

**EDUCATION RITUALS AND THE MARGINAL STATUS OF PRISON
EDUCATORS IN A CANADIAN FEDERAL PRISON: A STUDY FOR
ADVANCING ADULT EDUCATION IN PRISONS**

**A dissertation presented to the
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA**

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

Patricia Anne Fox

1994



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13128-9

Canada

Name _____

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

0516

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
 Art History 0377
 Cinema 0900
 Dance 0378
 Fine Arts 0357
 Information Science 0723
 Journalism 0391
 Library Science 0399
 Mass Communications 0708
 Music 0413
 Speech Communication 0459
 Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
 Administration 0514
 Adult and Continuing 0516
 Agricultural 0517
 Art 0273
 Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
 Business 0688
 Community College 0275
 Curriculum and Instruction 0727
 Early Childhood 0518
 Elementary 0524
 Finance 0277
 Guidance and Counseling 0519
 Health 0680
 Higher 0745
 History of 0520
 Home Economics 0278
 Industrial 0521
 Language and Literature 0279
 Mathematics 0280
 Music 0522
 Philosophy of 0998
 Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
 Reading 0535
 Religious 0527
 Sciences 0714
 Secondary 0533
 Social Sciences 0534
 Sociology of 0340
 Special 0529
 Teacher Training 0530
 Technology 0710
 Tests and Measurements 0288
 Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
 General 0679
 Ancient 0289
 Linguistics 0290
 Modern 0291

Literature
 General 0401
 Classical 0294
 Comparative 0295
 Medieval 0297
 Modern 0298
 African 0316
 American 0591
 Asian 0305
 Canadian (English) 0352
 Canadian (French) 0355
 English 0593
 Germanic 0311
 Latin American 0312
 Middle Eastern 0315
 Romance 0313
 Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
 Religion
 General 0318
 Biblical Studies 0321
 Clergy 0319
 History of 0320
 Philosophy of 0322
 Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
 Anthropology
 Archaeology 0324
 Cultural 0326
 Physical 0327

Business Administration
 General 0310
 Accounting 0272
 Banking 0770
 Management 0454
 Marketing 0338
 Canadian Studies 0385

Economics
 General 0501
 Agricultural 0503
 Commerce-Business 0505
 Finance 0508
 History 0509
 Labor 0510
 Theory 0511
 Folklore 0358
 Geography 0366
 Geontology 0351
 History
 General 0578

Ancient 0579
 Medieval 0581
 Modern 0582
 Black 0328
 African 0331
 Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
 Canadian 0334
 European 0335
 Latin American 0336
 Middle Eastern 0333
 United States 0337
 History of Science 0585
 Law 0398
 Political Science
 General 0615
 International Law and
 Relations 0616
 Public Administration 0617
 Recreation 0814
 Social Work 0452

Sociology
 General 0626
 Criminology and Penology 0627
 Demography 0938
 Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
 Individual and Family
 Studies 0628
 Industrial and Labor
 Relations 0629
 Public and Social Welfare 0630
 Social Structure and
 Development 0700
 Theory and Methods 0344
 Transportation 0709
 Urban and Regional Planning 0999
 Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
 General 0473
 Agronomy 0285
 Animal Culture and
 Nutrition 0475
 Animal Pathology 0476
 Food Science and
 Technology 0359
 Forestry and Wildlife 0478
 Plant Culture 0479
 Plant Pathology 0480
 Plant Physiology 0817
 Range Management 0777
 Wood Technology 0746

Biology
 General 0306
 Anatomy 0287
 Biostatistics 0308
 Botany 0309
 Cell 0379
 Ecology 0329
 Entomology 0353
 Genetics 0369
 Limnology 0793
 Microbiology 0410
 Molecular 0307
 Neuroscience 0317
 Oceanography 0416
 Physiology 0433
 Radiation 0821
 Veterinary Science 0778
 Zoology 0472

Biophysics
 General 0786
 Medical 0760

Geodesy 0370
 Geology 0372
 Geophysics 0373
 Hydrology 0388
 Mineralogy 0411
 Paleobotany 0345
 Paleocology 0426
 Paleontology 0418
 Paleozoology 0985
 Palynology 0427
 Physical Geography 0368
 Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
 Health Sciences
 General 0566
 Audiology 0300
 Chemotherapy 0992
 Dentistry 0567
 Education 0350
 Hospital Management 0769
 Human Development 0758
 Immunology 0982
 Medicine and Surgery 0564
 Mental Health 0347
 Nursing 0569
 Nutrition 0570
 Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
 Occupational Health and
 Therapy 0354
 Ophthalmology 0381
 Pathology 0571
 Pharmacology 0419
 Pharmacy 0572
 Physical Therapy 0382
 Public Health 0573
 Radiology 0574
 Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
 Toxicology 0383
 Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
 Chemistry
 General 0485
 Agricultural 0749
 Analytical 0486
 Biochemistry 0487
 Inorganic 0488
 Nuclear 0738
 Organic 0490
 Pharmaceutical 0491
 Physical 0494
 Polymer 0495
 Radiation 0754
 Mathematics 0405

Physics
 General 0605
 Acoustics 0986
 Astronomy and
 Astrophysics 0606
 Atmospheric Science 0608
 Atomic 0748
 Electronics and Electricity 0607
 Elementary Particles and
 High Energy 0798
 Fluid and Plasma 0759
 Molecular 0609
 Nuclear 0610
 Optics 0752
 Radiation 0756
 Solid State 0611
 Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences
 Applied Mechanics 0346
 Computer Science 0984

Engineering
 General 0537
 Aerospace 0538
 Agricultural 0539
 Automotive 0540
 Biomedical 0541
 Chemical 0542
 Civil 0543
 Electronics and Electrical 0544
 Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
 Hydraulic 0545
 Industrial 0546
 Marine 0547
 Materials Science 0794
 Mechanical 0548
 Metallurgy 0743
 Mining 0551
 Nuclear 0552
 Packaging 0549
 Petroleum 0765
 Sanitary and Municipal 0554
 System Science 0790
 Geotechnology 0428
 Operations Research 0796
 Plastics Technology 0795
 Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
 Behavioral 0384
 Clinical 0622
 Developmental 0620
 Experimental 0623
 Industrial 0624
 Personality 0625
 Physiological 0989
 Psychobiology 0349
 Psychometrics 0632
 Social 0451



Nom _____

Dissertation Abstracts International est organisé en catégories de sujets. Veuillez s.v.p. choisir le sujet qui décrit le mieux votre thèse et inscrivez le code numérique approprié dans l'espace réservé ci-dessous.



