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ABSTRACT

This study examines prison education within the Jamaican context with a view to uncovering, identifying and analysing key pedagogic techniques used by prison educators. Foucault was used as a theoretical framework for analysing the prison's role in society and the role of education in the prison context in order to focus on prison pedagogies. Freirean pedagogy was used as a framework for exploring the possibility of critical/liberatory pedagogy in the prison context. This research utilised qualitative methodology and was conducted across four adult prisons. Data was generated through interviews and observation. As will be explored in this research two pedagogic methods were observed; the first was functionalist and incorporated the use of the 'jug and mug' method in the classroom; and the second was critical/liberatory and incorporated the use of the reasoning method which has its basis in the Rastafarian ritual of reasoning. I seek to respond to some of the gaps in the literature by considering prison pedagogies specific to the Jamaican context; prison education policy in the Jamaican context; the role of critical pedagogies in a prison system that is designed to be overwhelmingly punitive; basic skills as a medium for empowerment; and women as “forgotten offenders” especially in regard to prison education.
INTRODUCTION

This thesis had its genesis in the author's Jamaican nationality and, by extension her concern with the development of the Jamaican nation. Within Jamaica and elsewhere, the recognition of education as a key to development, with concepts such as 'continuing education' and 'lifelong learning' gaining ever-more purchase, is now widespread. In fact, some commentators view adult education as the "key to the twenty-first century" (Niles and Bernard, 2000: 12). In Jamaica, education is seen as central to the development of the country, as well as a crucial tool for dealing with the problem of crime. In view of these considerations, educational reform has risen in importance on the political agenda. The Task Force on Educational Reform Jamaica commissioned in 2004 was charged with the responsibility of preparing and presenting:

an action plan consistent with a vision for the creation of a world class education system which will generate the human capital and produce the skills necessary for Jamaican citizens to compete in the global economy (Task Force on Educational Reform Jamaica, 2004: 8).

One of the recommendations is that "all citizens have equal opportunities at all stages: full access to early childhood, primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education" (Task Force on Educational Reform Jamaica, 2004: 31). Accordingly, the vision for Jamaica in 2015 sees:

A prosperous and dynamic Jamaica which upholds the fulfillment of human rights, dignity for all persons, and builds continual social progress based on shared values and principles of partnerships. Minds are transformed and extraordinary results are produced in this the most caring
and secure country in the Americas, where individuals fulfill their potential, are in control of their destiny, take responsibility for their lives and work always for the larger good. [The key outcome goal for education is] an education which facilitates lifelong learning and acquisition of social and life skills for all (Task Force on Educational Reform Jamaica, 2004: 10).

The taskforce fails to focus on adult learners who are not within mainstream education. However, the Jamaica Council for Adult Education (JACAE) and the Jamaica Movement for the Advancement of Literacy (JAMAL) continue to address the needs of those learners. JACAE’s Adult Education Week (2000) sought to emphasize “continuing adult education as a prerequisite to increased productivity, thereby enabling the country to achieve the competitive edge which it needs for economic development”. The renaming of JAMAL as the Jamaica Foundation for Lifelong Learning (JFFL) on February 28, 2007, signified a shift in focus from literacy education to lifelong learning. The Minister of Education and Youth (Henry-Wilson, 2007), while speaking at the launch of JFFL noted that:

Lifelong learning is an indispensable part of our social development. We are now living in a global society, which requires that all institutions of learning are sustainable and so JAMAL has had to be morphed into another stage in terms of its relevance and development of our human resource.

The negative impact of crime was recognised at the Sixth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime, where it was concluded that crime “impairs development, undermines people’s spiritual and material well-being, compromises human dignity and creates a climate of fear and violence” (Niles, 1997: 51). With regard to the Jamaican context “crime, especially violent crime ... presents a challenge to the country’s development” (Harriott, 2003: 1). The solution to this problem, it is mooted, lies in

\[1\] Square brackets indicate bridging words or phrases included in a quotation that are not a part of the original quote.
educational development. Various studies draw the link between crime and low levels of education (Carter, 1999; Niles, 2000; Wilson, Gallagher and MacKenzie, 2000), so that consequently, the raising of educational standards would seem to present a viable solution (Harriott, 2003; Niles, 1997). The focus of JACAE's Adult Education Week (2000) was aimed at:

Promoting a Culture of Peace through Adult Education in support of the UNESCO peace initiatives and especially in light of increasing levels of violence at all levels of society which it is hoped education will help us to eradicate or at least begin to lessen.

The conspicuous absence of prisoner input into the dialogue process for educational reform provided a strong impetus for this thesis's focus on prison education. In spite of the inclusive phrase, "all persons" in the 2015 vision, and the plans to use education to curb crime, prisoners are invisible, and even ignored in mainstream education policy, nor are they the primary clients for JAMAL or JACAE. In examining the documents on Jamaican justice reform, the education of prisoners went unmentioned. Jamaica's population stands at just over 2.5 million while the prison population as of June 2006 was 4,913, which is approximately 1% of the total population. Although the prison population is relatively small, it is unwise to ignore the issue of rehabilitation and education, because having paid 'the price' of crime; a prisoner is once more re-turned to society. Taylor (1994: 332) notes that by depriving prisoners of positive educational opportunities "we are only punishing ourselves by perpetuating the painfully costly cycle of criminalization, victimization, and

---

2 JAMAL does provide training for prison educators and JAMAL materials are used in prisons but the relationship between JAMAL and the Department of Correctional services only exits insofar as the Department chooses to maintain it. Although JAMAL as an organisation focuses on prisoners as a primary client group, it is heavily oriented towards adults in mainstream society.

3 Data provided by the International Centre for Prison Studies at http://www.kcl.ac.uk/depsta/rel/icps/worldbrief/caribbean_records.php?code=66
incarceration*. In light of the increasingly acute crime problem in Jamaica (Harriott, 2003) it is timely to examine the education of the inmate.

Before providing an overview of the chapters that follow, I first provide some context for this study by considering prison pedagogies in Jamaica.

**Prison pedagogies**

This thesis examines pedagogic practices in the Jamaican prison context and is concerned with uncovering, understanding and analysing the key pedagogic techniques employed by prison educators. The pedagogic practices observed were predominantly functionalist and teaching practices were not in keeping with the broader philosophies underpinning adult education. In spite of this, there was evidence of a more critical pedagogic approach. The thesis therefore aims to provide a platform for the academic discussion of prison pedagogies in Jamaica with a view to challenging the status quo with regard to the delivery and aims of prison education in Jamaica. Foucault is used as a theoretical framework for conceptualising the prison, not merely as a building, but as a contested space for the production of knowledge and power over the offender. Foucault also provides a basis for the analysis of the purpose of prison education. Freirean pedagogy is explored as a framework for investigating the possibility of critical and liberatory pedagogy in the delivery of basic skills and indeed higher levels of education within the prison context. A central theme running throughout this thesis is the flux between rehabilitation and punishment and how prison pedagogies oscillate between these poles. This thesis therefore contributes to the literature by addressing the gaps in
prison pedagogies specific to the Jamaican context. The study examines the role of critical pedagogies in a prison system that is designed to be overwhelmingly punitive rather than rehabilitative and considers the advantages of encouraging basic skills as a medium for empowerment, rather than their mere transmission. The examination of prison education policy within the Jamaica context raises the serious issue of the wholesale neglect of education and training in Jamaican prisons, and by giving voice to the silenced women in prison and their experiences, highlights how patriarchal structures continue to subjugate women.

Overview of the thesis
The thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 provides a review of literature pertinent to the issues raised in the ensuing chapters. The literature pertaining to pedagogy, adult education and prison education is examined; the various stages of development in pedagogy; contemporary pedagogy; pedagogies associated with adult education and prison education; the characteristics of the adult learner and their manifestation in the prison context; debates for and against prison education; and the measurement of the success of prison education programs against recidivism rates. Freire's (1970, 1987, 1999 and 2001) work is also examined and used as a theoretical framework for understanding critical literacy and is linked to the discussion of the reasoning method that is discussed in Chapter 6. This chapter also provides an examination of the general prison context and Foucault (1977) is used to examine the prison and its role in society. The chapter serves the purpose of outlining the relevant
literature and highlights current debates central to this thesis. However, it also serves to highlight gaps in the literature, which this thesis attempts to fill.

Chapter 2 looks at methodological issues: I consider the reasons for my choice and use of the qualitative method, paying specific attention to the latter's characteristics and epistemological underpinnings and explaining why these are particularly suited to this research. A concise account of how the research was conducted is provided, outlining the various methods employed. The literature pertinent to researching in prisons is examined, particularly as it relates to the Jamaican prison context. The use of social capital was central to the research process and is consequently examined in detail. The dilemmas encountered whilst researching, such as issues of access, security and the safety of the researcher are also examined.

Chapter 3 focuses on the Jamaican context, serving to sensitise the reader to the specifics of this study. Context is here conceptualised in three ways; historically, structurally and culturally. Each of these is examined for their impact on prison pedagogy. Issues such as the colonial legacy; the history of prison education in Jamaica; the impact of the physical structure of the prison classroom on pedagogic methods; and the impact of prison culture on prison education and prison pedagogy, will be examined.

Chapter 4 examines prison education policy, both in Jamaica and in the international arena. The chapter reviews the literature on prison education policy, highlighting the pertinent issues and debates. The political economy of Jamaica and its impact on prison education policy is examined, with Jamaica's less developed prison education policy
compared with prison education policies from more developed countries such as Canada and Britain. This thesis argues that a well-defined policy is a necessary support for the development of prison education. The examination of policy issues provides an understanding of how the government and the Department of Correctional Services Jamaica (DCSJ) perceive prison education and the importance that is accorded to it. The exploration of issues pertaining to the dissemination and understanding of policy, especially by those employed to the DCSJ, provides insight into the dissonance between theory and practice in the prisons. The comparison of Jamaica’s prison education policy with those of other countries provides an opportunity for assessment, as well as a means for deciding on good practice that might be adapted for the Jamaican situation.

Chapter 5 is the first of three empirical chapters. This chapter focuses on an examination of the training needs of adult educators and their work within the Jamaican prison context. In examining the training needs of the adult educators, one is better able to appreciate how well equipped (or not) the teachers are for the task of educating adult prisoners. The level and type of training that the educators possess also directly impacts how they approach teaching. The chapter also provides an examination of the first of two pedagogic practices observed in Jamaica’s prisons. The first pedagogic method can be described as functionalist and is based on a transmission or top down approach to education. This chapter also identifies the prison educators dividing them into three groups, civilian, warder and inmate teachers. The roles these educators are expected to fulfil are examined, as well as the ramifications of each teacher group on the student-teacher relationship as it relates to issues of power and authority within the prison classroom. The role of JAMAL with regard to the training of prison educators is explored and the success
or otherwise of its philosophies in practice, are assessed. The teaching of adult basic education in the prisons is then outlined and analysed looking specifically at the implications that the pedagogic method has for the empowerment of the inmate-student.

Chapter 6 focuses on the second pedagogic method. This second approach is prisoner-led: it is more inclined to facilitating liberation and shares common ground with the Rastafarian ritual of reasoning. The literature pertaining to Freire (1970, 1987, 1999 and 2001) in relation to other prison methodologies is outlined, with a view to placing the reasoning method within an academic framework. Literature on the Rastafarian movement and more specifically the ritual of reasoning are explored and compared with Freire's work. The substance of the reasoning method is explored in detail, paying special attention to issues of empowerment, consciousness raising and inmates' ability to subvert authority and enact change. The examination of this method provides a contrast to the more widely favoured functionalist method and is particularly important, as it emanates from the inmates and is prisoner-centric. This pedagogic stance challenges the status quo and stands as an example of the possibility of critical pedagogy with the prison context.

Chapter 7 explores the experiences of women in prison, looking especially at issues around their invisibility and the way that the patriarchal structure of the prison and gender stereotypes impact on prison pedagogies with regard to women. The literature on women in prison is examined, in order to ascertain whether this group has special needs and to understand how imprisonment affects them. Social/cultural constructions of women are examined in light of how they impact on women in prison. The subjugation of women in the Rastafarian movement is analysed, with a view to understanding why the reasoning
method is not present in the women's prison and why it is unlikely to be suitable for that context. Women's education and pedagogical needs within the Jamaican prison context are explored and the appropriateness of feminist pedagogy examined.

The concluding chapter examines the research questions posed in Chapter 2 with a view to looking at how the thesis has addressed these questions and explores key issues which have been raised through the process of research. It also examines possible avenues for post-doctoral research.
CHAPTER 1
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The focus of this study is pedagogic practices in prisons. Consequently, this chapter will review the literature on pedagogy with a view to gaining an understanding of education in the context of adult prisons. However, the concept of pedagogy does not stand in isolation and in this particular case; it is very much impacted by the context (Esland, 1977; Loewen, 1997; Watkins and Mortimore, 1999) of the prison and by the fact that the learners involved are adults. Any examination of prison pedagogical practices must thereby also explore their intersections with understandings of adult education in general and debates surrounding prison education in particular. The first section will therefore introduce the concept of pedagogy itself, mapping the origin and evolution of the concept and its application in the various pedagogies of both adult and prison education. Next, an assessment of Freire’s work, as providing a possible framework for a critical/emancipatory pedagogy within the prison context, will be undertaken. The second section examines the adult learner within the prison context. The literature pertaining to adult education is briefly reviewed, paying special attention to the philosophies that underpin the definition and scope of adult education, and how these philosophies are realised, or not, in the prison context. The final section explores the literature and debates specific to prison education.
A pedagogy for the imprisoned

The following section will explore the development of pedagogy in an attempt to provide a substantial definition. A critical assessment of the relationship between pedagogy and education will foreground the outlining of the pedagogies associated with adult education. Subsequently, prison pedagogies will be analysed in relation to this context, particularly within the framework of a Freirean critical pedagogy.

The word "pedagogy is derived from French and Latin adaptations of the Greek [for] ‘boy’ and ‘leader’, [and] literally means a man having oversight of a child, or an attendant leading a boy to school" (Watkins and Mortimore, 1999: 1). Too (1998: 5), though, uncovers a different connotation, noting that the word pedagogy has its roots in the Greek words "paid- + agoge, [and literally translates] the leading of the child slave". A contemporary dictionary definition of pedagogy is "the art, science, or profession of teaching; especially: education". This source, further, defines education as the "action or process of educating or being educated; the field of study that deals mainly with methods of teaching and learning in schools" (Merriam-Webster online dictionary, 2006). The simplicity of this model is useful in highlighting the continued relationship between education and pedagogy. Combining these dictionary definitions provides a basic comprehension of pedagogy as the discipline of understanding and developing various methods of teaching and learning in schools. The term pedagogy is multidisciplinary and can be located within the fields of "literature, feminism, cultural studies, philosophy and political theory" (Too, 1998: 6). As the term pedagogy came to be associated with several areas of study and as the understanding and application of the term continued to evolve
and be reshaped, the meanings associated with it became wider, more varied and increasingly difficult to define. Various organisations and authors such as the OECD, 2003; Simon, 1981; Too, 1998; Van Manen, 1999; and Watkins and Mortimer, 1999, espouse various definitions for pedagogy. Definitions of pedagogy differ, in part, because of the influence of external factors. For instance, the definition may vary depending on location (country) through the influence of culture and what is considered acceptable. In addition, perception plays a crucial role: a researcher/academic will define pedagogy differently to a practitioner/teacher because they are seeing and experiencing different aspects of pedagogy. For the purpose of this chapter, pedagogy will be loosely defined as "any conscious activity by one person to enhance learning in another" (Watkins and Mortimore, 1999: 3).

In the definition of pedagogy articulated by Watkins and Mortimore (1999) the process of education that is, “planned learning [that is]...a contrived and purposeful learning opportunity” (Rogers, 1986:10), is inferred. It is therefore appropriate to examine some of the complexities that surround the term ‘education’. Education has several purposes; it is the tool by which people are made literate and prepared to function within society; a means of control, a way of reinforcing the norms and mores of a culture; it is a wrapped up in issues of power and can be the tool for liberation as well as the instrument of enslavement. Education is neither simple nor apolitical. Degener (2001: 31) notes that “an important theme running through the [adult education] literature is the belief that educational systems the world over are political”. By virtue of this, and the integral nature of the relationship between pedagogy and education, pedagogy is also a necessarily complex and multifaceted concept.
The development of pedagogy can be categorised within four phases (Watkins and Mortimore, 1999). The phases outlined by Watkins and Mortimore (1999) are helpful in that they provide a framework for understanding some of the changes that have occurred in the field of pedagogy. These, though, can by no means be considered as prescriptive. Rather, the phases reflect the change of focus over time as instantiated through the writing of researchers. It is important to bear in mind that whilst the understanding of pedagogy is for the most part influenced by the viewpoint taken by the researcher, reflecting what they think is important about pedagogy and highlighting what they perceive as the 'issues', there are other key players, such as practitioners and policy makers, who may understand pedagogy otherwise. The difference between the knowledge base of practitioners and researchers and the ways in which they approach a situation can be summarised as follows. From the point of view of the practitioner, complexity defines the situation and the possibilities of short-term immediate action, whereas for the researcher, complexity exists across situations and is the characteristic of long-term indirect action (Watkins and Mortimore, 1999).

Pedagogy is always concerned with the transfer of knowledge. Throughout the four phases that are examined here, researchers have been grappling with the question of 'best pedagogy'. How can we conceptualise pedagogy in a way that will enable the best classroom situation, the best learning environment? What and/or who should be the focus for enabling the development of progressive classrooms? It is important to note that even though the authors have broken down 'pedagogical evolution' into four phases, this does not mean that one phase ceases to exist when another comes to the fore. Moving from
one phase to the next did not necessarily mean discarding all the premises of the previous phase, but often meant that different phases built on each other, that is, added to pre-existing phases to create the next phase of the movement. It is also possible for different phases to coexist simply because different people are at different stages of their pedagogical development.

Phase one of the movement is typified by understanding pedagogy in relation to ‘types’ of teachers. Pedagogy, thereby, became inextricably linked to the personal style of delivery within the classroom setting of individual teachers. These perceived styles determined whether the pedagogical practices of the individual teacher were ‘good’ or ‘bad’ and whether or not classrooms were centred on the learner and therefore progressive. The typologies invoked included the ‘authoritarian’, ‘democratic’ and ‘laissez-faire’. The influence of politics on pedagogy is evidenced here through language. Watkins and Mortimer (1999: 3) note that during the “inter-war and post-war years [there were] concerns about ‘authoritarianism’ and ‘democracy’ reflected in studies of group leadership style”. Furthermore, survey results revealed that the assumptions about the perceived links between the ‘type’ of teacher, pedagogy and progressive classrooms yielded insufficient explanatory power:

It became clear that prevalent models of pedagogy depended on much more than the style of the teacher...‘traditional’ practice remained dominant...[therefore] a productive focus on pedagogy...should incorporate an additional recognition that teachers are influenced by their context (Watkins and Mortimer, 1999: 4).

Phase two does not ignore the impact of the teacher’s delivery style in its taking into account the ways in which the context that teachers operate within may affect pedagogy:
So researchers into pedagogy not only endeavour to investigate how teachers organize subject-matter in their own minds, but are also interested in the teachers’ ability to understand and apply the subject matter in different ways, according to the context of their classes (Watkins and Mortimore, 1999: 6).

This phase recognises that the classroom is not a fixed, easily managed context, but rather, a ‘live area’ with an interplay between goals, outcomes and actions for which teachers have to develop their own coping mechanisms and ways of managing. In the classroom:

teachers orchestrate a complex situation, oversee numerous events and manage multiple activities. This broader view of pedagogy enables the classroom to be viewed as an ‘activity system’, which teachers need to establish and manage (Watkins and Mortimore, 1999: 5).

The conceptualisation of a context and the content to be taught therein, impacts directly on how the teacher delivers, as well as on how pedagogy manifests itself in that particular situation. For example, pedagogical practice could be determined by whether a classroom was conceptualised as “gardens where [learners] grow”; ‘factories in which [learners] are made’ or ‘hospitals where they [learners] are cured of their ignorance” (Watkins and Mortimore, 1999: 6).

Phase three begins with the acknowledgment that learners are active rather than passive. It is characterised by an:

explicit pedagogical focus on the learning process advance[ing] the learner’s conceptions of learning, improve[ing] what they learn and increase[ing] the likelihood that they will see themselves as active agents in learning (Pramling, 1990, cited in Watkins and Mortimore, 1999, p.8).

Bruner (1996: 62) puts forward two models to illustrate this idea. The first is:
seeing children as thinkers, constructing a model of the world to help them construe their own experience. Pedagogy is to help the [learner] understand better, more powerfully: this is fostered through discussion and collaboration, the process of sharing knowledge in an unthreatening community.

And the second sees the learner as:

knowledgeable, testing whether hypotheses stand up in the face of evidence, interpretation and existing knowledge. Teaching helps children grasp the distinction between personal knowledge, on the one side, and ‘objective’ knowledge on the other. ‘This perspective holds that there is something special about “talking” to authors, now dead but alive in their ancient texts’ (Bruner, 1996: 62).

This phase marks the important shift from imparting information upon/to the individual, to one for which the process of learning is a partnership in which learners are actively engaged.

The fourth and final phase reflects current views of pedagogy. The various phases up to this point broadened the meaning of pedagogy. This moved, from focusing only on teachers, to including the context as well as the student. Watkins and Mortimore (1999: 8) describe the situation as follows:

On the one hand it offers an increasingly integrated conceptualization which specifies relations between its elements: the teacher, the classroom, or other context, content, the view of learning and learning about learning. Such a model draws attention to the creation of learning communities in which knowledge is actively co-constructed, and in which the focus of learning is sometimes learning itself. This model of pedagogy would also be increasingly differentiated by details of context, content, age and stage of learner, purposes and so on.

From the evolution of pedagogy outlined here, we can see that contemporary pedagogy is not merely concerned with classroom teaching situations and methods of delivery, but is
very much learner focussed. Too (1998: 5) describes contemporary pedagogy as an “enterprise often associated with social change and left-learning agendas – hence ‘radical pedagogy’”. Contemporary pedagogy tends to develop according to its specific target, or according to a particular way of knowing. For Example, folk/cultural pedagogy is derived from norms and mores specific to a particular society, which, consequently, may influence how pedagogy is practised within the classroom setting. Another example is critical pedagogy, which is specific to the idea of liberating people’s minds. Critical pedagogy:

signals how questions of audience, voice, power, and evaluation, actively work to construct particular relations between teachers and students, institutions and society, and classrooms and communities....Pedagogy in the critical sense illuminates the relationship among knowledge, authority, and power” (Giroux, 1994: 30).

It encourages people to think ‘outside the box’ to question and challenge social norms that may be oppressive to them. One other example is feminist pedagogy, designed to promote a way of interacting in the ‘learning space’. Feminist pedagogy is also concerned with liberating the mind, looking to counter the domination in the classroom associated with the more traditional forms of pedagogy. Therefore, for Hooks (1994: 185) feminist pedagogy seeks to emphasise the “issue if coming to voice. That focus emerged as central, precisely because it was so evident that race, sex, and class privilege empower some students more than other, granting ‘authority’ to some voices more than others”. According to Hooks (1994: 186) the concept of coming to voice is a “complex recognition of the uniqueness of each voice and a willingness to create spaces in the classroom where all voices can be heard because all students are free to speak, knowing their presence will be recognised and valued”. Feminist pedagogy will be examined more fully in Chapter 7, in light of the analysis of the patriarchal nature of the prison system and the
way that women have been silenced. Feminist pedagogy, it will be suggested, is the most appropriate one for the women's prison, being better able to meet the needs of imprisoned women, raise their critical awareness and empower them. It thus affords them a voice, in a system typified by the domination and voicelessness of women inmates.

There are relatively few studies specific to prison education (Wilson, 2000) and writings on prison pedagogy are scarcer still. Some authors writing on education within the prison context tend to conflate pedagogies linked with adult education with prison education. Adult education tends to be concerned with certain pedagogies such as radical, critical and feminist pedagogy. The common ground between these three is that they are characterised as being critical, liberal, radical, emancipatory, and as challenging the status quo. Common to them also, is the influence, to a greater or lesser extent, of the writings of critical theorists such as Freire, Macedo, Giroux and Gramsci. The issue of prison pedagogy is strongly impacted by the prison context and the role of education as perceived by government, senior prison administrators, guards and teachers. As a result, prison pedagogical practices are likely to vary, as indeed is the case for practices within and across any institution. Pedagogical approaches in prisons may be concerned with using education as a tool of control, but there is also the possibility of more emancipatory/critical pedagogies within the prison context. In expounding on the concept of the 'total institution' Goffman (1961: 4) posits that:

> every institution has encompassing tendencies...however some are encompassing to a degree discontinuously greater than the ones next in line. Their encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside and to departure that is often built right into the physical plant, such as locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs, water, forests, or moors.
Prisons fall within the types of total institutions outlined by Goffman (1961). With regard to prisons Davidson (1995: 10) notes that:

the term 'total institution' conjures up an image where there is no place to hide, no possibility for argument, certainly no opportunity for 'eternal protest' or 'opposition to the powers that be'...[however] my position [is] that prisons as total institutions are also 'sites of opposition' – perhaps no less and no more constrained than other cultural and educational formations.

In exploring the possibility for a critical pedagogy in prisons, Davidson (1995) draws on Freire's work. Freirean pedagogy is important because it provides a theory for the education of the marginalised (Purcell-Gates and Waterman, 2000). As prisoners tend to be one of the most marginalised groups in society, a better understanding of Freire may well be useful for the purposes of this study.

Freirean pedagogy

Freire's pedagogy is influenced by his life experiences. According to Weiler (1994: 15) "Freire's pedagogy is founded on a moral imperative to side with the oppressed that emerges from both his Christian faith and his knowledge and experience of suffering in the society where he grew up and lived". Additional influences, however, came from theorists such as Marx, Hegel and Antonio Gramsci (Mayo, 1999). Freire is considered a critical theorist, concerned with critical pedagogy, that is, issues of "social difference, social justice and social transformation" (Mayo, 1999: 58). The foundation of Freire's theory and work is built on his conviction that "tremendous social, political, economic and educational inequities [exist] in the world, and that particular forms of education either perpetuate these inequities, or work towards transforming them so as to allow for greater equality and liberation for all" (Purcell-Gates and Waterman, 2000: 11).
Freire defines education as:

that specifically human act of intervening in the world [and by intervening he means] the aspiration for radical changes in society in such areas as economics, human relations, property, the right to employment, to land to education and to health, to the reactionary position whose aim is to immobilize history and maintain an unjust socio-economic and cultural order (Freire, 2001: 6).

Freire outlines three approaches to education; the authoritarian, the laissez-faire and the liberating (Roberts, 2000: 59). The authoritarian approach, as instantiated in the Banking Method, will be discussed in Chapter 5. The focus of the discussion here will be the liberating approach, which relates to Freire’s concept of a “dialogical problem-posing education” (Freire, 1970: 22).

What is dialogic problem-posing education? McLaren (2000: 7), in outlining Freire’s pedagogy describes it as having five key characteristics. For him, Freirean pedagogy is “anti-authoritarian, dialogic, interactive, (it) puts power in the hands of students, [and] puts social and political analysis of everyday life at the centre of the curriculum”. Shor (1993: 34) summarises Freire’s pedagogy in terms of ten values; “participatory, situated, critical, democratic, dialogic, desocialization, multicultural, research oriented, activist [and] affective”. Freire (1970) in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* explains his dialogic problem-posing education. He notes that “Problem-posing education...breaks with the vertical patterns characteristic of banking education...the teacher is no longer merely the-one-who-teaches, but one who is himself taught in dialogue with the students, who in turn while being taught also teach” (Freire, 1970: 61). He further contends that:
the students – no longer docile listeners – are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher ... [As] students are increasingly posed with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world, (they) will feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge (Freire, 1970: 62).

According to Freire (1970: 64) “in problem-posing education, people develop their power to perceive critically the way they exist in the world with which and in which they find themselves”.

Freire’s elucidation is illuminating: his concern extends beyond the bounds of basic literacy into a realm that is “concerned with the attainment of political literacy, the means of reading the world (Mayo, 1999: 72).

The two main principles underpinning Freire’s dialogic problem-posing education relate to the student-teacher relationship and the use of reflection. Freire challenges the traditional teacher-student relationship so that “both are simultaneously teachers and students” (Freire, 1970: 53). For Freire, education transpires:

where there are two learners who occupy somewhat different spaces in an ongoing dialogue. But both participants bring knowledge to the relationship, and one of the objects of the pedagogic process is to explore what each knows and what they can teach each other (Freire, 2001: 8).

Though Freire states that both teachers and students learn from each other through the educational process, he nevertheless maintains that their relationship is not one of equals. “While we recognize that we have to learn from our students...this does not mean that teachers and students are the same...there is a difference between the educator and the student” (Freire, 1985: 177). According to Mayo (2004: 53) teachers “have a directive role;
they need to exercise their authority, an authority derived from their competence as pedagogues". In this regard Freire differentiates between authority and authoritarianism noting that "the democratic teacher never, never transforms authority into authoritarianism" (Freire in Shor and Freire, 1987: 91). Further, Freire's stress on the importance of reflection restores some sort of equality of opportunity once more. Reflection should be directed toward "the self as actor in the world in consequence of knowing" (Freire, 2001: 8). When used by Freire, the call to reflect is always a call to action. Action, following reflection, is equally applicable to students and teachers alike. For Freire, critical teaching relies on reflection as it "involves a dynamic and dialectical movement between "doing" and "reflecting on doing"... Thinking critically about practice, of today or yesterday, makes possible the improvement of tomorrow's practice" (Freire, 2001: 43-44). Practice is similarly the nub of Freire's insistence on student reflection, "The insistence that the oppressed engage in reflection on their concrete situation is not a call to armchair revolution. On the contrary, "reflection – true reflection – leads to action" (Freire, 1970: 48). Freire's (1970: 33) use of the phrase Praxis underlines the strong link he wants to insist on between comprehension, through reflection, and actively changing the situation. Praxis is "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it".

The third principle underlying Freire's educational ideal is that education should be dialogic. Freire (1970: 69) defines dialogue as an "encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world". In making the link between dialogue and education, Freire states that "without dialogue there is no communication and without communication there can be no true education" (Freire, 1970: 73). Freire identifies five criteria that are prerequisite to dialogue. The first is love. Freire (1970: 70-71) argues that "dialogue
cannot exist in the absence of a profound love for the world and for people ... If I do not love the world – if I do not love life – if I do not love people – I cannot enter into dialogue”. The second is humility. “Self-sufficiency is incompatible with dialogue. Men and women who lack humility (or have lost it) cannot come to the people, cannot be their partners in naming the world” (Freire, 1970: 71). The third is faith. Freire (1970: 71) argues that dialogue requires “an intense faith in humankind [and] in their power to make and remake”. The fourth is hope. Dialogue cannot exist without hope. Freire (1970: 73) argues that “...dialogue cannot be carried on in a climate of hopelessness. If the dialoguers expect nothing to come of their efforts, their encounter will be empty and sterile, bureaucratic and tedious”. The fifth and final criterion is critical thinking. Freire (1970: 73) argues that “true dialogue cannot exist unless the dialoguers engage in critical thinking, [that is], thinking which perceives reality as a process, as a transformation, rather than as a static entity”.

Freire’s fourth underlying principle concerns the dialectical nature of education. This dialectical nature is the same as the fifth criteria for dialogue, that is, critical thinking. Roberts (2000: 3) makes the link between dialectical and critical thinking by defining dialectical thinking as thinking which “involves seeking out contradictions in social reality; it implies a penetration beyond and beneath surface appearances”. Roberts (2000: 3) goes on to argue that:

thinking dialectically is, for Freire, equivalent to thinking critically: it means being constantly open to further questions, and to the possibility – indeed, probability – of current assumptions being revised, repudiated or overturned.
Freire (1999: 73), in an effort to elucidate the qualities of the critical thinker, juxtaposes the naïve with the critical thinker:

For the naïve thinker, the important thing is accommodation to the normalised ‘today’. For the critic, the important thing is the continuing transformation of reality, in behalf of the continuing humanization of men.

Freire’s dialogic problem-solving education is designed to facilitate the development of critical learners and teachers, as well as to promote the raising of consciousness, a process he calls conscientization. Conscientization is the process of “learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality” (Freire, 1970: 17). Shor (1993: 32) outlines three phases of consciousness in Freirean pedagogy; the intransitive, the semi-transitive and critical transitivity:

The lowest stage is the most dominated, ‘intransitive thought’, where people live fatalistically, thinking that their fate is out of their hands. Only luck, or God, can influence their lives. They do not think their action can change their condition...The next level is ‘semi-transitive thought’, where people exercise some thought and action for change. Partly empowered, they act to change things and make a difference, but they relate to problems one at a time in isolation, rather than seeing the whole system underlying any single issue...Those people who do think holistically and critically about their conditions reflect the highest development of thought and action, ‘critical consciousness’...this group’s thought [is referred to as] ‘critical transitivity’.

Shor (1993: 33) also describes the four qualities of critical consciousness as “power awareness...critical literacy...desocialization [and] self organization/self education”.

Having examined the underpinning principles and the aim of Freirean pedagogy I will now briefly examine the method associated with the pedagogy. With regard to problem-posing education, Freire (1970: 85) notes that it is appropriate to:
present significant dimensions of an individual's contextual reality, the analysis of which will make it possible for him to recognize the interaction of the various components... The perception and comprehension of reality are rectified and acquire new depth. When carried out with a methodology of conscientization the investigation of the generative theme contained in the minimum thematic universe (the generative themes in interaction) thus introduces or begins to introduce women and men to a critical form of thinking about their world.

Shor (1993: 31) offers a summary of how a Freirean educator would prepare to teach a class:

Freirean educators study their students in their classrooms and in their community, to discover the words, ideas, conditions, and habits central to their experience. From this material they then identify 'generative words and themes' which represent the highest profile issues in the speech and life of the community, as the foundational subject matter for a critical curriculum. These generative subjects are familiar words, experiences, situations and relationships. They are 'problematized' by the teacher in class through a critical dialogue, that is, re-presented back to the students as problems to reflect and act on... Their experience now includes a self reflective dimension because of problem-posing around generative themes from daily life. With dialogic reflection among their peers, they gain some critical distance on their conditions and can consider how to transform them.

According to the explanations of the educational process outlined above, Freire's methodology has three basic steps. The first insists on the teacher's duty to know her students. The teacher must take up a stance of "enquiry driven by the need to understand the world from the learners' perspective" (Purcell-Gates and Waterman, 2000: 143). Secondly, she must next identify generative themes and/or words from the students' reality. And finally, the generative themes must be used with a view to encouraging dialogue, learning and critical reflection.
Freire’s work has been adopted in several countries across the world by organizations such as the World Council of Churches, by governments, and by educational practitioners across varying contexts (Allman, 2001; McLaren, 2000; McLaren and Lankshear, 1994). At this point, it is important to emphasize that Freire’s work cannot be reduced to a mere method. Although he outlines the use of a thematic methodology, it is neither prescriptive nor the only means for realizing Freirean educational ideals in actuality. Furthermore, Freire’s pedagogy is far deeper and more meaningful than a mere method in its insistence on the power of love, humility and dignity towards fellow human beings as the basis for critical thinking and social change. According to Roberts (2000: 67):

> Freire’s pedagogy cannot be reduced to a set of methods, techniques of skills. Liberating education ... represents a particular approach to human beings and a specific orientation to the social world, from which general principles – not universally applicable methods – for teaching and learning can be generated.

Aronowitz (2001: 8) also notes this misconception of Freire’s work:

> Since the English translation thirty years ago of his widely read book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire’s work has suffered the misreadings of well-meaning educators who have interpreted his work as a ‘brilliant methodology’, a kind of manual for teachers who would bring out the best in their otherwise indifferent students...Many read Freire as a tool for motivation and cannot recognize that for him dialogue is a content whose goal is social as much as individual change.

Freire’s work will be further explored in Chapter 6, where the reasoning method, one of the pedagogic methods within the Jamaican prison context, will be assessed in relation. Both Freire’s approach to pedagogy and the reasoning method offer a critical and emancipatory approach to basic education. This thesis contributes to the debate on the use of adult basic education in prisons by contending that the latter has the potential to surpass the mere transmission of skills to enable empowerment. Empowerment encompasses the
raising of consciousness through critical thinking skills; economically, through the acquisition of skills needed for employment; and civically through facilitating engagement with issues pertaining to governance, such as voting, for example.

In order for pedagogy to be effective, it must take into account the special needs created by the context and the learner. The OECD (2003: 166) notes, "decisions must always be taken in a given context. There is no ready-made pedagogical ... method applicable in all cases". Such an understanding of pedagogy becomes particularly relevant in the context of this study, where the specific intended audience is adults and where the context in which education takes place is both the environment within the prison and the debates surrounding the role of the prison in society. The fact that there is little academic writing on prison pedagogies was highlighted at the beginning of this section. This thesis attempts to partly redress this lacuna, specifically in situ of the Jamaican context. During the process of this research, two distinct prison pedagogies emerged from the data. These are assessed and analysed more fully in Chapters 5 and 6. This thesis also contributes to the debate on whether or not prisons provide a space that is amenable to the use and development of critical pedagogies. Davidson (1995: 10) notes that it may be difficult to "imagine there is a space for critical discourse within a total institution". This thesis will examine the possibility of critical discourse in the prison context by looking at the existence and role of critical pedagogies in the Jamaican prison context.
The adult learner as prisoner

This section will argue that the situation of adult learners in prisons is fundamentally different to that of adult learners in the wider society. The literature pertinent to adult education will then be reviewed, paying special attention to the tenets and underlying philosophies that seek to differentiate adult education from other forms of education. Finally, this study will contrast and assess the reality of adult learners within the prison context with the ideals of adult education per se.

Prison education for adults can be seen as a subset of the adult education discipline, with shared commonalities, such as a lack of sufficient funding, a lack of resources and a lack of training for practitioners, even if such problems tend to affect prison education to an even greater extent (we will analyse these in greater detail in following chapters). One might question the validity of examining adult learners in prisons separately from other adults. After all, adult education takes place in a variety of settings, and a person remains an adult even after incarceration. However, there are strong counterarguments for examining adult learners within a differentiated category of prisoners in contradistinction to other adult learners. Firstly, prisoners are not ‘typical adults’. The fact that a person is incarcerated suggests that they have exhibited behaviour that society deems as unacceptable. In addition, the reasons behind such behaviour may be quite complex. Secondly, several authors (Carter, 1999; Niles, 1997; Niles and Bernard, 2000; Schlesinger, 2005; Wilson, Gallagher and MacKenzie, 2000) suggest that persons who are incarcerated tend not to be well educated and it is possible that they have not been given the opportunity to participate in education or that their educational experiences up to the time of incarceration have been negative. Consequently, they are often unwilling or
unable to readily accept the philosophies of adult education, such as, for example, the onus on the self-directed adult learner. Thirdly, the physical context of the prison sets them apart. As was previously noted, contexts affect pedagogies and the context of prison is not a 'normal' everyday setting and so demands our separate attention.

There are several possible definitions of adult education espoused by various authors (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000; Knowles, 1980; Robinson, 1988; Rogers, 1986; Tight, 2002) and organisations (NIACE, OECD, and UNESCO). Knowles (1980: 25) breaks down adult education to three levels, suggesting that adult education can be understood as, "the process of adults learning", "a set of organised activities carried on by a wide range of institutions for the accomplishment of specialised educational objectives", and the "idea of a movement or field of social practice". However, what makes adult education distinct is how the adult is perceived and its affect on the approach to learning. Rogers (1986) clarifies this distinction through underlining the differentiation between ‘adult education’ and the ‘education of adults’. For Rogers (1986), the difference between the two lies not in what is being learned (that is, the subject matter) or how a person’s adulthood is defined, but instead in how the learning process is approached. Robinson (1988: 14) takes such a differentiation even further, by arguing that six principles form the basis of adult education:

recognition and acceptance of the rich and varied life experiences of adults; responsiveness to individual and community needs; conscious participation and responsibility of individuals in their own learning; awareness and understanding of existing political, social and economic issues; self-determination towards greater participation in social change and in the development process; and commitment to the redistribution of power and to power-sharing.
Thus, the delineation of adult education occurs through its two-fold purpose and its unique characteristics that arise from these. Firstly, adult education tends to focus primarily on the adult’s personal development; that is, it is some form of learning undertaken either for the adult’s own personal gratification, or in an effort to gain skills for employment, or to facilitate some other form of material or social advancement. Secondly, at the societal level, adult education may be promoted as a tool, designed to cultivate a milieu deemed necessary for the “maintenance and progress of that society” (Knowles 1980: 36).

According to Rogers (1986: 7), adult education:

should seek to promote personal growth [and] the full exploitation of the talents of the individual ... (it) should seek to encourage the development of a sense of perspective; [and] should seek to foster confidence, the power of choice and action, to increase responsibility rather than deny it.

Although there are similarities between child and adult learners, the field of adult education nevertheless distinguishes itself through its respect for the maturity of adult judgement. The first characteristic of adult education is that it is self-directed. Adults decide what learning they want to become involved with and how they become involved (for example, part-time/full time, distance learning, online learning and accredited/non-accredited). The second is that it is student centred. The students’ life experiences are also usually taken into account and used as a knowledge base on which further understanding can be built, developed, critiqued and deconstructed. Finally, adult education usually seeks to be more liberal than the education traditionally provided for children. This is evidenced in the classroom setting, where there is normally an effort to organise the classroom experience such that the student and teacher interact more as equals, developing their knowledge together. Here, the position of the teacher is that of a
facilitator’. In her article, Blackmore (1996: 2) highlights five assumptions about adult learners that encompass the characteristics set out above:

- Adults are autonomous and self-directed;
- Adults are goal-oriented;
- Adults are relevancy-oriented (problem-centred) they need to know why they are learning something;
- Adults are practical and problem-solvers; and
- Adults have accumulated life experiences.

In addition, further motivational factors for adult learning, such as the potential for increased economic earnings, for professional development or perhaps a pure self-interest, are not typically motivational for children’s educational learning.

By defining adult education in terms of its purposes and characteristics, attention is inevitably drawn to the tensions and limitations surrounding the provision of education to the adult within the prison context. The pertinent question is, to what extent is the prisoner treated as an adult learner? The self-directed nature of the adult learner may well be compromised in the prison context due to the constraints that exist, both in respect of the subjects offered for study and the level of study available. Given this situation, the adult learners’ face a limitation occasioned by their location and their choices are ‘directed’ to the programs available, which may not necessarily correspond to where their interests lie. For instance, prisoners are often denied the opportunity to pursue post-secondary courses from prison (the debate on whether prison education should extend to postsecondary education is examined in more detail in Chapter 5). Collins (1998: 101) notes that “education in a prison setting ... highlights structures of power and reveals images of coercion which challenge prevalent notions held about the nature of self-directed learning”. The issue of the prisoners’ right of choice- to choose or refuse- can also be compromised. Within the prison context the adult learners’ choices are often influenced
(whether overtly or covertly) by the realities of the prison context. The most extreme example, perhaps, is where the adult learner is forced to attend certain classes or programs as part of their rehabilitation plan. Davidson (1995: xiii) notes that:

sixteen state prison systems and the federal prison system in the United States had adopted mandatory educational policies...Prisoners are being compelled to attend school for specified periods if they are designated functionally illiterate; depending on the jurisdiction, those who resist are denied parole hearings or prevented from participating in alternative forms of 'treatment' until they comply.

However, the adult learner may still resist in this situation by refusing to engage with the material being delivered. If the premise of adult education is that it accords with the adult's decision, then how do we understand such a lack of participation? By choosing not to participate, one makes the conscious choice to abstain from, or, to utilise the terminology of other authors, to resist. Blaxter (1999) makes the salient point that the very notion of resistance on the part of the adult learner is a contradiction to the voluntary nature of adult education. However contrary it may seem, adults may choose not to participate. Hughes (2000) highlights the issues raised by looking at lack of participation as resistance. If an adult chooses to resist education, then is it justifiable to force him/her to learn? It can be argued that learning is very important, especially with regard to basic literacy skills. So if one was to justify forcing adults to learn basic literacy skills because it would help them to function better in society, then where does one draw the line? What else should they be forced to learn? Who decides what it is compulsory to learn and when it is permissible to allow adults to choose for themselves? And here warning klaxons should sound: if the educator is to dictate the reality of the educatee, then the educator thereby becomes seamlessly transformed into the coloniser.
Resistance speaks as a questioning of the value of educational systems. It challenges the relevance of the knowledges within educational systems for different groups of people. It problematises the efficacy of pedagogic practices for engendering joy and commitment to learning. It speaks out that the colonised are daring to question the colonisers (Hughes, 2000: 52).

The prison context has the potential to suppress the liberatory nature of adult education. Within the prison context there is a tendency to take a functionalist approach towards the provision of educational programs (Collins, 1995). This precludes “critical discourse since it cannot be steered within predetermined limits [and therefore the] manifestation in prison schooling is that ordinary men and women will, in effect, condition themselves according to institutionalised rules of conduct without bringing these norms into question” (Collins, 1995: 57). What results is a situation where education/schooling is a principal method for controlling prisoners” (Collins, 1995: 1).

The arguments elucidated here illuminate the problems inherent in applying the general principles of adult education directly to the prison context. Prison (adult) education though it is a part of the broader study of adult education warrants further investigation.

**Prison education: retribution or rehabilitation**

The following section examines issues pertinent to prison education. Foucault’s analysis provides a framework for understanding the prison’s role in society, as well as the role of education within the prison context. His analysis of the development of the prison and its inter(n)-relation to changing societal norms is here crucial, as, indeed, is his analysis of the training, or education (discipline) of the prisoner for his/her place within society as an
incarcerated being, and beyond, and the self-control that polices such an 
acknowledgement of responsibility, or acknowledged guilt. Foucault is here particularly 
apposite for his elucidation of how prisoners are perceived (mad/bad) and how the 
resultant theories of criminal behaviour impact upon the process of prison education.

Prison education (also referred to as correctional education) can be defined as a learning 
intervention that occurs within the context of the prison institution. Since prison education 
is greatly impacted by the prison context, in order to fully understand the issues 
surrounding prison education it is necessary to first understand the role afforded to the 
prison in society. Foucault’s analysis of society through an examination of certain 
institutions of control – such as prisons, asylums and schools -- offers a theoretical 
framework for conceptualising the prison. Foucault thought that viewing these institutions 
as “microcosms of larger forces … [would] reveal the strategies entire cultures use to deal 
with opposition, construction of self-identities, and manage collective power” (Cheshier, 
2002: 1). Central to comprehending Foucault’s thought on institutions as ways to ‘manage 
collective power’ is his concept of discourse. For Foucault, discourse is a way of 
identifying a body of knowledge that is used to justify exercising power over others 
(Ramazanoglu, 1993). This power is legitimised because the knowledge that grounds the

---

4 The terms ‘prison education’ and ‘correctional education’ are used interchangeably throughout the 
literature to refer to learning interventions that occur within the context of the prison institution. The main 
difference in usage may be linked to the negative connotations associated with the term ‘prison’. In an effort 
to underplay the negative aspects of incarceration and highlight the rehabilitative role of prisons, the term 
“correctional” is often used to replace the term “prison” in instances such as reference to prison buildings 
(correctional institutions) and to the activities that take place within them (correctional education). In this 
thesis, the term “prison education” will be used to maintain a consistency in discussion. Prison education 
may be facilitated in formal ways through academic, vocational and behavioural classes that are set up and 
run by the institution or in conjunction with colleges. It is important to note, however, that prison education 
may also be facilitated through informal and non-formal means where inmates learn from one another or 
teach themselves (Wilson, 2000). For the purpose of this chapter, the focus will be on formal academic 
prison education.
Chapter 1

Literature Review

discourse is normalised as “truth”. In other words, discourse is based on knowledge represented as truth that allows for control over bodies; or as Foucault (1980: 93) put it, “we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth”. In the prison, such production of knowledge and truth occurs because of the surveillance of the incarcerated that is inherent in the structure of the prison itself. Therefore, Foucault argued that the prison must be understood as more than a building; rather, it is a contested space within which knowledge is produced and power exercised. Simply put, within prison space, “the offender becomes an individual to know” (Foucault, 1977: 251).

