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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Question

In recent years, correctional education has been seen by many to be losing ground. As correctional philosophy embraces ideologies of punishment (Van den Haag 1975), incapacitation (Greenwood 1982), and "just deserts" (AFSC 1971; Fogel & Hudson 1979; Morris 1974; von Hirsch 1976) the efficacy and even the desirability of attempting to rehabilitate criminals in prison have been questioned. Especially hard hit by this ideological shift have been those educational programs which address more than basic literacy skills and employment training. Education programs are being re-examined with an eye to cost-efficiency, inmate control, capitalization of resources, and court-ordered standards.

The role options open to correctional education in this latest incarnation of corrections and the shape correctional education must take to accommodate the new demands and restrictions of the broader field are the concerns of this
paper. A central theme presented here is that correctional education has always shaped itself to meet the demands of external agencies seeking to accomplish their own purposes. For this reason correctional education does not exist as a separate and definable field, valued for its own intrinsic worth and assessed on its own merits; instead it has been shaped and distorted according to prevailing correctional theories and practices, factors which are themselves subject to the ebb and flow of public sentiment and political posturing. The lack of any significant consensus of purpose has led to division and conflict with education programs competing among themselves for recognition and resources. Lack of clear and consistent standards for assessing achievements has left the field vulnerable to criticism and open to manipulation. The field itself has become an arena for conflict and debate as various factions seek to gain control and assert claims which advance their own particular social, ideological, economic, and personal interests.

Without a central purpose or well-defined philosophy, the field has developed professional identification with neither the correctional nor the educational communities. Correctional education has had to struggle for legitimacy, competence, and professionalism in a correctional environment where it is "tolerated by custodial staff, ignored by treatment staff, apologized for by the educational
department, underfunded by management, left essentially unexamined by research, and criticized by everyone" (Reagen and Stoughton 1976:127).

Out of public view and dealing with the rejects, dropouts, and failures of the public school system, correctional education has no constituency. As a field, it has been unable to assert its needs and to attract sustained interest in its plight. Attempts to evaluate its effectiveness reveal the idiosyncratic definitions of program success and the widely varying conditions and policies within which it exists. The very name -- correctional education -- has attained general parlance only in recent years and has come to embody the conundrum that is the field itself: is it education that corrects or correction that educates; is it a particular discipline or merely a location; is it a meaningfully inclusive category or simply a useful bureaucratic distinction (Horvath 1982)? This ambiguity confounds development of standards or strategies for planning and implementing sound programs with reasonable and predictable chances for success.

These problems alone present significant challenge to correctional educators. Compounding this issue however are the steadfast refusals by the field to acknowledge its tenuous position in corrections, to address the impact of these outside forces, and to assess the nature and extent of
control and cooptation of educational efforts by these fac-
tors. The landmark study by MacCormack (1931) followed by
the more recent comprehensive assessment of the field by
Bell and associates (1979) reveal that fifty years have
changed little in correctional education. The problems
remain essentially the same and efforts to improve them have
been ineffective. To push for educational reform, to call
for more and better research, and, most of all, to presume
some agreement on the nature and purpose of education in
prison and on the standards to be used for assessing these
all ignore an essential and prior question. Why have these
obstacles persisted for so long and why have efforts to
change them met with such limited success?

The question for the field is not merely what correc-
tional education is nor even how it works but, more appro-
priately, how it does not work. The answer is problematic;
the field is complex, with layers of meaning, ideas and
purposes that come from many directions and seem to go
nowhere. Surprisingly, while correctional education has
been the object of evaluation and critique, it has rarely
been the subject of description. In the preoccupation with
program outcomes and standards by which might be measured
success of some sort, it has been less often thought to
first question the assumptions underlying these programs and
to seek an understanding of the processes at work in
educating these particular learners.

The purpose of this study is to provide a framework for identifying and analyzing correctional education programs in terms of the contexts -- educational, institutional, and other -- in which they are sited. My general thesis is that correctional education is not inherently part of any of these, but rather emerges from and reflects an amalgam of pressures and needs imposed by these separate areas. For this reason, post institutional evaluations of success and failure of inmates based on educational achievements in prison almost always find post institutional adjustment -- recidivism, employment, social adaptation -- to be unrelated to correctional education achievement. Indeed, it could hardly be otherwise since prison education programs are diffuse in purpose and secondary or tertiary as institutional priorities.

My goal is to ask not whether correctional education works in some preconceived way but rather just how it is that correctional education does work. To this end I have employed an intensive ethnographic analysis of a single, complex correctional education program which I believe embodies many of the dynamics of these pressures and needs and which suggests a method by which the overriding context(s) of correctional education may become clarified. It is from this framework, I propose, that program planning,
implementation, and subsequent evaluations may be tailored to the realities of correctional education rather than to the agendas of its hosts.

The Ethnography

The foundation for this study is an intensive ethnographic study of one correctional program: its design, implementation, operation, and decline. For this presentation, I draw extensively on my own participant observation at many different levels of involvement in this program over a fifteen year period.

It is customary for ethnographers to set the stage for their work by revealing the behind-the-scenes operations: how they entered the field, their problems in data collection, their various false starts, and the insights and perspectives which ultimately brought meaning to the disorderly array of their initial field observations. In part, this information allows the reader a glimpse of the context of the field data; in part it provides a rough chronology and lends authority to the telling by documenting the ethnographer's fieldwork. Most of all however, this ritual is meant to inspire confidence in the ethnographic process that renders at least "as if" sense from the brute facts of the field; the reader can preview the ethnographer's successive
changes of mind in backtracking to some conceptual position from which it all makes sense. Described variously as abduction and retrodaction (F. Hanson 1975; N. Hanson 1958; Singer 1981), this process remains otherwise as difficult to quantify as thought itself. It is in the tradition of all of these functions, but most especially the last, that I give the brief synopsis below.

Gaining initial access to prison was not a problem for me; through the college where I was a new faculty member, I was asked to teach introductory sociology and anthropology at a medium security prison for young adult male offenders. However, staying on in this part-time role called for more effort: classrooms were small and smoke-filled; classes were long and attention spans short; inmates were loud, demanding and often rude; the hour commute to and from the prison gave me enough time to wonder what a nice person like myself....

For reasons I have forgotten the work became a commitment before it stopped being an adventure. Far from growing comfortable with my gradual acceptance in the prison community, I became more troubled with my commonplace notions about rehabilitation and education.

In 1975 when this college expanded its involvement to a full-time, degree-granting postsecondary program for inmates, I looked for opportunities to broaden the base of my own experience. I returned to graduate school to study
deviance and organizations, using my prison experiences as
grist for papers and projects. As a graduate student I
maintained my link with this correctional education program
by teaching in the prison on a part-time basis. As soon as
my academic work allowed I returned to the prison as full­
time researcher and program developer for this program.

In the most general sense, my new job consisted of two
assignments: to find out what was happening in this program
and to explain this to others. At first I was preoccupied
with documenting how an inmate's participation in the pro­
gram might affect his later chances of succeeding or recidi­
vating. A young researcher, I was full of notions of the
"experimenting society" (Campbell 1971) and valiantly tried
to organize my data gathering along accepted lines of re­
search protocols.

I soon discovered the elusiveness of correctional re­
search referred not just to defining and measuring such
variables as recidivism, but to getting data (Glaser 1965).
My efforts to accumulate good data soon gave way to getting
any data at all (Sechrest et al 1979). Behind the recent
observation by Raymond Bell and his associates (1979:13)
that correctional education lacks rigorous and systematic
data lie the hundreds of tales of frustration of why it is
so difficult to get decent data on these programs. In
prison, information is a commodity to which one has
proprietary rights. Each division, each office, and even individual staff members solidly maintained rights of emin­ent domain over the territory of their information. Even getting it was only a minor success, for it was, more often than not, incomplete, ill-defined and suited more to justifying a particular operation than researching it (Gearing and Sangree 1979).

My efforts in this direction were only further compli­cated as I sought ways to define and explain this program to outside audiences. These included not only private citizens (who were generally supportive), but more critical, single-minded audiences of agencies, organizations, and businesses asked to support the program with credentials, program and scholarship grants, volunteer assistance, and job opportuni­ties for program participants. These people wanted evidence of attitude changes, increased employability, better com­munity adjustment, improved cost-effectiveness, transferabil­ity of skills, and the service value of the program for the prison, the college, and the faculty teaching in the pro­gram. Most especially, these audiences wanted to know these outcomes in relation to the particular component of the program their support assisted.

Armed with these questions I began again, this time more sensitive to practical concerns of documenting the program itself and establishing data trails for tracking
inmate participation from the beginning of their incarceration through community adjustment. It was in doing this that the program really began to make sense to me. By tracking hundreds of inmates individually through the experience of their incarceration, I could see where there were gaps: what experiences needed bridging, where there were supports and where there were not. I began to develop an understanding for how "going to college" was intersecting with "doing time," how and when inmates were changed by the experience, why they would drop out and why they would come back. More especially, through their collective case histories, I began to see the emergence of a significant community of behaviors, choices, values, and experiences. I was documenting how these inmates acquired the life style and support structures that made going to college in prison reasonable and meaningful for them. I theorized that through this emergent community, they might be building the bridge that would help span that enormous gap between prison and community.

At this point my efforts were brought to a halt by a change in administration on the college campus. A new college president brought a deemphasis on service-oriented involvements and a more single-minded academic purpose to the college. Predictably perhaps, this resulted in less experimentation in the prison program and adoption of the
more conventional continuing education model of correctional higher education found in many prison college programs. Although the trustee advisory board and key program staff strongly opposed these changes, one thing led to another and, within a year, the entire top level of program staff, including me, had been levered out. The program was pared back to conventional educational programming under a new college division of continuing education. Accumulated data of three years research were declared "private stock" by this new administration, and I was at once without access, without data, and without portfolio. I had so merged my research and my administrative agendas that it had never occurred to me to maintain separate personal files and records of my work.

This incident would be little more than an individual trouble if it did not illustrate, in an unusually graphic way, one of the problems that has plagued correctional education since its beginning, the question of ownership. In subsequent statements, the college president asserted that the academic program for inmates was not a correctional education program, but a "profit center" for the main campus and a central element of his capitalization projection for the college. By administrative fiat, the profit margin, always one of the elements of college support for the program, had become the primary determiner of program policy.
As existing funding for other program components exhausted themselves, replacement grants were not sought; gradually, the pieces that made this program "comprehensive" were carved away: remedial programs for prospective students, vocational counseling, employment readiness training, liaisons with the business/industry and human services organizations in the surrounding communities, internal liaisons with vocational and trade schools, and transition counseling for both inmates who made parole and those who did not.

The ease with which others are able to claim correctional education for their own purposes and the adaptability of education to other institutional agendas are among the central reasons correctional education has never developed a center. They suggest why, more than other fields, correctional education is subjected to the tugs and pulls of personal ambitions, vested interests, political maneuverings, budget cuts, and radical changes in programming following frequent administrative shifts.

From this ethnography I have drawn two observations which seem pertinent to the central theme of this paper. First, correctional education programs have enormous potential for changing inmates in profound and lasting ways. Not only does this education have the capacity for altering inmate's self perceptions, but it also provides them a
vehicle for re-viewing their past histories and anticipating future options outside of a life of crime. The key to this is not mastering course content as measured by academic achievement or skill attainment, but the experience of a program that is comprehensive, integrated, complex and of significant duration. Austin MacCormack told us this in 1931 in his comprehensive study of correctional education (MacCormack 1931).

Second, documenting the capacity of education to enable this change has been a consistently disappointing effort. Educational programs have rarely been allowed to develop in comprehensive, integrated ways; relevant data are fragmented by bureaucratic and ideological schisms or made unattainable by the constraints of prison administration or bureaucratic idiosyncracies. The list of reasons for this gap in knowledge is distressingly long (Bell 1979).

The important thing is not to understand that research on correctional education has been difficult to do, but to understand that the very impediments to this research are essential parts of what has to be accounted for. One might ask why, in the fifty years of educating inmates since MacCormack's critical analysis of the field, so little is known about it? Why has good research been so difficult to achieve, and why has correctional education not made better use of the expertise it already possesses (Horvath 1981)?
It is not that correctional education has failed in an absolute sense, but that it has failed so consistently. The inability of correctional education to take hold in either organizational or personal terms, is reflected in the disorganization and lack of direction in the field itself. John Conrad, speaking from years of experience, raises the question left unspoken by many: "The way to better prison education has been shown, the gains -- both short and long range -- are understood, and the means are available in impressive amounts. Why then, does correctional education still fall so far short of its objectives" (Conrad 1981:v)?

The Analysis

I return to the question I was first given as researcher for the prison college program: what is going on here? I believe a reasonable strategy for understanding the forces that move correctional education to be a twofold effort: first, to examine the historic record with particular attention to contexts, assumptions and ideologies which have surrounded correctional education efforts; second, to examine in detail particular program elements to see how these factors interact and with what consequences.

With these brief diachronic and synchronic surveys as a reference grid, I excavate the ethnographic data of this
study. In interpreting these observations, I seek to identify, explicate, and analyze the multiple, overlayed strata of meaning and interaction I believe to be present in each situation described. I illustrate the ways correctional education has shaped itself to accommodate the contours of the many institutional structures within which it must fit to survive and how the field's own purposes assume these myriad, often contradictory, shapes as well. In this process, I examine the various accountabilities correctional education assumes as well as the contexts of power and resistance, institutional mission, constraint, and innovation which ensue from these adaptations. I also look deeply into the practice of education in its correctional setting for the latent assumptions and expectations I believe to underly decisions, policies, and procedures and which limit and define potential outcomes.

In a more expansive and conceptual sense, Michael Foucault uses such an archaeological metaphor in getting at the layers of social intent and historical implication which mold thinking about punishment and correction (Foucault 1979). Not incidentally, the methodological tradition from which Foucault writes, deconstruction, is sensitive to the subtle and crosscutting nuances of meaning I believe to be as present at the microethnographic level at which I write as the macrohistorical level of corrections at which
Foucault directs his analysis.

In the United States, deconstruction has emerged largely as literary criticism, especially the rejection of the Yale "new school" of poetic interpretation and in historical analysis. Harold Bloom and Hayden White respectively perhaps best represent these two American expressions of this deconstructionist tradition. In the history of the social sciences, White cites Karl Mannheim as an early deconstructionist in his work on "the structures of thinking" which attempted to classify, or categorize traditions of thought by their utopian components (White 1973; Mannheim 1936). In this same sense, Thomas Kuhn arrived at scientific paradigms which circumscribe categories of theories by "deconstructing" theories to arrive at the prior assumptions and ideologies within which they made sense (Kuhn 1970). The practice of deconstruction is probably given most full voice in ethnomethodological approaches to understanding objects and events by intensive observation to discovering meaning "from within" (Garfinkle 1967).

A social science tradition of deconstruction emerges more clearly in continental sociology and psychology, especially in the so-called "post-structuralist" works of Foucault and of Jacques Lacan. Returning to the brief description above, Foucault, for example, believes prison can be more meaningfully understood by looking at the
cultural, conceptual, and linguistic evolutions of thinking about discipline and punishment than by looking at the apparent intentions of correctional policy. Translocated to fit the ethnographic use of this theoretical tradition here, deconstructive theory might be said to presume that the intentions and objectives of correctional education, per se, shape the field less than do those convolutions of correctional, educational, and general sociocultural expectations within which the field must exist.

Deconstructing correctional education entails the unlayering suggested by Foucault's archaeological analogy, understanding it from within by taking it apart to see what, if anything, is there. Furthermore, this "...if anything..." captures an essential concern of my inquiry and of correctional education itself.

To draw out this concern, a useful analogy might be the obverse of the classic Black Box. Here the contents of the box and their innerworkings are visible; it is the box itself which we cannot readily discern. Thus we might imagine correctional education to exist within, of all things, a prison-like box of ideas, conditions and expectations, some stated but most not. We can move educational programs around inside the box and experiment with different arrangements, but we cannot change the shape of the box, nor even know it explicitly. Although the shape of the
box changes and these changes are only partially announced, only ideas which fit the box may be put there. Clearly, the game is not merely to understand the objects inside the box but the nature and shape of the box itself.

Unfortunately the reality of the "box" of correctional education is not even so clear as this analogy. In the process of most program design and evaluation, its existence may be tacitly assumed but rarely overtly acknowledged.

The job at hand then is to infer the existence and the shape of this box from the traditions, ideas, and schools of thought which mold correctional education programs. Correctional education is not addressed here as an object or event to be understood in its own terms, but as a process to be understood within the matrices of ideology, intention, and value that shape it and give it meaning.

Correctional education has been shaped and defined by many purposes, each emerging in its own time and each accompanied by its own unique ontology. These purposes have not replaced each other, but have been added on in successive layers, creating new constellations of ideas and expectations and forming new encumbrances and conflicts where they intersect. There are inconsistencies throughout -- good programs that fail and weak programs that thrive; the field seems to be characterized by anomalies. As one correctional
educator was overheard to say in a moment of inspired frustration: "Nothing fails like success ... nor succeeds like failure!"

Framed in this sense, it may be that deconstruction's linguistic and literary origins make this an eminently reasonable metaphor for my analysis. In the end, I hope to demonstrate ways for knowing more clearly where correctional education may go within these many conditions and for beginning to exert some control, within these confines, for choosing just where it will go.

An Overview

Chapter two presents a brief historic perspective and argues that correctional education has emerged as a field best characterized by the conundrum that is its name. Adopting many rationales -- religious conversion, social schooling, literacy training, employment conditioning, and behavior/attitude modification -- it still has not found a niche for a coherent, well-articulated design or purpose. For fifty years correctional educators have documented the difficulties that beset their efforts and have made recommendations to offset them. As these recommendations go unheeded and problems persist despite occasional infusion of massive "model program" resources, the field obviously
deserves a closer look.

In the third chapter, the impact of this accumulated history is explored and illustrated through selected contemporary vignettes drawn from a variety of levels of correctional education programs. Though differing in scope and seriousness, these tales may be seen as variously allegorical and apocryphal, capturing different ways the field seems prevented from coming together.

Chapters four through six are ethnographic presentations, each capturing a different level of social, political, ideological and administrative contextual reality for correctional education. These data and their analysis provide views of correctional education which go behind the scenes to the arguments which shape program goals: to technical decisions of implementation; to questions of resources of budget, time, and space; to personal needs for recognition and career advancement; to political issues of ideological "sync" and profile.

In the scenarios derived from the field data, the conventional stuff of education -- courses, standards, grades, certifications -- become relatively minor props in the staging of an education which responds to a variety of audiences not educational in nature. These explicated case studies and the implications drawn from them illustrate how questions of program success or failure cannot be taken at
face value but must be judged against factors which produce them and audiences which ultimately assess them.

The last chapter is devoted to making sense of these analyses and exploring their broader meaning for correctional education. Expanding on the central theme of this study, the case is made in this final chapter that the field can no longer assume that educational standards and professional certifications alone assure program integrity and survival. As correctional educators and planners renew efforts in these directions, they must include realistic, politically mature strategies and standards for guiding implementation. Guidelines are needed which will facilitate truly comprehensive programming and protocols must be designed for successful linkage with other programs, both in prison and in the community. Finally, the field must select and establish appropriate and meaningful criteria for evaluation.

This chapter will suggest some of the qualities for implementing correctional education programs by identifying criteria by which program factors can be matched to essential correctional and other institutional factors. By demonstrating that the contextual givens of correctional education programming can be made explicit, a way may be opened for characterizing correctional milieux according to their receptivity and capacity for particular educational efforts.
Educational programs come in many sizes, shapes, and complexities; common sense dictates that they cannot be implemented without assessing the philosophic, political, and administrative environments of their institutional and community hosts. What remains however is moving this assessment out of the marginalia of program evaluations and "corridor talk" (Rabinow 1986:252) of conferences into the forefront of program planning, implementation, and research. From that point, correctional education planners can develop a range of program options to be combined in various configurations to optimize their contributions and ensure their survival.
CHAPTER II

THE HISTORY: A CONUNDRUM

Prison education is a product of history, its patterns are the warp and woof of education and corrections. Both histories are woven deeply into the fabric of correctional education and both are enormously resistant to change. Though lagging behind their cognates in the community, programs designed for inmates have drawn their patterns from the purposes and theories of public education. Perhaps more significantly, prison education has developed in ways consistent with the general policies and practices of incarceration, features which are in turn shaped and reshaped by a critical and doubting public. Observers of the history of correctional education have noted the strains apparent in these two agendas — punishment and education — and believe that, indeed, many of the problems confronted by correctional educators have largely to do with the problems of milieux (Conrad 1981; Holt 1978).

From another perspective however, these two institutions — corrections and education — have shared common purpose and structure, and the ease with which the two have
accommodated to the correctional education function gives some clue to the longevity and almost unquestioned presence of education in most prisons today (Beto 1979; Conrad 1981:34; Duguid 1981:43).

Since the nineteenth century, public education has represented values of order, efficiency, and uniformity. It has served the dual purpose of socializing the urban poor and educating society in general. Thus, it was believed, would behavior and attitudes be fostered to contribute to industrial productivity, and the safety and well-being of society would be ensured by decreasing products of ignorance—crime and vice. Optimism in the positive application of science to develop human potential and faith in institutions were linked in the ensuing Progressive reforms, resulting in orphanages, asylums and other houses of refuge, public schools, and prisons (Rothman 1971, 1980). As did schools, prisons had the job of molding people to fit into society and to assume productive, law abiding roles.

It was not always so. In the gradual emergence and development of the prison, the potential of this institution for education and rehabilitation was not readily apparent. Although classical reformers, notably Jeremy Bentham, did observe the capacity of prison to teach the wayward in the skills of crime and vice:
In a moral point of view, an ordinary prison is a school in which wickedness is taught by surer means than can ever be employed for the inculcation of virtue. Weariness, revenge and want preside over the academies of crime. (Bentham 1864)

For the most part, early prisons were intended to confine those awaiting trial, deportation, corporal punishment, or some other disposition of charges against them. It was the sixteenth century before "houses of correction" emerged with the intent to reform the criminal through hard work (Sutherland 1955:269). This is far short of educating inmates, but it marks a significant shift in the philosophy of corrections that does pave the way for the gradual combining of punishment and treatment.

Through early criminological writings we discover the subdued, but ever-present idea and principle that the main cause of crime was ignorance and lack of education:

From the initial concept that an individual without moral and religious ties to society is susceptible to criminal influence came the later concept that formal education, beyond the mere religious sense, combined with skilled labor was fundamental to the maintenance of a legal, moral and economic social competence. (Martin 1976:37)

The threads of education and incarceration first intertwine in American history in the Walnut Street Jail experience, in intent if not in actual practice. Quaker
reformists, objecting to extremely poor conditions and the indiscriminate mingling of hardened convicts with women and children, envisioned a setting of complete isolation and separation of prisoners. In solitary confinement, they believed, offenders would be led to profound self-examination, would experience guilt and eventually reject criminal ways. Prisons, formerly hotbeds of decadence, vice, and indiscriminate behavior, would no longer contribute to crime and immorality out of neglect and public indifference. Rather than being worsened by their experience, these well-intentioned reformers reasoned, prisoners would receive incarceration as productive and positive. Inmates would be better off for their confinement and the interests of society would be served (Martin:34-35). To the extent that it existed at all, education consisted of religious instruction and admonition by visiting clergy. Hence, educational instruction was deemed a necessary part of this arrangement so inmates could be exposed to biblical truths.

This system of total separation of inmates was applied to new penitentiaries built in Pittsburgh in 1826 and Philadelphia in 1929, and eventually became identified as the Pennsylvania plan. In the meantime a rival plan -- the congregate system -- was being experimented with in New York. Begun at the Auburn state prison between 1819 and 1823 and later at Ossining in 1825, this system stressed
work in large congregate workshops and rigid discipline. The differences between the two rested on the relative emphasis put on isolation. In the Pennsylvania plan, inmates were kept physically isolated from other inmates, seeing only clergy, a few friends and prison officials during the entirety of their incarceration. Under the Auburn system, protection from the bad influence of fellow convicts was insured through elaborate, rigid discipline and absolute silence. The ensuing debates between these rival plans became legendary (Rothman 1971:79-88).

The single focus of both systems was clear however — guarding criminals against corruption and teaching them habits of order and regularity. An organization devoted to the reform of the penitentiary at this time was the Boston Prison Discipline Society founded by Louis Dwight. Under his guidance, religiously motivated education was taking a different shape. Dwight supported Sabbath Schools which promoted the complementary objectives of work and education through congregate workshops. A backer of the Auburn plan, Dwight believed discipline and industrious habits combined with religious revival would more surely lead to inmate salvation than would solitude and penitence (Roberts 1971:4). This gave rise to a number of small scale experiments in prison education dedicated to the belief of moral regeneration through habitual practice and a structured
existence.

The first legal recognition of academic education in prison came in 1847 when New York state law provided for the appointment of two instructors for each state prison at Auburn and Sing Sing (Ossining) (Roberts:5). Now official, education was essentially instruction in the "3 R's" accomplished by intermittent cell-to-cell visitation, usually by a chaplain or another inmate. There were no formal programs, libraries, nor appropriations for books. Materials were donated, usually threadbare and out of date (Barnes and Teeters 1951:652).

The first significant change in this approach to education was signaled at the first meeting of the American Prison Congress in Cincinnati in 1870. The now famous Declaration of Principles from this meeting was to become the blueprint for massive changes in the correctional system, including a commitment to academic and vocational schooling. Zebulan Brockway, superintendent of the Detroit House of Correction and later the Elmira Reformatory, first put the ideals of education and training into practice. Coupled with the innovation of indeterminant sentencing, reform shifted from exhortation to a "carrot and stick" approach. The inmate now had the key to the manipulation of his own self interest, education. The focus became more practical, emphasizing basic skills and literacy. In 1876
Brockway initiated a collaboration with the local Women's College in Elmira and introduced a variety of courses into the reformatory. This set a style of educational delivery that was not fully explored until almost 100 years later when college and universities were again tapped for their resources.

Reformatories patterned after the Elmira experiment were never as successful as expected. Lack of funds, inadequate facilities and poorly trained personnel became a litany repeated time after time. By 1931, Austin MacCormack reported in his benchmark survey that educational programs had not been successfully integrated into prison routine. He found that there were no schools at all in thirteen of the sixty prisons studied, and that not one single prison made adequate provision for vocational education. "Not a single complete and well-rounded educational program, adequately financed and staffed, was encountered in all the prisons of the country." His conclusions were prophetic for evaluations of correctional education programs for the next 50 years. Among other things he noted a lack of clear goals, too rigid adherence to public school methods, poor teaching, failure to individualize programs, inadequate facilities and most importantly, lack of funds. His recommendations anticipate most contemporary standards for correctional education: individualized instruction, avoidance of stereotyped
programs, emphasis on the special needs of adult learners, broad and inclusive curriculum and interest rather than compulsion as the motivational basis of the system (Barnes and Teeters 1951:653).

MacCormack's survey has been credited with stimulating the modern era in correctional education (Roberts 1971:10). In addition to his contribution to raising the general consciousness of this emerging field, other events also contributed to this renewed interest in education. One was the rapid decline of prison industry following the rise in political power of labor, high unemployment and declining business markets (Ohlin 1977). From the beginning, work had played a central role in the ideology of the penitentiary (Rothman 1971:92). Quaker reformers especially believed the routine of labor would transform a criminal into a hard-working citizen. The practicality of this point of view for occupying inmates serving long sentences and the potential to save the state some money was not lost on most prison officials, nor was the opportunity to reinforce the idea that incarceration was, after all, punishment.

Wardens, from the first, were more interested in fostering prison industry than in establishing schools, hoping to make their prisons self-sufficient. As John Conrad has noted: "Education took second place to hard labor, and sometimes that was no place at all" (Conrad 1981:1).
For the most part, inmates were not inspired laborers and the returns on their work were not impressive. Labor gained its prominent position primarily for its capacity to be demeaning as well as to serve the interest of reformist goals. "The idea of labor, even more than the calculations of profit and loss, made it central to the penitentiary" (Rothman 1971:105).

With the rise of labor unions, free labor began to protest against prison competition and mounted successful efforts for passing restrictive legislation. With the passage of the Hawes-Cooper Act in 1929 and the Ashurst-Summers Act in 1935, the sale of prison goods in the free labor market was effectively eliminated. "In 1885 it was estimated that 75% of the prison inmates in the United States were engaged in productive labor. By 1940, the total was reported to be much lower, 44% for the country as a whole, and 50% in California" (Eaton 1962:126). The problem was evident -- what to do with inmates who could no longer be employed in industry. The solution was practical -- employ them in education.

Education was there to fill the gap. Prison industry's loss was education's gain, but the primacy of work was never questioned. Prison practices still revolved around the trinity of separation, obedience and labor (Rothman 1971:105). The either/or relationship between work and
education evolved early on. Education could benefit the inmate, but work would benefit both the inmate and the prison.

Another boost for education came when the U. S. federal prison system appointed a trained supervisor of education for each federal facility, organized and updated libraries, allocated funds for purchasing books, and instituted a system of cell-study correspondence courses to supplement classroom instruction (Reagen and Stoughton 1976:42). Since 1930, the federal system has demonstrated active and continuous interest in education and has assumed a leadership position in developing standards for state prison systems to emulate.

A third force which contributed to the added interest in education emerged in the rapidly growing behavioral sciences. In an increasingly heterogeneous and mobile society it was not surprising that concern would center on issues of social cohesion and cultural integration. Social disorganization was evidenced in increasing crime rates, mental illness, drunkenness and other forms of deviance. "Socialization" entered the vocabulary of social reformers as they aspired to draw off individual pathologies in the heat of the great melting pot. The responsibility lay with the individual to find his place in the land of opportunity. Newly accepted psychological insights were
incorporated into activities aimed at giving inmates insights into their motivation, attitudes and personality patterns (Dinitz 1978).

For education in prisons, this meant expanding education to include not only academic and vocational education, but social education as well -- education that would help the inmate adopt appropriate values and aspirations. The objective according to the influential report of the Engelhardt Commission in 1933 was "the attainment of some well defined end, such as changing attitudes, increasing vocational efficiency, elimination of complexes and the development of willingness and skill for cooperative living after release" (Wallack, Kendall and Briggs 1939:19). The report was clear in its recommendations to make education more comprehensive: "The term education as used in correctional work should be interpreted very broadly. Education in terms of the three R's alone, or of vocational training, organized and administered in the manner of traditional schools is inadequate in correctional work. Education can and must be administered in terms of individual needs."

This inclusive definition of education existed in theory only. For practical administrative purposes, programs were divided into academic, vocational and social education (Roberts 1971:11). This division of responsibility had significant consequences for programs which soon
found themselves competing with each other for access to limited resources of time, space and money. As John Conrad has noted: "The gap between penal reformers and practical prison officials has yawned throughout the history of American Corrections" (Conrad 1981:1).

