Federal Probation

MARCH 1987

Federal Probation

A JOURNAL OF CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY AND PRACTICE

Published by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts

VOLUME LI MARCH 1987 NUMBER 1

This Issue in Brief

Community Service: A Review of the Basic Issues.—Triggered by the Federal Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, the evolution of community service as a formal condition of probation has caused judges and probation officers to pay increased attention to the requirements of community service programs. Authors Robert M. Carter, Jack Cocks, and Daniel Glaser state that as various options are considered, basic issues must be identified, related to a system of judicial and correctional philosophy, and implemented in an atmosphere in which citizens have ambiguous feelings about community service as a sentencing option. In this article, the authors attempt to identify the basic issues and to place them in a frame of reference for practitioners.

The Alcoholic, the Probation Officer, and AA: A Viable Team Approach to Supervision.—Probation officers are encountering increasing numbers of problem drinkers and alcoholics on their caseloads. Most officers are not specifically trained to work with the alcoholic, and author Edward M. Read advances a practical treatment model for use in the probation supervision setting. The author stresses the necessity for an important re-education process which includes full acceptance of the disease model of alcoholism and an accompanying renunciation of several damaging myths still all too prevalent. Several techniques of countering the alcoholic denial system are discussed, and the author highlights the appropriate use of Alcoholics Anonymous in the supervision process.

The Perceptions and Attitudes of Judges and Attorneys Toward Intensive Probation Supervision.—In recent years the spectrum of criminal justice sanctions has widened to accommodate an intermediate sentencing alternative known as intensive probation supervision (IPS). In his study of the perceptions and attitudes of court personnel toward IPS in Cook County, Illinois, author Arthur J. Lurigio found that, overall, judges and public defenders viewed IPS favorably, whereas state's attorneys were essentially unwilling to accept IPS as a viable option to prison. According to the author, the success of IPS programs often hinges on developing effective strategies to promote the program so that it appeals to the various elements in the criminal justice system.

The Role of Defense Counsel at Sentencing.—This article establishes the duties and obligations of defense

CONTENTS

Disciplinary Problems Among Inmate College Students

BY GEORGE C. KISER

Associate Professor of Political Science, Illinois State University

LITERATURE ON disciplinary problems in the prison college classroom is virtually nonexistent. One possible reason is that such problems may be too rare and insignificant to attract scholarly attention. Indeed certain considerations do suggest that inmates taking college courses would be unusually well-behaved. Perhaps most significantly they are not typical prisoners. For instance, they have far more formal education than the average inmate, and this would seem to be evidence of their ability, academic motivation, and self-discipline. Moreover, prisons may require good institutional conduct records for admission to their college programs (Sebastian, 1983). And inasmuch as research finds that enrollees in such programs are delighted with their opportunity to take classes, we might expect them to make extraordinary efforts to follow the rules so as not to jeopardize the program or their participation in it (Hogan, 1968; Jones, 1982; Zogg, 1986).

But still other considerations suggest that college classes in prison would have significant disciplinary problems. First, it is important to recall that enrollees *are* convicted felons, people who by definition were unable or unwilling to obey society's most important norms. Second, possession of a good conduct record by college students in prison does not necessarily guarantee that they have in fact been well-behaved, for most misbehavior in penitentiaries is never detected by correctional officers. Third, psychologists tell us that people subjected to severe and prolonged frustrations tend to take those frustrations out on other people. And of course many inmates' backgrounds are teeming with frustrations ranging from those associated with poverty, racial discrimination, and child abuse to the inherent and severe frustrations of imprisonment itself. When prisoners are tempted to lash out at others, they may find the teacher a more inviting and less threatening target than fellow inmates or prison officers. Finally, students anywhere may be more prone to misbehave if the teacher is new and insecure in that setting, and each year many teachers from traditional campuses enter the prison classroom for the first time.