Foucault’s conceptualisation of the prison as a contested space where power is exercised can be juxtaposed with Bentham’s concept of the panopticon and panoptic control. Though the concept of the panopticon is often associated with prisons and prison buildings the panopticon is not a prison. According to Miller and Miller (1987: 3) “the panopticon is not a prison. It is a general principle of construction, the polyvalent apparatus of surveillance, the universal optical machine of human groupings”. The panopticon and its uses are multifaceted (Bentham, 1995, Lieberman1985; and Miller and Miller, 1987). On one level it operates as a distinct architectural design; on another level it acts as a tool of surveillance and on yet another level it is intended to perform the tasks of reform and control. With regard to the architecture of the panopticon Bentham (1995: 31-32) notes:

The building is circular. The apartments of the prisoners occupy the circumference. You may call them, if you please, the cells. These cells are divided from one another, and the prisoners by that means secluded from all communication with each other, by partitions in the form of radii issuing from the circumference towards the centre, and extending as many feet as shall be thought necessary to form the largest dimension of the cell. The
apartment of the inspector occupies the centre; you may call it if you please the inspector's lodge.

Bentham proposed the use of panoptic architecture for institutions where 'inspection' was paramount and highlighted the importance and value of surveillance in these institutions:

To say all in one word, it will be found applicable, I think, without exception, to all establishments whatsoever, in which, within a space not too large to be covered or commanded by buildings, a number of persons are meant to be kept under inspection. No matter how different, or even opposite the purpose: whether it be that of punishing the incorrigible, guarding the insane, reforming the vicious, confining the suspected, employing the idle, maintaining the helpless, curing the sick, instructing the willing in any branch of industry, or training the rising race in the path of education: in a word, whether it be applied to the purposes of perpetual prisons in the room of death, or prisons for confinement before trial, or penitentiary houses, or houses of correction, or work houses, or manufactories, or mad houses, or hospitals or schools. It is obvious in all these instances, the more constantly the persons to be inspected are under the eyes of the person who should inspect them, the more perfectly will the purpose of X of the establishment have been attained (Bentham, 1995: 30-31).

The architectural design of the panopticon and the way in which the design promotes surveillance is linked to the ultimate goal of reformation achieved through control. Miller and Miller (1987: 5) notes that because the panopticon is “an attempt to alter man, all chance must be controlled, banished. The panopticon is to be an area of totalitarian control”. For Bentham (1995:29) the aims of the panopticon was ultimately to be “a new mode of obtaining power of mind over mind, in a quantity hitherto without example: and that, to a degree equally without example, secured by whoever chooses to have it so…”.

Because the knowledge and power obtained through the surveillance of the inmate is in turn used to control and transform him or her, the prison must be understood as effecting a normalising function (Able, 2002). Normalisation “indicates the extension of control and
self-regulation. Discourse defines what is normal, and what is not normal is then seen as in need of normalisation, or conformity to the norm" (Ramazanoglu, 1993: 22). Normalisation illustrates one of the original intentions of prisons as the transformation of prisoners into law-abiding citizens who could then be reintegrated into society. Analogously, then, prisons appear akin to ‘schools,’ in terms of functioning as normalising institutions that rehabilitate through the (re-) education of the offender (Cheshier, 2002: 3). Indeed, even today, prisons are often discussed in terms of a function of normalisation. For example, Collins (1988: 103) notes that the incarcerated persons are essentially “delinquents marked out for treatment and correction within the penal system...the purpose is to correct what they are, preparing them for eventual release into ‘normal’ society”. However, Foucault (1977: 271) argues that prisons do not create conditions of normalisation. “If the law is supposed to define offences, if the function of the penal apparatus is to reduce them and if the prison is the instrument of this repression, then failure has to be admitted”. Foucault (1977: 265) further argued that “Prisons do not diminish crime rates”; “detention causes recidivism”; “the prison cannot fail to produce delinquents” (Foucault, 1977: 266); “the prison makes possible, even encourages, the organisation of a milieu of delinquents, loyal to one another, hierarchized, ready to aid and abet any future criminal act” (Foucault, 1977: 267); “the conditions to which free inmates are subjected necessarily condemn them to recidivism” (Foucault, 1977: 267); and “lastly the prison indirectly produces delinquents by throwing the inmate’s family into destitution” (Foucault, 1977: 268).

Foucault goes even further, arguing that prisons are a tool, one used by those in power to regulate those who are not:
Penalty would then appear to be a way of handling illegalities...of giving free reign to some and putting pressure on others, of excluding a particular section, of making another useful, of neutralizing certain individuals and of profiting from others (Foucault, 1977: 272).

Foucault thereby suggests that there is a fundamental tension between the goals of incarceration (namely of exclusion and neutralisation of certain segments of the population) and of education (to "normalise" individuals to take their place within society) which, as this thesis will demonstrate, are particularly relevant in the context of prison education.

Foucault's awareness of a gap between understanding the prison as a place of rehabilitation or normalisation and the reality that prisons are more apt to be merely sites of retribution or punishment points to both the changing understanding of the function of the prison in society and the subsequent pressure that such ideological change places on the prison itself and the possibilities of prison pedagogy.

Historically, prisons have always been used as a place of detainment but not always for the purpose of punishment. There are records of prisons existing in Europe as early as the twelfth and thirteenth century (McShane and Williams, 1996). In the ancient and medieval worlds, although prisons existed, they were not the main form of punishment. Peters (1998) outlines some of the punishments that existed during this time. In exploring punishment in countries such as ancient Athens, Egypt, Rome, ancient Israel, and early medieval Europe, Peters (1998) notes that the punishments tended to be capital such as being stoned to death, being thrown from a cliff, exile, compulsory suicide, public beatings, burning, decapitation, hanging and being thrown to the beasts. Punishment during this
time was brutal and focused on inflicting pain on the human body or in ending human life as painfully as possible. Prisons, though, did exist and although their use may have varied slightly from country to country, they were mainly used to hold prisoners who were awaiting some other form of punishment. In sixth century Athens, for example, prisons housed those awaiting execution, although in some cases, they also served as the site for executions and torture. In Egypt, however, prisons functioned slightly differently, reflecting a preference for imprisonment over death, such that prisons housed inmates who, whilst they were confined, were expected to work. There was no classification of different types of prisoners, which included those awaiting trial, those awaiting execution and those indeterminately confined. Rome’s prisons tended to have a disproportionate number of debtors (Peters, 1998). With the passage of time, the general tendency towards imprisonment became the main form of punishment worldwide, even if the history and use of the prison varied from country to country.

Marsh, Cochrane and Melville (2004: 187) provide a general overview of the history of the prison by dividing the past two hundred years of prison history into three main periods, which are “characterised by differing rationales for prison and imprisonment”. The first period spanned the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth and was typified by an emphasis on reform of the prison and the prisoner. During this time, prisons aimed to be both punitive and reformative; the rationale being that hard labour represented the road to reform for the prisoner. The second period, during the mid nineteenth century, saw the adoption of a “much more repressive approach” (Marsh, Cochrane and Melville, 2004: 187) and the third period, beginning at the end of the nineteenth century, saw the development of “new notions of reform and rehabilitation” (Marsh, Cochrane and Melville,
The development of the prison has been cyclical, moving from periods of harsh punishments and sentences to periods of reformation and rehabilitation. Bayliss (2003: 159) describes one such movement:

...a rehabilitation or training discourse was prevalent after World War Two, although not without critics. By 1974 criminal policy [was directed] away from rehabilitation towards concentrating on a punishment strategy.

The movement, from one position to the other, was influenced, to some extent, by a changing perception of the prisoner. Duguid (2000: 54) traces the developments of penal policy back to two basic positions:

On the one hand there is the approach to crime and deviance stemming from Plato that starts from the position that humans are basically good, moral human beings who commit evil acts through ignorance or because of social conditions. The opposite approach, central to much of Christian teaching, holds that humans are fundamentally flawed, ego driven, and perhaps even evil and hence must be restrained and, if possible, reformed or converted if they are to live a moral life.

Over the course of history prison reformers that have taken the position that inmates are essentially good, have tried various means of reforming or rehabilitating the inmate. Early reformers, including the Quakers, believed that the reform of inmates could be achieved by keeping prisoners isolated, occupied with (often meaningless) work and reading the Bible (Marsh, Cochrane and Melville, 2004; McGowen, 1998; Welsh, 1996). Others thought the best way was to ‘cure’ or ‘treat’ the inmate (O’Brien, 1998; Welsh, 1996). From an initial position of the inherent ‘badness’ and irredeemable character of the criminal, responses such as transportation, preventative detention and a policy of ‘hard labour’, ‘hard bed’, ‘hard fare’ ensued (McConville, 1998; McGowen, 1998; O’Brien, 1998).
Despite the evolution of prisons over time, in terms of their structure and role, their general perception as unpleasant places, punitive in nature and damaging to the inmate (MacGuinness, 2000; Warner, 1998; Wilson, 2000), remains. Prisons are still primarily mechanisms of control, used to separate those labelled as criminals from the rest of society.

Despite this, there have been attempts to make prisons more rehabilitative and, as such, the role of prisons has become multifaceted. Straus and Sherwin (1984) suggest that prisons currently fulfil a dual role which is both custodial and rehabilitative. Still other authors see modern prisons as having more than two roles. Taylor (1994) argues that the prison’s role is three-dimensional, in that prison is now concerned with rehabilitation, confinement and punishment. Warbis (2004), while agreeing with the three roles outlined by Taylor (1994), adds a fourth role in which the prison acts as a deterrent for past and future criminals. The fact that prisons are now expected to punish and rehabilitate at the same time creates a difficult situation. As Byaliss (2003: 159) points out: “the paradox of imprisonment lies in society’s expectations of both retribution and rehabilitation”.

If prisons have become places of both retribution and rehabilitation, what then is the perceived role of prison education? And how has prison education responded to the changing roles of the prison? Prison education fulfils many roles, although, as a joint report by the UN and UNESCO (1995) reminds us, in a position supported by Reuss and Wilson (2000: 173), the perceived roles of prison education often depends on the point of view of various stakeholders:
The functions of prison education mean different things to different people. The penal reformer may see it as a means of ‘softening’ the harsh regime; Prison Service staff may see it as a means of keeping prisoners occupied; security staff may see it as a ‘risk’; education staff may see it as a vocation; whilst for some prisoners it simply passes the time.

In 1931 MacCormick stated that:

> Education for adult prisoners has an aim and a philosophy. Its philosophy is to consider the prisoner as primarily an adult in need of education and only secondarily as a criminal in need of reform. Its aim is to extend to prisoners as individuals every type of educational opportunity ... that may be beneficial or of interest to them (cited in Warner, 1998, p.131).

MacCormick’s liberal view is supported by authors who propose that the purpose of prison education is to facilitate the empowerment and personal development of the inmate and imbue him/her with the ability to determine his/her reality (Maeyer, 2001; Reuss, 1999; Reuss and Wilson, 2000). Another position adumbrated is that prison education should provide training, skills and qualifications that will allow for the inmates’ successful re-integration into society (Batiuk et al, 2005; Bayliss, 2003; Pomeroy, 2003; Spark and Harris, 2005). In distinct contrast, others highlight the fact that in the prison context, prison education often becomes a means of control and means for achieving easier management of the prison (Bayliss, 2003; Forster, 1997; Vacca, 2004).

Upon comparing the roles of the prison with the purported roles of prison education, one can see that they are not congruous with each other. This is largely because the primary role of the prison, despite its more contemporary multidimensional roles, is still that of incarceration, which is coterminous with varying levels of security within institutions and having control of inmates imprisoned within its walls. Simply put, the prison’s rehabilitative function is secondary to its role of incarceration. Prisons are still essentially oppressive
and therefore not the most accommodating environment for education to flourish. Indeed, when education is not acting as a method of control, it is probably at odds with the punitive roles expected of the prison. Cosman (1990), Niles (1997), and Morin and Cosman (1989) and highlight the difficulties that exist in reconciling the role of prisons with the aims of education:

Most criminal law is based partly on the assumption that prison should essentially be punitive and retributive, objectives which are difficult to reconcile with the objective of education as human development (Niles, 1997: 52).

Such difficulties prompt Davidson (1995) to describe prison education as ‘stormy,’ with its very existence precariously balanced between the arguments of those who demand its cessation and those who fight for its survival. As this research will show, such arguments also have significant implication for understanding prison pedagogy.

Debates for and against prison education

There are many arguments in support of prison education, most of which focus on its rehabilitative potential and the subsequent benefits to society at large. One such argument stresses the link between crime and education, “the link between the crime rate and education is well established” (Batchelder and Pippert, 2002; 269). Generally speaking, persons within the prison population tend to have low levels of education.

5 There are, of course, other arguments in support of prison education. One of the most compelling is the argument that supports prison education based on the prisoners’ right to learn (Forster, 1997 and Maeyer, 2001). If the inmate is considered, not merely as a criminal devoid of rights, but as a human being with the same basic rights as other human beings in society (excluding the right to freedom which has been suspended as a consequence of the crime committed), then according to the United Nations, the inmate has a right to be educated. This right is clearly documented in the United Nations’ Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment and the Basic Principles for the Treatment of Prisoners.
(Carter, 1999; Niles, 2000; Wilson, Gallagher and MacKenzie, 2000). Wilson, Gallagher and MacKenzie (2000: 347) posit that “it is well established that prison inmates are, on average, less well educated...than the general population”. Speaking in relation to England and Wales Pomeroy (2003: 1) that “of 73,000 prisoners currently serving time in 136 prisons in England and Wales...criminology and social research shows that 80% of prisoners have writing skills and 50% reading skills at or below the level of an 11-year-old child”. Therefore, it seems plausible to deduce that inmates capable of raising their level of education would be less likely to commit crime. Feinstein (2002) concurs, arguing that there is a strong relationship between the level of education and the probability of committing crime. According to his research, persons with high levels of education are less likely to commit crimes.

The link between social inclusion and education is another argument used to support prison education. At the core of such arguments is the injunction to think beyond incarceration. What will happen on the inmate’s release? What will their impact be on the society? Ubah (2003: 200) points out that because education holds a degree of value in society, educated ex-inmates stand a better chance of social inclusion. “The value of education in prison becomes more compelling when one considers that about 95 percent of all offenders currently behind bars will eventually be released into the wider community and they will have to fend for themselves”. An associated argument for the societal benefits of prison education cites its economic ramifications. Werner (1997: 43), for example, argues that, “in the long run it is less expensive to educate people who will not return to prison than it is to continue to incarcerate those who will return”. The broader benefit to society as a whole underpins such arguments.
The supporters of such arguments often invoke evidence of the success of prison education programs, citing as corroboration the incidence of recidivism rates. Batiuk et al (2005) showcase four examples of research that highlight the effectiveness of prison education programs, which, in each case, are substantiated according to statistics that show a decrease in rates of recidivism. For example, a study undertaken by the Correctional Education Association, with a sample of 3,600 inmates who participated in correctional education, found a 23 percent drop in recidivism (Batiuk et al, 2005) compared to the norm.

Those who oppose prison education tend to do so for two main reasons. The first is that prison education is perceived as a threat. This ‘threat’ may be actualised in more than one way. Prison personnel may resent classes being held in prison because it is something that is out of their control and they may thus perceive these classes as a security risk (Reuss, 2000). Warders may also resent what they see as the prisoners taking away resources that they need. In this regard Niles (1997: 55) notes that “some officers are unhappy with the idea of prisoners receiving training, and for free, while their own training was costly and their professional development goes mostly unattended”. It is not only those who are directly involved with the prison system who oppose education for prisoners on financial grounds. There are people who resent and oppose prison education on the grounds of desert, arguing that those who are law-abiding citizens have a greater claim on
the money spent. Such arguments prevailed in the US when prisoners were denied access to Pell Grants.\(^6\)

The second argument utilised against prison education is quite simply that it does not work. The most celebrated study often invoked to support this contention is that conducted by Lipton, Wilks and Martinson. From the results of a single survey, Martinson (1974: 25) concluded:

> that on the whole nothing works – that while there may be isolated treatment approaches which seemed effective here and there with certain kinds of groups, on the whole nothing seemed to have any effect on recidivism.

In his later work, Martinson retracted his earlier stance, reporting that some rehabilitation programs were indeed beneficial, having a significant effect on recidivism. However, Martinson’s recant had little effect. Today, much literature on prison education remains fixated on the debate over whether or not prison education works. According to Ubah and Robinson (2003: 126):

> ...When all is said and done, it is clear that the debate over prison based education has not been resolved. Instead, it continues to divide scholars, policymakers, correctional practitioners and the general public.

Part of the continuing argument revolves around the question of how success is measured. Judgements as to the effectiveness of prison education programs tend to rely on estimations of their effect on recidivism rates (Bayliss, 2003; Reuss and Wilson, 2000).

In reality, the link between prison education and recidivism is difficult to prove, especially

\(^6\) “The Federal Pell Grant Program provides need-based grants to low-income undergraduate and certain postbaccalaureate students to promote access to postsecondary education” (US Department of Education, 2007).
because other factors may play a part in a prisoner’s re-offending (Bayliss, 2003; Forster, 1997). Nevertheless, a number of studies in the United States, United Kingdom and Canada have attempted to prove or disprove the link between prison education and recidivism. The findings of such research have been varied (Batiuk et al, 2005; Page, 2004; Spark and Harris, 2005; Taylor, 1994; Ubah and Robinson, 2003; Vacca, 2004), ranging from claims that there was no relation between prison education and recidivism to claims that there was proof that education programs positively affected recidivism rates. Between these opposite poles, claims varied, between those who argued that only post secondary programs affected recidivism rate to those who posited that both post secondary and basic literacy programs affected rates of recidivism. These research findings might suggest much confusion and a lack of clarity over the impact of prison education programs on recidivism rates. However, it is much more likely that they highlight the reality that some educational programs work, while others do not. Their variable success is rooted in the approach to the development and delivery of individual programs, an approach that is conditioned by an underlying theoretical perspective. This thesis acknowledges the prisoner’s right to education and is thus able to concentrate on questions of how prison education is conceived and its resultant delivery.

Although the success of education programs tends to be gauged according to rates of recidivism, an alternative conception, that prison education accords with humanistic principles, has significant implications for prison pedagogy. On this view, prison education represents a necessary means of empowerment. Reuss (1999), for example, acknowledges that the important issue of change is central to all prison education and that this is often measured only against rates of recidivism. Change, though, for Reuss (1999:
118; emphasis in original) is better assessed through a weaving theory of learning that provides a far better indicator of such change.

the student engages in a process of weaving together commonsense knowledge, newly minted knowledge, memories, life experiences and classroom practices and interactions all of which have a potentiality about them which, through time, can shape attitudes and ultimately behaviour.

Therefore for Reuss (1999: 122-123):

Successful classroom learning in a prison environment is about enabling, about facilitating processes of achievement and personal development. It is therefore about fostering self esteem. Rarely is it about ‘direct change’ in the sense that one can say: ‘Teach an offender this or that and s/he will not re-offend’.

Instead the way forward falls:

between an ‘education as corrections model’ and an ‘education for education’s sake’ model [that is] an ‘education for empowerment’ model (Reuss, 1999: 125).

Reuss, thereby, provides a significant argument that supports the necessity of prison education, whilst providing an alternative means of measuring its success.

Theories on criminal behaviour

Theories about how criminals behave impact “how, what and whom we teach and in some cases whether we can teach at all” (Duguid, 2000: 51). In terms of theories about crime and deviance, Duguid (2000) suggests that there are two meta-theories from which all other theories flow. The first is the ‘man is good theory’ which is linked to an:

approach to crime and deviance stemming from Plato (and Confucius) that starts from the position that humans are basically good, moral beings who commit evil acts either through ignorance or because of social conditions (Duguid, 2000: 52).
The second is the ‘man is bad theory’ which is linked to Christian teaching, (which) holds that humans are fundamentally flawed, ego driven, and perhaps even evil and must be restrained and, if possible, reformed or converted if they are to live a moral life (Duguid, 2000: 52).

Several theories can be accommodated within these two meta-theories and the juxtapositions created by this division could read ‘redeemable’ versus ‘irredeemable’; ‘mad’ versus ‘bad’ or ‘inherently good’ versus ‘inherently bad’. The prison system has been subject to vacillation between the desire to rehabilitate and the desire to punish (Bayliss, 2003; Duguid, 2000) and this movement is grounded in theoretical perceptions of the inmate and the cause of his deviant behaviour. These in turn influence subsequent policies regarding prison education (Duguid, 2000) and also give rise to several models for the conceptualisation and delivery of prison education. Such models include the medical, cognitive-deficiency and opportunities models (which can be dubbed the ‘fix it’ models in that they are motivated by the need to bridge deficiencies in the inmate), the Justice and Anglo-American models (which can be considered punitive), and the European, democratic, creative and participatory models (which can be considered as liberal).

Under the medical model, offenders are considered sick, which condition necessitates a cure through education (Bayliss, 2003; Collins, 1995; Duguid, 2000; MacGuinness, 2000; MacKenzie, Posey, and Rapaport, 1988). According to Collins (1995), literacy education exists in this light, acting as a tool that will transform the inmate, making him/her amenable to rehabilitation and therefore issuing in lower recidivism rates. Literacy programs under this model are predominantly functionalist in design, and thus structure a highly prescriptive curriculum.
The curriculum materials are typically prepackaged as learning modules which require the student to circle or underline the answer, fill in the blanks or provide short written answers predefined by tightly set parameters...Emphasis is placed on the ability to read and respond to short written statements rather than on writing for free expression (Collins, 1995: 51).

Collins (1995) has also linked this model to the concept of the panopticon (discussed earlier in this chapter), in that the standardised curriculum exists as a means for monitoring both students and teachers. This model began to decline following Martinson's famous “nothing works” article, and was superseded by the cognitive model (Duguid, 2000; Germanotta, 1995; MacGuinness, 2000).

The cognitive-deficits model has its theoretical roots in a combination of the cognitive development theory and neo-liberal perspectives on deviance (Davidson, 1995). This model centres on the belief that cognitive deficits are not intrinsic, but learnt (MacGuinness, 2000). Programs are thus geared to addressing problem solving, social skills and interpersonal skills (Bayliss, 2003; Reuss and Wilson, 2000). The cognitive deficiency model also supports religious fundamentalism and literacy, in that its central tenets aim to encourage moral development and develop practical reasoning skills (Collins, 1995; Davidson, 1995). The curriculum under this model often reflects liberal arts programs.

The opportunities model overlaps with the medical model, in that it has its roots in functionalist theory, it can be linked to the concept of the panopticon and it is concerned with ‘fixing’ the prisoner (Collins, 1995). However, rather than the prisoner being deemed ‘sick,’ he/she is understood to be someone who lacks the academic, vocational and social
skills to achieve socially acceptable goals. Criminal behaviour thus occurs as the recourse to achieve what lies beyond legal opportunities. At the core of this model is the belief that "meeting the prisoner’s basic educational and cultural needs should correct the criminal behaviour by opening up job and social opportunities that allow one to achieve goals legally" (Davidson, 1995: 3). Thereby, education, particularly literacy programs, specifically focuses on job training and making the inmate more employable. The notion that underpins the curriculum for the opportunities model is that inmates should be offered the widest range of educational and training opportunities whilst incarcerated (Collins, 1995).

Whilst the above models clearly aim to rehabilitate the prisoner, other prison educational models reflect the desire to punish that is also associated with the prison. According to Warbis (2004), the justice model of prison education focuses on punishment and places less emphasis on education and rehabilitation. This is perhaps one of the more inhospitable models with regard to prison education. It is premised on "'tough love', and 'tit-for-tat' theories that [give rise to actions such as boot camps, three strikes and the death penalty" (Duguid, 2000: 50). The Anglo-American model, like the justice model, is also linked to punitive theories, as instantiated in policies such as 'zero tolerance'. According to Warner (1998: 122), the model is characterised by "negative stereotyping of those held in prison; vengeful attitudes; [and] massive increases in the use of incarceration... [inmates are assumed to be] very violent people [and] hardened criminals". Education under this model tends to be narrow, largely because the inmate is considered as lacking any positive potential. In terms of the delivery of educational programs, the use of creative methodologies and certain concepts central to adult education, such as placing value on the student’s life experiences and valuing his or her
input, are discounted. In fact, this model supports the possibility of compulsory educational programs, which, as such, are often perceived by inmates as part of the 'package' that is the punishment of being in prison (Warner, 1998).

One of the more liberal prison education models is the European model. According to this model, the inmate is a 'whole person' and not merely a criminal. Since the aim of education under this model is to develop the whole person, education moves beyond just addressing criminal behaviour to facilitating education in other areas that may be of interest to the inmate. The curriculum offered in this setting therefore tends to be fairly wide (Warner, 1996; Warner, 1998). Areas such as "artistic activity, social education, academic study less directed toward vocational outcomes, health and physical education and consciousness raising can all have a more substantial and central role in the education program available in prison" (Warner, 1998: 121). An important model that can be included under this category is the participatory literary practices model, otherwise known as the Paulo Freire (discussed earlier in this chapter); an approach that is based on an adaptation of the philosophies that underpin Freire's work. Central to this model is Freire's belief in the necessity of communal learning and building on life experiences. One of its central features is that students and teachers form the curriculum together, such that the learners' voice extends beyond the merely heard to contribute significant material for the joint learning process (Collins, 1995). Perhaps the most liberal of such models is the creative model, which gives teachers a free hand in experimenting with the curriculum and teaching methods in order to discover what works best in their given situation. Sometimes practitioners experience little opposition because the relevant authorities are not particularly concerned with what is happening in prison classrooms. Consequently, there
have been cases of "prison-based adult literacy projects which, in terms of creativity and
commitment, make some of the institutionalized adult literacy programs for
'disadvantaged' people on the outside appear pedestrian by comparison" (Collins, 1995: 59).

Finally, there is the democratic model. According to Eggleston and Gehring (1999), this
model is perhaps more of a vision or a work in progress than a reality. Nevertheless, the
aim of the model is to put a stop to anti-social behaviour and to promote the development
of positive social attitudes. The model may manifest itself in three ways; in a democratic
classroom; a democratic school enclave and in a prison institution that operates according
to democratic principles. The democratic classroom should:

allow prisoner students to have some say over their own learning and help
them begin to have control over their lives...[The] democratic [school]
enclave is to establish a democratic/educational community that contrasts
with other institutional components , in which students assume some
responsibility for their own education [and] the objective of the entire
institution [being democratic] is to transform the prison into a school,
which can develop better citizens instead of better prisoners (Eggleston
and Gehring, 1999: 307).

The models outlined here provide a cross section of possible approaches to prison
education and are relevant in providing a framework within which to place the pedagogic
methods that will be explored in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. The approach explored in Chapters
5 and 7, is most closely linked with the 'fix it' models, in that education is functionalist and
is geared toward providing basic literacy and vocational skills which will lead to
employment. The approach explored in Chapter 6 is more in keeping with the more liberal
models.
Conclusion

Section one of this chapter examined the concept of pedagogy and explored the various phases of development through which pedagogy evolved. The various stages of pedagogy inform the pedagogical analysis of this thesis. Adopting the focus of contemporary pedagogy, the examination of pedagogy in the context of Jamaican prisons will assess the philosophies and teaching styles adopted by teachers, the way in which the prison context impacts pedagogic practices, and the learner’s contribution and involvement in the learning process. The pedagogies associated with adult education were highlighted as modes that were most conducive to critical and liberatory pedagogies, thus permitting the assessment of their relevance to the prison context. Freire’s work is salient here, primarily because his critical/liberatory pedagogy allows a contrast and comparison with one of the pedagogic methods that exist within the Jamaican prison context. The adult learner as prisoner represents a crucial facet of our examination into whether or not the ethos of identity construction associated with adult learning- such as being an autonomous self-directed learner- has relevance within the prison context. The final section explored prison education in terms of the debates for and against its provision and the influence that theories on criminals’ behaviour has on the approach taken to prison education.

In reviewing the available literature on pedagogy, adult education, and prison education, several significant factors have emerged. Firstly, there is a problem with a lack of specialised training for adult educators and by extension, a lack of specialised training for educators in prisons. The issues surrounding the training of adult educators will be
examined in Chapter 5. Secondly, pedagogical practices are impacted by several factors, such as context, culture, and philosophical beliefs. Thirdly, there is a noticeable gap in the writings on pedagogical practices within prisons (this could be indicative of the difficulties researchers have in accessing prisons or that practitioners are not writing about their work). Fourthly, there is no universal pedagogical method that can be applied wholesale in every situation. It seems that all the different variations on pedagogy (as a practice) are oriented towards finding the 'best' way forward. It has become abundantly clear that there is no 'right' or 'wrong' pedagogy. Instead, there is 'appropriate' pedagogy. Pedagogy is more likely to be effective if it is 'tailor made' to each individual situation. In light of the issues outlined here, this thesis seeks to contribute to the literature on pedagogic approaches, particularly within the context of the Jamaican prison. It is also concerned with exploring the ramifications of critical and emancipatory pedagogies within the prison context and the ability of these pedagogies to empower the inmate.
CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

Introduction
The purpose of this chapter is to explore the methodological issues that arose during the period of this research. The necessities of this work demanded a balance, between systematic design and planning, and flexibility to be able to respond to serendipity, chance, refusal and context. Chapter 2 begins with an examination of the literature on qualitative research, paying special attention to epistemological issues. The second section outlines the research process, examining the aims and objectives of the study and the actual processes and methods employed to achieve these ends. It also explores the research context, noting especially the difficulties associated with researching prisons. The chapter concludes with an examination of social capital as a form of research methodology, by way of an acknowledgement of the pivotal role that this has played in the research process.

Qualitative research
This section examines qualitative methodology, especially for its pertinence to this particular research project. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2003: 1-3), qualitative research "crosscuts disciplines, fields and subject matters...[and has been employed in the] social and behavioural sciences including education (especially the work of Dewey),
history, political science, business, medicine, nursing, social work, and communications".

In speaking of the characteristics of qualitative research, Neuman (2000: 144) describes "The language of qualitative research [as] one of interpretation". Bryman (2001: 277) outlines "five distinctive preoccupations among qualitative researchers". These include the need to see through the eyes of the people being studied; description and an emphasis on context; process; flexibility and lack of structure; and the comprehension of concepts and theory as grounded in data. (Bryman, 2001). Attempts to delineate the parameters of qualitative research have often contrasted it with quantitative research (Bryman, 2001; Corbetta, 2003; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Mark, 1996; Pole and Lampard, 2002). Bryman (2001: 284-285), for example, lists eleven frequently invoked contrasts between qualitative and quantitative research which include "numbers vs. words; static vs. process; structured vs. unstructured; hard reliable data vs. rich deep data; behaviour vs. meaning; [and] artificial settings vs. natural settings".

The 1960s saw an increased interest in qualitative research, which Bryman (1992: 70) attributes to two main causes. The first is that it was "possible to detect considerable disillusionment with the fruits of quantitative research among early writers on qualitative research [and] the second factor [was] the growing awareness of phenomenology, and more particularly Schutz’s version of it, which occurred in the 1960s". For the purpose of this chapter I will adopt the definition articulated by Bryman (1992: 46) in defining qualitative research as "an approach to the study of the social world which seeks to describe and analyse the culture and behaviour of humans and their groups from the point of view of those being studied". However, it is important to note that in terms of defining qualitative research, there is often "disagreement over what precisely qualitative research
is" (Bryman, 2001: 287). However, Phillimore and Goodson (2004: 5) pose, and answer, the question of what qualitative research is. "Is it a set of methods, a strategy, a critique or an approach?...qualitative research is as much a way of conceptualising and approaching social inquiry as it is a way of doing research". The characteristics of qualitative research outlined above are particularly suited to the purposes of our study. In exploring prison pedagogies this research is concerned with uncovering and understanding them from the point of view of the persons (administrators, educators, inmates) involved in the process of prison education. Adopting a qualitative approach allows for the generation of rich deep data; observation within the ‘natural’ prison setting; and the exploration of meaning(s) behind particular types of behaviour that influence prison pedagogy. In short, qualitative research is able to provide a more holistic understanding of prison pedagogies specific to the Jamaican context.

Any attempt to define qualitative research must surely acknowledge the importance of Denzin and Lincoln's eight historical 'moments' (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003; Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Phillimore and Goodson, 2004). These are; “the traditional (1900-1950); the modernist (1950-1970); blurred genres (1970-1986); crisis of representation (1986-1990), the post modern (1990-1995); postexperimental inquiry (1995-200); the methodologically contested present (2000-2004) and the fractured future (2005 - )” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 3). Despite the fact that it has been argued that “these moments overlap and simultaneously operate in the present” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 3) and that qualitative research means different things in each of these moments, they nevertheless present a useful looking-glass for the movement of qualitative prison methodologies. Specifically, what becomes evident is that there is a movement away from research methodologies
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that aimed to “write ‘objective’ colonizing accounts of field experiences that were reflective of the positivist scientist paradigm” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 15), towards those that exhibited a more reflexive awareness of the issues that impact upon any such research, particularly with regards to race, gender and class issues. Indeed, in its current phase of development, the so-called ‘fractured future’, qualitative research methodologies are particularly concerned with “moral discourse [and] with the development of sacred textualities ...[and] ask that the social sciences and the humanities become sites for critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalisation, freedom and community” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 3). This research accords with the ‘fractured future’ of qualitative research in that it seeks to interrogate pedagogic practices in the prison classroom addressing issues of control, power and authority, and the ‘freedom’ of the inmate to be a critical adult learner.

The research process consists of four interrelated components; epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology and methods. In general, epistemology is concerned with the

7 In the traditional period, “qualitative researchers wrote ‘objective’ colonizing accounts of field experiences that were reflective of the positivist scientist paradigm” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 15). The modernist period is characterised by an effort to “formalize qualitative methods. The modernist ethnographer and sociological participant observer attempted rigorous qualitative studies of important social processes, including deviance and social control in the classroom and society” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 16). The period of the blurred genres found qualitative researchers with “a full compliment of paradigms, methods, and strategies to employ in their research. Applied qualitative research was gaining stature and [it was proposed by Geertz] that the boundaries between the social sciences and the humanities had become blurred (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 17). During the fourth moment, the crisis of representation, “research and writing [became] more reflexive and called into question the issues of gender, class and race” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 18). The post modern period was characterised by “experimental ethnographic writing...new ways of composing ethnography were explored” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 20). The postexperimental period was also defined by “a concern for literary and rhetorical tropes and the narrative turn, a concern for storytelling, for composing ethnographies in new ways” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 3). The seventh moment, the methodologically contested present, is a period of “conflict, tension and retrenchment” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005: 20).
“origins and the nature of knowing” (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994: 4). Constructionism is the epistemology most often associated with qualitative research and it underpins this study. A constructionist epistemology posits the view that with regard to human knowledge:

there is no objective truth waiting for us to discover it. Truth, or meaning, comes into existence in and out of our engagement with the realities in our world...Meaning is not discovered, but constructed. In this understanding of knowledge, it is clear that different people may construct meaning in different ways, even in relation to the same phenomenon (Crotty, 1998: 8).

This research regularly uncovered instances when there was differing understandings of the learning experience within the prison classroom between educators and students. The researcher’s acknowledgement of the validity of each person’s constructive interpretation here obviated any desire to find the “correct” reality.

Bryman (1992) lists five intellectual undercurrents that influence qualitative epistemology and that have particular significance for this research. The first is phenomenology, which aims to “describe, interpret and understand the meanings of experiences at both a general and unique level” (Holloway and Todres, 2003: 348). It includes:

a pointed rejection of the positivist position that the differences between the natural and the social orders do not present any problems to the application of scientific methods to the study of society [and instead posits the view that] any attempt to understand social reality must be grounded in people’s experience of that social reality” (Bryman, 1992: 52).

The second is symbolic interactionism, which:

views social life as an unfolding process in which the individual interprets his or her environment and acts on the basis of that interpretation...Two

---

6 Crotty (1998), notes that there are a range of epistemologies such as; objectivist epistemology, constructionism and subjectivism.
central concepts to this tradition – the definition of the situation and the social self – give a flavour of the approach as well as capture some focal themes (Bryman, 1992: 54).

The third is verstehen, which finds its roots in Weber’s idea of verstehen [which] means ‘to understand’. According to Weber (1947), there are two types of understanding:

- direct observational understanding of the subjective meaning of a given act (Weber, 1947: 94) [and]
- explanatory or motivational understanding in which the particular act has been placed in an understandable sequence of action, the understanding of which can be treated as an explanation of the actual course of behaviour (Weber, 1947: 95).

The fourth is naturalism. According to Matza (1969: 5), naturalism is “the philosophical view that strives to remain true to the nature of the phenomenon under study”. The fifth is ethogenics, which approach is based on “the understanding of episodes in social life. ‘Episodes’ are sequences of interlocking acts by individuals. It is the task of ethogenics to elucidate the underlying structures of such episodes by investigating the meanings actors bring to constituent acts” (Bryman, 1992: 60).

The theoretical perspectives associated with qualitative research have informed this study. Qualitative research is often aligned with interpretivism as a theoretical perspective. In fact, there is overlap between epistemology and theoretical perspective in that interpretivism is the broad theoretical perspective under which symbolic interactionism and phenomenology (which are two of the intellectual undercurrents that influence qualitative epistemology) fall.

---

9 Other perspectives include positivism, feminism, post modernism and interpretivism (Bryman, 1992).
The final two components of the research process (methodology and methods)\textsuperscript{10} will be examined in relation to this research in the following section.

\textbf{Research account}

This section sets out the aims of the research project through the research questions. It examines the phases of the research and the fieldwork undertaken, the difficulties encountered and the unique challenges of researching in the prison context. The context of this research was an examination of prison education in adult correctional facilities in Jamaica. The main aim was to identify current issues and the role of Government policy and practice, focusing specifically on the pedagogical practices that exist within these institutions and the experiences of practitioners therein. The research revolved around four predominant research questions covering the following areas: the government’s policy on prison education; the transformation of policy into practice through the experiences of persons directly involved in prison education; the training needs of educators; and prison pedagogy. The research questions were as follows:

1) What are the values and imperatives underpinning Jamaican policy on prison education?

2) What are the key pedagogic techniques and values encouraged through staff development and training of prison educators?

3) What kinds of pedagogic practices and theories-in-use are utilised by prison educators?

\textsuperscript{10} Methodology includes strategies such as ethnography, grounded theory, phenomenological research, and survey research while method refers to the actual tools employed to gather data such as observation, interviews, document analysis, cognitive mapping and sampling (Bryman, 1992).
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4) Who educates the prisoner in the Jamaican context and how does this accord with the educators as perceived by the standard literature?

Bryman (2007: 5) notes the importance of the research question, seeing it as:

the linchpin of the research process. The research question is viewed as a crucial early step that provides a point of orientation for an investigation. It helps to link the researcher's literature review to the kinds of data that will be collected.

This research process occupied three phases. Each phase consisted of a review of the pertinent literature, a period of fieldwork, reviewing, analysing and validating data gathered in the field, a referring back to the relevant literature and using information gathered from the data to build and inform the next phase of research. The first phase of the research was conducted in the summer of 2002, over an eight-week period during the months of July and August. This phase was exploratory and was intended to provide insights into the operations of the DCSJ with regard to prison education. To that end, meetings were arranged with persons working at the administrative level of the DCSJ, such as the Director of Rehabilitation, the Educational Coordinator, the Senior Prison Chaplain, and a researcher from the research department of the DCSJ. These meetings served the purpose of sensitising key persons within the DCSJ to the research project, building networks that would later be needed in order to gain full access to the prisons and providing a basic understanding of what academic and vocational programs were being offered by the DCSJ and the intended outcomes of these programs. During this phase, four adult prisons were visited. In each case, the field visit included, observing classes and speaking with various members of prison staff (such as, superintendents, warders, and academic and vocational teachers) and inmates. The data gathered from these visits was
in the form of rich ethnographic accounts. The themes and issues that emerged enabled
the refinement and refocusing of research and the development of interview schedules
used in phase two of the research project.

The second phase of the research began in October 2002 with the use of letters of
correspondence. Letters were sent to all the persons subsequently interviewed in the first
phase. The letters were intended to enable the continued generation of data during my
physical absences from the field. (Letters of correspondence as a research method will be
examined in more detail later in the section). The research instruments (semi-structured
interview schedules), which were designed according to the data received from phase
one, were piloted with prison educators in England. This allowed for the testing and later
refinement of the instrument that I would subsequently use in the Jamaican context.
During the summer of 2003, field work continued in Jamaica. Access was limited to two
adult prisons (issues pertaining to access will be examined more fully later in the chapter),
one of which had been visited during phase one and another that had not previously been
visited. Classes were observed in these prisons and interviews conducted with prison
educators. Interviews, together with observation within the prison classrooms, allowed for
continued scrutiny of the context and various styles of prison pedagogies in use.
Organisations involved in the support and delivery of prison education were visited, and
interviews conducted with the relevant personnel. These interviews provided additional
data on prison education from the viewpoint of persons not directly employed to the DCSJ.
I also attended a quarterly seminar hosted by the DCSJ. This seminar importantly
highlighted issues of concern to the DCSJ and persons who volunteered in the prisons; as
well as the DCSJ's involvement with international bodies committed to prison education
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(such as Prison Fellowship International). The seminar also provided background information to some of the tensions in the prison context (such as those between religious volunteers and prison educators) and insight into the perceived importance of prison education and prisoner rehabilitation.

The third phase of the research occurred over a three-month period from September to November of 2004. Four previously visited prisons were revisited and more observation and interviews conducted. Further interviews with key personnel in the DSCJ (such as the Commissioner and the Educational Coordinator) also took place. The final phase of the research process allowed for continued observation, continued exploration of issues that had emerged from the two previous phases and the follow up and clarification of data gathered from previous phases.

The four prisons included in the study are, Jackfruit Prison, Mango Town Prison, Pine Town Prison and Ras I Prison\textsuperscript{11}. In 2002 and 2003, fieldwork in Jamaica took place over six weeks between July and August. In 2004 fieldwork was carried out over a three month period from September to November. Jackfruit Prison was visited in 2002, 2003 and 2004. In 2002, one day was spent touring the facility, observing classes and speaking informally with various members of prison staff and inmates. In 2003, one day was spent observing classes and conducting interviews with teachers. In 2004, one week was spent observing classes and conducting interviews. Mango Town Prison was visited in 2002 and 2004. In 2002, one day was spent touring the facility, and speaking informally with inmates and

\textsuperscript{11} Pseudonyms were used throughout the thesis to represent the names of the prisons included in the study and the names of the persons who were interviewed in order to preserve anonymity.
warders. I observed vocational classes, but no academic classes, as these had been suspended. In 2004, one week was spent observing classes and conducting interviews. Pine Town Prison was visited in 2002 and 2004. In 2002, one day was spent touring the facility and observing both vocational and academic classes. In 2004, one week was spent observing classes and conducting interviews. Ras I prison was visited in 2003. One day was spent touring the facility, observing teaching practices and conducting interviews. Although further access to Ras I Prison was denied, due to security issues and concern for my safety, data from this prison was included in the study for two reasons. Firstly, because of the uniqueness of the teaching practices at Ras I Prison and secondly, because of the transfer of a previously interviewed inmate teacher from Ras I Prison to Jackfruit Prison in 2004 which facilitated follow up interviews. The schedule of field visits is further illustrated in table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Schedule of Field Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISON</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackfruit Prison</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>WF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mango Town Prison</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>WF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Town Prison</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>WF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ras I Prison</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>DF</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF = 1 day of field work, WF = 1 week of field work. (Each day visit was approximately 6-7 hours long)

Interviews occurred with four groups of people. Firstly, with persons working within the Ministry of National Security and Justice under whose purview the Department of
Corrections falls. The second group consisted of senior personnel within the Jamaica Department of Corrections. Thirdly, interviews were conducted with persons teaching within the prisons and lastly, interviews with stakeholders associated with supporting prison education, but who were not part of the Department of Corrections, took place. In interviewing this cross-section of people, I hoped to get a more comprehensive view of prison education, both at the policy level and at the practical level. Interviewing people at various levels within the organisation also allows for cross-validation; that is, using information from various interviews to corroborate emerging data garnered, from interviews, observation and documentary evidence.

Obstacles to the research process

There were several areas of difficulty for this research. Firstly, initial investigations revealed that the literature specific to the Jamaican prison context was limited. This necessitated counter-strategies. The first measure was to write letters and emails to relevant personnel within the DCSJ and the MoNSJ requesting assistance in terms of ascertaining whether there were documents on adult prison education held within these or any other government departments. The second measure was to supplement the literature that was available on Jamaican prisons, with literature on adult prison education in other countries. Thirdly, this study made use of resources available in England. Interview schedules were piloted with educators in the British prison education system; literature on prison education in the British context was reviewed and utilised to provide a comparative analysis for Jamaican prison education, particularly as relating to prison education policies (further discussed in Chapter 4). Finally, contact was established with organisations involved in the delivery of prison education in Britain, such as the National Open College
Network (NOCN) and the Offenders Learning and Skills Unit (OLSU). Initially, contact established through the NOCN office at Warwick University. Subsequent to this interview, further interviews with other NOCN personnel and with persons from the OLSU occurred. One of the NOCN moderators that I met with was also able to facilitate an interview with a prison educator working in the West Midlands. Snowball sampling was thus triggered indirectly by gaps in the literature, and more directly by my early entry into the field. The data that emerged from the British fieldwork was important because it facilitated sensitivity to prison education generally and pointed to possible issues that might also be pertinent in Jamaica.

Logistical concerns were also important. I was in essence conducting my investigation from two locations. I was in England and the prisons I wanted to investigate were in Jamaica. In an attempt to overcome this problem, letters of correspondence (Harris, 2002; Letherby and Zdrodowski, 1995) were used to bridge the physical distance between the two countries/between researcher and respondent. Letters of correspondence were intended to assist in three ways, facilitating the continued forging of relationships between researcher and respondents despite a lack of physical presence, enabling the continued collection of data through the incorporation of questions such as "how are classes going" and "have any new inmates joined the school", and keeping respondents interested and engaged with the research. Persons who were formally interviewed and persons with whom informal conversations had been held were asked by the researcher if they would be willing to correspond by letter, with the addresses of those who were amenable being taken. The next step was to send out thank you letters expressing my appreciation for their help and asking for their continued assistance. I also used the letters to inquire after
their well being and work. Letters were sent upon my return to England at the end of each phase of fieldwork, although no one ever responded to the letters. During the period between phase one and two of my fieldwork, having received no responses, I assumed that the letters had failed. I refrained from writing further letters at that point, as I did not want the persons I had written to, to feel as if I was pressuring or badgering them. However, upon my return to Jamaica in 2003, I found that everyone I had sent letters to greeted me warmly\textsuperscript{12}. They all thanked me for my letters and wanted to know how my research had been going over the last year and so on. As we spoke, I asked why they had not returned my letters and I received responses such as:

\begin{quote}
boy I meant to but I never got around to it

I don't like writing letters but it was good to hear from you

I wish you had given out a phone number, I don't like to write but I would have called
\end{quote}

Letters of correspondence failed to produce additional data\textsuperscript{13}. However, they were successful in serving the purpose of keeping respondents interested in the research and maintaining relationships.