By now, the design for correctional education was becoming evident; the emphases were on individual needs, practical skills and compensatory training. These priorities were stated comprehensively in the Report of the Commission for the Study of the Educational Problems of Penal Institutions for Youth in 1937:

The objective of prison education in its broadest sense should be the socialization of the inmates through varied impressional and expressional activities, with emphasis on individual inmate needs. The objective of this program shall be the return of these inmates to society with a more wholesome attitude toward living, with a desire to conduct themselves as good citizens and with the skill and knowledge which will give them a reasonable chance to maintain themselves and their dependents through honest labor. To this end each prisoner shall be given a program of education which, on the basis of available data, seems most likely to further the process of socialization and rehabilitation. (Roberts 1971:15)

Few have ever doubted that correctional education, in all its various forms, would ultimately be measured for its rehabilitative impact. As stated by LLoyd Yepson in his "Standards for Evaluating Educational Programs in
"Corrections" (1942), "(t)he true test of correctional education is to see if the inmate is rehabilitated, particularly in demonstrating positive changes in attitudes and habits."

This standard did not emerge from penal philosophy however, but out of the direction for public education. A look at the history of public education reveals that schools were intended to make students industrious, orderly, law abiding and respectful of authority. American schools were uniquely designed to reflect and confirm the social structure that erected them. Prison education had to bear the additional burdens of treating the failures of this system and socializing criminals in appropriate social values as well and confirming the legitimacy of rehabilitation through confinement.

One of the earliest philosophies of schooling in the U.S. was proclaimed in the *Statement of Theory of Education* published in 1873 under the leadership of William Torrey Harris. It states that one function of school in America is to,

"train the pupil into habits of prompt obedience to his teachers and the practice of self-control in its various forms, in order that he may be prepared for a life wherein there is little police restraint on the part of the constituted authorities." (Katz 1971:94)
This urge for social order is perhaps the most enduring theme in educational development. In particular, through public schooling was the attempt made to "socialize the urban poor to behavior that would decrease crime, diminish expenditures on welfare, promote safety and contribute to industrial productivity" (Katz:109).

The idea that schools existed to promote law and order gave critics of public education grist for attack. Richard Grant White, an outspoken critic, argued that a key assumption that public education was necessary to the social and moral life of the community had been thoroughly disproven. The expectation that education would bring a decrease in crime, immorality, and other social ills rested on a confusion of correlation with causation. It assumed that ignorance causes vice when in reality the two co-exist as products of the same problem, poverty (Katz:92). White pointed out that the tremendous investment in public education over several decades had produced neither measurable improvement in the moral life of the community nor decrease in crime. By the end of the 19th century, the prevailing sentiment was that the public school had failed.

Despite this criticism and the overwhelming evidence in support of it, the American faith in the conservative power of schooling persisted, perhaps because it was so appealingly reassuring: if children are equipped with the
appropriate attitudes and skills, social problems will disappear. As the failures of the public school system fill correctional institutions, the answer has been to treat dropouts and failures with more of the same medicine.

Though public education has modified its expectations of ever achieving the melting pot, correctional education has maintained as its primary or perhaps only goal the production of thoroughly assimilated citizens. The failure to accomplish this end has brought forth an array of explanations, all of which cautiously avoid a questioning of the remedy.

Elmer H. Johnson captured the sentiment in correctional education:

American prisons have made real progress since 1950 toward becoming treatment-oriented agencies worthy of the twentieth century. But the task is far from complete. In fact, in most states, the people have not committed themselves to the philosophy of rehabilitation with sufficient clarity to provide the funds essential to a truly modern correctional system.

Since education deals with the development and change of human behavior, faith in education as a treatment is well placed. However, faith is not enough. The educator must operate within the framework of belief systems of the American people and within the structure and culture of the correctional institutions which employ him. Too often education is advanced as a cure-all for problems when the nub of the problems is in a sphere outside the control of the educator. He needs the support of the prison administration, but educational reform awaits a more broad base of public
support than any governmental agency can provide. The ultimate support must come from the citizens themselves. (Johnson 1965:17-19)

In addition to lack of funding and lack of public support, science provided other palatable explanations. Revival of biological explanations for criminal behavior in the works of Mednick (1981) and the disturbing results of twin studies (Christiansen 1968, 1973) were evidence of receptivity to explanations which blamed the victim rather than questioned our time-honored cure.

Just as troublesome was the "realization of the existence and persistence of a semi-permanent underclass of losers with its own ethic, values, goals and expectations" (Dinitz 1978:235). Society was now more undeniably confronted with a growing class of "unmeltables" who had internalized a coherent set of values that contradicted conformist behavior. As Walter Miller noted, this was not so much a position of discontent or limited opportunity, real as that was, but a lifestyle which led to involvement with crime.

The reform spirit dies hard however. With rising unemployment in the 70's, liberals again asserted the claim that the overriding social conditions of unemployment and poverty were major contributors to crime. In the face of growing disillusionment with treatment programs and in
keeping with the much overstated "nothing works" doctrine (Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks 1975; Martinson 1974), attention again turned to work and industry. The government responded by funneling massive monies through the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) to "re-tread" America's workforce in new technology and to address the problems of the chronically unemployed. Though not specifically intended for inmates, creative proposal writing and discretionary decision-making succeeded in channeling some of the money into correctional institutions. Through the quirks of such government funding, many service delivery areas lay outside prisons necessitating the involvement of community service agencies in delivering vocational training and job readiness programs inside prisons.

In contrast to the practical, vocational skills oriented nature of employment programs, another thread was becoming visible in the pattern -- postsecondary education. Although most people will concede the desirability of literacy and basic skill training for inmates, college remains a luxury for many Americans and few feel any urgent need to provide such opportunities to incarcerated felons. Postsecondary education raises not only questions of accessibility, but questions of educational philosophy and purpose not involved at the basic skill level. Throughout the history of correctional education, it was understood
that education was to result in a product, be it religious conversion, basic literacy, vocational skills or realigned attitudes. With higher education came the introduction of the "non-productive" curriculum: humanities, arts, and the social sciences.

One of the earliest of these programs was introduced in 1953 by Delyte Morris of Southern Illinois University into the Menard Correctional Institution in Illinois (Herron, Muir and Williams 1974). Another early program was begun by Stuart Adams at San Quentin and later became the model for Project Newgate (Wolford and Littlefield 1982).

Project Newgate was funded in 1967-68 by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the purpose of establishing demonstration postsecondary programs. Six programs were begun with this seed money, initiating a more ambitious and comprehensive approach to college education than had been used with correspondence programs. It was hoped the Newgate model would provide a full complement of teaching, counseling and mentoring to inmates and enrich the culture of the prison. Among its most important contributions was establishing a standard for follow-through and follow-up services for inmates once released from prison (Seashore and Haberfeld 1976:2).

The Newgate programs were beset with the typical administrative and custody problems which were only heightened
by the tensions of outside service delivery by community colleges and universities. In addition to reducing recidivism, the programs adopted goals of "achieving stability" and "realizing life goals." These first comprehensive programs set a standard for college programming and delimited four qualities for success:

1. Outreach and remedial components to attract inmates who would not otherwise attend college.

2. Activities and services offered outside the classroom as a part of college programming.

3. Transitional components to provide support to participants as they leave college.

4. A strongly committed independent [emphasis theirs] college or university.

(Seashore and Haberfeld:188)

The most dramatic and significant result of Newgate programs was the potential for college programming to overcome social class disadvantages. Far from being the "cream" of prison population, the typical student had never experienced college and had a performance level comparable to the general prison population. That these dropouts and failures of the public school system could perform on par with college students in society had implications beyond consideration of correctional education and drew attention to one of the more controversial contributions of higher education.
Evaluations of these programs did not reveal any consistent differences between the participants and the non-participants. This lack of definitive results from follow-up studies was attributed to complexity of the phenomenon being studied and methodological problems in documenting program outcomes.

In spite of the lack of demonstrable success, college programming increased dramatically in 1973. In 1967 the number of college programs nationwide was 46 (Adams 1973). By 1973 the number had risen to 218 (Herron, Muir and Williams 1974). While this increase might have been in response to a documented felt need or a reaffirmation in the Newgate model in spite of technicalities of documentation, it was instead an unintended consequence of a new source of federal funding. This source was the Basic Education Opportunity Grants (BEOG) initiated in 1973. Incarcerated students could easily meet the requirements of financial need and created, almost overnight, an untapped and financially supported market for postsecondary education. The timing was most propitious. Colleges and universities were faced with declining student enrollments and prisons were experiencing the largest and most rapid population growth in the history of U.S. correctional institutions (Wolford and Littlefield 1982). Again, education was able to pick up the slack of too many prisoners with not enough to keep them busy.
The impact of this postsecondary influx was far-reaching. Joining the ranks of correctional educators were highly trained university educators and administrators with strong professional identities and credentials in the broader educational community. Though relatively few in number, they represented the wealth of the universities and the access to federal entitlement funds and private sector involvement. In protecting their own interests, they spearheaded a development of political consciousness and national profile which had not emerged in correctional education since 1870.

Issues for correctional education took a national focus with efforts to establish a national profile, lobby support for congressional funding of inmate education, and establish a corrections unit with a full time staff at the U.S. Department of Education. U. S. Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger began drawing attention to education for inmates calling for mandatory literacy and proficiency in basic skills and increased training in vocational crafts. U. S. Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania joined the ranks with a bill requiring that prisoners be literate and have job skills before being paroled from state prisons (Coffey 1981).

The broadened base of interest in correctional education and the call for more money and public support was
bound to draw critics as well as supporters. U. S. Congressman G. William Whitehurst of Virginia joined the ranks of the former by pointing out the unintentional nature of the BEOG, later known as Pell Grants, for use by inmates. His success at disqualifying inmates for social security and veteran's education benefits and his attacks on inmate use of federal subsidies for attending college dampened the enthusiasm of college educators and revived arguments on the privileged nature of higher education. Since that time, 1983, college programs in prison have existed precariously, knowing that time and public sentiment were against them. Most programs took refuge in modifying their curriculum to provide the more acceptable practical and applied training in the areas of vocational training.

Fifty years after the MacCormack survey of the state of correctional education, Raymond Bell and colleagues from Lehigh University were commissioned to evaluate the current status of correctional education (Bell 1979). Their study identified twenty issues that had to be resolved in favor of inmate education programs if they were to be successful. The major problems they cited, administrative shortsightedness, indifference, and neglect, staff shortages, inadequate funding, lack of power, and inadequate space are by this time familiar. Though few would argue that correctional education had not changed and improved, the very earliest
problems still persisted. Bell reported that funding for educational programs in adult prisons averaged only about 9% of the total operating budget; educational goals were unclear, irrelevant, or nonexistent; the education departments' allotted space and institutional influence was woefully inadequate, and even in the most basic programs only one-third of inmates who could potentially benefit from education programs were enrolled. (Bell 1979:85 and Horvath 1981:1).

At the same time Rep. Whitehurst was mounting his challenge, the Specter initiative resulted in an unprecedented amount of money allocated for the development of a model correctional education program at the Lorton Penitentiary in Washington, D.C. This culminated years of effort at profile building and a concerted effort on the part of the Correctional Education Association. For the first time, significant monies were allocated specifically for correctional education and it appeared the years of lip service without substance were coming to an end. However, correctional education lost much credibility and momentum in the failure of this project to produce any significant results. "Men coming out of Lorton have no greater measurable or tangible resources than they had prior to the initiative," according to Margaret Nolan, executive director of the Washington Correctional Foundation which studied the program. "That is
the tragedy of millions of dollars. The men have no more than they had before" (Brisbane and Anderson 1986). The failure this time could not be blamed on insufficient funds. With the Lorton fiasco, the deeper roots of the problem were surfacing.
CHAPTER III

THE PROBLEM: AN ALLEGORY

In the fall of 1983, the District of Columbia was given six weeks to devise a plan for spending millions of federal dollars on correctional education. Under the sponsorship of Senator Arlen Specter, the intention was to devise a model program for offering inmates extraordinary opportunities to obtain basic education and skills leading to employment upon release. Three years and 41 million dollars later, observers are referring to the effort as a vast waste (Brisbane and Anderson 1986).

The Specter initiative followed several years of intensive effort by the Correctional Education Association (CEA) and other national organizations to bring the plight of correctional education to the attention of legislators and to develop a national mandate for the effective education of incarcerated offenders. The award marked what many who had advocated such a move hoped would be a new day in correctional education, ending decades of political and financial neglect.
A team of consultants representing widely varying areas of expertise was drawn together by the CEA, including a state director of correctional education, an expert on educational assessment and standards, a director of a comprehensive educational program, and a researcher and program developer. Together with the Executive Director for the CEA, this group hoped to draw upon a national network of correctional educators to contribute ideas for the design, development and implementation of this model program. As a member of that team, I was able to witness the emergence of strong vested interests, the political patronage, and the sandbagging that followed the award of the money. As it became evident that District of Columbia politics were to outweigh the mission itself and that the sponsoring congressional committee was not willing to tackle the District of Columbia home rule issue in order to intercede, Correctional Education Association withdrew from active involvement in the project and limited participation to lobbying efforts on behalf of a more serious approach to the project.

From the very beginning of the Lorton project, it was clear that the last agenda to be met in this effort would be correctional education. Early in the project's history, leadership was given to a former head of the District of Columbia school system who boasted among her qualifications
of having no knowledge nor experience in correctional educa-
tion. Challenges to her leadership brought on threats of 
withdrawal of support for the project from the District of 
Columbia public education community and brought to the fore 
the complicated network of political ties and favoritism 
evident in any community, but abundantly present in the 
District of Columbia. The subsequent attempts by the pro-
ject director to impose a public school model on the Lorton 
prison system and to staff the program largely with D.C. 
teachers working on an overload basis, as well as her bla-
tant disregard for the existing Lorton correctional bureau-
cracy, resulted in footdragging and institutional confusion 
by the correctional community. Her failure to seek the 
advice or cooperation of correctional educators at Lorton 
and her decision to use public school employees in their 
stead were seen for what they were, standard District of 
Columbia political patronage. Most blatant throughout, was 
her consistent refusal to draw upon the resources or exper-
tise offered by the correctional education profession.

By almost any criterion, the program was a failure. No 
significant efforts were made to assess the particular needs 
of inmates for remedial education or job preparation or to 
bring these in line with job market opportunities; follow-
through counseling and reintegration services were not in-
corporated into the service delivery model; data trails and
records of inmate participation and achievement went unattended; equipment and materials went unused, often because of failure to anticipate space arrangements or staff training needs. The evening scheduling of most classes was done to accommodate moonlighting public school employees and limited access to programs because of work schedules, counts and lockups.

What emerged from this episode was not a new awareness of problems that beset correctional education, but a dismal repeat of old mistakes. Once again, correctional education failed, or was unable, to take hold and exert significant impact on the correctional setting. What was new in this venture was the unprecedented amount of attention and money being given to correctional education. With all eyes turned to Lorton, with enthusiastic support, with abundant funding, and with high expectations, the program failed. Dr. Osa Coffey, Executive Director for the Correctional Education Association at the beginning of the Lorton project noted in a Washington Post interview: "There was a concern that if the District did not make good use of this, it would dampen the support for correctional education in general. I'm afraid it has done that" (Brisbane and Anderson 1986).

This vignette of the Specter initiative allegorically represents the many problems which have historically accompanied correctional education:
1. Lack of interest from the educational community in the special needs of correctional education or professional recognition of the specialized expertise of correctional educators.

2. The inappropriateness of imposing a public school curriculum model on adult learners in a prison setting.

3. Conflict with correctional needs for use of space and control of inmate movement.

4. Inability to put in place comprehensive and integrated educational programming, including follow-up with implementation and service delivery including reintegration into the community.

5. Failure to design adequate data trails for program accountability.

6. Inability to assert the priority of educational agendas over extraneous agendas.

The apparent problem for correctional education is a consistent inability to claim professional status in either field of corrections or education. The correctional education effort is directed by theories and rationales which are external to its purpose. These factors are primarily adjunctive to corrections and an afterthought for education. Existing between two powerful fields, these efforts, singular in nature as they are, have developed only the most shallow sense of "fieldness." This lack of consistent, coherent identity or unified purpose is reflected in the record of fragmentary delivery of educational programs mentioned in the previous chapter.
Historically correctional education has drawn upon correctional philosophy and theory to define its purpose; in practice it has responded to workaday administrative dictums of order, punishment, control, and protection. These correctional agendas have always taken precedence (Marsh 1976:28), putting pressure on educational programming to demonstrate effectiveness in like manner: by reducing recidivism, by changing behavior, values and attitudes, and by preparing inmates for economic self-sufficiency. As in the Specter episode, when correctional education has received recognition, it has most frequently been posed as an unrealistic panacea for reducing criminal behavior, then criticized widely to the extent that this goal is not reached. As Glaser has noted: "The highway of correctional history is paved with punctured panaceas..." (Glaser 1964). The cycle of unreasonable expectation, vaguely conditional support and funding, clouded evaluation and disappointing results has become familiar. When the "slam bang effect" is not forthcoming (Gilbert, Light and Mosteller 1975), administrators and policy makers renew their confirmation of Martinson's pronouncement that, in corrections, "nothing works".

From its inception in penal history, correctional education has drawn heavily on rehabilitative theories. The notion that learning and social understanding lead to social
integration and law abiding behavior affirms deeply held beliefs among many in our culture (Katz 1971). Given basic skills, it is argued, a person is more likely to want, and to be capable of, productive membership in society. However, documentation of this link between education and rehabilitation has not been forthcoming (U.S. Department of Labor 1971; Glaser 1964; Greenwood et al. 1983; Hudson 1981; Lewis 1973; Seashore and Haberfeld 1976). To the extent it has been tried, the results are less than clear. Education in all its forms has not been able to document consistent, impressive, long-term results which have satisfied the expectations of both the correctional and educational communities.

Among other things, these efforts have drawn heavily upon a belief in the desirability of upward mobility by the clients of correctional education. Increasingly however, these professionals are confronted with a class of people who have rejected conventional goals after generations of failure in our educational and economic systems (Dinitz 1978). Given their general impoverishment and deviant lifestyles, personal life histories and the facts of their incarceration itself, it is unlikely that education programs, as presently conceived, will have much impact on these individuals (McCollum 1977).
The case can also be made that corrections itself has not had the latitude to develop as a profession, independently of judicial, legislative, and administrative interpretations of public attitudes (Marsh 1976:11). The field, a mix of unplanned and irrational philosophies inconsistently applied (Rothman 1980), has regularly changed emphases and goals to more acceptably fit changing public policy (Ohlin 1977). Rehabilitative efforts have been further hampered by the coexistence of conflicting philosophies about the purpose of prisons: a place for punishment, incapacitation, rehabilitation and deterrence.

Cressey's extensive analyses of prison organization (1954, 1960, 1961, 1965, 1968) indicate that most modern prisons have three administrative hierarchies which typically operate independently of each other: custodial staff, treatment staff, and work supervisors. The resulting lack of integration and lack of any chain of command between these systems leads most inmates (not to mention employees) to experience prison as a chaotic and unpredictable setting. Each system has its own patterns of relationships and authority, communication channels, decision-making processes and procedures for distributing rewards and punishments. In this setting, "(w)hat appears to be 'treatment' may actually be anything from social work to friendship to unofficial punishments and rewards. The whole meaning of
rehabilitation becomes subverted and distorted in the futile attempt to meet all the conflicting demands of the institution" (Lewis 1973:48).

Under these conditions, it is not surprising to find that "education" does not exist as a cohesive and integrated program (March 1976:19). Administrative practices of distinguishing between vocational, social, remedial, and traditional academic programs have made it difficult to plan an integrated program centered on student needs. Equally important, this standard practice has contributed to a zero sum approach to administration of programming and led to competition between complementary programs for space, time, resources, access to inmates, and client count. Conflicts with custody are regrettable but understandable; conflicts within educational and treatment programs are optional and debilitating (Bell 1979:69).

The potential for comprehensive programming exists within almost every prison but rarely comes together as such. One explanation is the practice of many wardens to exert control by a "divide and conquer" approach to administration. Another reason is suggested by the structure of funding, which often necessitates artificial boundaries for purposes of assigning grants to entitlement areas and achieving satisfactory, non-duplicated client counts. The roots of these divisions run deep in the historical develop-
ment of treatment programs and there is little incentive for changing them.

More recently, the growing acceptance of more punitive and custodial goals for corrections, expressed in policies of incapacitation and deterrence, has yielded attacks on rehabilitative programs as neither possible nor even desirable outcomes for our prisons (Fogel 1973; Hudson 1981; Morris 1974). This trend has underscored the vital importance of flexibility and adaptiveness in building correctional education programs. Constantly resynthesizing and blending goals that will be acceptable to the correctional community has become the survival edge for correctional education, often necessitating the disregard of conventional educational theories and practices.

The centralized authority that accompanies the mandate for maintaining secure confinement is unquestioned in correctional administration. The subordination of educational programming to institutional needs goes unchallenged. That teaching must occur interspersed between lock-downs, numerous head counts, chow times, work schedules, shake-downs, cell block movement, infirmary calls, visits, court appearances and changing job assignments is also taken for granted.

Attitudes and assumptions evidenced both formally and informally by prison administrators also have significant
impact on the "place" for education in an institution. In many institutions it is assumed that participation in school is a privilege that can be granted or withdrawn based on adherence to institutional rules. Timing and locations allocated for educational programming are often consciously and artificially selected to conflict with prime visit or recreation activities, the feeling being that inmates should have to sacrifice to get an otherwise "free" education. And commonly, participation in an educational program is less related to academic achievement or motivation than to the inmates's ability to manipulate the system or to other informal arrangements.

The organizational structure of correctional education has contributed to this co-mingling of purposes. Of the four models for the bureaucratic administration of correctional education -- through departments of correction, through departments of education, through joint correction and education administration, and through special correctional education state-level department -- only the last of these four results in any separate identity of correctional education. While all models have proponents who espouse their merits (Conrad 1981: 56), an underlying expectation of all of the arrangements is that correctional needs and goals will be the primary focus. Correctional educators are hired as civil servants, ensuring their acceptance of correctional
philosophies and goals as conditions of employment (Miller, 1978). The problem is even more apparent with the practice of assigning teaching personnel to security types of duties as well (Coffey 1981).

There are few status rewards for educational staff. They are often mistrusted by other correctional personnel and denigrated as pretentious or soft-headed. Nor do correctional educators receive recognition from a grateful public or even former students, who put as much distance as they can between themselves and their incarceration. A look at most prison administrative charts reveals that the top level of responsibility for educators is several rungs below those for other administrative lines. Often, the only recognition available for educators and opportunities for career advancement lies outside the field of education.

If the curriculum within the prison is fragmented, so does the field itself reflect this fragmentation. Many correctional educators view themselves more as correctional personnel than educators. Funding structures as well as space arrangements separate vocational instructors from academic instructors; they rarely meet on common ground to form collegial ties or develop mutual interests. Membership in professional organizations is not viewed as crucial for professional development nor for keeping current in the field. This in turn reinforces the uniqueness and
singularity with which each views their teaching situation. Recent efforts to develop a strong national organization divided the field among the "young professionals", the "good old boys", and those who were too busy trying to do their jobs well to be bothered. Beset with all these problems, it is no surprise that the field has not found a common focus strong enough to pull its various pieces together.

On the other side of the relationship, lack of acceptance within the broader fields of education has, by default, contributed to the ascendancy of correctional over educational goals. As Coffey has pointed out: "As long as we give tacit approval to such a limited view of correctional education, it is not surprising to find that the educational community on the whole subscribes to the convenient theory that correctional education is the concern of and for the corrections system alone" (Coffey 1981).

If education is the "neglected child" of corrections, it is the "illegitimate child" of education. In spite of the very particular and recurring problems found among its clients, correctional education is not among those educational subfields -- special education and adult education, for example -- requiring special training or preparation. Most departments of education and teacher training programs provide no in-service nor pre-service training designed especially for prison teachers. There is no professional
training for curriculum development which recognizes the specific needs of the typical incarcerated population -- adult, high school dropouts with a plethora of learning disabilities, personal and interpersonal problems, and whose varied sentences and security classifications bring highly varied lengths and intensities of participation.

Marsh and Gares have noted (1972:6-7) the lack of participation of correctional educators in the broader networks:

Correctional education is an element of education that lacks personnel certification, lacks accreditation by any regional agency, is not officially recognized by the American Association of University Professors, the American Council on Education, the National Society for the Study of Education, the American Association for Higher Education, the American Personnel and Guidance Association and others.

Only one school in the United States has significant curricula in its teacher education program on correctional education (Reagen and Stoughton 1976:27) and in Canada none at all (Hudson 1981:167). Only two texts on correctional education have been written -- one in 1931 (MacCormack) and one in 1971 (Roberts), and neither of these seriously addresses the question of "how to do it." Probably no element of the correctional education scene is more negative, more lacking, than that of professional status (Marsh
1972:25). Recent attempts (1981 and 1982) to establish a corrections desk at the Department of Education were received with minimal interest (Coffey 1981).

Unlike public schools, prison schools are programs without special, supportive/critical constituencies — support groups, parent committees, school boards, etc. Correctional educators find themselves professionally removed from groups which provide backing and support for educational issues and instead find themselves in a setting where operational and security needs take precedence over educational needs. For this and other reasons, educational administrators and teachers are often drawn from other correctional ranks and often lack certification or professional training in education. Many correctional educators still view themselves, and are viewed by others, as rejects of the public school system. Their student population — rejects, criminals, failures of society — does little to boost their professional image or the desirability of their positions. Most teachers have "ended up" in corrections; few have chosen it as a career.

By now, the notion that correctional education has problems with its opposite numbers outside the field is clear. To most observers, the problems within the field are not as evident. The long debate and confusion about the purposes of education is far from being resolved. This is
most evident when the field is called upon, as it frequently is in times of austerity, to justify itself and reiterate its contribution to the prison setting. To this end, the field is constantly calling for more research to document the "effectiveness" of educational programs, usually in terms of almost immediate, dramatic changes of educational or employment productivity, or other hypothesized indicators of rehabilitation -- needs not often felt by public or private education. The problem lies as much with lack of research efforts (Adams 1968; Reagen and Stoughton 1976) as with the quality of research. As Bell and his associates aptly observed, the complete lack of rigorous and systematic program evaluation is the "single most important issue to be resolved" (Bell 1979:12-13).

In the competition for scarce resources, both money and space, evaluation research in correctional education has become more a political tool than a benign social scientific endeavor. Studies, when done, are often self-serving, legitimizing whatever profile the program needs to maintain. As Conrad put it, evaluations are another way of "keeping score" (1981:11). Results are not so important as are the implications of the capacity to do research, and most especially, the promise of outcomes which will justify funding and produce accountability of program expenditures.
All too often, educational researchers find themselves trapped into asking questions which fit the priorities of an external funding agency, explaining in part the excessive attention given to questions of recidivism. Focus on recidivism as a measure of educational success and worth is viewed by an increasing number as a "suspension of common sense and an expensive exercise in futility" (McCollum 1977:30), and an enterprise which detracts from more productive application of efforts to understand program effectiveness and to plan improvements in design and delivery (Conrad 1981:11). As correctional philosophy itself draws away from the desirability or probability of rehabilitating inmates, educational programs may be relieved of documenting this global objective. Conrad put it more succinctly: "Evaluations by the criterion of recidivism are of no value for planning and should be ignored" (1979:12-13).

Bell documents a number of reasons for the poor quality of correctional education research. The list is extensive, insightful, and familiar: lack of measurable objectives, lack of appropriate funding, lack of research expertise in the system, low priority given to correctional education, inability to control variables and establish any sort of acceptable control group, the hostile environment of the prison setting, lack of concern for assessing marketability of training and skills and determining labor market needs,
intervening concerns of security and/or treatment standards and disagreement as to appropriate measures of success, including recidivism.

In addition to the list of problems with what is being done, there are additionally, significant gaps in what is not even being considered for research. Variables relating to program acceptance, stability and continuity remain undocumented, largely because they are not easily or uniformly quantifiable. As made painfully clear with the recent Lor­ton experience, correctional education programs are largely dependent for their success on the social, political and economic decisions made prior to programmatic decisions and which set the stage for subsequent success or failure. The existence of these "external" variables account for the widely varying conditions within which programs exist and research is attempted. Bell and associates might have added to their list the idiosyncratic nature of most program evaluations making comparison between programs difficult. What research has been done has not contributed to growth in the field but instead has served to underwrite individual efforts. In this atmosphere, claims for success are more accurately interpreted as bids for continued support and funding, and are seen for what they are --isolated success or failures.
The constant cooptation of educational agendas by other agendas, the fragmentation of educational efforts, the efforts to cope with the peculiarities of a prison setting, all have reduced the opportunity for direction and control of programs by correctional educators. As John Marsh has noted, even the spokesmen for correctional education tend to come from outside the field itself (Marsh 1976:29). As a result, correctional educators feel often a sense of futility and lack of control over program directions. There is little incentive for ambitious or innovative programs which exceed the capacity of the correctional system to reward, acknowledge, or even perceive.

In response, correctional educators have developed a "meatball" approach to program design and administration. The standard for the field is "do whatever works." Program administrators have had to discover for themselves the limits of program acceptability as if they were unique. Program replicability is not even aspired to as the contexts and the conditions of funding vary so widely. With every program "inventing" itself, little benefit can be drawn from the typical and narrowly conceived standard for correctional education research. In the never ending attempt to document the problems of the prison milieu as a rationale for whatever program results obtain, our attention has been drawn away from documenting and analyzing the social, political,
economic and ideological forces which ultimately have set the standards and defined the boundaries within which programs may work.

This "problem" which is an a priori condition of the field, is frequently defined as a "personal trouble" (Mills 1959), one each educational administrator has to confront at the institutional or perhaps the state level. Every program is believed to have a unique set of circumstances within which it must achieve acceptance. "Making a program work" is relegated to the position of institutional politics, personal savvy, power plays, circumstantial "luck" and administrative whimsies, variables not deemed appropriate in program evaluations. As a result, the field has no professional arena in which to compare notes, document successful or unsuccessful policies, strategies and administrative styles that have gotten programs in place or not, analyze funding strategies, and examine program dynamics. When recognized, the "how" of correctional education is still more art than science. [A notable exception to the lack of such information in the field is the remarkably candid assessment of program development given by Seashore and Haberfeld in the appendix to their book (1976).] It is ironic that the major problems for the field continue to exist outside the realm of correctional education "expertise" or that information in dealing with them is to be
found only in the "fugitive literature" of the field (Sechrest, White and Brown 1979).