Significant disciplinary problems do exist in some prison college classrooms, and the dearth of literature is a serious impediment to correctional education. New prison teachers are not alerted to problems they may encounter—problems that may be radically different from any they have encountered in the more traditional classroom and unresponsive to solutions that may have worked well back on the college campus. As they stumble into these problems without having had a chance to study them, their "solutions" may be less reasoned than they would prefer. And if they are unaware that other teachers are encountering the same problems, they may be intimidated by the fear that inmates have singled them out for unique harsh treatment. Of course they also lose the opportunity to learn from the experiences of colleagues who may have achieved some success in dealing with misbehaving inmate students.

A good starting point is for prison teachers to identify the disciplinary problems they have encountered, the solutions they have attempted, and their successes and failures. This article concentrates on one prison class in which I encountered significant disciplinary problems, then devotes very brief attention to two other inmate classes which were considerably better behaved. All three were taught in maximum security penitentiaries while I was a full-time faculty member at a nearby college or university.

The Problem Class

The problem class was Constitutional Law, which I had taught for several years at Illinois State University and taught as an extension class at Illinois' Pontiac Correctional Center during the early Summer of 1984. This class of about 20 students met three nights per week in 3-hour sessions. It focused heavily on student discussion of Supreme Court cases, the great majority of which dealt with the rights of defendants in criminal cases.

We have already noted some reasons why college classes in prison might experience few disciplinary problems. As I prepared to teach the Pontiac class, several additional considerations seemed to suggest that I should have few such problems with this particular class. First, during some two decades of college and university teaching I had experienced very few disciplinary problems. Second, I was already an "experienced" prison teacher, having taught a class at the Colorado penitentiary in 1967, and I had encountered

almost no disciplinary problems there. Third, the Pontiac class, with only about 20 enrollees, would be too small to protect the anonymity of badly misbehaving students. Fourth, students could not conceal their misbehavior from prison authorities, because one of the correctional officers enrolled in the course. Fifth, the subject matter of the course—defendants' rights—seemed ideal for capturing and holding the interest of inmate students.

Despite these favorable considerations, others pointed to the likelihood of disciplinary problems. Since the well-behaved Colorado class of 1967, maximum security prisons had changed significantly. They now contained far more violent, apparently incorrigible, prisoners and tensions had increased dramatically. The large Pontiac Correctional Center, with its turn-of-the-century buildings, had had more than its share of well-publicized riots, assaults, and murders. Moreover, several colleagues who had taught at Pontiac warned that disciplinary problems were very likely. For instance, they noted that students commonly wandered in and out of lectures at will and that unruly inmates had disrupted classes. One colleague told of a near-fight between members of rival gangs in his class and another told of a teacher who had been assaulted by a student in his class.

The Problems.—As predicted, problems did arise—early: at rollcall on the first night of class. I asked students to answer and raise their hands so I could learn their names as soon as possible. All but two cooperated. When their names were called, they mumbled something but did not raise their hands, so I was unable to locate them. Nor did they respond when I repeated their names and asked them to raise their hands. And night after night the number of students in class was two greater than the number of hands raised.

When I called another name during the first rollcall, a student responded that that was not really his name. At the end of rollcall he came to the front of the room to explain. For some unknown reason the prison authorities had arbitrarily assigned him the name that appeared on the class register. Although he had repeatedly informed them of his real name, they had stubbornly refused to use it. Would I please correct the roll and call him by his real name?

Shortly after my announcement on the first night of class that examinations would emphasize lecture material, one of the students strolled out to the hallway where he stood for several minutes while I continued to lecture. Then he wandered back into the classroom. During the evening several other students also left the room while the lecture was in progress and returned a few minutes later. Some made the same leisurely trip two or three times. During these self-scheduled recesses, they engaged in such activities as going to the bathroom, drinking water, stretching, visiting with other inmates, and standing in the hall and staring back at the classroom. None asked to be excused, and it was obvious that they assumed they could come and go at will.

Another problem was some students' remaining in the hallway for several minutes after the scheduled beginning of class. And some failed to return promptly after the recess occurred about half-way through the evening class period.

Still another problem involved two or more students responding simultaneously to my comments and questions. Although little discussion occurred during the first few sessions, when they finally did begin to discuss few raised their hands and waited to be recognized. Sometimes several students would all respond at once, seemingly unaware that other students were trying to talk.