SUJET

CODE DE SUJET

Catégories par sujets

HUMANITÉS ET SCIENCES SOCIALES

COMMUNICATIONS ET LES ARTS

Architecture	0729
Beaux-arts	0357
Bibliothéconomie	0399
Cinéma	0900
Communication verbale	0459
Communications	0708
Danse	0378
Histoire de l'art	0377
Journalisme	0391
Musique	0413
Sciences de l'information	0723
Théâtre	0465

ÉDUCATION

Généralités	515
Administration	0514
Art	0273
Collèges communautaires	0275
Commerce	0688
Économie domestique	0278
Éducation permanente	0516
Éducation préscolaire	0518
Éducation sanitaire	0680
Enseignement agricole	0517
Enseignement bilingue et multiculturel	0282
Enseignement industriel	0521
Enseignement primaire	0524
Enseignement professionnel	0747
Enseignement religieux	0527
Enseignement secondaire	0533
Enseignement spécial	0529
Enseignement supérieur	0745
Évaluation	0288
Finances	0277
Formation des enseignants	0530
Histoire de l'éducation	0520
Langues et littérature	0279

Lecture	0535
Mathématiques	0280
Musique	0522
Orientation et consultation	0519
Philosophie de l'éducation	0998
Physique	0523
Programmes d'études et enseignement	0727
Psychologie	0525
Sciences	0714
Sciences sociales	0534
Sociologie de l'éducation	0340
Technologie	0710

LANGUE, LITTÉRATURE ET LINGUISTIQUE

Langues	
Généralités	0679
Anciennes	0289
Linguistique	0290
Modernes	0291
Littérature	
Généralités	0401
Anciennes	0294
Comparée	0295
Médiévale	0297
Moderne	0298
Africaine	0316
Américaine	0591
Anglaise	0593
Asiatique	0305
Canadienne (Anglaise)	0352
Canadienne (Française)	0355
Germanique	0311
Latino-américaine	0312
Moyen-orientale	0315
Romane	0313
Slave et est-européenne	0314

PHILOSOPHIE, RELIGION ET THÉOLOGIE

Philosophie	0422
Religion	
Généralités	0318
Clergé	0319
Études bibliques	0321
Histoire des religions	0320
Philosophie de la religion	0322
Théologie	0469

SCIENCES SOCIALES

Anthropologie	
Archéologie	0324
Culturelle	0326
Physique	0327
Droit	0398
Économie	
Généralités	0501
Commerce-Affaires	0505
Économie agricole	0503
Économie du travail	0510
Finances	0508
Histoire	0509
Théorie	0511
Études américaines	0323
Études canadiennes	0385
Études féministes	0453
Folklore	0358
Géographie	0366
Gérontologie	0351
Gestion des affaires	
Généralités	0310
Administration	0454
Banques	0770
Comptabilité	0272
Marketing	0338
Histoire	
Histoire générale	0578

Ancienne	0579
Médiévale	0581
Moderne	0582
Histoire des noirs	0328
Africaine	0331
Canadienne	0334
États-Unis	0337
Européenne	0335
Moyen-orientale	0333
Latino-américaine	0336
Asie, Australie et Océanie	0332
Histoire des sciences	0585
Loisirs	0814
Planification urbaine et régionale	0999
Science politique	
Généralités	0615
Administration publique	0617
Droit et relations internationales	0616
Sociologie	
Généralités	0626
Aide et bien-être social	0630
Criminologie et établissements pénitentiaires	0627
Démographie	0938
Études de l'individu et de la famille	0628
Études des relations interethniques et des relations raciales	0631
Structure et développement social	0700
Théorie et méthodes	0344
Travail et relations industrielles	0629
Transports	0709
Travail social	0452

SCIENCES ET INGÉNIERIE

SCIENCES BIOLOGIQUES

Agriculture	
Généralités	0473
Agronomie	0285
Alimentation et technologie alimentaire	0359
Culture	0479
Élevage et alimentation	0475
Exploitation des péturages	0777
Pathologie animale	0476
Pathologie végétale	0480
Physiologie végétale	0817
Sylviculture et faune	0478
Technologie du bois	0746
Biologie	
Généralités	0306
Anatomie	0287
Biologie (Statistiques)	0308
Biologie moléculaire	0307
Botanique	0309
Cellule	0379
Écologie	0329
Entomologie	0353
Génétique	0369
Limnologie	0793
Microbiologie	0410
Neurologie	0317
Océanographie	0416
Physiologie	0433
Radiation	0821
Science vétérinaire	0778
Zoologie	0472
Biophysique	
Généralités	0786
Médicale	0760

SCIENCES DE LA TERRE

Biogéochimie	0425
Géochimie	0996
Géodésie	0370
Géographie physique	0368

Géologie	0372
Géophysique	0373
Hydrologie	0388
Minéralogie	0411
Océanographie physique	0415
Paléobotanique	0345
Paléocologie	0426
Paléontologie	0418
Paléozoologie	0985
Palynologie	0427

SCIENCES DE LA SANTÉ ET DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT

Économie domestique	0386
Sciences de l'environnement	0768
Sciences de la santé	
Généralités	0566
Administration des hôpitaux	0769
Alimentation et nutrition	0570
Audiologie	0300
Chimiothérapie	0992
Dentisterie	0567
Développement humain	0758
Enseignement	0350
Immunologie	0982
Loisirs	0575
Médecine du travail et thérapie	0354
Médecine et chirurgie	0564
Obstétrique et gynécologie	0380
Ophtalmologie	0381
Orthophonie	0460
Pathologie	0571
Pharmacie	0572
Pharmacologie	0419
Physiothérapie	0382
Radiologie	0574
Santé mentale	0347
Santé publique	0573
Soins infirmiers	0569
Toxicologie	0383

SCIENCES PHYSIQUES

Sciences Pures

Chimie	
Généralités	0485
Biochimie	487
Chimie agricole	0749
Chimie analytique	0486
Chimie minérale	0488
Chimie nucléaire	0738
Chimie organique	0490
Chimie pharmaceutique	0491
Physique	0494
Polymères	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathématiques	0405
Physique	
Généralités	0605
Acoustique	0986
Astronomie et astrophysique	0606
Électronique et électricité	0607
Fluides et plasma	0759
Météorologie	0608
Optique	0752
Particules (Physique nucléaire)	0798
Physique atomique	0748
Physique de l'état solide	0611
Physique moléculaire	0609
Physique nucléaire	0610
Radiation	0756
Statistiques	0463