The argument being made here, is that understanding the context of correctional education is more important than understanding the educational activities themselves. The central issue here is not whether these programs educate; indeed, studies show that they do: inmates learn to read, improve in comprehension and retention, acquire vocational skills, and think better of themselves for their educational achievements in prison, at least during the period of their confinement. It is even suggested that these inmates may recidivate less frequently or less immediately after release than others and that they may reintegrate themselves more fully, although these studies rarely control for "creaming" or post hoc fallacy. The point is that all this seems not to matter: ultimately, these are not the lines along which correctional education will succeed or fail. The failure of correctional education is that program "success" or "failure" is defined only by its ability to respond to standards and expectations external to educational considerations. The more conventionally it is seen as a tool of incarcerational technology, the more difficult it becomes to examine correctional education as an isolated phenomenon.

Here is the gap between the promise and the performance. Correctional education's purpose is to serve the
agendas of other legitimizing institutions and, lacking any identity and professional status of its own, in the end this is all it can do.

The longer these problems are perceived to lie outside the field of correctional expertise and experience, the longer the field remains disorganized and resistant to analysis. Always on the verge of losing its center, correctional education readily lends itself as a battleground for correctional and educational administrators who have no sense of, nor any commitment to, correctional education as a field. That the problem lies outside the field suffices only as an initial observation and partial explanation. Left at this level, widely disparate program results and standards and insufficient documentation are rationalized with the soporific: "Given what we had to work with..." It continues to be the "givens," that make program success unpredictable and program failures excusable.

This perspective, however, is producing more and more program anomalies: programs that should work but do not, and programs that do succeed, "undeservedly." Anomalous failure, as seen in the Lorton experience draws public attention and attributes to correctional education yet another failure to do its job. In Tennessee, the reverse situation takes an even greater toll of confidence among correctional educators themselves. In spite of striking
performance with meager funds and little administrative support, educational programs were criticized for their ineffectiveness in rehabilitating inmates and reducing recidivism. Tennessee's notorious Plan for the 80's totally eliminated these programs in an election year gambit to reduce the costs of incarceration and enhance revenue-generating programs like prison industries (Tennessee Department of Corrections 1980).

At points such as this, the tenuous nature of the "box" that supports and defines correctional education becomes most clear. Education was chosen to bear not just the brunt, but the blame for unacceptable recidivism rates. Nor can this be dismissed as an isolated incident. The report of the Law Reform Commission in Canada concluded that rehabilitation had failed and treatment was "inappropriate" resulting in drastic cutbacks for education programs (Hudson 1981:160).

The failure of education to achieve more significant and stable acceptance in the correctional community is usually realized in less dramatic ways, and has been so pervasive as to be a condition that is taken for granted. The difficulty in delivering even basic programs is a reflection of the status of the field and reveals yet another layer of consequences to take into account. We could argue that those who suffer most from this state of affairs are
the inmates, whose need is great.

Although no agency maintains national data on the educational status of prisoners, and states vary in their diagnostic and assessment tools, we can estimate the general contours of this need (Conrad 1981:4). The average prisoner tests at about the eighth or ninth grade achievement level, and many considerably below that. Given the operational definition of functional illiteracy at the fifth grade achievement level, most states will have between 20-30% of their population who are functionally illiterate, and who are candidates for Adult Basic Education (ABE). Although more offenders are arriving in prison with high school diplomas, Roberts and Coffey report that up to 90% of adults in penal institutions (state and federal) are without high school diplomas (Roberts 1976). Very few can actually pass a test at the 12.0 grade level or higher. For these people who have been "pass-alongs" in public education, their option is obtaining the General Education Development (GED) certificate. In our society a high school education, and the skills and competencies it implies, is a requirement for establishing eligibility for employment in most entry level jobs. These data indicate that 60-90% of the inmate population is not prepared with even the most rudimentary and basic skills for seeking employment in our country.
These figures are not readily explained by lack of ability. Fifty percent of inmates have "average" intelligence scores; 37% "above average;" only 13% have scores lower than average (McCollum 1977:32). The dimensions of the problem become more evident when we realize the optimum level of enrollment in education programs in prison is 30-40 percent and often as low at 10 percent (Conrad 1981:5). In noting this wide gap between inmate educational needs and the capacity of correctional education to deliver services, Dr. Osa Coffey, former Executive Director of the Correctional Education Association asserted that "one is tempted to agree with those who feel that education as a rehabilitative agent has not really been tried yet" (Coffey 1981).

Yet another conclusion can be drawn here. Given the present organization of correctional education, it is doubtful whether it can deliver adequate or meaningful educational programs to meet the needs of this increasingly "caste-like underclass" (Dinitz 1978). If, in spite of our best efforts, there are experts who can claim we have not really tried yet, we must conclude that we have been looking for direction in the wrong places. Paraphrasing William Perry (1979), perhaps we are in the presence of "profound forces." For a more complete understanding of how these forces work we must look to the inner, or perhaps the outer workings of programs themselves.
CHAPTER IV

ETHNOGRAPHY: A NARRATIVE CHRONICLE

Introduction

In his major treatment of qualitative evaluation, Michael Quinn Patton justifies an initial presentation of the qualitative narrative. Patton argues that such an approach makes available to the reader information, usually chronologically or topically organized, that is necessary to understand the program being evaluated (1980:302-306). Robert Yin (1981:303-304) challenges Patton and cautions against the preliminary narrative, although he seems to miss Patton's distinction between the "study narrative" and the earlier, more formative "case record."

The purpose of a narrative presentation of the ethnographic material here is twofold: to identify the ethnographic field -- temporally, geographically, and institutionally -- and to provide a chronological framework for placing the units of ethnographic analysis presented in the following chapters. Although this is not the early, organizing use of the narrative of concern to Yin, his concerns are
nevertheless important here. Yin cautions that premature narrative formation, as opposed to simple field write-ups, cost inordinate time and brings the risk that text organizational factors may putatively become conceptual or analytical principles (60). D. Royce Sadler mirrors this concern with the observation that "the natural tolerance for ambiguity, together with our adaptive ability, (which) allow us in everyday living to recover from...a partially incorrect judgement" are absent as evaluative observations are formed and recorded (1981:26-27).

Indeed, it is this pedestrian level of ethnography, the chronological narrative, which may be the most pernicious source of bias and distortion. It is in the basic telling of the ethnography that "storyness" itself is imputed, that contiguity, sequentiality, causation, and other meaningful relations are attributed to elements experienced by others to be, at most, coincidental. It is at this point of ethnography that researcher selectivity and reader response may ultimately benefit most from the deconstructive tradition described above. Hayden White's notion of "prefiguration" (1973:30-31) and Jonathon Culler's description of "écriture" (1975:131-133) present concerns for this function in history and literary criticism. Vincent Crapanzano brings this issue to a more direct application for purposes at hand when he describes ethnography itself as metaphor. According to
Crapanzano, in order to be meaningful to readers, the ethnography must present more or less than a strict isomorphic representation of the field described. Minimally, he maintains, "ethnography is historically determined by the moment of the ethnographer's encounter with whomever he is studying" (1986:51).

Jacques Derrida describes the ways these various, distorting imputations are and are not addressed by deconstructive theory:

(D)ecommunication is not...a specialized set of discursive procedures, still less the rules of a new hermeneutic method that works on texts and utterances in the shelter of a given and stable institution. It is,...at the very least, a way of taking a position, in its work of analysis, concerning the political and institutional structures that make possible and govern our practices, our competencies, our performances. Precisely because it is never concerned only with signified content, deconstruction should not be separable from this politico-institutional problematic and should seek a new investigation of responsibility, an investigation which questions the codes inherited from ethics and politics. (Derrida 1982)

These concerns and qualifications notwithstanding, frontline ethnography is still largely an intuitive business, and contract research is additionally subject to conscious and unconscious distortions of the ethnographer in situ. In specifying particular factors contributing to such ethnographic distortion in evaluation, D. Royce Sadler
frames these three categories of bias as "cognitive limitations", "ethical compromises", and "value inertias", respectively.

In the narrative that follows, I have attempted to control for bias in four ways. First, there is a commonality of the data in that they all occur under the same program "banner", even if bearing different names and locuses during the period studied. Second, keeping in mind the cautions of James Luckey, Andy Broughton and James Sorensen (1982) regarding the use of archival data in program evaluation, I have interspersed the narrative and the analytical treatments that follow with references to various archival documents, most of which are generally accessible.

A third check on the bias of my presentation comes in the form of an apology, more precisely an apologia. In my introduction and throughout the chapters on ethnography, I have attempted to acknowledge and qualify my own biases and those of the position I held. As Rosalie Wax illustrates in a very candid critique of her own fieldwork (1957), this self-evaluation, though painful, matures and gains depth with the passage of time. For me, even three years distance has allowed less personal involvement in recounting the ethnographic observations in this study. As did Wax, I see my own sophistication as a fieldworker unfold in relation with the increasing elaboration of the thing I was studying.
Fourth, as discussed more fully below, I am creating culture here. In part, this study is an argumentation for a perspective of correctional education for which adequate observational data do not yet exist. Following Crapanzano's lead, I am attempting to deconstruct conventional understandings of this ethnographic field by stealth. By elaborating what may be another unreal cultural description of correctional education, I can minimally challenge the conventional unreal understandings proffered by the contexts in which the field is found. Hopefully my descriptive analysis can function, in Crapanzano's words, to "like the magician, the hermeneut, Hermes himself, clarify the opaque, render the foreign familiar, and give meaning to the meaningless" (1986:51).

The Mission Years: 1967-1974

In 1966, a Middletown banker took it into his head to offer an informal seminar on money and credit, which he entitled "street economics", for inmates of Lebanon Correctional Institution, an Ohio prison adjoining the property of his country home. Intrigued by the initial enthusiastic response to the course and the persistence of the participating inmates, he approached a nearby university which had recently located a branch campus in Middletown with the
proposal that the university offer classes at the prison. The university was willing to do this only on a no-credit basis or with the understanding that inmate-students could not transfer the credits to the main campus after their release from prison. Through a neighbor and mutual friend, the banker met the president of Wilmington College, a small liberal arts college owned by and affiliated with a branch of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers) and located 30 miles from the prison. Since the college had a variety of programs serving non-traditional students, the banker approached the college president with the idea and the idea fell on the right ears (Millan 1983).

The Wilmington College president, an accomplished historian, former United Nations High Commissioner for post-war reconstruction in Europe, and a "weighty Friend" (a Quaker term for those with strong religious conviction as well as strength for bringing consensus) had brought to this small, rural campus a commitment to practical solutions for social problems. Reflecting on the long history of Quaker involvement in penal reform, he was eager to explore the opportunities to involve the college in this new idea (Newman 1972:409-410).

The initial response of the faculty was one of tentative interest. As an institution, they agreed to the idea, as long as it did not cost too much; as individual
In spite of these obvious drawbacks, the idea took hold. In the first year, 81 inmates were given time off work to attend one or more of the ten courses offered. Instructors were paid nominal stipends funded by private donations, travel and miscellaneous expenses were absorbed by college and department budgets, and student books and materials were provided out of the prison recreation budget. The college and the prison cooperated under an informal letter of agreement. The First Year Report stressed the "rehabilitative" nature of the program in providing inmates a constructive use of time. It was not anticipated that inmates would want to or have the opportunity to continue
their education upon release.

This low key Quaker-mission approach characterized the college's prison involvement for the next several years. Courses continued to be offered with little attempt to define an overall philosophy or develop a coherent curriculum. A prison disturbance -- a work stoppage in the prison license plate factory -- in the summer of 1968 temporarily put a halt to most programs involving participation of non-prison personnel. Although another woman professor and I had been the first faculty to teach in this program this disturbance also stopped female faculty involvement for several years. On campus, the energies of the college community were being consumed by an increasingly activist student body, anti-war demonstrations (and ensuing town/college antagonism), and a growing consciousness among a growing minority student population.

Following major health problems, the college president who initially presided over the college's prison involvement retired. Under an interim acting president, classes at the prison continued on a lessened and more sporadic basis. A new president, a Quaker and an anthropologist, was selected and arrived for his inauguration to find the community and the college threatening each other with lawsuits over a controversial yearbook, tension between conservative and liberal factions of faculty and administration, and a black
student take-over of the administration building.

Under this second president to oversee the prison instruction, these efforts became less a Quakerly witness and more an administrative procedure. The decision was made to continue these courses, which had now dropped to one or two each quarter, as long as they broke even. A faculty member was appointed as coordinator to solicit course ideas from faculty and to arrange enrollment and classroom space at the prison. Few faculty wanted to leave their strife-ridden classrooms to spend their evenings in the uneasy, hostile environment of the prison.

As did many other schools which survived this period of conflict, this college gradually turned its concerns from the turmoil in the broader society to the conflicts and dissatisfaction brewing within. The more activist students became disenchanted and frustrated, took their parting shots at faculty and administration, and left. Discontent formerly directed at the various protagonists of the Vietnam war, institutionalized racism, and the corporate world in general was now focused on a more tangible adversary -- the college administration. Ironically, although this president had brought both anthropological and Quakerly community decision-making into the administrative strategy for his presidency, he was seen by a vocal segment of the community as manipulative. In particular, the practice of
conducting college business meetings by "sense of the meeting" — a transitive, interpreted consensus process conventional in Quaker meetings — and his continuing of the Wilmington College tradition of including all staff (faculty, administrators and support personnel) in these meetings were characterized as cumbersome at best and conniving at worst (Hinshaw & Young 1980). After four years, this second president to lead the prison efforts left to chair an anthropology department at another college.

Although this president had not contributed significant changes to the prison efforts directly, major individualization of both the academic and student service areas of the college during his administration had broken through the general campus hesitation to tamper with these programs. This undoubtedly introduced an expectation of change for the expansion of prison efforts that were to follow. The general climate of the campus and its receptivity to change were the subject of a longitudinal study from 1970-75 (Lindquist 1978:129-163). A more unwitting legacy perhaps was the faculty frustration with involvement in decision-making which resulted in giving the anthropologist president's replacement a stronger autonomy in administration discretion, so long as he seemed to evidence deference to faculty status. (By this time, the faculty had managed to exclude administration and staff from faculty meetings, which para-
doxically resulted in excluding the faculty from most of the workaday decisions that actually steered the school.) Most important perhaps, it was during this presidency that the Middletown banker was brought onto the college board of trustees and encouraged to help keep the prison involvement going. In looking for a more conventional style of leadership the college selected an alumnus of Wilmington College, a Trustee of the college, a retired public school superintendent...and a non-Quaker.

To this point the college prison activities had not grown beyond the initial ten courses per year and had often dwindled to one or two each term. For the most part, the courses offered represented "basic" subjects: introductory courses in social/psychological sciences, economics, English composition, history, religion and philosophy. Major determinants for the size and content of offerings were time, space and faculty availability. Daytime courses had to compete with existing high school and technical offerings by prison education staff; evening courses faced the continual problem of security supervision as sections of the prison closed at the end of the first shift -- 2:30 or 3 PM. The former problem was never to be successfully solved; the latter partially resolved by opening classes to correctional officers. This particular resolution created as many problems as it relieved. Different ability levels between
guards and inmates, the conventional competition of the classroom, the unique attraction of non-prison, often female, faculty, and the everpresent tension between the keepers and the kept were a volatile and unpredictable mix. Classes were consciously planned with facesaving elements for officers confronted with inmates who took special delight in out-performing them. "Bright" inmates were often the object of special attention by officers outside of class and the tense atmosphere carried over into the classroom. Awkward situations were created for instructors who had to rely on cooperation from guards in order for their classes to be offered, and guards who would exert pressure for an adequate grade in order to please their supervisor and prove themselves to inmates.

The inmate students presented a broad range of abilities. The fact that they were selected from a pool of inmates recommended by treatment staff and approved by the security officers in the classification process attested to the non-academic factors involved in enrollment; inmate abilities rewarded in this process were more often persistence and knowledge of the system than academic potential. These students tended to be the more innovative and aggressive inmates and in many ways the more troublesome residents in the institution. Because the program was small, enrollment limited, and faculty involvement still
more "anecdotal" than routine in nature, a few individual inmate students would emerge each year as "stars" or recipients of Pygmalion efforts of college staff. A handful of the inmate students participating in these early years transferred to the main campus upon release and coasted for awhile on the special attention and assistance ascribed to their status. Although a few faculty gave themselves particular credit for "giving them a chance" and "turning them around", none of these episodes was remarkably successful and a few were disastrous.

The Community Service Years: 1975-1979

With the change to a third president overseeing this prison involvement, the college itself had begun to reflect a different set of values. No longer encumbered by consensual decision-making and broad college representation, policy, program and budgetary decisions were more forthrightly made and evidenced the more streamlined, consistent qualities more characteristic of executives than of committees. Program heads reported directly to the president, instead of the combined faculty and staff. The president, in turn, made decisions with the advice of a small core of top administrators and the review of a smaller group of college trustees. Relieved of responsibilities for the direction of
the school, the faculty devoted their time to their classrooms, increasingly unaware of policies and decisions which did not affect their day to day teaching environment.

With his public school background, the new president brought a new mission to the school: to repair the local community ties damaged by the rebellious, liberal image created by students and programs of the previous decade. Once intentionally seeking a broad mix of domestic and international multiethnicity, the college recruitment process now focused just as consciously on serving the local community and drew students from a thirty mile radius of campus. The persistence of the school's old image in concert with this new regional emphasis resulted in strikingly low enrollment, frozen budgets and deficit financial statements. The initial priorities of this presidency were to survive and to change the bottom line from red to black, while still honoring the perceived mandate of returning the college to a regional service focus.

Two factors, unrelated to each other and external to both campus and prison administrative activities, came together to bring the potential for dramatic change in the college involvement in prison education. In 1973 a few prisons had tapped federal tuition assistance grants for inmate students; by 1975 the knowledge of that funding source and the comparable Ohio program of tuition assistance
had made the rounds of Ohio's prisons with postsecondary offerings. At about the same time, a suit brought against the Ohio Department of Corrections by the Franklin County prosecutor, resulting from crimes committed by inmates attending school on limited release and furlough, caused the state prison system to dramatically cut its liabilities by virtually eliminating such programs. At Lebanon these programs had been so fully utilized that a fulltime security officer/bus driver had been employed to ferry participating inmates to their various work and educational assignments in the surrounding communities. At virtually the same time, the prison had a large number of inmates idled by this cutback and a potential source of funding for inmate educational programs it could only tap via an accredited college or university.

With the Middletown banker again acting as matchmaker, the prison educational administrator approached the college in the Spring of 1975 about expanding the educational involvement to a fulltime degree-granting program. In addition to information about the financial aid breakthroughs, they brought policy changes at both the state and institutional levels that would make possible the assignment of inmates to college as a fulltime job and a willingness to assign adequate space and time allocations to college programming.
The college response was not immediate; a firm decision to expand was not made until mid-summer of 1975 and a staffing decision was not made until late August -- just days ahead of deadlines for application for both the federal and Ohio tuition assistance programs that were to actually pay for the instruction. Ultimately however, the possibilities for increasing enrollment practically overnight and tapping into new federal and state tuition money moved the president of the college to declare an "experimental program" and to hire a director. With earlier, less momentous decisions on this program as a guide, it is likely that consulting the faculty and aligning consensus on this new degree program would have prolonged this decision by at least six months and the opportunity would likely have been given to another school. As it was, this president did not feel so constrained, nor did faculty even comment on the decisions involved.

The administrator chosen to implement and direct this program had instituted major individualized student service and academic programs for the former president and was generally received as controversially as were these programs and the former president himself. Seen variously as a "meatball", an opportunist, and an entrepreneur by the campus community, he nevertheless had the record of accomplishment the new president sought, had taught at the prison and
was acceptable to the prison staff and the Middletown banker who the president saw as essential to the future of the program. In this case a staffing decision was made by the president -- his first in office -- that would likely never have been made by campus faculty.

The mandate given to the new director by the president was to the point: "Set up and run a two-year degree program in the prison, see to it that it breaks even the first year and don't bother me with the details. Work with a faculty committee if you want, but you will be evaluated on results." In late August of 1975, with no approved curriculum, no faculty or staff, no students, no books and no support system, his job was to open the "doors" of a college program by mid-September.

Enrollment for this first quarter of this program was eighty-nine students spread over fourteen courses. This was not a "creamed" group, in the conventional sense at least. With little start-up time and no precedents for enrolling inmates in a full-time degree program, and with a high school degree or its equivalent as the sole academic requirement, the initial recruits were inmates not then assigned to any job or educational program -- the drop-outs of the prison community itself. These were inmates rejected by their work supervisors as troublesome and difficult, those who could not or would not get along with other inmates.
For a variety of reasons — largely lack of anything better to do — many of them decided to "check out" the newest game in town, college.

At the end of one year the enrollment had grown to 141 fulltime students and the program had done better than break even: it had shown a $91,000 margin beyond all direct costs, including those for a summer term for which no financial aid was available. At the end of this first year, the director was assisted by a part-time secretary and advised by a five-member faculty advisory council. The course offerings were beginning to take the shape of an academic program and plans for this growth were increasingly comprehensive and ambitious. A proposal to the Ohio Board of Regents was developed to request certification to offer associates degrees in three areas: social science and service, business administration, and math/computer science. Later a fourth program was added in industrial technology. Approval for these degrees was granted prior to the program's first graduation ceremony in the fall quarter of 1977.

In 1977 a new component was added to the curriculum, one intended to address the "extra-academic" skills felt by some of the program staff to be important for successful reintegration after release and even more valuable for encouraging more complete participation in the college program while incarcerated. This component included peer inter-
action/confrontation training based on transactional analysis and gestalt therapy training, and an introspective career/life planning course. These respective elements had been designed in consultation with the Queen City Transactional Analysis Group in Cincinnati and Richard Bolles of the National Career Development Project of the United Ministries in Higher Education. The name selected for this component, Project Talents, was derived from the biblical "parable of the talents" (Matthew 25:14-27), exhorting the responsible use of individual resources. By 1978 Project Talents had become the name for the whole college program.

Faculty

Academic faculty were hired to teach for this program on part-time contracts, usually as a supplement to their normal teaching load. At first, full-time campus faculty made up the bulk of faculty at the prison, but soon the demand far outstripped their availability and recruitment was expanded to include faculty from nearby schools as well as practitioners from various service fields, business and industry who had the requisite degrees. Over the objections of on-campus faculty, correctional institution staff were used to teach as often as curriculum needs and their credentials allowed. As procedures became routinized and program
staff gained some control over its in-house operations, attention was given to incorporating the program into the routine of the prison.

Students

The initial image of the program as a hang-out for "bikers", "dopers" and "troublemakers" gradually began to change, largely in response to initiatives by the program staff to do their own recruiting. At first, inmates were selected into the program by prison staff and the program director was dependent on them for informing and recruiting inmates, processing necessary paperwork, getting the requisite permissions from the classification committee, and all the other institutional procedures associated with job transfer. With more staff, the college program began their own information/recruitment meetings with new inmates coming into the institution. While other college programs in Ohio prisons resisted the financial aid application process and the accumulation of veterans and educational certifications necessary for college admissions, Project Talents found that doing these things relieved an area of tension with institutional staff and eliminated "soft" places in the recruitment/enrollment process. Taking over these procedures allowed the program more control over enrollment by speeding
up the conversion of applicants to eligible students. This more broadly based recruiting effort also began to diffuse the influence of the inmate cliques and administrative selectivity on the kinds of inmates entering the program. The only avenue left open for prison staff to control enrollment was the rate at which they administered GED and other academic assessment tests which were prerequisites for enrollment. It was not unusual then to find these tests either not scheduled (for "lack of sufficient numbers") or scheduled after college deadlines had passed (for "lack of space" or "time" for testing.)

A watershed was achieved when the enrollment passed 200 full-time students. Two hundred was the capacity of one of the smaller cell blocks at Lebanon. At that point it made institutional sense to house all of the college students, except those with merit status and living on the merit block, in one block for ease of movement to and from the school area. Until this point, a major problem had been the institutional management and logistic complexities of getting inmates from many different areas of the prison to the school area at the same time. The physical layout of the prison and the supervisory style of the prison administration together required that inmates be moved in long marching lines to meals, laundry, commissary, recreation, work, and other activities. Many inmates never made it to
class as they were caught up in movement to some other area of the prison, or their block officer refused to honor an unfamiliar pass, or the particulars other work assignments held by the majority of inmates on other blocks dictated cellblock timetables or procedures that conflicted with the college schedule. All unusual inmate movement and other activities and procedures that lay outside regular operations were announced over the institutional paging system. This was often difficult to hear because these pages were invariably at times of inmate mass movement and changes in prison personnel shifts; also, as these "exceptions" became more numerous, they became irritants and were often put aside for other administrative transactions. With the advent of the "college block" (inmates began referring to it as their dorm), all college students could get to early meals and be moved en mass to their school assignment area.

The inmate student population was not only becoming significant in terms of numbers, its institutional demographic make-up was also taking on special characteristics. Many of these students had been in the program long enough to acquire the status of "upperclassmen" and a student subculture began to emerge. Outward signs included student newspaper, basketball and softball teams (wearing school colors and adopting a school name), a student senate, a debate team, and students who had earned honors and Dean's
List recognition. Student leaders took responsibility for orienting new students and monitoring the halls, classrooms and restroom facilities to prevent incidents. In short, they assumed responsibility for establishing and maintaining a "reputation" for the program.

The curriculum was expanded to respond to the current emphases on educational relevance. On campus, students were demanding practical applications and assurances of employment opportunities when they graduated. The college responded with career personnel, internship programs, co-op opportunities, and seminars in career planning.

For the inmate student, the pressure to make schooling relevant to employment, indeed to his life, was an immediate concern. While many of these students were not the first in their families to go to prison, most were the first to even think of going to college. These students had little perspective from which to "plan a career," especially since college had not been one of the ingredients in their life story. The program initially responded to this need by requiring the two courses of the original "Project Talents" component of all students. While there were some raised eyebrows on campus for mandatory requirement of such non-traditional courses, the full endorsement of the chairman of the psychology department, a former prison psychologist, put complaints to rest. Soon these classes were supplemented by
career nights several times each quarter when outside guests representing business, industry, and service careers were invited in to meet inmates and discuss careers with them. By relying on volunteers, expenses were kept down, but the administrative time it took to recruit and organize these in-prison visitations made these difficult activities to sustain.

Staff

The staff gradually increased: an assistant was added along with several program coordinators who supervised the evening activities and served as liaisons with the institution, a half-time researcher and program developer, and several support staff. The director continued to spend the majority of his time overseeing every operation from transporting books and equipment to enrolling students and teaching classes. While classes were in session, staff responsibilities included maintaining all security procedures, authorizing inmate movement to and from the school area, responding to any disciplinary problems, advising and counseling students, assisting faculty with equipment and instructional material, escorting visitors in and out of the prison, keeping relationships smooth with custody staff, tracking down missing students, and heading off any major
problems. It was a demanding job and the added knowledge that any incident that reflected slackness could jeopardize the program made it a stressful one even when things were going smoothly.

Physical Facilities

College classes were held in the rooms that housed the basic education and high school classes during the day. Since college enrollment was much higher, classrooms were crowded and inmate movement in the area between classes became a constant source of problems. In particular, the inmate restrooms were insufficient for the large number of students so there was a constant flow of inmates leaving classes for the restrooms. Since restrooms became the ideal location for a variety of "deals," altercations, and other transactions, these facilities became areas staff members had to constantly patrol.

High school teachers used their rooms as offices during their working day; often they decorated their rooms with personal items or inmate projects. Understandably, these teachers felt their territory was being invaded by teachers and inmates who left their rooms dirty, in disarray or, at least not as they had left them. When inmates urinated in the personal rock collection of an unpopular high school
science teacher, the college students were blamed, although it was later proved to be the act of high school students. Angry, often hostile notes, were passed back and forth between high school/basic education and college teachers. Eventually, in return for physical improvements in several classrooms, the purchase of equipment and furniture for joint use by high school, basic education and college, and the designing of special remedial courses in which additional prison personnel were qualified to teach, the prison education administration pressured the transfer office to assign a porter to the school area to see that classrooms were cleaned after evening use.

In some ways, this particular arrangement was a breakthrough. By using space that would otherwise go unused at night the Projects Talents program set a precedent for "intensive programming," i.e. making multiple uses of space that would normally be occupied for only one shift. Another precedent, never formally acknowledged, was the practice of letting Project Talents personnel assume responsibility for supervision and control over what was essentially an inmate work assignment. The fact that it was the largest single inmate work assignment in the institution, indeed, in the Ohio correctional system was also underplayed.
Relations with the Prison

To say the Project Talents program was accepted into prison routine would be accurate but not complete. As long as the Project Talents staff relied on prison staff for information, instruction and authority, the relationship was one that could be controlled. Just the passage of time, however, brought a level of expertise and familiarity with the prison that made program staff more independent and thus players to be reckoned with. Increasingly, the program staff had to make their own way, often aware that they were the brunt of "gotcha" games and set-ups which would illustrate that they were really outsiders after all. Instruction into the culture of the prison did not come from fellow professionals and colleagues, but from inmate students who patiently and inobtrusively instructed their teachers and supervisors in the subtleties of prison administration.

The increasing competence of the staff drew mixed reviews. Prison staff appreciated the efforts that went into organizing and administering this large and complex program. The program record of no incidents and the accuracy of its system for tracking inmates began to exceed the capacities of other prison programs, however, and brought as much resentment as acceptance. In due time, prison staff began to rely on Project Talents staff to provide them with data
for inmate files and check the college records of inmate movement and participation against their own.

The "outsider" status of college personnel was exemplified by a new prison dress code prohibiting the wearing of blue jeans inside the prison. Specifically aimed at college personnel, for whom jeans were the accepted campus uniform, the dress code was used as a reason to turn away professors, visitors, and program guests who showed up for class in the forbidden dress. Minimally, the offending party could expect an extended wait in the outer lobby while guards went through exaggerated clearance procedures to allow them to enter the prison. Ostensibly, the reason was to facilitate distinguishing civilians from inmates, who wore blue denim uniforms. However, that female staff were not allowed to wear jean slacks or skirts, and that this policy did not apply to prison staff stretched the credibility of this rationale.

Daily irritations were the rule: finding a room reserved for registering one hundred inmates being used for a staff meeting; discovering requests for inmate passes still sitting on the secretary's desk; keys that were not available or authorizations that were not cleared. Although the superintendent of the prison had given the program his full support, this did not always translate into facilitating the day-to-day business of running a program nor was it evi-
enced in the practices of the staff who turned the keys.

One approach for easing the tensions caused by the outsider status was for Project Talents staff to spend more time in the institution, essentially just "hanging out." Some staff joined in the intramural sports competition among institutional staff, went out for beer after work and generally tried to establish friendly, social relationships.

Other initiatives came in the form of programmatic responses. "Free college for convicts" was deeply resented by many correctional staff who reasoned vocally that they could not themselves afford an education nor provide one for their families. Project Talents responded to this by developing credit-bearing courses specifically designed for correctional personnel, offering them at the prison and scheduling them through the office of the superintendent to facilitate staff participation. The college agreed to a special tuition rate of roughly one-half the campus rate (on the condition that the program make up the difference by increasing commensurately the margin of income over costs) and the program director and the everpresent Middletown banker arranged through a philanthropic foundation for scholarship grants for any who did not qualify for federal or state tuition support.

