. Anthony, "Personal Electronic Transactor," Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C., December 1977.
- A. Stone, "To Explore the Options Available to Corrections Educators," New York, N.Y., April 1981.
- "Terminal Island CAI Project," Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C., May 1981.
- "Computer Related Training, A Point of Departure," Recommendations of the Computer Education Work Group, Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C., December 1984.
- S. McCollum, "New Options in Offender Education," Annual Conference of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., April 1984.