Adding to this chaotic effect were the occasional discussions students held with each other, apparently unrelated to the topic of discussion. The most serious of these involved four students in the back of the room who talked to each other and often laughed for no apparent reasons. They were more disruptive than other students because they were louder and apparently more organized and deliberate.

When examinations were returned one student was unwilling to wait his turn. Each time he came to the front of the room to demand that the orderly distribution cease so he could receive his test immediately.

In combination these disciplinary problems were more substantial than those I had faced in any previous class. Consequently I started searching for solutions very early in the semester.

Coping with the Less Serious Problems.—Early in the semester I decided that it was important to distinguish the more serious problems from the less serious ones. While some problems could seriously undermine the entire class, others, although mildly disruptive and/or annoying, were unlikely to interfere significantly with the overall learning process.

The less serious problems appeared to be: (1) the two students' refusal to respond to rollcall; (2) the inmate's insistence that his name on the class roll was inaccurate; (3) students answering questions out of turn; and (4) the student's unwillingness to wait his turn when examinations were returned.

In 20 years of teaching I had never encountered students who refused to respond to the roll. In the traditional college classroom, it would be very difficult to understand what possible benefit they could hope to gain from such behavior. But from the perspective of some prisoners, refusal to answer roll might make sense.

They might be trying to prevent certain other inmates from learning their identity (e.g., a fellow classmate might be planning to kill them). Or as noted in a perceptive article on disciplinary problems in the prison classroom, some inmate students deliberately try to unnerve the teacher or to draw attention to themselves by refusing to meet even the most reasonable and simple requests (Reynolds, 1982). I decided the best response was to simply ignore the two students' refusal to respond to rollcall. Since attendance was not mandatory, a couple of pupils refusing to answer roll created no great problem. Moreover, I could have obtained a complete list of students in attendance from the correctional officer who escorted them to class, although I never bothered to do so. Also by the process of elimination it soon became apparent which two students were not responding to the roll. And when exams were returned, they finally had to acknowledge their identity in order to receive them.

Another unprecedented problem in my teaching career was the student's insistence on being called by a name other than the one on the class register. But as a recent legal column notes, disputes between inmates and prison authorities over inmate names are not uncommon (Warren, Possley, and Tybor, 1986). Prisoners may try to change their names for religious purposes or to constantly annoy and confuse correctional officers. And if an inmate goes by several different names, it may be easier to escape punishment for violation of prison rules. In 1986, a dispute over Pontiac inmate attempts to change their names was decided by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 7th Circuit. In upholding the right of correctional authorities to control name changes, the court wrote:

> We can imagine a situation where, when roll is called one morning, Fields refuses to answer his name because last night he changed it to Muhammad; the next day he changes it to Azeez, and the next back to Fields. How are the authorities to keep track of prisoners in these circumstances? (Warren, Possley and Tybor, 1986)

I simply made note of the name the student wished to use, addressed him by that name, and continued to use his official name for all other purposes.

The phenomenon of several students trying to discuss at once was not all bad. This problem seemed to spring more from academic enthusiasm than any desire to be disruptive. Generally on campus I ignore it altogether, because students themselves soon recognize it as a problem and act accordingly. However, after a class or two at Pontiac there was still no sign that the problem there would take care of itself, so I called it to the attention of the class. But I attempted to explain my concern in terms that would not hurt their feelings or inhibit their willingness to discuss in the future. I told them that I very much appreciated their willingness to discuss, but we were losing some of its benefit because of our inability to hear all of it. I asked them to please raise their hands for recognition before commenting and each student would get his turn. Although a few students' eagerness to discuss caused them to forget the rule, almost all obeyed it for the rest of the semester.

Never before in my teaching career had I encountered a student who demanded that his papers be returned before anyone else's. This student would come to the front of the room as soon as I started to distribute papers, interrupt me, and state his demand in an intimidating manner. I decided from the beginning that it was so unreasonable that acquiescence with it would suggest to the entire class that the teacher could be intimidated into meeting all kinds of irrational demands. So I simply and politely told him each time that he would have to wait his turn. And while I continued distributing papers he remained at the front of the room, glaring at me. While his behavior was mildly disruptive, it did not interfere greatly with the opportunity for other students to learn. Only two examinations were returned so there were only two brief "confrontations."