There were difficulties that surrounded the context in which I conducted my research, that is, the prison context. “Prisons are unique among organisations”, (Hart, 1995: 165) partly because they are closed institutions that operate differently from the rest of society. The rules and guidelines of the prison must be adhered to in order to maintain its integrity,

\textsuperscript{12} Letherby and Zdrodowski (1995) highlight the concept of distance rapport noting that the development of research relationships is possible through correspondence.

\textsuperscript{13} In retrospect, the use of letters raised issues that I had been unaware of, or not thought about enough. I had not taken into account that security practices within the prison would mean that letters entering and leaving the prisons would have been read before being passed on to the relevant persons, a practice that may have made respondents reluctant to commit their thoughts and observations to writing.
particularly as regards its security. Such restrictions meant that I had to be flexible and modify my research. The following section will outline some of the literature on researching prisons and examine in more detail how the prison context affected the methods and their employment.

Researching Prisons

Hart (1995) and Patenaude (2004) suggest that prison research is generally characterised by its problematic and complicated nature. Hart (1995: 165) notes that:

research is a time consuming and uncertain process in any organisation. But, researching prisons poses difficulties for the researcher more so than studying other types of social institutions, because of the need for security and secrecy that has historically dominated prisons. Workers in prisons have a vested interest in controlling access to information which often produces the impression of a ‘fortress mentality’.

Patenaude (2004: 72) outlines some of the challenges associated with prisons research such as “gaining entry to the field, establishing rapport, gaining and maintaining trust, providing timely feedback and analysis and publication of results”. Some of the difficulties encountered in this research are outlined in the following paragraphs.

One of the challenges faced in this research, was the perception of my research as a threat. Both the researcher and the research topic are prone to such perceptions from prison personnel (Hart, 1995). The threat as a researcher existed in two ways. In the first instance, there was much concern regarding my nationality. Persons within the DCSJ thought that I was a British student and were reluctant to entertain my request until I specified that I was a Jamaican student studying in Britain. Their reluctance followed from the fact that around the time of conducting this research, the DCSJ had recently received
negative reviews from Amnesty International and it was felt that research by a foreigner might result in further negative publicity. Secondly, my physical presence within the prisons posed a security risk, both in terms of maintaining my own safety and ensuring that my actions did not compromise the security of the prison. Researchers are often prone to overlook this aspect. However, Jamieson’s (2000: 61) reminder that “risk and danger to the personal security of the researcher is an issue gaining greater recognition within the social sciences”, is well taken. It may manifest itself in several forms, such as in the “physical, emotional, ethical and professional” (Lee-Treweek and Linkogle, 2000: 8). Initially, when I was denied access to Ras I prison, I felt that the issue of security was being used as a means of keeping me from a prison where educational programs may not have been ‘up to scratch’ and directing me towards ‘better examples’ within the prison system. However, reports in the media around the time of my visits, confirmed that security was indeed an issue. Treweek and Linkogle (2000: 9) note that as researchers “we often study the risks to society from ill health or crime etc., yet we rarely consider the dangers involved in carrying out research”.

Certain people who also believed that the dissemination of information about the prison system, even if it pertained to prison education, could have negative repercussions for the DCSJ, also perceived the research as a threat.

A further challenge existed in gaining access to prison institutions (Hart, 1995; Jupp, 1993; Patenaude, 2004). Although crucial to the sustainability of the research, obtaining access to both sites and subjects can be one of the most difficult tasks faced by the researcher (Bryman, 2001; Corbetta, 2003). Although various types of settings exist, two categories
encompass them; closed settings, such as formal organisations, and open settings, such as parks and public restrooms (Singleton and Straits, 1999). "Research settings vary considerably in the extent to which they are ‘open’ or ‘closed’ to public scrutiny. These differences, in turn, impact upon the nature and degree of negotiation necessary to secure access" (Nooks and Wincup, 2004: 56). Jupp (1993: 19) notes that, "by their very nature [prisons] are truly closed, particularly to those not doing officially sponsored research".

There are often several barriers to gaining access to organisations. Patenaude (2004), speaking in reference to gaining access to prisons, warns of both external and internal barriers to access. According to Patenaude (2004: 73), one example of an “external barrier to entering the prison is the IRB at the researcher’s home university or college”.

During the first two years of this research, despite numerous attempts to gain access through official channels, particularly through letters to relevant persons within the MoNSJ and the DCSJ, both letters and phone calls remained unanswered. For these two years, the only means of access to the prisons was via an unofficial gatekeeper. A gatekeeper can be defined as, someone through who access to an organisation or setting is gained (Corbetta, 2003; Neuman, 2000; Nooks and Wincup, 2004). Jupp (1993: 19) remarks that, “in prison research, gaining the confidence and support of gatekeepers, at whatever level, is crucial”. The support of unofficial gatekeepers sustained this research. However, it also caused certain limitations, in that I was unable to gain regular access, whilst it also meant a lack of predictability in terms of which prisons I would actually be able to visit from day to day. In the final year, I was able to gain official access to the prisons. Gaining official access, however, meant that I encountered internal barriers. These took the form of various applications and security checks that had to be adhered to (Patenaude, 2004). However, the irksome nature of these checks, as described by Patenaude (2004), can
also be viewed as necessary internal checks and balances, which contribute to the overall security of the prisons. The DCSJ must ensure that prisoners are held securely, thus posing minimal risk to society, but they are equally charged with the task of ensuring that the inmates in their care do not come to harm. Therefore the information that the researcher must provide on application forms and other documents, some of which are legally binding (see Appendix A), is required in order for the DCSJ to fully assess the risks to the inmate, the researcher and the general security of the prison. The second form of internal barrier is people’s willingness to cooperate with the researcher. The granting of access from top level management does not always ensure cooperation within individual institutions. Reuss (2000: 30) notes that some persons may refuse to participate precisely because the research is perceived as coming from the "Home office", or in this particular case, from the DCSJ. This was just what I found. Even though I had received approval for prison visits, I sometimes met persons who were reluctant to participate in the research. At the ground level then, resistance from persons within individual prisons illustrates the multifaceted layers that exist for the attempt to gain access to the prison context. It also points to the importance of building rapport and trust between the researcher and those being researched (Drake, 1998; Patenaude, 2004; Reuss, 2000).

Another difficulty associated with researching prisons, is that the researcher does not always have full control over the research project. For example, it is not always possible for the researcher to have full control over the sample used for their research. Both Reuss (2002) and Drake (1998) note that there is often someone within the prison selecting the persons whom the researcher works with. Even after gaining official access, I was only able to visit the prisons selected by the DCSJ. Reuss (2000: 28) notes that when the
researcher loses control over deciding his/her sample and "the whole range of carefully premeditated methodological strategies and designs disappear one by one...(nevertheless) still you have your hypothesis ... and your working relationship with a small core of [people] who ... will know exactly what your research is about". When the researcher is not afforded the opportunity to choose his/her own sample, the possibility exists that the research may be skewed towards what the gatekeepers inside the prison want the researcher to know and not necessarily toward what the researcher is trying to find out. Initially, research access was only granted to two male prisons, even though I had also requested access to the female prison (which had been previously visited 'informally). When I queried why access to the latter prison had been denied, I was advised that the persons who afforded me access did not see the relevance of including the women's prison. It was necessary for me to make further requests and make an argument for why it was necessary for women to be included in the study. After further discussions, it became apparent that the officials selecting the prisons were trying to choose those where education programs were well established and where they felt I would be able to gather the most useful data.

Researching in the prison context may also impinge upon best practice. For example, when conducting interviews, it is advisable to use a tape (Bryman, 2001; Neuman, 2000). However, in some prisons, I was advised that I would not be allowed to take the tape recorder in, whilst in others where it was permitted, the conditions were not conducive to taping. In some instances, conditions did not allow for note taking during the interview and observation process. For example, some person's spoke freely once I made eye contact with them and stopped if my attention seemed to be concentrated on writing. Others were
concerned that my research notes could be confiscated, thereby compromising their anonymity. One interviewee expressed the concern that:

*dem (senior officers) might take your notebook and see what you write and figure out is me say it...and I would get into trouble*

Therefore, in an effort to facilitate fruitful interviews, interviewees were asked if they were comfortable with having notes taken\(^\text{14}\) and if not, their wishes were respected. However, in order to endeavour accuracy, I made notes as soon as I was outside of the prison. These notes relied on memory. In order to confirm my recollection, I sought validation from the respondents who had declined to allow note taking by verbally reiterating to the respondent what I had understood from the interview. In instances where interviewees had been amenable to note taking, validation was sought by providing the respondent with written notes of the interview, asking them to read them and highlight anything that was incorrect, or advising me if anything had been left out. I discovered that oral respondent validation produced better responses than those received from requests for written validation. In the latter cases, I found they did not want to be concerned with reading through pages of notes. The validation process was conducted on subsequent visits to the prison, or by phone (however there were instances where this was not possible, such as when visits to a particular prison were curtailed and in circumstances where phone contact information for the interviewee was not available).

Finally, researchers may be restricted in what they may publish (Drake, 1998; Jupp, 1993; Patenaude, 2004). In some cases, the DCS where the research is being conducted may,

\(^{14}\) This is a further example of the researcher's assumptions and the research literature not applying to particular populations. As a novice researcher the feeling was that the proper way to conduct research was to take notes, however in the field (in this instance the prison context) this was not always possible.
as part of the provisions for access, make provisions which require all publications resulting from the study to be seen and agreed to prior to publication, by person(s) within the DCS. As it pertains to the DCSJ, access to the prisons was contingent on my agreement to provide the DCSJ with a copy of the thesis and not to include drawings or maps of the prisons, which could become a threat to the security of the prisons. It was felt that if unscrupulous persons were able to have drawings of the prison floor plan they might be able to use it to plan escapes. The other consideration informing the writing up of this thesis was a commitment to honouring promises of anonymity. The prison community is relatively small and it is imperative that persons who participated in the research not be harmed, or suffer ill effects due to the publication and dissemination of the research findings. These considerations are in accordance with the research design, which takes into account the British Sociological Association Statement of Ethical Practice (2002).

As mentioned previously, gaining access to the research context is critical to the viability of the research process. During this research process, social capital was used extensively in order to gain access to the prisons. The following section examines the theory of social capital and the way that it influenced this research.
Social Capital

The following section briefly reviews the literature on social capital and examines how it informed the research process, especially with regard to gaining access to the prison context.

According to LandhauBer and Ziegler (2006: 1) the concept of social capital may be linked to, and bears certain similarities with, earlier concepts such as:

Marx and Engel’s notion of ‘bounded solidarity’, Durkheim’s ‘value introjection’, the Weberian idea of ‘enforceable truth’ and Simmel’s concept of ‘reciprocity transactions’. One thing these conceptions seem to have in common is that they point to the value added form of social associations.

There are varying definitions of social capital (Field, 2003; Greeley, 1997; Krishna, 2000; LandhauBer and Ziegler, 2006; Portes, 1998; St. Clair, 2005; Van Deth, 2003). However, regardless of the field of study, the central tenet of social capital is that “relationships matter” (Field, 2003: 1). That is, social capital is manifest in relationships between persons (Brewer, 2003; and Coleman, 1988). For the purposes of this chapter, social capital will be defined as “the set of relationships used by an individual to achieve a desired outcome” (St. Clair, 2005: 2). Woolcock (2001: 13-14) categorizes social capital into three groups:

bonding social capital, which denotes ties between like people in similar situations, such as immediate family, close friends and neighbours; bridging social capital, which encompasses more distant ties of like persons, such as loose friendships and workmates and linking social capital, which reaches out to unlike people in dissimilar situations, such as those who are entirely outside the community, thus enabling members to leverage a far wider range of resources than are available within the community.
Portes (1998: 8) outlines three basic functions of social capital: "(a) as a source of social control; (b) as a source of family support; (c) as a source of benefits through extrafamilial networks".

Within the literature on social capital, the work of three main authors has been particularly influential, Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam (Field, 2003). In summarising the works of Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam, Field (2003) and St. Clair (2005) note that there are similarities and areas of overlap in the work of the three authors. However, there are also differences. Bourdieu sees social capital as a tool of control, limited to affluent groups within society. For Coleman, social capital applies to both advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Both Coleman and Bourdieu view social capital as operating at the individual and family level. Putnam views social capital from the societal or national level (Field, 2003).

The use of social capital was evident throughout this research project, both in England and Jamaica, and pertained to issues of access. Within the British context, social capital took the form of bridging social capital. In speaking to a co-worker about the research I was undertaking, he offered to introduce me to a friend of his family who worked as moderator for the NOCN. Upon meeting her, she in turn introduced me to two other persons who taught in prisons in the West Midlands and I was able to arrange interviews with them to learn about their experiences as prison educators. Although bridging social capital was used in this context, the co-worker who assisted me utilised bonding capital, as he was calling on a close family friend. That family friend could have ended her assistance with the interview that she gave me. However, she was aware that I needed more information, and she indicated that because of my relationship with her family friend,
she was willing to extend herself further by calling upon her own social capital. She in turn used bridging social capital to secure other interviews with her co-workers who taught in the prisons.

Two aspects of Jamaican culture made gaining access (especially from Britain) more difficult. The first is that Jamaican culture is more relaxed than British culture, making the gathering of information from people more difficult if you are not physically there to follow up on the information required. The second is that social networks are extremely important within Jamaican culture: one is more likely to get the required information and gain access to certain settings if one knows a family member or friend who has direct access to what is required, or who in turn knows someone who can grant the access or information required. As previously noted in this chapter, it is often difficult to gain access to organisations for the purposes of research, a difficulty compounded in the case of prisons. For research conducted in Jamaica, I relied heavily on social capital in order to gain both official and unofficial access to the prisons used in this study. Bryman (2001: 295) outlines some tactics that can be employed when trying to gain access to a closed setting such as “use friends, contacts, colleagues, academics to help you gain access; get the support of someone within the organization to act as your champion; offer something in return [and] be prepared to negotiate”. Bryman’s (2001) tactics reflect the use of social capital. The type of social capital I employed in Jamaica was bonding social capital, that is, I relied on immediate family and close friends who in turn utilised their networks and in some instances used bridging social capital, by calling on their co-workers.
During the first and second year of my research, whilst attempts to gain access through official channels failed, I managed to gain unofficial access to the prisons through a gatekeeper whom I will call “Mr. Brown”, in order to preserve his anonymity. Mr. Brown is a close friend of my family. He attended University with two senior members of my family, subsequently working with them and becoming very good friends with them over the years. I asked senior family member A for assistance in gaining access to the prisons. Senior family member A in turn called Mr. Brown who worked with the DCSJ and asked him to arrange entrance to the prisons for me. Mr. Brown agreed. I met with Mr. Brown at his DCSJ office in downtown Kingston. He greeted me and spoke fondly of the fact that he had been to school with several members of my family. After inquiring after various members of my family, he asked me to tell him about my research. I did so and he explained to me that if I were to wait on official permission to get into the prisons it would take some time, with no guarantee that access would be granted. He proposed instead that he would take me with him on his routine visits to the institutions and I would be able to observe. Before each visit, he called ahead to the prison, speaking with the Superintendent and gaining permission for me to accompany him into the facility. Thus, even though I was technically entering through the ‘back door’, my visits were not completely unauthorised. These visits were often followed by lunch during which Mr. Brown would give me ‘off the record’ information about various persons I had met, or elucidate issues that had been alluded to, but which I had not fully understood. Mr. Brown proved to be not only a gatekeeper but also a key informant. A key informant is someone who tries to help the researcher by directing him/her to things and people who may be important to the development of the research, often providing insights and explanations that the researcher may be unaware of or have missed (Bryman, 2001; Neuman, 2000;
Singleton and Straits, 1999). Apart from the visits to the prisons, Mr. Brown also tried to obtain information for me that he thought might be relevant. I learned about the politics surrounding computer donations by a visiting academic from a prominent University based in the US; Reverence for Life’s (RFL) role in education and the rift between its founder and members of a department within DCSJ.

The end of phase two of my fieldwork signalled the need for me to renegotiate access to the prisons at a higher, more formal level that had hitherto been the case. The access through Mr. Brown had been useful, but was no longer sufficient. The data gathered in the first and second phase had uncovered issues that I needed to be free to follow up making. This necessitated my being granted official access. I thus redoubled my efforts to gain official access for the final phase of my fieldwork. My requests remained unfruitful, so I decided to contact senior family member B, who was able to make a phone call to a senior official within the DCSJ. Subsequent to this call, I received responses to my letters, was sent relevant forms and information and the process proceeded with relative ease. There were one or two set backs, however a call from family member B to his contact often meant that setbacks were quickly resolved.

There is evidence in the literature that social capital may have negative consequences. Bourdieu was concerned that social capital often maintained inequalities in society, while Putnam, similarly, believed bonding social capital to be exclusive. Portes (1998: 13) outlines four possible negative consequences of social capital, "(the) exclusion of outsiders, excess claims on group members, restrictions on individual freedoms, and downward levelling norms". In one particular instance, social capital worked negatively for
the research process, in that I was denied access to a prison because the gatekeeper
through whom I was attempting to gain access had previously worked for a member of my
family and had left on poor terms. His dislike for members of my family was so potent that
once he ascertained that I was a relative, he refused to assist me. Mr. Brown tried to get
him to comply, but in the end, although Mr. Brown was his superior, he could not force the
issue because he was asking him to ‘bend’ the rules to accommodate me. In explaining
the concept of fungibility, Astone et al (1999: 4) give the example of children whose family
are members of organised crime. “If these children want to enter organized crime
themselves, this capital is of very high value; it may be indispensable. It may not be useful
to facilitate entry into other careers, however”. In my case social capital became
nonfungible once my family ties became known to that particular gatekeeper.

Conclusion

This chapter has sought to review relevant literature on qualitative research with a view to
exploring the appropriateness of the methodology and method to this particular research
project. The chapter also outlined and explored the research process as experienced by
the researcher examining issues such as the nuances of researching in prisons and the
issues raised by the presence of social capital in the research environment. This overview
of the methodology behind this research project is vital in enabling the research process to
be as transparent as possible (Bowen, 2005) so that others may be better able to
understand how the study was conducted and be able to draw from the knowledge which
has been generated from the study.
CHAPTER 3
THE JAMAICAN PRISON CONTEXT

Introduction

This chapter will seek to examine how the prison context impacts upon the development of pedagogic practices, with a view to providing a framework for understanding the pedagogic practices that will be examined in following chapters. Understanding the research context is critical to understanding what takes place within the parameters of the research setting. In articulating the importance of understanding context, Neuman (2000: 146) states that, "qualitative researchers emphasize the importance of social context for understanding the social world. They hold that the meaning of a social action or statement depends, in an important way, on the context in which it appears". For the purposes of this chapter, the examination of the prison context and its impact on prison pedagogies has been conceptualised in three ways; the historical, structural and cultural. The basis for this conceptualisation derived from various issues that emerged from the data, such as the difficulties associated with establishing appropriate rooms/buildings within the prisons to house classrooms, and the difficulties associated with establishing a less punitive prison culture. Accordingly, this chapter divides into three sections, exploring the ways in which historical, structural and cultural contexts have influenced the development of prison pedagogy in the Jamaican prison system. Within the historical context, issues pertaining to colonialism, post colonialism and early educational programs are examined. Discussions on the structural context will outline issues pertaining to pedagogic limitations
and adaptations that have occurred as a consequence of the physical structures of the prison buildings. Finally, the cultural context will explore cultural tensions and norms within the prison culture that impact prison pedagogy.

**Historical context**

This section will offer a brief historical overview of Jamaica, with special reference to the development of prison education during the colonial and post-colonial eras and highlighting those aspects of early prison education programs that have developed into contemporary programs. The concept of the colonial legacy will also figure in the examination of present-day legal processes within the Jamaican judicial system.

The Jamaican prison system has its roots in the processes of colonisation begun by Britain in 1655. Kohn (1958: 5) notes that "the colonial relationship has generally been the result of a conquest; at least it was until the fifteenth-century 'age of discoveries' [and was often] characterised by heavy settlement [which proved] dangerous for the natives". Another feature of the colonial relationship was that it also tended to be exploitative in nature (Stern, 2005). Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2000: 46) further elucidate this point by noting that:

The fact that European post-Renaissance colonial expansion was coterminous with the development of a modern capitalist system of economic exchange meant that the perception of the colonies as primarily established to provide raw materials for the burgeoning economies of the colonial powers was greatly strengthened and institutionalized. It also meant that the relation between the colonizer and colonized was locked into a rigid hierarchy of difference deeply resistant to fair and equitable exchanges, whether economic, cultural or social.
Within the academic sphere, colonisation has been analysed through frameworks such as; colonial discourse, which is “the system of knowledge and beliefs about the world within which acts of colonization take place” (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 2000: 42); and post-colonial theory, which engages with the ways in which colonisation has (and continues) to impact colonised societies (Binns, 1997; Yeoh, 2001).

Colonisation within a territory is often considered to have ended once that territory has gained independence as a nation state (Yew, 2002). However, even after ‘liberation’ the future of the former colony will be shaped to some extent by the experience of the colonial relationship and by the legacies of colonialism that remain, which may be positive or negative (Binns, 1997; Gandhi, 1998; Landow, 2006; Tsurumi, 1980). In defining ‘colonial legacy’, Cumings (1997: 34) states that:

> a colony [was] one way of organising territorial space in the modern world system, one that obliterated political sovereignty and oriented the colonial economy toward monopoly controls and monopoly profits...and a legacy [is] something that appears to be a follow on to the different historical experiences of colonialism.

Some of the colonial legacies identified within the literature include; economic (Cassidy, 2003; Chester, 1974; Grier, 1999; Stern, 2005); education (Brock, 1986; Cassidy, 2003); people’s attitudes and way of thinking (Tsurumi, 1980); language (Nero, 2000); Religion (Comaroff and Comaroff, 1986); infrastructure/structures (Stern, 2005; Yeoh, 2001) and legal systems (Okereafioezekje, 2002).
Within the Jamaican context, the judicial system remains heavily influenced by its colonial past. In the first instance, Jamaican law is based on British law. Secondly, the highest court of appeal is the Privy Council, which is located in Britain. Thirdly, certain aspects of the protocol followed in Jamaican courtrooms (such as the wearing of wigs by judges, the use of the phrase “mi lord” to address judges and the requirement that attorneys bow when entering and exiting the courtroom) are derived from British protocol. Fourthly, there are legislative Acts passed during the colonial period that contain archaic sections yet to be amended or repealed. Some aspects of the judicial system have developed beyond the colonial system. Gradually, reviews and amendments to laws have been initiated that take cognisance of the current needs of society, and changes continue to be made. For example, on 14, February 2001 the Caribbean Court of Justice (CCJ) was established. The CCJ currently offers redress in matters of trade between Caribbean states. However, the intention is that the CCJ will eventually replace the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The influence of the colonial past is also strongly evident for the Jamaican penal system. The construction of prisons in Jamaica began in the 1700s during the period of slavery (Paton, 2004). The conditions of prisons did not overly concern the plantocracy, however, as planters generally dealt with the punishment of slaves themselves. Prisons were thus primarily places for holding runaway slaves, persons who were free (as opposed to being slaves) but who were serving time for indecent behaviour, or those who were debtors (Green, 1992; Paton, 2001; Paton, 2004). The general lack of interest in prisons, though, changed with the onset of emancipation in 1838:
when society had been divided between masters and slaves, the masters had administered most discipline independently and had exhibited very little concern for the condition of public jails. Freedom changed that. The planter elite was prepared to repair or rebuild facilities (Green, 1992: 166).

Freedom created the need for the urgent revamping of prisons because emancipation saw the introduction of a period of apprenticeship, which in turn meant the removal of:

upwards of three hundred thousand people from the absolute control of their masters and of the old slave courts, which in the nature of things had ceased to exist. Freedom had placed all these emancipated people in precisely the same position as the rest of her Majesty's subjects, so that the courts of justice, which in former years had jurisdiction only over the free people of the colony as distinct from slaves, had now to deal with the entire community (Gardner, 1971: 406).

The renovation of the prison system did not only focus on structural issues. There was also the recognition of the need to have programs in place for the rehabilitation of prisoners. The abolitionists who had worked tirelessly to remove the scourge of slavery now put all their weight behind campaigning for the transformation of prisons (Paton, 2004). Prior to emancipation, prisons in Jamaica had no concern with educating or rehabilitating prisoners. Their role was strictly that of punishment and control. During the time of slavery, the fate of slaves in prison was either that of being returned to their owners, sentenced to transportation, executed, or to be left in prison, where they were hired out in work gangs until they died, escaped or were resold to another planter (Paton, 2004). Emancipation, however, meant that former slaves would now be returning to the wider society as free men and women, who, as such, represented ‘problems’ that had to be addressed.
The need to control the ex-slave became an issue and apprenticeship represented one way of addressing this problem. Through apprenticeship, the plantocracy aimed to control the movement and labour of the ex-slave by introducing laws that made it difficult for the ex-slave to leave the plantation. According to the stipulations of apprenticeship, the children of slaves who were under six years of age were to be freed immediately. Slaves who were agricultural workers were to serve for a period of six years and domestic servants were required to serve for a period of four years, meaning that they would not receive full freedom until 1840 and 1838 respectively. The planters, for their part, were directed to provide the apprentices with basic necessities (such as housing, food, clothes and health care), in return of which consideration, apprentices would work for forty-five hours each week, without remuneration. However, all labour beyond the stipulated forty-five hours each week was to be remunerated (Green, 1992; Satchell, 1999; Williams, 1984). The system of apprenticeship intended to safeguard the free labour that the plantocracy had relied on for the running of the sugar plantations. Williams (1984: 329) notes that:

Slavery was abolished, but the plantation and the plantocracy remained. The emancipated slaves were to be adscripti glebae, attached to the soil, but to the soil of the sugar plantation, to be compelled, even against their will, to produce sugar....

Paton (2004: 59) notes that:

Like slavery, apprenticeship defined a person’s legal rights and responsibilities according to his or her membership in a particular group within the population... The bulk of the Jamaican Abolition Acts was taken up with defining transgressions of the law for which the apprentices should be punished, and their appropriate punishments; a smaller section laid out punishments – always fines – for planters who failed to fulfil their obligations.
Since, under the apprenticeship system, slavery was abolished in name only, the judicial system retained much of its form and character, existing as a predominant form of punitive punishment for the apprentice or former slave, rather than existing as a comprehensive form of universal justice incorporating slave and planter alike. For example, apprentices could be penalised for offences such as:

- absence on pretext of ill health;
- refusal to perform labor required by the Abolition Act;
- wilful negligence that resulted in damage to the masters’ property;
- “ill use” of cattle or other stock;
- insolence or insubordination;
- leaving or attempting to leave the island;
- sheltering a runaway;
- and being a part of a distinct community, habitually abandoning and neglecting to perform the duties imposed on them by law (Patton, 2004: 61-62).

Indeed, upon comparing the evidence from the slave courts with evidence found in the journals of magistrates, Paton (2004: 77) concluded that “the conviction rates suggest that in one sense apprentices’ experience with the law was harsher than that of slaves”. Because of the prohibition against post-abolition Planters administering their own justice against their apprentices, crimes by apprentices were now the sole jurisdiction of the courts, with the result that the prison population increased. This increase in the prison population resulted in more concern over the state of prisons and those held within them.

The lack of attention to education in prisons that was characteristic of the colonial era, continued well into the 20th century. The Governor-in-chief of Jamaica, His Excellency Sir Hugh MacKintosh Foot, established a commission to investigate the state of the prison and lock ups in Jamaica. The commission’s report, produced in 1954 by Duffus, H. et al covered issues such as accommodation, sanitary arrangements, maintenance and repairs, fixtures and furniture, condemned prisoners and medical services. The 1954 report focused on problems within the prison system as it related to the treatment of the
offender, the prison structures and lands, and made recommendations for improvement. Duffus et al (1954: 30) were extremely critical of the lack of educational programs in prisons. They wrote that:

one of the most glaring and deplorable defects in prison administration is the absence of any educational programme in the broadest sense, whether it be training in spiritual and moral principles, in standards of decency in speech and personal habits or in industry and diligence. There is no worthwhile attempt to even prepare the prisoner before he leaves, either by admonition and advice, or practical help, along the lines that he needs to make him fit for society ... [prisons can be considered] as a Government University for the teaching of crime.

Duffus et al (1954: 32) recommended that with regard to prison schools, there should be two schoolmasters at each of these prisons, and that rooms should be set apart for their use and for storing school books etc ... suitable prisoners [should] be appointed orderlies to assist the schoolmasters... [and] as an inducement to attract the most suitable type of teacher ... they be provided with additional salary allowances.

Although there is little available literature on actual prison education programs during the colonial and immediate post colonial era, there is evidence for the existence of educational and rehabilitation programs. The purpose of these was to transform the offender “into a dependable willing worker” (Davis, 1975: 242). Thanks to data found in the Reports on the Treatment of Offenders (RTO, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963) and in the Annual Report of the Prisons Department (ARPD, 1967 and 1968), we have some idea of how the education system was set up and what prison education programs consisted of during the period of colonisation. In the 1959 RTO there was mention of the ‘Adult Education Work in Prisons Scheme’. This scheme saw the birth of a partnership between the Jamaica Social Welfare Commission (JSWC) and the Prison Authorities. The JSWC appointed four Adult Education Officers for all the prisons. Three classes were held
Monday through Friday in each prison. Preferential access to classes was given to those who were illiterate or semi-literate (RTO, 1959). The report notes that the Adult Education Work in Prisons scheme was to be trialled as a two-year experiment. There is no clear indication of whether or not the scheme continued beyond two years, but there is evidence in all the reports up to 1968, that the JSWC continued to provide teachers and deliver adult literacy programs in prisons. In addition to the adult education officers provided by the JSWC, warders/wardresses “who showed an aptitude in teaching were trained by the JSWC to assist the education officers” (RTO, 1959: 12). Evidence also exists for vocational training programs. Given the focus on literacy and vocational skills, one might deduce that education and training programs intended to equip the prisoner with basic skills necessary for performing basic functions within society, but not to disrupt the status quo by challenging social class or gendered demarcations. This would lend support to Davis’s (1975) contention that the goal was to make dependable willing workers out of ex-inmates. The vocational training available varied from prison to prison but evidenced gendered assumptions of separate spheres and the associated different forms of employment suitable for men and women. Thus, Male prisoners had access to vocational programs such as basket making, carpentry, cabinet making, blacksmith and tinsmith work, tailoring, shoe making, mat making, horticulture, agriculture, animal husbandry and dairying (RTO, 1959-1963; ARPD, 1967 and 1968). Women, on the other hand, had access to vocational courses such as washing, ironing, sewing, embroidery, dressmaking, handcrafts and simple home economics (RTO, 1959—1963; ARPD, 1967 and 1968).

The report submitted by Dufus et al in 1954 indicates that there were no educational programs (academic, vocational or spiritual) in place up to the time of the publication of
the report. However, the data retrieved from the RTOs does provide some insight into early prison education in that it offers a basic understanding of the education programs that existed during the time of colonisation, and from 1959 onwards. It was inevitable that colonialism would leave its mark on the colonised (Tharoor, 2002; Tsurumi, 1980). Gandhi (1998) suggested that it was futile to try to disown or escape one’s colonial inheritance. Therefore, the important question is to what extent the colonial system infects the present and how has it affected prison pedagogy?

With Independence, feelings of national pride, the hope of positive changes for the people and the challenges of nationhood predominated. Former colonies often face issues of “identity, economic development, social transformation and institutional re-engineering” (Harriot, 2003: 1) as they begin the journey of nationhood. Norman Manley (leader of the People’s National Party at the time of independence) charged that “the mission of his generation was to end colonial rule and secure ‘political independence’, and that the mission of post-independence leadership was to ‘reconstruct the social and economic society and life of Jamaica” (Manley, 1971: 380-381). The newly formed independent government recognised that issues within the prison system were in need of urgent attention if the government was to achieve its avowed goal of social and economic transformation. The 1963 RTO indicated that the newly independent government recognised the benefits and success that have been gained from methods inherited from the English Penal System on which the administration of our prisons is based, [however] there is yet a great deal of pioneering to be done in many fields of penal reform to conform with Jamaican conditions...An examination of the prison system discloses the need for constructive policy in (1) the training of prisoners to fit them for a useful life in the community; (2) an effective After Care system; (3) the education of the
community in their responsibilities to assist in the rehabilitation of the discharged prisoner (RTO, 1963: 1).

After independence, two notable changes occurred in the prison system. The first was that prisoners were encouraged to take correspondence courses (at their own expense) with recognised institutions and secondly, lectures and discussions were introduced. In recent times, more changes, such as the use of computers in prison classrooms, have occurred. Despite the seemingly radical change in the direction that such initiatives suggest, it is possible to argue that these changes simply reflect technological advancements taking place around the world and do not reveal a particularly radical re-conceptualisation of prison education in Jamaica. Indeed, the main components of the prison education system have not really evolved since colonisation. In the first instance, staffing practices remain much the same. As previously mentioned, the early educational programs were staffed by trained teachers provided by the JSWC, and warders/wardresses who showed an aptitude for teaching. The present-day system is similar in three ways. First, prison education programs are staffed by trained civilian teachers (one per prison), assisted by warders and wardresses that may (or may not) have an aptitude for teaching. One notable exception to the staffing of prison education programs is that inmates now also assist in teaching. The use of inmates to assist in the provision of prison education is not unique to the Jamaican context. For example, the Toe by Toe system used in British prisons is based on inmates teaching fellow inmates to read. In fact the use of prisoners to assist with aspects of the day-to-day running of the prisons system has long historic antecedents. During the period of slavery, prisoners often acted as drivers who enforced discipline on other inmates. According to Paton (2004), the hierarchy of authority within the prison system ranged from the superintendent, to subordinate officers, to drivers. “Prisons [sometimes] used long-
term enslaved prisoners [as drivers] to enforce internal discipline [and be] responsible for overseeing the work of the workhouse gang" (Paton, 2004: 40). There are several reasons for the utilisation of prisoners as teachers within the prison context. The first is economic, in that there is a need for trained persons to teach within the prisons, and a lack, given the financial constraints of the DCSJ, in the possibility of their provision. In light of the fact that some inmates possess a high level of education on entering the prison system (some inmates are trained teachers while others are educated to graduate and post graduate level) the DCSJ is able to meet the demand for more teachers at no additional cost. Educated prisoners represent a human resource that can be readily utilised to address staffing issues within the educational programs. Secondly, using inmates to teach is useful in bridging the 'us' and 'them' divide between warders and prisoners, in that it allows for prisoners and warders to work together in a non threatening way toward the common goal of educating the wider inmate population. Thirdly, this can generate an atmosphere of positive peer pressure, such that prisoners are able to see their fellow prisoners as a positive role model, which in turn may influence other (non-teacher) prisoners to become involved in the educational programs. The second way in which the present-day system of prison education mirrors that of its colonial counterpart is evident in the content of education. Specifically, the syllabus is still heavily oriented towards basic literacy. Finally, the present-day system of prison education maintains the gender division of vocational subjects established in the colonial period.

The 1963, RTO highlighted several problems within the prison system that needed to be addressed. Unfortunately, some of the problems that existed then (such as inadequate facilities for the training of prisoners) persist in the present-day prison system. The need to
effect change within the prison system has been recognised. However, some of the support structures necessary to achieve change, such as adequate financing, are not yet in place (these issues will be explored in more detail in Chapter 4).

**Structural context**

The following discussion on structural context will explore the physical structure and condition of the prison buildings (such as the design of cells and classrooms) with a view to examining how they affect pedagogic practices. The design of new prison buildings and their ramifications for pedagogic practice will also be explored.

The structural/physical learning environment plays an important role in the learning process (Atherton, 2005; Hill and Cohen, 2005; Lackney, 1999; Niles, 1997; Vosko, 1991). Lackney and Jacobs (2002: 1) note that “it is difficult, if not impossible, to separate instructional activity from the physical environmental setting within which it occurs”. Fulton (1991) offers the SPATIAL (satisfaction, participation, achievement – transcendent/immanent attributes, authority, layout) model as a framework for examining the relationship between learning and the physical environment. SPATIAL is built on the hypothesis that:

1. individual perceptions of space affect learner satisfaction, participation and achievement;
2. certain aspects of a space, as perceived by learners, are subjective and beyond the visible physical attributes;
3. authority and layout are external realities that can be changed” (Fulton, 1991: 18).
In further articulating the first level of the SPATIAL model, Fulton (1991: 19) asserts that learning is conceptualised as three-dimensional:

Satisfaction [is seen as] an intrinsic measure of how pleased or fulfilled a learner is with an activity. Participation is a measure of how engaged a learner is with an activity and achievement is a measure of progress toward one or more learning goals.

Fulton (1991) further notes that the physical learning environment may affect these three dimensions positively and/or negatively. The second level of SPATIAL, transcendent and immanent attributes, speaks to the issue of reality. Various authors (Fulton, 1991; Lackney, 1999; Lackney, 2003; McGuffy, 1982; Vosko, 1991) have acknowledged that certain facets of the teaching environment, such as the classroom temperature, lighting and air quality seem to have some effect on the learning environment. Fulton (1991: 19) notes that though:

temperature, lighting, density, noise levels, and seating arrangements are all objective realities of the setting [that] exist independently of any individual and can be measured objectively on some scale ... these realities are tempered by the immanent perceptions of humans in the environment.

The third level of the SPATIAL model addresses authority and the physical layout of the learning environment. Fulton (1991: 20) notes that:

the interrelationship between authority and layout allows for a more complete understanding of how a particular educational setting may be perceived by certain learners. Authority is one of the messages of the physical environment ... For example; an environment can be authoritarian or institutionalized in nature, affording learners little power for change. Layout of the learning environment [such as] furniture, audiovisual equipment, and the human bodies occupying the space [are linked to] learning purposes.
Having acknowledged the importance of the learning environment it is worthy of note that with regard to physical structure the prisons that make up this study were built by the British from as early as 1655. The prison structures that are currently in use are dated and as a result are far from the most conducive settings for a positive learning environment. The limitations experienced in terms of the design and condition of the prison buildings, in particular the classroom areas, have impacted current pedagogic practices (the pedagogic difficulties experienced by educators will be examined in greater detail in Chapter 5). It is useful at this point to offer descriptions of the physical layout and structure of the prisons included in this study, in order to illustrate the various dimensions of the structural context of this research.\(^\text{15}\)

According to data provided by the Ministry of Justice and the DCSJ, two of the prisons focussed in this study were constructed during the 15\(^{\text{th}}\) and 16\(^{\text{th}}\) century and were upgraded in 1898 and 1845 respectively. In these two cases, the original prison buildings are still operational. However, additional buildings have been built within the prison compound. It was intended that the cells in both these institutions should accommodate one inmate. In dimension each cell is 9 feet high, 6 feet wide, and 8 feet long. The other two prisons included in this study were both built in 1948. These prisons do not have individual cells. Instead, inmates occupy dormitories. These dormitories are 30 feet wide

\(^{15}\) However, in accordance with the prior agreement that facilitated access to the prisons, and in order to avoid compromising the security of the prison system, the complete floor plan of the prisons will not be divulged. Instead, a general description of the prisons will prevail, while the design of the schools will permit more detail. In a bid to preserve anonymity, the names of the prisons will not be used within the description.
by 100 feet long and house between 32 and 34 inmates. The school facilities vary from prison to prison.

The description of the prisons and the diagrams of the prison schools depicted in Appendix B, provide some insight into the structural difficulties faced within the context of the prison school. Using the SPATIAL model as a framework for analysis, the classrooms (depicted in Appendix B) negatively impact the learning experiences of the students. The transcendent/immanent attributes of the classrooms are problematic. Both teachers and students complain about the temperature within the classrooms. The buildings lack air conditioning and have either slab or zinc roofs, which trap heat within the buildings causing them to be unbearably hot. Students and teachers find it difficult to concentrate in the heat. In some instances, there are fans in the classrooms but these offer little relief. Lighting is also an issue, with classrooms having few windows so that there is limited natural light. Although artificial light is present, it does not always work. With regard to authority and the physical layout of the classrooms, the seating arrangement is in keeping with a traditional classroom layout. That is, the rows face the teacher at the front of the class. This traditional layout is in keeping with the authoritarian classroom in which the teacher imparts knowledge to the student. It does not lend itself to group discussions, as students are not able to see each other without twisting in their seats. Teachers in some of the prison classrooms express a desire to experiment with other classroom layouts, but space is often limited, with several classes existing in the same space, making it impractical to move desks and chairs into other formations. The buildings that exist fail to comply with the requirements of a twenty first century classroom (Baines, 1999; Withrow, 1999).

Appendix B shows floor plans of the schools (classrooms)
There is currently an urgent need for the modernisation (or alternatively the building of new prisons) of the buildings that are presently in use. However, the issue of prison building is a controversial one, not only in Jamaica, but in the United States and England as well. Outside of Jamaica, the debate over whether or not to build new prisons is intertwined with more general concerns about prisons as an industry in and of itself. Specifically, the debate revolves around the motivation behind the construction of more and more prisons.

The trends towards increased prison building began as early as the 1980s in countries such as England and Wales, France and the United States (Rutherford, 1991; Sudbury, 2000). Over twenty years later, the prison building industry continues to flourish. One reason for this is the Prison-Industrial Complex (PIC) (Schlosser, 1998; Sudbury, 2000). The PIC is composed of "a set of bureaucratic, political, and economic interests that encourage increased spending on imprisonment, regardless of actual need" (Schlosser, 1998: 53). Sudbury (2000: 135) offers three reasons why the PIC continues to exist:

First is a 'common sense' connection between crime and punishment … Second is the racialization of crime, so that high rates of incarceration can be presented as a normal reaction to [crime] … Third is the symbiotic relationship between state correctional institutions, politicians, and the corporate sector.

Economic forces have also played a role in the increasing number of prisons (Dolovich, 2005; Schlosser, 1998). Dolovich (2005: 470-471) notes that within the US context:

communities in rural areas in particular have come to look to prison building as the way to boost their economies, provide jobs, and increase tax revenues. These communities also see [prison building] as 'recession-
proof; as a result, voters and their political representatives now regard incarceration as a means to promote their own financial interests.

Another indication of the economic importance of prison building is evidenced by the fact that there is a “trade newspaper devoted to the latest trends in the prison and jail marketplace ... Correctional Building News” (Schlosser, 1998: 60). An argument invoked against prison building is that the economic impetus behind it has the potential to cause negative effects to the prisoners, as was strikingly revealed in the misuse of supermax prisons in Virginia. Virginia’s two supermax prisons, built in the 1990s, were originally intended to house inmates considered as the ‘worst of the worst’. However, the Virginia Department of Corrections found that “it had more supermax cells than qualified prisoners and in response ...expanded the eligibility for supermax classification ...resulting in inmates sentenced to as few as five years, who had harmed no one and had never been disruptive” (Dolovich, 2005: 470) being housed in supermax facilities.

Prisons are also sometimes built as the result of legislation. Prison overcrowding is an issue that recurs for many administrations. Within the US context, there were instances when ‘caps’ were placed on certain prison populations, which meant that, in order to keep the prison population to an acceptable level, for every ten persons sentenced to time in prison, ten more had to be released (Schlosser, 1988; Tonry, 2001). This practice meant that offenders only served a part of their sentence. The unpopularity of this practice resulted in two actions; prison building to provide more space to house criminals and truth-in-sentencing laws (Tonry, 2001). Tonry (2001: 15) notes that:
By 1994, those campaigns had become so effective that the U.S. Congress authorized $8 billion in subsidies for prison building to states that would enact truth-in-sentencing laws requiring designated violent, drug, and other offenders to serve at least 85 percent of the announced sentence in prison. By 1999, more than thirty states had changed their laws to qualify for the federal money.

Finally, prison building has also occurred in an effort to reform prison standards, particularly as it relates to overcrowding. Those concerned with the plight of the prisoner supported prison building, insofar as this was a response to overcrowding. However, those who argue against prison building have "been vindicated in light of a worsening of overcrowding and the further deterioration of regimes" (Rutherford, 1991: 5). Casale (1994: 70) notes that there is a consensus "that prison building is an ineffective means of reducing overcrowding; it merely results in moving the goal posts".

As noted throughout in the discussion above, those who advocate the building of prisons face stiff opposition. Rutherford (1991: 5-6) notes that "if the primary object of penal reformers is not to abolish prisons it is certainly to secure reduction in prison population". Opposition occurs on three grounds; that economic interests distort the legal process, leading to incorrect classifications; that prison building fails to solve the problem of overcrowding; that it diverts necessary funds away from other areas of development (Gottfredson and McConville, 1988; Rutherford, 1991; Schlosser, 1988).
For the Jamaican context, there has been little interest in prison building until recently. The last decade witnessed the building of one remand centre, intended to house both male and female persons remanded into custody while they await trials. In interviews with senior management within the DCSJ, I was told of plans to build a modern, five thousand bed facility. However, construction has not yet begun and in any case would make little difference to the overall conditions in Jamaican prisons. According to annual reports provided by Amnesty International (2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006), prison conditions across the island are "harsh and in many cases amounted to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment" (Amnesty International website, 2007). The annual reports for 2001-2004, report severe overcrowding in several of the islands prisons. There is no question that the need for reform in terms of prison conditions is critical. However, any such initiatives would undoubtedly face opposition, albeit in a different form to that occurring elsewhere. For example, the concept of private prisons is foreign to the Jamaican context, so that any prison building that occurred would currently involve a cost to the government. In light of the economic hardships experienced by Jamaicans, it would be difficult for the government to justify spending on prison building, especially given the current shortage of monies for the development and building of schools and hospitals. Social opposition to the improvement of prison conditions also detracts from any movement towards constructing new prisons. Jamaica’s crime rate is relatively high. Harriot (2003: 119) notes that in the 1990s the “crime rate peaked in 1997 with 1,038 homicides, a rate of 41 per 100,000 population. This inched upwards in 2001, with over 1,138 homicides”. Faced with increasing violence- gun crime which sees children being murdered in schools; the elderly being burned to death in their homes; innocent law abiding individuals being assaulted and killed for no known reason; and police being targeted and shot down in the streets-
members of the wider society do not always feel empathy for prisoners, especially those imprisoned for violent crimes. There is a segment of the population who feel that the perpetrators of these vicious crimes do not deserve to live (the last state execution in Jamaica was carried out in 1988). For example, on June 25, 2002 the Jamaica Observer ran an article entitled “Woman’s Murder Leaves Papine in Shock”. The online version of this newspaper allows readers to post their opinions. Many of these showed the anger of the public and reflected the sentiment that murderers should be killed. One such post summed up these feelings when the author wrote:

They should be sent straight to hell... I call for the death penalty for these brute[s]...the only way to hang them is up high.

Clearly, the feeling among some Jamaicans is that people in prison deserve either the harshest conditions, or, particularly if they are murderers, death. This sentiment, that prison should be unpleasant, is also found in the concept of less eligibility. This holds that the conditions of penal institutions ...had to be worse than the conditions of the poorest person outside the institution; otherwise, poor people’s would be deliberately to get themselves incarcerated to gain access to better conditions inside (Paton, 2004: 21).