Sciences Appliquées et Technologie

Informatique	0984
Ingénierie	
Généralités	0537
Agricole	0539
Automobile	0540

Biomédicale	0541
Chaleur et thermodynamique	0348
Conditionnement (Emballage)	0549
Génie aérospatial	0538
Génie chimique	0542
Génie civil	0543
Génie électronique et électrique	0544
Génie industriel	0546
Génie mécanique	0548
Génie nucléaire	0552
Ingénierie des systèmes	0790
Mécanique navale	0547
Métallurgie	0743
Science des matériaux	0794
Technique du pétrole	0765
Technique minière	0551
Techniques sanitaires et municipales	0554
Technologie hydraulique	0545
Mécanique appliquée	0346
Géotechnologie	0428
Matières plastiques (Technologie)	0795
Recherche opérationnelle	0796
Textiles et tissus (Technologie)	0794

PSYCHOLOGIE

Généralités	0621
Personnalité	0625
Psychobiologie	0349
Psychologie clinique	0622
Psychologie du comportement	0384
Psychologie du développement	0620
Psychologie expérimentale	0623
Psychologie industrielle	0624
Psychologie physiologique	0989
Psychologie sociale	0451
Psychométrie	0632



**EDUCATION RITUALS AND THE MARGINAL STATUS OF PRISON EDUCATORS IN A
CANADIAN FEDERAL PRISON:
A STUDY FOR ADVANCING ADULT EDUCATION IN PRISONS**

BY

PATRICIA ANNE FOX

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

© 1994

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publications rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
DEDICATION	vii i
Chapter One	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Background to the Study	1
Purpose of the Study	14
Significance of the Study	15
Research Questions	16
Definition of Terms	17
Limitations of the Study	19
Chapter Two	20
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	20
Development of Prisons	21
Rehabilitation in Prisons	22
A Brief History of Education in Canada's Prisons	25
Prison Education Programs as Rehabilitation Processes	28
Prison Education and Character Development	31
Prison Education as an Agent of Social Control	32
Prison Education as Moral Education	33
Adult Education	39
Prison Education and Adult Education	42
Teaching Prisoners	45
Adult Basic Education, General Education Development and Prison Education	48
Education Rituals and Marginal Status	52
Summary of the Review of Literature	57
Chapter Three	61
METHODOLOGY	61
What is Qualitative Research?	62
Qualitative Research Methodologies	63
Observations	63
Interviewing	70
Field notes	71
Triangulation	73

DESIGN OF THE STUDY	74
Subjects	74
Student Participant Data	74
Prison Educator Data	80
Procedure	80
Research Location	85
Data Collection Process Used in This Study	86
Pilot Study	87
Interviewing Process	88
Observation Process	89
Field notes	93
DATA ANALYSIS	93
Analysis of the Interview Data	93
Analysis of Observational Data	94
RESULTS OF THE STUDY	96
SECTION ONE: ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS	97
Prison Educators Use of Educational Rituals	98
Prison Educator's Perceived Status	110
Summary of Prison Educator's Interview Responses	115
Prisoner Students' Reasons for Class Participation	118
Education Rituals Recognized/Rejected by Students	123
ABE Students' Recognition/Rejection of Education Rituals	123
GED Students' Recognition/Rejection of Education Rituals	127
Prison Educator's Status - Student's Perspective	137
Summary of the Student's Interview Responses	145
SECTION TWO: OBSERVATIONS	147
Observation Data Notes	148
SECTION THREE: FIELD NOTES	154
SECTION FOUR: TRIANGULATION	159
Evidence of Adult Education Principles and Practices	162
Chapter Five	164
SUMMARY AND FINDINGS	164
EDUCATION RITUALS	164
Control Rituals Used By The Educators	165
Teaching Rituals Used By The Educators	166
Prison Educator Interview Feedback	168
Reasons Students Participated In The Classes	169
Teaching Rituals Recognised By The Students	170
Teaching Rituals Rejected By Some Students	170
Control Rituals Identified And Rejected By Some Students	171
PERCEIVED STATUS OF THE PRISON EDUCATORS IN THE PRISON ..	171
ADULT EDUCATION PRINCIPLES & PRACTICES UTILISED IN THE	
ABE & GED PROGRAMS	172

Chapter Six	173
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	173
Education Rituals	174
Perceptions About the Prison Educator's Status	175
Adult Education Principles and Practices Utilized in the ABE and GED Programs.	175
Prison education and adult education: Program differences	178
Recommendations From The Study	182
Recommendations for Further Research	185
REFERENCES	188

LIST OF TABLES

		Page No.
Table 1	Principles of Adult Learning and Teaching	12
Table 2	Student Participants	77
Table 3	Age, year level, and self-identified cultural groups in ABE programs	78
Table 4	Age, year level, and self-identified cultural groups in GED program	79
Table 5	Observation Schedule	84
Table 6	FIAS Categories	91
Table 7	Comparison of FIAS to Knowles' principles/practices of adult education	92
Table 8	Students' responses to Prison Educators' Status	138
Table 9	Students' ratings of most important prison personnel	142
Table 10	Observation Data Notes	150
Table 11	Adult education principles/practices utilised in the ABE & GED programs	162
Table 12	Adult education principles/practices not utilised in the ABE and GED programs	163
Table 13	Adult education principles/practices utilised in the ABE & GED programs	172
Table 14	O.I.S.E's 1979 recommendations regarding prison educators and professional development	178

ABSTRACT

Adult education has been recognised and advanced in Canadian federal prison education programs since 1836. Yet, there is limited research investigating adult education practices, policies, and staffing issues pertaining to education in Canada's federal prison system. This study examines the education rituals performed in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) classes offered in one Canadian federal penitentiary. Education rituals include: teaching rituals, which are rituals that apply to the teaching situation and can include the way in which teachers structure their lessons, their teaching style and motivational strategies. Educational rituals also include: control rituals, which are rituals that apply to the control of disorderly behaviour in class and consist of, the teacher's attempts to control inattentiveness, mischievousness, and unacceptable behaviour. The research also investigates if the prison educators and their students perceive that the educators are marginal to the total workings of the institution. Finally, the study examines what adult education principles and practices advocated by Knowles (1980) are utilised in the ABE and GED classes. Respondents to the study were four ABE educators and twelve of their students, and a GED educator and ten students. Applying a three-part qualitative research methodology involving open-ended interviews, classroom observations, and fieldnotes, the research shows that the education rituals commonly used by

the prison educators are individualised instruction, one-on-one teaching, and curriculum practices governed by the GED workbooks. Generally, the students appreciated the individual attention given to them by their educators. However, some students expressed frustration with learning from books, lack of group work, and an inadequate curriculum designed for native students. The prison educators and their students concurred that the educators were important for teaching and learner development in the education centre. However, in respect of the whole institution the prison educators were perceived to be marginal. This conclusion was based on the prison educators and their students recognition that the primary purpose of the institution was that of public safety and security. Those prison occupations whose duties and responsibilities were to ensure security and safety were considered the most important at the institution. Consequently, the correctional officers were considered the most important personnel working at the institution. There was limited demonstration of Knowles' (1980) adult education principles and practices. Only one prison educator has had any formal training in adult education. The education centre curriculum is dominated by the GED workbooks, which are sequentially designed and students are required to move from one section to another. The ABE classes involved the use of work sheets with the educator giving individual consultation. The institution's limitations and the use of the established GED curriculum, meant that only three of Knowles' adult education principles and practices are

utilised in ABE and GED classes. The principles and practices are:

- 1.Learners feel a need to learn (Knowles' principle number 1).
- 2.Learners actively participate (Knowles' principle number 5).
- 3.Learners have a sense of progress toward their goals for evaluation (Knowles' principle number 7).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My gratitude and appreciation is extended to Dr. Deo Poonwassie, Faculty of Education, as the chair of my committee and co-ordinator of the research, he gave me insights and critical evaluation as the study progressed and encouraged my efforts. Dr. Poonwassie proved to be an expert practitioner of facilitation. Dr. Rick Linden, Faculty of Arts, a criminologist who generously shared research for the study and diligently edited the transcript. Dr. Hal May, Faculty of Education, an extraordinary educator who was giving of his time, and guided me through the processes for creating the dissertation.

I am grateful to the prison authorities for permitting my numerous visits to the institution, and for their commitment to, and support of the research. To the educators: Winston, Dick, Jonine, Ken, Linda, and Marc; their dedication and professional endeavour will always be a vivid memory for me. I would like to acknowledge the respect and courtesy demonstrated toward me during my visits by the students, and I thank them for their input and genuine interest in the topic.

Appreciation and thanks are extended to a group of people who have encouraged, supported, and helped me at various stages of my research. Lynn C. Hamilton, a university administrator and sociologist, who listened to my theorising, provided resources, and encouraged me throughout the

duration of the study; Remo G. Mamaril for his help with mastering the computer. Brenda M. Gregory, Kimberley G. Thomas and John V. Brandon academic colleagues: Mary Perlmutter for her assistance with accommodation and transport; and Charlene J. Colbourne a patient and supportive friend.

Throughout my career my family have been a source of inspiration, and they have all played an integral part in my development and education. I wish to express my appreciation to my mother Joan, who instilled in me a passion for learning; and my father Frank, for teaching me to accept and understand. I am grateful also to my four brothers: John for paving the way, Stephen for making it look easy, David for daring to be different, and Paul a scholar who constantly encouraged me and made me laugh when I needed to. Finally, I offer my dissertation to Callan, Alicia, Lucy, Leigh, Sarah, Tom, and Elizabeth, and to the generations of my family to come as proof that dreams can be accomplished.

DEDICATION

It is with pleasure and pride that I dedicate this dissertation to an extraordinary woman - a woman who has helped, guided and encouraged me throughout my life. I dedicate this work to my much loved best friend, my mother:

AILEEN JOAN McNEILL FOX

She is clothed in strength and dignity,
she can laugh at the day to come.

When she opens her mouth, she does so wisely;
on her tongue is kindly instruction.

She keeps good watch on the conduct of her household,
no bread of idleness for her.

Her children stand up and proclaim her blessed,
her husband, too, sings her praises:

'Many women have done admirable things,
but you surpass them all!'

(Proverbs 31:25-29).

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Prison education programs are often justified as rehabilitation programs because they provide the requisites for an inmate's return to society. Consequently, the effectiveness of prison education programs is assessed in terms of the programs' success in decreasing recidivism (Glaser, 1969; Linden and Perry, 1983; Reagen and Stoughton, 1976). However, there is very little research supporting the view that prison education programs decrease recidivism, and that which is available is fraught with methodological flaws (Linden and Perry, 1983).

Judging the effectiveness of prison education programs based on recidivism numbers is problematic. There are many variables that can influence an individual to resume criminal activities which result in their re-incarceration. For example, a prisoner's self-concept, which is based on what each of us know about ourselves, can play a major role in recidivism (Forster, 1981; MacCormick, 1932). In addition, Duguid (1981a) and Ross and Fabiano (1981) suggest several other variables which can affect recidivism including: self-esteem, which deals with their perceptions of how prisoners believe others see them; socialisation skills; socio-economic status; and cognitive thinking patterns.

Education programs are one rehabilitation strategy that can affect those variables known to influence recidivism. Attention to education practices such as: teaching strategies, student/teacher interaction, curriculum content, motivation and encouragement techniques, and student behaviour can assist educators in establishing how individuals are influenced by their learning and how, if possible, the learning can influence recidivism. There needs to be a closer examination of specific elements of education practices in prisons to foster and advance prison education programs as viable rehabilitation strategies.

One aspect of this study examines the interaction behaviour between the prison educators and their students in the learning environment. The research labels these behaviours as "education rituals" and suggests that, an understanding of education rituals can provide a basis for examining how the educators and prisoners relate, and if the calibre of the relationship has any impact on student learning.

The study of "how" and "why" adults learn is an integral component of adult education research (Cross, 1981; Brookfield, 1986; Brundage and Mackeracher, 1980; Moore and Waldron, 1980). Teaching methods and practices are usually examined when addressing "how" adults learn, and individual learner needs and interests are the issues studied to establish "why" adults learn. This research investigates "how" prisoners learn by describing the education rituals that are carried out in the prison classroom, and details

educator/ learner interaction that occurs in the prison education environment. The details provide the basis for determining "how" the prisoners learn, as well as deducing what education rituals affect their learning.

There is no shortage of information on "appropriate" teaching styles to ensure learning, many adult education researchers contend that "appropriate" teaching styles or methods vary both situationally and individually (Cross, 1981; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982; Bouliane, 1985; Brookfield, 1986, Brundage and Mackeracher, 1980; Cheatwood, 1988; Knowles, 1980). Situational influences and individual differences are more influential on learning in a prison environment compared to programs offered in the community at large (Scrivastave, 1985).

Adult education is based on the teacher "facilitating" learning; by challenging learners to examine alternative ways of thinking and interpreting their experiences (Brookfield, 1986; Knowles, 1980). Moreover, Brookfield (1986) suggests that, facilitators should present to their learners ideas and behaviours that will cause them to critically examine their values, ways of acting, and the assumptions by which they live. Examining the specific interaction behaviours between the prison educators and their students helps establish what elements of the interaction stimulates learning.