Coping with More Serious Problems.—Early in the semester I decided that the most serious problems were: (1) students wandering in and out of class at will; (2) their failure to report promptly to class; and (3) non-class-related talking in class.

I considered students wandering in and out of class to be a serious problem because: (1) it was disruptive to other students and to me; (2) it seemed to exemplify a poor academic attitude; and (3) students who engaged in it learned less because they missed important material. Because I had never encountered such a problem in my teaching career I decided to discuss it further with colleagues who had taught at Pontiac. They stressed that it had occurred in all of their classes, that many students engaged in it, that it was apparently an old tradition at Pontiac, and that probably it would be very difficult to curtail. Furthermore some thought that it was not the kind of problem that would seriously undermine a class and that if some students were willing to miss important class material and pay the price by getting lower grades that was their prerogative. But one teacher did indicate that students wandering in and out of class had annoyed him, so he had announced early in the semester that if they left without permission they were not to return—ever. Although he thought this had reduced the problem slightly, students continued to leave without permission and he continued to let them return.

It soon became apparent that even if I could have stopped my students from wandering in and out of the classroom I would have solved only a small part of a broader problem. On the first night of class I could see from the windows of my room that students were more or less continually entering and leaving all the classrooms. Even when all classes were in session as many as 10 to 20 students might mingle in the hallway, some talking quite loudly. And these hallway sounds carried easily into my classroom through the non-soundproof security door. This usually loud noise was a greater distraction to my class than its own members coming and going. Thus solving the disruptions to each class would have required *all* teachers along the hallway to stop their students from taking unauthorized breaks. And even this would not have completely solved the problem. Teachers did not coordinate their break-time with other teachers, so many of the students in the hallway at any given time were legitimately "on break." As one class would be returning to the classroom another might be going on break, thus adding perhaps 20 to 30 students to the already nosiy hallway. Viewed within this broader context, it became apparent that stopping my students' wandering in and out of class would have reduced the distractions to my class relatively little. With mixed feelings, I decided to live with the problem, at least for the duration of that course.

I also judged the failure of students to report promptly at the beginning of class and at the end of breaks to be a serious problem because it too resulted in a significant number of students learning less. For the first few days I simply delayed the start of class until all the stragglers were there, hoping that the problem would correct itself. But instead of improving, it grew worse. When students learned I would wait, they became more and more tardy. Consequently I soon announced that I was concerned about this problem and would convene the class promptly in the future. At first there was no substantial improvement, and sometimes only a few students would attend the first few minutes of class after the break. But gradually more and more students began to report promptly. Eventually some even began rounding up their classmates at the appropriate time, yelling something like "Okay, the prof is ready to start, so get movin' before you get left out."

Students talking among themselves during class was a serious problem because it caused the talkers to miss important information and it made it more difficult for the rest of the class to hear. However, some of these disruptions were less serious than others. The less serious talkers talked less often, more softly, and more briefly, and they did not appear to be following a ringleader or intending to disrupt the class. Although not all of these conversations were loud enough to be heard by the rest of the class, some apparently involved borrowing pencils and paper, reacting to or asking for clarification of some point the teacher had just made, saying brief "hellos" and just "kidding around." Perhaps a third of the class engaged in such conversations at some point in the course.

A much more serious problem was created by four inmates near the back of the room who appeared to be deliberately disrupting class as they frequently talked among themselves and laughed loudly when there appeared to be nothing to laugh about. Soon it became apparent that one of them was the ringleader and the other three, all younger, were followers. They spent much time looking at and taking their cues from him. They laughed when he attempted to be humorous and tended to talk only after he had initiated the conversation. These inmates were much more disruptive than the ones discussed above, because they talked louder and much more frequently.

It soon became apparent that non-class-related talking in class was a serious problem that would have to be dealt with if it was not to seriously undermine my ability to teach and the students' ability to learn. When added to the noisy four, even the disruptions of other students which appeared to be relatively harmless in and of themselves became more serious problems. Moreover, there was the danger that if the four were not brought under control, their example would prompt other students to become even more disruptive.