There has been too little effort on the part of the government and the DCSJ to educate the wider society on the need for rehabilitation. Citizens thus remain disconnected from the inmate, having no understanding of the ways in which social background, opportunities and circumstances may have shaped his or her actions. Consequently, there is little recognition of society’s obligation to rehabilitate the inmate for the greater good. Often, there is merely the belief that the inmate deserves to suffer. Such sentiments are linked to the mad/bad debate which was discussed in Chapter 1.
Cultural context

In discussing the cultural context within the prison, I am referring to a particular way of thinking and doing, and the affect of these norms on the design and delivery of the subject matter. The examination of the literature on organisational culture and prison culture will here follow. This, in turn, will lead to an examination of the cultural context within Jamaican prisons, with specific focus on the attempts by the DCSJ to cultivate a more rehabilitation-centred culture and the difficulties encountered when these ideals come up against the prevailing punitive subculture.

The prison is an organisation and as Collins (1998: 115) notes, “we should not assume that organizational cultures are simple, mirror-images of the cultures of wider society”, although the organisation is not so distinct from the wider society that it would not have some things in common also. Pratt, Margaritis and Coy (1999: 45) note that “a survey of the literature on organisational culture will produce almost as many definitions as there are authors”. However, for the purposes of this chapter I will use the definition provided by Robins (1996: 681), which states that organisational culture "refers to a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguishes the organization from other organizations. This system of shared meaning is, on closer examination, a set of key characteristics that the organization values". Corresponding to the many definitions of organisational culture, there are also many views on what organisational culture should accomplish (Hartog, Deanne, and Verburg, 2004; Kelemen and Papasolomou-Doukakis, 2004; Robins, 1996). What is common to these authors is the notion that organisational culture should allow for
some uniformity of behaviour among employees, in line with management goals. Robins (1996: 17) outlines five functions of culture, one of which is that culture acts as a “sense-making and control mechanism that guides and shapes the attitudes and behaviour of employees”. In fact Kelemen and Papasolomou-Doukakis (2004: 123) argue that “the more cohesive an organisational culture, the easier it is to get people to buy into new ways of acting”. Organisations may vary along the spectrum from strong to weak (Pratt, Margaritis and Coy, 1999) and the stronger an organisation’s culture, then the more influence that culture is able to exert on the behaviour of the employees within the organisation (Robins, 1996; Van Den Berg and Wilderom, 2004).

Several authors expound on the existence of prison culture (Corcoran, 2005; Hunt, Riegel, Morales and Waldorf, 1993; Tyrner-Stasny and Stasny, 1977; Winfree, Newbold and Tubb, 2002; Wright, 2005). Within prisons, there tend to be two major groups, which form an ‘us’ and ‘them’ tension; the guards and the prisoners. Definitions of prison culture tend to focus on one group or the other. For example, Corcoran (2005: 24) defines prison culture as “the values, assumptions and beliefs that correctional staff hold in common”. While the New York Crime Commission (1930: 8-9) defined prison culture as a “code among convicts whereby no inmate, whether he be a trusty or a potential parolee, dare inform the wardens or any of the guards against another inmate”. The culture that exists within the prison dictates the interactions amongst the prison population in three basic relationship groups: inmate/inmate; inmate/guard; and guard/guard relationships (Sykes and Messinger, 1960). Ultimately, each group tries to protect itself from the other. In conducting an examination of inmate culture, Winfree, Newbold and Tubb (2002) highlight three important aspects which reveal how inmates view themselves and others and
suggests that these values are at the core of prison inmate culture; respectability, orientation towards crime and anti-institutionalism. With regard to respectability, qualities such as “peer loyalty to the inmate class; honesty in dealings with fellow inmates [and]; calmness and reservedness in the face of custodial staff” (Winfree, Newbold and Tubb, 2002: 217) are valued. In terms of orientation towards crime, there are certain crimes that are frowned upon. “Not all inmates are ‘created equal’ [as] sex offenders, owing to the depravity of their acts, often find themselves prison community outcasts” (Winfree, Newbold and Tubb, 2002: 218). According to penologists, the adoption of an anti-institutional stance is functional, in that it allows the inmate “to reject his rejector rather than himself” (McCorkle and Korn, 1954: 88). The inmate code of behaviour in which anti-institutional sentiment, particularly toward prison authorities (Winfree, Newbold and Tubb, 2002), is highly valued, inherently sets up an adversarial relationship with the guards who are there to enforce order. So much so, that the guards who are in a position of power sometimes engage in behaviour which not only breaks prison rules, but also borders on the criminal act (Corcoran, 2005). Guards also have their own culture and code of conduct, which influences their behaviour. Guards face peer pressure to be like other guards especially in light of the fact that “in corrections especially at a maximum security facility, the lives of staff depend on the support and responsiveness of other staff” (Corcoran, 2005: 24). Here, there is pressure to conform to the norm, even if the norm is punitive behaviour towards inmates. Corcoran (2005: 25) also suggests that the punitive culture that emerges amongst prison guards can also be aggravated in situations where there is “a lack of positive staff recognition, poor communication and a lack of boundaries in relationships between staff and inmates, and staff and other staff, and a perception that the inmates are better treated” than staff. The punitive practices of guards within the
prison compound may not be in keeping with the culture that the department of corrections supports. Corcoran (2005: 24) notes that:

> an institution’s culture [may] veer off track, however leaders and leadership styles can strongly influence the culture of an institution...The administration [must] take proactive steps to promote a positive institutional culture — modelling, emphasising and rewarding ethical behaviour throughout the institution.

Within the prison setting, there is much emphasis laid on following rules and procedures and respecting those in authority. The structure within the prison organisation is also hierarchical. The communication in this setting is mostly top down. Decisions come from the prison management at the top of the structure and are then passed down through the ranks to the warders who are at the bottom rung of the organisation. The prison organisational culture has been described as “authoritarian: there is a powerful, and often unquestioned chain of command embedded in the policies, procedures, and practices of prison staff” (Wright, 2005: 23). The culture that existed in Jamaican prisons was (and in most cases, still is) a punitive one in terms of the orientation of the prison staff (in particular the warders) towards the inmates. Presently, the prison management in Jamaica is in the process of trying to change the culture of the prison to be less punitive and more positive. Through the rules orientation, the senior management of the prison system have been trying to implement a culture whereby the inmate is valued as a whole person and for which there is a strong emphasis on rehabilitation and education. Based on observation of the operation of the prisons and interviews conducted with warder teachers, it became apparent that although senior management is trying (with limited success) to implement a particular culture concerning how the inmate is conceived and treated, there is a struggle within the actual institutions. Robins (1996: 684) notes that,
"most large organisations have a dominant culture and numerous sets of subcultures". In the case of the Jamaican prison system, the official culture, as that supported by senior management within the DCSJ, is not necessarily the dominant culture. The subculture, as punitive, is supported by disgruntled employees lower down in the hierarchy of the prison system and is the one which is perhaps more dominant. The senior management of the DCSJ promote a culture that is the position towards which they would like the see the DCSJ move. However, lower down in the ranks there are those who only pay lip service to the 'dominant' culture and who seek every possible means of sabotaging the 'dominant' culture that the DSCJ is trying to maintain. This creates a situation where more credence to the beliefs of the subculture obtains. The divergence between the two cultures that exist within the prisons affects the pedagogic practices within the prison education system. In trying to maintain the more rehabilitative culture, in particular with regard to the treatment of inmates, certain measures, which include changing the names of prisons, have been introduced. For example, Ras I Prison has instead become Ras I Adult Correctional Facility. Another change affects how prison staff refer to the imprisoned. The imprisoned person is no longer called an inmate or prisoner, but instead he/she is called a client. There have also been attempts by the DCSJ and other stakeholders (such as Food for the Poor and various church groups) to better equip prison classrooms in order to facilitate rehabilitation and educational programs.

Security is of paramount importance in prison. Prison systems and procedures are all geared towards ensure that the security of the prison is not breeched. The prison culture which promotes security above all else is immediately at odds with education in prison (Davidson 1995; Eggleston and Gehring, 2000; Niles, 1997). Thomas (1995: 27) gives...
four reasons why “maximum security prisons simply are not designed for delivering adequate, high-quality educational programs”. The first reason he gives is that “the behaviour of prison staff can intentionally or inadvertently disrupt [education] programs” (Thomas, 1995: 27-28). The second is lockdown. “Lookdowns are one of the most frustrating obstacles...lockdowns hinder teaching by preventing students from attending class” (Thomas, 1995: 28). The third is “fucking with the prisoner (or instructor) game. Staff are able to disrupt the educational environment by invoking discretionary authority in ways that disrupt a class” (Thomas, 1995: 29). The fourth and final reason is disciplinary constraints. “Staff discretion also can subvert academic freedom by imposing a priori constraints on pedagogical strategies and course content” (Thomas, 1995: 31). In the Jamaican context, the issue of reconciling security and education goals is also problematic (these issues will be discussed more fully in Chapter 5). The security first culture breeds distrust in the guards towards the inmates. Guards are constantly looking for actions that would constitute security breeches.

Another aspect of the prison culture in Jamaica is that of fear. Wright (2005: 23) notes that "prison cultures are cultures of fear, shaped by the expectancy of a riot or hostage taking – the loss of control". The fear that operates within the prison context in Jamaica is two-way, meaning that the inmates fear the guards and the guards fear the inmates. There have been reports in Jamaican newspapers of inmates being assaulted by guards and in interviews with some inmates there was a certain reluctance to divulge their point of view, for fear of retribution by guards should the information they disclose not be kept in the strictest confidence. Guards, on the other hand, are in constant fear for their safety. They are outnumbered and a riot or attempted escape could cause them to be injured or even
claim their lives (as was the case in 2004, when a guard was killed in an attempted prison escape). The DCSJ is trying to eradicate this culture of fear by promoting and implementing a more positive culture.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the ways in which three manifestations of context; historical, structural and cultural, impact the pedagogic practices within the prison setting. As was previously explored in Chapter 1, pedagogy does not exist in isolation, but is subject to the boundaries within which it operates. With regard to the historical context, one can clearly see that pedagogic practices carry historical legacies from the colonial era, which persist to the present-day. The mindset of the coloniser, for which the ex-slave needed to be made into a “willing worker”, is visible today in the focus of prison education on training prisoners for employment, which in turn, is instantiated in the continued stress on basic literacy in prison education. The limited nature of prison education programs is also determined, in part, by the debate on how far prison education should go: in other words, is basic literacy enough or should post secondary courses be offered in prison (this is examined in Chapter 5). The gendered nature of prison education (particularly vocational courses) is a legacy of colonialism and present-day patriarchy. It continues unabated. In spite of the fact that women in the Jamaican context are often single parent head of households, they continue to be taught skills that fail to address their realities (this is discussed further in Chapter 7). The structural context of the prison itself has the power to impact the learning process, both negatively and positively. The structural context affects the teacher, the student, and the syllabus (further examined in Chapter 5). As detailed in
this chapter, the structural context raises larger issues concerning prison building per se, but it also raises issues of policy and financial commitment to the prison system as a whole and to prison education more specifically (examined in Chapter 4). Finally, the cultural context, particularly the struggle between factions within the prison system who are pro-rehabilitation and those who are anti-rehabilitation, also affects pedagogy. This division points to the gap between theory (policy) and practice and raises the issue of implementation. It also exemplifies the view of the prisoner, either as redeemable, or irredeemable. The ‘mad/bad’ debate was examined in some detail in Chapter 1. However, the manner in which the prisoner is viewed, particularly by those within prisons, and the implications of these views for rehabilitation and pedagogy are examined in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 4

EDUCATION IN PRISONS: THE POLICY TERRAIN

Introduction

This chapter will examine the policy adopted by the Jamaican Government with regard to prison education and its implementation. The first section of this chapter reviews the relevant literature on educational policies in prisons, highlighting the debates and issues that arise. This study will examine the spectrum of penal policies and their relation to prison education. The second section will then explore prison education policies as conceived by international organisations, such as the United Nations, examining issues such as prisoners' rights to education. Next, the study will assess the ways in which economic drivers affect prison education. The thesis will also critically consider the implementation of prison policies in some of the more industrialised countries in the world, such as the United States, Canada, Britain and Denmark. The third section will examine prison education policies in Jamaica from the point of view both of the government, and of those working within the prisons. Lastly, I will appraise Jamaican policy in light of the international trends in prison education policy.

There is a substantial body of academic work on the subject of prison education, in the form of books, articles, proceedings from conferences and so on. However, there is less information available that is specific to prison education policy, particularly as it relates to the Jamaican context. One possible reason for this is that the general area of prison
education is under researched (Wilson, 2000; Spark and Harris, 2005). In addition, the paucity of literature is partly due to the serious underdevelopment of prison policy in many countries across the world. According to the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy (2001: 7), there is a:

need for assistance in the area of policy development. This need was confirmed during the course of visiting a number of correctional jurisdictions in various countries and regions of the world where, in some cases prison policies were practically non-existent. In others they were severely limited or outdated and virtually inaccessible to staff let alone offenders or the public.

The literature on prison education policy is usefully supplemented by the literature on prison/penal policy (Caplow and Simon, 1999; Cavadino and Dignan, 2006; Haney and Zimbardo, 1998; Keating, 2002; Oliver and Marion, 2006; Pakes, 2000; Smith, 2005). The latter is important for several reasons: it highlights current debates in the field; it is an indicator of various attitudes towards the treatment of prisoners across several countries; and, especially given the absence of an extensive literature on prison education policy, it can provide critical insights into possible attitudes towards prison education. In other words, if penal policies lend themselves to certain rehabilitation and educational strategies, then it is possible to infer them engendering a likely stance towards prison education policy.

Penal policy is in essence a policy on imprisonment and the various aspects of the inmates’ welfare while imprisoned. In order to understand the impetus behind penal policy, one must understand the factors that influence imprisonment. Over the years, the rate of incarceration has steadily increased globally, and this increase is due to several factors (Caplow and Simon, 1999). In the first instance, there are links between imprisonment and
economics. Within the political arena there are "economic interests that have grown to serve the demand for punishment" (Caplow and Simon, 1999: 65), with stakeholders supporting and lobbying for penal policies that are punitive and encourage high rates of incarceration. Cavadino and Dignan (2006: 440), link political economy to four economic typologies, "neo-liberal, conservative corporatist, social democratic corporatist and oriental corporatists", with each economic typology giving rise to a "dominant penal ideology" (Cavadino and Dignan, 2006: 441). Neo-liberalism tends to support a highly punitive approach to imprisonment, while the other three typologies are more oriented towards rehabilitation (Cavadino and Dignan, 2006). Cavadino and Dignan (2006: 441) explain the differences between the four typologies according to several socio-economic and penal indices. They associate:

- neo-liberalism with an exclusionary mode of punishment...high imprisonment rate [and] a dominant penal ideology of 'law and order'.
- [Conservative corporatism incorporates a] mixed mode of punishment ...medium imprisonment rate [and] a dominant penal ideology of rehabilitation/resocialisation.
- [Social democratic corporatism has an] inclusionary mode of punishment ... low imprisonment rate [and] a dominant penal ideology that is rights based.
- [Oriental corporatism has an] inclusionary mode of punishment...low imprisonment rate [and] a dominant penal ideology that is apology based restoration and rehabilitation.

Jamaica's political economy moved, from a period of democratic socialism in the early 1970s (Edie, 1994; Stone, 1986; Weis, 2005) to present day neo-liberalism. Neo-liberal reform began in the late 1970s, while Michael Manley was Prime Minister. The move away from democratic socialism toward neo-liberalism was instigated by external pressures, particularly "a prolonged and intense relationship with the IMF and the World Bank [which saw the implementation of policies such as] trade liberalisation" (Weis, 2005: 116). Prime
Minister P.J. Patterson (who took over the office of Prime Minister in 1992) said during a budget presentation:

The extensive reforms carried out by the government during the last decade have cemented Jamaica's integration into the world economy ... we have done more to build the market than any other administration in our history ... Liberalisation, deregulation, privatisation, and the elimination of price controls are fundamental strategies in the building of a market economy. No other government has done more in this regard than we have ... Our action in freeing up Jamaica is recognised internationally (Patterson, 2001, budget presentation).

Weis (2005: 115) notes, however, that certain sections of Jamaican society are being negatively affected by Jamaica's neo-liberal stance:

Neoliberal economic reforms obviously contain profound contradictions - the ratcheting-down of workers' and citizens' rights, while those of capital are privileged; the cut-back and privatisation of public services; the increasing subjugation of local production possibilities to the globally-determined logic of comparative advantage, with large areas of the world moving from exploitation to outright exclusion; and the disjuncture between the promise of freedom and prosperity, and their manifestation as commodified consumerism and rising inequality.

Weis (2005: 116) further notes that it is not surprising that:

neoliberalism is cultivating frustration around the world, and there are many hopeful cases in which this frustration is being channelled into constructive mobilisations, both in protest and in building alternatives.

However, within the Jamaican context:

the frustrated energy is instead fuelling a social implosion characterised by spiralling crime, violence, fear, and, perhaps most destructively, anti-social behaviour (Weis, 2005: 116).

The core elements of neo-liberalism emphasise "the market, fiscal discipline, trade, investment and financial liberalisation, deregulation, decentralisation, privatisation and a reduced role for the state" (Robinson and Hewison, 2005: 185). Neo-liberalism virtually abolishes the role of the state in economics, with the result that socialist policies designed
to ameliorate the condition of the poor give way to market forces (Bond, 2003; Chase, 2002; McCluskey, 2002). According to Chase (2002: 2), the raison d'être for neo-liberal reforms is "competitive efficiency". Chase (2002: 2) gives the example of a lack of urgency in assisting Honduran farmers during a "devastating drought" to highlight the callousness of the neo-liberal reality. The response of the Latin American Director of the United Nations Food Program to the plight of the Honduran farmers was "These people are subsistence farmers in a world that is not a subsistence world" (Gonzalez, 2001: 1). If such callousness is the neo-liberal response to poor law abiding farmers, then how can we expect prisoners to fare under the doctrine? "The neo-liberal society tends to exclude both those who fail in the economic marketplace and those who fail to abide by the law – in the latter case by means of imprisonment" (Cavadino and Dignan, 2006: 448). If the rate of imprisonment serves as a reliable indicator, then neo-liberal countries tend to be more punitive (Cavadino and Dignan, 2006).

Another factor that influences policy on imprisonment is the breakdown of societal norms in terms of the contravention of laws and the engagement in behaviour perceived to be socially unacceptable. Durkheim (1933) posits that punishment is influenced by society's response to the violation of social norms. Governments respond to the concerns of the public over crime, safety and corruption (Irwin, 2003). Therefore, as the public fear of crime rises, society demands measures to ensure its safety, and the mindset of people generally becomes more punitive and pro imprisonment (Pakes, 2000). Imprisonment then can serve as a tool, by means of which government can attempt to assuage society's fear and indignation. Imprisonment can serve either as an instrument for retribution (an attempt
to subdue criminals into acceptable behaviour), or as a medium for rehabilitation (to teach criminals to be ‘better’ citizens).

In terms of the actualities of penal policy, McAra (2005) identifies three main developments, reflected in the academic discourse. The first is that “rehabilitation has been replaced by greater emphasis on just deserts and individual rights, with offenders being required to take greater responsibility for their behaviour” (McAra, 2005: 283). The second position is that penal discourse has become split between two views, that is, “the criminology of self (offenders are normal and rational and capable of exercising choice) and the criminology of the other (offenders are differently constituted, they are abnormal or pathological) (McAra, 2005: 283). The final argument is that there has been an “incursion of actuarialism into penal discourse” (McAra, 2005: 283). Actuarialism or actuarial justice speaks to the “convergence of economic and penological thinking ... the imperatives of [which] are to manage a permanently dangerous segment of the population (the ‘underclass’ of permanently excluded, irredeemably dysfunctional deviants) while maintaining the system at minimum cost” (Brownlee, 1998: 323-324). McAra (2005: 283) recognises these shifts in penal techniques, whilst noting also that to some extent there has been an abandonment of “efforts to treat offenders, greater effort is now being placed inter alia on crime prevention; a return to more punitive measures; risk management; incapacitation and electronic surveillance”. The emphasis on crime prevention effectively means fewer resources spent on the treatment of offenders.

There is no homogenisation of punishment across the various countries examined in this study (Behan, 2005; Cavadino and Dignan, 2006). However, there is a sharing of penal
policy information across countries, and penal policy practices in some countries often influence what happens in others. Cavdino and Dignan (2006: 438) note that “there has been an enormous increase in the international traffic of information about punishment, and much greater readiness to import ideas and practices from elsewhere”. In the United States during the 90s, four penal policies began to be heavily used in the judicial system. Truth in sentencing, three strikes and you’re out, boot camps and juvenile court transfer provisions (Cavadino and Dignan, 2006; Williams, 2003; Caplow and Simon, 1999). All four policies are punitive in nature and reflected the Justice and Anglo-American models of prison education (previously discussed in Chapter 2). The influence of these penal polices was far reaching, affecting penal policies in other countries to such an extent that, “at present, most of the movement is undeniably in the direction of a US-led rise in penal harshness” (Cavdino and Dignan, 2006: 440). Speaking in relation to Australia, Andrew M. Williams argued that “Australian correctional practice closely parallels American trends” (cited in Cavdino and Dignan, 2006, p.438). The United States is not the sole influence on penal policy. The Council of Europe has also affected penal policy and prison education policy. Although European penal and penal education policy is far from homogenised, members of the Council of Europe work within a framework provided by the Council. For example, when Russia wanted to become a member of the Council of Europe, in a bid to conform to the framework provided by the council (capital punishment is a prohibited practice for member countries of the Council of Europe) Russia abandoned capital punishment (Cavdino and Dignan, 2006). With regard to prison education policy, the Council of Europe adheres to two documents. These are; The European Prison Rules; and Education in Prison 1990 (Behan, 2005).
As evidenced through the literature examined here, the likelihood that prison education and rehabilitation initiatives will flourish within a particular prison setting, depends on the prison education and penal policy currently in vogue. The following section examines prison education policy in the international arena.

Penal policy in the international arena

The first section will explore prison education policy and issues such as prisoners' right to education at the level of world organisations such as the United Nations. Next, I will examine the way in which economic concerns impact on prison education. I will pay special attention here to the role of economic forces in shaping policy, especially through insisting on efficacy as a correlation between prison education and recidivism rates. Juxtaposed to arguments about the cost effectiveness of prison education are more humanistic concerns about empowerment and personal development and I will assess the weight of these. Finally, the study will address issues concerning policy implementation and funding with reference to specific countries and international organisations.

In spite of the low priority often accorded to prison education, it has existed on the agenda globally for some time. In fact, the United Nations (UN) Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 could be regarded as indirectly addressing the right of the incarcerated to education. Article 26 (1) states that, “Everyone has the right to education”. Again, in 1976, in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Article 13 (1) states that “The States Parties to the present Covenant recognise the right of everyone to
education". Although neither document specifically states that prisoners are intended to be considered as part of the "everyone" referred to in these documents, there is nothing either to suggest their specific exclusion. There exists considerable room for debate regarding the prisoner's claim to be human, and the rights associated with this. Parallels with the current debate on the prisoners' right to vote can be seen here (Hill, 2000; Molyneaux, 2006; Shapiro, 1993). Several countries, including the United States (excluding the states of Maine and Vermont)\(^{17}\), Britain, Russia and Hungary exclude prisoners from voting (Molyneaux, 2006). Three British inmates, who argued that the restriction on prisoners voting was incompatible with the Human Rights Act, recently challenged this practice. The case was dismissed in the British courts, but one inmate (Mr. John Hirst) took his case to the European Court of Human Rights in March 2004 and the court ruled in his favour (however the voting restriction against prisoners has not yet been lifted in Britain).

The rights of prisoners to education were directly addressed in 1955 in the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners under the subsection on Treatment 65 and 66 which states:

\[
\text{The treatment of persons sentenced to imprisonment or a similar measure shall have as its purpose, so far as the length of the sentence permits, to establish in them the will to lead law-abiding and self-supporting lives after their release and to fit them to do so. The treatment shall be such as will encourage their self-respect and develop their sense of responsibility. To these ends, all appropriate means shall be used, including religious care.}
\]

\(^{17}\) In Maine and Vermont prisoners behind bars are allowed to vote. In some other states felons may vote once they have left prison while in other states persons who have left prison but who are on parole or otherwise under the jurisdiction of criminal justice authorities may not vote (Manning, 2007).
in the countries where this is possible, education, vocational guidance and training, social casework, employment counselling, physical development and strengthening of moral character, in accordance with the individual needs of each prisoner, taking account of his social and criminal history, his physical and mental capacities and aptitudes, his personal temperament, the length of his sentence and his prospects after release.

It was also addressed in 1988 through the Body of Principles for the Protection of All Persons under Any Form of Detention or Imprisonment. Principle 28 states that:

A detained or imprisoned person shall have the right to obtain within the limits of available resources, if from public sources, reasonable quantities of educational, cultural and informational material, subject to reasonable conditions to ensure security and good order in the place of detention or imprisonment.

Again in 1990, in the Basic Principles for the Treatment of Prisoners it was stated that:

All prisoners shall have the right to take part in cultural activities and education aimed at the full development of the human personality.

Clearly, the education of prisoners has been on the UN’s agenda for some time and one would have hoped, by extension, that member states would have followed suit. Although many states were signatories to the above documents, in practice, most failed to adopt the spirit of these declarations on the rights of the detainee to education. In the Jamaican context, it is only recently that prison education has begun to become more important.

Currently the concept of prison education has much purchase globally. The increase in the perception of the importance of prison education has arisen from both social and
economic drivers. Increasingly high crime rates and high rates of recidivism have caused many governments to look more closely at the effectiveness of their prison systems. According to the findings of the Seventh United Nations Conference on the Prevention of Crime and the treatment of Offenders in 1985, crime was a problem that impeded development and threatened human rights. The UN called upon its member states to find up to date approaches to deal with the problem (Niles, 1997). Governments at the national level need to be able to provide a certain level of social stability and offer citizens a quality of life not plagued by crime and violence. At the international level, governments need to be able to equip their countries to compete in an increasingly competitive global market, and fostering economic development locally as well as attracting foreign investment is difficult in a society beleaguered by lawlessness. We live in an era driven by strong economic forces. The theory best suited to elucidate this concept of the 'economic bottom line' is neo-liberalism (as discussed earlier in this chapter). Governments are concerned with pursuing economically viable ways of addressing the issues and costs associated with criminality. Education and rehabilitation programs represent a means to rehabilitate the inmate for an effective re-assimilation as a productive member of society. Therefore, the measurement of the success and economic viability of education and rehabilitation programs often focuses on recidivism rates.

Various governments (or governmental departments) have commissioned research to assess the effect of education on lowering recidivism rates and producing positive outcomes. The link between education and lowered recidivism has also aroused the

Since 1990 literature examining the return rates of prisoners, or recidivism, has shown that educated prisoners are less likely to find themselves back in prison a second time if they complete an educational program and are taught skills to successfully read and write.

The contrary and varied arguments that exist for a correlation between prison education and recidivism tend to be associated with the debates as to whether or not prison education ‘works’. These debates and issues are discussed more fully in Chapter 1.

In 2001 a Nordic project group was commissioned to conduct research comparing education and training in prisons across Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, although it also looked briefly at Iceland, Greenland, Faeroe Islands and Aland Islands. The report found that while educational programs were being offered across these countries they did not correspond to the prisoners’ educational needs and that additional investment in prison education would be beneficial for society as a whole (TemaNord, 2005).

The report made several recommendations for moving prison education in the Nordic countries forward. In the first instance, it suggested a new three-pronged system of categorisation. Prisoners would be classified as; ‘abusers’, (referring to inmates with drug or drink addictions); ‘casual visitors’, (those inmates who have been convicted for the first time but come from a relatively orderly background); and the ‘professional criminals’, applying to inmates who are members of known criminal gangs (TemaNord, 2005). The belief was that such categorisation would facilitate the tailoring of activities towards individual needs. The report noted that ‘one precondition for meeting the needs of the
different groups of prisoners for education and training skills enhancement is that the authorities possess the tools to correctly assess their needs and the options available" (TemaNord, 2005: 15). The study also revealed that “prisoners' rights to education and training are not clearly defined" (TemaNord, 2005: 15) and therefore recommended that appropriate legislation needed to be put in place to clearly stipulate the prisoners’ right to education. Some of the other recommendations included prisoners being involved in the general education system through greater use of day release; the need for "informal skills (like life skills, the ability to function in a team at work, in society, in the family etc)" (TemaNord, 2005: 3); administrative co-operation; and documentation and research (TemaNord, 2005).

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC), following research completed in 1992 that was entitled 'Can Educating Adult Offenders Counteract Recidivism?' concluded that specific intellectual skills gained through adult basic education (ABE) may equip offenders to deal more effectively with daily problems encountered in the community. Moreover, the sense of achievement and confidence that results from successfully completing such a program may encourage offenders to make further positive changes in their lives (CSC, 2007).

In England, the seventh report of the Select Committee on Education and Skills, stated that:

Reducing recidivism is achieved through the rehabilitation of prisoners into society and secure employment, giving prisoners a real alternative to crime on release... However, the purpose of prison education should be defined not just in terms of its contribution to the reduction of recidivism. It is important to recognise that to provide prison education is important in itself in a civilised society because it is the right thing to do. We should be developing the person as a whole, not just in terms of the qualifications they hold for employment. Education, and the process of engaging in
learning, has a value in itself which needs to be recognised. A focus on reducing recidivism without considering the prisoner's right to education more broadly, would not be sufficient (Select Committee on Education and Skills, 2005).

The Forum on Prisoner Education also feels that "education can be one of the most effective ways of preventing crime among ex-prisoners" (Forum on Prisoner Education, 2004).

The import of prison education has been such that it has spawned the birth of international non-governmental organisations whose operations span several countries across continents. These have dedicated themselves to supporting and fostering prison education, in organisations such as Prison Fellowship International (PFI) and the European Prison Education Association (EPEA).

PFI is a conglomeration, an organisation whose constituent parts are national prison fellowship organisations that operate at a global level. At present PFI operates in every continent and consists of one hundred and twelve national prison fellowship organisations. PFI has a category two consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council and is a participant in the UN Alliance of NGO's on crime prevention and Criminal Justice. According to the PFI website (2007), the PFI organisation is Christian based organisation and its vision is:

  to be a reconciling community of restoration for all those involved in and affected by crime, thereby proclaiming and demonstrating the redemptive power and transforming of Jesus Christ for all people.
PFI believes that:

imprisonment only serves to institutionalise inmates and to breed dependence rather than independence (PFI website, 2007).

They further link recidivism to the fact that ex-prisoners often do not possess the skills necessary to allow them to be productive members of society. PFI aims to counter recidivism by offering programs that teach inmates basic life and work skills. The type of program offered in each country is adapted to the needs of the inmates and to the country context. PFI currently offers programs such as *Lives in transition* in Australia, *Compass* in England and Wales and *Prisoners of Purpose* in Guyana. The PFI thrust towards dealing with issues of illiteracy and lack of skills is timely. In the Jamaican context, 26% of males and 14% of females (age 15 and over) are illiterate (Development Economics Development Data Group, 2005: 1). Niles (1997) notes that although some prisoners may be illiterate and under skilled, they are not unintelligent. For Batchelder and Pippert (2002), literacy is vital to gaining employment.

The EPEA is recognised by the Council of Europe (COE) and currently has eight hundred members in thirty-five countries both in and outside of Europe. According to the EPEA website (2007) the organisation consists of:

prison educators, administrators, governors, researchers and other professionals whose interests lie in promoting and developing education and related activities in prisons throughout Europe in accordance with the recommendations of the Council of Europe (EPEA, 2007).

The EPEA also holds an international conference on prison education once every two years. Despite the lack of an explicit link between prison education and recidivism rates in
the EPEA’s “aims” or “visions”, this linkage exists in various documents and reports that are available on its website, as well as coming to light in conferences that it has hosted.

There are economic arguments for the cost effectiveness of prison education (Taylor, 1994; Werner, 1997). However, these are rarely made purely on the basis of dollars and cents, but tend instead to be dressed up in a more humanistic way. Prison education is often associated with arguments such as the fundamental right to education, and basic human rights, and to concepts such as ‘empowerment’ and ‘personal development’. Conferences on prison education extend to the global level and serve the purpose of providing a forum for the discussion and evaluation of prison education in various countries around the world. In some cases, the organisations that host conferences attempt to move beyond mere discussion in developing recommended courses of action at the global level. For example, the EPEA works in accordance with the COE recommendation no. R (89) 12 for Education in Prisons. Another example is the World Conference on Education held by UNESCO, which saw the birth of the initiative World Declaration on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs. Members of these organisations are encouraged to sign up to these recommendations.

In some cases though, despite members signing up to these recommendations in theory, their practical implementation are often inadequate. This failure to implement practice is a huge problem. In an attempt to understand the problems surrounding implementation, I will now turn to an examination of the issues as outlined in the policy analysis literature.
The importance of considering policy implementation was not always recognised. In fact McLaughlin (1987: 171) notes that “in the mid-1960s and early 1970s, prevailing theories of governmental action and organisational behaviour assumed away implementation issues or overlooked them altogether”. However, from the early 1970s onward increased attention was paid to the importance of implementation, which came to be viewed as a part of the policy process (Deleon and Deleon, 2002; Hogwood and Gunn, 1984; May, 1989). Implementation research plays the important role of “sensitising analysts by providing a more realistic sense of what it takes to bring about policy change” (May, 1989: 210). The relationship between policy making and policy implementation is a complex one, particularly because the execution of policy tends to involve a number of interest groups who may, or may not have been involved in the framing of policy (Deem and Brehony, 2000; Sabatier, 1991). Implementation research has been described as occurring in waves or phases (Deleon and Deloeon, 2002; Fitz, 1994). Deleon and Deleon (2002: 468) outline three ‘generations’ of implementation studies. The first “consisted of case study analysis that considered the immense vale of troubles that lay between the definition of a policy and its execution”. The second generation had a more theoretic orientation, and developed according to two predominant schools of thought. On one hand, there was the ‘top down’ approach and on the other, the ‘bottom up’ approach (Fitz, 1994; Deleon and Deleon, 2002). Fitz (1994: 54) notes that:

top down studies characteristically focused on the implementation of policies developed at the centre in local or ‘street level’ environments. The research was primarily concerned to identify the conditions which would maximise the translation of policy objectives into practice...The ‘top down’ approach conceived policy formulation and policy implementation as two distinct phases within the policy process...[therefore] studies tended to render the policy process as hierarchical and linear.
The ‘bottom up’ approach:

proposed that street level bureaucrats were key to successful implementation and that the top downers ignored them at their own peril. From their vantage point, implementation occurred only when those who were primarily affected were actively involved in the planning and execution of those programs (Deleon and Deleon, 2002: 468).

The third generation sought to explain:

why behaviour varies across time, across policies, and across units of government and by predicting the type of implementation behaviour that is likely to occur in the future. In a word the objective of third-generation research is to be more scientific (Goggin et al., 1990: 171).

Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983: 20-21) offer a description of the ideal process of policy implementation:

the carrying out of a basic policy decision, usually incorporated in a statute but which can also take the form of important executive orders or court decisions. Ideally, that decision identifies the problem(s) to be addressed, stipulates the objective(s) to be pursued, and, in a variety of ways, “structures” the implementation process. The process normally runs through a number of stages beginning with the passage of the basic statute, followed by the policy outputs (decisions) of the implementing agencies, the compliance of target groups with those decisions, the actual impacts of agency decisions, and, finally, important revisions (or attempted revisions) in the basic statute.

However, policy implementation often encounters difficulties. Policy failure can take two forms, non-implementation and unsuccessful implementation. Hogwood and Gunn (1984:
197) define non-implementation as a scenario where “policy is not put into effect as intended”; and unsuccessful implementation as occurring “when a policy is carried out in full, and external circumstances are not unfavourable but, none the less, the policy fails to produce the intended results or outcomes” (Hogwood and Gunn, 1984: 197). Various factors can negatively influence the implementation of policy; environmental conditions, such as shrinking budgets and changing levels of support (Heck, 2004); practitioners interpreting policies other than was intended by the policymaker (Fitz, 1994); and policymakers being unable or unwilling to “be of one mind” (Deleon and Deleon, 2002: 471). Hogwood and Gunn (1984: 197) maintain that there are three reasons behind failures in policy implementation; “bad execution, bad policy, or bad luck”. McClaughlin (1987) argues that policy success is dependent on capacity and will, and a balance of pressure and support. A policy can address the issue of capacity in that “training can be offered. Dollars can be provided. Consultants can be engaged to furnish missing expertise” (McCloughlin, 1987: 172). However, will is dependent on persons’ “attitudes, motivation, and beliefs that underlie an implementor’s response to a policies goals or strategies, [and] is less amenable to policy intervention” (McCloughlin, 1987: 172). Finally, a combination of pressure and support is required. “Experience shows that some balance of pressure and support is essential. Pressure focuses attention on a reform objective, [while] support is needed to enable implementation” (McCloughlin, 1987: 173).

In instances where developing countries fail to successfully implement policies that they have agreed to in the forum of the United Nations, other international bodies or through regional or local legislation, any number of the explanations outlined above may be
responsible for the failure. With regard to prison education in Caribbean states, a lack of resource funding is often cited as the main reason for failure to implement prison education policy. There is evidence in the literature that prison education is under funded (Reuss, 1999; Thomas, 1995). In the case of Caribbean states, Niles (1997: 54) notes that: “there is no major budget for prison education [and governments] prefers educational opportunities that build skills and income, while not requiring expenditure”. Jamaica is a member of the UN and PFI and yet rehabilitation and literacy programs in Jamaican prisons are under-utilised in relation to the possible target clientele. In an interview with the Commissioner of Corrections, he identified lack of funding as the main reason for non-implementation or partial implementation of programs.

*The rehabilitation program is currently [operated by what] we can adequately fund... [there] is a resource problem.*

It may be that prison education has such a high profile internationally that governments feel pressured to fall in line with recommendations and declarations (the possibility of countries being influenced by trends in penal policy and by organisations such as the Council of Europe was previously discussed in this chapter). As a result, although they may agree on paper, the practicalities inherent in situations of poor funding, insufficient human resources and lack of strategic planning and clearly laid out government policies, may kill off any remaining commitment.

If prison education is to stand any chance of flourishing, it must become an integral part of the criminal justice system. According to Niles (1997: 56):

*Very little can be done to improve prison education until it becomes a permanent, funded part of the criminal justice system. Governments need*
to mandate and finance prison education instead of having the prison authorities "pinch" a little bit from here and there.

There are examples of developed countries that have progressed and implemented prison education policy. For example, Canada has a well-defined national policy on prison education. The Correctional Services of Canada (CSC)\(^\text{18}\) operates according to legislation and regulations enshrined in the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations. Policy takes the form of Commissioner's Directives and Standard Operating Practices. The policy regarding prison education is detailed in Commissioner's Directive 720 the purpose of which is,

To provide offenders with provincially accredited pr certified programs which meet their identified education needs to assist them to reintegrate into the community as law abiding citizens (CSC website, 2007b).

Britain is another example of a country with well-established prison education policy. The policy provision for prison education is here governed by two Prison Service Orders (PSOs). According to HM Prison Service Website (2007), PSOs are "long-term mandatory instructions which are intended to last for an indefinite period". PSO4200 covers the curriculum framework otherwise referred to as the Core Curriculum and PSO4205 outlines guidance and mandatory requirements on how education is to be provided to prisoners.

One indicator of a country's commitment to prison education is the amount of money invested in it. The CSC budget reflects this is dedication to prison education. In the fiscal year 2004-2005, the overall CSC budget was CAD$1571, 000,000, of which approximately

---
\(^{18}\) The CSC works in collaboration with the UN, Organisation of American States (OAS) and the COE and "is recognised as a world leader in the field of corrections [and] as a valued source of information and expertise. CSC has provided technical assistance to countries such as Algeria, Barbados, Czech republic, Hungary, Namibia, Slovakia, St. Lucia and Sweden" (Retrieved from http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/intlforum/index_e.shtml).
CAD$393,000,000 (25%) was earmarked for rehabilitation and case management. While in Britain (for the same fiscal period) £122,000,000 (approximately CAD$251,320,000) was spent on prison education. It is important to note that both of these examples are developed countries, with stronger economies than Jamaica, putting them in a far better position to commit financially to prison education. The following section examines Jamaican prison education policy.

Jamaican national prison education policy

According to Burchell Whiteman (who served as Minister for Education Youth and Culture in Jamaica from 1992-2002), education and rehabilitation are vital if the incarcerated are to find peace and develop the skills necessary for successful reintegration into society (Niles and Bernard, 2000). Jamaica is geographically located in the Caribbean region and is a member state of CARICOM. Through its membership of CARICOM and because of its links with UNESCO, Jamaica is one of the signatories to Education for All. It is also a member of PFI, and signed up to the principles advocated by that organisation. These associations would entitle one to expect a well-developed prison education policy in Jamaica and an appropriate organisational framework to support these commitments. At an initial cursory glance, the Jamaican prisons education system appears organised, with educational and vocational provisions in all adult correctional prisons, and inmates achieving success in external examinations. However, in reality, it lacks two of the most fundamental ingredients for success – formal policy at the government level and sufficient funding.
In interviews with members of the DCSJ, policy content was attributed various meanings. In part, meanings derived from the roles and functions that these individuals fulfilled in part reflected their position in the prison service hierarchy. For example, of the teachers that were interviewed (including civilian, inmate and warder teachers), responses ranged; from those who were unsure if there was a policy, to those who were certain there was no policy. Interviews with persons within the Ministry of Security (MoS), under whose purview the DCSJ operates, indicated that there was no policy. However, in interviews with persons within the rehabilitation unit and with top management within the DCSJ, prison education policy was recognised and affirmed. In an interview with the Educational Coordinator, when asked about educational policy in correctional facilities, the interviewee quoted policy without hesitation; that "All inmates who are illiterate should be made literate. The emphasis is on literacy. Notwithstanding, there are advanced classes for those who are interested". In this instance, the respondent understood policy as "an expression of general purpose or desired state of affairs" (Turner and Hulme, 1997: 59)\(^{19}\).

In an interview, the response of the Commissioner of Corrections to the same question was two fold. Firstly, he spoke of the Minister’s (Minister of National Security) mandate: 

*He [the minister] is saying that everyone who comes into our institutions, we should at least endeavour to have them come out numerate and literate...so from a policy perspective our focus is to ensure that each inmate should become numerate and literate ... and any other program that we can run at a higher level we endeavour to do so.*

For the commissioner, ensuring inmates leave prison numerate and literate is policy because it is a directive from the Minister of government, whom he answers to. However, 

\(^{19}\) Turner and Hulme (1997) outline ten ways in which people use the term ‘policy’: “As a label for a field of activity; As an expression of general purpose or desired state of affairs; As specific proposals; As decisions of government; As formal authorization, As a programme; As output; As outcome; As a theory or a model; [and] as process” (P.59).
whilst the Minister's will is legitimately important, it is not necessarily fixed. The Minister may change direction at his discretion, or be replaced by someone else who chooses to change the policy:

Although policy is like a decision, it's not just a “one-off” independent decision. A policy is a set of coherent decisions with a common long term purpose(s). When decisions are one-off, incoherent or opportunistic, complaints are made that a government or minister “does not have a policy”. Government policies are often supported by special legislation (International Livestock Research Institute, 1995).

If one were to understand policy “as formal authorisation, for example, as Acts of parliament or other statutory instruments” (Turner and Hulme, 1997: 59), then in the Jamaican context one would have to conclude that there is currently no formal policy in place. In response to a letter that I wrote to Mr. Justin Jarrett querying prison education policy (see Appendix C), I was informed that the DCSJ’s operations were governed by three Acts; The Department of Correctional Services Corrections Act, The Juveniles Act and the Probation of Offenders Act. Careful perusal of these Acts revealed that they had nothing to say regarding the education of adult inmates. To date there is no Act in place that specifically addresses the issue of adult education in correctional facilities, nor is there any policy paper pending in Parliament with regard to adult prison education.

The second aspect of the Commissioner's response on the issue of policy reflected what the DCSJ envisaged as the necessity of rehabilitation and its relation to the inmate's prison term. In an interview the Commissioner outlined the process as follows:

When an inmate is admitted at reception, [they] require what is called a risk needs assessment. It's an instrument that is used to determine the risk associated with the inmate and his needs in terms of rehabilitation...that is now the instrument that points you to what is called his sentence plan [and] the sentence plan informs what is called case
management. [The information gathered from the stages mentioned above should be fed into] an inmate database or inmate management system that can readily determine for us the outputs based on our needs assessment, which would now give you some reports to say these inmates fit the profile of [a] sex offender with no basic numeracy, literacy etc. and then that would form your rehabilitation program.

This answer also evidenced the conceptualisation of policy "as a program" (Turner and Hulme, 1997: 59). The process outlined here is a part of the National Rehabilitation Strategy.

The National Rehabilitation Strategy (NRS) was prepared in 2001 by Planning Concepts (Management Consultants) for the DCSJ. The purpose informing the development of the NRS was to put in place a system that would allow the DCSJ to cultivate a more humane rehabilitative approach to corrections. In providing an overview of the state of rehabilitation in 2001, Planning Concepts found that a marginal number of inmates (referred to in the report as clients) were participating in rehabilitation and work programs.

If these current conditions prevail, there is a real risk that people will emerge from correctional institutions feeling numb, dispirited and fatalistic rather than to any degree rehabilitated or better equipped to lead a productive law abiding life when they return to the community (Planning Concepts, 2001: 4).

Although Planning Concepts (2001: 16) found that there was "no formal strategy in place to guide DCSJ in achieving the rehabilitation of clients", they did acknowledge that the DCSJ had made some progress in the past decade (1991-2001), highlighting five examples:

- the acknowledgement of the human rights of each individual
- the humane treatment of clients as stipulated in international agreements, correctional code and standing orders
• the construction of correctional facilities that comply with international standards for habitation of inmates and wards
• the development and implementation of Risk Assessment tools that are internationally competitive
• and a case management process that drives us toward reintegration at the earliest possible time without undue risk to the community (Planning Concepts, 2001: 44).

Planning Concepts, in conjunction with the DCSJ, have articulated a vision for the future. Three vital areas of commitment were identified; clients, staff and the public. Eight corporate objectives were also identified. Planning Concepts was in essence trying to initiate a paradigm shift. Central to the new paradigm were three concepts; "client satisfaction, empowerment and strategic alliances" (Planning Concepts, 2001: 48). The actual rehabilitation strategy was composed of eight sub-strategies:

- Client Information Management Strategies: Assessment, Classification and Programming.
- Client Aftercare Strategies
- Client Welfare Strategies
- Educational Training and Development Strategies
- Human Services Strategies (Medical, Psychological, Psychiatric and Dental Services)
- Client Recreational Strategies
- Strategic Alliances

With regard to the education, training and development strategy, Planning Concepts (2001: 72) criticised the:

piecemeal approach to [correctional education as missing] the opportunity to make the educational and training experience a comprehensive tool for [the] total personal development of the client. [They suggested] a structured rehabilitation setting [wherein] clients will be able to make a clear and meaningful connection between what they are taught and how it applies to their everyday experience.
The report also lists the expected outcomes that will help clients to:

- develop a greater understanding of themselves in relation to the behaviour problems they demonstrated;
- develop a greater understanding of normal versus abnormal behaviour as well as socially acceptable versus socially unacceptable attitudes;
- gain a wider view of responsibility as lawful and productive members of society (Planning Concepts, 2001: 73).