Elements of the teacher/learner interaction can include; teaching style, subject presentation and format, learning style, the processes employed to motivate and encourage learners, and methods that are used to address

inappropriate or disruptive learner behaviours. These elements are called education rituals.

Education rituals refers to teaching strategies and behaviour control techniques used in the learning process. Clifton and Rambaran (1987) divided education rituals into teaching and control rituals.

Teaching rituals include: rituals that apply to the teaching situation and can include the way in which teachers structure their lessons, their teaching style and motivational strategies.

Control Rituals include: rituals that apply to the control of disorderly behaviour. For example, teachers' attempts to control inattentiveness, mischievousness, and other kinds of unacceptable behaviour (p.315).

In this study reference to education rituals will be used synonymously and interchangeably with the terms teaching strategies, teaching styles, and behaviour control techniques.

Besides their role in learning, education rituals are aligned to the concept of the "hidden curriculum." Squires (1987) notes that initially the term "hidden curriculum" referred to cues that students learned (or did not learn); to pick up what to do and what not to do on their course, to cope with, survive, succeed or play the system. Jarvis (1988) aligns the concept of "hidden curriculum" to advancing values which are recognised and intended but some of which may be unrecognised and unintended by those who

formulate them. The impact of the "hidden curriculum" according to Squires (1987) goes beyond the learning situation. He writes:

Some sociologists of education have explored the ways in which the hidden curriculum of educational institutions may mirror, and socialise students into, the pattern of social and economic relationships that exists in the wider society. The 'hidden' or 'informal' curriculum also points to the importance of role models and social learning in education (p.9).

Therefore, the intention or perceived outcome of the "hidden curriculum" complements Duguid's (1981b) contention that, educating prisoners is necessary so they can return to, and ultimately 'succeed' in society.

Determining how educators advance learning in a prison setting requires an appreciation of: the environment, the workings of the institution, the students' abilities and attitudes toward learning, and the educators' status within the hierarchy of the prison. There is scant reference to the status of educators in prison organisations. Cressey (1977) writes:

Positions for prison school teachers, industrial foremen, and treatment personnel are not part of the chain of command...In corrections, the "staff organisation" is a set of separate organisations which competes with the line organisation for resources and power. Systems of non-line positions, such as those for treatment, training, and industrial

personnel, are essentially separate organisations...(p.498).

Administrative organisation and staff hierarchy led Kauffman (1981) to theorise on the phenomenon of "pluralistic ignorance." This involves members of a group systematically misperceiving the attitudes and behaviours of fellow group members. Typically, prison organisation and staff hierarchy includes: Warden, assistant warden, ranked correctional officers, and prison administrative workers. Prison educators are distinctly separated from the prison staff in terms of their role, responsibilities, and supervisors. Consequently, they hold marginal status in the prison organisation. Being marginal means that their role is peripheral to the main purpose of that institution (Clifton, 1979).

The marginal status of prison educators in the prison organisation allows for understanding some of those influences that impact on their interaction with the prisoners. For example, the prison educators' marginality can reduce their authority. Clifton (1979) studied the notion of authority within the context of educational institutions, he reports on three authority concepts, they are:

(a) Traditional authority which involves attachment to established customs and practices. For example, civil authority, dealing with the courts, the legal system, and the role of the police.

(b) Official authority which is concerned with the organisational position; that is, whoever occupies such a position in the structure of the organisation is granted legal or official right to exert power. For example, prison guards and the enforcement of the rules and regulations associated with the institution.

(c) Expert authority which relies upon technical knowledge and experience due to a recognised competence and expertise. Prison educators, because of their academic achievements or skill proficiency would be considered experts.

An additional authority concept, (d) bureaucratic authority postulated by Max Weber in his 1920s seminal work The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (T. Parsons, 1958 Trans.) was concerned with the notion that bureaucratic authority ensured that society would function in the capitalist tradition. Weber (1920) suggests that the influences of "economic forces" for advancing the "spirit of capitalism" established and maintained the bureaucracy. Moreover, the stability and nurturing of the bureaucracy necessitated authoritative institutions to ensure the stratification of society. Weber (1920) altered traditional positions of authority from being a process for controlling wrongdoing to a process for maintaining the stratification of society.

Authority in an educational environment has been aligned with teacher expertise. Clifton (1979) suggests that most teachers rely upon a combination

of expert, official and to a lesser degree, traditional authority. Yet, prison educators working in an unconventional educational setting may have a different combination of authority types. For example, bureaucratic authority could dominate the prison environment and advance the traditional authority concepts of: law, enforcement, and incarceration. Moreover, because the prison educators are marginal in the institution, they may have little or no official authority.

Education rituals are also influenced by the educational attributes of each prisoner. Typical educational characteristics of prisoners according to Forster (1981) include:

1. Lack of schooling - deliberate or by truancy; also behavioural problems in the classroom.
2. Very low intelligence - spent considerable time in special schools and have not learned to read.
3. Short attention span - neurotic and/or highly extrovert prisoners are incapable of sitting and concentrating for more than 10 minutes.
4. Dyslexia - reading disability.
5. Poor long term memory - those who are unintelligent or those with brain damage especially from alcoholism (p.120).

These educational characteristics justify the necessity for advancing Adult

Basic Education (ABE) in prison education programs.

ABE emerged in the 1960s and has encompassed elementary education for adults, English as a Second Language (ESL), and preparation for the General Educational Development (GED) according to Rossman, Fisk and Roehl (1984); they list the following attributes of ABE learners to include:

1. Individuals who never had the opportunity to acquire basic skills, although they may have been successful in other aspects of life.
2. Individuals who have met repeated failures in learning and in other areas of life. Poor and unemployed, they may have developed a defeatist attitude and a poor self-concept.
3. Individuals who have a learning disability in the area of basic reading and computation.
4. Culturally distinct individuals for whom the educational programs of the dominant culture have been inappropriate.
5. Immigrants well-educated in their own countries who need to learn the language and socio-cultural norms of this country.
6. Immigrants with little or no education whose need to learn English is complicated by their unfamiliarity with formal instructional settings and procedures (p.10).

Forster's (1981) description of prisoner educational characteristics are comparable to the educational attributes of ABE learners. Yet, Scrivastave (1985) argues that while prisoners appear to have similar educational characteristics and needs to adults in the community at large, their incarcerated status makes them unique.

The influence of the prison environment on learning has emerged as a major consideration in prison education research. Cheatwood (1988) concluded that, the anti-education bias held by many prisoners and the requirements of life in prison constrain those involved in education.