Although this program became a minor drain on the overall budget, it was agreed that the benefits in improved
relationships far outweighed the costs. Within a couple of years, it had grown into a B.A. program in criminal justice and students from campus were invited to the prison where they could participate in these classes. Of all the program components, the prison superintendent had special praise for this effort and recognized it as a contribution to the entire institution. His practice of rewarding graduates with promotions did not go unnoticed by other correctional personnel.

The other program policy of hiring educational and social service staff to teach courses for the college also allowed the program to selectively reward cooperative staff by bringing them some prestige, not to mention additional income. This policy was also helpful in creating good relations and positive feelings about the Project Talents program.

The Organizational Structure of the Program

Advisory Structure: On campus, Project Talents was referred to as simply "the prison program." To a large extent, it was out of sight, out of mind. Occasionally, faculty would remind the director that they had ultimate authority over matters related to curriculum and faculty hiring, but they were more than willing to leave the administrative details
of the program up to him. Consequently, the program director borrowed a chapter from the college president's book and gave deference to faculty control but organized hiring and other academic procedures with efficiency or administration and effective prison teaching the primary characteristics. As a matter of policy, prospective faculty members were asked to meet with their campus counterparts who made recommendations for hiring. Once they had passed through this procedure however, they were used freely for subsequent teaching without additional direct faculty review. Each term the curriculum and contracted faculty lists were faithfully circulated with elaborate requests for feedback -- a process that virtually guaranteed that there would be none. A Governance Board was created which included the president of the college and his top advisory staff: the college dean, business manager, development director, the chairman of the Board of Trustees and the chairman of the trustee oversight committee, and the director of the program. Their primary concern was "bottom line" though they were also influential in determining program directions.

Administratively, the program was becoming more complex and falling into several distinct areas of responsibility. From the Governance Committee the director received permission to promote several people to responsibilities over major program areas.
Budget and Operations: A different calendar year (four full-time terms), a different degree program, a different faculty contract, and the necessity of developing procedures that dovetailed with the prison administration, all led the Project Talents staff to develop their own set of books, tracking procedures and business forms. The staff took all responsibility for processing students through enrollment and financial aid applications, planning course schedules, hiring faculty, ordering and distributing books, paying invoices, keeping student records and so forth. All movement in and out of the prison, all program activities, and all supplies and equipment, were checked through the director of this area. Her staff consisted of an assistant, two secretaries, and three to four inmate clerks. Officially, this person was the liaison between the two institutions and the coordinator of all levels of program activities, from issuing inmate passes to planning and staging graduation ceremonies.

The need to be accountable to the college, the prison, state and federal agencies which administered financial aid, and the various sources of private donors, made it necessary to design data trails and devise accounting procedures that would ensure elaborate and accurate record keeping. With little effort, a report could be generated detailing exactly how much a particular aspect of programming cost, where the
money came from, and how it was spent. The tracking procedures of this division became so sophisticated that both college and prison personnel used it as a source of information for their own bookkeeping. In particular, this director gained a reputation for detail and for her ability to project an accurate budget. This division had the effect of making Project Talents a college within a college.

Academic Program: Since initially the entire program was the academic program, the history of the program for the first two years is the history of the academic component. As the entire program grew beyond this single component however, this academic unit began to assume more tangible boundaries. The director of this area supervised four academic supervisors, termed "honchos", who were in turn responsible for administering all aspects of the academic programming. Recruiting, interviewing and hiring faculty, selecting books for ordering by the budget and operations staff, selecting courses and organizing schedules to assure, the integrity of a regular curriculum cycle, providing academic and financial aid advisement, generating the standard academic paperwork -- catalogs, student and faculty handbooks, etc. -- and keeping order in the classroom area during the evening hours constituted the majority of their responsibilities. During the day, these people were the
"presence" of the program in the institution as they met with students for academic counseling and represented the program with prison staff.

Research and Development: The central purpose of this division was to continually monitor the program, assess effectiveness of program components and suggest ways the program might respond to identified need areas. Interviews with inmates were conducted on a regular basis beginning with "newboys" and continuing through return to community living. A particular concern of this research was how released inmates were using their college experience to help them readjust. A study on the experiences of inmates in finding and keeping employment led to a proposal to CETA for beginning employment readiness inside the institution. Increasing awareness of the interrelatedness of employment with other personal problems concerning families, alcohol, drugs, indebtedness, health and continuing legal entanglements, led to a subsequent proposal for developing a broad network of community supports which would provide resources inmates could draw upon both during and after incarceration. These efforts were successful, bringing almost one million dollars of funding into the program, offsetting the dozens of proposals and grants that had been turned down along the way.
In addition to the development of new programs, this division was responsible for representing the program to the various publics interested in it. Presentations were made to social, civic, religious, and governmental and service agencies. Brochures, slide shows, newsletters and other promotional materials were developed to put a face on the program and generate interest in its activities and in the participants. An unintended audience of these promotional activities grew out of interest from student/inmate families. With the help of the Dayton office of the American Friends Service Committee, a Quaker service organization, a support group for offender families grew up in the two large metropolitan areas near the prison. Other activities growing out of identified need areas included a co-sponsorship with Man-to-Man/Woman-to-Woman Associates of Ohio to provide diagnostic testing and tutoring for inmates with learning disabilities and major efforts to link up education and training programs with prison industry.

Over-all Program: The elaborateness of the over-all program, the expanding size of the staff, the increasing autonomy and remoteness and "differentness" of the activities from conventional campus operations, all led to an increasingly separate identity. With this separation from most on-campus functions came the freedom to develop a
program that was responsive to the needs of its students and that had the kind of integrity most programs can never achieve having been passed through several layers of committee decisions. With this also came some antagonism from those on campus who resented the program's growing influence and who sought to limit its growth and "put the program in its place." Generally this translated into inadequate office place, extraordinary demands on staff to put in a full day on campus in addition to their night-time duties, little support from other college offices, and the exclusion of program staff from faculty meetings, even though most held faculty rank and were active teachers.

The saving grace was money. With large enrollments of inmate students for whom full tuition was charged, virtually no capital expenses, and an efficient non-tenured staff, the program was realizing profit margins close to one half million dollars a year. It was generally acknowledged, begrudgingly, that the school was staying afloat by virtue of the Project Talents program. At first an experimental program merely expected to break even, it was now expected to make enough profit margin to offset the deficits incurred in the on-campus operations. For Project Talents, this meant finding supplemental income to support the expanding base of the program and to provide the range of follow-up and support services that gave the program coherence and
made it appropriate for the needs of its inmate students (Young 1980).

The Partnership Years: 1979-1983

Community awareness of the program was growing. In the course of a year over fifty different faculty members from a broad geographic area were teaching in the program. Volunteers brought yet another sector of the community into contact with the prison. Attention was being drawn to what happened to these inmate/students as they left the institution. Former inmates themselves attested to the need for transitional skills in resuming community living, particularly as they sought work, attempted to continue their education, and reestablish themselves with their families.

Under the "community partnership" mission which had become the hallmark of this president's administration, the director moved away from hands-on responsibility of running the program and began developing sources of funding for non-tuition-bearing program components: churches and private foundations were tapped for resources to expand the library and supplemental teaching aids; government monies in the form of CETA grants were sought to develop training seminars and workshops in career development and job-seeking skills; a large and prestigious local industry was approached with a
proposal to begin building community networks that would support ex-offenders in their efforts to rebuild another lifestyle once outside prison. The director and several members of the staff began a two-year intensive campaign of public appearances, speeches, and presentations and proposal and grant applications. In this two year period, over one million dollars was raised for programs that focused on targeting and delivering training programs in life coping skills, employment readiness and reintegration into the community.

The size and complexity of the program was now drawing national attention. The Chairman of the National Chamber of Commerce referred to it in his speeches; then Presidential advisor and later U. S. Attorney General Edwin Meese was advised of the program by some of its corporate supporters. In the eyes of many it had become a "model" program, exemplifying qualities that few programs had been able to achieve: size, longevity, complexity, strong integration of key support constituencies and financial profitability.

Ironically, in these accomplishments the seeds for failure had been sown.

The Project Enterprise Program (1981-1983)

The newest addition to the program as a result of the
expanded resource base was called Project Enterprise, a blatant and intentional attempt to snare some of the "privatization" momentum of the Reagan administration. This program emerged directly out of a research and development project which tracked inmates from the beginning of their incarceration through reintegration into the community. Particular need areas had been identified and projected into a program that provided training, resources, counseling, and personal support at times during incarceration and reintegration when those services would be most needed and most well received. The staff rapidly expanded to provide this program, and additional space was set aside in the prison to accommodate the daytime program activities.

Building on the theme of "private sector initiatives" which had been popularized in the recent presidential campaign of Ronald Reagan, this program stressed the partnership between education, prison and the broader community; it also tailgated on the "do more with less" theme by emphasizing careful targeting of resources at critical points in inmates' transitions. Behind the tangibility of the program components, lay the more abstracted assumption that reintegration into community living was a two way process, one that would ultimately require the active participation of community members. Simply signing the private sector leaders on in this effort, for whatever reason, and
winning their part ownership of the problem was seen as first vital step.

For the inmate's part, he was expected to take charge of his own reintegration by actively planning and practicing the skills needed upon release while he was still in prison. The format of the program called for the inmate to begin building an educational/work history while in prison, and using the resources of the prison community in developing a plan for investing his time while he was doing his time.

Sequential training seminars were supplemented with ongoing enrichment programs that brought guest speakers on various topical issues — finance, health, family problems, conflict resolution, and job market opportunities, for example. The idea was to keep inmates in touch with outside communities as well as to begin developing contacts and resources they could tap into once released. Work assignments in prison were taken seriously and inmates were encouraged to use them to develop work habits and good relationships, even if they were not learning transferable skills. As the inmate approached his parole hearing, Project Enterprise staff helped him document his accomplishments while in prison and compile a "portfolio" to use while seeking work on the outside. For those who made parole, a next "pre-release" component was sandwiched in with the institutional responses to this new status (large-
ly, assignment to outside gang work activity.) For those who failed to make parole, a special support group was formed to provide direction and a safe environment for "venting" emotions.

The key to tying together these varied sets of activities was an individualized plan prepared by the inmate with assistance and counsel from staff. The intent was to actively engage the inmate in directing those aspects of his incarceration he could control. For most inmates, the prison is a total institution which takes over and controls almost every aspect of their lives. Having made bad decisions in the past, the inmate is prevented from making any decisions at all. Typically an inmate responds to this lack of control over his life by becoming totally dependent upon the institution and by creating "spheres of influence" through manipulation, threat, blackmail, and I.O.U.'s.

The individualized plan was an attempt to reverse this process of infantilization by demonstrating areas in which the inmate could take charge and use his incarceration to benefit him. At the very least, it was intended to allow the inmate to impose a sense of order and progression, albeit his own (of all things!), to the chaotic and empty experience of "doing time." It appeared to many staff that the sense of making progress and achieving goals while still in prison was a potential for many inmates and, when accom-
plished, brought about a striking difference in their view of and approach to their world (Brown 1952).

For the college, this new source of money brought in additional budget relief both in overhead expenses and salary compensations. Profit margins were now approaching three quarters of a million annually. People half jokingly referred to the Project Talents program as "the tail wagging the dog." Announcement of a major grant from a private industry foundation changed critical charges of "empire building" to acknowledgements of "the empire strikes back," playing on the title of a popular science-fiction movie released at that time.

However, this increasing dependency of the college on the Project Talents/Project Enterprise program was a source of growing concern for the director and the trustee representative, and to a lesser extent, the president. Congressional attention was being drawn to proprietary programs that exploited public funds not specifically intended for use by inmate/students and then using those funds to line their own coffers. Prior to this development, in 1980, the director included in his report to the Governance Committee a request for the college to evidence a deeper level of support for the Project Talents program (Young 1980). Specifically, he requested:

1. A policy for returning a portion of the 111% profit margin back into the program itself;
2. An acknowledgement of the tenuous and precarious nature of funding for post-secondary programs in prison which could result in their being withdrawn altogether;

3. A statement which incorporated the Project Talents program into the overall stated mission of the college;

4. More professional recognition of the expertise and contributions of the staff to correctional education.

For the prison, this new initiative brought a degree of public attention that was viewed with uneasiness and skepticism by the superintendent, ever conscious of public perceptions and criticism for "coddling" inmates. Though prior agreements had been made for accommodating the Project Enterprise program in the former medical experiments block, closed by constitutional questions about this activity, this had only been done by making concessions with the education and treatment staff to have access to the same space. The differing needs of these three programs competing for time, space and access to inmates caused much of the ever-present latent friction to erupt in "personality" problems and symbol-laden contests over who would be allowed to carry the key ring. Under the pretense of "security measures", Project Enterprise staff were subject to spot checks by guards, their desks and files were searched at night, and they were required to get both permission from Central Control and a guard escort before they could walk the corridors to and
from their offices.

The balance of power between the prison and the college, with specific reference to the Project Talents/Project Enterprise program had been upset. The entry of private business and public agency support in the form of considerable money created new forces with which to contend. With the money came compliance standards as well as goals and objectives which were not only not within the control of the original hosts, but represented basically different kinds of expectations of the program.

To further complicate the picture, soon after it awarded the grant the private industry sponsor saw its fortunes change and was confronted with the necessity of closing down plants and laying off of workers. Wary of attention being drawn to the thousands of dollars being given inmates while their own employees joined welfare lines, they began backing away from the intention of the program for building community awareness and support structures. The other major sponsor of non-academic programming in the program, the Comprehensive Employment Training Administration (CETA), also proved not to be immune to forces of the political and economic marketplaces. A federal program which entitled the poor for training and subsidized employment, much as federal and state financial aid entitled college students, CETA fell victim to the new standards of lessening federal involvement
and greater local control of assistance monies. CETA and most especially the state offices of special grants, under which Project Enterprise was funded, were scheduled for dismantling. In their place was put a program aimed at "re-treading and re-tooling" workers who, as the explanation went, had been displaced by technology. Notably absent in the legislation and statutory guidelines for this new Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) were set-aside monies for incarcerates, service delivery areas that included prison, and functional equivalents to the CETA Special Grants Office which targeted the various invisible minorities overlooked by the politics of local allocation of funds.

In many ways and seemingly all at once, the Project Talents/Project Enterprise program was testing the limits of acceptability on the part of all its hosts: the college community, the prison community, private industry and public services. In part because of these factors, but for other reasons as well, Project Enterprise drew criticism from Project Talents staff. The combined Project Talents/Project Enterprise program had become increasingly broad in its effort to create a "community" within the prison, but the attention given to these expanded "non-tuition" programs generated an air of competition between the "academic" and "non-academic" programs. This was heightened by a variety of, at best, tangential factors; for example, the total
program had grown so large that it had to be split into two buildings on campus, just as it had two separate locations in prison. The two programs had dramatically different daily work schedules in response to both space availability and the particular groups of inmates and institutional staff with which they worked. Also, the various twists and turns of the fiscal fortunes of the funding bases for the various components had made staff very conscious of the particular sources of their paychecks.

Ironically, as threat was perceived, the academic staff reacted to this "new" program much as prison staff had responded to the newly emerging college program. It appeared the program that had been enthusiastically hailed as a "major breakthrough" and a key ingredient for integrating inmate educational and training services, was going to be subverted by its own sponsors, or perhaps the structure of its sponsorship. In either case, this program provided the focal point for an emerging contest of power and authority.

In anticipation of this problem, both the program director and the chairman of the college trustee oversight committee (the Middletown banker) for the program had begun laying the groundwork for setting up a separate Board of Directors which would oversee the integrity of the combined Project Talents/Project Enterprise programs (Project Talents
By including representatives from the various "partners" they hoped to provide a format for solving issues related to turf and control without disrupting the flow of programming. This met with the approval of the college president who went so far as to turn supervision of the project director over to this new board of directors, with day-to-day reporting to be done to both the president and the board chairman. The college board of trustees generally endorsed this, although without much deep consideration. Discussion was also beginning to emerge about the possibility of separate incorporation of the Project Talents/Project Enterprise program under the umbrella of college ownership. This would put a step or two between the periodic financial emergencies of the college and the program's margin, but retain the special relationship between the college and its historic involvement in prison (Project Talents Advisory Board 1983).

In a broader context, this period also showed some glimmer of what appeared to be the emergence of a national movement toward the kind of multi-sector partnership sought by the Project Talents/Project Enterprise leadership. The Correctional Education Association, headquartered in Washington, had enlisted several of the program staff to participate in congressional hearings on new set-aside monies for educational/industry efforts in the national
prisons. The staff of Senator Arlen Specter requested information and suggestions from the Project Talents/Project Enterprise research division on what was to eventually become the ill-fated Lorton initiative. The CAPE program, a kindred effort on the West Coast hosted a delegation from the Project Talents/Project Enterprise Advisory Board to look at cooperative components in San Jose and Los Angeles. An initial, very tentative suggestion was made by the superintendent of the prison that the program director meet with the director of the Ohio correctional industries program to investigate possible areas for collaborative effort. Although these many "leads" called for a few program staff to invest substantial time and energy with little promised, they were seen to be an opportunity to build some entity outside the program's immediate world to which staff could point as a model of some sort.

Before this model could be established or the stronger, separately incorporated Project Talents/Project Enterprise Board could be formed however, the president of the college announced his retirement and all considerations by the college Board of Trustees were put on hold until a new president arrived.
Traditionally, the presidential selection process at Wilmington College involved a broad base of participation by college community members. This time, however, the selection committee, under the direction of a new chairman of the Board of Trustees, met candidates in private. Their eventual selection was an historian, a non-Quaker, with experience in several short (two and three year) administrative assignments. Immediately prior to this appointment, he had been working in development for a private Presbyterian college after being asked by the faculty of that school to step down from his earlier position as academic dean. It would be discovered later that no request was made by the selection committee for recommendations and evaluations from the school of this president's earlier employment.

When the new president arrived on campus, he had not met any representative from the Project Talents/Project Enterprise program nor visited the extensive "campus" that served the incarcerated one-third of the college student body. He also had not met most of the faculty, only a few of the administrators of the college and had not been informed of the college Peace Center mission nor an extensive college/community joint YMCA venture. For whatever reason, the new president disparaged these various cooperative
efforts and the community-building efforts of his predecessor. In public he referred obliquely to Project Talents/Project Enterprise as "that prison program."

At this point a serious illness and major surgery forced the program director to withdraw from active involvement with the program for several months, the first several months of the new president's tenure. In his place, the director of the academic program, one of three director-level staff reporting to the program director, developed a close working relationship with the president, the implications of which would become more clear later.

The earlier work with the college board of trustees to consider separate incorporation and a board of directors signaling the wider partnership envisioned for the program had achieved a commitment by the trustees to return a significant amount of the program's profit margin to programs serving inmates. Although short of their ultimate goals for the program, this was somewhat reassuring for the trustee overseer, the program director and several other key program staff. All felt that the magnitude of the profit margin and the increasing heat from Congress made such movement both ethically and politically necessary. A graduated plan for reducing the extent of the college's profit had been agreed upon with the outgoing president.
The new president made it clear he did not intend to honor this plan. Early in 1983, several months after he began his presidency, he announced his plan to "balance the budget at any cost" through a strategy he characterized as "capitalization." For the Project Talents/Project Enterprise program this meant:

1. As outside grant money ran out for the Project Enterprise programs there would be no effort to replace it;
2. No money for the profit margin would be invested in the program unless it was a "credit-bearing" expense;
3. Programs dependent on grant or foundation support and contracts would be terminated unless staff could take positions elsewhere;
4. Existing grant and foundation money intended for "non-academic" programming would be diverted into academic programming or expenditures benefiting the main campus;
5. Budget and tracking procedures for the combined Project Talents/Project Enterprise program were to be unbundled and merged with on-campus procedures, making it impossible, among other things, to accurately track the extent of the profit margin.

The program director, trustee overseer, budget director and research director voiced their strong concern and disapproval of this plan. Confronted with a "lame-duck" program and the uncertain future of their careers, morale plummeted and discontent rose with Project Enterprise staff.
The president's strategy seemed clearly to be the elimination of opposition to his capitalization plan. As he explained it to the program director, his style was not to fire people nor to wait until their contracts expired, but to "make their lives so miserable they'll have to leave." The dean of the college was the first to go, followed by the directors of development and of planned giving, and finally the former president, who had agreed with the trustees to continue in a fund-raising capacity after his term of presidency. Project Talents/Project Enterprise also received the attentions of the new president.

By the end of 1983, the trustee overseer, the program director, two of the three program area directors answering to the director and another staff member of the Project Enterprise program had resigned under fire. The tactics involved in the process were personal as well as philosophical in nature and a number of careers were severely disrupted.

Organizationally the impact signaled by these changes had even more profound impact on the program than the loss of these particular personalities. The immediate unbundling of financial tracking, obfuscating the cost effectiveness of various components and redlining of components with no immediate financial reward for the college virtually doomed the more unique elements of Project Enterprise. The
replacement of an open-ended research strategy with studies relating only to the academic credit-bearing components of the program eliminated any opportunity to address those structural aspects of the program which might have been replicated with various contents for varied learner groups at different skill levels. The scaling back of the program to a continuing education model effectively stopped exploration of the multi-sector service partnership. And for other members of the program and college communities the lesson of the career plights of those administrators who disagreed with the president was an equally forthright message.

The carnage from these changes was belied by the business-as-usual attitude with which the program resumed its operations and by a new argot which came to typify this administration. "Capitalization" required turning the correctional education efforts of the college into a "profit center." In "normalizing" the program, the focus of operations shifted from the prison to the campus. In a "new policy of open communication" the program's multisector board of directors was disbanded and replaced with a faculty committee advising the president. The ouster of over a dozen top and mid level college and program administrators was referred to as "some turnover in certain areas." In "making the program part of the whole college operation", program budget-tracking procedures were unbundled and the
margin now approaching $1 million each year was absorbed into the college total budget: the campus library was expanded with funds earlier designated for the prison library; staff subsidized by grants intended for inmate services were assigned to on-campus operations; and activity on non-academic program components was reduced. Replacement funds for these expanded components were not sought and when existing monies were expended the components were red-lined and eliminated. The program continues as "Project Talents", in a more narrow and conventional continuing education format; Project Enterprise no longer exists.

Afterword

The last part of this narrative is significantly abbreviated and does not proportionately represent the volume of observational and archival data collected in the final year of direct involvement with this program. Although fuller elaboration and analysis of this period and these materials awaits a subsequent effort, some comment on them here is appropriate.

First, I have synopted these materials to keep the quantity of representation of this period at a scale consistent with that of other periods of the program presented here. Although there are episodes in this final segment in
which I was more actively involved politically and about which I was personally disappointed -- and about which I am not yet sufficiently disinterested to analytically describe -- I propose that what was different here was the complexion, not the structure of what was going on. Second therefore, I have selected levels of interpretation of this period which are in keeping with similar foci of other periods.

Third, I believe the internal tensions and conflicts that emerged within the program staff in this final stage are worthy of further analysis and are not merely incidental to the contextual factors described by this study. To some extent, these internal elements may be characteristic to such contexts. In a chapter aptly entitled "(h)ow to cut your own throat" (1972:17-32), Lyle Schaller presents an uncanny anticipation of the internal administrative decisions made during this period as well as the resulting outcomes. In an interesting study of the "incestuous" nature of organizational and personal behavior in programs cut off from reasonable linkage with their various contexts, William White (1986) also presents insight for further analysis of such internal behavioral parameters.

Finally, the issue of researcher disinterest is not one this study should skirt. Although any successful resolution of that issue for the field, or even this study, is beyond
the scope of this paper, I do address this question in my summary observations of researcher role in the final chapter below.
CHAPTER V

ETHNOGRAPHY: AN EXPLICATION

Introduction

In addition to simply providing a chronicle of an event, ethnography should bring readers close to the ethnographic subject. Clifford Geertz conveys this ambition with a notion borrowed from Gilbert Ryle when he describes ethnography as "an elaborate venture...in 'thick description'" (Geertz 1973:6). For Claude Levi-Strauss, ethnography has the capacity to disclose interior meanings of a cultural event; in a remarkable analogy describing the detail of a lace collar in a painting by Clouet, he compares ethnography with portraiture in its potential for deep insight(Levi-Strauss 1962:22-27). For E. G. Guba, the evaluative use of ethnography has a capacity to "get inside" both a program and its context to describe and explain that program and its consequences in terms of participants' realities and meaning systems (Guba 1978: 11-15).

Attempting more than a simple chronicle of the correctional education program described in the previous chapter
brings an immediate confrontation of the problem at the heart of this study — the contextual matrices for correctional education. With the spatial and temporal boundaries as well as the many affiliations of the program so ambiguous and transitory, where does the phenomenon begin and the context leave off? What are relevant ethnographic data for such a study? Indeed, prior to that, how can an individual datum be sorted and identified when borders are so fuzzy?

At this very basic level of analysis I have chosen two ethnographic methods to merely bring coherent units of observation to the "focal plane" of this study. In response to the issue of kind of data to select, the perspective employed here is one known as "constitutive ethnography" (Mehan 1978, 1979, 1982). A tradition emerging from educational anthropology, this approach focuses on the ways interaction among human groups is organized and the derivative principles by which behaviors and things attain meaning. Similar to ethnomethodological foundations in sociology (Cicourel 1974; Garfinkle 1967) and cross-cultural studies in culture and personality (Wallace 1967:21-29), this ethnographic technique posits the occurrence of more or less shared operating principles which constitute a group's culture. Ward Goodenough operationalizes these ideas somewhat more in his description of culture as a "system of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating and acting"
(Goodenough 1981: 110), a definition to be pursued at greater length in the following chapter.

I address the second of these problems, the "affiliation" of data, their identification as members of particular sets, by the use of a case study approach, in this case a "mini-case study." Donald Campbell, as well as his critics, defend the derivation of multiple qualitative observations from a single, weighty case study (Campbell 1975; McClintock, Brannon and Maynard-Moody 1979; Yin 1981). Additionally, Yin cites this technique for research setting typical of the program studied here:

As a research strategy, the distinguishing characteristic of the case study is that it attempts to examine: (a) a contemporary phenomenon in its real-life context, especially when (b) the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident. (Yin 1981:61)

In a practical sense, the inclusion of ethnographic data into appropriate membership sets, e.g. prison, college, correctional education and so on, is a matter of seeing them as integral parts of a sequence or episode, itself with boundaries "natural" to the ethnography. That there is a circularity of sorts at work here is more a point of interest for me than one of concern; ultimately ethnography, as culture itself, is self-referential.
However, the very seeing of such culturally meaningful sequences and episodes is a problem. From a more limited vantagepoint, many of the behaviors here described are experienced as anomalous, as stray environmental factors or, even more insidious, as "merely" personal troubles. It is from the more extended, multi-role, and multi-contextual involvement of this particular research that these become discrete and meaningful data.

Finally therefore, I am drawing these two methodologies, constitutive ethnography and the mini-case study, together under a methodological umbrella of explication. In the sense that K. L. Koppelman (1979) introduces this research model, I am drawing away to a vantage point sufficiently broad to draw out the regularities of phenomena and context not apparent when experienced on a day-to-day, individual basis. Analogous to remote sensing in geography, this amounts to discerning, then extracting and describing patterns often lost among more commonplace understandings and realities. Although there is no doctrinaire methodology for the deconstructive tradition used as a metaphor for this study, such an explicative model would seem an eminently appropriate first step.

What follows then is a selection of sets of events which are, within themselves, sequential, episodic and meaningful and which characterize or typify dynamics of
interactions at the boundaries of the Project Talents pro-
gram. Although these observational data emerge from the
techniques described and qualified above, their selection is
not random and certainly not without bias. In the sense of
Erickson's reminder, ultimately "all description (and the
inquiry which yields it) is done in terms of a point of
view. The problem is the selection of 'bias' -- or the
theoretical frame -- appropriate to the research problem at
hand" (1979:4).

In addition to the obvious bias and subjectivity of
role described in chapters above and in the final chapter to
follow, the particular intent is to illustrate how endeavors
such as correctional education programs, are socially as-
sembled and organized by participants as they use their
particular ideas and beliefs about what is real and true,
and by their values and notions of what behaviors and things
mean.

Some of these accounts relate exchanges that happened
every day; others are unique to particular occasions where
otherwise implicit meanings and values became explicit.
Together, they convey the many "contexts" of one correc-
tional education program.
The Campus Setting

Wilmington College is a small, liberal arts school owned by a regional branch of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). The campus is located on the edge of Wilmington, Ohio, a small, rural community with a population of about 10,000. Enrollment of the college varied between 550 and 800 students during the period covered by this study. In the 70's, many of these students came from the east and west coasts and Quaker boarding schools and the campus population included 15-20% minority and international students. Toward the end of the decade, recruiting strategies shifted, dramatically emphasizing rural students drawn from the immediate area. Although the school's curriculum is largely traditional liberal arts, there are also applied programs in agriculture, industrial technology and teacher training. The school had a long history of co-operative education and required, service-oriented field terms until the mid-70's when these programs were made optional and then abandoned. Although various Quaker tenets have occasionally been featured in college rhetoric and publications and the school by-laws require that 40% of the board of trustees be Quaker, in recent history the Quaker contingent on campus has rarely been more than 5% of either faculty or students.
The Prison Setting

Lebanon Correctional Institution is a medium security prison in south-western Ohio. Technically considered a reformatory, it houses an average of 2,000 male offenders between the ages of 18 and 30. During the period of this study, all the inmates were serving their first prison sentence on felony convictions but most have records of previous skirmisher with the law. Although almost 80% of the prison's population were incarcerated for violent crimes, and the average length of stay was 19 months, well below the national average sentence served of 45 months. Over the span of this study the sentence length steadily increased.

The prison is built in the "telephone pole" design and began operation in 1962. Inmates were moved en mass from their cellblock area to their daily work assignment, recreation, mess hall, school, and other activities -- an unusual military model for Ohio prisons at the time. Yard recreation was permitted only during warm weather, with all other activities under one roof. Inmates were not allowed outside the institution unless they were on recreation or working on outside workgang assignments, which generally meant that they had already been approved for parole or otherwise had a low security risk rating.
Defining the Program

"College" usually brings to mind a campus -- buildings, landscaped lawns, students milling about, professors conferring over stacks of paper and half empty coffee cups. For the outsider, these things, and others readily imagined, signal "education"; for the insider, they reassure "education"; for the novice, they presage "education." In a surprisingly small fraction of the time spent in higher education do most participants actually hear a lecture, see a grade being given, or observe a paper and lectures being prepared.