The National Rehabilitation strategy is essentially an evaluation and proposal for a way forward. Some system proposals, such as client information management (which includes classification, assessment and program planning), were detailed. In the case of other systems, such as education and training, a rehabilitative approach was suggested, and its possibilities sketched, with the actual conceptualisation of a program in terms of syllabus and delivery left unspecified. Although the National Rehabilitation Strategy was devised five years ago, it has yet to be fully implemented.

The rehabilitation program is currently driven by programs that we can adequately fund and operate, [including] programs that are supported by non governmental or faith based organisations... [the program is also affected by] space limitations and staffing... naturally because of security considerations it is not demand driven (interview with the Commissioner of Corrections).
Figure 4.1 depicts the structure of the DCSJ from the Ministerial level downwards and the relation of these positions to prison education.

**Figure 4.1 Organisational Chart of the DCSJ**
Conclusion

This chapter has examined prison education policy through an exploration of the relevant literature and by examining the practical efforts instigated by international organisations and individual countries. An examination of penal policy supplemented to the limited literature available on prison education policy. The assessment of the literature revealed that penal policy operates along a spectrum from the punitive to the rehabilitative, and further highlighted the shift within debates on penal discourse, which tends to represent the more punitive and actuarial aspect within penology. The orientation of a country's penal policy is indicative of how the offender will be treated while incarcerated, and more specifically suggests the direction for the development (or underdevelopment) of prison education policy and its possible implementation.

The second section examined the role of international organisations such as the UN, PFI, and EPEA. These bodies have a regulatory role in that they offer blueprints/guidelines on prison education, which member countries may chose to initiate as policies. On the international stage, debates on prisoner's rights are being played out. This is important because it allows the prisoner's voice to be heard, and his/her point of view to be taken account of in the academic and political policy debates surrounding issues such as the prisoner's right to vote and prison education. The idea of the prisoner's voice being heard and prisoners contributing to their own education and rehabilitation will be examined in more detail in Chapter 6 through Rastafarian and Freirean applications of pedagogical practices in the Jamaican prison context. This chapter re-examined the effectiveness of quantifying prison education in terms of recidivism rates, subsequent to the detailed analysis in Chapter 1. In particular, research into the correlation between prison education
and recidivism rates conducted in Nordic countries, Canada and England, was assessed. The use of recidivism rates as indicators of whether or not prison education ‘works’ is important in that the failure or success of prison education programs impacts on policy decisions regarding prison education. The use of recidivism as an indicator of success raises doubts as to its appropriateness (an alternative outlined by Reuss, 1999 was explored) and further necessitates the question of how best to evaluate success within the field of prison education. Policy implementation literature also helped explain the shortfall between policy and practice. Failure to develop and implement policy in prison education impacts the pedagogic practices within the prison context. The difficulty in establishing a dominant rehabilitative culture within the Jamaican prison context (as outlined in Chapter 3) may well be associated with a failure to implement clear rehabilitation and prison education policy. Chapter 5 will examine the ways in which teachers, who are implementors of the National Rehabilitation Strategy, perceive the inmate, and the pedagogic practices that they employ.

The third section examined Jamaican prison education policy. During the process of this research, the fundamental question as to whether a prison education policy existed within the Jamaican prison context came to the fore. All the data, both documentary and garnered from respondents, indicates that Jamaica lacks an official adult prison education policy as enshrined in an Act of parliament. The DCSJ does however have goals of eliminating illiteracy among the prison population based on a mandate derogated to the Minister of Security and there is a National Rehabilitation Strategy, which functions as a blueprint for driving the DCSJ forward to become a more rehabilitative organisation. The DCSJ currently lacks components of the formula outlined by McCLAUGHLIN (1987) for
successful policy implementation, that is capacity and will and the ability to offer a balanced combination of pressure and support. The DCSJ currently faces difficulties in meeting the program set by the minister due to a lack of funding, an appropriate infrastructure, a lack of resources and a failure to disseminate information about the program that would enable persons working within the institutions to commit to the plan. The full implementation of the National Rehabilitation Strategy also suffers because of this same lack of resources. Teachers, Warders, Superintendents and others working on education and rehabilitation programs in the actual correctional facilities, in most cases, were not aware of what the DCSJ’s policy was with regard to prison education. Basic education and rehabilitation programs are currently in place. Despite their operating in a sub-optimal manner, it nevertheless represents an attempt by the DCSJ to honour its commitment to education. This chapter has highlighted the need for appropriate policy, funding and dissemination of ideas among all levels of staff.
CHAPTER 5

TRAINING NEEDS AND THE WORK OF THE EDUCATORS

Introduction
The purpose of this thesis is to investigate pedagogic processes in the context of Jamaican adult correctional facilities. Accordingly, this chapter focuses on the role of correctional teachers and their contribution to the development of pedagogic practices. The chapter contains three main sections. The first examines the relevant literature on issues pertaining to the training of adult educators, the question of professionalism and the accreditation of adult educators, and the literature specific to the training provisions available to adult educators within the Jamaican context. The second section looks at educators in the Jamaican prison context: it examines provisions for their training; the various roles expected of them outside of facilitating the transfer of knowledge, such as counselling; assesses their support mechanisms; and considers the role of the Jamaica Movement for the Advancement of Literacy (JAMAL) in the training of prison educators. The final section will focus on the teaching of adult basic education (ABE) in the Jamaican prison context, examining this in light of the wider debates around ABE and post secondary education in prisons. The focus will be on current pedagogic practices, with special attention paid to the predominant use of the 'jug and mug' method of delivery and its implications for the learning process. We consider the importance of prior learning experiences, as well as how teachers' values and attitudes affect their teaching practices.
Finally, issues of trust and power within the prison classroom and these affects the teaching process will be explored.

Training adult educators

Adult education operates with certain assumptions about adult learning, employing concepts such as, 'self directed learning', 'student-centred', and 'liberal classroom' (see the detailed discussion on adult education in Chapter 1). These serve to illustrate the ideal of the adult educator more as a facilitator of the learning process than as a teacher in the traditional sense. This section explores the reality of the adult educator, outlining his or her role, the issue of their education, debates over the professionalism of the adult educator, both in the prison context and for adult education per se, and finally examines the types of training available to adult educators, particularly within the Caribbean context.

Broadly conceived, an adult educator is someone who facilitates or assists in the process of helping adults to learn (Ellis, Ramsay and Small 2000; Knowles, 1980). If there is much diversity in the field of adult education, there is also diversity in the attributes and levels of education and training that the adult educator brings to the job. Knowles (1980) sub-divides the role of the adult educator into three categories. Firstly, there are those "at the firing-line...teachers, group leaders, and supervisors who work directly with adult learners on a face-to-face basis" (Knowles, 1980: 26). In the second category, there are those "at the program director level...chairmen, training directors, evening-school principals, extension deans and other administrators" (Knowles, 1980: 27). Lastly, there are those "at the professional level [they] are the small group of career adult educators" (Knowles,
1980: 27). Benn (1998: 7) notes that adult educators are "often highly qualified but in a discipline other than adult education, experienced but not trained…where qualifications do exist they are often concerned with professional competence rather than with adult education itself…". However, this is not always the case. At the other end of the spectrum is the adult educator who does not come to the field as a well educated/trained individual (Robinson, 1988). Adult education occurs in various settings such as universities, colleges, prisons, churches and community centres. At the local community level, some who work as adult educators are not necessarily highly educated people (Robinson, 1988). In fact, there are those who may only have completed secondary education or an ABE course. However, just like the adults they are teaching, they are able to draw upon their life experiences. The advantage of both educator and educatee speaking the same language of life is also greatly enhanced through the driven desire of the educator to help others in the community. For example, whilst conducting fieldwork in Jamaica, I came across volunteers from various churches, who not only ministered in the prisons, but in addition ran outreach programs in communities local to the churches, such as reading programs, and sewing workshops. In one particular case, one of the ladies teaching sewing had no formal training, but had been taught to sew by someone in her family. In another instance of a reading class, the person facilitating could read well enough, but had not been educated beyond secondary level. In spite of where the adult educator may fall along the spectrum of education and training, what is often common is the fact that they have not received training pertinent to the task of being an adult educator (Ellis, Ramsay and Small 2000; Knowles, 1980; Robinson, 1988; shah, 1998). The lack of training of adult educators may reflect the importance attributed to it, both by educators working within the field and by other stakeholders (such as governments and NGOs) outside the
field. For some adult educators, training is not a high priority because they do not perceive themselves as adult educators and therefore do not see the need for specialised training in the area (Fordham and Fox, 1989). The importance of adult education has been undervalued (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000; Fordham and Fox, 1989). The underplaying of the significance of adult education and the subsequent undervaluing of specialised training is not exclusive to those who teach in the field. Ellis, Ramsay and Small (2000: 15) note that, "many seem not to understand the critical role [of] adult education...". They also note that there is a "need to recognise, value, and pay more attention to adult education...and to see adult education as an integral part of the national education system" (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000: 95). Another obstacle is a lack of funding. Brown (1990) and Huddleston and Unwin (2002), writing in reference to the British context, note the decline in funding for adult education. Whilst for the Caribbean, Ellis, Ramsay and Small (2000: 23) note that:

In 1989, there were 115 governmental agencies; 167 local NGOs; 46 regional and 45 international organisations; and 155 other agencies including trade unions, professional associations, educational institutions, and businesses involved in adult education. [However] the majority of these organisations suffered from inadequate funding as allocations for adult education in national budgets were very small; in some cases as low as 3-4% of the education budget.

In some instances, though, training is available for adult educators (for example, a three year certificate course for Teachers of Adults offered by the University of the West Indies), although it is not mandatory that training be undertaken in order to work in the profession (Shah, 1998). However, for other instances in the Caribbean, "there is no developed system in place for training adult educators" (Lavrna and Klapan, 1998: 112).
The arguments for training reflect the desire for professionalisation in the field of adult education, whilst also recognising the need to equip adult educators with the skills that will enable them to perform to the best of their ability (Benn, 1998; Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000; Knowles, 1980; Robinson, 1988; Shah, 1998). As the field of adult education has evolved and diversified, so too have the role and needs of the adult educator. One of these needs is that of training, which, over time has developed towards various forms:

As the mission of adult educators has become more complex and significant, the character of their role has gradually been changing. The demands on them to prepare more carefully for performing the role have increased proportionately...the role of adult educator has moved gradually away from that of willing amateur toward that of trained specialist, and opportunities have multiplied for the requisite training to be obtained at all levels (Knowles, 1980: 37).

Shah (1998: 4), in arguing for the need for professionalisation, states that:

an essential prerequisite for the professionalisation of adult education is the development of a well designed training programme with adequate institutional backing, certification procedures and a code of practice.

Robinson (1998: 21), on the other hand, focuses more on the quality of work. His view is that:

it is essential for all adult education practitioners to seek to acquire appropriate skills and knowledge in adult education so that they can be more effective in their work.

The types of training available for adult educators ranges from seminars and short courses to full degree programmes up to the doctoral level (Chivers and Chowdry, 1998; Dymock, 1998; Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000; Knowles, 1980; Shah, 1998; Tadeusz, 1998).
Within the Caribbean region, the need for the training of adult educators has also been recognised (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000; Robinson, 1988). Robinson (1988: 21) notes that "very often the [adult education] practitioners are unaware that there is a body of knowledge and techniques which they can learn, and which would help them to play their role as adult educators better". In 1977 there was an intensive effort to make adult education a priority at the regional level. 1978 saw the birth of the Caribbean Regional Council for Adult Education (CARCAE). CARCAE's remit was to:

- promote the formation of national associations of adult education,
- organise and implement a programme of training of adult educators in the region, and draft a constitution for CARCAE (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000: 15).

CARCAE's efforts concentrated on the English-speaking member states of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and they have had some notable success in achieving their goals. Education within the Caribbean region tends to be highly prized as the vehicle for both personal and national development (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000; Robinson, 1998). According to Robinson (1988: 7):

Adult education is ... an important tool that can enable [the] process of national, community and individual development to take place ... Special efforts can be made to provide adults with the knowledge, skills and confidence to initiate change and development in their societies.

CARCAE's first foray into educational development began with a three year Certificate Course for Teachers of Adults in 1978. It has subsequently produced a training manual for adult educators entitled 'The Rainbow Route: A Caribbean Experience of Adult Education' (published in 1988). At the national level, CARCAE has lent support to individual countries through the provision of "information, advice, and resource persons; the identification and accessing of funds from international agencies for training programmes, and for the
participation of adult educators in regional and international seminars and conferences” (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000: 16). In spite of the recognition of the potential of adult education, and in spite of the progress achieved, much more is required. A review of adult education policies in the Caribbean between the years of 1977-1999 (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000) applauded the advances, as, for example, evidenced in the formation of Adult Education Units in various countries. Jamaica too saw progression, with organisations such as the Jamaican Council for Adult Education (JACAE) and the Jamaican Movement for the Advancement of Literacy (JAMAL) being established (in 1984 and 1974 respectively) to manage and promote adult education within the island. However, in spite of these advances “many seem not to fully understand the critical role that adult education can and must play in determining the process and outcome of national development” (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000: 15). Governments in the Caribbean claim to appreciate the:

> The importance of [adult education] and say they are committed to it [but] their words are not always followed by actions that demonstrate their commitment (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000: 100).

According to Ellis, Ramsay and Small (2000: 22), this lack of commitment can be evidenced by the fact that there are; “few explicit policy statements or documents in which governments clearly articulate policies on adult education”.

In the Jamaican context, the Jamaican Council for Adult Education (JACAE) is “the chief NGO responsible for the development of adult education and for promoting the training and development of adult educators in Jamaica” (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000: 68). JACAE’s contributions to equipping adult educators include; a masters degree programme in adult education initiated in 1999 in collaboration with the Mount St. Vincent University in
Halifax, Canada; the development of a two year certificate in adult education initiated in 1997/1998 and offered through UWIDEC (University of the West Indies Distance Education Centre); and through collaboration with JAMAL, the development of an Adult Education Resource Centre which houses a Documentation Centre and a collection of adult education materials (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000).

In spite of the best efforts of CARCAE and JACAE, adult educators within the Jamaican and the wider Caribbean context remain largely untrained. One suggested method of addressing the problem of untrained adult educators is to make it "mandatory for teachers, lecturers, tutors, and instructors in tertiary institutions, including those at universities, teachers' colleges, and community colleges to participate in training programs in adult education" (Ellis, Ramsay and Small, 2000: 102). Theoretically, the proposal for mandatory training of adult educators is a good one, in that it would seek to ensure that adult educators were appropriately equipped to undertake the task of teaching adults. However, there are limitations in realising this, such as the fact that courses available through UWI are not available on all three campuses, and in some cases are unavailable through distance learning, making access more difficult. Ellis, Ramsay and Small (2000: 103) suggests that "UWI needs to implement certificate, diploma and degree programs in adult education as soon as possible, and make these available on all three campuses and through schools of continuing studies in every country".

The training required for adult educators may vary, according to where and whom they teach. For those who undertake the training of adult learners in prisons, training in adult education methods is required, whilst in addition, other types of training that enable them
to deal with the everyday challenges of the prison context, such as counselling and dispute resolution, may also be necessary. The following section of this chapter will examine the training that is available to adult educators within the correctional system in Jamaica.

**Training teachers in the Jamaican prison context**

The following section is sub-divided into three: Firstly, I identify the prison educator and explore three types of educators working in the prisons. Secondly, I explore the roles fulfilled by the prison educator. In this section, I explore the ways in which prison teachers are not simply required to transfer knowledge, but also take on broader roles, such as counselling. In the third section, I examine the role of JAMAL in the provision of training, especially in influencing the adult education teaching methodology of prison educators.

**Identifying the prison educator**

Prior to examining the training provisions for adult educators within the context of the Jamaican correctional system, it is necessary to clarify who the adult educators are. In the four prisons included in this study, the group of people who make up the teaching staff within the adult prisons consist of three groups; civilian teachers, warder teachers and inmate teachers. Teachers enter prison education through different avenues and with different skills and capabilities. The DCSJ stipulated that every adult correctional facility should have at least one trained civilian teacher on staff (meaning that the teacher should posses a diploma in education). However, civilian teachers belong to one of two subcategories. In the first, there are those civilian teachers specifically recruited to teach
in prisons. These teachers accord with the department’s stipulation that they should have at least a diploma of education (this qualification, obtained in teachers’ colleges is considered a tertiary level qualification). The second subcategory is those civilian teachers primarily employed by the DCSJ in other capacities who also volunteer their services to teach. These teachers are educated to at least bachelor degree level and often possess postgraduate degrees, but they do not have specific training germane to being an educator. Across the four prisons there were two such teachers, one was a medical doctor trained in psychiatry and the other was a social worker who had a master’s degree in counselling psychology. Although well educated, neither of these two persons had received any training in adult education.

The warder teachers constitute the second group. Warders find themselves posted or detailed to work in various positions around the prison compound. Assisting teaching is just one of the many positions that a warder might be detailed. The warder does not have any say in where he or she is to work. Therefore, warder teachers do not necessarily choose this vocation, but rather, find themselves occupying this position. Warders have far less stringent educational requirements imposed upon them to teach, than do civilian teachers. In the study, most warder teachers were not educated beyond secondary level. Some warder teachers possessed teaching experience gained prior to entering the prison service, mostly in primary and basic schools, but none of them came to the post equipped to teach adult learners.

The final group of teachers are inmate teachers. These persons are serving a prison sentence, so have no choice about their location. However, inmates cannot be compelled
to teach in the prisons. Inmate teachers either volunteer or are asked to help out. The levels of education of inmate teachers vary, from secondary education to postgraduate education. The teaching experiences of the inmate teachers range from having a "knack" for a particular subject (and being able to share their knowledge of that particular subject with other inmates); to being trained teachers who taught at secondary and tertiary level in educational institutions in the wider society.

As previously noted, prison educators are drawn from three groups of people who hold different positions within the prison hierarchy and whose educational backgrounds and training vary. One thing they all have in common is the fact that they teach in prison. The challenge faced by the DCSJ is to equip this disparate group for the task of teaching in prison. Before examining the training provisions in place for adult educators in prisons, I will briefly examine the role of the educator within the prison system.

Role of the adult educator

The educator’s primary role is that of facilitating learning. According to Tight (2002: 28), teachers "remain primarily concerned with how best to encourage and develop relevant learning in their clients". Other authors take the role of the adult educator a step further, linking the adult educator’s role to that of an educational emancipator. Robinson (1988: 1) notes that:

adult education practitioners need to be aware that there are gaps in the lives of many of the individuals with whom they work in the communities. They are frustrated, angry, silent and dependent. Many of these gaps exist as a result of a history of underdevelopment. [Adult educators must help] such people break out of this culture of silence and dependency.
Speaking in the context of the prison classroom Davidson (2000: 392) encourages adult educators to “attend to what the prison school has become by promoting critical discussions that may open up possibilities for reasoned resistance and the formulation of alternative, emancipatory pedagogies”. Alongside their primary role, adult educators also fulfil other roles. Various authors set out the different roles expected of educators (Rogers, 1986; Rogers, 2002; Suvaal, 1991). Nesbit, Leach and Foley (2004: 76-77), highlighting nine roles of the adult educator; “convenor, facilitator, advocate (of missing perspectives), adversary (of oppressive behaviour), lecturer, recorder, mediator, clearing house [and] librarian”. In the context of the Jamaican prison, the teacher’s role extends far beyond merely facilitating access to learning. In an interview, the Educational Coordinator noted that when teaching in prison:

_You must prepare for the unexpected. There is a wide range of prisoners with social problems. It is rarely business as usual. You have to be flexible about their needs._

In order to understand the many roles fulfilled by adult educators within the prison system, this study sought the responses of prison educators as to what they perceived their role to be. The teachers interviewed all acknowledged their primary teaching role, but also perceived additional roles, which varied from teacher to teacher. These included “father figure”, “positive role model”, “counsellor”, “problem solver”, “friend”, “listener” and “mother”. Although there are subtle differences between these roles, they all incorporate a pastoral element. This more holistic approach, when set against the discourse of prisoners as ‘mad’ or ‘bad’ (see Chapter 1 for more detailed discussion) would seem to indicate the possibility that the prison teachers see prisoners as ‘mad’ but redeemable. However, as will emerge from the discussion that follows, this correlation between the teachers’
adopted pastoral roles and how they perceive and treat the prisoner in the classroom setting is far from unambiguous. The way in which prisoners are perceived, treated and taught varies based to some extent on the type of teacher (warder, civilian or inmate); and whether or not (in spite of the pastoral roles they adopt) they believe it is possible to rehabilitate the prisoner. In her study, Magro (2002: 5) noted the importance of the teacher’s role as counsellor/therapist and their need to be able to “help learners deal with anxieties and emotional barriers that may interfere with learning”. Magro (2002: 5) further recognises that “most adult educators are not trained as counsellors to deal with the problems that many adult … learners’ experience”. During informal conversations, teachers were often more open and willing to talk about aspects of their jobs that might be perceived as controversial, and which, consequently, they preferred to remain ‘off the record.’ They seemed to feel that their anonymity was more likely to be preserved when there was no notepad or tape recorder in use. As the teachers spoke of their work within the prison, it became evident that they often found themselves in counselling roles. The following excerpts are three examples of situations in which teachers assumed a pastoral role. The first is a conversation with a teacher at Pine Town Prison:

One time I was teaching in class but one inmate was not responding, he didn’t seem to be paying much attention to the class. He’s normally active in class, always participating. I was worried so I called him outside and asked him what the problem was. He said he was angry because he didn’t hear from his girlfriend in four weeks and he decided that she had found somebody else. So I asked him if he had children with the girlfriend…he said yes. So then I said maybe she can’t visit because she now has to take care of the children by herself. He said maybe. So then I tell him to cheer up the girlfriend will soon visit. I tried to set his mind at ease so he could do his school work. The girlfriend came the following week.

The excerpt above shows the teacher being sensitive to the inmate’s mood and lack of participation in class, and helping the inmate to work through feelings of abandonment
consequent to his girlfriend's failure to visit. From the teacher's perspective, his intervention encouraged the inmate to think rationally about reasons that might have prevented his girlfriend from visiting, and so make him less anxious about the situation.

The second excerpt is taken from a conversation with a teacher at Jackfruit prison:

An inmate came to me one day and tell me he was going to have somebody fixed [killed] on the outside. He wanted revenge but he said he didn’t do it yet he was thinking about it because he kept hearing all the things I talk about in class. Things like taking responsibility for actions and being role models for our children. He said he wanted to be a better example for his yute [son] because he didn’t want him to end up in prison. I listened and then I try to help him think it through and try to convince him not to order the murder. When we finish talk he said he still wasn’t sure what he would do. I was worried. I didn’t know if I should break his confidence and report him or wait and hope him change him mind. I would feel bad if the murder went through but I wanted to give him a chance to do the right thing. He came back a few days later and said he decided not to order the murder. He thanked me and told me that if I had somebody like you to talk to I probably wouldn’t be here.

In the excerpt above, the teacher acts as a moral sounding board for the inmate. The teacher’s counselling and advice enable the inmate to choose to do the right thing. The third excerpt is taken from a conversation with a teacher at Jackfruit Prison:

One day I got to class and the inmates were angry. I came prepared to teach but I couldn’t get them to settle down. So I put down the lesson and I ask them to tell me what was happening. They were angry because they had cell search earlier in the morning. So I listen and let them tell me what was wrong and why they were angry. I let them speak freely. Then when they finish talking and I listen they were in a better frame of mind for class.

In the final excerpt above we see the importance of the teacher being willing to listen and afford the prisoner a voice to express him/herself with regard to the injustices he/she perceives him/herself to be experiencing.
Based on the above examples, one can gain some understanding of the issues that teachers in the prison context deal with on a day-to-day basis. The role of an adult educator entails more than 'just teaching'. Inmates do not come to the classroom as empty vessels, to be filled with knowledge and skills so that he/she may be 'stamped' rehabilitated and returned to society. They come with complex issues and feelings that need to be addressed. Accordingly, the adult educator often takes on pastoral roles that enable them, not only to be more effective in their primary role as adult educator, but also to contribute to the maintenance of prison discipline and potential rehabilitation. The question is what prepares them for this multi-skilled job?

**JAMAL and the training of the adult educator**

Although any mention of the training of educators was noticeably absent from all the documentation that I received from the DCSJ, I was informed of the training provisions in place for adult educators through interviews conducted with the Director of Rehabilitation and the Educational Coordinator. There are three sources of training: the first and main training initiative is that organised by JAMAL. In addition to this, the Department offers training in the form of seminars and the Jamaica Library Service conducts training specific to library skills. The focus of the JAMAL training is towards teaching the adult educator how to teach adults. In theory, all adult educators within the prison system (civilian, warder and inmate) are trained by JAMAL.

The issue of illiteracy came to be prominent for the Jamaican agenda as early as the 1940s. The first national literacy effort was launched in 1940, taking the form of the Laubach method; 'each one teach one' (JAMAL, 1977), meaning that each person who
learned to read was encouraged to teach other persons to read (for example family member or friends). This initiative was not very successful, and in 1972, the National Literacy program superseded it. This program, in turn, had little success and in 1974, the Jamaica Movement for the Advancement of Literacy (Salgado and Santamaria, 1989; JAMAL, 1977) came into being. JAMAL has been the primary organisation dealing with the problem of illiteracy in Jamaica from 1974 to the present day. The relationship between the DCSJ and JAMAL is one where JAMAL provides training in adult education teaching methods to adult educators within the prison context, as well as teaching material (please see Appendix D for examples of JAMAL teaching materials). Within the structure of JAMAL there are parish managers who are responsible for training and literacy programs within each of the fourteen parishes across the island. Each Parish Manager is responsible for training the prison personnel who fall within their designated parish. JAMAL also produces literature in the form of text books and manuals covering subject areas such as literacy, numeracy and life skills. JAMAL's training is centred on pedagogical techniques which "have been tried and tested and reflect the needs of the Jamaican situation" (JAMAL, undated). An elucidation of the JAMAL methodology occurred during an interview with a senior officer at JAMAL:

JAMAL uses a ... method called 'sight reading'. The aim is always to leave the adult feeling motivated. Therefore our syllabus is built around life skills, starting from where the adult learner is, that is, their life experiences. Therefore we have developed the sight reading method, where familiar words are introduced into conversation. For example words centred on family. Then everyone brings to the table their experiences and prior knowledge on family. We do not start with the alphabet as we find that is too demotivating. Instead the words are used on flip cards so that they can learn to recognise them and they can read. The alphabet is introduced at a later time.
The design of the JAMAL methodology follows the three basic stages of adult learning; familiarization, mechanical application and the independent stage (JAMAL, 1990). In the teaching of each stage, JAMAL uses one or a combination of methods. In the first stage, which is the familiarization stage, students handle books, and pictures and the ‘look and say’ or ‘sight reading’ method is used (JAMAL, 1990: 8). In the second stage, which is the mechanical application stage, the mechanics of reading are taught, such as the characteristics of sound, letters, and pronunciation. The phonics method is relied upon here (JAMAL, 1990: 8). In the third and final stage, the independent stage, “students are now at the level where the difficulty of pronunciation is overcome, they understand the meaning of words and they can use the dictionary” (JAMAL, 1990: 9). At this stage, the look and say and phonics methods are utilised in combination.

In accordance with its methodology, JAMAL outlines forty-one objectives, divided under thirteen themes that adult learners should achieve. The thirteen themes include “identity and self image; citizenship and government; consumer education; community; continuing education; home and family life; health and hygiene; nutrition; food production; occupations; work; communication; and enquiry and critical thinking” (JAMAL, 1973: 1). Taken in its entirety, the program seeks to produce a rounded individual who is equipped to function at various levels within society, addressing issues pertaining to the individual, the community and the nation. In educational terms, these themes suggest that JAMAL’s aim extends far beyond basic literacy, as indeed is indicted by themes such as continuing education and enquiry and critical thinking. The training that JAMAL parish managers conduct with adult educators within prisons would cover all aspects of the JAMAL method and objectives outlined above. As previously mentioned, in theory, all adult prison
educators receive training from JAMAL. However, there are often gaps between theory and practice and difficulties involved in achieving stated objectives (see the discussion on policy implementation in Chapter 4).

At Ras I Prison, 6 teachers were interviewed; 4 inmate teachers and 2 warder teachers. None of the inmate teachers had received training from JAMAL, nor had they attended any departmental training seminars. One of the two warder teachers interviewed indicated that he had attended a three-day JAMAL training seminar, whilst the other had received no training whatsoever. At Jackfruit Prison, 6 teachers were interviewed, 1 inmate teacher, 2 civilian teachers, and three warder teachers. The inmate teacher had not received JAMAL training, one of the civilian teachers had, although the other had not, and only one of the three warder teachers had received JAMAL training. At Pine Town Prison, two teachers were interviewed; one civilian teacher and one warder teacher, both of whom had received JAMAL training. At Mango Town Prison, three warder teachers were interviewed. Two of them had been trained by JAMAL, while one had not. Table 5.1 provides a breakdown of the number and category of teachers in the study who have received JAMAL training across the prisons used in this study.
During the interview process, several issues pertaining to the current training provisions became apparent. In the first instance, one issue of concern was that none of the inmate teachers had received JAMAL training. In most cases the inmate teachers were educated to masters level and in some cases they had teaching qualifications but none of the inmate teachers had been trained as adult educators prior to beginning their prison sentence and none of them had received training since they had been teaching in prison schools. The issues surrounding the training of adult educators, discussed at the beginning of this chapter, are present within the Jamaican prison context. The situation in the prisons, where there was a complete exclusion of the inmate teachers from adult education training, suggests that the importance of training adult educators is not valued highly enough. The second issue raised concerned the frequency of JAMAL training sessions. In two examples, two warder teachers had been teaching within the prison...
system for six months and two years respectively and neither of them had received JAMAL training. I was unable to ascertain from JAMAL personnel or DCSJ personnel the frequency for scheduled training sessions. The third issue was the perception of JAMAL training by its recipients. In some instances, JAMAL training was unrecognised as training. For example, during the interviews when teachers were asked if they had received training, some teachers' initial response was "no". However when prompted and asked specifically about JAMAL training they would acknowledge that they had been to a JAMAL seminar or 3 day training course. Other teachers, although acknowledging JAMAL training without the need for a prompt, indicated that the training was not highly valued. Comments included:

* I went to two JAMAL workshops but they were not sufficient. I need a whole lot more.  
* They send us on [JAMAL] courses but I can't even remember them. We need to get upgraded to get teaching diplomas.  
* We need [training] in line with Ministry of Education principles where you are taught how to teach.

One possible reason for the low estimation of JAMAL training is its lack of accreditation. Persons participating in training are generally far more interested in accredited rather than non-accredited courses. In a study conducted by Crossan et al (2003: 61) it was noted that a student "stressed the importance of being able to ... [gain] recognised qualifications". The educators of adults are no different in desiring accreditation and credentials. Acquiring credentials may reflect a desire to increase marketability in the professional arena or to achieve a certain status within society. According to Brown (2001: 19), "Credentials [are] a primary determinant of modern stratification systems". In expounding on credentialing theory, Brown (2001: 19-20) notes that:
credentialing theory sees the expansion of educational degrees as the growth of culturally based stratifying barriers to occupations and organisations... credentialing theorists argue that educational certification is a historical legitimation of advantages that empower degree holders in occupational and organizational recruitment. Credential requirements for jobs are less concerned with concrete work skills than demanding that recruits hold similar, school-taught cultural dispositions to incumbents of positions.

The teachers seemed to want training that resulted in some sort of certification, preferably a certificate or diploma in education. This need for accreditation was stronger among warder teachers, who in most cases did not hold post secondary qualifications. They also seem to place emphasis on the length of the training, mentioning that it was just a “seminar” or it only lasted for “two days”. Perhaps the training would be more valued if it lasted longer. Sixteen of the seventeen teachers interviewed opined that the teacher training they received needed to be designed to deal specifically with the prison context. For example:

Yes [there should be specific training to the correctional context because] you have to consider they are adults but confined and you have to find ways and means to motivate them. The easiest thing can be difficult and turn them off.

Yes [training should be specific to the context] but it’s not necessarily the job of the teachers college to train teachers for prison. The department should develop a program based on the expertise if those within the system to train new teachers. Training should be ongoing. Benchmarking between prisons would be good.

Teachers also indicated that along with a system that would equip them to teach in the prison context they felt that they should also receive some additional training because of the demands placed on them. Suggestions for additional training included counselling, special education, computer literacy and Spanish.
In an interview, the Educational Coordinator noted that the relationship between JAMAL and the DCSJ could and should be exploited more fully. She noted that:

> JAMAL could do more in offering training. For example, they could train literate inmates to train...It would also be good if there were a JAMAL representative to work alongside [the teachers] daily in the prisons...JAMAL also provides books but those books need to be revamped. Society has changed, and the vocabulary and the storylines in the books are now redundant...But JAMAL is a government agency and they are also strapped for cash.

In terms of overall training efforts, two areas of training are highly inefficient. Training is supposed to be offered in library skills, but of the seventeen teachers interviewed, only one warder teacher indicated that she had been trained. The other form of training is supposed to take the form of seminars and workshops run by the Department. Only three of the eighteen teachers interviewed indicated that they had participated in departmental seminars and workshops. The training mechanisms in place for teachers thus appear to be weak and inadequate for the roles expected of teachers. Training concentrates primarily on equipping teachers with a method suitable for delivering basic literacy and numeracy skills to adults. The training takes into account the fact that the students are adults, but does not address the uniqueness of the context or the issues that inmates bring to the classroom. For instance, training presently does not equip teachers to recognise or deal with students who have special needs such as dyslexia. This inability to recognise and appreciate adults with learning difficulties was all too evident in an exchange that took place between an inmate and a teacher at Mango Town prison. The inmate came to the teacher with a note that required a signature. The inmate’s note was poorly written. The penmanship was bad, the grammar was poor, words were spelt incorrectly and letters were turned back to front. The teacher chastised the inmate, telling
him that he needed to attend school instead of being lazy and staying away. As the teacher chastised the inmate, the latter became withdrawn. The inmate tried to explain:

I am dyslexic... I was diagnosed before I came here. It's not my fault.

But the teacher would not listen:

You are lazy! Good for nothing. Nothing is wrong with you. You just make up excuses so you don't have to come to class.

This unfortunate exchange shows just how much more needs to be done in terms of sensitising teachers to adult learners with special needs, whilst also highlighting the teachers' perception of inmates as 'bad' rather than 'mad'. Another area where the current training provisions fall short is in equipping the teacher for the pastoral roles often required of them.

The formal support mechanisms in place for teachers are scarce. The first form of support, as teacher training, we have already seen is weak. The second formal support mechanism exists in the form of the Educational Coordinator, who tries to meet the needs of the educators. However, the Educational Coordinator is a single person who assumes responsibility for all prisons (both adult and juvenile) and there are therefore limits to the practical effectiveness of this role. During interviews some respondents questioned about the support mechanisms in place to help them, knew of none. Teachers voiced the following views with regard to formal support mechanisms:

[There are no support mechanisms] you are left on your own.

We don't have any, but the group of us here meet and discuss and try to help each other.
No there is nothing just for educators, but there is a union for correctional officers.

Teachers expressed the desire to have some mechanism in place that would facilitate the meeting and sharing of ideas across adult correctional facilities and a mutual support network congruent with this. Based on their interviews, it seems that in at least two prisons, Mango Town and Pine Town, the teachers have tried to instigate ways of sharing ideas and networking that would offer some support. The sharing of ideas between these two prisons may be the result of their proximity, as well as the fact that some staff have served in both prisons. The training received by these teachers has encouraged the development of certain pedagogical practices that tend to be in keeping with a more prescriptive model of teaching.

Teaching ABE in Jamaican Prisons

This section will outline the educational programs available in the Jamaican prison context and will also examine the literature on the wider debate surrounding the use of ABE and post secondary education (PSE) in prisons. An extensive use of the ‘jug and mug’ method was evident in the prison classroom and the study assesses the effectiveness of this method, particularly in relation to its possible conflict with adult education teaching ideals. The thesis will examine both the importance of prior learning experiences, especially as a negative impediment to learning, as well as the impact of teacher’s values and their influence on the teaching methods adopted. Finally, I examine issues of trust and power within the classroom and its effect on students’ learning.
Adult education may be conceptualised in several ways. For example, it may be formulated as literacy, or to refer to recreational courses (Fordham and Fox, 1989). However, it is conceptualised, it is important to realise that the “image [of adult education] will vary according to context” (Fordham and Fox, 1989: 199). In Chapter 4 it was noted that Jamaica had signed up to the UNESCO Education for All (EFA) program. Bhola (1998: 492) argues that a part of the manifestation of EFA has been that:

adult education [has become] ‘Basic Education for All’ ... [and has become] dissociated ... from its conceptualisation as lifelong learning meant to enable citizens to participate continuously in processes of development and democratization of their societies. It meant competency acquisition now, empowerment later, if at all!

The issue of whether or not prison education should extend to PSE has been subject to extensive debate in the literature and remains essentially contested (Batiuk et al, 2005; Pomeroy, 2003; Taylor, 1994). Taylor (1994: 316) notes that opposition towards PSE in prisons comes from various interest groups such as, “legislators, correctional administrators, concerned citizens, and other students”. The objections raised to PSE in prisons include; “the question of whether it is proper to permit inmates, especially those convicted of the most serious offences, to have access to collegiate ... opportunities; the failure of such programs to positively affect recidivism rates; the cost of such programs” (Taylor, 1994: 316); [and] the idea that “ABE, GED, high school and vocational/technical programs, are all that is needed to achieve the desired benefit [of education]” (Batiuk et al, 2005: 56). Advocates of PSE in prisons, on the other hand, argue that in terms of cost, PSE programs “represent an extremely cost-effective method of efficiently providing educational programming” (Taylor, 1994: 319). Further, several studies highlighted in Taylor (1994) and Batiuk et al (2005) demonstrate the positive impact of PSE on
recidivism rates. PSE “works to reduce recidivism by enhancing employability, increasing self-esteem and fostering personal growth” (Batiuk et al, 2005: 56). In addition, there are those who argue that PSE programs positively affect the institution. According to Taylor (1994: 330) “the higher the level of education a prisoner had, the less ‘social distance’ the inmate required. This level of educational attainment resulted in increased social, ethnic, and racial interfacing, leading to greater social harmony within the prison and, subsequently, to less violence”.

Within the Jamaican prison context, adult education programs concentrate on basic literacy and numeracy. The structures of the schools vary from prison to prison. At Jackfruit Prison, there are four levels for classes. Level one caters for inmates who are illiterate, level two and three overlap and are considered intermediate levels and level four caters for those students preparing for JSC (Jamaica School Certificate) examinations. There are students at Jackfruit Prison preparing to sit CXC (Caribbean Examinations Council) and GCE (General Certificate of Education) examinations, but these students do not fall within the remit of the regular school operations. These students are either self taught (meaning they teach themselves from a text book) or peer taught (meaning one person in the class may have already passed the subject and is now teaching the others). At Mango Town Prison, there are three levels. Level one caters for non-readers, level two caters for persons preparing for JSC and level three caters for those preparing for CXC and GCE examinations (however, the level three classes were not being run throughout the time of my research). The school at Pine Town Prison has two levels. The first caters for non-readers and intermediates, whilst the second caters for those students preparing for JSC examinations.
Based on my observations and interviews, this study identified two predominant pedagogic methods within the prisons. One approach is more prisoner-led and appears to share communalities with the concept of ‘reasoning’ as understood by Rastafari. This reasoning method will be explored in more detail in Chapter 6. The other approach is more teacher-led and is more in keeping with the ‘jug and mug’ approach to teaching.

With the jug and mug method, the:

- objectives are defined in terms of ‘what people need to know’, [and as such] a ‘transmission model’ of teaching in which the user is an ‘empty vessel’ into which ‘acceptable knowledge’ is transferred by the teacher [emerges]. [These courses] are ‘prescriptive’ in that ‘experts with authority decide what is to be learned and whether it has been learned satisfactorily’ (Harrison, 1993: 4).

The jug and mug method of teaching conflicts with ideals such as self-directed learning or student-centred learning, both of which predominate in approaches to adult learners and adult education. In order to function effectively as an adult educator, appropriate training is necessary. Ellis, Ramsay and Small (2000: 96) note that lack of training (or poor training) creates a situation where it becomes the “tendency of tutors, lecturers, and trainers to use traditional, non-participatory teaching methods with adult learners”. Therefore, the predominant use of the jug and mug method in the Jamaican prison context may be indicative of the need for more effective training of prison educators and the broader necessity for addressing specific aspects of adult learning.

The method explored here was prevalent in three of the four prisons visited; Mango Town Prison, Jackfruit Prison and Pine Town Prison. In these prisons knowledge was somewhat centralised within the person of the head teacher. In two of the three prisons, the head
teacher was a trained civilian with JAMAL training and in the other, the head teacher was a trained warder with JAMAL training. These head teachers prepare the lessons and then explain to the other teachers (warder and inmate) how they envisage the delivery of lessons. Not all of the assistant warder teachers and none of the inmate teachers were JAMAL trained. The thinking behind this structure appears to be that the head teacher will pass on the JAMAL method and philosophy to the assistant teachers. The process is akin to the cascade model of learning (Skaggs and Hodge, 2005; Tribe and The Family Rehabilitation Centre Staff, 2004). Skaggs and Hodge (2005) explicate the steps involved in the process. Management "(1) attends an in-depth educational session about the topic and receive educational tools, [and] (2) provides education to their departments using the most appropriate tools" (Skaggs and Hodge, 2005: 10). The parallel in the Jamaican prison context sees the head teacher (management) being trained by JAMAL and given the appropriate tools, which knowledge and tools are in turn passed on to the other teachers (their department).

In terms of classroom structure, the classrooms were set up with the teacher at the head of the class and inmates sat in rows facing the teacher. Observation of classes across the three prisons revealed the predominant teaching method as learning by rote. The typical classroom scenario saw either a list of words (for example a list that had the months of the year, or a list of verbs), or a passage, written on the board by the teacher, who then used a pointer to either say the words or read the passages, which the students then repeated back to the teacher. Repetition of this format occurred several times, until the words or the passage became fixed. A writing exercise usually followed, requiring the students to answer questions by filling in words from the passage or word group that they had been
memorising. Students were also given exercises from text books (See Appendix E for examples of schoolwork).

One challenge to this approach was a lack of concordance: although the head teachers across all three prisons seemed to have bought into the JAMAL approach, this did not necessarily apply to the assistant teachers. It was not physically possible for the head teacher to both teach and monitor all the other classes across the various levels, and thus ensure that his/her instructions were being followed. Assistant teachers were thus provided with ample opportunity to deviate from the head teacher’s instructions. The freedom to extemporise is not necessarily negative; indeed this study has already highlighted the need for flexibility on the part of the adult educator. Notwithstanding, the deviation from planned lessons sometimes allowed assistant teachers to transpose their negative attitudes and teaching practices into the learning environment.

Another difficulty with the structure outlined here, is that some of the assistant teachers were themselves in need of upgrading their skills in terms of their own educational level and basic understanding of the English language. Because some of the assistant teachers were lacking in the basic skills that they were trying to teach, they often taught incorrect grammar, pronunciation and spelling. In one such example, a warder teacher was formulating questions relating to a passage on the board. One question he wrote was, “What does the heart does”. The head teacher wanted to correct her but could not because of her positioning at the other side of the room at the head of the class. A fellow warder teacher went to her and told her to change it to “what does the heart do”. She changed it, but when the class was over and the head teacher asked her if she
understood why the first sentence had been incorrect, she replied that she did not. She only changed it because of the instruction to do so.

One other shortcoming was the lack of, or limited use of discussion. It appeared, from observation, that the adoption of JAMAL methodology was at best, partial. This lack of compliance was indicative of teachers who had not fully grasped the uniqueness of the adult learner or the importance of using appropriate methods with adult learners. Whilst it is true that illiterate adults have the same needs as children for learning the rudiments of reading and writing, including appreciating the alphabet, phonetics and letter formation as foundational, the difference is that the atmosphere in an adult class benefits from following an androgogical model as opposed to a pedagogical one. For example, in Jackfruit Prison I observed the use of the 'look and say' method both on the blackboard and on flash cards (stage one, the familiarisation stage of the JAMAL method) as well as for word building exercises (stage two, mechanical application). Those aspects of the JAMAL method that were incorporated into practice pertained to learning by rote. Therefore, it appears that most teachers only adopted from the JAMAL method that which was most recognisable to them, namely, learning by rote. It seemed as if teachers made little effort to include the use of discussion, or the students' life experiences, which are key components of the JAMAL methodology and part of the wider pedagogic stance of adult education. They taught adult inmates as if they were children. There were some inmates who when questioned by teachers about coming to school expressed concerns about having the ability:

Teacher, me nuh have book head me cyaan understand di tings in class.

Me better wid me hands, school nuh really work fi me.
Di last time me go school me a likkle bwoy me too old fi understand dem tings now.

Here, the inmate vocalises his belief that he is not smart enough to understand what is written in the textbooks and therefore it does not make sense for him to come to class. Adult learners often face several hurdles to their learning, such as dispositional barriers, institutional barriers, situational barriers and educational barriers (Harrison, 1993; Leonard, 2002; Tight, 1993). According to Harrison (1993: 11) dispositional barriers "relate to the learner's own attitudes and self-perceptions". Institutional barriers include "the rules and regulations which define the time, place and entry requirements of courses of study" (Harrison, 1993: 11); while situational barriers "arise from an individual's life situation [such as] courses may cost too much money" (Harrison, 1993: 11). Finally, educational barriers include "lack of formal qualifications" (Tight, 1993: 26). Within the prison context, prisoners often face dispositional barriers: they may lack self-esteem, or be hampered by prior negative learning experiences that have caused them to be wary of learning. Unsatisfactory learning experiences "act as major barriers to people's participation in and progress with organised learning" (Calder, 1993: vii). Schlesinger (2005: 229), further, observes that, "many offender/students have had negative school experiences in their lives". Armengaud (1991) suggests that the effect of prior negative learning experiences on prisoners is such that teachers must factor these into their teaching methods. Diaz, Marzo and Moreno (1991: 60) further note that in applying teaching methods designed for young children to adults, there is the danger "that memories of previous school experiences may be reactivated and produce a negative reaction".
The teacher-led approach to teaching across these three prisons was also affected by the attitudes and beliefs held by the teachers. In examining the importance of teachers' values and beliefs to their work Pratt and Associates (1998: 33), posits that teachers bring to their practice values, that is, "a perspective, a set of interrelated beliefs and intentions which give meaning and justification" to their actions. Roberts (1998: 21), speaking on the attitudes of teachers', notes that the adult educator "must appreciate the importance of his/her attitude and how it affects the learning process". Some of the warder and civilian teachers bring an attitude of their own superiority to the classroom. Both the organisational structure of the prison and the hierarchical structure of society, encourage their self-estimation as superior by virtue of the fact that they are not incarcerated. Even though, as teachers, they fulfil pastoral roles, this does not signal equality for the pastoral relationship. They are still helping someone that they view as inferior to them. The attitudes of superiority and lack of equality in the warder/prisoner and civilian/prisoner relationships is perpetuated in the classroom, where inmates are often viewed as intellectually inferior. Some teachers are of the opinion that the adults they teach in prison lack ability:

I started with letters but that was difficult as the [inmates’] mind is already formed...it was decided it is better for them to try and identify words.