Ferguson and Haaven (1990) argue:

The provision of a suitable learning environment is more difficult in the correctional setting because teaching methods must be adapted to account for the inmate's characterological [sic] disorders and associated idiosyncrasies which can impact the learning process (p.32).

These arguments justify the necessity for current and potential prison educators to be familiar with the uniqueness of their teaching environment, which includes: educational characteristics of inmates, the workings of the institution and the limitations associated with the environment (Cheatwood, 1988; Corcoran, 1984; Ferguson and Haaven, 1990; Knights, 1981; Shea, 1980).

A major source for addressing the myriad of influences on adult education programs is Knowles' (1980) seminal work on the principles and practices of adult education. They include:

Table 1

Principles of Adult Learning and Teaching

Learning	Teaching
1.Learners feel a need to learn.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teacher exposes the learners to new responsibilities and fulfilment. * Teacher helps the learners to clarify their aspirations. * Teacher assists the learner to recognise the gap between their aspirations and present level. * Teacher helps the learners identify the problems they experience because of the gaps.
2.Learning environment is characterised by comfort, trust.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provision of physical conditions that are comfortable and conducive to learning. * Accepting the learners as persons of worth and respect their feelings and ideas. * Seeks to build relationships of trust and helpfulness. * Encourages cooperative activities. * Contributes resources as a co-learner for mutual enquiry.
3.Learners perceive the goals of learning to be theirs.	* Involves the learners in mutual process in formulating learning objectives.
4.Learners accept a share of responsibility for planning and operating learning experience.	* Shares thinking about options in designing of learning and selection of materials and methods that involves the learner.
5.Learners actively participate.	* Teachers help the learners to organise themselves for sharing mutual enquiry.
6.Learning is related to the learner's experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Help the learners use their own experiences as resources for learning. * Gears presentations to the experience levels of the learners. * Helps the learners to apply new learning to their experience.
7.Learners have a sense of progress toward their goals for evaluation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Involves the learners in mutually determined measures for evaluation. * Helps the learners develop and apply self evaluation based on these criteria.

(Adapted from Knowles, 1980. pp. 57-58).

ABE and adult education use specific principles and practices of instruction and learning to provide learning opportunities to adults (Hayes, 1972; Knowles, 1980). Using the principles and practices of adult education [see Table 1] in prison education programs can stimulate a change in prisoners' negative attitude toward education. This position is best summed up by Brookfield (1986) who writes:

Significant personal learning entails fundamental change in learners and leads them to redefine and reinterpret their personal, social, and occupational worlds. In the process, adults may come to explore effective, cognitive, and psychomotor domains that they previously had not perceived as relevant to themselves (p.214).

Commitment to advancing adult education practices in Canada's federal prisons has been advocated since 1936 (Bouliane and Meunier, 1987; OISE, 1979; Weir, 1973). Yet, information about adult education and ABE practices in Canadian prisons is scarce. Also, details about education rituals and prison educator status in prisons are rare. Ascertaining this information can assist researchers in establishing what elements of prison education programs stimulates learning, and how these elements can generate prison education practices. Plus, the information can assist prison educators to develop their teaching styles and methods based on the principles and practices of adult education. This professional development can, as Brookfield (1986) suggests,

lead adult learners to critically examine their values, ways of acting, and the assumptions by which they live. Therefore, the prisoners can enhance their ability to problem solve in a manner appropriate for social acceptance as opposed to criminal pursuits. It would follow that this transfer of learning, should it occur, may decrease recidivism.

Purpose of the Study

Prison education programs are vulnerable to criticism because their assessment is routinely based only on recidivism numbers. If prison education programs are designed to decrease recidivism, obviously recidivism numbers are an appropriate measure to determine the program's effectiveness. However, research on education programs decreasing recidivism are generally methodologically flawed (Linden and Perry, 1983).

Investigating education rituals in a prison setting can provide specific information about teaching in a unique environment. The information can lead to the adaptation of teaching and behaviour control strategies to enhance, clarify or dismiss many prisoners' negative perceptions about education. Also, the information can help develop the prisoners' learning and skills acquisition abilities. This development can lead to changes in learner attitudes and behaviours; changes which can decrease recidivism. Consequently, the purposes of this study are to establish:

- a. the education rituals used in a federal prison
- b. the purposes they serve, and
- c. which of the rituals are identified, accepted and/or rejected by the prisoners.

Also, given that advancing the practice of adult education in federal prison education programs has been established in Canada since 1936 (Weir, 1973), this study will:

- d. determine which adult education principles and practices are used in ABE and GED programs offered in the institution.

Finally, based on Clifton's (1979) notion of institutional marginality, the study will:

- e. determine whether the prison educators and their students perceive that prison educators are marginal in the prison institution.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it is exploring an area in which the literature shows limited information. It is the first known investigation dealing with education rituals performed in prison education programs. The study of education rituals is an area which has received scant attention in the discipline of adult education. In addition,

although research pertaining to the marginal status of teachers has been investigated by Clifton (1979), there are no known studies dealing with the marginal status of prison educators.

The study is significant because qualitative research methodologies have been used to give insight into: prisons, prisoners, their educational needs, prison education programs, the influences of the environment on learning, and the unique problems being faced by contemporary prison educators.

Research Questions

There is very little information about teaching strategies used in prison education programs (Dell'Apa, 1973; Shea, 1980). Also, there are no known studies about the status of educators within the prison organisational hierarchy. Determining prisoners' understanding of education rituals provides a basis for planning and implementing prison education programs more suited to the principles and practices of adult education. Moreover, establishing the prison educator's status in the prison organisation can give some insight about his/her authority in the total workings of the institution, and how this authority can influence his/her relationship with the students. Consequently, it is necessary to establish:

1. What education rituals are performed by educators in the prison environment?
2. Why are these specific rituals performed by the educators?

3. What education rituals are recognised by the prisoners?
4. Which specific education rituals are rejected by the prisoners?
5. Why are the education rituals rejected?
6. Do prison educators and their students perceive that the educator's status within the institution is marginal?
7. What adult education principles are practised in the ABE and GED prison education programs?

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following definitions will be used:

Adult Basic Education - Encompasses elementary education of adults, English as a Second Language (ESL) and preparation for General Educational Development (Rossman, Fisk and Roehl, 1984).

Adult Education - A process whereby persons whose major social roles are characteristic of adult status undertake systematic and sustained learning activities for the purposes of bringing about changes in knowledge, attitudes, values, or skills (Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982; p.9).