At first I attempted to deal with the talking problem exactly as I had always dealt with it on campus. Until it became an obvious problem I did nothing. Then I used such strategies as briefly stopping lecture or discussion or looking directly at the offending students and saying "please." While this was enough to stop most students from talking, it had little effect on the gang of four. The next step was to diplomatically tell the class that students talking to each other had become a problem that they would need to curtail because it was interfering with their opportunity to learn. This strategy was no more effective so I began to search for other alternatives.

One option was to drop the most disruptive students from the course. Teachers at the Pontiac Correctional Center have the authority to drop any student at any time, for any reason, and the student has no right of appeal. But I soon decided that this would not be the solution I would prefer. First, such unchecked authority could be used unfairly. For instance when several students are disruptive in a noisy classroom, the teacher might mistakenly accuse a nonoffending student. Second, dropping a student from the course might turn other students against the teacher, particularly if it ap-

peared that he had been unfair. And third, the very students who misbehave most may be most in need of education and other rehabilitational opportunities. Despite my reservations about using this power, I was glad to have it because it was certainly conceivable that a few students would deliberately attempt to destroy the learning environment for the entire class. Obviously no teacher could allow that to occur despite his deep reservations about employing such dictatorial power. But I decided to use it only as a last resort.

In the meantime I sought ideas from more experienced colleagues. Most reported that they had had similarly disruptive students in class. In fact one of the teachers had taught the ringleader of my most misbehaved students. I learned that this student was also the leader of one of the major gangs at the prison and that his three younger followers were apparently members of that gang. He had been disruptive in the other teacher's class, but his behavior had improved as they came to know each other better and he had been drawn more into class discussion. I learned, too, that he was apparently very bright and had compiled an excellent college record over several semesters.

Colleagues had devised several "solutions" for dealing with students talking to each other while class was in session. One indicated that when serious disruptions occurred he would announce that if they did not cease he would drop the offending student from the course. Another would ask such students to go to the hallway to continue their conversations and return to the classroom when they were through talking. One colleague had decided that such talking could be reduced by adding more recesses. He thought long classes meeting at the end of a long day tend to be more disorderly because the students are so tired. The addition of more recesses, he reported, had indeed helped curtail the problem of talking in his classes. Another colleague would announce that because the loud talking was making it impossible for him to teach, he would have to stop the lecture and wait for order to be restored. Sometimes that announcement was enough to get the disruptive students to cease talking immediately. But on other occasions they would continue to talk for a few minutes before deciding to be quiet. At other times, their classmates would tire of the forced break and tell the offenders, successfully, that it was time to "shut up and let the class continue." Although all of these teachers thought their "solutions" had helped, all emphasized that some of their students had continued to talk to others during class.

One of these approaches has been mentioned in the literature:

> One technique is to let the whole class experience the consequences of inmate misbehavior. When used effectively, this procedure will not lead to charges of unfairness. The teacher simply halts the lesson whenever disruptions occur, and he sits at his desk for a ten-minute time-out period. After the ten minutes are up, he quietly resumes the lesson. Since he does not name the students who caused the problem, there is no reinforcement of their attention-getting behavior. He simply explains that he doesn't enjoy teaching in a disorderly classroom, and he needs the time-out period to maintain his effectiveness (Reynolds, 1980).

After consulting with colleagues I decided to try two "solutions." The first was to institute more break time. In retrospect I decided that my break policy had not been very reasonable: one recess of about 15 minutes in a 3-hour class which met at the end of a long day in a hot humid classroom. So I announced to the class that we would have three recesses each night. I acknowledged that the talking problem could have been due in part to my initial break policy, and I explicitly linked the more liberal policy with the hope that students would curtail that problem. Moreover, after the new policy went into effect I sometimes reminded disruptive students that they didn't need to talk in class because another recess was coming up soon. Almost immediately after inauguration of the more liberal recess policy, the talking problem improved.