Inmates are inherently selfish and lack ability to reason.

The Department believes training improves the teacher, but the standard of teaching depends on the quality of the inmate.

Such comments reflect a belief that the inmate students' success is solely dependent on the inmates' ability and has no bearing on their attitudes or teaching methods. Some of the teachers also believed that it was their duty to impart knowledge to the prisoner: they
did not consider the prisoner as an individual who may already have useful or valuable knowledge. These beliefs are borne out in statements such as:

*I am called as a teacher to impart [knowledge]...to influence the minds of the inmates to rehabilitation.*

*If I have taught you learn.*

*When you can regurgitate something [I teach you] you have learnt.*

All of the above statements reinforce the teacher as the font of knowledge without acknowledging in any way that the inmate student contributes to the learning equation when considered other than as a sponge. The belief that the teacher must impart knowledge to the student reflects the wider issues of trust and power within the classroom. Rogers (2002: 32), in underlining the link between distrust and the mug and jug method of teaching notes that, “If I distrust the human being, then I *must* cram her with information of my own choosing lest she go her own mistaken way”. The teachers within the prison context distrust the inmate on more than one level. They distrust the inmate because he/she is incarcerated, which means he/she has already broken society’s norms; they distrust the inmate because they are his/her keepers entrusted with preventing the inmate from escaping; they distrust the inmates’ ability to learn; and they distrust the inmates’ ability to contribute positively from their life experiences to the learning process. The teacher holds the power in the classroom, which, until devolved in favour of a more egalitarian space, makes it difficult, if not impossible, to move beyond the jug and mug method towards something more in tune with approaches to adult education.

The issues of trust and power are particularly relevant to the prison context, permeated as it is by feelings of distrust and divisions, of the ‘them’ and ‘us’. The most notable division in
any prison is between the warders and the inmates. The prison culture creates power-driven divisions with warders/guards on one side and prisoners on the other (see Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion on prison culture). The issues of power and trust and divisions of "them" and "us" are a part of the reality of the prison classroom. The power relations and the level of trust between teacher and student varied across the three teacher groups. Among the inmate teachers and inmate students, there seemed to have developed a bond and a certain level of trust perhaps due to their common status within the prison context. They tended to see each other as equals and within the classroom setting, I found that teachers were much more amenable to facilitate learning through discussions and the use of life experiences. At Jackfruit Prison, an inmate teacher explained the teaching method he employs:

*I use discussion, chalk work and their life experiences to discuss issues and try to tie it in to the lesson.*

In observing the classrooms of inmate teachers one had a feeling of a more relaxed atmosphere, camaraderie, the notion of shared ideas, and a flow of information between inmate and teacher. Among the civilian teachers, a certain level of trust also existed. Students were often willing to share problems experienced within the prison context with civilian teachers, more so than with warder teachers. The power dynamics were different with civilian teachers. The civilian teachers maintained a certain distance between themselves and the inmates. One teacher explained that

*In the correctional schools especially a civilian can be pressured to do undesirable things by inmates [however] where inmates are concerned [I try to be] fair and just.*
Although a professional distance between the inmate student and the civilian teacher was maintained within the classroom setting, I observed that civilian teachers still attempted to create an atmosphere within the classroom that allowed for the flow of information both backwards and forward from teacher and student. The groups for which power relations and issues of trust were most tense was those of students and warder teachers. The warder teachers fulfil dual roles within the prison context, where they are at once guards/jailers and teachers. The issue of trust (or lack of trust) was greatest among inmate students and warder teachers. Some warder teachers when interviewed said that they viewed the adults they taught as inmates, not as individuals. Some of the warder teachers viewed the students as untrustworthy, whilst students, for their part, voiced distrust of warder teachers not to exact revenge later for challenges to their authority within the classroom setting. According to one inmate student:

you have to be careful what you say because is a different story when night come and you in your cell.

When observing some warder teachers’ classes the atmosphere was quite tense. When asked questions, inmates would only answer if called specifically by name. Some warder teachers found it difficult to disengage with the warder aspect of their job, which made a difference to the classroom atmosphere, especially in how students related to the teacher. In the example noted previously, where the warder teacher incorrectly wrote ‘does’ instead of ‘do’ on the board, some of the inmate students in the class recognised that it was wrong and whispered among themselves, but no one openly challenged/corrected the teacher. In an interview with an inmate, the inmate expressed the view that prison education was “token education” and expressed dissatisfaction with several aspects of the prison school. The warder teacher who was present at the interview tried to get the inmate to change
what he had said “That’s not true. We have good education here. Why you tell the lady that?” The inmate would not retract the statement and the warder teacher was visibly angry. In another observation, a warder teacher expressed displeasure at having to rely on an inmate student’s assistance. Presently, there are several native Spanish speakers within the inmate population. This presented a communication problem between a warder teacher and an inmate student who spoke only Spanish. One of the inmates in the class spoke Spanish and offered to translate:

\[\text{Me can talk Spanish miss I will tell him what you want him to do.}\]

The warder teacher was, however, extremely reluctant to allow the inmate to interpret. The warder teacher explained later that she did not feel it was “right” for an inmate to be translating for her because she was not sure that she could trust the inmate:

\[\text{Him [the inmate] can tell him [other inmate] anything at all dat is not what me say to tell him. I don’t like that. I don’t trust them.}\]

In defence of the warder teacher, she may not have felt it appropriate to develop a relationship with the inmate where they were equals. However, this merely serves to highlight once more the problems inherent in combining the role of educator with that of jailer. In a prison, security will always take precedence over education, and therefore a warder teacher is likely to be a warder first and a teacher second.

Conclusion

The first section of this chapter mapped the issues pertaining to the training of the adult educator, professionalism within the field and the types of training available within the field particularly in the Caribbean and Jamaican context. Although there are training provisions
in place at the regional and national level, some prison educators still remain untrained in adult education methods. Section two focused on the training available to prison educators within the Jamaican context and the roles which they were expected to fill. Training provision for educators within the prison context is in the form of JAMAL training; however, the training available is insufficient and not available to all categories of teachers. The level of training that teachers have access to directly affects the methods that they employ. Because the training mechanisms are weak, teachers revert to the methods of teaching that they are most familiar with, which is their own experiences of education at the primary and secondary level. Section three examines the debate as to whether ABE is adequate or whether there is justification for the use of PSE in prisons. In addressing the issue of basic learning needs Niles and Bernard (2002: 12) note that “Basic learning needs, as stipulated by the EFA programme, are essential for the rehabilitation and re-socialisation of offenders, in the specific context of prison education”. Having noted the importance of basic adult education one cannot then ignore the issue of what should happen next. Presently, concepts such as lifelong learning, continuing education and learning for life are pivotal. The world is moving in a direction where the need for continued learning and the upgrading of skills is a necessity. There can be no denying the importance of adult basic education, but the reality in prisons is the need to prepare inmates for the next phase of education. The use of the ‘jug and mug’ method was identified and examined in terms of the way it conflicts with adult education ideals: how the level of training given is related to the application of this method; the implications it has in terms of being a barrier to learning; and how it reflects issues of power and trust within the prison classroom and the wider prison context.
CHAPTER 6

REASONING, RASTAFARI AND FREIRE

Introduction

This chapter will explore the second of two pedagogic approaches identified during the process of conducting this research. This pedagogic practice is in stark contrast to the 'jug and mug' method discussed in the previous chapter, in that it is prisoner-led and has a far greater liberatory potential. The Rastafarian ritual of reasoning influences this pedagogic approach, so that, consequently, I have termed it the 'reasoning method'. The first section of this chapter will give a brief overview of relevant prison pedagogies and Freirean philosophy, with a view to placing the reasoning method within the academic literature. The second section will explore the development of the Rastafarian movement, and in particular, the ritual of reasoning. The concepts underpinning the Rastafarian ritual of reasoning will then be compared and contrasted with Freirean philosophy. The third section will examine the use of the reasoning method; looking at issues that arise from the training of inmate teachers, exploring issues produced by the change in inmate consciousness, such as critical thinking and acting as change agents, and issues of power and the politicalization of prison education.

There are several theoretic models for the conceptualisation and delivery of prison education. In Chapter 1, the exploration of these theoretic models identified three types; the 'fix it' models; the punitive models; and the liberatory models. The reasoning method is
incompatible with the first two groups, firstly because it abjures the idea of the inmate as someone/thing to be ‘fixed’, and secondly because it is not punitive. It does however bear similarities with the third group, which contains liberatory models such as, the European, democratic, creative and participatory (Paulo Freire) models. According to Evans-Hall (2006: 49), the similarities between the reasoning method and the liberatory models include:

- A liberatory approach to education; envisaging the inmate as a person and not just a criminal; valuing the input of the inmate; building on life experiences of the inmate; a communal learning process; and teaching methods that are flexible using what works best.

As previously discussed in Chapter 1, adult education is often associated with certain types of pedagogies, be they feminist, radical or critical, and these pedagogies are themselves influenced by the writing of critical theorists. The reasoning model also has similarities with critical pedagogy and to the work of critical theorists such as Freire (see Chapter 1 for a detailed examination of Freire’s pedagogy). Freire’s work concentrates on the education of the marginalised, whilst the Rastafarian movement was born out of the struggles of the marginalised. Freire’s work is therefore illuminating for this pedagogic practice.

Rastafari, Reasoning and Freire

This section will examine the origins and growth of the Rastafari movement and will explicate the ritual of reasoning. It will also compare and contrast the Rastafarian concept of reasoning with Freirean philosophy.
Rastafari began in Jamaica in the 1930s and originated as a response to a context of poverty and economic oppression (Donlin, 2001; Edmonds, 2003; Erskine, 2005). Rastafari has been defined by some as a religious movement (Donlin, 2001), while others define it as a political movement (Pollard, 1982). For the purpose of this chapter, I use the definition of Wallace (1956: 265), who defines Rastafari as a revitalization movement, meaning that the movement is a “deliberate organized, conscious effort by members of society to construct a more satisfying culture”. Rastafari, thus, is a “conscious attempt to deal with the historical experience of colonialism and its contemporary legacies” (Edmonds, 2003: 41). Rastafari is multifaceted and operates on several levels. Some view it as inextricably linked to protest, resistance and struggles for liberation, equality and justice (Barrett, 1997; Donlin, 2001; Hansing, 2001), although others argue over its status, whether religious or political. Nevertheless, the common thread running through all definitions of Rastafari is the element of protest (Donlin, 2001; Pollard, 1982).

During the early years of the movement, Rastafari was not widely accepted by the Jamaican population. However, with the passing of time, the movement has gained popularity, both locally and internationally. Within the Jamaican context, Rastafari has moved, from an existence on the fringes of Jamaican society where it was considered little more than a cult, to becoming “an integral and vital component of the popular culture” (Edmonds, 2003: 137). Reggae music and in particular the contribution of Bob Marley has increased awareness, interest and acceptance of the movement. At the international level Rastafari is now considered:

one of the leading Afro-Caribbean religions [and] one of the most popular cultural trends in the world...Rastafari communities can be found throughout the Caribbean, in parts of central America and Brazil, North
Several aspects of Rastafari permeate Jamaican culture: dreadlocks, ital cooking, reggae music, dread talk, reasoning, ganja smoking and the concept of Babylon, all derive from Rastafarian culture, having made the transition from fringe to mainstream, so that they have become widely accepted as vital components for self-understanding within the wider Jamaican society. Prisons have not remained immune to the spread of Rastafari culture, which has been the prime mover in facilitating the development of the Reasoning Method. Before explaining the mechanics behind the Reasoning Method in the prison context, I will look briefly at the Rastafari understanding of reasoning.

Reasoning may be defined as, “an open-ended dialogic discourse between two or more brethren, which is aimed at the exploration of intersubjectivity” (Edmond, 2003: 75). The dialogic process may be described as a process of “questioning, doubting, reexamining assumptions, clarifying meanings and so forth that joins partners in a teaching-learning relation in which, together they can unlearn the falsehoods that they may be burdened with and reconstruct a truer, fuller understanding of their worlds” (Burbles, 2000: 393). Burbles (2000) suggests four distinct forms of dialogue. Firstly, there is dialogue as conversation, which is “an inclusive and divergent process of exploring interpersonal understanding” (Burbles, 2000: 394). Secondly, there is dialogue as inquiry, which is “an inclusive and convergent process of co-investigating a problem in order to find an answer, solution, or compromise” (Burbles, 2000: 394). Thirdly, there is dialogue as instruction, that is, “a critical and convergent process of drawing one or more participants, through a
sequence of leading questions, to a conclusion that another participant (teacher) already has in mind" (Burbles, 2000: 394). Finally, there is dialogue as debate, "a critical and divergent process in which agreement is not an expected aim but in which the vigorous confrontation of alternative views is thought to inform all participants" (Burbles, 2000: 394). Although there are different types of dialogue, the use of one does not preclude the incorporation of the others in a learning context. Dialogue as it pertains to Rastafarian reasoning incorporates dialogue as conversation, inquiry and debate. Reasoning is often a part the worship grounded in the Rastafari religion. However, Rastafari also uses reasoning as a means of uncovering the trickery of Babylon. According to Erskine (2005: 50) "There is a dimension of wisdom present in reasoning that transcends reasoning about Jah or the mysteries of Jah". Reasoning sessions are often several hours long and very intense. There are also rules for the reasoning sessions, which include disbarring women participants, as well as the insistence that all participants respect the views of the others (Barrett, 1997; Erskine, 2005). Reasoning sessions may be closed or open (meaning that some sessions are only open to Rastafari while others are open to outsiders). Rastafari is associated with raising consciousness. The manner in which Rastafari deconstruct their reality and the social issues they face through the reasoning process, is in a counter discourse to the 'official' discourse. Rastafari subscribe to the concept of the 'head creator'. "This term refers to the idea that everyone has a mind of their own with which they can achieve anything if only they use it. It is a self-empowering concept that encourages individual, critical thinking and choice" (Hansing, 2001: 740). Rastafari believe that reasoning is a gift from Jah and that Rastafari have wisdom, which is a 'reason shaped by revelation' (Erskine, 2005: 50) that other persons lack. It is this
Rastafarian concept of reasoning, this looking beyond the obvious, which influences the Reasoning Method.

Comparing Freire and Rastafari

Both the review of literature on Freire and Rastafari, as well as my observations within the context of prison classrooms, prompt me to suggest that there are strong similarities between the concept of reasoning and the manifestation of the reasoning method and Freire’s approach to education and the concept of conscientization. However, it must be emphasized here, that the connection being proffered is a theoretical one. Neither the teachers nor students interviewed had ever heard of Freire, nor read his work. The reasoning method that they employed was born out of a desire to rise above the prison reality and make positive changes in their lives. It was also born out of the prisoners’ need to critically engage with authority figures and challenge the status quo in a legitimate way. The following section elucidates the connections between Freire, Rastafari and the approach to teaching embodied in the Reasoning Method.

One similarity between Freire’s philosophy and Rastafari is that they both arose as a response to oppression, poverty and social inequalities. Freire observed and experienced poverty first hand in Brazil, whilst the Rastafari movement took hold amongst persons who fell within the disenfranchised black underclass in Jamaica. Prisoners are generally considered as a marginalised group and the prisoner-students at Ras I prison can be considered more so, because for some time they were deprived of a civilian teacher who might take charge and run the school. Out of this situation, a group of inmate teachers
decided that their primary task was to educate those around them in a way that was humanistic and that produced socially and politically aware inmates.

Another similarity is that both Freire and Rastafari believe every individual to be capable of thinking critically. Freire speaks of varying levels of transitive thought and conscientization, while Rastafari use the concept of the head creator. In Ras I prison, and to a lesser extent in Jackfruit prison, the aim of the inmate teachers was to raise the level of consciousness among the inmates. This concept of raised consciousness achieved through reasoning and dialogue is common to both Rastafari and Freire.

Both Freire and Rastafari value the learner's prior knowledge and life experience in the learning process. This is evident in Freire's insistence that teacher's get to know their students and understand the context from which they are coming, as well as in the use of generative themes and talking circles. For Rastafari reasoning, sessions are a forum for sharing knowledge and deepening understanding: formal learning is not a prerequisite and life knowledge is much more highly valued.

Freire and Rastafari both promote an approach to learning which is dialogic and dialectical in nature. Freire stresses the importance of dialogue throughout his work and the Rastafari concept of reasoning develops through dialogue between brethren. In both cases, dialogue is valued as a means of stripping away the inessential, thus arriving at a better comprehension of the reality of the situation. In Ras I prison, dialogue is a daily part of the teaching process, helping inmates understand the intricacies and political nature of their immediate context and those of society generally.
It is evident that both Freire’s philosophy and the Reasoning Method promote education as a means for life-enhancing change. In fact, Freire (1996: 11) argues that:

> those who in learning to read and write, come to a new awareness of selfhood and begin to look critically at the social situation in which they find themselves, often take the initiative in acting to transform the society that has denied them the opportunity of participation.

The discussions that occurred within the classroom of Ras I prison (and, to a lesser extent, the classroom of Jackfruit prison), challenged inmates to reflect on how they might impact upon their prison situation and effect positive change for themselves and their fellow inmates (examples of inmates taking action to effect change will be examined later in this chapter). In addition, inmates were asked to envisage how, once released, they would not only avoid returning to prison, but might positively affect their immediate communities and the wider society.

Finally, Freire, Rastafari, and all those within the prison setting involved with the reasoning method, recognise the importance of language and the power of words. Purcell-Gates and Waterman (2000: 6) note that:

> often, the language spoken by marginalized groups is a completely different one from that spoken by the sociopolitical group in power – or of the language of instruction...or a dialect perceived by those in power as critically different, and as a marker of their low socio-economic status.

In acknowledgement of the power of words and language, Rastafari developed dread talk as a means of rebelling against the language and actuality of Babylon through deconstruction and critique (this will be discussed in more detail in the following section). Freire, on the other hand, imbued power to the language of the peasants by legitimizing it
in the classroom setting. For Freire learning proceeds from generative themes and words, which derive directly from the language and experiences of the peasants’ everydayness. During my visits I observed that in all the prisons there were words, phrases and rituals that were specific to the prison setting. With regard to total institutions Goffman (1961: 53) proffers the notion of “institutional lingo”. He maintains that “an ‘institutional lingo’ develops through which inmates describe the events that are crucial in their particular world” (Goffman, 1961: 53). So for example in one of the male prisons, when a prisoner entered the bathroom and wanted to know if any of the toilets were free, he would stand at the door and call “bike” and if the stalls were occupied then the other prisoner(s) would in turn call back “rider”. The layperson, hearing ‘bike rider’, might wonder what it meant, since inmates are not allowed to possess motorbikes on the compound. In most cases, as indeed that instanced here, language was mostly superficial, existing as slang, or a passing fad. However, in Ras I prison the language was more militant and utilised as a critique of prison officials and politicians. The language being used in Ras I prison was more in line with the dread talk previously mentioned (this prison talk will be examined in more detail later in the chapter).

Reasoning method

I first encountered the reasoning method on a field visit to Ras I prison in 2003. At the time of my visit, classes had yet to resume and therefore the evidence for the reasoning method came from interviews conducted with teachers and their accounts of what
transpires in their classrooms. The school at Ras I prison is similar to the other prison schools, in that the school was divided into four levels. There was a head teacher and individual class teachers. The most notable difference from other prisons was that inmate teachers predominantly staffed Ras I prison. There was a warder teacher in charge of the running of the school, who ordered supplies and ensured that the day-to-day operations of the school proceeded smoothly. However, he undertook no teaching. He deferred the role of head teacher to Ras Conscious, an inmate teacher. There were warder teachers involved with the school, but they indicated when interviewed that they filled in where necessary and taught Bible study. In describing his role in the school, one warder teacher indicated that:

I am employed here as a warder, but I help to teach as well...I help mainly with Bible study and wherever else I am needed.

Following an explanation of the teaching methods used in their classrooms, I was taken to the school to see the setting first hand. The classroom was fairly standard in its layout, in that there was a black board to the front of the room and the students’ desks were facing the blackboard with a chair for the teacher to the front (see figure 3.1 in Appendix B). However, as the interview progressed it became clear that they were not describing the ‘jug and mug’ method. The interview process itself was different at Ras I prison to the other prisons, in that reasoning became a part of the process. Although I began conducting the interviews individually, when I began to interview Ras Conscious, the format changed. After speaking with me for a few minutes and determining that I was not a threat, Ras Conscious invited a few more inmate teachers to contribute to the interview.

---

20 It was intended that further visits be made to Ras I prison in order to observe classes, however due to rioting and other security breaches, the DCSJ deemed that it was unsafe to continue research in that prison.
In the end, approximately six of the inmate teachers formed a group and shared their views on education with me, explaining the methods that they employed. The difference was not only in the fact that the interview became a group interview, but also that the interviewer/interviewee dynamics were different, fluid. The format, of my asking questions and the inmate teachers responding, evaporated. For each topic that arose, I faced lengthy questions concerning my own beliefs as they sought to test my level of awareness. The following is an excerpt from field notes, demonstrating how group discussion was authorised by Ras Conscious and how, during the interview, my opinions were constantly sought out:

**Ras Conscious**: You work with officialdom? Me see you come in here with them.

**K**: No I'm a student doing some research

**Ras Conscious**: You have ID?

(I presented my Warwick ID to him)

**Ras Conscious**: Ok, gwaan den. What you want to know?

**K**: What subjects do you teach?

**Ras Conscious**: English, History and IT
K: What are your views on prison education?

Ras Conscious: On the one hand it is good. It helps inmates to prepare for the outside world. We go to GCE and get 100% pass in History and English. 2 students took history and 7 took English. The passes were A, B and C. But there is a bad side as well. There are no materials-school cyaan open. We need books, pens and pencils. We have enough qualified teachers but we need more classroom space, we need at least one more building that can house about 100 pupils.

(At this point in the interview two more teachers turn up to the interview room. They do not acknowledge me; instead they ask Ras Conscious using sign language and another language, which it seems they have made up, whether or not it is ok to join in).

Ras Conscious: Yeah man is a schoolers, she all right, she not with officiaaldom.

(Two more teachers join the group, which is now in the shape of a circle and shortly there are six teachers sitting with me in a circle talking about prisons, prison education and teaching in prisons).

K: What problems do you experience?
Cello: The situation is demotivating, there is no privilege ... we're not paid for work.

Harp: Teammates [this is a reference to inmates] should be paid for the work\textsuperscript{21} they do inside prison.

Guitar: What do you think about paying teammates?

K: I believe that it’s something that ought to happen. Even if it’s minimum wage something should be paid. It’s exploitative to use prisoners to work in the prisons without any form of compensation.

Ras Conscious: Is hypocrisy ... you understand the hypocrisy of what officialdom is doing...they preach rehabilitation and yet there is nothing in place to teach simple work ethics...there are no incentives, no differentiation between those who are not trying to change and those who are. You understand? You believe that the department do all that them say? They say it, they write it but when you come into prison it’s not here.

K: Yes there is a gap between what is said or written and what is actually happening here.

\textsuperscript{21} Work in this context refers to jobs that the prisoners perform around the prison. Such as mechanical work on the officers’ cars, washing and detailing officers’ cars and acting as an orderly (which involves running various errands around the prison compound, such as distributing mail to inmates and officers).
Ras Conscious: Your eyes open man, dem nuh fool you.

The teachers from the above interview described their teaching method. From their descriptions, it appears that the reasoning sessions were interwoven with more traditional teaching methods. They used textbooks, flash cards, letter and number recognition and board work. In describing their teaching method, the following statements were made:

We read, then we discuss and then we reason

I teach those who are illiterate. They have difficulty recognising letters and numbers ... their speech may be outstanding but they can’t read. So I begin with an introduction [ice breaker], then flash cards, letter and number recognition, and then we relate life to what we are learning...they share their experiences...then we reason

I teach maths. I use the textbook, then we practice, then we go into smaller groups and ‘each one teach one’. Then we talk and reason out what they don’t understand or how it might apply outside.

The teachers ‘Jamaicanised’ their tools. Examples and exercises from textbooks were rewritten, or substituted with material that facilitated easier access within the Jamaican context. The flash cards, for example, were made by the inmate teachers and carried images that were easily recognisable. The flash card for the letter ‘H’, for example, might have had something like a handcart drawn on it. The teachers expressed the important role of education and the reasoning process for inmates:
**Education helps to prepare inmates for the outside world.**

In order for rehab to work people have to be educated. If they are not educated it is impossible to be rehabilitated. Education teaches to reason and logic.

For the teachers at Ras I prison, reasoning is the starting point regardless of your academic level. For them, education teaches inmates to reason, whilst, conversely, one must be able to reason in order to take full advantage of education. Ras Conscious spoke of the need for prisoners to experience a change in reasoning/thinking if the cycle of prison is to be broken. He used the following analogy:

*Let me tell you what wrong with the prison situation. When a man come in and go out the same way. A man come in fi tief mango and him come een and yu say to him, bwoy, it nuh mek sense tief mango. And him say all right. Him serve him sentence and two twos yu see him come back fi tief banana. Him seh yu never tell him nuh fi tief banana yu seh nuh fi tief mango...di man never learn fi reason. An if prisoners come in and go out and don’t learn to reason dem will always come back and keep coming back.*

Reasoning enables the inmates to become aware of the hidden agenda and empowers them to take charge of their potential and destiny. Therefore, when inmates attempt to persuade other inmates to go to school, this is not just about learning to read and write, but about showing them how education allows them to become empowered and take charge of their situations. It is about awakening their awareness of themselves and their place in society and the world. It is about opening the mind to perceptions that are both macro and micro. According to the teachers, reasoning about their context and society at large is a part of the daily educational regime:

*We include reasoning in our classes everyday...the man dem have to be prepared to go out into society and function, dem have to understand the double standard and di politics and know how to deal with it in a non violent way.*
The reasoning method was also observed at Jackfruit prison. Here, though, the reasoning method was not an established classroom practice, but occurred, rather, in informal groups either just before class or just after class. As we have previously seen, the 'jug and mug' method was the one that predominated at Jackfruit prison and within the classroom there was not always a space for the inmate to be heard. However, it was not unusual during field visits to observe groups of inmates reasoning together, on subjects as diverse as something heard on the radio, to what had happened in class. On occasion, the inmates invited a civilian or warder teacher or chaplain that they trusted to join in the reasoning session with them. For example, I observed a group of inmates sitting together before classes had begun...they called out to the chaplain

*Rev come reason wid we nuh.*

The session covered several topics, ranging from people's religious and moral convictions to the roles of persons with authority in society (such as police, ministers of religion and politicians) and then came round to how they, as ex-inmates, might be able to impact certain situations once they returned to society.

*When I go back I want to be a better example to my yute. Me nuh want him inna di gun and drugs. We poor but we can come out of it [poverty]. Me never have the opportunity fi go school. Me want to make sure my yute take him books...cause yu haffi have learnin and can understand di politics out dere in order fi survive and make someting out a yuself. Me a go school in here me ago show my yute say me can change, me want him proud a me.*

This inmate was drawing on a dominant portrayal of education, as the promise of meritocratic success, which, he considered, offered a more appropriate route for his child.
By 2004 when I conducted my final visits, reasoning was beginning to make the leap into the formal classroom setting. The catalyst for this change was the transfer of Ras Conscious from Ras I prison to Jackfruit prison. The atmosphere at Ras I prison had become tense. From an interview with a DCSJ employee, I learnt that a group of troublemakers had started a hunger strike and were attacking prisoners who did not wish to join in. As a result, some the prisoners had been relocated to other correctional facilities. The so-called ‘troublemakers’ were students and teachers of the school, who through reasoning had become more conscious of the oppressive conditions in which they were imprisoned, and more importantly, who recognised the power they had and how they might use it for positive change. When I began the last set of field visits at Jackfruit prison and saw Ras Conscious there, I realised that he was one of the persons who had been transferred. The following is Ras Conscious’s account of what happened:

Things at Ras I [prison] got bad especially in terms of sanitation. So we [inmate teachers and students] decided to write a letter asking that our concerns be addressed...yu know toilets nah work, showers nah work, probation system not right and other things....and we tell them in the letter we would go on hunger strike if dem [prison officials] don't deal with the problems. We send di letter to the commissioner [of corrections], di minister [of security], di superintendent [of Ras I prison] and some others. Dem never deal wid di problems, so we went on hunger strike. The warders broke up the hunger strike and say that we from the school were troublemakers. Dem come for me late in the night...the yard full of armed officers...like dem tink say me a Aristide an [is] a coup...so many guns for one man. I was in solitary for one hundred and ten (110) days then they call me in and let me know that if I promise not to cause any more trouble and lay low they will let me out on parole next year summer. They didn’t like us at the school ... too political...too outspoken...so me a keep a low profile.

A consideration of power relations within the prison setting may well lead to the conclusion that the prison authorities and the guards hold the power. However, in this case the prisoners realised they also had power and they attempted to use it (power relations in the
prison classroom and wider prison context will be discussed more fully later in this section). In attempting to quell the situation, the DCSJ disbanded the inmate teachers and inmate students that they perceived to be problematic. In attempting to defuse the situation at Ras I prison, they may well have encouraged Jackfruit prison to develop the very type of thinking/reasoning and political consciousness that they were trying to eradicate. Ras Conscious was asked to help with the CXC/GCE class and immediately began to introduce reasoning into the classroom context. In the CXC/GCE classroom, the following scenario unfolded. There were approximately eight inmates in the class, they all had books and they were learning a new concept in accounts. An inmate teacher was explaining an idea from the text, using an example from the book, which he drew on the board. He seemed to be very competent in his knowledge of the subject, but not so well equipped to impart it. He began by reading the definition of the concept from the book and moved to drawing the example provided in the book on the board. He spoke and moved quickly. On occasion he would say:

"You understand?"

Some inmates looked confused, others looked as if they did understand but at that point no one admitted to not understanding. Then I began to observe a shift in the classroom dynamics. From the back of the room, Ras Conscious challenged the teacher:

_Yu nuh si di m an dem nah andastan ... look inna dem face man._

At this point, some of the students confessed to not understanding the previous illustration. So the inmate teacher began again. However, he merely repeated what he had said before. So Ras Conscious chimed in from the back and said:

_let wi use a example_
and he began discussing and relating the topic to ‘real life’. He used the concept of running a shop and ordering goods and the process of stock taking at the end of a month.

Then the students began to join in the discussion and other topics such as the legality of ‘no return’ policies and looking at the role of FINSAC (Financial Sector Adjustment Company) in providing aid to failing financial institutions. This led to discussions on the collapse of financial institutions and what it meant for ‘poor people’ and whether or not they felt the government had dealt with it ‘right’.

Ras Conscious was in the position of being able compare the schools in Ras I and Jackfruit prisons, having experienced incarceration and been involved in teaching in both institutions. He had this to say:

> At Ras I people were motivated to go to school; they asked more questions in class and were more inclined to practise outside of class time. At Ras I they knew the value of learning and they were hungry for knowledge. They knew that education was the way to advancement, whereas at Jackfruit, school is more of an escape from lock up and warders than anything else. The missing ingredient at Jackfruit is a lack of change of consciousness. It is a must that the inmates begin with a change of mind. So I am here [Jackfruit] trying to reason with them to bring about the required change.

Through our examination of the reasoning method, several issues have been raised; teacher training, the issue of consciousness raising, the question of ‘how much’ education inmates should have and the issue of power and the inmates’ ability to subvert authority within the prison setting.
In terms of the training, none of the inmate teachers at Jackfruit or Ras I prison had received JAMAL training, or any other training in adult education methods. The inmate teachers in both Ras I and Jackfruit prison, experience the same problem of lack of training faced by other adult educators. In the case of Ras I prison, the inmate teachers were in possession of at least a Bachelors degree, and three inmate teachers held Masters degrees. Two of the inmate teachers had been lecturers at university and one other had been a trainer in the army. At Ras I prison, the head teacher and the other teachers worked together to decide on the syllabus and the approach to teaching, however each teacher had relative autonomy with regard to the actual teaching process. All the teachers subscribed to the core value of reasoning and then incorporated it in each subject taught. Within the CXC/GCE class at Jackfruit prison, teaching tended to occur in small groups in the form of peer teaching or self-teaching. The civilian teacher at Jackfruit prison was not qualified to teach at that level and so the inmates who were interested in taking examinations at this level taught themselves. Peer teaching describes a situation where an inmate who had already passed a particular subject, for example English, would attempt to teach English to the others in the group who had not passed that subject and were interested in doing so. Self-teaching refers to situations in which no one in the group had taken a subject. In such cases, they wrote to their relatives asking for books and tried to teach themselves.

A central theme of the reasoning method is the raising of one's consciousness. Ras Conscious uses the term "change of consciousness". This change of consciousness refers to a critical engagement with one's reality, which for the prisoner is the immediate context
of the prison but also the society to which he/she will return. One example of the inmates' critical engagement with their reality is evidenced in their assessment of the rehabilitation program. Through the process of reasoning, they were able to see the mismatch between the proffered goal of rehabilitation and their own experiences within the system. So negative were their conclusions that in their minds the DCSJ took on the form of Babylon.

For Rastafari, Babylon is a state of disempowerment, effected by various persons, organizations and governments. It is:

- a term of varying levels of concreteness and specificity: historically, the predecessors of the Romans and the entire white European colonial world; presently, the entire post-colonial western power structure and its supporting ideology and political apparatus; the oppressive condition of "exile" in the black diaspora; the cosmic domain presided over by the pope of Rome and his Anglo-European political cohorts; the source of death-dealing and destructive spiritual power (Homiak, 1985: 510).

Babylon affects people politically, economically, socially, spiritually and mentally. Babylon is the nemesis of Rastafari and they work to see its demise – chanting down Babylon. Education is one of the tools used by Babylon to 'miseducate' the masses, hiding from the black man "the realization of his own gifts and capacities" (Cashmore, 1983: 130). "The Rastafarian understanding of 'Babylonian' education can be linked to the concept of deschooling developed by Illich" (Evans-Hall, 2006: 51). "Illich argued that education's top-down management style ... was robbing students of their creativity and personal decision-making abilities" (Leonard, 2002: 50). In analysing the rehabilitation program and the DCSJ's implementation and support of these programs the following comments were made by inmates and inmate teachers:

*There is hypocrisy about rehabilitation...they run with the achievements but they don't highlight the problems*
This quote refers to what the inmates see as insufficient work on the part of the DCSJ. They point to the fact that there is a lot of talk about rehabilitation but not enough work and money directed towards the development of rehabilitation programs. It also speaks to the fact that the inmates feel that the DCSJ takes credit for achievements made by the inmates (such as their CXC/GCE passes), despite their failure to put an infrastructure in place that would provide adequate support for these programs:

*People throw the word rehab around because it sounds good...there is no tribalism in prison*

This highlights prisoners’ perceptions of the lip service paid to rehabilitation. The reference to ‘tribalism in prison’ is a reference to political affiliations and speaks of the fact that prisoners feel largely ignored in prison because of their lack of power, particularly a right to vote. The following quote again highlights this sceptical view of prisoners as people who believe that they do not even figure on the government agenda because of their status as outcasts. Not that this prisoner pleads for any special financial consideration, all he suggests is an efficient solution that may also encourage self-esteem:

*We don’t expect the government to spend on rehabilitation; people won’t take kindly to it so make the prisons self sufficient. This isn’t done…officialdom talks about logistics*

Again, another quote voices an inmates’ dissatisfaction with the rehabilitation strategy as it stands and here, the play on the word strategy underlines the consequences of a lack of commitment for all inmates:

*Rehabilitation strategy is a rehabilitation tragedy*
Finally, we consider a criticism of some of the changes made by DCSJ. A change of appellation, from prisons to adult correctional institutions/facilities and for the prisoners likewise, a change in how they are addressed is insufficient as it fails to tackle the problem of the mindset, of both the warder and the prisoner:

*Officialdom changed the name [from] penitentiary to correctional facility and expect the mindset to change. That doesn’t work ... it cannot.*

The ‘prison talk’ which is instantiated in the use of the word ‘officialdom’ and the phrase ‘rehabilitation tragedy’ is similar to, but not as radical as, the Rastafari concept of dread talk. Dread talk is one of the ways that Rastafari rejects society and the language of Babylon. For Rastafari words have power. Rastafari seeks to unmask Babylon’s language by deconstructing certain words. For example, the word ‘education’ becomes ‘head-decay-shun’ which reflects Rasta’s perceptions of how Babylon’s education destroys the black man. Another example can be seen in the word ‘participate’ which in dread talk becomes ‘fullticipate’. “Participate signifies less than full commitment to the specific venture at hand” (Edwards, 2003: 63) hence the change to fullticipate.

The raised consciousness of the inmates led them to be more politically aware and proactive about affecting their prison reality. As was stated earlier, the inmates had critically assessed their situation and found that it was less than satisfactory. However, they were not merely observers in their critique of ‘officialdom’, they took measures to try and correct their situation. Their movement became one aimed at instigating change. At the time of my visit to Ras I prison the inmates had sent a letter to the Commissioner of
the DCSJ requesting a meeting to discuss issues and recommendations for change. Items on their agenda included concerns over prisoner treaty transfer, training, the daily operation of the school, classification, the housing of inmates and parole. In May 2003, they also organised a forum between the inmates, members of the DCSJ, lecturers from the University of the West Indies (Mona Campus) and government officials. The purpose of the forum was to provide inmates with an opportunity to engage in discussions and share their ideas and concerns as it related to the imminent reform of Jamaica’s penal and justice system. Topics on the agenda included “Crime and Violence in Jamaica: the root causes”, “Jamaica’s System of Justice: the deficiencies in our system” and “The Penal System: Incarceration creating better citizens of Jamaica’s convicted” (see Appendix F for a report produced by the inmates pertaining to the forum that was held). At Jackfruit prison, the inmates were not as formal in their efforts to effect change in their situation but they did take steps to take their grievances to the appropriate persons in order to effect change in their situation. The following is an exchange I witnessed while on a field visit to Jackfruit prison. I observed inmates from the CXC/GCE class asking permission to address the Educational Coordinator who was making a visit to the school:

**Inmate 1**: Mr. F we can get permission fi talk to Mr. Yellow? (Mr. Yellow was the educational coordinator)

**Mr. F**: Yes go ahead

(A group of about 4 inmates approach Mr. Yellow)

**Inmates 1-4**: Morning Mr. Yellow
Mr. Yellow: Good Morning gentlemen

Inmate 2: Bwoy we want to talk to you bout the school

Inmate 3: Nuff changes a happen still and we want you know say we thank you fi di tings whe you promise from the last time we talk.

Inmate 4: We get the desk dem and the blackboard put up but we still need more text books and exercise books and pencil and ting.

Inmate 1: Exam a come up and we need fi get di things in time.

Mr. Yellow: I am glad you got some of the things. I am trying my best but there is a lot of paperwork involved. I'm not making any promises but I'll try to have the supplies you need to you within the next two weeks.

Inmate 2: Something wrong wid the system...too much paper paper. We in the school know what me need so why can't we write out what we need and get Mr. F to sign it and take it from there...why it have to go through so much hand and then it jus a slow up the process.

Mr. Yellow: Red tape ...that's how it goes in a government department. I will try my best to get these things sorted quickly. If there are more hold-ups then you let me know. You can send a message or a letter with the chaplain to head office. He will get it to me.

In the preceding exchange the inmates acknowledged changes that had been made based on prior requests and then moved the discussion towards things that they were still dissatisfied about and made suggestions about how the red tape surrounding the ordering of school supplies could be lessened by the DCSJ. The inmates in both Ras I Prison and
Chapter 6

Reasoning, Rastafari and Freire

Jackfruit Prison continually sought practical ways to open channels for dialogue with those who have the power to affect their reality.

The level of critical awareness and the proactive nature of the prisoners is in part instigated by the issues of how much education and what type of education inmates are entitled to. In the previous chapter, I examined the debate about whether or not prison education should extend beyond ABE. The type of education available is linked to desired outcomes. What type of prisoners do we want? Prisoners who are literate and numerate and able to contribute to society without upsetting the status quo... or prisoners who move beyond basic literacy to become more critically aware in terms of their rights and their ability to change and challenge the status quo? ABE does not necessarily preclude critical thinking, as is evidenced through Freire's approach. However, ABE is often taught in a way (jug and mug) that does not encourage the inmate to become critically aware. Prisons are filled with the poor and uneducated. ABE and the vocational skills taught to prisoners often prepare them for a function in society that causes them to be likely to remain amongst the lower strata. It does not equip them to break the cycle of economic, social or mental oppression. Post secondary education/higher education has the potential to introduce critical discourse into the prison context. Davidson (1995: xv) notes that "during the two decades in which higher prison education grew dramatically, an increasing number of sociologists and historians were brought into prison education as teachers for these university programs. Among them were teachers who were familiar with critical discourse". It is possible that the inmate teachers at Ras I prison were able to infuse a certain level of criticality into the school context because of the level to which they
themselves had been educated and because several of them had been teaching in universities.

In Chapter 5, I discussed the power dynamics between the three groups of teachers in the classroom. However, in both the CXC/GCE classroom at Jackfruit prison and the classrooms of Ras I prison, the power dynamics in the classroom between teacher and student were different. In Jackfruit prison, the inmates do not really claim the title of ‘teacher’. Everyone is learning and sharing knowledge together. Power is non-hierarchical and the inmates view it as such; as shared amongst the inmates equally. In Ras I prison, even though the inmate teachers identify themselves as educators, the classroom environment that they try to create is one based on equality and the valuing of knowledge brought to the classroom by each individual. This contrasts with the power divisions found elsewhere in the prison context, which we examined in Chapter 3, the struggle for power between the imprisoned and those who enforce the imprisonment – ‘them’ and ‘us’.

Davidson (1995: 3) notes that “Schooling in prison cannot avoid being caught up in the power and politics of crime and social control ... everything about schooling in prison is political”. Education may be used as a tool of control in the hands of the warders and prison administrators, but in the hands of prisoners, it can become liberatory. Prisoners who are critical in their thought and political in their actions are a threat to the fabric of the prison. “through politicization [that is] by individuals becoming conscious of themselves as historical beings [they] demand to create social forms that are conducive to genuine social justice” (Davidson, 1995: 11). Education provided a key for subverting representations of power and authority in the prison. As evidenced by the prisoners at Ras I prison, through
education and the reasoning process inmate teachers were able to raise the consciousness of their fellow inmates and, further, encouraged and enabled inmates to engage with politicians, educators, the DCSJ and other stakeholders so as to make their voices heard on issues that were important to them.

Conclusion
This chapter has examined prison pedagogy in the form of the reasoning method within the framework of Freirean pedagogy and Rastafarian reasoning. The first section offered a brief overview of theoretic models that contribute to the development of prison pedagogies, as described in Chapter 1. The reasoning method shared characteristics with liberatory models and links with critical pedagogies, particularly with Freirean pedagogy. The second section explored the origins of the Rastafarian movement and examined the concept of reasoning. Reasoning shares communalities with, and was compared to, the literature on dialogue. As a means of consciousness raising and wisdom it was contrasted with Freirean pedagogy. The third and final section examined the manifestations of the reasoning method. I detailed where it was observed, how it worked and the issues brought to the fore. Its method was examined and critically assessed through the concrete examples of teacher training, consciousness raising and the ability of inmates to be politicalized and to subvert authority and power within the prison setting. This raised the acute question of the level of education that inmates should be exposed to and whom this should serve, prisoner (and society) or institution and society.
The issue of inmates being involved in their own education is an important one. Traditionally, prison education has evolved slowly. It tends to be offered to inmates under the auspices and regulation of the establishment. The Reasoning Method, therefore, appears important because it presents a radical alternative in which education emanates from the inmate, meaning that it is no longer something that is done to them, but something that they are actively a part of.
CHAPTER 7
PRISON PEDAGOGY AND WOMEN IN PRISON

The door to the doctor’s office was open and the inmate sat waiting while the doctor was on the phone with his friend. While he spoke on the phone about a job he had applied for he wrote out a prescription and gestured with his chin to the inmate to leave...she came out complaining that she had questions for the doctor but that he was too busy on his call to realise she was trying to communicate with him.

*Him not even a pay me no mind and me have things fi ask him...now me haffi go wait till when him come back again.*

Introduction

I begin this chapter with the above observation from my fieldwork diary because it draws attention in a striking and vivid manner to the focus of this chapter; namely, the invisibility of women; within the prison structure and for prison pedagogy. It is no accident that preceding chapters have predominantly focused on pedagogical experiences within male prisons. There is only one female prison in Jamaica. Therefore, for purely practical reasons, this research on prison pedagogy has focussed on the pedagogical needs and experiences of male prisoners. The relative invisibility of women within this research was further compounded by the limited literature available on the experience of imprisoned women in general (Foster and Sanford, 2006). Simply put, “the experience of women in prison is severely under-researched and the voices and views of these women are silent” (Zaitzow, 2006: 16). Nevertheless, despite these difficulties, it would be remiss to ignore the implications for women’s prison pedagogy in light of the findings of this research.
Indeed, this chapter seeks to address the glaring oversight in this field of research by exploring the limitations and potentialities of prison pedagogy for women in Jamaica. The silence that exists here screams for the narratives that would illuminate, and thus be a first step towards addressing the experience of Jamaican women within prisons. The first section will examine the literature on feminist pedagogy and the possibility of feminist pedagogy within the context of the women’s prison. The second section addresses the issue of the silencing of women within the prison context. The third section examines societal constructions of gender and the way these contribute to muzzling women’s needs, particularly those of education, in the prison context. The final section examines women’s actual educational and pedagogic needs within the Jamaican prison context and outlines the concept of the policy of amelioration.

This chapter will demonstrate that women’s educational needs are virtually unrecognised, within the prison system. The latter is dominated by a patriarchal functionalist approach to education. I have already identified the theoretical, practical and pragmatic need for an alternative pedagogic approach for prison educational practice. At present, though, there is no evidence of a feminist pedagogy within the Jamaican prison system. However, as an alternative to the status quo, Byrne and Howells (2002: 39-40) advocate the principle of “Needs and Responsivity [which states that] the effective management of female prisoners, as with other offenders, should be based on a comprehensive needs analysis of the female offender population ... adapted to the characteristics of the group. The Responsivity principle is a feature of best practice”.
The delivery of education in the Jamaican women's prison context clearly reveals a gendering of education. Gendered education refers to instances where the educational experience gives greater preference or is prejudiced towards one sexual orientation over another. In this particular instance, educational experiences favour men over women. Kimmel (2004) notes that, in spite of over a century of feminist advocacy and significant advances in access to education, there is still considerable disparity with regard to gender equality at all levels of education. Caillods (1997: 9) speaks of the importance of education for women:

There are very high benefits to be gained from girls and women's education. An educated woman is likely to have fewer and healthier children: she will encourage her own children to become educated, thus making it possible for the next generation to learn and to make a better contribution to society. A better educated woman is also able to earn a living for herself and her family. In the poorest regions in the world ... developing women's education and training is likely to be a very powerful way of fighting against poverty.