Control Rituals - [see Education Rituals] Rituals that apply to the control of disorderly behaviour in the classroom setting. This would

include; teachers' attempts to control inattentiveness, mischievousness, and other kinds of unacceptable behaviour (Clifton and Rambaran, 1987).

Education Rituals - Behaviours and expressions that apply to the teaching situation and to the control of disorderly behaviour, or praise of acceptable behaviour, which are not formally defined. They are informally defined "customs" that apply to the learning situation (Clifton and Rambaran, 1987). These involve teaching rituals and control rituals.

Marginal - Roles within the institution which are peripheral to the main purpose of that institution (Clifton, 1979).

Prisoners - As this study is focusing on federal prisoners, individuals who face incarceration for at least a minimum of two years are deemed prisoners.

Prison Education - Education carried out in the prison setting. It may include, academic, vocational, remedial and socialisation programs. However, for this particular study the term prison education is concerned with ABE and GED classes.

Teaching Rituals - [see Education Rituals] Rituals that apply to the teaching situation and can include the way in which teachers structure their lessons, their teaching style and motivational strategies (Clifton and Rambaran, 1987).

Limitations of the Study

This study investigated the use, rejection or acceptance of education rituals, and the status of prison educators in one federal prison. They are subject to influences from the institution used for the study which include: institutional policies, regulations, and personnel. Therefore, the findings are applicable only to the penitentiary that was the research location. Also, this study deals with the education rituals performed in the ABE and GED classes only; results and implications can only apply to these classes. They may not be relevant to education rituals demonstrated and/or rejected in vocational or university prison education programs.

This study was a snapshot, the investigation and data collection was over a specific period of time. In this case, during May and June. There were limitations to the timing of the data collection. In particular, at this time students were preparing for examinations and regular classes were winding down for the summer break. Also, some staff were not sure if their contracts would be renewed.

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The focus of this research is threefold. First, to investigate the impact of education rituals performed in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) prison education programs. Second, the study determines the status of the prison educators in the prison administration hierarchy. Third, the research details the use of adult education principles and practices in the ABE and GED classes offered in a federal prison.

The review of the literature highlights the historical development of prisons and rehabilitation as a function of incarceration. A detailed analysis of education as a rehabilitative process is presented including: education as a vehicle for character development; an agent for social control; and as a means for moral enhancement. Information about adult education and prison education roles in prisoner learning, and ABE and GED programs are also presented. An account of education rituals and the educators' marginal status in prisons is discussed. Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of highlights from the review of the literature.

Development of Prisons

Punishment for wrongdoing can be traced back to the beginning of humankind however, prisons and the purpose of incarceration are relatively new phenomena. Political pressure by English and North American prison reformers, John Howard and William Penn resulted in a significant change in the purpose of prisons during the early part of the eighteenth century (Sykes, 1978). A sustained loss of freedom through long term incarceration as an alternative to death or exile was advanced (Rothman, 1971). Advocating a humanistic approach for dealing with prisoners, incarceration was to promote prisons as a means of continual, visible punishment, and to act as a deterrent for wrongdoing (Singer and Statsky, 1974).

During the latter 19th and early 20th centuries, reform through incarceration emerged as a process of prisoner manipulation. Singer and Statsky (1974) report that, in the 1820s the warden of Auburn Prison in New York introduced the idea of prison profit-making by using cheap prison labour to bestow favours upon certain private entrepreneurs. The profiteering and exploitation of prisoners led to the end of the humanitarian intent of penitentiaries. Singer and Statsky (1974) write:

Prisoners became tools of profit; their low status was so widely recognised that one in court, in the late 19th century, was moved to remark that they were "for the time being, the slaves of the state" (p.5).

Historically, the development of prisons up to the 19th century was based on the three R's: revenge, restraint and reformation. It was not until the early 20th century that a fourth R: rehabilitation was introduced.

Rehabilitation in Prisons

Prisoner rehabilitation programs include: counselling for those inmates with psychological problems usually associated with drug and/or alcohol dependency difficulties; medical and dental programs advancing health and hygiene practices; educational programs that attempt to help prisoners with necessary knowledge and skill for their return to society (Duguid, 1981b; Roberts, 1973; Rothman, 1971).

Rehabilitation in prisons has been based on the "medical model" where prisoners are viewed as "sick" suffering from a social disease which can be "cured" with the proper treatment (Glaser, 1973). Ross, Fabiano and Ross (1988) argue that the dominance of the "medical model" aligns criminal behaviour to it; detracting from assessing rehabilitation programs that "work". Conrad (1981) writes that the "medical model" has endorsed and advanced the belief that prisoners could not change their own criminal tendencies; this being the responsibility of the state.

Determining what measure(s) should be used to establish what constitutes "effective" rehabilitation is difficult. Currently, the accepted measure for determining effective prisoner rehabilitation are recidivism rates.

However, using these figures is problematic because there is a multitude of variables that can cause an individual to recidivate, Conrad (1981) writes:

...recidivism rates produce the wrong answers to whatever questions it is important to ask about the rehabilitation of criminals. In every treatment program, the essential information is the achievement or non-achievement of the intended primary benefits of the program itself (p.1720).

Assessing the effectiveness of rehabilitation programs must be based on a measure(s) which indicate some influence on each individual participant. This can include recording any changes in attitude, social development, or learning.

A significant investigation concerning rehabilitation in prisons was reported by Martinson (1974). Researching 231 treatment studies used in prisons across the United States of America between 1945 - 1967 he concluded that, "with few and isolated exceptions, the rehabilitative efforts that have been reported so far have no appreciable effect on recidivism" (cited in Ross, Fabiano and Ross, 1988; p.44). Responding to this conclusion, Ross, Fabiano and Ross (1988) note that while Martinson's research has been the most widely quoted and frequently endorsed in criminological literature, it did not seem to matter that Martinson changed his mind. They write:

In 1979 he [Martinson] acknowledged that he had been wrong withdrawing his conclusion that "almost nothing works". He rejected the methodology he used calling it "premature" by

saying, "...contrary to my previous position, some treatment programs do have an appreciable effect on recidivism...(p.44).

Justifying prisoner rehabilitation programs is also influenced by societal attitudes towards prisoner reform.

Fox (1986) argued that the indifference toward prison rehabilitation programs may be due to the prevailing notion that prisoners must be punished for their wrong doing. Roberts (1968) suggests that, the greatest barrier to prisoner rehabilitation progress is ordinary people's ignorance regarding the programs. He writes:

In the fight against crime much has to be done to convince British people that in the treatment of men in prison, only humane methods are permissible or indeed, effective (p.168).