Project Talents did not exist on a campus. Although office space was set aside for staff, most of their work took place in prison, at night, far away from the scrutiny and participation of other campus personnel. Except for the "off" hours they spent on campus, Project Talents staff did not access the professional life with which they were the most familiar, nor the rewards and energies that come from sharing experiences with colleagues. For the most part, they were also cut off from participation in committees and other campus meetings which were typically held in late afternoons after Project Talents personnel had departed for prison. Long night hours meant no time for strengthening social bonds with campus co-workers or investing in the com-
munity life of the college.

On campus, there was a need for assurances that the college programs had substance, that personnel were doing their jobs. This posed a problem for Project Talents staff, who were expected to provide the customary reassurances by being on campus doing things with their classrooms, students, teachers, books and all the other tools of their trade -- things for them not even in existence. Removed from the site of their program, which itself did not even "exist" until evening, they were still expected to be in offices by 8 a.m., sit at desks, hold conferences, and produce the memoranda, paper trails, and other impedimentia that would be evidence of their work.

The task for Project Talents staff was to create a program that, for the college, did not exist. Constant attention was devoted to giving the program shape, dimension, events, and faces which would be recognizable to campus staff yet still relate the separate reality of the actual program (whatever that was). On campus, a bulletin board filled with pictures of classes at the prison, Project Talents staff meeting with students, and samples of student projects was displayed outside the president's office (more importantly perhaps, just next to the only men's room in the administration building). Faculty and administrative staff were invited, a few at a time, to be guests for an evening
at prison. The two hours of commuting and the four hours of hectic activity usually exhausted them, but they were dropped off at the campus late at night with a friendly but poignant, "See you in the morning!"

Daytime hours were filled with staff committee meetings; writing up minutes from committee meetings; preparing weekly, monthly, quarterly and yearly reports; and making the rounds of various campus offices. Use of official letterhead, college colors, college notebooks, and college rubber stamps, were all symbolic, if phatic, reminders that this program indeed belonged to the college. Twice each year, graduation ceremonies were occasions for campus dignitaries to come to the prison to invoke "...the power vested..." and perform a symbolic laying on of hands that claimed these wards of the state as their own alumni, albeit at the level of the associate degree, a degree offered by the college only at the prison and not on campus.

The "transubstantiation" of the program from its campus existence to its prison being was accomplished with highly visible rituals. Phone calls to the outpost staff assigned to the prison on a rotating basis confirmed that everything was in place; handcarts carrying books, projectors, office supplies and mail bags were loaded up in the hallways of the administration building. Finally, the official satchel was filled with the necessary paperwork and documents needed to
transact official program business that night. A 'honcho,' the staff member designated to be in charge of activities for that evening, would pick up the official satchel and the program went "on the road."

Space, always a scarce resource in prison, was not available at Lebanon until second shift, when Project Talents was allowed use of what in the daytime was the prison high school/GED program. There were no college classrooms, no college students or teachers until after 3 p.m.; after several years, there was a small space set aside for college-related business. At the appointed time, Project Talents staff were permitted through the gates with handcarts and flatbeds loaded with books, film projectors, stacks of paper, notebooks and brief cases with which they would set up shop in the vacated offices and classrooms of daytime personnel. Inmates were paged from their various cellblocks and work assignments in the prison, faculty would converge on the prison from miles around, and college would begin. At 9:15, the trolleys and flatbeds would again be loaded up and the artifacts of college would be exported until the next day at 3 p.m.

The program, with no home base and no permanency from day to day began to resemble a road show. Most of the day's activities were spent not on educating, but on delivering education: assembling the props and cast, loading them into
vehicles, transporting them forty miles, and reassembling them as a "college" inside a prison. Showtime!

These were one night stands however. Each night the set was struck, loaded up, carted back to campus to await re-creation the next day. Each night was an event which took as much energy as the night before. No momentum built up over time, only the energy of the staff carried the program from one day to the next.

To those on campus, Project Talents staff seemed to spend most of their time making bulletin boards, giving speeches and running around. They did, on campus at least. In spite of all the attention given to presentations of the program, staff would be stopped on campus sidewalks and asked: "Just what is it that you do?" The inability of Project Talents staff to identify themselves with a recognizable product, their unconventional roles in a non-traditional setting, all worked to increase the distance between them and their academic colleagues.

Implementing the Program

"Prison" usually brings to mind lines of inmates in single file, guards checking passes, commands blaring over a loudspeaker, gates slamming shut, keys clinking, and unrelenting sour odors and noise. There are no conversations
here, only instructions; no movement that is not superficially purposive.

Picturing the activities and atmosphere of a college in this setting is more difficult. One might expect a certain amount of tension accompanying any effort to transplant the goings-on of either of these institutions to the context of the other.

In the prison, the absence of the program during daytime hours meant "out of sight, out of mind." One evening as Project Talents staff arrived, baggage in hand, they were informed that a power outage earlier in the day had caused all programs to be shut down while inmates were put on lock-down. Over thirty faculty and staff members were already en route to the prison coming from a seventy mile radius. At this point, there was no way to inform them there would be no college that night. Although a phone call to the campus would have saved hours of preparation and the inconvenience of travel for all these people, no one at the prison had thought to notify Project Talents staff of this disruption in routine.

The need to establish some physical space at the prison became a high priority. Under the informal "letter of agreement" arrangement, there were no obligations to provide office space. As a result of a mutual exchange, the prison agreed to provide a desk in the corner of one of the school
offices from which a program staff member could conduct limited program business during the day. The corner was decorated with college emblems, pictures and brochures, an electric typewriter and a coffee pot. The typewriter, primarily for the unofficial use by prison education staff, bought some favors and also served to display, in an institutional frame of reference, that something official was going on. The coffee pot, kept full at all times with store-bought, rather than institutional, coffee was the hub of conversations and casual passing by — and a valuable source of information of what was going on in the prison. The presence of a Project Talents staff member was a reminder that "college" existed, even if no program was taking place at that time.

Everyday the transformation of space into college had to be accomplished with a minimum of fuss and an eye to keeping prison routines intact. While any operation of this magnitude would be complex, the additional concerns for checking every item and every person for security reasons had the potential for making it a masterpiece of confusion. The program director decided in the earliest stages to take the initiative for assuring that the program met the security standards of the institution. Procedures for checking and double checking all equipment, orienting new faculty members, doing security clearances for guests, and assuming
responsibility for all incidents within the college's area went a long way to relieve guards that their concerns were taken seriously. A faculty member suspected of bringing in contraband was not re-hired; students who caused a disruption in class were dismissed, with due process but dispatch; passes were issued three days ahead of time; inventories were maintained on every piece of equipment and all office supplies down to pencils and erasers.

In many cases the program's attention to security was more strict than that shown by other prison offices. This was due in part to the fact that Project Talents staff consulted with inmate/clerks who not only knew the rules of the book, but added their own understanding of how things worked to alert staff to potential problems. With their expert review and critique of standard operating procedures, the program gained a reputation as a "prison program" par excellence.

Presentations of Self

Erving Goffman notes that "(we) live by inference" (Goffman 1959:3); as we appear before others we try to control the impressions they receive of us and influence them into thinking of us in one way or another. For correctional educators, the role they play is not clearly defined.
Often it depends not so much on what we do as how we do it -- our "style."

Both institutions, college and prison, required employees to conform to the protocols for doing business and the informally agreed-upon qualities that either led a person to "fit in" or not. These informal expectations were for the most part handed down by senior staff who had made it and who offered tips on "how we do things around here." On campus, there was a long tradition of the work ethic, coming in part from the school's Quaker heritage. (An often-repeated joke on campus was that Quakers had come to southern Ohio to do good and, by hard work and thrift, they had done quite well.) The work-study ethic had been a part of the Wilmington College trademark for one hundred years. Staff were expected to work hard, and to look like they were working hard. "Good" employees showed up for work early, took short, hurried lunch breaks, and worked into the night with the lights from their office illuminating both the night and their dedicated efforts. Important decisions were preceded by lengthy memos where positions were outlined and philosophies forged. One-on-one meetings reassured possible opponents that "this was not personal," and compromises were eagerly sought. This modus operandi was difficult for Project Talents staff to achieve as their work day did not allow for the time to cover all bases this way. As they
were leaving in the afternoon for the prison, program staff
would often be met by campus personnel with: "Keeping
bankers' hours, huh?" or "Taking off early again?" For the
staff, having the "right stuff" came to mean doing the
impossible -- working fourteen hour days; seeing who could
work the hardest, go the longest without eating, carry the
heaviest load to the prison, counsel the most inmates, or
process the most financial aid applications.

The prison called for quite a different persona.
State employee expectations counseled "don't rock the boat,""don't work too hard" (people will suspect you're up to
something), "don't take a stand, keep people guessing."
Deals were struck for personal gain; everything and every­
body had a price. People moved ahead as they were adept at
creating networks of obligations by being a "good old boy."
Where it occurred, hard work was given the veneer of "take
it easy," so one did not want to appear too busy, too pushy,
or too committed to anything. To reveal the latter revealed
a soft spot and would undermine a bargaining position.

Having the right stuff in prison also meant knowing how
to establish and maintain face: "Never back down with an
inmate; hold your position even if you're wrong; he's more
wrong or he wouldn't be here." Project Talents staff won
immediate respect from guards, or perhaps merely gave them
fealty, if they developed and demonstrated "hard noses." To
have a guard overhear a staff member dress down an inmate was an ideal situation. Word of the incident would be in the institutional grapevine and the staff member would be honored as a legend would grow in the retelling of it.

Exchanging banter with correctional personnel was more than passing the time of day; it was a test. "Do you really think these scumbags deserve a college education?" Acceptable answer, to a guard, might be: "It's a job." But to an overhearing inmate or fellow educator, as well as to one's own sensibilities, this was rarely sufficient. Interactions with prison staff also called for one to appreciate their particular brand of prison humor. Laughing at homosexual jokes, participating in pranks which made others appear ridiculous, participating in "gotcha" situations, and storytelling at the expense of other staff were all tests of belonging. Through these mechanisms you were either "one of them" or part of some broad category of "outsider."

Favors were granted, concessions made, and doors opened for those who had the "right stuff." It was not just a way to pass the day, it was a way of doing business, getting the job done.

Not surprising, the Project Talents program began to revolve around staff personalities; this had the advantage of identifying who one was, but the disadvantage of locking one into a particular role. Somewhat reluctantly, staff
assumed identities not entirely of their own making. Reputations of being a "hard ass," an "easy make," "good folk," or a "straight arrow," preceded one and, like it or not, often formed the basis of relationships for doing business. Everyone had a reputation. Once that reality was accepted, staff often looked for opportunities to manipulate their image and "stage" an encounter which would establish a reputation or revise an unfavorable one. One female staff member who was soft spoken and "nice" found she was often the object of embarrassing flirtations with inmates as she walked down the halls outside the classrooms. One evening, after practicing ahead of time, she approached an offending inmate and "dressed him down" with a good deal of flourish, facing him out in front of his buddies. In the shocked silence that followed, she nodded at the gathered audience as if to indicate this was a performance but to also to give the message that there was more where that came from.

**Women in a Men's Prison**

Female staff members had a particularly difficult time finding ways to be acceptable in the contexts of the prison, male culture. Soft voices, polite manners, aloofness from bantering, reluctance to take on boisterous inmates were at once their expected behaviors and signals that they could be exploited. Coming on like "one of the guys" was usually
seen as an anemic attempt to be tough. Lack of female role models in the institution added to the dilemma for women of how to act appropriately and get the job done.

In 1978 the prison superintendent had acquiesced to pressure to hire a female correction officer and demonstrate the prison administration's commitment to equal employment hiring practices. Her insistence on being treated just like other guards was taken literally by her supervisors who did not hesitate to assign her duties in the inmate block areas, where she supervised inmates in their daily living routines, including showers, cell check and strip searches. Objections from inmates and her zeal for these duties eventually resulted in her relegation to front desk operations, where she sorted and inspected mail and from time to time operated the key room. (Key room duty meant operating the three sets of gates one had to pass through to get into the prison proper. Everyone entering the institution had to be cleared by the "key man," who could hold people up, refuse to let them enter, or delay their entrance until satisfied that there was no security risk.)

On one evening, this female officer was "key man" while Project Talents faculty and staff were arriving for their evening classes. A female Project Talents staff member who had worked in the prison for several years was passed through two gates where she was stopped by the female offi-
and asked to submit to a search. Although Project Talents staff regularly warned faculty that they could be searched as they entered the prison, it had been a tacit agreement with the institution that the program staff would run a tight ship and would not be hassled at the gate. Proof to date was that no staff member had ever been asked to submit to a search, and the only suspected contraband situation was brought to project staff attention for appropriate action.

The program staff member identified herself with her employee pass, asked why she was being searched, and explained that the delay was preventing her from starting her class on time. The officer demanded her purse as well as the pass and emptied the contents out on her desk. She then told the staff person that her purse and her pass would be kept in the key room and she could pick them up at the end of the evening.

The staff member pointed out that women employees were allowed to carry purses in the institution and stated that she was not going into the prison without her institutional pass. The officer called the shift captain and complained that she had "a problem" and needed assistance with a possible strip search. Not knowing what this "problem" was, the captain and several officers rushed to the gate prepared for the worst. In the meantime, all movement through the gates
had been halted and anxious staff and visitors were backing up in the lobby, peering through the gates.

When the situation was explained, the shift captain said simply "Return her purse and let her pass. I know this lady." Angry at being detained and humiliated by being threatened, in front of prison employees and inmates, with a strip search, the staff member hurried to her class.

One look at her face and the class fell silent. Finally one inmate cautiously raised his hand and said: "We heard about (the female officer)." The class applauded and the staff member was "welcomed to the club." That evening, each student in the class took his turn telling his own story of an encounter with this officer and then the staff member recounted her experience earlier that evening.

As class broke up for the evening, one inmate who had been particularly hostile in the past came up to the woman and said: "I knew that look in your eye when you came in here. It's how everyone of us looks after we've been humiliated or pushed around. You don't ever let them get inside your head. You don't ever let them get past your eyes." Then he put on the reflector sunglasses he always wore and left the classroom.

Long after the female officer was eventually dismissed the staff member would be asked by inmates to tell the story about the incident. The episode seemed to be reassuring to
inmates as it reinforced the "outsider" status of Project Talents staff and aligned them less with institutional personnel and more with inmates.

The Exchange System

In prison everyone keeps a ledger. Carried around in one's head, this is a daily accounting of what is owed and what is paid, what favors are due in the form of support on a particular issue, agreement to overlook or cover up an error, a good word here, a raised eyebrow there. The Project Talents program and the staff it brought into the institution were a wealth of resources. Program staff soon learned that their ability to turn around purchase orders was far faster than the cumbersome state system. Equipment and supplies were among the many things they had to offer in return for space and access to inmates. Early on, the college had "purchased" office space by seeing to it that prison employees were reimbursed with an electronic typewriter "so they can help us type out passes." With each concession made in space, came new equipment: a new reading lab, tapes and headphones, study carrels, new microcomputers and software, telephones, tiles for floors and shades for the classroom windows. More space meant more students, more students meant more money. The college called it an
investment, although expenditures came out of each year's operating budget, not out of the program margin earmarked for the college general fund. The prison administration did not call it anything, since even acknowledging it could compromise their position with the centralized offices to which they were responsible. Both institutions recognized this for what it was however, a quid pro quo with Project Talents staff as the procurer.

Equipment bought space; as important for the program to run smoothly was good will. Undermining a program in prison is easy: passes can be lost, schedules confounded, reserved space double booked, and information not passed on, all with impunity. Acquiring a level of good will was necessary to insure that the program would fit in with prison routines. Here, not in custody, was where the prison exercised ultimate control. The program was allowed to exist to the extent prison personnel were willing. Individual support was encouraged by offering prison staff the opportunity to teach in the program. This had the dual rewards of providing a welcome source of additional income as well as a certain amount of status and prestige by being associated with "college." For those people who were qualified and did a decent job, the benefits were clear. Their assistance in troubleshooting potential problems and providing strategic support accounted for much of the smooth functioning of the
In other cases, this practice raised ethical questions which not only made Project Talents staff members uneasy, but also highlighted the organizational differences between the prison and the college. Occasionally, prison employees teaching for the college in the evening were found "double dipping," — staying on the institutional timeclock while doing work for which they were reimbursed by the college. This did not usually involve additional payment of funds by the prison, but did result in the build-up of compensatory time. When these prison staff were also highly placed correctional education personnel, the situation became awkward. Whose problem was it — the college or the prison? A regular memo from the Project Talents director to the prison superintendent simply listing the names of all prison employees who were teaching and their hours, resolved the organizational obligations, but did little to relieve staff discomfort about being in the middle.

Later, heated debates among Project Talents administrators centered around whether to hire one particular prison employee who used his position to continually undermine the program. His offensive manner with inmates did little to recommend him. To ignore him, however, was certain assurance that the work of the program staff in the institution would be made as difficult as possible. Informally, a prac-
tice emerged of hiring him as a reward for being helpful, or withholding a contract when he insisted on being troublesome. This situation, more than the other decisions to hire prison employees, underscored to program staff the extent to which they themselves were also co-opted by this commodities exchange game.

Competition Between Departments

In addition to potential friction between the program staff and staff in various areas of the prison, it was also necessary to be sensitive to competition among various prison departments. Prison educational staff were offended if more social service personnel got teaching contracts than they and vice versa, although most other departments realized that the education staff would usually receive more of these positions. Some people were off limits for teaching altogether if they were known to be "wimps" or "hot heads." No overture by Project Talents personnel was taken at face value; everything was seen to have deeper implications, whether intended or not. When the guest list was made for graduation ceremonies, it got as much attention as a state dinner. Who made the cake for graduation, the culinary arts class or the kitchen crew, was a major decision carefully reviewed for implications. Letters ex-
pressing appreciation were significant for who was and who was not mentioned. No business was conducted, no decision made that did not pass through these layers of accounting. So pervasive was this practice and so accepted as the medium of exchange, that one was obligated to apologize for a decision that had to comply with some overriding principle or policy, an apology only in proper form when ended by: "I owe you one."

Reports to Campus

Most campus department heads turned in their budget reports and requests for the next year with little flourish. It was not expected that they explain or justify their program; it was accepted. For Project Talents however there was a special budget review session. These sessions, scheduled by the president once or twice a year, became occasions to critically examine program initiatives, make policy decisions, account for all program expenditures and examine staffing needs. They were tense sessions, on which the future directions of the program rested.

These were also among the few opportunities that Project Talents staff had to describe what it was they were doing to other campus personnel. The director of the Project Talents program was not included in any of the
regularly scheduled presidential staff meetings. On one occasion, he and other key Project Talents staff members were invited to the "inner circle" to explain their expenditures and bid for continued support and approval for new program efforts.

Among the issues at that time were emerging political challenges at both the state and federal levels to inmate use of educational subsidy money, plans by the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction to divert inmates from Lebanon to a newly remodeled facility, and strong possibilities of two major grants to Project Talents for non-academic programming. All of these developments held major implications for Project Talents enrollment, tuition assistance eligibility, and other program income for the next budget year. Since Project Talents was by that time virtually 20% of the operating budget of the college and since the margin of income over costs was keeping the college abreast of its annual deficit, these particulars had grave implications for the main campus as well.

Since the budget possibilities rested on so many contingencies outside the control of the program and the college administrations, the program staff wanted to avoid conveying both a single budget projection and the scores of possible outcomes that were truly possible. Instead, they decided to try to explain the various factors at work, show
the implications of each, project a few scenarios to display the interaction of these factors and then get the support and direction of the presidential advisory council for ways of addressing these issues. The program staff also needed to forewarn the college that the program profit margin could not be expected to continually rise and carry the campus deficit.

Charts and visuals were developed to depict how decisions about institutional security levels and classification systems could impact the number of students qualifying for enrollment. Correctional policies pertaining to parole and shipping inmates to other institutions to balance population levels were reviewed; the political climates developing in Washington and Columbus regarding inmate use of educational assistance grants were described; new funding possibilities and their contingent new obligations for program performance and institutional mission were explained.

In addition to charts and graphs to illustrate various parameters, the program director and budget director devised a three-dimensional table model to illustrate program growth and a pie chart with removable pieces to illustrate both income and expenses for various levels of the program. The presentation had taken days of staff time to prepare, critique and rehearse; it was crucial that the presidential committee understand and appreciate the extent to which
these outside factors could dramatically affect the budget. It underlined the necessity of recent efforts to track lobbying efforts in D.C. which were aimed at eliminating inmates from educational entitlement grants, and request for capital expenditures in the institution which would pave the way for access to more space -- both major investments of time and money.

Several Project Talents staff had been brought in to this meeting and were at the ready to field questions and follow up with more information following the presentation. The director finished his presentation and the president looked expectantly around at his staff, all seemingly deep in thought. Finally a senior college administrator raised his hand and announced that he had a question: "How do you get those little things to stick up there?" he asked pointing at the pie chart. The gathered members allowed as how that was truly remarkable and, with no additional questions, the meeting was adjourned. The staff was congratulated for "really putting on a good presentation" but left with no decisions made and no indication that the situation was understood.
In addition to the annual budget projection and mid-year update, the director of Project Talents was asked each year to submit an abbreviated budget projection including a statement of the anticipated margin of income over all costs for the year -- profit, in the non-academic world. This projection was requested a few weeks prior to the trustee meeting in which the budget for the next year was reviewed and approved or disapproved. This Project Talents statement was then integrated into overall college budget. Although Project Talents items were unbundled and reassembled with their campus cognates, which presented a more homogeneous picture of general financial health, it was possible for a skilled budget analyst to take these figures back apart and see where everything was coming from and going.

In 1980, an unusually small campus enrollment projection threatened to pull the proposed budget into the red, something not experienced since the first year of the expanded involvement at the prison. The college business manager and president met with the Project Talents director and asked him to project a more "optimistic" budget, a margin that would assure the trustees of a balanced budget.

A visiting administration professor who was serving for a sabbatical year as special assistant to the Wilmington
College president, and who was working most directly with the Project Talents program, encouraged the director to avoid such a commitment. The president and business manager persisted however with promises the Project Talents director would be "covered" if it proved to be necessary. Over the now open disagreement of the administration professor, the program director agreed, and together with the Project Talents budget director, redefined the budget to project a greater profit. The resulting changes included increasing staff responsibilities in lieu of hiring much needed staff, repairs and replacement of equipment eliminated, inmate enrollment projections increased, and individual class size also increased; the program went into a "survival mode" operation. Additionally, plans were made for speeding up the submitting of proposals and grant applications for program components on the drawing board at the time.

Almost immediately the maximum grant level available for the federal tuition assistance program upon which virtually all inmates relied was lowered by Congress. Then, as the school year began, both enrollment and retention of inmate students fell. There seemed to be no explanation. Factors for estimating parole attrition as well as academic difficulty and disciplinary infraction withdrawals which had been developed over several years and generally proved accurate were not working. When enrollment stayed low for
winter term, concern increased. Operations and budget staff identified some rough parameters on students not showing up for enrollment and the research staff began interviewing inmates to more precisely pinpoint the potential students not coming to college. The result of these efforts was the definition of a classification of new inmates seemingly going directly from receiving and classification to an outside gang work assignment. These jobs were usually reserved for inmates making parole and waiting to leave. Apparently these "newboys" (newly arrived inmates) were making parole without even seeing the parole board.

This information and analysis was shared with prison educational staff who expressed genuine surprise but had no explanation. The research director also shared the observation with a former student from the main campus who was in a central position in the state office of the Department of Corrections. After describing her findings, he explained: "That's the ad hoc parole project. Nobody's supposed to know about that."

In Columbus, an informal parole board had been established to categorically review all inmates sentenced to state prisons and "cream" those who might qualify for early release. For the most part, this meant offenders who were third and fourth degree felons, serving their first prison time and who were young -- all qualities of the typical
inmate at Lebanon Correctional Institution. Pressures resulting from overcrowding and impending court orders had necessitated these extraordinary measures for reducing population. At Lebanon Correctional Institution, it meant that many "newboys", essentially the larger part of the incoming freshman class, were spending no more than six months in the institution; long enough to sign up for college, but not to actually enroll and complete a quarter. Most prison staff involved with education programs were not aware of this policy. For the most part, prison staff did not need to know; their programs would continue, and their jobs would continue, regardless of the flow of inmates. For Project Talents however this was a major threat.

The president and campus business manager were notified as soon as the discovery and confirmation were made. The director took what corrective action was still possible: class sizes for the third quarter were almost doubled, staff were assigned to teach overloads at no additional compensation, and all purchases not absolutely needed were postponed. A new employment training project was hurried through the proposal and contracting process, and indirect overhead expenses for the college were frontloaded. Unfortunately, the bulk of the damage had already been done; the fall and winter quarters held the greatest accessibility for federal and state financial aid.
In spite of a $23,000 loss on federal financial aid and 25% reduction in students for that year, the profit margin delivered by the program for that year split the difference between the initial projection and the requested adjustment: $50,000 long of the former and $50,000 short of the latter.

At the final trustee meeting of the year and at the annual faculty retreat that following summer, the campus business manager described the actual deficit budget performance of the college that previous year as due to Project Talents not meeting its budget. The program director accepted this characterization since he had willingly revised the budget projection. The president was somewhat more generous, acknowledging the extent of the profit it had contributed -- $398,000 above all direct costs with a total operating program budget of $948,000. No mention was made of the earlier budget projection negotiations, nor was the "cover" promised by the business manager and president forthcoming. The year's campus backslide deficit was attributed in meeting minutes, and faculty perceptions, as resulting from failure of Project Talents to perform and contribute to the total campus effort.

Several years later this episode re-emerged once more as a succeeding president sought to discredit the leadership of Project Talents and override a trustee decision to return a greater share of the program margin to services for in-
mates. At this later point, faculty and trustees were asked to remember the year that the prison program "cost the college $50,000." For this reason, he explained, a greater percentage of margin could be earmarked for inmate services only after enough reserve could be set aside to prevent a repeat of that cost to the college. He cautioned the faculty and trustees that there was a limit to how far the school could "carry the program" (Young 1983).

Teamwork and Cooperation

When Project Talents made the successful bid for CETA funding for employment training components, the correctional system had also submitted a companion proposal to be administered by individual institutions as allocated funds by the central office. The educational staff at Lebanon designed training elements which would build upon those elements provided by Project Talents. The two proposals differed however in their respective strategies for preparing inmates for employment in the "real world." The Project Talents services included experiential training components aimed at building confidence, strengthening work habits, developing problem-solving skills, and providing information about the specific job markets to which participants would be returning upon release. Included in this format was a weekly
presentation including participation of outside citizens -- employers, employees, and people representing various other facets of community life.

The prison staff opted for a program built around technology. At the center of this program was a complex of diagnostic exercises utilizing precision measurement devices called the ValPar, which tested motor skills, hand-eye coordination, response time, and a variety of other variables hypothesized by the manufacturer as predictors of job abilities and satisfaction. This system was marketed with an accompanying computerized individual profile which would predict employment areas in which such skill sets might be applied.

As with most CETA money, capital investments in such things as equipment and building improvements were not permitted; funds could only be used for direct service delivery, with a minor amount spent on indirect institutional support and supplies. The money for ValPar constituted the correction system's contribution to the program. Project Talents had agreed to contribute a microcomputer, software, and personnel for tracking participants in both their own and prison components.

Based in part on the uniqueness of such a cooperative venture, CETA grant money was awarded to both Project Talents and the prison with the expectation that the two
programs would complement each other and deliver double impact for the inmate clients. Both programs set up shop in what was formerly the hospital wing of the prison. In addition to the microprocessor configuration, Project Talents provided money for painting the area, installing new drapes, lighting, furniture and a new intercom communications system.

Project Talents staff assigned to this program were an acting director (the research director assigned for an initial implementation phase), three trainers, an office manager and two inmate clerks (drawn from the total inmate clerk allocation for the Project Talents programs). The prison contingent was a director (reassigned from a high school counseling position), a trainer, a secretary and numerous inmate clerks and runners.

The Project Talents part of this joint project, entitled Project Enterprise, was given one classroom and one office for staff to use during the day. Prison staff received three offices and two classrooms, one of which was designated to house the ValPar system. Together, the two halves of the program were to share two large rooms with the caveat that prison staff had priority for use of this space. The irregularity with which this space was scheduled made it impossible to use for training on a day to day basis. For all practical purposes Project Enterprise had one room plus
the occasional use of the larger room for all their various programming.

Both programs began, with mutual agreements to work together and support the joint effort. ValPar however did not arrive. The state correctional system had not approved the purchase, and the prison was left without the major feature of its component. Soon after the start-up time, the Project Enterprise training program was underway with more inmates wanting to participate than could be accommodated. In several months the waiting list of participants was already into a second year, at the pace and capacity of the program at that time. The ValPar room remained locked, unused, and inaccessible to Project Enterprise staff for programming. The explanation given was: "ValPar will be here any day now and we don't want to start programming this space now just to cut it off later."

The director of the prison CETA program, steadfastly refused to allow any Project Enterprise staff into the ValPar room, becoming more and more defensive as time passed and it became clear participation in Project Enterprise had far surpassed their own efforts. Without the frontispiece for their program, there was little for them to do. Prison staff also refused to make use of other, conventional program materials for rough diagnostic aptitude and interest identification.
In the interest of collegiality and in an attempt to strengthen bonds between the two staffs, Project Enterprise staff regularly contributed their efforts to the flagging prison program -- staffing prison components when prison staff were drawn away to work on institutional assignments, substituting Project Talents components for the missing ValPar equipment, and working out scheduling of services for all components in the joint effort.

As quarterly reports were made to CETA, special mention was made of how the prison's component (which at this time consisted of one computerized program for generating a job interest profile), dovetailed with the Project enterprise efforts. In presentations, the contributions of prison staff were included in Project Enterprise flow charts and slide shows in a way to more generously represent these minimal efforts. One year later, there was still no Val Par. Pressed for space to accommodate the increasing demand from inmates, Project Enterprise staff moved to offering programs during two shifts, splitting staff into two schedules, requiring overtime with no additional pay. The room set aside for the prison training component was used for several hours a day and then stood empty. Requests to use this room and to open the empty ValPar room were ignored.

In the three years of these CETA-funded programs, the
ValPar room was opened on one occasion. A new state director of corrections had been appointed and was making site visits of all prisons. In preparation for this visit, the director of the prison component filled the ValPar room to overflow capacity with "idle" inmates (those not assigned to work or school) and sat there talking with them while the state director made his rounds. The large test rooms were filled with inmates going through security orientation (nothing to do with any CETA programming), and prison staff were seen everywhere doing everything. The Project Enterprise staff, which regularly served 30-50 inmates a day, was relegated to its office and virtually had to sit around while the prison staff co-opted all the space to stage a program that did not exist with inmates who were not participants. The Project Enterprise staff felt slighted and hurt at the low profile given their efforts, but were told in essence: "It's all part of the game."