Education has two contrasting roles; it "has been expected to maintain the status quo through the regulation of citizens, but also to contribute to social change and the emancipation of citizens. These contradictions manifest themselves in everyday [educational contexts] through tensions between control and agency" (Gordon, 2006: 1). Robinson-Pant (2004: 474) argues that schools play a roll in "perpetuating traditional inequalities". Scering (1997: 63) argues that "Schools reproduce and reinforce the social construction of gender through the dichotomization of nurturance and autonomy, public and private, masculine and feminine". Lafrance (1991) notes that within the teacher-student relationship there are verbal and non-verbal messages that maintain gender inequalities. The messages include:
how teachers respond to verbal participation by female students; how teachers’ discourse reveals subtle sex bias; how teachers assist female and male students in unequal ways; and how teacher non-verbal messages feed sex-based differences in present interests and future goals (Lafrance, 1991: 3).

Gallagher (2000: 75) warns that "curriculum is never neutral; it must begin from a particular point of view". In support of this stance, Fenwick (2004: 180) posits that "ongoing vigilance is needed to remove sex stereotyping in all educational materials, to include female perspectives in vocational and other subject areas, and to promote the construction and dissemination of knowledge supporting women’s world view".

While it is true that gendered education does still exist, and it does enable the continued subjugation of women, this is not always the case. Returning to the concept of the dual roles performed by education (as discussed in Chapter 1 and as outlined by Gordon, Holland, and Lehelma, 2000 in this chapter), we must also acknowledge that women are in some instances able to transcend gendered education, and through transcendence, liberate themselves. During the 1980s Pascall and Cox carried out two research initiatives; the first a review of academic literature providing a feminist account of social policy; and the second a study of mature women at a university which examined the disparity between the accounts of women studying and the theoretical viewpoint that women are dominated within a gendered society. According to Pascall and Cox (1993: 17), two views emerge on education:

Broadly, the theoretical work was claiming that education for women was dominated by the structures of a gendered society; in particular, that it reproduced women’s roles of domesticity and low-paid work. The emphasis was on structures and their reproduction, with education forming a key element in the institutional web that kept women ensnared. On the other hand the accounts of the women returners were altogether
more positive. They reviewed life histories in which domesticity and poor opportunities in paid work had knotted together to tie them down. They saw education as the way to untie the knot.

Feminist pedagogy has contributed another means by which women have been able to utilise education as a tool for empowerment.

Feminist pedagogy has its antecedents in the women’s movement (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002) and emerged in response to “control-oriented pedagogy [which had been] dominating educational thought and practice” (Scering, 1997: 62). Several authors espouse definitions of feminist pedagogy (Langdon, 2001; Mayberry and Rees, 1997; Sandell, 1991; Scering, 1997; Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002). However, Tomlinson and Fassinger (2002: 39) note that a “single, conclusive definition of pedagogy” is unlikely. Two possible reasons for this are; firstly, that feminist pedagogy is comprised of diverse “theoretical perspectives [represented across] academic disciplines” (Cohen and McKee, 1999: 8); and secondly that “feminist pedagogy varies with teacher and student characteristics, as well as with other contextual aspects of the classroom (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002: 39). For the purpose of this chapter, I will use the definition articulated by Mayberry and Rees (1997: 57), which defines feminist pedagogy as a:

theoretical and methodological practice, [which] embraces a commitment to incorporating the voices and experiences of marginalised students into the academic discourse as well as educating all students for social justice and social change...At its core, feminist pedagogy is ...a commitment to the development of cooperative, multicultural, and interdisciplinary knowledge ... and the development of a critical consciousness empowered to apply learning to social action and social transformation.

Another way of defining feminist pedagogy is by comparing it to traditional pedagogy (Gallagher, 2000; Langdon, 2001; Scering, 1997). Feminist pedagogy stands in direct
opposition to traditional pedagogy in so much as it is a "different way of thinking about the relationship of schools and society and the hierarchical social relations for teaching/learning contexts" (Scering, 1997: 62). Bignell (1996: 316) outlines four principles of feminist pedagogy:

feminist pedagogy implies a restructuring of the power relations in the classroom to favour women and is specifically concerned about empowering female students; that feminist pedagogy opposes traditional patriarchal power by validating women’s experiences; that the feminist teacher becomes more of an authority with the students rather than an authority over the students; and that feminist pedagogy rejects the traditional frameworks of academic knowledge which value the objective and rational.

In addition Tomlinson and Fassinger (2002) consider five core concepts of feminist pedagogy. The first is that of integrating/balancing dichotomies. The three dichotomies that feminist pedagogy seeks to challenge are “reason versus emotion, objective knowledge versus subjective knowledge [and], content versus process” (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002: 40). With respect to these dichotomies, feminist pedagogues emphasise “balancing and/or integrating dichotomies as opposed to privileging one half of the dichotomy over the other” (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002: 41). Traditionally, characteristics associated with being feminine such as:

emotions, intuition, cooperation and subjectivity [have] been dismissed as inappropriate for higher education and relegated to the private sphere...feminist pedagogy asserts that this is a false separation that stifles thinking and learning for all students because it discourages them from becoming wholly engaged with course material

The second core concept relates to the role of power and authority. Feminist pedagogy acknowledges power structures within the classroom but seeks to counter these through the creation of an “egalitarian classroom...where hierarchies are minimized and students
actively engage in their learning processes" (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002: 43). Within the classroom, the student-teacher relationship is one of shared power and understanding which "premises the student as student-teacher and the teacher as teacher-student" (Mayberry and Rees, 1997: 71). Within the feminist classroom the dynamics of "dialogue, participation and experience" (Chow et al, 2003: 259) are central to the learning experience and the personal experiences of the student are valued. The third core concept is difference/diversity. This concept speaks to the fact that "feminist pedagogy encourages multiple perspectives in the classroom and especially seeks to hear from those voices that historically have been silenced, [such as], people of colour, women and sexual minorities" (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002: 44). The fourth core concept is concerned with epistemological diversity, meaning that:

feminist pedagogy expands the range of acceptable epistemologies from exclusively abstract, objective, rational ways of knowing to include contextualised, subjective, emotional ways of knowing...[there is an assumption] that women, racial and ethnic minorities, sexual minorities, poor people and other marginalized groups have unique knowledges related to their personal experiences at the peripheries of academe and society (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002: 44).

The fifth core concept is social action. "Feminist pedagogy emphasises the transformation of vision into social action, so that classroom discussions are never far from the reality of oppressive social arrangements" (Tomlinson and Fassinger, 2002: 45). Feminist pedagogy is often associated with liberal and critical pedagogic orientations (Briskin and Coulter, 1992; Tomlinson Fasisnger, 2000). Feminist pedagogy shares similarities with Freire and Rastafari in that all three are concerned with critical thinking, consciousness raising and education for empowerment and liberation. Feminist pedagogy represents the best way forward for the context of the women's prison, because "feminist pedagogy
alone, grants primacy of attention to women and to the intersections between gender, race, class and educational endeavours" (Briskin and Coulter, 1992: 251).

**Women: the “forgotten offenders”**

Mendonca (1991: 119), speaking in reference to women in the Caribbean context, notes that women "are an after-thought in systems run for men by men" and the Jamaican prison system is not an exception to this norm. Indeed, the invisibility of the female prisoner has been recognized by several authors (Baird, 2001; Covington, 2001; Foster and Sanford, 2006; Leland, 2003; Zaitzow, 2006). Generally, they cite two reasons for the invisibility of women in prison and the lack of research: first, the relatively small number of incarcerated females; and second, the inherent marginalization of women that occurs in the social construction of females in patriarchal societies.

Despite the fact that “half a million women and girls are held in penal institutions throughout the world, either as pre-trial detainees (remand prisoners) or having been convicted and sentenced" (Walmsley 2006: 1), the incarceration of women remains at a level that is much less than that of men. In comparative terms, the relatively small number of women incarcerated, compared to men, has been generally accepted as the predominant reason for their invisibility in pedagogical research\(^{22}\). Indeed, “prior to the

---

\(^{22}\) Mann (1984) also offers two additional reasons for the neglect of female inmates: the fact that many female offenders are incarcerated for offences that do not present the threat of inconvenience to society that men’s crimes do; and the fact that women’s docility (“women inmates rarely riot, destroy property or make reform demands” Mann, 1984, p.190) brings little attention to them. Although the number of imprisoned females is comparatively low there is concern about the increased rate of incarceration of women particularly with regard to drug related crimes (Covington, 2001; Flowers, 1987; Fossi, 2005; Foster and Sanford, 2006; Owers, 2005; and Zaitzow, 2006). According to research conducted in the United States by The Sentencing
1970s, very few studies had been conducted on incarcerated women because they were considered to be too insignificant as a category to be included in the research on criminality" (Baird, 2001: 171), or as Resnik (1982: 246) puts it:

prisons are principally occupied by men [and therefore] not surprisingly, the numerical dominance of men as prisoners, and as prison keepers, has resulted in the availability of far more information about prisons for men than about institutions which house women.

In terms of the actual make up of the global prison population women make up a very small percentage of the total number of persons incarcerated around the world. Walmsley (2006: 1), notes that female prisoners generally constitute “between 2 and 9% of the total prison population” in individual countries. However, there are some countries with percentages above 9%. These numbers are born out in the Caribbean experience as well. In the Caribbean, the percentage of female prisoners in most islands is below 5%. In Jamaica specifically, the rate of female incarceration is 4.8% of the total prison population (Walmsley, 2006).

The relatively low numbers of females within the overall prison populations of Jamaica undoubtedly contribute to a lack of interest in their pedagogical issues. For example, during an interview with a warder in response to a concern raised over women’s seeming lack of interest in the type of education that was be offered, the comment was made that:

---

23 Countries such as Hong Kong-China and Thailand have percentages above 9%. In 2005, the percentage of females in prison was 22% and 17% respectively.
I work at both the man and woman prison. The men go to school dem interested to learn. The women now, well you know how woman stay dem only want to idle and gossip dem not interested in nuh school, nothing wrong wid di subject dem, dem [the women] jus unruly.

This particular warder feels that the women’s lack of participation in the educational programs on offer has nothing to do with the inadequacy of the programs or the way that the programs are delivered. Instead, the ‘blame’ is placed on attributes seen as inherent in women, that is, idleness and gossip. Another member of DCSJ staff acknowledged that the educational programs offered to women were not sufficient but indicated that it was not feasible to develop programs for just one small section of the prison population:

*The women tend to have a higher level of education and so the basic education programs really aren’t suited to them, but it would be difficult and costly to organise something for just one portion of the women in prison who are already educated, because some of them still need basic education.*

It is important to recognise the marginalisation of women in prison but of even greater import is the marginalization of the importance of women in society as a whole. Specifically, cultural and social institutions in Jamaica, as elsewhere, have contributed to rendering women invisible and silent, which in turn, has created a gendered approach to the delivery of education both within and without the prison that directly impacts prison pedagogy. Indeed, it has been noted that “women's access to institutions like schools depends on the extent to which cultural and religious beliefs accord women a role in life outside the family” (Elliot and Kelly, 1980: S3). Thereby, it is important to understand the cultural and religious factors that affect women's access to education in the Jamaican context and that inevitably shape prison pedagogy.
Social constructions of gender and the prison system

Lake (1998) observes that women in the African Diaspora are affected by both European and African culture, to the extent that men exert control over women. With respect to the European colonial influence, a woman’s place was considered to be in the home and in so far as women were educated “it was to provide them with the necessary attributes to become good wives and mothers” (Moore and Johnson, 2004: 235). For African culture, whilst “women were the main agricultural producers, African men exerted control over African women in cultural, political, and economic spheres” (Lake, 1998: 142). According to Lake (1998: 142), “Cultural beliefs that deem women to be inferior to men are part of the superstructure that supports and sustains their marginalization”. In Jamaica, therefore, as with other areas of the African Diaspora, cultural practices have often not traditionally provided women with any control of the manner in which their education has been delivered to them.

Religion plays an integral role in the Jamaican context. The importance of religion in Jamaica is evidenced by the fact that Jamaica has the highest number of churches per capita in the world as well as more than 100 different Christian denominations. The importance of noting the particularly religious character of the Jamaican cultural context for this study is in the subjugated role of women that often occurs within religious ideology across a variety of religions. Lake (1998: 146) sums up these ideas succinctly when she writes:

Rastafarian religious orientation is central in maintaining the roles and statuses of Rastafarian women [while] the patriarchal nature of Christian dogma legitimates the secondary position of women...[within] Judaism
women have been governed by a set of laws delineated in the Talmud that encode her inferiority. [Within the Islamic religion] the Qur’an also hold men to be a degree above women.

In this regard, I would draw particular attention to Rastafarianism and the manner in which its belief systems encode women in a subordinate position to men because Rastafarian reasoning as a pedagogical practice that was detailed in the preceding chapters is strikingly absent from women’s prisons.

In the previous chapter, the Rastafarian ritual of reasoning informed the reasoning method found in two of the four prisons that form a part of this study. The reasoning method was found only in male prisons and within the female prison the influence of Rastafari was absent as was the reasoning method. As discussed previously, the Rastafarian movement is associated with struggles against oppression and a fight for equality and justice (Hansing, 2001). However, the treatment of women within the Rastafarian movement is at odds with its philosophy. Lake (1998: 141) highlights three tenets within Rastafarianism that speak directly to the status of women within the movement. “1) Rastafarian men are the spiritual leaders of the movement; 2) women can only become Rastafarian through Rasta men; and 3) Rasta men are the natural leaders of households”. Women are also considered inherently unclean because of the two natural female functions of menstruation and childbirth. Lake (1998: 148) notes that, “Buba Shanti women, for example, cannot be preachers based on their ability to menstruate. Neither can they enter the church when they are menstruating”. Rasta women are also excluded from reasoning sessions, not only on the basis that they are unclean, but also because they are “too emotional” (Erskine, 2005: 50) and because it is felt that it is not necessary for women to
attend as the women will be “instructed by [their] husband about the proceedings” (Barrett, 1997: 242). Based on the subordinate role of women within the Rastafarian movement it is not unusual that non-Rastafarian women do not necessarily identify with the movement. The latter may also constitute a powerful reason for the non-uptake of the reasoning method within the women’s prison.

The failure of the Jamaican prison system to provide a relevant education for women is reflected in the treatment and rehabilitation programs offered to women, which are permeated by the social construction of gender; reflecting the roles that the wider society perceives as pertaining to women’s proper place or function. “Historically, society has treated female offenders in accordance with societal expectations of what women ‘should’ or ‘should not’ be” (DeBell, 2001: 59). Traditionally, women were “expected to be pious, pure, and submissive, the ideal woman was one who became a wife and mother and stayed at home to care for her family. Women who did not adhere [to these stereotypes] were considered a threat to the family and social order” (Feinman, 1994: 40). Today, women choose to adopt varying roles within society. Some women adopt more traditional roles, staying home with the children and taking care of the home. Other women, despite having families and the responsibilities that go with them, also work outside the home, whether on a full or part time basis. Some women do not adopt traditional roles at all, choosing not to have a family and instead to focus on other means of fulfilling themselves. Some women are able to maintain positions of power, such as the CEO of a company, the owner of a company, or president of a country.
Even though some women have liberated themselves from stereotypes in constructing their identities and adopting prominent roles within society, liberation is far from universal, with certain types of behaviour still considered anti-feminine and socially frowned upon. Imprisonment for a crime is one example of such social mores. Hampton (1993: xiii) notes that "women who come before the courts encounter not only the rejection of their allegedly illegal activity, but also strong rejection of what is too often perceived as their 'anti-feminine' behaviour". In speaking on the same matter, Spark and Harris (2005: 143) posit that "female criminality is often associated in the public mind with gender role transgressions and 'double deviance'". These opinions of women inmates mean that "they are rarely allowed to speak or be heard" (Cook and Davies, 1999: 5). The concept of women prisoners as unseen, neglected and silenced appears in several academic writings (Baird, 2001; Covington, 2001; Leland, 2003; Mann, 1984; Zaitzow, 2006). However, the persistence of gendered conditions within society contributes to fuelling women's criminality. According to Foster and Sanford (2006: 582), there are structural factors within society that influence female incarceration, such as,

- persistent gender discrimination in education,
- the feminization of poverty,
- the pervasiveness of gender violence in intimate relationships,
- and women's subordinate status in both formal and informal economies.

Women tend to commit:

- drug and economic crimes, suggesting that gender, race, and class politics of both paid and unpaid labour and the subsequent feminization of poverty have left many women little choice but to become involved in informal economic activity – such as low level drug trafficking – as a way to support themselves and their children (Foster and Sanford, 2006: 582).

A striking illustration of the clash that occurs between constructed ideals of womanhood and the experience of women prisoners is the lack of privileges that women prisoners
have in relation to male prisoners, particularly in terms of the education provided to them in prison.

Historically, the treatment of incarcerated women was designed to foster the development of behaviour considered ‘suitable’ to women. This ‘treatment’ would “entail the fostering of sexual morality, the imposition of sobriety, the instilling of obedience and the prescribing of the sex-role stereotype of mother and homemaker” (Mann, 1984: 191). These goals were to be attained by “providing skills such as homemaking, religious instruction as education and work as therapy” (Baird, 2006: 170). Zaitzow (2006: 15) argues that, “few changes have been made in programs and opportunities offered to women prisoners since the beginning of the century”. Today rehabilitation for women is still linked to reinforcing gendered roles and perpetuates a certain level of dependency within the psyche of the female inmate, both whilst she is incarcerated and also upon release. Zaitzow (2006: 15) posits that the programs found in women’s prisons rarely “train women in skills [that] help them become legitimately independent on their release”. Feinman (1994: 69) further argues that rehabilitation programs do not meet the “socioeconomic realities of either the backgrounds of the women in prison or the neighbourhoods to which they return”.

The subjects of study generally offered to incarcerated women include adult basic education, clerical skills, food service, cosmetology, sewing, and laundry (Flowers, 1987; Mann, 1984; Zaitzow, 2006). These subjects at best prepare “women to be domestics or occupy other ‘women’s’ vocations” (Mann, 1984: 216) and “as it happens, these are skills that are needed to maintain the prison” (Feinman, 1994: 69). Women not only face the handicap of gendered programs, but they also have less opportunity (than men) to
participate in educational programs (Covington, 2001). Mann (1984) and Flowers (1987) both offer similar reasons for the paucity of rehabilitation programs for women inmates.

Mann (1984: 216), proposes six contributing factors:

1) Women in prisons comprise such small numbers as to make programming cost prohibitive; 2) the high cost of training per female prisoner, since there are so few; 3) the notion that women criminals present less of a threat to society than male criminals and therefore do not require the same financial expenditures; 4) low participation of women in such programs; 5) the inaccessibility of female institutions; and 6) the fact that society still views a woman’s status as wage earner as secondary to her role of housewife and mother.

Whilst there are some instances of non-traditional programs on offer in women’s prisons (Zaitzow, 2006), there is still an issue with the take up of these courses. One possible reason is that some women inmates have not been able to distance themselves from the stereotypes that society has of them. Spark and Harris (2005: 154) note in their research that:

when asked what courses they would like implemented, the majority of women suggested practical courses, with the most popular being cooking/hospitality, sewing, knitting and parenting skills, all of which can be related to conventionally feminine and more specifically, mothering roles.

Zaitzow (2006: 15) further offers three possible reasons for the low take up of non-traditional courses:

1) Qualifications for program entry which may be too difficult or have disadvantages attached to them that outweigh the advantages (for example, a particular level of reading which they may not qualify for); 2) it may be that women in prison are more committed to traditional feminine roles when it comes to choosing vocational programs; 3) staff resistance to such programs.
In comparing the education and rehabilitation opportunities offered to incarcerated women as opposed to incarcerated men, Feinman (1994: 69) notes that women "are not offered the academic or vocational training, work/study release, and job training programs that are offered to men". Not all women inmates are content with the status quo and some have protested against the inequalities between men and women’s rehabilitation. Resnik (1982: 248) notes that women imprisoned in Michigan:

brought a lawsuit where they claimed that they were permitted fewer job training opportunities – in five limited and mainly renumerative areas such as food service and building maintenance – while men had access to some twenty vocational programs. Men printed a newspaper; women made personal calendars. Men learned welding, women did small handicrafts ... Men apprenticed as machinists, tool and die makers, and electricians were then permitted to practice those trades in prison industries. There were no apprentice programs for women and no industries in their prison ... the federal court concluded that "significant discrimination against the female prison population was evident.

Women prisoners’ educational and pedagogical needs

The silencing of women that occurs within society as a whole is reflected within the prison, by structures that are unwilling to recognize and address the different needs of female and male inmates, particularly with regard to education, and the content of the education delivered. That males and females have different needs has been acknowledged by authors such as Beals, 2004; Byrne and Howells, 2002; Carlen, 2002; DeBell, 2001; Zaitzow, 2006. Notwithstanding, the debates over women and women prisoners still draw on essentialist and stereotypical generalisations about the nature of ‘woman’. For example, DeBell (2001) highlights five differences that need to be taken into account. The first has to do with obvious physical differences between men and women, which mean that consideration must be given to matters such as "physical health differences
surrounding reproductive issues ... [and] the difference in female nutritional needs" (DeBell, 2001: 58). Secondly, and more essentially, DeBell (2001: 58) suggests that women and men have different social needs:

cognitively, women possess the need for belonging more strongly than men. It is quite common to see male offenders segregate themselves for time alone. [On the other hand] female offenders need the closeness of others to such a degree that while incarcerated, females will develop and foster "fictive families".

Thirdly, female inmates are more likely to make use of "medical services within the facility" (DeBell, 2001: 58). Fourthly, "female offenders, when overwhelmed with issues of low self-esteem, the stigma and shame of incarceration...are quick to perceive their new environment as a threat to their existence and voice or act out suicidal ideation" (DeBell, 2001: 58). Finally, women and men communicate differently. DeBell (2001: 58) notes that "females typically communicate with the usage of "meta-messaging" or the message beneath the message" while men do not. In summarising the differences between men and women, Byrne and Howells (2002: 39) note six differences, "physical, psychological, dietary, social, vocational and health". Women also have different "lawbreaking profiles and rehabilitative requirements" (Carlen, 2002: 76). Women tend to be incarcerated for non-violent crimes (Covington, 2001; Fossi, 2005; Foster and Sanford, 2006; Owers, 2005; Zaitzow, 2006), such as "drug use, 'moral' and sex offences, or minor property crimes" (Mann, 1984: 190). Beals (2004: 237) also notes that women tend to have "fewer previous convictions".

Whilst it is easy to concur that physical differences between men and women (particularly with regard to gynaecological and other health issues) require differing treatment, it is also
important to acknowledge that some of the differences being highlighted in the literature may be related to the harm caused to women by the prison institution itself. The prison system is by nature masculine. In a briefing from the Fawcett Society and Women in Prison (2006), submitted during the House of Lords debate on the case for a Women's Justice Board it was argued that:

women are shoehorned into a system designed by men for men, with damaging consequences. Prison ...services have been developed along a male model which assumes the offender does not have primary care giving responsibilities for children and other family members (Women in Prison website, 2006).

Documentation supports the claim that women prisoners are more likely to suffer from mental issues and suicide (Fossi, 2005; Foster and Sanford, 2006). However, their mental well being is quite likely affected by the realities of their imprisonment. Factors such as; separation from their children (Owers, 2005); that they are likely to be imprisoned far away from home (Carlen, 2005), which makes the possibility of seeing their children and loved ones even more difficult; and concern over their family’s welfare, given their predominant position as heads of households.

With regard to the Jamaican woman prisoner two possible groupings include the well-educated career woman who (may or may not be financially secure and) is not in need of basic education, and the woman who is not well-educated and who bears the additional

24 The Fawcett Society is an organization dedicated to addressing issues of (in)equality between men and women.
25 The following provides a profile of the imprisoned woman in Jamaica. In the first instance, eighty six percent (86%) of the women imprisoned in Jamaican prisons are serving sentences for drug-related offences. Secondly, the female inmate is likely to have children. Thirdly, the female inmate is likely to be the head of the household. In this context, forty-four percent of incarcerated women were heads of their households. Finally, the female inmate is not likely to be a repeat offender (Henry-Lee, 2005). What emerges from these general statistics is the important fact that the needs of the female prisoner are very different from those of the male prisoner.
social role as mother and carer. The latter roles carry social expectations that require women to shoulder the emotional, physical and economic requirements of her dependents. Whichever category she falls into, the female prisoner needs education and a pedagogic approach that will challenge her intelligence, and provide empowerment through the raising of consciousness and economic independence.

In terms of rehabilitation programs, women in Jamaican prisons are also faced with a situation where very little is offered and what is offered is gendered. In research conducted by Henry-Lee (2005: xii), inmates were interviewed about their views of the programs to which they had access, which “were almost non-existent”. In my own research and observations I found that women were often wandering about the prison compound, with very little available in the way of activities and work programs. They were basically left to their own devices. By contrast, in male maximum-security prisons, men were locked in their cells for the majority of the day. Male inmates were allowed out of their cells in the morning (for approximately two hours) to “slap up”, that is, to empty waste from their cells and bathe. They were also allowed out of their cells for another two hour period in the afternoon. Women, however, were allowed out of their dormitories between 7:30 and 8:00 in the morning and only returned to their dormitories at 5:00 in the afternoon. The freedom accorded to the women is in keeping with the perception that women are less likely to cause trouble, that is, the traditional view that they are more passive and submissive than men and potentially less dangerous, less likely to pose a threat. Although women have more freedom (in terms of their ability to move around the prison compound) than their male counterparts, they are restricted in their behaviour. The women have to wear uniforms with caps, they are corrected about how they stand and sit.
and are constantly reminded that they need to behave like ladies. The following excerpt was taken from my field notes:

While walking with the superintendent we saw a woman sitting on a wall with her leg up. She was wearing tights underneath so her underwear could not be seen. As we passed the superintendent called her out by name and told her to sit properly. When the lady objected pointing out that she was wearing tights, the superintendent said,

It's not ladylike for you to sit like that. Sit properly!

Women's education seeks to uphold the ideals of how women should comport themselves in public and the domesticated roles they should fill. Robinson-Pant (2004: 479) notes that, “women's literacy is seen in terms of providing access to useful information rather than challenging women's roles”.

The vocational and educational programs on offer would not have been able to accommodate all the inmates (had they been inclined to attend the courses), but most courses were not operating at full capacity. The vocational courses were gendered and included courses such as hairdressing, home economics, shoe making, dress making and art and craft. In terms of the educational courses on offer, the women were being taught basic education as in the male prisons. However, their needs were not being met. During my field visits, I discovered that academic classes (with the exception of computer classes) were very poorly attended. In interviews with warder teachers in the female prison, their explanation for this was the relatively high educational levels within the female prison. Data from my interviews revealed that most of the female prison population was not in need of basic education. This was confirmed by research conducted by Henry-Lee, which indicated that eighty-two percent of the incarcerated women were educated to
the level of secondary education (Henry-Lee, 2005); therefore basic education classes were not useful to the majority of the female prison population. According to Miller (2000: 135)

The general pattern for many so-called developing or Third World countries is that women are disadvantaged in gaining access to education at all levels, but in particular to tertiary education...[however], this picture is not true generally of the Commonwealth Caribbean. In the region, on the whole, girls start schooling earlier, attend school more regularly, repeat fewer grades, are less likely to drop out and therefore more likely to stay in school longer, and achieve higher standards of educational performance than boys. In the adult population more women are literate than men. Girls are more highly represented in those sections of the secondary and tertiary levels of the education system that enhance the prospects of upward social mobility. In a real sense girls and women constitute the first sex in Caribbean education. The Caribbean is one of the few areas of the world in which this is the case. In an interview with a senior DCSJ employee the view was expressed that the level of literacy and numeracy among women is far greater than men.

The mandate of the DCSJ is to target illiterate prisoners; there are currently no provisions in place for those female inmates who would like to continue to tertiary level education.

Some inmates wanted to take subjects at CXC/GCE level. The head teacher began a class for them, but the subsequent refusal to allow them to take the exams led to their refusal to return to the class. During interviews, two possible reasons were given for denying the women the opportunity to sit exams. On the one hand, the teacher said she did not believe the students were ready, thereby reinforcing the idea of women as intellectually less capable, and on the other hand senior personnel within the DCSJ indicated that there was not enough money to pay for the women’s exams, thus confirming the low priority given to women’s education. The women felt slighted and refused to return to the class. The women inmates felt that they were suitably prepared for
the exams and that they should have had the opportunity to sit them. Whether they would have passed or not can never be known, however their failure was ensured by not affording them the opportunity to sit the exams. During my last visit, the situation had still not been resolved. In the male prisons, where CXC/GCE classes exist, the situation is often that inmates are teaching themselves and the DCSJ pays for the exams. There is no warder or civilian teacher to prevent the male inmate from taking the exam. However, in the women’s case, the warder teacher dictates whether the DCSJ spends money on exams for women according to the criterion of whom she deems ‘ready’ or ‘not ready’. Although the majority of the women in prison do not need basic education, those who do need it are still reluctant to participate in classes. One warder teacher indicated that:

there are persons here who know they cannot read but because of pride and not wanting friends to know they don’t come to school.

There is negative peer pressure for those who are unable to read. During one field visit, I witnessed one inmate teasing another who was in class trying to do a comprehension exercise. As the first inmate walked past the window of the class she shouted:

dutty gyal gwe you cyaan read!

The inmate in the class lost her temper and traded verbal insults and a threat:

if yu duh dat again gyal me ago stab you up.

Although the inmate in the class responded to the jeering with aggression, once the inmate was out of sight she seemed to lose her confidence and she complained to the teacher:
Within the same group of under-educated women, there are those who have learned to survive in society without learning to read and write. They hold down full time jobs (as domestic helpers or cleaners) and sometimes are involved in cottage industries or farming (such as cake baking and making sweets or selling produce in the market or on the street side). Because they are able to function in society, albeit within relatively low paying, menial jobs, they are not inclined to learn to read and write. In speaking to one inmate, she indicated that what they were teaching in prison would not improve her quality of life:

\[\text{Me nuh wha nuh fool fool education....dem ago teach me fi read and write? Me run my own business me duh my hustling pan di street side and a dat send my pickney dem go a school...me have one big girl she jus done high school and the other one in second form...how read an write ago help me? Dem people ya nuh serious...dem not even a mek wi do likkle CXC so wha di point.}\]

This woman's refusal to become involved with the prison school is based on her estimation of the inferior education on offer. In her estimation, learning to read and write is not enough to improve her economic prospects and so she is not inclined to participate.

At the other end of the spectrum is the educated inmate, some with bachelor degrees, some with medical degrees, and others with postgraduate degrees. One might question how educated women end up in prison. There may be various factors at play, but the gendered nature of society indubitably affects some women inmates, in that although they are educated they are unable to find jobs, or are in jobs in which they earn significantly less than their male counterparts earn, so that they consequently become dissatisfied.
Levitt (1991: 48) notes that "Even where women have similar qualifications, perform similar tasks and have the same level of productivity, their remuneration is usually significantly lower than their male counterparts". This dissatisfaction may lead them to commit illegal acts. In an interview one inmate explained how she became a drug mule:

I went to university. I got a good degree but I couldn't get a job. My grandmother raised me and she couldn't afford to send me to university so I took a student loan. The interest on the loan was piling up and I couldn't get a job and my grandmother expected that I would be able to help her with the others after school. So to get a little money to help my grandmother and to pay off my loan I decided to carry the drugs to England. But they caught me at the airport and here I am.

This particular inmate's story points to the difficulty educated women face in finding employment.

The classes within the women's prison follow the 'jug and mug' method of delivery as described in Chapter 5. In counterposing the reasoning method as a pedagogic approach, one is able to contrast the possibilities for pedagogy for reasoning with the realities of pedagogy for control. This pedagogic tension, between reasoning and control, is present in the women's prison, but it is also a key theme recurring throughout the thesis. The government, through the DCSJ, is committed to an educational program that teaches adult basic education, but this serves to perpetuate women's gendered roles. Additional courses in post-secondary education are required as remedy, whilst a feminist pedagogic approach within the prison context is necessary if the women's population is to have a chance of engaging in meaningful education. However, the DCSJ is in a bit of a bind: even if they acknowledge the educational needs of the women, they are not in a position to provide more resources to meet those needs. Therefore, they practice a policy of
amelioration where they try to meet all sides. They try to appease the women by providing some education, they appease the government by sticking to the directive issued with regard to adult basic education and they feed the public's punitive nature, which demands that persons in prison not benefit from their crime more than law-abiding citizens outside.

Conclusion

This chapter sought to explore the issues faced by women offenders within the prison context in general and in Jamaica specifically. It sought to consider both the reasons for women's continuing marginalization within the prison system and to explore the pedagogical implications of such marginalization. It revealed that, as suggested by other researchers, those in positions of power in society, including officials within correctional departments and representatives of government, perpetuate the status quo when it comes to the treatment of women in prisons. The direct result of maintaining stereotypical views of women – particularly the "[m]yths that women do not need to be self-supporting or that they are not interested in non-traditional employment [myths that] are perpetuated by many correctional policymakers and often prevent realistic and practical programs from being developed" (Feinman, 1994: 69) -- is that if one of the goals of incarceration is to rehabilitate women for society, then women's corrections has failed (Feinman 1994; Flowers 1987; Micucci and Monster 2004). In terms of the Jamaican experience specifically, this research found that the Jamaican prison context was extremely gender-biased and inhibited by the policy of amelioration practiced by the DCSJ. The need for a more empowering pedagogic approach, such as a feminist pedagogy is conclusive.
CONCLUSION

Introduction
This thesis examined adult prison education in Jamaican prisons with a view to identifying pedagogic practices and the imperatives underpinning them. Pedagogy is influenced by several factors, and in light of this, the impact of the context, policy, and training of adult educators was examined in relation to the pedagogic practices evidenced. This thesis contributes to the literature on prison education and prison pedagogy in the Jamaican context. It also examines the possibility of critical pedagogies in the prison context, looking at the need for empowerment through consciousness-raising. Further, it opens a dialogue with the 'forgotten' women prisoners and looks at their experiences in a system that is ill designed to meet their needs. This chapter offers a review of the thesis highlighting key issues and debates. The examination of prison education was structured around four research questions (outlined in Chapter 2). Here, I revisit these research questions, looking at possible answers that arise from the research process. The second section outlines fruitful areas for post-doctoral research.

Research questions revisited
This section will examine the ways in which the research process generated answers to the fundamental research questions with which I began.
Question 1: What are the values and imperatives underpinning the Jamaican policy on prison education?

The study of prison pedagogy goes hand-in-hand with the value of prison education, with the former constituting an important indicator of the latter. The history of the prison is cyclical and characterised by a vacillation between periods of rehabilitation and retribution. Debates over the purpose of the prison and imprisonment and the movement between the conflicting perspectives of rehabilitation and retribution, are embedded in the discourses and ideologies that construct the prisoner as mad versus bad or redeemable versus irredeemable. The tensions between these perspectives become problematical in the context of the modern prison, which performs multiple roles. In other words, today's prison is simultaneously concerned with rehabilitation, confinement and punishment (Taylor, 1994). Within the Jamaican context, the current climate of violence and the escalating murder rate amplify the readily available discourses of non-rehabilitative prisoners. The middle 'ameliorative' course taken by policy makers does nothing to challenge the embedded discourses and ideologies that construct the prisoner as either mad or bad. Instead, prison education policy in Jamaica seeks to find the path of least resistance by vacillating between the poles of rehabilitation and punishment.

The values and imperatives underpinning the Jamaican policy on prison education are, in consequence, in conflict. On the one hand, the DCSJ speaks the language of rehabilitation, and commits to rehabilitation and prison education on paper. For example, prisons are now referred to as "correctional facilities" or "correctional centers" and inmates
are now referred to as "clients". On the other hand, education and rehabilitation programs are underfunded and lack the appropriate infrastructure and human resources. In an interview with the Commissioner of Corrections, he revealed that the budget for the DCSJ for the fiscal year 2002-2003 was JMD$1.95 billion\(^{26}\) (approximately GBP£22, 204509). The Commissioner noted that for that fiscal year the DCSJ came in under budget and 'saved' JMD$130 million. It is difficult to understand this ‘saving’ in light of the lack of resources (such as proper desks and chairs, books, computers, and money to pay for examination fees for prisoners) within prison schools.

Clearly, a country’s prison education policy depends on various factors, such as its political economic stance, penal policy, and public consensus. Cavadino and Dignan (2006: 440) link political economy to penal policy through four economic typologies; the "neo-liberal; the conservative corporatist; the social democratic corporatist; and the oriental corporatist". Jamaica’s neo-liberal political stance (examined in Chapter 4) is reflected in a penal policy that is predominantly focused on "law and order" (Cavadino and Dignan, 2006: 441). Jamaica’s stance on political economy and penal policy is more likely to support a punitive prison system that is unlikely to be conducive to prison education. Durkheim (1933) associated the desire for punishment with the violation of social norms. The murder rate in Jamaica reached a peak of “43 per 100,000 in 2001” (Harriott, 2003) and crime, particularly violent crime, continues to spiral out of control. This has bred a society that is "impatient of properly planned, systematic, and long term treatment [and

\(^{26}\) Although requested on several occasions the exact figure allocated to prison education from the overall budget was not given.
which perceives state institutions [such as prisons] to be ineffective" (Harriot, 2003: 2-3).

Society’s current predilection for punishment is similar to the desire for public punishment and retribution that characterised the early forms of punishment described by Foucault (1977). This is borne out in the following incidents:

The first incident occurred in the usually peaceful town of Spaulding in the parish of Manchester, where the rate of violent crime tends to be relatively low. There, in response to a series of incidents of violent crime, citizens mobilized themselves as vigilante groups and rioted and attacked a police station in an effort to “lynch” three men whom they erroneously thought were criminals and who had sought refuge in the police station. More recently, in July 2002, there was a similar incident in Clarks Town, Trelawny (another parish with a relatively low rate of violent crime), where over three hundred residents attacked the local police station with the aim of punishing four alleged offenders who had been detained by the police for violently victimizing a prominent member of the community. These are unusual events, but they nevertheless show the extent to which citizens seem to have lost their patience with the crime problem, and lost confidence in the ability of the police to protect them and in the capacity of the state to provide effective institutional responses to the problem (Harriott, 2003: 3).

It is against these complexities that the DCSJ tries to implement a policy for rehabilitation and education in the prisons. The government is practicing a policy of amelioration, meaning that the government is trying to meet the rehabilitative needs of the prisoner on the one hand, whilst still satisfying the wider society’s demand for punishment on the other. The resulting situation is one in which senior personnel within the government and the DCSJ understand the importance of educating and rehabilitating prisoners and therefore commit to international policies and frameworks for rehabilitation (as discussed in Chapter 4). However, countering this is a government perception that the public demand a demonstrable commitment from them that they are tough on crime and
criminals. Any action that might be construed as "coddling" prisoners, such as spending large amounts on the development of rehabilitation and education when the mainstream educational system which caters to children and other law abiding citizens is under-funded and in need of reform, is thereby both controversial and potentially dangerous. The UN (2006) notes that "the public may regard resources being allocated to the health, social welfare, education and vocational training needs of prisoners as unfair, reducing the funds available for those who have not committed offences". The policy of amelioration, that is, trying to meet the educational needs of the prisoners while trying to satisfy the wider society's need for retribution, has led to the implementation of a weak prison education policy that is both under-funded and poorly implemented. The DSCJ's education policy reflects the Mandate from the Minister of security that "all inmates that are illiterate should be made literate". The implementation of the NRS is intended to ensure the realisation of the mandate. This policy emanates from the need to reduce recidivism rates and to reintegrate inmates into society.

However, a lack of sufficient funding and an associated lack of political commitment has meant that the NRS has not been fully implemented and the DCSJ currently does not have the capacity to offer education to all the inmates in need of basic literacy. The mandate also fails to meet the educational needs of the women prisoners (see Chapter 7). The majority of female prisoners are not in need of adult basic education and there has been no modification of the educational provisions in order to cater for the female prisoners educated to secondary and tertiary level. If the DCSJ is to commit fully to a prison education policy that values the individual as a holistic person, then there is need for a stronger prison education policy. There is also a need to remove the vestiges of
punitive practices within prisons and to improve prison conditions (such as plumbing, appropriate bedding and lighting). Cosman (1995: 71) notes the incompatibility of expectations that punitive prisons could produce non-violent behavior, stating that, "most criminal law [and by extension prisons] is punitive, reflecting a strange belief in it as a kind of penal magic, as if violence could produce non-violence". A major factor, then, is the need for public education on the importance of rehabilitation, not only for the prisoner as an individual, but for society as a whole. Niles and Bernard (2000: 41), in reference to the wider Caribbean region, advocate a "re-education drive; educating people on the importance of prison education" for the symbiosis that is both individual and social. The case for prison education and the rehabilitation of prisoners can be argued on moral and social grounds (such as linking education to crime and social inclusion), as well as on economic grounds. One argument is that educated prisoners are less likely to return to prison and therefore it proves more economical to educate prisoners than to continue to incarcerate those who return to prison on numerous occasions (Werner, 1997). Further, it can be argued that educated prisoners are better able to make a positive contribution to the development of the country upon their return to society. The economic case has often been more persuasive than the moral case, as debates over equal opportunities policies in the workplace (Cassell, 1997; Dickens, 1999; Perotin and Robinson, 2000; Rubery et al, 1999) demonstrated. However, Jamaican policymakers have failed to utilise the economic arguments to influence and inform the debate over what prisons and prisoners represent. The thesis highlights a central problem of the rehabilitative-retribution binary, namely, that it severely hampers the development and change of the moral, social and economic imperatives for prison education.
This thesis highlights the necessity of having stronger more developed prison education policy in place. In this regard the following recommendations may be considered in the development of prison education policy for adult correctional facilities in Jamaica. The first is that prison education policy needs to be linked to appropriate legislation. Secondly the policy should acknowledge and address the right of each prisoner to education. In light of this, the issue of what level of education is offered needs to be rigorously debated and a clear and precise plan of action set in place to address the educational needs of all inmates and not just those who are illiterate or male. Thirdly the question of who should teach particularly with regard to the use of warders in the classroom should be examined, and a standard of training which includes qualifications in adult education teaching methods set and adhered to. Finally every effort should be made to link prison education programs with local universities, teachers colleges and community colleges so that the expertise of tertiary adult educators may be brought to bear on the prison education context and so that prison education may be more closely linked with mainstream adult education.
Question 2: What are the key pedagogic techniques and values encouraged through staff development and the training of prison educators?

Within the literature on the training of adult educators, the issue of lack of training and debates over professionalisation and accreditation are frequently considered. Adult education is the ‘Cinderella’ of the field of education, always afforded a lower status than the education of children. Consequently, the training of prison educators receives a lower priority than the training of their counterparts in mainstream adult education. In the Jamaican context, this is clear in the government’s focus, in its reform of the educational system. The greatest emphasis was on early childhood to secondary level education. Arguments for the training of adult educators are also associated with debates on professionalism. The call for professionalism is twofold, reflecting both the desire that adult educators be fully equipped to perform their required roles and the desire for an appropriate recognition of their skills as specialists (Knowles, 1980). However, the training of prison educators, as the development of prison education policy generally, is impacted by insufficient funding.

The DCSJ is seeking to create a culture of rehabilitation that views the inmate as a whole person and not ‘just a criminal’. The visions of the DCSJ for the correctional process speak to the issues of rehabilitation and empowerment:

We are serving the needs of our clients by creating and facilitating opportunities for their empowerment and rehabilitation, resulting in a more caring, peaceful, society [therefore the correctional process is] one which provides to those in our care a relevant, structured, therapeutic
environment to facilitate their empowerment and rehabilitation to become peaceful, responsible and productive members of society (DCSJ website, 2007)

The intention is that staff training, including pedagogic techniques and values, is the means for facilitating such an outcome. The three types of training offered by the DCSJ were outlined in Chapter 5, the main form of training being instruction in the delivery of the JAMAL method. The JAMAL method teaches the delivery of basic literacy and numeracy in keeping with the broad philosophies underpinning adult education (such as valuing the learners' life experiences, and developing a democratic classroom that allows for a two-way flow of information between student and teacher). Although the JAMAL method is in keeping with the rehabilitative culture the DCSJ is trying to cultivate, my research made it apparent that not all educators are adopting the JAMAL method. As a result, the types of pedagogies associated with adult learning (such as critical and feminist pedagogy) and the pedagogic techniques associated with adult learning (such as valuing the learners' experiences) are scarce in prison classrooms. There are several possible reasons for this. One is that JAMAL training is not occurring often enough (as evidenced by the fact that some prison educators have been in the classroom for as long as 2 years without training), so that many prison teachers are non-Jamal-trained, relying on what little they know or on previous experiences of teaching children. Another reason is that JAMAL training is often not well-received by the educators. Many interviewees voiced their opinion that JAMAL training was insufficient. The main reason cited by educators for being dissatisfied with JAMAL training is that the training was too short and lacked accreditation. This supports the already noted desire on the part of the educators for professional
recognition and further supported by credentialing theory (as discussed in Chapter 5). In terms of values, the language of the DCSJ and the culture that it is trying to enforce is one in which the inmate is a "client", offered a service, that is, rehabilitation through which he/she may be empowered. However, the same punitive feelings extant in society towards criminals and offenders exist in the prisons, and the DCSJ has been largely unsuccessful in changing this mindset that remains amongst some of its employees. This inability on the part of DCSJ to inculcate in its staff, through strong training structures, the pedagogic techniques or values that it wishes its staff to adopt, may well reflect the weakness of a policy commitment to prison education generally.

Question 3: What kind of pedagogic practices and theories-in-use are drawn on by prison educators?

Issues of pedagogic practices within the prison context speak to the conceptualisation of the adulthood of the prisoner. Inmates are deprived of their freedom and various rights of citizenship (such as the right to vote) while incarcerated. Adult education is distinct from the education of children, both in terms of teaching styles and how the student is perceived. The ideologies surrounding adult learners include constructs such as self-directed learning, autonomy and the valuing of life experiences. The realisations of these constructs are problematic in the prison context, undermined as they are by structures of authority, power and coercion (Collins, 1998). The notion of educating the prisoner rests on the notion that he/she is worthy of rehabilitation. However, this does not necessarily translate to the use of pedagogic approaches conducive to adult education. Theory and
practice need work before they can marry. The functionalist approach to prison education (discussed in Chapter 5) is founded and mired in a view that sees the child learner as an empty receptacle, to be filled with knowledge that is repetitively beaten into the casing of the memory. It is poorly suited to viewing the adult prisoner learner as a ‘full adult’. The functionalist approach also tends to focus on basic literacy as the minimum standard that none should fall below, a value economically grounded in the belief that literate persons contribute more in economic terms to society as a whole. Pedagogies associated with adult education tend to be critical and liberal, valuing the empowerment of the learner, as seen, for example, in Freirean and feminist pedagogy. Within these pedagogic models the adult learner is conceptualised as a ‘full adult’; one whose life experiences enable them to actively contribute to their own learning; one who can appreciate social, economic and political change; and one who can critically engage with the learning process and learning materials with a view to social change (Robinson, 1988). In the Jamaican context, the manifestation of critical pedagogy in a Freirean sense was not a part of the official pedagogic approach to prison education and instead came in the form of the reasoning method developed and administered by the inmates.