Fatigue is probably a much more serious problem in prison classes than others. As one article has noted: "Many inmates. . . come to class after a long day of strenuous physical labor." Adding to the fatigue produced by this "is the fact that many classes in penal institutions meet once each week for several hours. Thus, many students have been awake upwards of 18 hours by the end of the class (George and Krist, 1980)." Consequently the need for recesses is probably much greater than on campus.

The second "solution" was to attempt to get the gang leader's cooperation. Since his three followers had copied his misbehavior so faithfully, perhaps they would also emulate any improvements in his behavior. So I started making a greater effort to get him to participate in class discussion. Although most of my discussion questions were directed to the class in general rather than to specific students, I started calling on him by name. It soon became apparent that he was articulate and well prepared to discuss assigned cases. When he did well, he seemed pleased with himself and my praise for his good answers. I also made it a point to chat with him before class and during recess. He seemed particularly pleased when I praised him for some charity work I learned he was doing. By perhaps midsemester he was volunteering answers to many of my questions and had become one of the most valuable discussants. And as he was drawn more fully into class proceedings, his disruptive behavior grew less common. So did that of his three followers.

Neither increasing recess time nor drawing the gang

leader more into discussion completely eliminated the problem of students talking to each other while class was in session. Sometimes he and the other three members of his gang would revert to disruptions almost immediately after he had made important contributions to class discussion. And still other students occasionally talked out loud to each other. But, on balance, this problem declined as the semester progressed.

Two Classes With Fewer Problems

In sharp contrast to the Constitutional Law class at Pontiac, my Principles of Sociology class at the Colorado Penitentiary in Canon City in 1967 had no disciplinary problems at all. There are several possible explanations for the better behavior of the Colorado inmates. First, there was much less tension in the prisons of those days and relatively more of the residents were non-violent offenders. Second, the college program there was much newer, with no assurance that it would continue; consequently the students may have been more concerned that any disciplinary problems could lead to its termination. Third, the program's newness meant that there had been no time for traditions of academic disruption to develop. Fourth, Colorado's policy of requiring college students to purchase their own books and pay tuition virtually guaranteed that all students would be significantly motivated. In contrast the State of Illinois furnished Pontiac inmates with free books and tuition plus a stipend for attending college; not surprisingly, some inmates who seemed to have little or no motivation were attracted to that free program. And fifth, Colorado inmates were not tempted to wander in and out of class because there were no prisoners in the hall with whom to visit; only one class was offered at the penitentiary and the only person in the small hallway outside the classroom was the correctional officer.

As we have seen, the two classes discussed above represent two extremes. While one was extremely well-behaved, the other was the most disruptive class I had taught during about two decades of college and university teaching. A second class I taught at Pontiac, also during the Summer of 1984, represents a more intermediate example of disciplinary problems. Perhaps surprisingly its behavior was more akin to that of the well-behaved Colorado class than to that of the Constitutional Law course I had just completed at Pontiac.

American Judicial Process, my second Pontiac class, might have been expected to generate disciplinary problems similar to my first Pontiac class. In addition to being taught at the same prison during the same summer, both enrolled about the same number of students and student discussion was encouraged in both. Why were the problems so much less severe in Judicial Process? There are several possible answers. First, the most misbehaved students in the first class did not enroll in the second. Neither the gang leader nor any of his three followers registered for Judicial Process. Enrollees tended to be the better behaved students from the first class.

Second, as the literature notes, certain inmates make a special effort to intimidate new prison teachers (Brodt and Hewitt, 1984). By the second class, I was, of course, no longer new. Moreover, while I started the first class without any "fans," I was warmly welcomed to the second one by several of my former students. To students I did not know, this conveyed a message of inmate acceptance. If they were inclined to misbehave, this may have given them reason to reconsider.

Third, in the second class behavior standards were made clear from the beginning. The syllabus clearly indicated that: (1) students were not to talk to classmates while class was in session; (2) if they wished to discuss, they were to first raise their hands for recognition; (3) they were to return promptly to the classroom at the end of recess periods; and (4) students were not to leave class without permission. While some of the students did violate these rules, the "forbidden" behavior was much less common than in the preceding Pontiac class.