Shortly after this episode, the director of the prison component offered to make a presentation at the regional Correctional Education Association conference highlighting the employment training programs sponsored by the prison. The Project Enterprise suggestion to make this a joint presentation was turned down. The slide show for this presentation displayed Project Enterprise training sessions, the Project Enterprise enrichment program which brought
outside speakers into the prison, inmates signing up for Project Enterprise seminars, and Project Enterprise staff delivering training. The statistics cited for clients served were drawn directly from Project Enterprise reports. Other prison staff, aware of this individual's tendency to ride on others' coat tails, were usually candid in giving credit to Project Enterprise staff for the bulk of the work in this "joint" effort. On this occasion however and increasingly thereafter, they supported their colleague in usurping ownership and credit, and found themselves basking in the praise for "their program."

Broadening the Base

Both the Project Talents director and the banker who founded the program and now served as trustee overseer shared an intention of bringing together education and industry in their prison programming efforts. Starting from the position of the academic program in the prison however, they were faced with enormous conceptual, administrative, and programmatic gaps. Prison academic and vocational education programs were themselves widely divergent in goals, budget sources, and administrative structure. The prison industry operations were far more distant from education, with strikingly different relationships with the state cor-
rectional system and with the institutional administration, as well as an entirely different funding structure. Performance standards and over-all expectations for the two program areas were widely divergent. More than anything else perhaps was the fiefdom factor: each program was run from a different office at the central correctional administration, both were shaped largely by personalities of their respective top administrators, and both heavily vested with their own particular organizational inertia. There was not much working for such a cooperative effort. When CETA opened the door for providing employment training, they felt a step closer. What they needed however was a stronger identity as a program capable of bringing off such a marriage, and some leverage. After several years of trying, they finally got both of these.

In 1979 the chairman and chief executive officer of a major industry in the region retired from his role as CEO to take a one year appointment as president of the U. S. National Chamber of Commerce. In this capacity, he contributed heavily to Ronald Reagan's campaign for the Presidency. Under this leadership, the Chamber developed its own national campaign for a return to social values and governmental policies strengthening business and industry. This campaign presented a variety of programs with strong "Americana" currents and centrally featured the notion of "private
sector initiatives" addressing social problems instead of continued reliance on federal- and state-funded efforts.

The idea became a central theme in the initial years of the new Reagan administration. As the industrialist completed his year at the helm of the National Chamber and retired from his chairmanship of the industry, he was asked to assume the chairmanship of the Presidents Task Force on Private Sector Initiatives. He did remain on the executive committee of the industry board however and kept his role as chairman of the industry's philanthropic foundation.

The industrialist and the banker were neighbors and had been friends since their youth. Although the banker had been successful in attracting the attention of a small foundation which supported the college efforts at the prison, his attempts to get the support of this industry in the past had not met with success. The corporate giving of the industry's foundation had largely been concentrated on more conventional and conservative projects. In keeping with the theme of the campaigns of the National Chamber of Commerce and the newly elected President however, the industrialist initiated a redirection of the foundations goals to target grants which would highlight social responsibility in the business sector.

Sensing that the time was right, the banker and the program director developed and initiated a campaign for
major corporate support for their shared goal of an education/industry program in the prison. They hosted a delegation from the industry's foundation, arranged visits to the prison and set up a working group including both representatives of the foundation and program staff. The result was a $580 thousand grant to be provided over a period of four years.

Several factors converged to make this grant happen. The attentions of the banker and the existence of the program were constants throughout, although the program did have a several year history of successful operation and was large enough to command some regional, state, and national attention. More important perhaps were the politics of the day, the position of the industrialist on the Private Sector Task Force, his sincere interest in signalling a new era of business/industry community leadership, and the fact that the industry's foundation representative had recently been passed over for a position on the prestigious Business Roundtable. The focus of the foundation was clearly on making some significant contributions to some significant and visible social problems.

The proposal that was actually funded was a plan to strengthen community support networks for returning inmates and to encourage citizen participation in the rehabilitation process. In particular it was hoped that, through the
education and training efforts of an expanded Project Talents, the business and industry communities of the region would work cooperatively with their counterparts in the prison's industries, and develop components combining training with hands-on work experience, eventually leading to post-release job placement (Project Talents of Wilmington College 1981). The project goals seemed to be a good fit with the industry's needs and was awarded, at a pace that took the program staff themselves by surprise. This was the largest single grant the industry had ever made and the largest that the college had received.

The award was made in late summer of 1980, but it was not to be formally announced until later that fall. From several years of navigating the channels of public and organizational suspicion of programs serving offenders, the program director drafted several "background advisements" for use by the industry's foundation in announcing the program, including possible scenarios and question-answer reviews of "safe" program portrayals. He provided these to his opposite number in the industry foundation to be provided to the speechwriters and public relations staff for the industrialist; the program director had developed a sensitivity for public reactions to correctional efforts, but still had much to learn about corporate communications.

While these preparations were being made, the economy
brought a very different contribution to the announcement process. In the early 1980's, the corporation's sales and production went from an all time high the year before the grant to an all time low the next year. Corporate stock values declined and the company went into a graduated series of cutbacks. Diversified holdings were sold, plants were idled, bonuses were eliminated, executives were given early retirement, and, finally, lay-offs began. By the time of the "kick-off" breakfast/press conference to announce the grant (October, 1981), the agenda for the unveiling moved from maximizing to minimizing public attention to the grant. The program director was given some last-minute signal changes for the tenor to be set with the announcement, deemphasizing "community involvement" which was feared to sound too much like "giving inmates jobs." At a time when many in the region surrounding the prison were laid-off by this industry, both the language and the size of the grant had become liabilities.

At a national level, the groundwork announcing the grant had already begun. In August, a letter describing the program was drafted by foundation staff and sent over the industrialist's signature to then Presidential Counselor Edwin Meese. This announcement described the industry foundation's intent to "reduce the cost of government spending" with a bold new program which would reduce recidivism. It
emphasized the strict discipline enforced by the prison superintendent, but did not mention the college, the program or the particulars of the grant itself (Verity 1981a). Later that month, in a speech before the Midwest Governor's Conference, the industrialist president captured more of the spirit of the project in describing crime as a "local problem" best addressed at the community level by active involvement of business and industry solving their own problems (Verity 1981b). This introduction also focused on the prison rather than the college or the program itself however.

Other "faces" were attributed to this program at the initial meeting of a new Board of Advisors which had been drawn together especially for the purposes of guiding program development. All major participants were included: the president of the college, the superintendent of the prison, the manager of the industry foundation, the trustee overseer for Project Talents, the director of Project Talents and a university criminologist who had provided advisement to the program at various stages of growth. In part to initiate the meeting in a neutral corner, the criminologist was asked to make some initial comments, sharing his insight of trends in corrections and community involvement.

This initial meeting, immediately following the formal grant announcement, was intended as a "get acquainted"
session, with each member invited to share their perspective on the grant, what it could and should accomplish, and what they in particular would like to see. The minutes of that meeting foretell the intricate inter-weaving and cross-cutting of purposes that were to plague this effort (Project Talents Advisory Board 1981).

The trustee overseer saw the new program as having two fronts, one in the prison and one in the community. The eventual outcome he anticipated was a model program for community involvement in corrections. Reflecting on how his own interest in corrections began, he advocated bringing people into the prison and getting them involved working with inmates so they might appreciate the prison end of their efforts in the community.

The director of Project Talents saw the existing program providing the "link" between the prison and the community but emphasized that it should not be the central focus of the program. While he and his staff could provide ideas, resources and administrative assistance, the leadership for the program, and the ownership for it, would have to be firmly based in the community if it were to continue. He expressed his hope that the industry leadership in "volunteerism" would extend to providing volunteer assistance for working with prison industries to begin tying them into the already existing educational and training components.
The criminologist advised an emphasis on reintegration services, and like the trustee overseer, advocated getting community leaders involved in the prison community. He noted that involving the media at an early stage would help ensure community awareness and receptivity to later developments. He also advised setting up a working relationship that would involve the central office of the state Department of Corrections and other prisons, with an eye to replicating the program elsewhere.

The prison superintendent called for a low profile. He cautioned against media attention and advised a strategy which would downplay the program and not get people's hopes up for a "magic cure." He resisted the idea of bringing community people into the prison noting: "We don't need help running the prison; keep the focus where the problem is -- in the community." He relayed a message from the state Director of Corrections expressing a hope that this program would benefit corrections officers and would not stress benefits for inmates.

The president of the college saw industry's influence in the community extending to initiating community involvement. He envisioned a series of community meetings drawing together the community resources and serving as a forum for problem-solving. His goal was not to reduce recidivism, but to address the problem at the early end and prevent
incarceration. Key reference points for him were his own experiences setting up alternative high schools for drop-outs when he was public school superintendent.

The manager of the industry foundation reiterated the importance of this grant for industry in starting a new trend within the private sector for addressing significant social problems. He announced the industry's intent to provide a travel budget for the director of Project Talents, beyond the grant money, so that he might stay in touch with programs of similar intent around the country, and inform them of developments with the Industry initiative. He felt strongly that Industry, itself, should not take the leadership role in directing this grant, but should step back, and stay out of the limelight once the grant was announced. With this "mandate" the program began.

One year later, in his report to the industry foundation, the director advised the grant sponsors that "things were not going well" (Young 1982). He specifically cited the lack of institutional support and cooperation that had plagued the program in its first year. His analysis focused on the "lack of infrastructure" in the prison for hosting educational as well as business and community involvements. "Our program," he said, "met sometimes with hostility but more frequently was met with bewilderment. There is no role for the private sector in corrections, except as provider of
grants or jobs." He noted the lack of a "conceptual space in the prison for a program that does not have established units of performance or was not directly related to some on-going prison function." Commenting on the absence of any sense of community upon which the project efforts could readily build, he adopted Gertrude Stein's observation on Oakland: "There's no there there."

Reaffirming the Partnership

The first year anniversary of the beginning of Project Enterprise was an opportunity to report on the progress of the project to CETA, industry, college and prison hosts, and to once again try to dramatize the "collaborativeness" that might yet emerge. With the reluctant assistance of the prison employment training staff, Project Enterprise planned a formal meeting to present this yearly report, a diplomatic version of the report to the industry foundation.

The occasion was an opportunity to reaffirm and celebrate the unique partnership concept behind the program; theoretically at least, corrections, education, government, and private industry had come together to make this program possible. Plans for the day included a morning meeting with continental breakfast, pictorial displays and informal conversations with inmate participants and staff trainers, as
well as the formal presentations. Invitations were extended to all the representatives of the organizations who supported the program.

Most major stockholders meetings, boards of directors meetings and other annual performance reports have certain aspects of ritual and ceremony. Presentations of emerging programs components are often somewhat idealized to convey not only what is but also what is yet aspired to. Information is usually packaged in ways to fit the expectations and capacities of various constituencies to understand and "make sense" of it. This audience was a striking mixture of constituencies however; the challenge was to depict the program in ways which would fulfill each sponsor's expectations and still represent the basic integrity of the program itself. By grounding the presentation in the reality of incarceration and very tangibly illustrating how services had been targeted to meet the needs of the inmates at various points in "doing time," each organization was invited to see how its particular contribution was a vital link in a chain of services that together formed a comprehensive plan for reintegration into community life. Visuals were crafted to portray the sequence of training components and program activities, and the presentation itself was designed around anecdotal accounts of inmates' participation.
On the day of the presentation the invited guests assembled in the program area. The CETA and industry representatives were present; the college sent no representative. The prison superintendent arrived late in the middle of the presentation and engaged the industry representative in a conversation about adjoining prison and industry property. For their part in the presentation, the prison gave a brief, unpolished presentation that portrayed the program as "just another part of inmate orientation." Following the presentation, the superintendent and the industry representative left to discuss an upcoming SWAT demonstration. The CETA representative had to leave early.

One staff member later observed: "It's like nothing happened." Another replied: "Maybe nothing's supposed to." A footnote to this non-episode occurred a few days later when the industry representative approached the Project Enterprise director with a complaint. Having read the materials from the meeting, he explained that he did not like the impression that the industry had entered a partnership with CETA. Even though CETA had provided the first big money for the project and, at that point in time, had overspent the industry by over $50,000, he felt that it belittled the singularity of the industry foundation's contribution. Specifically, he requested that descriptions of the Project Enterprise program be "unbundled" in such a way that there
was a separate identifiable piece that could be identified as the industry's own.

**Site Visits to Model Programs**

The industry foundation grant was designed to build community networks and support groups, using existing social services and community treatment programs in an integrated effort to address ex-offender needs. It was not intended to create a new layer of services, but to target what was already available to address the needs of a low-visibility group (Smyth 1981; Young 1981, 1983b).

In the footwork for the industry foundation proposal, the Project Talents staff had located a model program in San Jose, California, which had been successful with a similar approach to reintegrating offenders. Furthermore, the program had solid links with the National Alliance of Business, the National Chamber of Commerce and the new administration in the White House — all the right symbols for the industry foundation board and staff. The national director for this program, Community Alliance Program for Ex-offenders (CAPE), met with the Project Talents director at a conference on correctional education in which they were both speaking. The CAPE director was invited to the Project Talents program, a visit he followed with an additional meeting with
the industry foundation staff. Following much communication and exchange of ideas, the CAPE director invited top Project Talents staff, the banker chairman of the industry grant program, and the industry foundation representative to visit San Jose CAPE program to see first hand how this community networking process worked.

The delegation of five people toured the San Jose operation, then traveled to Los Angeles to meet with U. S. Probation officials active in advocating private sector "third party roles" in corrections. This part of the trip also included a visit to a sheltered workshop sponsored by U.S. Probation.

In San Jose, the CAPE program had an office located in the state employment bureau where a staff person met with 15-25 people in a day, listening to their problems and linking them with a network of employment counselors, drug counselors, family therapists, ministers, educators, legal and financial advisors, health care specialists and other social service agencies. He pointed out that since most ex-offenders have to check in with the employment bureau anyway, his office was strategically located. This one staff person served as the ex-offenders advocate for getting help and their conduit for comprehensive community services. He reported numerous instances where problems had been prevented from escalating into crises and where individuals had
been directed to organizations to help them when and how they needed it.

Behind this "storefront" operation, CAPE had put together an impressive Board of Advisors consisting of all the prominent business, political and civic leaders from the community. Through them, the organization had developed a broad network of services. They had provided the leverage needed to get past "client count" problems and other conventional stopping points. They had developed a strong cooperative ethic among the business, corrections, and social service communities. The industry representative was polite, but perplexed. Looking at the office, he asked: "Is this all there is?"

In Los Angeles, the sheltered workshop was an experiment using Federal reparation monies to subsidize a small assembly operation. Inmates released to a halfway house could work here for one month prior to being released on their own. The incentive for them was an immediate job with some pay, and a good work recommendation. The industry consisted of assembling the plastic ball apparatus for toilet plungers. The company making these parts had previously shipped them offshore, but a government subsidy made it economically attractive to contract with this workshop.

Altogether, about a dozen employees were working on the floor at any time. In addition to supervising the indus-
trial operation, the staff provided training for job searches, crisis counseling, and "pulled piss" (conducted regular drug testing) for participants. The industry representative was visibly impressed with the "industriousness" of this operation, the layout of the physical plant, the security procedures, and the lab tests on the participants.

Although the San Jose CAPE project was closer to what Project Talents had in mind, the only sign of anything existing was one office staffed by one person. The "network" itself was large and from all accounts it was a potent intervention strategy -- but it was not visible. As a result of these site visits, the Industry representative began pressing the Project Talents staff to consider an industrial operation in lieu of the community network idea.

**Job Training Partnership Act**

Over the period of several years, the Project Talents staff was developing a capacity to spot, track, and lobby legislative and administrative actions with potential impact on the future of the program. In addition to the Ohio prison education and employment training networks with which they were affiliated, they could access the Correctional Education Association network through the involvement of the program director and the many, active Quaker legislative
action organizations. A regular newsletter, The Pipeline, was developed by the research division of the program for building and regularly updating a constituency for program efforts and their counterparts elsewhere. Two successful interventions in this particular effort included enlisting both Ohio U.S. senators in active opposition to legislation to halt inmate eligibility for federal tuition grants and convincing the selective service administration to adjust registration requirements to not categorically make incarcerated offenders ineligible for tuition grants.

As CETA was phased out and the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) was introduced, each state was to develop its own guidelines for implementation. Ohio's first efforts in this development managed to eliminate incarcerated offenders and others, homebound handicapped for example, from eligibility by using rigid geographic and client qualification parameters in defining who could benefit from these services.

Project Talents invested two staff administrators for several months to work with the state JTPA planning team, to gather statistics on incarcerated populations, present "friend of the court" studies and suggestions for more reasonable guidelines, to keep other programs like our own informed, and suggest appropriate lobbying activities by others.
Among those regularly informed was the office of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction which had been involved with the previous CETA programs. This office had initially contracted with CETA for the funds used to sponsor the prison components of the joint employment training program at Lebanon. The correctional administrator in charge of this effort at the central office was well aware that Project Enterprise had actually delivered much of the service expected of the prison staff and that this had enabled the prison to show the required positive termination of clients to justify the grant. This same administrator, in tracking and reporting the development of JTPA guidelines for the correctional system, regularly incorporated the update information provided by Project Talents.

After much effort, Project Talents staff, in league with representatives of organizations lobbying for the interests of handicapped citizens, were able to incorporate several key phrases in the administrative guidelines that allowed set-asides for these special populations. When, as a result of these inclusions, these monies were made available for the correctional system, the Project Talents director visited the correctional administrator to discuss the possibility of cooperative efforts or sub-contracting to match existing industry foundation funds and promised college support for industry-related training. The response of
Afterword

In describing his explication model, Koppelman proposes this approach for educational settings where more conventional evaluation, whether ethnographic or more rational in design, might prove insensitive to the program under study. He selects the term "explication" both to avoid the perjorative aspects of "evaluation" and to emphasize his methodology's "primary meaning for clarifying, explaining, and interpreting, and the additional meaning of developing a theory or principle." (60) Koppelman prescribes the technique for settings where complexity is an inherent part of the program to be observed and where defensiveness, hostility and the sense of threat are high.

Essentially an enhanced descriptive technique, explication focuses not on the things of the ethnographic setting but on "an interaction of many elements." Koppelman explains that "the intent of an explication process (is) to expose the disparities between aims and outcomes,...to clarify present status(es), and to develop ideas leading to results which are more consistent with the intended goals of
the program" (60-63).

In Koppelman's illustration, measuring teachers' implementation of new curricula, the safeguards incorporated to guard against oversubjectivity are active involvement of the teachers and students and a technique of systematic observation used in anthropology (Edgerton & Langness 1974). Subjectivity checks used in my explication of the Project Talents/Project Enterprise experience are the corroborating archival data and the internal integrity or "sense" of the episodes themselves. In both Koppelman's exemplar and my explication, data are extracted from their everyday matrices and condensed to "present the pieces as they seem to fit and work...to complete the picture" (Koppelman:63).

There are obvious distinctions in the way I have modified this explicative approach here. First, Koppelman's example uses an ethnographic evaluator role. In my study, the role is that of participant observer or even, as John Herzog describes, "observant participant" (Herzog 1972). Second, and following from this initial distinction, I do not attempt the degree of disinterested objectivity described by Koppelman. Finally, I use this technique in analysis of data, not in their collection. It might be said however that, since I am selecting data from a more extensive set of data available, I am "re-collecting" them.
CHAPTER VI

ETHNOGRAPHY: AN IMPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS

Introduction

In an earlier writing (Brown 1981), I proposed the emergence of a culture within the Project Talents program and ventured to further identify and describe it. In justifying my request I was soon caught up conceptualizing my research in ways to quantify this observation, to identify appropriate control and comparison groups, even to defend the culture concept itself. Looking back I can see these justification efforts as false starts, but perhaps necessary frustrations in shaping the argument I am making here. I did see something; whether a culture, a subculture, or merely the emerging internal consciousness of a new social institution, it was that moment of community Durkheim describes as "collective conscience" and which teachers are sometimes lucky enough to happen onto.

In the chapters above, I have moved from the day-to-day experience of Project Talents/Project Enterprise to some explicated, condensed vignettes which I believe characterize
significant realities of that and every correctional education effort. In this chapter I look more deeply at these episodes to identify and describe not only the elusive culture sought in my earlier research, but the many areas and strata of context that function to bound and define that culture.

The Method

Among the difficulties of such a task are the very pervasiveness and the interiority usually ascribed to culture. Few would argue that education can progress with indifference to cultural aspects of its students and the classroom; perhaps especially for these particular students, the socializing and cultural transmission functions of education are generally expected outcomes. However, measuring, operationalizing, and even accessing culture are more complicated issues.

In discussing the implications of socialization and cultural transmission in education, John Singleton cites some of the difficulties of using the culture concept in research. Although culture is pervasive and universal in human experience, any particular manifestation of it is unique; although it is considered a stabilizing force in a social group, culture is dynamic and is in constant change;
although it fills and determines much of our lives, culture rarely intrudes into our conscious thought. (Singleton 1974: 29)

Claude Levi-Strauss is given credit, even by his strongest critics (Derrida 1976:97-140), for having at least woven a complete cultural tapestry in his massive work, *Mythologiques*. For Levi-Strauss, *myth* is the closest one can get to isolating culture, and yet even myth remains largely projective, a function of the imagination, and reflective of attempts to interpret it. Nevertheless, through myth Levi-Strauss attempts to structurally analyze culture to illuminate the hidden "infrastructures of experience", the cultural truths that he believes precede consciousness and even the individual.

I therefore claim to show, not how men think in myths, but how myths operate in men's minds without their being aware of the fact....It follows that this book on myths is a kind of myth." (Levi-Strauss 1969:6-12)

James Fernandez draws back from both the enormity and the interiority of Levi-Strauss' mythic analysis of culture to focus on the more finite metaphor as a cultural expression. For Fernandez it is the most emergent and undefined domains of human existence which are given substance and form by metaphor.
(E)thnographies are sensitive to local figures of speech, the chief of which is the metaphor. ...(E)very perspective requires a metaphor to organize it....In a sense we may say that metaphoric predication takes an inchoate frame and incorporates it into a domain of objects and actions whose identity and action requirements we more clearly understand. (Fernandez 1974:119-126)

Fernandez encourages attention to two functions of metaphor in cultural studies: first, defining particular features into given domains of experience, and second, relationships between these domains. (132-133) Essentially ethnoscience's foundational meaning and syntax, these two functions correspond to the methods specified above for explicating ethnographic observations: Campbell's "mini-case study" method for including data within a domain and the "constitutive ethnography" method of studying interaction.

F. Allan Hanson (1973, 1975) has also addressed the interiority feature of Levi-Strauss's analysis of culture. His study provides a framework for addressing both meaning and syntax, both inclusion of features within a domain and the interactions among domains. Especially useful in the efforts here is Hanson's concept of implicational meaning. Summarizing for the issue at hand:

1. All human phenomena are intrinsically meaningful.

2. In its goal of making this intrinsic meaning intelligible, social science must ask different questions of these phenomena; and the kind of question asked will largely determine the particular usability of the answer.
3. Questions of meaning asked of individuals will give answers involving intention; questions of meaning asked of institutions will give answers involving implications.

4. Implicational meaning emerges not via intentional meaning -- the stuff of individual questions -- but directly from customs, beliefs, theories, and other elements of culture -- the stuff of institutional questions.

5. Implicational meaning specifies logical relations of reinforcement, contradiction and coexistence among various institutions. Implicational meaning of an institution is to be found in its relation to other institutions.

6. Therefore, understanding institutions amounts to knowing the implicational meanings of its relationship with other institutions. (66-67)

Although similar in some ways to unintended consequences, implicational meaning does not necessarily follow some event or process in a clear sequential or causal way.

Implicational meaning, for its part, concerns how institutions and developments are linked, not so much to concrete events and processes, as to abstract principles or axioms of culture. It connotes little of the temporal sequence and causal direction of unintended consequences: it draws attention more specifically and exclusively to logical consistency (or the lack of it) among institutions and developments. (72)

And, in the sense of the the analysis at hand,

(t)he aim of (implicational analysis)...is to make the order of the system under study intelligible. That is, to fill in the higher-order suppositions
or premises, themselves unobserved but from which the institutions discernible in observed behavior flow logically, "as a matter of course." (83)

Both Levi-Strauss and Fernandez provide modes of analysis potent enough to get at the deeper level structures at work in such covert ethnographic settings as Project Talents and Project Enterprise. However, Hanson's formula for directly accessing implicational meaning is more inviting for the contextual nature of ethnographic data in this study.

In explicating the ethnographic data, I drew observations out of their everyday circumstances to describe less apparent patterns of experience. With these patterns in mind, I will analyze the deeper meanings implied by these data -- what Hanson calls the "flow of observed behaviors" -- to more fully define contextual boundaries for this education program.

According to Gerald Britan (1981), ethnography should provide a perspective from which to understand the social processes involved, to convey the subtle pattern of beliefs, attitudes, decisions and networks that lie beneath the experiential surface. Contextual analysis must seek not one-dimensional relationships but be open for a spectrum of events associated with implementation and impact. (49-51)

For ethnographers, context refers to interpretations of "who we are" and "what we are doing", reference frames from
which to chose what to do next. (Bateson 1972; Cicourel 1974) These contexts may be nested within one another, making possible multiple layers of interpretation of ethnographic observation (Don-Breme 1985).

Within the conventional contextual domains already described -- prison, college, and industry -- Project Talents/Project Enterprise was additionally bounded by such contextual layers. In the material that follows, these strata or layers of context are framed in the categories of Ward Goodenough's operational definition of culture, i.e."a set of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and acting" within a society. (Goodenough:110) The ethnographic events located in these categories are more minimal than the earlier episodes, but represent nexuses of interaction rich in implicational meaning.

An episode above, describing one the countless exchanges between security personnel and teachers in prison, is such an example. Meanings may be drawn from the contextual nexuses of the participants (guard & teacher), of setting (school in prison), of observers (inmates for whom the exchange is really intended). The exchange embodies the conundrum nature of correctional education.
The Analysis

In the history of correctional education in the United States, an appropriate contextual environment has been largely non-existent, and correctional education programs have had to exist in situations extreme in any usual expectation of education. External political, judicial, organizational, and even personal events have frequently caused abrupt, major changes in definitions and purposes of these programs. Inside correctional settings these programs are regularly impacted by social, cultural and political currents far less restrained than what would be the case outside this environment. Surprisingly, most research on correctional education has treated these contextual aspects only lightly and usually as part of a general description of the program setting. Although these contextual factors are generally known by program staff and researchers to make program direction unpredictable and program evaluation difficult, they are generally treated as the "givens" of correctional education and not subjected to analysis.

Project Talents/Project Enterprise had no space truly its own, either physical or conceptual: no firm geographic or institutional boundaries, no secure philosophical or theoretical base which distinguished the program from its sponsors. In these characteristics this program was dis-
tinct from many other correctional education programs, but only in degree. Most correctional education programs suffer most of these conditions; most derive meaning and purpose from missions and identities other than their own; most programs continue to lack an appropriate context.

In the program chronicled by this study an attempt is made to create an appropriate and supportive context. The resistance with which this effort is met helps define where the boundaries for such programs are and begins to contextualize some of the major issues of correctional education.

Standards for Perceiving: Dramatic Realizations

Most people do not see the inside of prisons and have far less notion of correctional education. Most images for the public are drawn from fiction and media coverage and are highly stereotyped. Experience of the Project Talents/Project Enterprise program with media during the period described was limited and generally unsatisfactory in terms of insightful or educative coverage. One newspaper reporter visited the college activities for an entire evening, meeting with staff, interviewing individual students, going to classes; his story on the program was exclusively devoted to his impressions of one "tough" who sat by the classroom
door and said "hi teach" when the instructor arrived. Television coverage was limited to one unannounced, uninvited videotaping of part of a graduation ceremony, closeup footage of an inmate in cap in gown singing "Climb Every Mountain." Following that taping the television reporter and crew went throughout the correctional facility looking for a shot of a cell corridor with inmate hands sticking through the bars. Since most Lebanon Correctional Facility cell doors have no bars, they finally ended up asking officers to put some inmates in unused holding cells, which did have bars, located in a staff training area. At that point the superintendent objected and they left, complaining of censorship.

Prisons are endowed with overwhelming images seeming to have lives of their own, images of massiveness, anonymous uniformity, dead time, latent violence, and crowded conditions. These are not the things of education and not images correctional educators can identify with or build upon. In the shadow of prison itself, prison schools lack an image. At best education personnel are invited to the view of prison schooling as a way to structure time, not a mode of rehabilitation (Reffett 1983).

Early in their efforts, the Project Talents/Project Enterprise staff sensed a need for an image, both in the prison and on campus. The relative invisibility of their
work setting necessitated what Erving Goffman describes as dramatization (Goffman 1959:30-34), and this took energy. Seeming to be working is often harder than working, and doing both is confusing as well as hard. Additionally, the staff found, as Goffman notes, that this communication of working requires different attributes than do the jobs being dramatized.

The image most available for staff was a jerrybuilt combination of special knowledges and skills with difficult, unpleasant work. This called for wearing semiprofessional images in public presentations and shirtsleves for the equally visible bulk work of the program. Much of the program's early existence called for a certain amount of dirty work -- haggling, striking deals, exchanging favors, loading out equipment and books, and peddling program components to potential supporters -- all to assure a dignified and respectable delivery of "college." It was a bordertown existence for the program in these early days, and the roles open for staff were those of the crosscultural go-betweens: scouts, translators, tour directors, and pimps. Although their actual roles changed as the program became larger, more sophisticated, and as more staff led to specialization, these early images never fully faded. Staff often speculated that the clarity and resilience of these images may have spoken more of perceivers needs than those
In the entirety of the period described by this study, one campus faculty member, a former academic dean, perceived the activities of the formative period similarly to the staff themselves. He sent the program director a card with a quotation from the journal of an early American Quaker:

I have gone forward, not as one travelling in a road cast up and well prepared, but as a man walking through a miry place in which are stones here and there safe to step on, but so situated that, one step being taken, time is necessary to see where to step next. (Woolman 1961:122)

The staff often felt their time was spent more in talking and presenting than actually doing. Staff differed in their sensitivity to this image issue. Gradually, the early efforts of the staff which resulted in these images were replaced with the dramatization itself as a conscious activity and with the suggestion that it was even a necessary feature of a successful program. This legitimization however risked exposing a crassness and an appearance to be "less than professional educators" and "less than prison administrators." Jean-Paul Sartre captures the dilemma: "The attentive pupil who wishes to be attentive, his eyes riveted on the teacher, his ears open wide, so exhausts himself in playing the attentive role that he ends up by no longer hearing anything" (1956:60).
On campus the objective was to convey the complexity of the program structure needed to translate an academic curriculum into the context of a prison community. The amount of time spent off campus and the inaccessibility of the program made this message difficult and resulted in "packing in" large amounts of information on the few occasions they were invited to present themselves. Translating a college program into prison, and then translating the sum total of that effort back to the campus community was only one challenge of the communication. Any appreciation or even recognition of the effort and expertise required to make all those translations was lost altogether. Conveying the contextual plight of correctional education was one problem; first however the very awareness of context had to be inculcated as well. Eventually, Project Talents staff earned a reputation for working hard, but it was difficult for people to understand what it was they worked so hard at!