The research data revealed two dominant pedagogic practices within the Jamaican prison system. The ‘jug and mug’ method (examined in Chapter 5) and the reasoning method (examined in Chapter 6). The ‘jug and mug’ method predominates although it is antithetical to JAMAL training. However, the weak training provisions, together with the lack of checks and balances, allow prison educators in the Jamaican system to operate with relative autonomy. Consequently, educators appear to fall back on the educational practices that are most familiar to them. The ‘jug and mug’ method is functionalist and
relies on a top down flow of information from teacher to student. The educators’ reliance on the ‘jug and mug’ method is due in part to their perceptions of the inmate and his/her abilities (the inmate is often perceived to be below average intelligence) and in part exemplifies a lack of trust on the part of educators (Rogers, 2002) links distrust to the use of the ‘jug and mug’ method). The JAMAL method and the DCSJ refer to empowerment as one of their outcomes. In reference to the ‘jug and mug’ method, to the extent that the illiterate inmates learn to read and write then they are empowered to participate in everyday activities within society. However, the JAMAL method does not lend itself to conscientization. The functionalist approach to education and the JAMAL material help to enforce gender and class roles within society. Learning to read and write does not necessarily provide inmates with the tools to grapple with social injustices through the appropriate channels, nor does it necessarily provide an avenue for breaking the cycle of poverty and dependence experienced by many inmates.

The reasoning method does not rely on the JAMAL method, but has it roots instead in the Rastafarian ritual of reasoning. The reasoning method shares similarities with Freirean pedagogy and is focused on more than basic literacy and numeracy. It encourages conscientization through critical thinking and dialogue. One of the major differences between the two methods lies in the approach (‘jug and mug’ versus dialogic); the classroom environment (functionalist versus democratic); and how the inmate is perceived (unintelligent versus intelligent). However, critical education also challenges traditional power relations and it is perhaps hardly surprising that such approaches do not form part of the training, or developed pedagogy, of prison educators in Jamaica.
After analysing pedagogy in Chapter 1, I surmised that there is no one ‘right pedagogy’ but instead a particular pedagogy appropriate to each situation and to achieving specific aims. Thus, both the pedagogic methods examined achieved a level of success. The DCSJ’s aim is to redress illiteracy and it is not concerned necessarily with conscientization. It is important to acknowledge that critical pedagogies represent a challenge to existing power structures within the prison context, and that the latter’s structure of power, both internal and external, render it dependent on its own standard of performance. The vacillation in values, between the twin masters of retribution and rehabilitation (which may favour a conservative pragmatism towards radical change in prison education per se) does not promote a susceptibility to adopting critical approaches to prison education. However, if Jamaica is to achieve the vision articulated for 2015 (as outlined in the introduction), then it is necessary to look at prison education as more than basic literacy and to encourage the development of pedagogic techniques and theories in keeping with adult literacy. This would mean an adult capable of taking responsibility for their own education and one that is aware of their dual nationality, both citizen and individual, the one in the other; inextricable. To take a critical stance towards one’s own living conditions is perhaps the meaning of education, the growth that comes out of reflection, the understanding that thrives better for not being inculcated, but argued for and won.
Conclusion

Question 4: Who educates the prisoner in the Jamaican context and how does this compare with who educates the prisoner according to the literature.

In spite of the multifaceted roles of the modern prison, their primary role is incarceration that is, keeping the inmate safely locked away; separate from the rest of society. As such, security is of paramount importance in all operational aspects of daily prison life, including prison education programs. A prison culture that prioritises security tends to conflict with educational programs. The debate on who should teach in prison classrooms opposes those who argue for the convenience and cost effectiveness of using internal prison staff (such as warders or civilian educators employed directly by the prisons), with the more costly option of outsourcing teaching positions (such as educators from local colleges and universities). The security oriented nature of the prison impacts decisions with regard to the staffing of prison education programs. In this sense, warder teachers or assistants may well represent the security option on prison education programs: they may well offer ‘protection’ to a civilian teacher otherwise ‘unprotected’. However, warders may also represent the economic option. In a situation where funding for prison education is inadequate, using warders to fill two positions, that is, to provide security and education, allows for paying half the price of differentiated roles. The economic argument is further bolstered by the pragmatics of money, which dictates that the DSCJ is already woefully under funded in terms of being able to provide a full compliment of trained teachers. The weave, of security and economics, is difficult to unpick and prioritise, but it undoubtedly provides a heady mix that helps to explain the number of warder-teachers who currently practice.
As outlined in Chapter 5, there are three categories of persons who teach in the Jamaican prisons; warders, civilians and inmates. The implications of teachers' values and attitudes and how these impact their pedagogic practices were examined. Within the literature there is evidence of prison education being carried out by volunteers, teachers from tertiary institutions, guards and inmates engaged in peer teaching (for example the Toe-by-Toe project)\(^{27}\). Within the Jamaican context, it was found that the warder-teacher/student relationship was the most contentious of the three, particularly as it pertained to issues of power, authority and democracy in the classroom. In spite of the convenience of using warder teachers, it is not a recommended practice. With regard to the use of warder/guards in the delivery of education, although there are examples of warders teaching or assisting to teach in the literature, the practice of warders as educators is not advocated (UN/UNESCO Institute for Education, 1995). Niles, (1997: 52) argues that one must recognise that "it is not an educator's duty to collaborate in punishment but rather in growth and rehabilitation". A warder's primary task is issues of security and these will always supersede the teacher student relationship. Dunne (1991: 19) goes a step further in suggesting that the matter of education should not be handled by persons employed directly by the prison services stating that: "education should be provided by an outside agency ... the introduction of "outsiders" [is] calculated to open the prisons in a beneficial way to outside influence. [It will contribute] to the breaking down [of] the closed prison mentality". Niles (1997: 55) notes that within the Caribbean context the most successful [prison education] programs are those receiving organizational and pedagogic support from an institution". It is possible that the DCSJ would benefit from considering the

---

\(^{27}\) Toe-by-Toe is both a book and a scheme geared towards eradicating illiteracy. It is used both in schools and in prisons and involves a mentoring system. Within the prison context a literate inmate mentors an illiterate inmate using the Toe-by-Toe book in short daily sessions until literacy is achieved.
feasibility and benefits of using outside agencies to provide prison education (such as community colleges and universities).

Limitations of the research
The reality of conducting research in prisons is that the research process is shaped by the access afforded the researcher. One of the main challenges of prison research is gaining access to the field (Patenaude, 2004). Reuss (2000), speaking of the prison context, notes that the researcher can often lose control over deciding the research sample. In this particular case, the researcher was unable to remain true to the original group envisaged for the research within prisons. This means that this thesis does not account for the prisoners' views of their experiences of prison education. The researcher's original intention was to focus on precisely this aspect of the prisoners' perceptions of their own educational experience. However when the proposal was mooted to senior personnel within the DCSJ I was informed that such a study would be difficult to sanction, due to the potential risk to the researcher and potential breaches to the security of the prisons. I was therefore forced to redirect the focus of the research towards the adult educators themselves and inmates were only included insofar as they were themselves educators or through observation. The redirection of the research was a direct result of issues pertaining to access. Without the endorsement of the DCSJ it was not possible to have the kind of sustained access to the inmates which would have been necessary in order to focus the study on the inmate.
The limitations to this thesis are also methodological. Firstly, the cessation of my access to Ras I prison after one visit, because of security concerns, meant that the researcher was unable to continue to explore as fully as she would have liked, the manifestations of the reasoning method and the daily operations of classes within Ras I prison. This limitation was partially circumvented through follow up interviews with Ras Conscious (the head teacher at Ras I prison), who happened to have been transferred to one of the prisons to which I had access. The second was the inability to rely on written text from respondents as a means of generating data. Although the use of letters is well-documented in the research literature, my respondents within the Jamaican prison context were unwilling to communicate by letter. They expressed discomfort over committing their thoughts to paper and a fear of being ‘found out’. Jamaica has a strong oral tradition, which proved itself even stronger for the prison context. It was a salutary reminder that useful and detailed textbook scenarios do not always translate seamlessly into the field. It also demonstrates how the novitiate researcher learns in the field through trial and error. Thus, respondents were more willing to share their thoughts, views, and criticisms verbally than they were when writing it down.

**Avenues for post-doctoral research**

This research demonstrated beyond doubt that the data and concerns that emerged merit further study and research into the Jamaican prison system as it pertains to education. In light of the limitations of this study in exploring the inmates’ perceptions and experiences of the educational programs offered in prisons, it would be useful to pursue a study that permitted in-depth interviews with inmate students. In addition, a longitudinal study with
inmates as they move through the prison education system from levels 1-4, and beyond, could be extremely illuminating.

Another area for future research is the role of the chaplaincy and various church organisations in hindering or developing prison education. During several field visits, members of the chaplaincy were observed interacting with inmates. They provided spiritual guidance, helped with practical matters (such as contacting family members), and encouraged the educational endeavours of the inmate. The DCSJ is bound by law to allow religious groups of varying denominations access to the inmates in order to minister to them. Whilst there is nothing inherently wrong with this practice, there is conflict and tension between members of various church groups and prison educators as the church services tend to disrupt the schedule of the school. An assessment of the impact of chaplaincy and religious groups on the prison education system and the tensions between spiritual and secular rehabilitation is important. The church in the Jamaican context has a long history of providing quality education to the Jamaican people. However, in the prison context it is necessary to examine whether the role currently undertaken by church groups representing various denominations is more of a hindrance than a help to the provision of quality education in the prison system. The role of the prison chaplaincy in mediating the tensions between the church groups and their desire to minister and the prisoner's need for education could also be explored.

With regard to women inmates in Jamaica, studies to date have focused on women's involvement in the drug trade, and how women's incarceration affects their families, particularly their children. This thesis also begins to explore the experiences of women
inmates with regard to education. However, a more in-depth study of the experiences of women inmates, particularly regarding their perceptions of educational programs, would be timely. Unlike the men, the majority of the women in this study have not sought to contribute to the development and delivery of their own education. Exploring the reasons behind the women's lack of participation and engagement with the educational programs may be the first step in the development of education programs specifically suited to the needs of women prisoners.

The thesis has provided a timely investigation of pedagogic practices in the Jamaican prison context. It has explored the prison pedagogies uncovered in the Jamaican prison context and has sought to challenge the status quo with regard to prison education in Jamaica.
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术语与参考

政策目标
1. 鼓励科学研究（操作、医疗和行为学），研究/访谈/摄影在纠正措施中以尊重囚犯、患者和工作人员的权益及遵守纪律治理的伦理准则的方式进行。

参数
2. 研究是系统性、控制性、实证性的调查，以提供信息。研究包括测试假说、调查和分析二次数据。

申请向司法部申请研究/访谈/摄影将要求以下内容并在三周前提交：

必要条件
- 要求信件须呈送给司法部长。
- 须由您所附机构（尤其是学生）发出的认证信件。
- 复印本研究报告/项目提案。
- 复印本研究工具如问卷/访谈计划。
- 同意书：所有参与者须签署书面知情同意书。应清楚解释研究，说明原因及来源。指出可能的风险和任务应被描述。声明参与是自愿的，不会影响他们的刑期，且可随时退查无后果。（标准模板可在司法部。[点击这里]）。
- 详细日程。
- 陪同您进入机构的所有人员的姓名、职位。
- 联系：邮寄地址及电话号码。
- 完成访客申请表

特定于访谈/摄影
- 所有问题必须由所有参与者提出的问卷须提交给司法部长。
least thirty (30) days before the date of the actual interview.
- The purpose and intent of the interview/documentary must be clearly and
comprehensively set out in your request, this should also state the persons, agencies,
organizations etc. to which the interview/documentary will be distributed or supplied.
- Photographs of inmates, wards and staff faces as well as voice recordings are
restricted.

Specific to MEDICAL RESEARCH
- The Commissioner shall review all proposals which involve medical programs. Such
proposals shall also be reviewed and approved by Medical Coordinator/Chief Medical
Officer/Psychiatrist and the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of National Security
and other relevant bodies if necessary.
- Programmes must agree with the Ministry Of Health research guidelines.

An inmate may volunteer to participate in a medical research
study only if he:
- has been diagnosed with the condition being studied
- clearly understand the objective of the study
- understand and accept the methods to be used.
- is aware of the anticipated benefits and risks
- has signed a consent form which describes the objectives of the study and
stipulates conditions.

3. Each research proposal/questions shall be reviewed by the appropriate Research Committee:
Commissioner of Corrections; Deputy Commissioner of Custodial Services; Psychiatrist/Chief
Medical Officer; Director of Rehabilitation; Legal Advisor; Representative of the Ministry of
National Security; other relevant personnel. If it were a high density research this process require
20 working days.

PROPOSALS/QUESTIONS WILL BE SCREENED CONSIDERING THE FOLLOWING FACTORS:
- Their compatibility with the research priorities and objectives of the Department.
- The observation of research ethics including possible risks and harm to subjects.
- Required probe will neither interrupt inmate’s treatment plan nor conflict with
institutions’ regulations/operations
- The quality of the proposal: methodology, research instrument and schedule in
comparison to others
- The benefits this research will have to the department
- The ability for Reports to be submitted to the Department

AGREEMENT WITH RESEARCHERS/INTERVIEWERS/FILM MAKERS

4. Once a proposal has been approved, a written agreement between the Department and the
researchers shall be drawn up. This proposal shall comply with governing legislations and shall
include and be acknowledged by Researchers to:
- A. Respect the legislative and policy provisions for the protection of the confidentiality
   of information and the privacy of staff, offenders and ex-offenders. This shall include adherence to
   the appropriate legislation.
- B. Abide by all rules and regulations of the correctional service applicable to volunteers.

http://www.dej.net/p/mentor.htm
10/23/2007
visitors or staff.
  C. A recognition that permission to conduct research may be withdrawn at anytime for violations of the rules and regulations or unapproved deviations from the original proposal, or may be temporarily suspended for operational reasons.
  - D. an acknowledgement that, other than the report submitted for publication, no further release of data collected shall be made without the permission of the Department and/or the Ministry of National Security.
  - E. a stipulation that all reports shall make appropriate acknowledgement and include a statement of the disclaimer that opinions and conclusions do not necessarily represent those of the Department and/or the Ministry of National Security.
  - F. The Department of Correctional Services reserves the right to request a report of findings especially where there are relevant to reviews of correctional programmes.
  5. It is imperative that confirmation be received from the Department of Correctional Services before your research is confirmed with your institutions/organizations.
  6. Upon receiving permission, Superintendents shall inform Researchers of the applicable rules and regulations of the correctional institutions. Which includes: No staff member/inmate shall be offered privileges in exchange for their participation

** The Department’s Research Officer will also monitor research activities to ensure compliance with the policy and will aid where necessary. The Research Officer will remain connected to ensure the dissemination and application of research findings as appropriate.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT AND EXTERNAL RESEARCHER

(5)

I _________________________________ of ______________________________ agree to:

1. Respect all legislative and policy provisions for the protection of the confidentiality of information and the privacy of staff, inmates and wards.

2. To abide by all applicable rules and regulations of the Department of Correctional Service (D.C.S.), including those disguised to ensure my safety.

3. To recognize and accept that permission to conduct research may be withdrawn at anytime for violation of the said rules and regulations or approved deviation from the original proposal or may be suspended for operational reasons.

4. That report will only be used for said purpose and no further release of data collected shall be made without the permission of the Commissioner of Corrections.

5. That all reports shall include a statement and disclaimer that opinion and conclusion do not necessarily represent those of the Department.

6. That all reports resulting from research findings shall be reviewed by the Department prior to publications/releases in order to ensure considerations established for the contract have

http://www.dcsj.net/pr/otor.htm

10/23/2007
been met and the legislation has been respected.

7. The Department of Correctional Services shall receive a copy of the Research Report.

I understand and accept all above clauses:

Researcher/Interviewer/Film Maker ________________________________
Date __________________________

Instructor of Programmes [lecturers] ________________________________
Date __________________________

Return to previous page
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

CONSENT FORM

I, the undersigned, hereby willingly participate in this research project being undertaken by

[ Mr./ Mrs./ Miss ] ______________________________________________________________

entitled __________________________________________________________________________

In agreeing to participate, I understand that:

1. My anonymity will be preserved at all times because my name and any other identifying information will be kept strictly confidential; and the results of this report will be reported in such a manner that I will not be identifiable in anyway.

2. I can refuse any question that I do not want to answer.

3. I can discontinue participation in this research at any time and for any reason, without fear of negative consequences to me.

4. The interviewer may request that the interview to be taped/videotaped.

   Tick one of the following:
   [ ] I agree that the interview may be recorded/video taped
   [ ] I do not agree to have the interview recorded and videotaped

5. The interviewer may request that photographs be taken of you.

6.

7. Check the following:

   [ ] I agree that the interviewer may take photographs of me
   [ ] I do not agree that the interviewer may take photographs of me.

8.

I __________________________________ have read this consent form, been given the opportunity to ask questions, and all questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction.

In signing this consent form, I am agreeing to participate in this research project.

Appendix A

Documents required to gain access to Jamaican prisons

Department of Correctional Services
5-7 King Street, Kingston, Jamaica.

VISITOR APPLICATION FORM 2
For Attorneys, NGOs, CBOs, and other groups.
Persons under 18yrs are not allowed in Adult Correctional Centres
Group members must complete separate application forms
(please use block capitals)

Name of Visitor: ____________________________
Also known as: ____________________________
Name of organization: _______________________
Nationality: _______________________________
Address: Residential: __________________________
Postal: ________________________________
Date of Birth: _______ _______ 19____
Day Mth Year Occupation: __________________________
Contact #s Work ( ) Home ( )
Have you ever been convicted of a criminal offence? Yes ___ No ___

Date of visit being requested: _______ _______ _______
Day Mth Year Purpose of Visit: __________________________

Date of next visit: _______ _______ _______
Day Mth Year

* Excepting Attorneys, this application must be completed accurately six weeks before requested date of visit and must be accompanied by a cover letter addressed to the Commissioner of Corrections.

* False information could result in loss of privilege.

* Research requests must be accompanied by a research proposal including methodology, research instrument, interview schedule, copy of consent form and schedule of visits. Upon completion of your study A COPY OF YOUR RESEARCH REPORT MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT.

* I understand that I cannot make physical contact with the inmate and that money, weapons, cell phones or other prohibited articles are not allowed inside the institution.

Visitor’s signature __________________________ Date ___________
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor's signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Visitors are required to show a valid photographic ID.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID type</th>
<th>ID #</th>
<th>ID expiration date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Approved  □  Declined  □  Deferred  □

Permanent Secretary Approval required □

Superintendent  □  Date

Date Referred:    Day Mth Year
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Figure 3.1 Floor Plan of a Prison Classroom

KEY
1. Student Work Station with two computers
2. Printer Station
3. Filing Cabinets
4. Student desk & chair
5. Door
6. Chalkboard
7. Interior wall

The drawings displayed in figures 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4a and 3.4b are not to scale and the dimensions displayed are approximations.
Figure 3.2 Floor Plan of a Prison Classroom

Classroom dimensions estimated at 5.8m x 3.7m

KEY

4. Student desk & chair
5. Door
6. Chalkboard
8. Window
9. Teacher’s desk & chair
Figure 3.3 Floor Plan of a Prison Classroom

Room estimated at 7m x 1.7m

Room estimated at 7m x 4.3m

Room estimated at 4.3m x 3.4m

Room estimated at 4.3m x 3.6m

KEY

1. Student Work Station with three computers
2. Door
3. Chalkboard
4. Partition/ wall for office
5. Window
6. Bench
7. Student desk & chair
8. Work table
9. Cupboards
Figure 3.4a Floor Plan of a Prison Classroom

Classroom estimated at 6.7m x 3.7m

KEY
1. Filing cabinets
2. Student’s Work Station/desk & chair
3. Door
4. Chalkboard
5. Window
6. Teacher’s desk & chair
7. Bench
8. Table
Figure 3.4b Floor Plan of a Prison Classroom

Classroom estimated at 5.2m x 4.7m

KEY

2 Printer Station
5 Door
8 Window
10 Teacher’s desk & chairs
13 Book cupboards/library
15 Table
16 Computer
17 Chair
Mr. Justwin Jarrett,
Ministry of Justice,
2 Oxford Road,
Kingston 5

Re: INFORMATION ON THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES

The following is information that was requested on the Department of Correctional Services.

1. The main guidelines under which the Department of Correctional Services operates include the Department of Correctional Services Corrections Act, the Juveniles Act and the Probation of Offenders Act.

2. The Department of Correctional Services under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of National Security has been in charge of both Juvenile Correctional Centres and Adult Correctional Centres (prisons) in Jamaica since 1975.

   Education of both a vocational and coordinated by its Educational Coordinator. The Department collaborates with both governmental and non-governmental organisations to undertake this task. The JAMAL (Jamaica Adult Literacy) Programme, Food For the Poor, Religious Volunteers, Harvard University, the Organisation of African States, HEART Trust NTA are but a few of these organisations.

   The Department utilizes the services of trained teachers, Correctional Officers and inmates in its educational programmes.

3. The Department of Correctional services, as a government organisation does have an auditing body. At present there are four (4) external auditors who report directly to the
Auditor General. The Department also has its internal auditors, presently headed by Mr. Hugh Rose.

4. The Department has been fortunate in forming alliances with Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) in providing a safe and rehabilitative environment for its clients.

There are over seventy (70) NGO's Islandwide that offer financial, material and human support. Some Kingston and St. Andrew has the Salvation Army, Red Cross, Dispute Resolution Foundation, HEART (Human Employment And Resource Training) Trust-NTA (National Training Agency), Corner Stone Ministries, University of Technology, University of the West Indies, Jamaica Social Investment Fund and Peoples Action for Community Transformation, just to name a few.

Along with the above there are approximately one hundred and fifty (150) Religious Volunteers offering religious, moral, financial and material support to our clients.

5. The adult prison population as at 26th, July 2002 was 3762. Approximately 10% of this population are currently receiving an education (academic). The facilities and the limited resources are both limitations to the programme. The Department has established alliances with JAMAL and Harvard University with its aim being to increase and improve its education programme.

6. The two oldest Adult Correctional Centres are Tower Street Adult Correctional Centre built in the 16th century and upgraded in 1845 and the St. Catherine Adult Correctional Centre built in 1655 and upgraded in 1898.

Both above mentioned institutions are 9 feet in height, 6 feet wide, and 8 feet long. It is approximately 48 feet square feet. The cells were made to accommodate an inmate each but because of the overcrowding being experienced St. Catherine Adult Correctional Centre houses between 1 and 3 inmates to a cell and Tower Street Adult Correctional Centre houses between 1 and 7 inmates to a cell.

Fort Augusta and Tamarind Farm have dormitories which are 30 feet wide by 100 feet long. Here between 32 and 34 inmates are housed.

7. The Department has in place a Classification Committee that selects inmates on the risk they pose and the offences they commit. Low risk inmates with minor offences are sent to the Minimum-Security facilities and high risk with major offences, to the Maximum-Security facilities.

Within these facilities the majority of inmates are housed depending on their offences.

The overcrowding of the institution has lead to minor cases where an inmate may be housed where accommodation is available. If an inmate’s life is at risk he may also be housed where accommodation is accessible.
The National Rehabilitation Strategy established in both the Juvenile and Adult Correctional Centres focuses on social intervention, counseling and value education to assist in the development of our clients' personal and social lives. It also focuses on inmates' adaptation in the centres including medical, legal, school and work related.

The Department has expanded its staff complement at the administrative level of rehabilitation. This has facilitated the expansion of the client welfare services through which inmate grievances are addressed. We have also assigned both a Coordinator for Strategic Alliances and experienced Probation Officers to develop the Case Management Programme in the Tower Street and St. Catherine institutions.

Likewise, the Educational Coordinator has implemented projects which brings benefits, such as earning power, timely acceptance into the community, re-acquaintance with free society, gradual independence from a controlled environment, effective engagement in a law abiding life style, gradual re-acquaintance with family members, improved attitudes, in other words, total empowerment of inmates.

Community mobilization and organisation development aimed at bridging gaps between institutional life and community involvement is also a main area of focus. The aims at re-integrating inmates into society by providing them with valuable skills, an education, religious counseling along with counseling in conflict resolution and anger management.

The Rehabilitation Programme being undertaken has proven to be effective, hence its expansion and continuation.

The Hostel and Aftercare programmes are methods presently used to monitor the performance of the Rehabilitation Programme. One way of testing our accomplishments is by focusing on the achievements realized by the Adult and Juvenile Centres. For instance, South Camp Adult Correctional Centre in 2001 had 23 inmates doing computer studies, 108 on work release and 12 on school release. Their internal programmes include a tailor shop, woodwork shop, library, framing, welding, computer, art and craft and plumbing.

Another way of testing the effectiveness of the Rehabilitation Programme is to observe the recidivism rate. In 2001 there were 474 recidivists compared to 707 in 1998 and 504 in 1999.

Upon observing the Rehabilitation Programme in the different Centres and the reduction in the recidivism rate. It is right to conclude that the Department of Correctional Services has been increasing its effectiveness in rehabilitating its clients.
There are facilities in place for both the monitoring and support of inmates who have left the correctional centres. The Aftercare Programme and the Parole System facilitate ex-inmates and inmates serving a portion of their sentence outside the institutions, respectively.

The Parole System caters to inmates serving a part of their sentence in their community. Here inmates report to Probation Officers on a weekly basis. These inmates are selected based on the portion of the sentence they have completed. The Aftercare Programme caters to inmates who have completed their sentences and need help in adjusting in society. Here Probation Officers and other Agencies, which the Department collaborates with, act as counselors. These Probation Officers also act as facilitators and advisors especially as they monitor the ventures undertaken by these ex-inmates with the grants they receive.

This integration process normally last between six months and a year.

8. We are unable to say whether there are articles or books written by Jamaicans on the Penal System. However, there are articles compiled within the Department that might be of assistance such as, "International Conference on Crime and Criminal Justice in the Caribbean" written by Lt. Colonel John Prescod.

It is hoped that this information will be adequate to assist in the completion of your research.

Donald Miller
Director (Actg.)
Planning, Research & Evaluation Unit
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TO THE TEACHER:

The students who have completed "Our Class and Our Family" and "A Day with the Sharps" should know 114 words by sight, the actual vocabulary of those books. They should also have an additional sight vocabulary of a number of other words which they should have learnt in discussions arising out of the books.

In "A Day with the Sharps", they should have a fair knowledge of letters and their sounds. In addition to this, they should be able to understand what they read and to relate it to their daily lives.

In "Henry Sharpe", the aim is to improve the reading skill of the students and to develop in them a desire to read for information and for pleasure.

No flash cards and exercises are provided for Word Drill with this book, but suggestions for further word building and discussions are given in the Teacher's Guide.

When the students have completed this book they will know by sight, 264 different words used in the books and in addition, a large number of associated words.

The teacher must always bear in mind that the student must be taught not only to read, but to apply what he reads. Each student must therefore be encouraged to express himself in writing as well as to apply the knowledge gained from his reading. Students must also be encouraged to read other books at this level of reading. The Teacher's Guides for the third and fourth Readers give many suggestions for this.
Henry Sharpe has no work.
He wants to get work.
He gets up early and looks for his clean clothes.
He hurries to get on his clean clothes and he hurries to have his breakfast.
He has heard that they want a man to work at Brown's Supermarket and he wants to get there early.
Henry's wife, Ruby, is ready to go to work.

She works with the Greens and she has her breakfast at their home.

Both Henry and Ruby leave the house together.

They walk quickly.

Ruby waits for the bus but Henry goes on walking.
“Good luck,” Ruby says as Henry leaves her.

Henry walks quickly.

As he walks he says to himself, “Life is really hard.

If only I could get a job, then Ruby and I could do much better for the children.

But I look for work till I am tired.

Life is really hard.”

Henry gets to the Supermarket.

It is not open. He waits at the door.

Soon he sees his friend Stanley coming his way.

“Hi, man,” Henry calls out.

Stanley looks at Henry.
“What are you doing here?” he asks Henry as he comes to him.

“I am looking for work and I heard the Supermarket wants a side-man. But now I hear the pay is so small, I don’t know if I want the job.”

“True, Henry, the pay is small and life is hard. But good jobs are hard to get now.

Take what you can get and with luck you will get a better one.”
"That is true, Stanley, but remember I have Ruby and the children to look after. I must have a better job."

"True, Henry, but if you want a good job you must learn a trade. Why not learn to drive? Drivers get good jobs."

"That is good, Stanley, but I have no money. How am I going to learn to drive?"

Stanley says, "See, that's why you must take the side-man job. Mr. Brown is a good man. If you do well he may make his driver teach you. But there are many things that a driver must know before he can drive on the road. Read the book called 'The Road Code' and you will learn the things you must know."
"I can think about it Stanley, but that is all I can do."

"Don't say that, man, till you try."

But I have to leave you now.

I can't stop.

It's getting late."

Soon the doors of the Supermarket are opened.

Henry asks for Mr. Brown.

He runs the Supermarket.

Someone takes him to Mr. Brown.

"Good morning," says Mr. Brown.

"What can I do for you?"

"Good morning, sir," says Henry.

"I am Henry Sharpe."
Someone told me you want a side-man on your truck.”

“Yes that is true, Sharpe,” says Mr. Brown.

“But I want a man who will work hard.”

“I will work hard, sir,” says Henry.

“I have to have work.”

“Good,” says Mr. Brown.

“You can start today and work in the Supermarket.

And then you can go on the truck for the rest of the week.”

“Thank you, sir,” says Henry.

Henry works in the Supermarket for the day.
He works hard and goes home late.
He sees Ruby cooking the dinner.
  “You look tired,” she tells him.
  “I am tired,” Henry says.
  “I got the job.
The pay is small and the work is hard.
If I didn’t have you and the children to look after I wouldn’t take the job.”
“Henry, don’t say that. One day something better will turn up.”

“Maybe! I saw Stanley today. He told me that men who can drive are getting good jobs these days. He says I must learn. But I don’t know who will teach me.

He says the first thing I must do is read a book called ‘The Road Code’. But I don’t know where to get it.”

“Road Code,” says Ruby, “You know I think I see Mr. Green with one of those Road Code books. I will ask him for it.”

“But while I am reading and learning to drive, there is no money for you and the children.”
“Henry, you can’t have everything one time.
You get a job first thing today.
Thank God for that and try to learn something to make you get a better one.”
“You right, Ruby.
It is hard, but I’ll try.”

Next morning, Henry goes to work early.
George the truck driver is there.
“Hi man,” he says.
He asks Henry where he was working before.
Henry is sad.
He has to tell George that he has not had any work for a long time.
Henry works hard all week.

George and himself sing songs as they work.

Henry likes the 'Banana Song'

"Day Oh, Day Oh,  
Day deh light  
And me wan go home."

Mr. Brown is pleased with Henry. He tells him he can keep the job.

"You work well, Sharpe," he says.

"Keep it up."
That evening Henry tells Ruby that Mr. Brown says he can keep the job. Ruby is pleased but Henry is still sad.

"I work all week and look at my pay," he says.

"What can this buy?"

Ruby says, "It can't buy everything. But remember last week you didn't have any money at all.

I wouldn't worry. I would thank God."

"Ruby you are a good wife. You really do your best to help me."

On Monday morning Henry and George have a talk. Henry tells George that he wants a better job, but he has no trade.
"You can read?" George asks Henry.

"Yes, man," Henry says.

"I went to school.
I can read."

"Then why don't you learn to drive?"
asks George.
"You know something," says Henry. "I have a friend who was asking me that one morning last week.

He said that if only I had my licence I could do better for my family."

"Listen to me Henry," says George. "We had a good side-man on this truck before.

He wanted to learn to drive.

He would sit beside me when the truck was empty.

Mr. Brown saw that my friend wanted to learn to drive.

He told him to get his Learner's Licence.

Then he told me that I could let him drive the truck when it was empty.

But I must sit beside him and teach him.
"Who is going to teach you?" she asks.

"Well, George, the truck driver, said I can sit beside him when the truck is empty.

I would learn very quickly if I could see what he does."

"But you can't learn to drive that way," says Ruby.
“Listen, Ruby,” says Henry.

“George told me Mr. Brown let a man learn to drive the truck when it was empty.

But he had to have his Learner’s Licence.

George said he helped him and in six months he passed his test.

He is now driving a truck for a Bauxite Company and making good money.”


Don’t worry.

Do your best on your job and Mr. Brown may help you.

I will talk to Mr. Green and get the ‘Road Code’ book for you.”

Next day Henry and George meet Mr. Brown.

George says, “Please sir, we were coming to see you.

Henry wants to learn to drive.

We come to ask you to let him learn to drive on your truck.”

Mr. Brown thinks for a long time.

Then he says, “Sharpe, I am very pleased with your work.

I think you are a careful man.”
That evening Ruby and the children wait for Henry.
They see him coming and see that he is very happy.
Ruby and the children hurry to meet him.

"It's a long time since I see you look so happy," Ruby says.

"Mr. Brown told me I can learn to drive on his truck.

Ruby laughs.

"Look what I see," she says.

"Henry singing for his family.
Next thing you know, he will be in the festival."

"Don't laugh at me," says Henry.

"Who knows, you may be right."
workbook

Henry Sharpe
To the Teacher:

This book is designed to accompany the third book of the reading series, "Henry Sharpe". The general Teacher's Guide for this book gives instructions as to how this Workbook should be used in collaboration with the Reader.

The fine print in each lesson under 'Teacher's note' has detailed instructions for the teacher. Using this as a guide, tell your students what should be done in each lesson. Most of the students should be able to do the exercises on their own. If they cannot, help them to do so.
Lesson 1

Teacher's note: To be done after pages 4 and 5 of the third book, "Henry Sharpe". From these pages, help the student to write in the answers to 1 and 2.

1. Henry Sharpe gets up early. Write two things Henry does when he gets up.

_____________________________________________________________________

2. Why does he want to get to Brown's Supermarket early?

_____________________________________________________________________

Teacher's note: Let the student write as many words as he/she can that have the short vowel sounds of "a" as in MAN and "o" as in POT. He/she should also list any words that begin with the sound of "br" as in BROWN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>e.g. man</th>
<th>o</th>
<th>e.g. pot</th>
<th>br</th>
<th>e.g. Brown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lesson 2

Teacher’s note: To be done after pages 6 and 7 of the third book “Henry Sharp”. Let the student answer question 1.
Then let him/her write sentences 2, 3 and 4 again, using capital letters, full stops and question marks where needed.

1. Where does Ruby have her breakfast?

2. Ruby works with the greens

3. Henry and Ruby walk together

4. How does Ruby get to work

Teacher’s note: Let the student call out as many words as he/she can beginning with the sounds of “gr” and “th”. Now help him/her to write these words, saying them as he/she writes them.

g r
  e.g. Green
  ______
  ______
  ______

      th
 e.g. that
 ______
 ______
 ______
Lesson 3

Teacher's note: To be done after page 8 of the third book, "Henry Sharpe". Let the student answer the questions below.

1. Henry says to himself, "Life is really hard." Why does he say this?

2. What do you think he will be able to do for his children if he gets a job?

Teacher's note: The words on the left are new words in the "Henry Sharpe" book. Let the student make words ending with the last 3 letters of the words and having the same sound. Let him/her say them as he/she writes them.

- hard - lard
- till - sill
Lesson 4

Teacher’s note: To be done after page 9 of the third book, “Henry Sharpe.” Let the student answer the questions below.

1. When Henry gets to the Supermarket it is not open. What does he do?

2. Who comes his way?

3. Is there a Supermarket in your town? If not, where do you buy the things you need?

Teacher’s note: Let the student write as many words as he/she can that begin with the letter sounds of “fr” and “st”.

e.g. friend

_________

_________

_________

e.g. Stanley

_________

_________

_________
# NUMERACY FOR ADULTS

## WORKBOOK

**LEVEL 2**

### Table 1: Multiplication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x 4</th>
<th>5 x 3</th>
<th>1 x 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 x 2</td>
<td>9 x 1</td>
<td>3 x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x 5</td>
<td>8 x 2</td>
<td>6 x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 x 4</td>
<td>4 x 3</td>
<td>3 x 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 x 3</td>
<td>9 x 2</td>
<td>4 x 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>x 5</th>
<th>x 2</th>
<th>x 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Worksheet 3: Money

- 50 ø
- 25 ø
- 10 ø
- 5 ø
- 2 ø
- 1 ø
- 50 ø
- 25 ø
- 10 ø
- 5 ø
- 2 ø
- 1 ø

*Total change:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 ø</th>
<th>3 ø</th>
<th>2 ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*You have:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 ø</th>
<th>3 ø</th>
<th>2 ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total change:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5 ø</th>
<th>3 ø</th>
<th>2 ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Count the pencils, then practice writing the numeral and its name.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>three,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>five,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>six,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>seven,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eight,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nine,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zero,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 2 / Unit 1
### Sums of 10

Find the missing numbers.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | $2 + \_ = 10$ | 2. | $\_ + 3 = 10$ | 3. | $1 + \_ = 10$
| 4. | $\_ + 5 = 10$ | 5. | $4 + \_ = 10$ | 6. | $\_ + 6 = 10$
| 7. | $7 + \_ = 10$ | 8. | $\_ + 9 = 10$ | 9. | $8 + \_ = 10$

### Sums to 10

Find the missing numbers or add:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. | $4 + 0 = \_ $ | 2. | $2 + \_ = 7$ | 3. | $\_ + 8 = 9$
| 4. | $\_ + 3 = 5$ | 5. | $0 + \_ = 10$ | 6. | $1 + \_ = 6$
| 7. | $6 + 4 = \_ $ | 8. | $2 + \_ = 4$ | 9. | $8 + \_ = 8$
| 10. | $4 + \_ = 7$ | 11. | $3 + \_ = 10$ | 12. | $\_ + 7 = 9$
| 13. | $\_ + 2 = 8$ | 14. | $4 + \_ = 6$ | 15. | $\_ + 5 = 10$
| 16. | $3 + \_ = 6$ | 17. | $\_ + 5 = 9$ | 18. | $9 + \_ = 9$
| 19. | $4 + 4 = \_ $ | 20. | $5 + \_ = 8$ | 21. | $6 + \_ = 7$
| 22. | $\_ + 6 = 9$ | 23. | $2 + \_ = 10$ | 24. | $9 + 1 = \_ $
PLACE VALUE, TENS AND ONES
Count the groups of ten and ones and print the numeral.

1.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
1 \\
\text{O}
\end{array} \quad 14
\]

2.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
\text{O}
\end{array} \quad 14
\]

3.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
\text{O}
\end{array}
\]

4.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
\text{O}
\end{array}
\]

5.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
\text{O}
\end{array}
\]

6.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
\text{O}
\end{array}
\]

7.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{T} \\
\text{O}
\end{array}
\]
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Level 2 / Unit 3
Follow the pattern, write in the next number.

1. 2, 4, 6, 8, 10  ____  ____  16  ____  ____
2. 3, 6, 9, 12, ____  ____  21  ____  ____
3. 4, 8, 12, 16, ____  ____  ____  32  ____  ____
4. 5, 10, 15, 20, ____  ____  ____  ____  50
5. 10, 20, 30, ____  ____  ____  ____  ____
6. 100, 200, 300, ____  ____  ____  ____  ____

Find the missing numbers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 + ___ = 10</td>
<td>____ + 4 = 9</td>
<td>6 + ___ = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ + 3 = 7</td>
<td>2 + ____ = 10</td>
<td>7 + ____ = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 + ____ = 8</td>
<td>1 + ____ = 6</td>
<td>____ + 3 = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11.</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 + ____ = 12</td>
<td>8 + ____ = 11</td>
<td>____ + 7 = 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____ + 9 = 11</td>
<td>____ + 5 = 12</td>
<td>4 + ____ = 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Examples of JAMAL teaching material

How many ones and how many tens? Add the ones first and then the tens.

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

Add the ones first and then the tens.

1. 27 + 2 2. 64 + 4 3. 7 + 92 4. 3 + 12 5. 89 + 0

6. 50 + 20 7. 90 + 7 8. 43 + 50 9. 24 + 60 10. 15 + 40

11. 0 + 78 12. 65 + 20 13. 30 + 40 14. 82 + 16 15. 44 + 53

16. 40 + 40 17. 77 + 21 18. 93 + 3 19. 12 + 26 20. 41 + 35

21. 8 + 71

22. 70 + 17

23. 50 + 40

24. 32 + 47

25. 66 + 33

53

Level 2 / Unit 5
English

Topic: Structure

IS

ARE

1) The cats _______ happy.
2) We _______ resting.
3) Mother _______ sad.
4) The mangoes _______ ripe.
5) Rain _______ falling now.
6) They _______ here.
7) My brother _______ gone.
8) The sun _______ bright.
9) The duster _______ on the desk.
English

Letter writing

Dear Mary,

[Blank lines for writing]

Your friend

Joe

English

Composition
Write six sentences telling about yourself.

Name
Birth month
Like
Dislike
Favourite food
Parish
Family
Maths

Addition and Subtraction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>69</th>
<th>89</th>
<th>98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>42</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>79</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30</th>
<th>88</th>
<th>99</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REVERENCE FOR LIFE FOUNDATION

Report of the forum
On Jamaica’s
Penal & Justice Systems Reform

Ras I Correctional Centre
Preface

The forum on “Penal and justice Systems Reform” held on Saturday May 3, 2003 at Ras I Correctional Centre was hosted by the executive members of the Reverence for Life Foundation, with the permission of, and under the auspices of the Superintendent in charge of the institution, Mr. Abyssinian and with the supervision of Assistant Superintendent Bengal.

The forum was selected as a means through which inmates of Ras I Correctional Centre and the invited participants of civil society would have an opportunity to share their concerns and ideas that relate, directly or indirectly, to the imminent reform of Jamaica’s penal and justice systems.

Purpose & Planning

In appreciation of the limited focus of the associated problems that exist within the two systems, and the critical importance of a strengthening capacity in relation to specific problem identification, analyses and a system of implementation, and in recognition of the wealth of experience within the inmate population, a participatory approach was adopted by the reverence for life foundation. Thus planned approach was consisted of two stages:

29 Pseudonyms have been used for all the persons who participated in this forum in an effort to preserve anonymity.
In the first stage, the lecturers and the students of the Department of Sociology at the University of the West Indies, Mona ere invited to partake in an interactive workshop of Friday May 2, 2003 as a prelude to the forum discussion. This collaborative process was to initiate feedback from an academic perspective by the people involved n the study, teaching, and research of criminology, penology, and other related social sciences. The invitations for participation, for this first stage was sent to Professor Birman, lecturer of Sociology and Criminology in the faculty of the social sciences, however the late receipt of the invitation and the factor of ill timing with the student actively engage in preparation for final examination resulted in the workshop, as planned, not taking place. However, despite receiving a last minute invitation Professor Birman in a show of good will, attended the institution accompanied by Miss Ceylon, a student pursuing post graduate studies, to interact with the executive members of the reverence for life. During this visit the professor delivered an informative and audience captivating, short lecture.

In light of the visit, professor Birman donated two books to the library, which he authored, and committed to the donation of a complete compact disk set of Microsoft’s Encarta encyclopedia. A firm commitment for the Department of Sociology’s collaboration in the staging of a workshop and forum in September 2003 was also made.

In the second stage, government officials, members of civil society and media representatives were to be invited to the forum to serve as panelist guest speakers or to provide media coverage; however the requisite authorization was not received for media coverage to take place. Responses were received from attorney at law Manx, Bishop Somali and acting commissioner Sphynx informing of their regret of being unable to attend. Positive responses were received from the Independent Jamaica Council for Human Rights, Dr. Korat and Mr. Javanese.
The Forum Discussion
The forum discussion which started forty minute after the designated start time of 10:00 a.m. was preceded by an opening prayer by inmate Burmilla and the welcome addresses by senior supt. Abyssinian and Inmate Balinese, president of Ras I’s Reverence for life.

The persons who were in attendance and served and panelist were;
\check{V} Ms. Burmese – Attorney at law and legal officer, I. J. C. H. R.
\check{V} Dr. Korat – Physician, and new paper columnist
\check{V} Mr. Javanese – Psychologist and founder of R.F.L.F.
\check{V} Mr. Munchkin, Returning resident from the United Kingdom and computer technician of container project
\check{V} Staff officer Sokoke
\check{V} Staff officer Singapura
The inmates who served as panelist were;
   * Siamese
   * Siberian
   * Snowshoe
   * Chartreux

As a result of no response from the invited professional moderators, the forum was moderated, at the eleventh house, by inmate Ocicat, the executive member of the reverence for life foundation who conceptualized the workshop and forum discussion, and had intended to participate as a panelist. In addition to the visiting panelist two university students studying law accompanied Ms. Lynx, and Mr. Havana, a lecturer At the University of Technology and four visitors from Toronto Canada accompanied Mr. Javanese.
Discussion agenda
The topics discussed in three segments were as follows;

» Crime and Violence in Jamaica: “the root causes”
  - Social factors; values and attitudes, gun culture, lack of education/opportunities etc.
  - Political tribalism.
  - The association between Jamaica’s problem of violent criminality and the Jamaican drug trade. (narco-terrorism)

» Jamaica’s System of Justice: “the deficiencies in our system”
  - Upon arrest, is there really a presumption of innocence?
  - The right to choose trial by judge or jury.
  - Creativity, sensibility and equality in sentencing.

» The Penal System: “Incarceration; creating better citizens of Jamaica’s convicted.”
  - The rehabilitation strategy
  - Prison overcrowding
  - Parole, reprieve and other mechanisms for early release from prison.
  - Does society forgive?

The participants indicated that the forum was very objective. In particular, all the visiting participants stated that the forum has afforded them the opportunity to gain a greater appreciation and awareness of the deficiencies that exist within the penal and justice systems. All the visitors, except for Mrs. Lynx were visiting a penal institution for the very first time, and stated that although they really knew not what to expect, any negative perception of Ras I prison and its inmate population that they held through the media reports or otherwise were basically put to rest.

The discussions were lively and the forum process was effective and adequately organized although the approach proved a bit lengthy time wise. The forum in general resulted in the objectives of the organizers being fulfilled.

Recommendations
Among the recommendations brought forward to improve the penal and justice systems were;

» Tax incentives or exemptions for victims of crime.
» The utilization of inmate labour to generate income to make prisons self-sustaining and to pay compensation to victims of crime.
» The appointment of more judges to the bench, who are drawn from a pool of attorneys in private practice.
» A review and amendment of the Parole Act to make provisions for the superintendent and staff of the adult correctional center to play a more integral role in the decision making process as it relates to the granting or refusing of parole application.
» The establishment of electronic monitoring for the conditional release of prison inmates or accused persons out on bail.
The establishment of a three strike sentencing guideline to be used by the courts to ensure equality, transparency, and impartiality, for all convicted criminal offenders.

The establishment of a structured rehabilitation system that includes ways and means to evaluate the level of achievement attained by the inmate. Measurable success would include the inmate completing academic courses and counseling sessions.
Positive achievements derived from the forum
✓ A commitment by Mrs. Burmese that the independent Jamaica Council will look into the discriminatory aspects of the parole system and the department of correctional services conditional release programs.
✓ A commitment by Mr. Havana to assist in the implementation of external educational programs for inmates who have attained the standard of matriculation, to pursue courses such as pre-engineering and other technical subjects.
✓ The donation of a complete set of Microsoft's Encarta Compact disks.

Follow-up
In terms of follow-up activities a number of possibilities were identified. These include:
» The forum has proved to be a valuable instrument in setting the stage for subsequent strategic planning processes. The product (i.e. the inmate forum) is sufficiently relevant to be continued on a broader scale, to include the participation of senior level policy-makers and representatives from the social development services, human rights groups and key NGOs.
» The organizers of the forum intent to send thank you letters and a short evaluation questionnaire to the visiting participants of the forum.
» The executive members of the reverence for life are to make a formal request to the acting commissioner of corrections, through the senior superintendent, seeking to have a meeting with him to discuss the many concerns of Ras I inmate population.