Fourth, the layout of the educational facilities for the second Pontiac class contributed to its better behavior, especially the lesser tendency of the students to wander in and out of the classroom. Unlike the first Pontiac class which met in a building with several adjoining classes meeting simultaneously, the second one met in a tiny "school area" of another building where it was often the only class in session. Thus generally there was no one in the short hallway with whom to visit, except the guard. Consequently students rarely left class to stand in the hall and they hardly ever lingered there after class was scheduled to begin. Fifth, members of the second class were probably much less fatigued, because it met during the morning rather than at night, class sessions were shorter, and a more liberal recess policy was inaugurated from the beginning.

Summary and Conclusions

Obviously it is impossible to generalize from a single teacher's experience with disciplinary problems in the prison classroom. However, even that limited experience may provide useful hypotheses for testing on a broader scale. Here are some of the most important "lessons" that are tentatively suggested by my prison teaching experience.

First, teachers may experience more disciplinary problems during their early weeks in a new correctional institution. As the literature suggests, some inmates may make a special effort to intimidate the new teacher.

Moreover, the new teacher begins with no student "fans," the people who are probably least likely to create problems in the classroom. But later in the term, disciplinary problems may recede as the instructor develops a student following and enough seniority in the prison college program to cause inmates anxious to intimidate brand new institutional teachers to moderate their disruptive behavior. Disciplinary problems may be alleviated even further if that instructor teaches a second course at the same institution, because it will tend to attract students who adjusted well in the previous course. This hard core of inmate "fans" in the new class may set a positive tone that discourages other students from misbehaving.

Second, understanding disciplinary problems in a given teacher's classroom may require an examination of traditions at that prison. If inmate misbehavior, such as wandering in and out of class, is supported by firmly entrenched traditions at the prison, it may be more difficult to correct. Also if the teacher realizes that classroom misbehavior is encouraged by tradition, his morale will be less likely to suffer from the belief that his students are simply "picking on" him.

Third, while teachers may prefer not to discuss their disciplinary problems with others, sharing experiences with colleagues can be beneficial. Doing so enables each teacher to realize that the occurrence of such problems in his classroom does not mean that he has suddenly lost his ability to deal with students. Moreover, he may be able to benefit from "solutions" his colleagues have tested.

Fourth, it is important to distinguish between more important and less important problems. The standard ought to be whether the misbehavior interferes seriously with the educational process—not simply how annoying it happens to be.

Fifth, it is important for prison teachers to set realistic disciplinary goals. While behavior that seriously undermines the learning process cannot be tolerated, attempts to totally abolish all disciplinary problems will probably be self-defeating. For instance, expulsion of half the students in a class to get a marginally better behaved class would not be justified.

Sixth, teachers should not become so preoccupied with behavior problems in prison classes that they ignore more positive characteristics of those classes. For instance, even in my most misbehaved class, most of the students were as well-behaved as students on campus. Moreover, even most of the worst behaved students improved as the semester progressed.

REFERENCES

Brodt, Stephen J. and Hewitt, John D. (1984) "Teaching 'Cons' about Crime and Justice: Experience with Non-Traditional Students in a Non-Traditional Setting." *Journal of Correctional Education* 35 (March): 15.

George, Paul S. and Krist, Gary (1980) "A Unique Educational Experience: Teaching in a Correctional Institution." *Corrections Today* 42 (July–August): 58–59.

Hogan, Frank (1968) "College Classes at CSP." *The Interpreter* 3 (January–February): 6–7.

Jones, Wesley A. (1982) "Attitudes of Corrections Educators and Residents Toward Post-Secondary Programming for the Incarcerated." *Journal of Correctional Education* 33 (December): 4, 6.

Reynolds, Jean (1982) "Strategies for Controlling Classroom Misbehavior." *Journal of Correctional Education* 33 (December): 19–20.

Sebastian, Niki (1983) "Learning Maketh the Honest Man." *Psychology Today* 17 (April): 77.

Warren, Possley, and Tybor (1986) "An inmate by any other name." *Chicago Tribune* (July 22), Sec. 3, p. 1.

Zogg, Jeff (1986) "Learning behind the walls." *Horizons: A Supplementary News Magazine of the Daily Vidette* (Illinois State University), (February 27): 4–5.