Educating their campus supervisors to the peculiarities of prison and the obligations and responsibilities that go with that territory was a matter of survival for program staff. Hearing and comprehending those messages was optional for campus personnel. The National Crime Commission captures the one-sidedness of this public education public effort in noting: "Corrections is not only hard to see; traditionally society has been reluctant to look at it"
Certainly this was the case on campus; it was if the staff's campus colleagues wanted to avoid any "association by knowledge" with the prison or its clients. The almost total absence of regular campus personnel at the site of the program (except for those at the bi-annual graduation ceremonies), was received by program staff as evidence of a preference for a safe distance.

Although much has been said about the necessity of integrating education programs into prison, little attention has been given to the creating of a receptive climate for such programs in educational circles, or for generating acceptance by the broader public. The widespread general ignorance of correctional education heightens the absence of and the necessity for a common baseline knowledge for rational decision-making.

On one occasion the fourth college president to oversee the program was strongly advocating a change in calendar for the college. Program staff, asked to consider the change and report consequences of such a change for programming at the prison, explained several negative factors for the program: quarters meant more entry opportunities for incoming inmates than would semesters (the desired correctional education standard is open entry/open exit), eleven-week quarters with two week interims fit the "flow" of the prison better, attrition rates would be magnified over longer
terms, and several other issues reflecting the reality of institutional life. The staff advised against such a calendar change from the standpoint of these weaknesses, but suggested a compromise plan which would allow the college to proceed with a change on campus and leave the program at the prison intact. The president responded angrily to this suggestion in a committee meeting, rejecting the analysis, denouncing the staff, and ignoring even the solid projections of enrollment reductions and income reductions which would ensue. "No prison program will ever dictate policy for this school," he exclaimed. "Project Talents will do whatever I say is good for the campus."

In some instances this attempt to establish a profile on campus backfired. Campus personnel viewed with suspicion the growing program and the huge sums of money it brought to the school. People made open references to "the tail wagging the dog," and "empire building." Devices to keep the faculty informed were received as "aggressive" and "ego trips." The staff was caught between the Scylla of obscurity, ergo even less baseline understanding of program needs, and the Charybdis of over-exposure, with the resulting hostility evidenced in this episode with the new president.

While a high profile seemed ultimately preferable on campus, the opposite was true in the prison. In that setting, the less attention drawn to the program the better.
The strategy in prison was to blend in, to avoid even minor disruptions to prison routine, and to deflect attention away from the program. The need for the prison to limit success was never a subtle message. The more inmates the program enrolled, the more significant it became in the prison. Near the end of the period studied, the program was the largest inmate work assignment in the state of Ohio, and it was supervised totally by non correctional personnel. The prison superintendent, who was generally supportive of the program, was also known for underplaying its significance in public. His remarks about the program were usually prefaced with disclaimers that "this is a prison, after all."

In practice, the "don't rock the boat" approach is one of the few consistently effective survival strategies for personnel and programs in corrections. The challenge for the program was to launch the boat and put the oars in the water without rocking it in the process.

"Cover your ass" is one of the most familiar aphorisms in corrections. Program staff did find themselves underplaying their own efforts and minimizing success in order to blend in, to not pose a threat, and to avoid jealous responses from other program administrators. However there were unmistakable reminders that the prison controlled the limits to success of the program: the predictable forgetfulness of the prison staff to follow through on issues
requiring their cooperation, the inaccessibility of space which had nothing to do with availability, the continued harassment from key corrections personnel, and the indifference of the superintendent when these problems were brought to his attention. The program would never exceed, in scope nor in complexity, the ability of the lowest level of corrections personnel to accommodate it in their routine responsibilities, as they understood them.

From the standpoint of the prison, the program was a convenience, not a necessity. As that distinction became less clear, as the program threatened to really become integrated into prison routine, steps were taken to remind the staff that they were there by the good graces of the prison. The permission for the program to operate within prison walls did not translate into equal status with prison employees. A selectively applied dress code, elaborate security procedures with veteran staff members, escorts for walking to and from offices, withholding of permission for using space and equipment, and severely limited access to data files all bespoke the superficial acceptance of the program. Prison personnel had a security that program personnel would never know -- their jobs would continue whether the program succeeded or failed.

It would be naive to assume that harassments and inconveniences were the work of a few troublesome personalities.
In the day-to-day existence of running a program, it often seemed as though some staff had nothing more to do than make staff lives miserable. Even where that might have been true however, there was an institutional reality behind the scenes.

A factor to be considered in this regard is the all-encompassing nature of the prison itself as the quintessential total institution. By their very organizational nature, such institutions develop complex patterns of power conservation and manipulation, along with the bureaucratic mazes which tend to neutralize any innovations (Lewis 1973:43).

While Project Talents staff experienced this resistance in a personal way, adding to the stress of an already difficult situation, they tended to overlook the basis of the resistance which was firmly entrenched in the "pernicious bureaucracy," the power structure and the staffing patterns of a state civil service system, magnified yet more by the closed nature of prison. Calling their "troubles" to the attention of the superintendent only drew negative attention to their seeming desire to upset whatever applecart was already there.

Morgan Lewis (1973:43) and his colleagues found similar troubles in their experimental effort to introduce humanities programming into prison. Reflecting on the dif-
ficulty of exchanges with staff he explains that employees themselves "are entangled in a vast system of authoritarian and bureaucratic guidelines, loopholes and knots which allow little or no flexibility." They regard with suspicion and fear any disruption of a routine which for them is the basis of job stability and security. For the Project Talents staff, it was often difficult to see the harassments, the stumbling blocks, and the rudeness with which they were treated in the broader context of the prison bureaucracy. The boundaries between program and self were not always clear and many staff, like the inmates, felt "hardened" by the experience.

Standards for Acting: Presentations of Self

Another issue for correctional education centers on the question of identity, "who are we?" Goodenough notes that the individual living in a multicultural world must constantly take into account different cultures and contexts and establish competencies in any one of these by interacting effectively with those already acknowledged as competent (1975:4). These competencies are established in the day-to-day rites of passage wherein one's abilities to live up to the formal and informal expectations are ritually assessed.

The realities of prison and college did not add up to
the third reality of "Project Talents." Credibility in one area did not necessarily lend to credibility in the other; often just the reverse was true. On campus, Project Talents staff were received as crass, aggressive, and rough, in part because of the nature of their clientele and the anticipations of others of the response needed for such a clientele. In the prison, they were seen as lost liberals, ivory tower idealists, and more perjorative descriptions. A prison official once described one of the prison staff as, "a commie pinko fag's commie pinko fag."

Valued statuses and accomplishments were trivialized in both settings. In prison the oft-repeated putdown was, "hey Doc, been cutting on anybody lately?" The implication was that real doctors performed operations. On campus, the staff were viewed as something of an oddity and whenever several staff members were seen together they were responded to as though they were a gang. Rewriting scripture (Matthew 18:20) to reinforce the pushy natures ascribed to the staff, other administrators quipped: "Wherever two or three of you are gathered together, we'll do anything you want."

These daily incongruences in style and expectations, within themselves, among their co-workers, and with prison and college colleagues left staff feeling exhausted, depleted, and with no satisfying or even clear definition of who they were. Even simple exchanges were laden with impli-
cations for identity and the seriousness with which one would be taken.

A dilemma frequently encountered was the almost allegorical exchange between security officers and faculty, within earshot of students. "Do you think these scumbags deserve an education?" was the riddle of the sphinx. It drew together the conflicting needs to be well-received, to establish credibility, and to project a new, not well understood professional identity. The question was an opportunity to align oneself with the guard's worldview, to assert the more questionable validity of education for inmates, or to "shuffle and play the role".

The secret of the sphinx is still safe; no particularly satisfying response was found. As do many correctional educators, program staff found it generally efficacious to establish credibility as prisonwise and accommodated accordingly. Other educators coming from a college community have found it more rewarding to maintain a distance from custody staff (Lewis 1973:71). In fact in accommodating in these ways, program staff enabled most of the program faculty to remain aloof and still facilitated the program's place among prison staff. Even this accomplishment however functioned to confirm impressions of staff as hustlers.

Working in prison and associating with criminals was seen by campus personnel as dirty work and less dignified
than their campus endeavors. For most faculty there was something suspicious about a person who would spend long hours in prison and enjoy it. Professional exchanges were replaced by requests for "prison stories" which were appreciated for their exotic qualities, but which also served to distance the teller from the audience. The exclusion of program staff from both faculty and administrative staff meetings on campus indicated their status as a "breed apart." There was no professional community on campus where staff could hang their hat, talk shop, and get recognition for their efforts.

Competency was likewise an issue in prison. In this case the only authority staff could bring to their positions was their technical expertise, their ability to do well what the prison itself requires. Ironically, it was these very credentials that were the greatest opportunity for professional debunking by prison staff. While program staff were polishing administrative and security routines, developing procedures within procedures, and constantly perfecting all areas of program performance, they were increasingly aware that they were the only ones going by the rules. In the prison administration jargon, the program staff were "just jerking off."

Program staff were assuming that authority was based on competence and were unaware that prison authority was ulti-
mately based on rank. As Donald Cressey (1965) explains, these two kinds of authority are quite distinct in prison. In the prison setting, authority based on position or rank emphasizes obedience and discipline; in the case of expert authority, one defers to technical authority on the basis of competence. The custodial prison is an excellent example of rank authority which must enforce its legitimacy with force and regimentation. Program staff were put in their place when prison staff could totally disregard expertise and performance merely by pulling rank. The closed door of the ValPar room was an eloquent reminder of what (and who) really mattered.

One of the manifestations of this system is the inner circle of decisionmakers known as "the good old boys." This designation is reserved for people who have known each other, have worked together over a number of years, and who can be counted on to do business in ways that look out for each others' interests. Jobs are awarded, careers are made on the basis of recommendations from or inclusion in this inner circle. As elsewhere in prison there were circles within circles. A friend in the state department of corrections, who had worked his way to the top, offered this advice to program staff: "If you want to be included in the group, go hunting and fishing with them, practice on the target range, go out and drink beer with the guys."
The familiar we/they dichotomy that divides inmates from staff also divides the staff from the outside world. "We" included the people who knew what prison was like, people who dealt with a reality most prefer to deny or forget. "They" were outsiders, naive, ignorant, and willing to turn their problems over to someone else and forget them. Many prison staff, particularly those in education, were themselves dropouts from careers outside of corrections. They often felt abandoned by society and cling to their insider status, resentful of attempts to professionalize their jobs and upgrade their work according to standards imposed by people who do not really understand the prison.

In this charged political atmosphere, correctional personnel are expected to rely on each other, to help watch the backs of their fellow employees. Participating in the give and take of favors helped create bonds of dependency and trust. In the vernacular of the prison: "What goes around, comes around." Part of the team effort means looking good to outsiders, as during tours or presentations at professional meeting. Members of the team are expected to lend credibility to their comrades, and not reveal the backstage realities that would discredit the performance (Goffman 1959).

Sometimes looking good called for elaborate staging, as
when the new state director of corrections visited the prison and rooms were packed with inmates doing things they had never done before and would never do again. This often meant stretching the boundaries of one's work to take credit for what someone else had done.

Project Talents staff were not dependent on prison employees for advancement and promotions. Their relative autonomy from the prison system meant they could not always be trusted to perceive or perform the obligations necessary to get ahead in prison. There was no reason to include them in the daily conspiracies and compromises, the give and take, the rumors and the scuttlebutt that are part of working in prison. Sometimes these exclusions were pointed, but more often the result of simply being overlooked -- a poignant reminder to program staff that they were "not really there." When the ad hoc parole process resulted in drastic loss of students and income for the program and when the JTPA planning effort resulted in a won battle and a lost war, state administrators were perplexed that these issues were of such value to the program.

The campus equivalent to this good old boy network was less apparent but as consequential as its prison counterpart. Without formal representation on most campus committees and in staff meetings, program staff found they had to "psyche out" policy decisions and indirectly influence deci-
sions from their sideline position. In making reports only to the president's advisory committee, official interpretations of the program were the province of this small group of officials. The interpretation in 1983 that the program had earlier "cost the college money," presumed for the president and his advisors the prerogative to define success and failure according to standards external to the program and beyond the control of program staff. The image of the college as a stable institution, struggling to maintain a costly program for inmates was more important than the image of Project Talents compensating for enormous disadvantages and making a profit for the college to live on.

At best, the program leaders could hope to associate themselves with these inner circles of decision makers, if not interact with them. With the CETA and industry grants, being in the right place with the right idea was not just a matter of luck but of information gathering, careful positioning, and patient cultivation of contacts. The groundwork for these proposals took weeks of research, writing, designing program prototypes, reconciling rhetoric, and preparing presentations. The staff had to have been put in place and ready to put their energies into these efforts.

Although the efforts of the staff did not go unrecognized, it was generally thought that the CETA grant was not truly a competitive award and that the industry grant
resulted from a personal friendship of the Middletown banker who had so consistently supported the program. Of course both of these interpretations were accurate, along with many others regarding national politics, corporate and agency imagebuilding, public attitude, and the timing and organizational positioning abilities for orchestrating all of these together.

The particular point in the Project Talents/Project Enterprise history where this analysis of roles and role networks is most significant is that of implementation. Implementation is an area of concern for correctional education since so many well-designed programs rarely operate as they were intended. John Conrad has noted that this gap between intention and practice has plagued prison reform throughout history (Conrad 1981:1). Michael Quinn Patton (1978) goes so far as to suggest that the implementation itself should be the prime focus of program evaluations, and only later should the question of program outcome even be regarded.

From this point of implementation, where the above observations converge, can be drawn two implications. Reminiscent of Benjamin Disraeli's observations of men building institutions and institutions building nations, these implications regard both organizational and individual issues in correctional education.
In an organizational sense, it is not surprising that an education program would have to adapt design and structure to fit the mandate of another, and different, host institution. Even fitting into the prison mandate to maintain custody and control over their inmates is possible, though this is not done without compromising at least some program standards and goals. However, if the program is provided by an outside service deliverer, increasingly the case in correctional programming, there are additional burdens of meshing organizational boundaries and administrative styles.

In addition to designing a comprehensive program, Project Talents/Project Enterprise staff had to design from the ground up, an operational strategy which blended the innerworkings of its host institutions. Mistakes, hunches, and experience were the only guides for this. Without access to organizational decisionmaking and information networks that affected them, program staff were constantly playing catch-up -- reacting to an environment over which they had no control. For educational programs to be in sync with prison routines satisfies only the least requirement of such programs; educational personnel and educational concerns must be integrated into the bureaucracies of decision-making to which they must report.
Bureaucratic clout comes in part from public image. Correctional educators are accurate in their observations that mere involvement in the bureaucracy does not ensure that programs will be implemented, protected from hassle, nor even evaluated on their own merits. Until a broad constituency for such representation emerges, fully complemented with appropriate images, expectations, and accountability, simple involvement with the system is not enough.

Equally significant is the implication drawn from these observations regarding individuals. The success of this particular program often rested on the degree to which staff were seen as competent players in their various organizational environments. With the "right stuff," staff found doors opened, advice given, assistance offered, and support provided which no amount of paperwork could have accomplished. To the extent they were denied those things, the program was ultimately limited.

For correctional educators there is no well defined right stuff. People as well as programs are compromised by the institutional setting, ensuring that programs will rarely exceed the minimum requirements. It was at this informal level of the prison folk culture that staff encountered the most obstruction and frustration.
Standards for Believing: Legitimacy

In representing people who have no supportive constituency, correctional education has been left without one of its own. There are no parent committees, no alumni associations, no parent-teacher associations to provide impetus and legitimacy for correctional education (Reffett 1983:41). Correctional education has had to borrow its mandates from other institutions with other purposes.

One way to garner legitimacy for one's efforts is program sponsorship. The experience of this program was that funding and support were given not to the needy so much as to the worthy. Displays of such worth included reassurances that the program and its staff were experts at what they did and could be counted on to make the funding agency look good.

For Project Talents/Project Enterprise, transition points called for displays of success which would lay claim to future investments. At the end of fiscal years, the staff would ceremoniously present the results of their efforts for approval and to leverage salary raises, staff increases, and promotions. In requests for monetary support of a new project, presentations had to convey more than the proposal at hand; they had to also convince patrons of the expertise, reputation, and ability to deliver that would
accompany any investment. These too were ceremonial occasions where the focal point itself is merely a device by which worth can be assessed. From the perspective of the program itself, these occasions were opportunities to identify Project Talents interests with those of powerful groups or agencies, and to search out bases of common belief or interests, which would enable a more long term partnership.

The concept of common ground was at the center of a program that defined itself as the "intersecting point" of a variety of other institutions. As a program, Project Talents/Project Enterprise existed only to the extent that such diverse organizations as a prison, a college, a private industry, religious organizations, and government agencies could see or be convinced to see a commonality of purpose. This was a delicate position to maintain and most staff agreed that a generous, perhaps even a disproportionate amount of time was consumed by defining and redefining the program to align it with the beliefs of other organizations. To the extent that these organizations themselves represented not only diverse but conflicting purposes, the program often seemed to be posed as being "all things to all people."

In bidding for CETA support, the program was characterized as "practical" and "hands on," images not usually attributed to nor preferred by a liberal arts college. The
potential clients for this CETA effort were described as people who had failed in school and in the workplace for lack of personal skills and knowhow. With training and appropriate information about the market place, it was argued, they would stand a better chance of succeeding when they got out.

The college did not find much harmony with the rhetoric of practical skills training and job-finding counseling. Even less familiar to the college administration was the role of grant fiduciary for a governmental bureaucracy, a responsibility that went with the grant. The need to establish separate accounts and tracking systems met with some resistance. Only as the program staff were themselves willing to assume the responsibilities for these compliance requirements, did the college business office reluctantly move ahead. As it became apparent that CETA money could also provide salary relief and allow the college to rent its own office space from itself, using CETA funds, the grant became more palatable, although program staff still did the actual work which ordinarily would have been done by the business office.

However, for the duration of the grant the mandate for providing tangible reintegration skills for inmates was never fully legitimized. This program was distinguished from the college's vested interests by always referring to
it as the "non-academic" program. Gradually program staff also adopted this distinction, causing a division within the program that was never resolved. Though it was anticipated that this service would eventually be incorporated in the regular program budget, the reluctance of the college to associate itself with this function as well as the school's unwillingness to part with the funds this would require ultimately resulted in the abandonment of this effort.

The partnership with private industry was equally tenuous. The region around the prison was the home and international headquarters of the industrial benefactor of the program. The industry had long made contributions to the philanthropic and civic needs of the community. Serving inmates was controversial, more controversial than the industry had bargained for. Further, these inmates were not even their "own boys" but came from the entire southern half of the state. At one point, the industry representatives suggested selecting out only those inmates from the industry's own community to receive services provided by the industry money. After the announcement of the grant the program received a host of requests and suggestions for how the money should be spent: several college faculty proposed an elaborate plan to pay faculty to visit the prison; a probation officer from a neighboring community hosted a delegation from the program to lunch, proposed using $100
thousand of the money for his program and then pouted through the rest of the lunch when the nature of the grant was explained; a corporate public relations manager from the industry itself proposed that the program purchase an overrun of careerbuilding pamphlets used for the industry's junior executives.

As the fortunes of the industry changed, as stock values diminished, bonuses eliminated, and employees laid off, the atmosphere surrounding the grant changed. The philanthropic arm of the industry was an endowed foundation -- its gifts and grants were "in the bank" -- so the shortfall of the corporation could not drain grant resources. This did not prevent pressures to redefine the grant-sponsored efforts of the program however. Among assurances that the money for the grant would continue, came overtures and suggestions for changing its initial intent. The idea of a community support network seemed less attractive, although industry representatives foundered in their own efforts to describe an acceptable alternative.

In the long run, no clear mandate was derived from the industry monies. The bottom line for CETA was compliance with regulatory guidelines and accurately filling out quarterly reports. When a new college president took office and declared that the mandates provided by the sponsorship of these agencies were not consistent with college policy, only
staff within the program itself responded with concern. The industry representatives who initially demanded reassurances that the grant would not be spent on the main campus activities were now relieved that the focus could be drawn away from prominent involvement in the prison.

CETA was itself being dismantled and replaced with JTPA and was in no condition to question the intent of the college. The Project Enterprise program was left without any mandate and without the support of a powerful constituency to assert the ultimate needs of the inmates.

For correctional education, mandates are hard to come by. Only by creating a kinship of purpose with an existing organization can correctional education legitimize the full range of programs and services needed to deliver a comprehensive and integrated program. The attempt by the program director and the trustee overseer to create a separate board of directors with a broad representation was an attempt to establish a power base for the program while recognizing the vested interests of the program's various sponsors. They also intended to situate the program in such a way as to provide it some shelter from one or the other partners simply deciding to withdraw, or directing program objectives from a purely self-serving vantage point. This latter fear proved to be prophetic as the new college president vehemently rejected the idea, going so far as to call such a move
illegal, and interpreting it to the college board of trustees as a plot to steal the Project Talents program, and profit margin, away from the direct control of the college.

The significance of an outside power base lending legitimacy and clout was also noted in the evaluations of the Project Newgate programs (Seashore and Haberfeld 1976). Ironically, the more comprehensive and complete educational efforts become, the more difficult it is to find an umbrella that will encompass them and give them shelter.

Standards for Evaluating: Expectations

Before programs can be evaluated, it must first be established just what it is that they are intended to do. Herein lies the problem with much evaluation research -- not adequately evaluating the expected outcomes themselves. Recently the concept of "stakeholder" has entered the vocabulary of evaluation research (Dunn 1982; Weiss and Bucuvalas 1980). Dunn points out that outcomes of some sort are unavoidable and that all are mediated by the diverse standards of appraisal which are in turn distributed unevenly among those having an investment or stake in a program (Dunn: 295). Taking this perspective to a more basic conceptual level, Stephen Toulmin views reforms themselves as arguments, debate, or "critical social transactions" which
must compete for recognition and legitimacy (Toulmin et al. 1979).

From this more politically mature perspective is established the possibility, even the probability, that program purposes and outcomes may rely as much on persuasion for their acceptance as on logical consistency and reasoning (Kelly 1980). From this perspective, program outcomes do not stand alone, but are mediated by worldviews, ideologies, and frames of reference. With this in mind, more can be learned about what will be permitted and what will be acceptable by analyzing the frames of reference brought to the program by its stakeholders.

One of the most frequent questions for Project Talents/Project Enterprise was whether or not the program prevented recidivism. This criterion is one frequently used as a standard for measuring effectiveness of treatment programs, regardless of its appropriateness or usefulness. Where it is useful is for sponsors of programs, usually experimental programs, who want to point to their project as the "magic bullet", the intervention which reduced recidivism. Measuring recidivism and its reduction is one thing; demonstrating cause, usually one's own or one's sponsor's own intervention and not some other or combination of others, poses a different problem.
In the prison the education staff, constantly faced with inadequate budgets and limited resources, were interested in demonstrating that students going through education programs recidivated less than those given industrial work assignments. One of the prison education staff members, posing as an employee of Wilmington College (he had taught a course for the college), conducted a phone survey of inmates released for six months, comparing job assignment in prison to their self-reported descriptions of encounters with the law. Although his survey reported school inmates a slight margin favoring those from education programs, his methodology left many questions unanswered, and raised many others. The results were not widely quoted.

A year after this study, the program research director began a follow-up study of prison inmates including college and non-college participants, hoping to use parole records as a source of information. After months of circular referrals from the state office of corrections to individual parole officers, she found she could not get access to the criminal records of inmates (maintained by the Bureau of Criminal Investigation), the parole records of inmates (maintained by the Parole Division of the State Department of Corrections), or the institutional records of non-college inmates (maintained by the Institutions Division of the Department of Corrections.) Although it was feasible to get
aggregate data, there was no way to trace individual inmates through the different record-keeping systems of three organizations without doing it for one person at a time. This on the other hand was feasible but not allowable. Though individual employees were interested and helpful, they were limited in their assistance by the many bureaucratic "gatekeeping" rules and procedures which made it virtually impossible to get any data to a private citizen. The "system" turned out to be three administratively separate systems, and the idea of tracking an inmate through incarceration and reintegration was put on the back burner.

The college was not so preoccupied with recidivism, though it would crop up as a question in the context of someone challenging the program ("But do you prevent recidivism?"). Instead, the research director was asked to assess inmate/students along the lines of continuing academic careers: did they attend college on the street, finish degrees, go to graduate school? A mail survey to program graduates and inmates who had completed at least one year brought mixed results. Some had transferred to a college on the street immediately after being released, but typically dropped out soon after; others had found work, but intended to return to school for a course or two, when and if they got the money; most had found employment and were preoccupied with reassembling their lives.
By this criterion, continuing education, Project Talents program did not appear to be a clear "success." When the research director asked for the college research on former students and graduates for use as a comparative baseline she was informed the college had never done that kind of research. Apparently, the college had expectations and standards for measuring effectiveness of the Project Talents academic program that it did not hold for its campus programs.

CETA and the industry also had standards of success in mind. For CETA, the expressed goal was to "find these boys jobs." The CETA grant provided a follow-up period of one month, hardly enough time to adequately assess whether an ex-offender had found and maintained steady employment. Even short-term follow-ups were indicating that the host of personal, legal and familial problems ex-offenders were facing could often not be offset by employment and in many cases were exacerbated by the unfamiliar restriction of steady employment. At any rate however, the required quarterly reports were made long before there could be adequate feedback of the effect of the training program in prison.

The industry grant, intending to provide a base for drawing together community resources and packaging them for reintegrating offenders, was redefined several times in response to the changing financial problems the industry was
facing, their perceived role in the community, and the grant's representative's preference for producing a tangible product. By the third year of the grant the original purpose had been redefined so extensively that there was no opportunity to assess whether the community network concept was a helpful one or not.

So what was going on here? In more than any other phase of program operations, staff experienced the most confusion and contradiction over the expected outcomes of the program. It seemed at every juncture, that various goals were held out more to "keep the program in line" than as reasonable expectations.

This question is best addressed by referring again to the ethnographic accounts of what indeed was going on, and the way in which program outcomes were defined and enacted by the host organizations. From these various accounts, one can hypothesize that each organization was assessing program worth and contribution in light of its own organizational goals and standards, and not those that would necessarily apply to correctional education. Each organization had a "stake" in the program being or doing those things that reaffirmed that organization's own purpose, and outcomes tended to be mediated through the organization's own frame of reference (Suchman 1972).
In public speeches the prison superintendent described his role as "keeping the blood off the floors, keeping the toilets flushing, and preventing escapes." Order, maintenance, and security -- all else was optional. It had always been clear, though not in writing, that any incident or breach in security would result in the Project Talents or Project Enterprise programs being shut down. Indeed, this had been the case in 1968 when an incident in the industrial area resulted in the college courses being discontinued, even though the incident was not related to college offerings.

On several occasions when referring to contributions of the program, the superintendent referred to the impact it had had on institutional discipline and the fact that it occupied the time of the more inventive troublemakers in the prison. Indeed, the original motivation for beginning the program had been to serve as a work assignment so inmates would not be idle and cause trouble. Given no incidents, the program was working well. There was never any mention of rehabilitation, recidivims or reintegration into the community.

The college was monitoring another set of records. Its primary goal was to satisfy the Ohio Board of Regents and the North Central Accrediting Association. The crucial data for these agencies were faculty/student ratios, enrollment
patterns, credit hours taught and accumulated, grade point averages, student contact hours, curriculum development and fiscal health. Whereas the bottom line for the prison was security, the college expected academic integrity. Less openly referred to, though acknowledged among the president's immediate staff, was the expectation of a profit margin. No other department of the college was expected to return a profit in order to justify its continued existence. One year's experience indicated that even an increase in profit from the year before was not sufficient if it was not enough to balance the college's growing deficit.

Though individual CETA administrators may have been genuinely interested in their program resulting in good jobs for inmates, their accountability procedures were not set up to assess results in this area. For CETA the bottom line was fulfilling the compliance standards described in the regulatory guidelines set for the CETA program by Congress. Quarterly reports included data on numbers of clients served, budget expenditures in various accounts, and a timetable that indicated both programs and expenses were occurring at a predetermined pace. Often the Project Enterprise program was described as one of their most successful efforts because of the high client counts, the promptness of reports, the adherence to guidelines, and because there was little money left at the end of the fiscal year. In CETA
terminology, asking for program extensions indicated a successful effort; not spending all the money allocated indicated something was probably wrong.

The industry for all its good intentions of leaving the particulars of their funded project up to the "experts" really had some particulars of their own in mind. The size of the grant had not been so much in response to Project Talents needs, as to be significant enough to draw national attention to their effort. The company developed a high profile for their program within the political community and clearly identified their effort with the new republican administration in the White House. They were not interested in having their project complementing and supplementing an effort that was linked to previous administrations' policies or philosophies of dealing with social problems. As industry people, they were more inclined to see products as real outcomes and were not philosophically prepared to find satisfaction in abstract ideas of networks of services. Eventually, they withdrew their support from the idea of comprehensive programming and identified with the less controversial and more "product oriented" degree program.

Correctional education is caught in the vortex of many masters. It remains vulnerable to intensive scrutiny of outcomes that are either not genuinely supported or have little to do with program integrity and inmate needs.
Of all the sponsorships, CETA was the most unencumbered with covert agendas. Here, what you saw was what you got. What you saw was forms, and seemingly endless ways to document compliance with governmental rules and regulations, most of which have little or nothing to do with program objectives. Beyond this, the program was left a free hand to deliver a program of its own design and intent.

The prison's agenda was direct. Operationalizing the program to blend in with prison routines of security and custody was a sizeable task, but do-able. Harder to take into account and plan for were the additional layers of administrative style that make even institutions within the same system vary widely and the informal system of credits and debts and intrigue that permeated every facet of exchange. The prison was a difficult host for obvious reasons and an unforgiving host for reasons that go largely unacknowledged.

The industry and the college were demanding in their roles of correctional education sponsors. The expectations here were ever-changing and subject to individuals' interpretations and organizational agendas beyond Project Talents staff's capacity to influence, sometimes even to know. From the college's perspective alone, the program went from its initial beginnings as serving a Quaker mission (even if it cost money), to providing a service (as long as it broke
even), to broadening its base (as long as it made a profit), to becoming in the end a "profit center" alone.

The industry's plan was to parlay a local response to the crime problem into a national campaign to highlight private sector involvement in what were formerly seen as governmental concerns. The industry's changing financial fortunes, personnel changes in the grants manager position, and their obvious discomfort at sharing the stage with CETA (a fact known all along), added a list of impediments to a program already overladen with heavy agendas.

For Project Talents and Project Enterprise, the agenda was to adapt or be swallowed. By lending itself to these various organizational goals, the program did manage to carve out a space for itself and to introduce its own set of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating and acting into the prison. It is only conjecture to suppose that by creating an independent power base to give it legitimacy it might have broken through the inertia that seems endemic to correctional educational efforts. That this did not happen that way brings the argument full circle. Consistent within these changing expectations was the necessity of serving institutional interests other than its own, even when they conflicted with or detracted from its own needs, in order to survive. In the words of another staff member, to the extent the program marched to the beat of a different
drummer it could survive; to the extent that it marched to its own or to none at all it could only fail.
CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OBSERVATIONS

Introduction

In the chapters above, I have attempted to move from a straightforward presentation of the ethnographic narrative to successive levels of analysis one step at a time, qualifying as much as possible the various ramifications being drawn from these data. In this final chapter, I draw several observations from these analyses as they may impact on program design, implementation, and evaluation in correctional education.

These observations are more suggestive than comprehensive, and, while they are all drawn from the ethnography presented above, some are ratiocinatively derived and others more intuitive in nature. Although they are less directional than a conclusion, I believe these observations collectively express the sense of this ethnography.
As the institutions which house it, correctional education addresses a chronic and seemingly insoluble problem. That this problem has been so resistant to societal solutions is reflected in the lack of enthusiasm with which any aspect of corrections is generally received. With the exception of the occasional over-response as in the Lorton debacle, service programs serving correctional populations will likely be continually underfunded and understaffed, and will continue to fall short of even modest expectations.

Unfortunately, in the economy of scarcity which characterizes prison systems, the competition for even scarce resources seems to encourage programs which are designed and implemented in ways that preclude interpretable comparisons. As Campbell has observed, program administrators are aware they probably only have one shot and so stress uniqueness and overadvocate successful outcomes. All of this becomes politically necessary to get even that "drop in the bucket" (1982:43).

In the rush to attract scarce resources, correctional education has fallen victim to the anxious search for external validation and immediate, once-and-for-all evaluations long before programs have been debugged or before determining if there is even anything worth evaluating. The
aspiration to produce scientific validation is at best premature and perhaps even inappropriate. This approach assumes that the contexts of programs are known and the variables explaining program outcomes are even accountable neither condition holds true for most correctional education programs.

What are encountered in correctional education programs are definitions which are diverse and contradictory, and boundaries that are changing and problematic. Unlike laboratory experiments which lend themselves to rigorous testing, correctional education programs are socially mediated experiments where the goals are often diffuse, treatments long, theories poorly validated, and results multidimensional (Britan 1981:47). Until these contexts are themselves clarified, program evaluations will be incomplete at best, misleading and destructive at worst, and will continue to be molded by unspecified forces accepted indiscriminately as "givens" for the field.

Ethnographic methods are ideally suited to drawing out these socially mediated contexts, for illuminating interacting systems of variables and for revealing the dynamics of the institutions in which these programs are embedded. In this regard, eventual analyses of programs must draw from a data base of program history, implementation descriptions, elaboration of program activities, analysis of formal rules
and informal goals, sounding of participants' understandings, and appreciation of environmental pressures (Britan:50).

In the search for scientific validity, Campbell calls for situation specific wisdom. "The lack of this knowledge, (whether we call it ethnography, or program history, or gossip), makes us incompetent estimators of program impacts, turning out conclusions that are not only wrong, but are often wrong in socially destructive ways." (1982:34)

In a similar vein Borich argues that "the responsibility of an ethnographic account is to collect data not just for purposes of determining merit, but to also determine all the different criteria or value positions from which these judgements can be made" (1983:62). Ultimately, programs will be justified, or not, in terms of the values, needs and concerns of those from whom the impetus for the program originated. These values, needs, and concerns may not always coincide with those implicit in the program's goals and objectives. In optimizing the chances of survival, these data would appear crucial to program planning and interpreting program results and evaluations.

To the extent that an ethnographic mandate does exist for correctional education research, I believe the Project Talents/Project Enterprise episode calls for a four-step agenda for the field. First, correctional education leaders
and planners must actively encourage and enable correctional educators to provide intensive, descriptive accounts of correctional education programs — how they emerge, the forces and motivations that give rise to them, the dynamics that shape them, the sources of mandates that direct them, and the politics that determine success and failure. The work of Thom Gearing, Correctional Education Association historian, soliciting anecdotes and impressions of frontline correctional educators is a striking example of such work (Gearing 1985).

Second, a more generous inventory should be made of existing ethnographic description, including narrative commentary from standard program evaluations and proposals. In the absence of conventional ethnographic material Erving Goffman has advocated the use of such materials and even fictional accounts by insiders (Goffman 1973). So-called purist objections to materials from those with vested interests overlook the biased structure of virtually all reporting (Klockars 1979).

Third, efforts should be made to make future and already existing descriptive accounts accessible through centralized repositories and practical instructions for developing program archives should be made available for correctional program administrators. Fourth, frameworks for reconciling the different purposes and formats for
narrative should be elaborated to facilitate the comparative analysis of such ethnographic data and to draw out consistencies and patterns which may be subjects of further investigation.

One possible framework for such reconciliation of disparate data is suggested by the explicative/implicative analysis above. While this format is not a substitute for ethnographer experience and insight it does function to adjust for level of observation and work toward comparability of variant data. Additionally, Koppelman's explicative model was designed specifically to eventually bring even relatively unskilled fieldworkers to similar reference points (Koppelman:62).

The Ethnographer

Correctional Educator as Observer

As correctional educators are called upon in an additional role of "objective observor" of the systems in which they are participants, attention is drawn to the conflicting role expectations of such an endeavor. The complications and sense of threat involved in this dual role are doubtless at work in the relative dearth of insider ethnographic data on correctional education. Nevertheless, the prospective
reservoir of information, experience, and know-how which correctional educators can tap is itself ample reason for resolutions to neutralize the conflicts to the extent possible. Magorah Maruyama's experience using inmates as "cultural insider field researchers demonstrates both the value of such material and the protections which can be designed in to such a practice.

Robert Merton offers insight on the particulars of these role conflicts in his dichotomy of technician and intellectual:

If the intellectual is to play an effective role in putting his knowledge to work, it is increasingly necessary that he become a part of a bureaucratic power-structure. This, however, often requires him to abdicate his privilege of exploring policy possibilities which he regards as significant. If on the other hand, he remains unattached in order to preserve full opportunity of choice, he characteristically had neither the resources to carry through his investigation on an appropriate scale, nor any strong likelihood of having his findings accepted by policy-makers as a basis for action. (Merton 1957:217)

Merton summarizes his observations: "He who innovates is not heard; he who is heard does not innovate." As Rossi points out however, observers are rarely faced with this dilemma as they are rarely in a position to affect policy:
It should be kept in mind, however, that applied social research is no occupation for would-be philosopher kings. The applied researcher ordinarily does not get very close to the seats of decision making and policy formation. (Rossi 1980:897)

The key for this focus is its grounding in ethnography. Ethnography's central concerns of history and holism make process, context, and multiperspective realities the stuff of observation and recording. Additionally, ethnography's rejection of the concept of autonomous culture is coupled with an assumption that cultures are symbolically real, created and used by people in multiple, even insidious ways. Finally, ethnography controls knowledge through the discipline of observation, reason, and argument rather than by prior research criteria which control knowledge through technical judgements. As Noblit (1984:100) summarizes, keep the political explicit and insist that ethnography remain concerned with the creation of everyday life rather than judging the veracity of theory.

Frank Salamone (1979) credits the "insider/outsider" aspect of the participant observer role with itself assuring quality of ethnographic observation. The inside involvement in a program tends to prevent oversimplification in observing complex societies; the outside perspective engendered by the describing itself makes for an objectivity worthy of a social scientific endeavor. The role brings a
social and professional marginality with it however, as Hinshaw and Young (1979) have also described.

For Salamone, as with Simmel's stranger this marginality is "methodologically essential for carrying out fieldwork of good quality" (51). To the extent that, by definition, correctional educators are already somewhat marginal and to the degree that the fostering of acceptability for ethnographies is successful, the very doing of insider fieldwork might strengthen the field.

Correctional Educator as Participant

The other side of the participant observer's dual role, the participating part, is beset with four major problems: access, bias, ethics, and, as suggested above, the role itself.

Access: Though much fieldwork is accomplished by outsiders who gain entry to the field by their observer status, this is not an option for gaining entry into most prison settings. For the most part, ethnography of correctional education must rely on those who already have legitimate access to inside information about program/institutional dynamics. This is not to argue that traditional fieldwork cannot also occur through site visits, document and archival analyses,
interviews, and conventional evaluations, but rather that such re-creations will not substitute for the insights and perspectives of the long-term participant.

The case for this insider role has several strengths. First, long-term access to a prison setting as a visiting observer is unlikely. There are few roles for outsiders inside prison and even fewer which provide day-to-day access to the more subtle intrigues and power plays that make up much of prison communications. Like any kinship system, one has to be on the chart before really understanding what the chart means.

In response to an earlier proposal to study the culture of the prison academic community (Brown 1981), the granting agency suggested that I do a similar study in another prison for comparison. This response illuminates the message presented here: five years of intensive involvement were my payment for a vantagepoint for viewing the subtleties of a subculture in a prison. If, in service to a solely rational interpretation of scientific validity, this constituted biased data, then the alternative was no data at all.

Bias: This question of bias is familiar to fieldworkers: with insight come bias and possible role conflicts. In analyzing the obligations between researcher and sponsor,
David Fetterman (1983:215) alerts researchers to the often hidden obligations between employers and employees. In this relationship, the employer assumes legal and political liabilities for the actions of the employee. In return, the employee has ethical and contractual obligations to fulfill a commitment to the employer which includes presenting findings consistent with the employers needs and interests. These needs and interests in turn serve as the basis for decisions about data collection, fiscal administrative, and academic accountability which ultimately impact on the employee (215).

Carl Klockars (1979) is more to the point: "The occupational structure of modern science makes research, ethically speaking, a 'political vocation'" (1979:264). To understand what is going on, one must first of all be caught up in the doing of it. Those who are in the best position to tell the story, must to some extent tell the story which protects the interests of their job, their employer, or both. They are compromised to the extent that they have to make decisions about program directions and content, to make appropriate selections of information, and to present interpretations of findings consistent and meaningful to their employer's interests.
Ethics: In addition to this question of acceptability of results, correctional educators who become ethnographic witnesses also must confront the realities of "guilty knowledge" (Polsky 1967) — confidential knowledge that would otherwise be private — and the risk of "dirty hands" (Klockars 1979:271) — participating in the deals, deliberations, and distortions requisite to positioning, hence to access. This reality is no surprise, not foreign or shocking, just unacknowledged; this is the stuff of back room talk and corridor speculation. As shown by converse example in the ethnography above, this more than anything signals that something is working. Successful implementation, administration, and evaluation of correctional education programs relies on informal processes, personal dynamics, and political positioning.

Role: In his rich Ideology and Utopia (1936), Karl Mannheim challenges researcher's consciences with another distinction in role, that between administration and politics. For Mannheim, administration is concerned with a "series of social events which have acquired a set pattern and recur regularly," whereas politics is concerned with "those events which are still in the process of becoming, in which, in individual cases, decisions have to be made that give rise to new and unique situations" (112).
The former role calls for further rationalizing the social world so that its administration is more feasible, efficient, or appropriate. On the other hand researchers and participants may be called upon to clarify the emergent and to assist in comprehending what is going on and what might be done about it (Noblit:97).

The choice for correctional administrators is a fundamental one: to see themselves as administrators serving the interests and needs of bureaucracies and reconciling program contents and styles to fit these structures, or to see themselves as political advocates for independent, and essentially internally-defined roles of correctional education. The former is the typical mode, today and historically. However, the increasing sophistication and political consciousness introduced into the field by the leadership of the Correctional Education Association in the early 1980's has made correctional educators more aware of a choice, albeit an uncomfortable one.

Ethnography in Implementation

In the events chronicled by the ethnography above, much of the attention for research and evaluation was focused on individual outcomes and isolated, "magic bullets" that could be shown to have produced them. However, most of the
administrative energy of the program was being devoted to organizational and interorganizational issues of implementation. The ethnography begs the question: can an ethnographic approach be of practical use in the planning, designing, and implementation of correctional education programs?

Regarding ethnography and program implementation Walter Williams points out "the lack of concern for implementation is currently the crucial impediment to improving complex, operating programs, policy analysis, and experimentation in social service areas (Williams and Elmore 1976:267). Organizational sociologists have documented the particular problem of implementing programs that are new and innovative alongside or into existing programs (Corwin 1973; Hage and Aiken 1970).

In regard the plight of the program evaluator Michael Quinn Patton anticipates the risk of asking the wrong questions and ending up with useless information. To avoid this he urges framing evaluation questions in the context of program implementation (Patton 1978).

Ethnography is ideally suited to this kind of early assessment. The experience with Project Enterprise illustrates the point of Hage and Aiken, that it is at this early stage, during implementation, that organizational conflict and disequilibrium are the greatest:
The stage of implementation is thus the stage of conflict, especially over power. It is the time when the new program results in the greatest disequilibrium in the organization because it is the stage when the program becomes a reality and the members of the organization must actually live with it... tempers flare, interpersonal animosities develop, and the power structure is shaken. (Hage and Aiken 1979:100-104)

Ethnography's insider view reveals the dynamics of these power struggles and shifts, and provides explanations for the successes, failures, and changes in the program as it emerges. It gives us an analysis of the processes whereby the program comes to produce the result it does. Program evaluations are inherently problematical in that they entail numerous decisions about what and how to evaluate, the measures and standards to use, the values to invoke and so on. Prior to the end evaluation are the numerous administrative, procedural, and substantive decisions which are motivated and shaped by vested interests, which define and limit possible outcomes.

As seen in the elaborated case study of Project Talents, diverse meanings are attributed to programs by various stakeholders with various action-motivating agendas for their involvement in correctional education. These stakeholders apply different standards of appraisal for assessing outcomes; conflicts among them lead to selectivity in data which lend support to one's own perspective or
which refute competing ones. Using a jurisprudential metaphor, Stephen Toulmin likens this process to a debate or argument (Toulmin 1958; Toulmin, et al. 1979) in which all data or evidence is symbolically mediated. Rather than being subject to proof, demonstration, or validation, truth is more appropriately seen as a social construction which is subject to tests of appropriateness, relevance, and cogency (Phillips 1973).

In applying ethnographic review and analysis to implementation of programs, the gap between theory and practice is highlighted. George Noblit (1984:97) suggests viewing this as a gap between orientation and conceptualization. In bridging this gap, ethnography calls for a rethinking of the questions for which we seek answers. Noblit cautions that evaluation research is often in service of policymakers. Researchers must be careful to know what the questions are as the policymakers may simply be seeking rationalistic solutions to problems that are themselves irrational (98).

Dunn (1981:109-110) characterizes these issues as second-order errors. These involve selection of the less appropriate of two or more worldviews, ideologies, frames of reference, or problem definitions, whereas first-order errors involve setting statistical confidence limits too high or too low. What is at stake is not the appropriateness of
the answer but the appropriateness of the problem.

The gap between program plans and practice can be addressed with an applied ethnography. "It can use history; it can distinguish between kind and degree; it can place knowledge in context; and it can capture how humans adapt to uncertainty (Noblit 1984:98). When it comes time to evaluate program results, the details of the implementation history, the site-specific wisdom, and the gossip regarding where bodies are buried are all essential to interpreting any quantitative data (Campbell 1974, 1975, 1979).

On the other hand, while evaluators of correctional education have been preoccupied with the problem of determining whether their effort works or not, a more appropriate question, one raised earlier, would be: "Does it exist?" In the Lorton experience of the Specter initiative, the conclusion popularly reached was that it had failed. An ethnographic account of the program might have revealed that what failed was not the program, but its implementation. The "Lorton program" never existed.

An Ethnographic Epistemology

Correctional education planners and administrators would embrace information that would make their programs more feasible, efficient, and appropriate -- which would
facilitate predicting eventual success or failure. Though still far from predicting which model of education program will work where, with whom, and under what conditions, it may be possible to anticipate qualities that make some programs more likely to be acceptable than others and to project which types of programs will emerge from which contexts.

Salamone defines epistemology as "the theory of the existence of a knowable reality and the means for knowing it" (1979:47). Fernandez (1974:124) describes the deep metaphorical use of "quality space" to designate some topographic reality to factors influencing behavior and belief; Ernest House (1983) elaborates on metaphoric continuua used both popularly and by evaluators to convey program positioning and development. Here I use these concepts collectively as a base for positing two qualities I see at work in the ethnographic data presented: legitimacy and meaning. As described below, these qualities are proposed as two cross-cutting continuua, forming a matrix within which may be located and which anticipate particular values a program's contextual matrices bring to its existence, operation, and survival.

Legitimacy: To some degree, all correctional education programs derive their legitimacy and authority by associa-
tion with the professional organizations and sponsors which justify their efforts. Project Talents, owned by an agency outside the prison, shared this dependency for such credentialization and enablement.

These legitimizing affiliations vary in their external or internal orientation to the program, some were local and some were centralized. Examples of centralized, externally-validating structures are certification programs. In these cases, legitimacy comes in a currency of value outside the prison community: credit hours, standardized educational units, certificates, and degrees. Adult Basic Education (ABE), high school diplomas and equivalency (GED) certificates, college degrees, and apprenticeship certificates are all examples of such certification.

With the umbrellas of legitimacy that accompany these credentials come expectations for program conformity with outside standards and regularities, e.g. appropriate student to teacher ratios and standard contact hour to credit hour conversion. These standards provide a framework within which progress can be uniformly assessed. External validation comes from professional organizations, Correctional Education Association and the American Corrections Association for example; these agencies also bestow approval and acceptability on programs which conform to their professionally mediated standards.
As programs invoke the legitimacy of these, and other professional associations, they convey status and public reassurance that they are accountable to a higher authority. Organizational reputations are at stake; these programs must in turn enhance the reputation of their enablers, or risk losing the endorsement of these communities of colleagues.

Funding vehicles are also sources of program mandate. Public funds, usually in the form of either programmatic or individual entitlement grants (eg. CETA, PELL, JTPA, state instructional grants), and private revenues (foundations, churches, businesses, and individual grants) are all accompanied by particular expectations and limitations. Government appropriations are attached with rules and guidelines for using funds and for ultimate accountability to congress. Programs are responsible for maintaining compliance with enabling legislation through the administrative procedures of an agency monitoring the funds. This usually entails necessitating a separate and complex system for tracking expenditures, uses of time, counts of clients served, and other measures specific to particular agencies. One implication of the "grants economy" that has emerged in the past twenty years in education is that programs have become so involved and dependent on these monies that they must shift programming rapidly to keep up with corresponding shifts in these agencies' policies (Cohen 1972:193). As
Kenneth Boulding noted: "The sum total of grants is likely to be more stable than any participating component of it." (1970)

Private funds on the other hand come attached with product outcomes; these anticipated products usually reflect or enhance the values of the organization itself. A private foundation may define the value as a philanthropic objective or service; churches may draw upon the component as a way to provide service opportunities for volunteerism; businesses may anticipate training needs for future employees, new markets for products in prison education programs; colleges may see increased enrollments, faculty teaching slots, and opportunities for new development strategies.

Programs may also derive internal legitimacy by serving the needs, values and concerns of either their institutional host (the prison and the prison system) or, more rarely, their participants. Thus, some programs are legitimate if they do nothing more than structure time, enhance security, contribute to institutional maintenance and functioning of the institution, and keep "rehabilitation" covered for political purposes.

Meaning: Another quality of program context that emerges from the ethnography is meaning, the interior definitions of culture or, in this case, a program. Here the realities
of interest to ethnographers are not idiosyncratic, individual realities -- the intentional meanings -- but those that belong to social groups -- the implicational meanings (Hanson, 1975).

Here the contrast between etic and emic realities is useful. Borrowed from linguistic phonological distinctions between phonetic and phonemic sound designations, ethnography uses the terms to distinguish conventional, standard, and culturally-external interpretations -- etic meaning -- from interpretations of significance to those in the culture itself -- emic meaning. (Harris 1968:568-604)

Within this dichotomy, etic constructs or accounts consider phenomenon from the point of view of standardized measurement "or if not in terms of measurement at least in terms of systematic ways in which scientists as external observers define units" (Erickson 1977:60). Emic constructs and accounts on the other hand are those of the ordinary actor in the setting under study.

Applied to the interests here, programs may be embued with and express sense and meaning of the values, norms, and expectations of the program community itself, or the program may import meaning from some exterior reference point or community.
A Taxonomic Paradigm

These two qualities I am proposing to be significant in assessing the contexts for correctional education programs, sources of meaning and affiliations of legitimacy, once again parallel ethnoscience's meaning and syntax. In the sense that they are used here however, I am drawing no further or universal implications from this observation. Instead, I propose them as axes for a simple sorting device, a taxonomic paradigm for conceptually organizing the kinds of contextual factors encountered by correctional education.

Beginning with these two contextual qualities -- legitimacy and meaning -- I further elaborate respective continua of localized/centralized (legitimacy affiliations) and emic/etic (sources of meaning). The resulting configuration is a rudimentary four-fold paradigm for categorizing contexts for correctional education programs.

The features of these four models of program context matrices organize associated and characteristic areas of strength and weakness as well as expectations and limitations. This paradigm is more suggestive than definitive, emerging from a single, albeit comprehensive, research setting. However, I believe it does invite elaboration and refinement with data analysis from additional program searches. Ultimately, a model of some utility for program
planning, implementation, and evaluation might be derived from such an effort and provide tangible assistance for fitting appropriate programs to particular contextual environments.

Uniform Model
(central legitimacy/ etic meaning)

Programs categorized here are characterized by their reference to centralized credentializing agencies and their deference to "expert" opinion in design and delivery. They are totally constructed outside the context of prison with little anticipation that, beyond obvious deference to prison regulations, they will be modified to fit the particulars of any one institution. Indeed, such modification would violate the uniform integrity of their design. These efforts may, and usually do, exist independently of other prison training and treatment programs. These are generic programs and, theoretically at least, may be used anywhere by any type of inmate population. Examples are ABE, GED, certificate programs, and basic literacy skills programs.

These components permit a modular approach to program design. Training and educational skills can be broken into component parts and assembled around a certain number of units, or credits. They can be packaged and marketed separately or in customized packages, and are usually introduced
by consultants who have been specifically trained in a pre-
determined set of guidelines.

This type of program is useful for covering bureau-
cratic bases. Outside authority and expertise leave little
opportunity for discretionary decision-making, and assure
any would-be critics of the authenticity of the finished
product. They are useful for serving basic educational
needs and for conforming with court-ordered mandates for
minimal levels of educational opportunities. The prison
assumes little liability and results can be easily monitored
by outside agencies.

On the other hand, these programs may indeed provide
only minimal level programming. Often such programs adhere
to the letter of specifications and miss the spirit of
educating entirely. They offer opportunities to "nudge"
performance reporting by interjecting discretion in those
areas not specifically detailed (eg. the standards may re-
quire a number of student/teacher contact hours but do not
specify how that time must be spent; or equipment must be
available a certain number of hours each day, but does not
specify that can not be while inmates are in lock up). More
emphasis is placed on quantity of participation than on
quality.
Adaptive Model
(central legitimacy/emic meaning)

Other programs may also draw on centralized credentializing agencies or professional organizations, but incorporate these programs into the overall routine and pattern of institutional programs. This may be accomplished by linking these programs with other educational/training components to provide a coherent sequence, or by defining the program as preliminary to some other task assignment (e.g. industrial shop repair, computer lab technician, office clerk) or a capstone to other efforts (e.g. certifying an internship or apprenticeship). This program type is adaptive in the sense that it allows a particular prison to use personnel and resources available and may become an integral part of the prison community. Project Talents aspired to this model with its "partnership" approach to education and training, based on the premise that one program cannot do everything necessary. Another example of such a program is the emerging TIE (training, industry and education) effort, an attempt to establish cooperation at a national level through a consortium to provide such programs in prisons a ready-made context to be adapted to the particulars of specific institutions (Coffey 1986).

Such a model provides the possibility and attractiveness of comprehensive programming, making use of available
resources by linking them to create a program effort greater than the sum of its parts. Ideally, such an arrangement would provide inmates with an integrated sequence of activities, all validated by centralized, external affiliations and applications.

However such partnerships have so far proven hard to come by; organizations working so closely together necessitates integration of programs at administrative and organizational levels as well. As the case study of Project Talents illustrates, this provides many opportunities for conflicting interests and agendas and confusing standards for assessment.

Indigenous Model
(local legitimacy/ emic meaning)

Programs which derive legitimacy from local, internal standards and needs include the whole category of state-run programs: prison farms, factories, maintenance crews, and institutional work cadres. These operations are served secondarily by educational and training programs which have as their purpose the preparing of inmates for production roles. It is not uncommon to find these work assignments themselves described as "educational" because they teach a trade or skill. These programs are essentially self-serving in that they exist to serve the needs of their host. Many
state-run trade schools fall into this category, as did all educational programs in the Tennessee prison system as required by the notorious Plan for the 80's, which required that only those educational programs which prepared inmates for institutional job assignments or prison-run industries would continue to function.

Such programs may be useful for inmates serving long or life sentences who do not aspire to training for street life, but only that for a vocation inside the prison. Such programs are desirable for their service function to the prison system and their contribution to the control and management of the prison.

These are programs to "keep the lid on." By definition however they are administrative programs and are subject to the political tides and changes in leadership at either the state or institutional level. There is no pretense here of preparing inmates for realistic jobs and these programs may contribute to the overall "institututionalization" impact of prisons.

Participatory Model
(local legitimacy/ etic meaning)

Less well known are grass roots educational programs that are legitimated locally by virtue of their integration into the prison structure and routine. These programs may
spring from the particular needs of the inmate clientele, yet derive meaning from an application that can only be fulfilled outside the prison community. This presents a dilemma in that such programs can only exist in prison and yet, in the context of the prison, they do not make inherent sense. Although in the often absurd environment of prison, this illogicality may be less inappropriate than more conventional educational components.

Thomas Mott Osborne's experiment with the Mutual Welfare League is a prototype for such programs (Barnes and Teeters 1951:691-697; Murton 1979). Osborne's plan to turn incarceration itself into an educational experience was a radical idea which has yet to be fully tried. Osborne believed it possible for inmates to be self-governing. Under his system, inmates were trained for citizenship through an opportunity to devise their own rules; run a commissary, an employment bureau, and a court; schedule their leisure time; and form mutual support networks upon release. They could begin practicing the roles they would take once released while still in prison. He advocated the entire prison as an educational institution.

In a similar vein, Lawrence Kohlberg's philosophy of moral development has led to some educational programs being transformed into havens within prison for inmates to practice moral decisions and experience consequences of their
choices. This "just community" gains some of its impetus from the contrast it provides with the prison culture and its attempt to recreate conditions of decision-making to be experienced once released (Kholberg et al. 1974). In design at least, the Project Enterprise effort described in the ethnography above was such a program. It consisted entirely of prison routines, job assignments, and institutional resources overlayed with the idea that an inmate could take charge of his own incarceration and begin acquiring, in the context of incarceration, skills and habits for community living.

Historically, these programs have not fared well. They are usually received with much enthusiasm by the inmates but are either rejected by a critical public for lack of "prison-ness," as in the case of the Mutual Welfare League, or are eventually rejected by the prison. Project Enterprise dovetailed surprisingly well with prison routines, both formal and informal, and drew extensively on the resources of the service and treatment resources already present in the institution; but it ultimately derived sense and meaning from individual inmates planning for lives outside prison. Though it did not exist long enough to trace impact on the prison, its short existence may confirm the observed prognosis for programs in this category. The idea of inmates taking charge of their own incarceration and making time
work for them does not evidence clear, continuing subordina-
tion to any of the contextual domains discussed. Hence,
beyond meeting ephemeral needs and conditions in a particu-
lar institution, these programs have neither currency nor
credibility among key corrections personnel, they violate
the conventional notion of of "prison."

Final Observations

With the possible exception of this fourth, participa-
tory model, all the categories of this paradigm of contexts
feature correctional education programs as clearly subordi-
nate to principles and organizations outside themselves.
Although no deeper significance is intended beyond a simple
organizing taxonomy, some can be inferred. For example,
while no inherent incompatibility exists between programs
categorized participatory and uniform, experience shows
few examples of successful merging of such efforts. Espe-
cially where curricular products are involved -- reading
programs, computer-assisted learning software, and employ-
ment information units, for example -- little emphasis is
placed on fitting these to the settings where they are used.
In the words of one correctional education evaluator,
"stand-alone educational products usually do just that,
stand alone." Perhaps the fluctuations of the product
chain, from design consultant to manufacturer to marketing and sales forces to centralized education personnel and finally to the end user, militate against sensitivity to the actual local needs.

Another inference that might be drawn from this taxonomy is that some program/context types may evolve from one model to another; participatory concepts may become adaptive concepts through maturation and institutionalization. Additionally, certain affinities may exist among particular models; the Project Enterprise experiment for example found greatest support from institutional activities described by the indigenous and the most resistance from those described as uniform. However, beyond the possible utility of these and other observations which can be drawn from this device, the taxonomic paradigm itself may imply something more significant for the correctional education field.

Structurally this representation looks more like the "sorting out" of natural history than theoretical analysis. This may follow from either of two explanations. In the sense of Thomas Kuhn's thinking on scientific revolutions (1970), correctional education may be in a pre-paradigmatic, natural history phase of development; the field may have not yet formed a coherent theoretic overview. On the other hand, the field may be so overlaid with theories that no
single one is any longer distinguishable. In either case, correctional is certainly less a discipline than a field, if that.

In this regard, two concluding observations and recommendations for the advancement of correctional education flow from the descriptive analysis above.

First, data on correctional education programs and settings, unfettered by narrow, immediate evaluation agendas, must be made available to researchers also unfettered by these immediate institutional needs. This calls for collecting and disseminating extensive ethnographic observations of the field.

Second, I believe the deconstructive tradition used as a metaphorical foundation for this study is a valuable approach for analyzing these ethnographic data. Essentially an anti-disciplinary discipline, deconstruction has the capacity to effectively cut through superficial analyses to expose implications and hidden agendas. It has rigor, yet is suited for complex phenomena. Most important perhaps, except for Foucault's work, a deconstructive approach would bring to the field a new, outside metaphor.

In one of the more avant-garde of the Project Enterprise guest lectures, a transcendental meditation "guru" was brought to the prison. At one point in his presentation he said to one of the participating inmates: "You have gone
about as far as you can go with that particular mantra." I believe correctional education has gone about as far as it can go with the prevailing analytical and organizational "mantras."
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