Moreover, Ignatieff (1981) suggests that to punish justly, a society itself must be just. Corcoran (1984) believes society's attitudes toward prisoner rehabilitation are significantly influenced by the media and political campaigns advocating a "tougher" approach to incarceration. In order to overcome these prejudices Morin (1981) advocates that society must have a clear idea of the judicial system and its corollary; the penal system. One way of achieving this objective is to introduce studies associated with these systems in the elementary level of schooling.

The primary objective of prisoner rehabilitation involves improving individuals to enable them to return to society to lead a good and useful life (Duguid, 1981b; Forster, 1981). One method that assists in the socialisation process and provides prisoners with marketable skills for seeking gainful employment is education (Hudson, 1981).

A Brief History of Education in Canada's Prisons

Weir (1973) writes that advocating education in Canadian federal prisons was first recorded in the Canadian Justice Minister's Report of Penitentiaries. The development and construction of Canada's first penitentiary during the 1830s led the commissioners co-ordinating its construction to note that confinement with labour and moral instruction would benefit the prisoners. Angle (1989) cites the commissioners, noting:

Absolute solitude for years, without labour or moral or religious instruction bear too severely on a social being like man (p.97).

By the 1830s Canada was becoming increasingly aware of the necessity to establish provincial penitentiaries, and the first was constructed in Ontario in 1835. Angle (1989) notes that the penitentiary commissioners led by Charles Duncombe emphasised the reformation of prisoners, he writes:

Duncombe had chaired a number of committees that had delved into a range of social issues....His report revealed a conviction shared by a growing number of penologists that criminals could

be reclaimed and their characters reformed....Like many of his contemporary educational reformers Duncombe saw schooling as a measure to be used to combat crime (p.102).

This position was a cornerstone for advancing education programs in Canadian prisons. Weir (1973) writes that during the latter part of the 19th century, prison education was based on teaching the rules and regulations of the institution and advancing spiritual development. Consequently, classes were the primary responsibility of the prison Chaplain until the early 1900s (Owens, 1985).

The Archambault Royal Commission of 1936 recommended a complete reorganisation of the education system in Canadian prisons (Weir, 1973). The Commission reported that:

Education programs are to be structured to meet the needs, interests, and abilities on an individual basis of the potential student body, the majority of whom were found to be academically under educated, vocationally unskilled, and culturally deprived (in Weir, 1973; p.43).

The Archambault recommendations led to education being seen as a training and learning process for individual development rather than a function of the prison ministry. However, Bouliane (1985) reports that a 1947 independent investigation chaired by General Gibson, determined that the implementation

of the 1936 recommendations were minimal. These findings were verified again in 1956 by the Fauteaux Royal Commission on Canadian Penal Services. It concluded that gross deficiencies in implementing and organising prison classes prevailed. Weir (1973) writes that the Fauteaux Commission stressed the necessity to:

Provide programs of **adult education** [emphasis added] that would contribute to the maturation of those inmates exposed to it, provide programs of vocational training designed to teach the occupational skills required to compete in the labour market, and while so doing, hopefully bring about changes in behaviour and attitude to the extent that substantial numbers of inmates who enter federal institutions each year would avoid wasting the remainder of their lives in the shadow world of the criminal (p.45).

By 1956 recognition of, and arguments for, adult education in Canadian federal prisons were well established. Yet, a 1977 report to the Canadian House of Commons criticised federal prison education programs noting that they are only time filling activities. Bouliane (1985) writes that during the 1970s the main purpose of education was to relieve boredom or to provide basic skill training for employment.

The justification of prison education programs as rehabilitation, although recognised in Canada, failed to gain political and social endorsement. The value and necessity of education in prisons is best summed up by

MacCormick (1932) who writes:

...while no guarantee of good character and non-criminal behaviour, education is a powerful aid for transforming criminality; the education of prisoners offers one of the very real hopes for their rehabilitation (p.32).

Historically, the advancement of adult education in Canadian federal prisons is well recorded. However, it appears that the consistent repetition of recommendations for advocating adult education in prisons may be due in part to failure of the federal system to monitor the adoption of the recommendations.

Prison Education Programs as Rehabilitation Processes

Contemporary prison education includes all education programs offered in the prison setting. It may include life skills classes, ABE and GED programs, regular high school classes, vocational training, correspondence programs, or university courses. The dominating theme throughout most of the literature concerning prison education is based on equipping prisoners for their "successful" return to society (Duguid, 1981b). In addition, some researchers have discussed the necessity of prison education to assist prisoners in their cognitive deficiencies, problem solving abilities, and social interaction skills (Fox, 1987b; Ross and Fabiano, 1981; and Ross, Fabiano and Ross, 1988). The implications that most prisoners' cognitive processes and problem

solving abilities are deficient logically establishes the justification of education as a means of prisoner rehabilitation.

In order to bring about changes in prisoner thinking processes, the relationship of cognitive ability to the concept of intelligence must be examined. Lewis and Samuda (1989) note that traditionally the assessment of cognitive ability began with the assumption that such abilities are static and unchanged by teaching and learning. Although this concept of mental ability has helped us to understand some aspects of human intelligence, it does not adequately explain what intelligence is nor how it functions, they write:

Factor analytic studies of intelligence have been useful in identifying the number of specific abilities that make up an overall mental ability, but they fall short in explaining how a specific ability or cluster of abilities develops. Mental ability tests would be far more useful if, in addition to measuring intelligence as a product, they also could identify the process by which intelligence changes and/or accumulates as an individual acquires new experiences (p. 254).

Lewis and Samuda (1989) conclude that, because of the implications associated with the processes by which intelligence changes, intellectual assessment must consider both static knowledge (instant recall of facts) and cognitive processes (problem solving and thinking skills).

In congruence with the idea that education develops cognitive processes, Kerr (1970) suggests that education is a socialisation process in

which persons acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make them more or less capable or effective members of society. Hudson (1981) writes that, prisoners can become more effective members of society and socially acceptable by developing their socialisation skills. Yet, the question of how prisoners acquire socialisation knowledge and skills through education must be scrutinised. The learning process goes beyond knowledge retention to include: understanding, application, evaluation, analysis, and re-application. The socialisation process is an ongoing education process (Kerr, 1970).

The value of cognitive process enhancement and social development in prison education programs supports Wylie's (1974) arguments that, education in prisons reduces the social isolation of incarcerated offenders, provides social integration skills for released offenders, and gives prisoners realistic but non-criminal access to the world of work. Moreover, Duguid (1981a) writes that education can be utilised in the criminal justice system to persuade or to enable the criminal to make different decisions in the future; decisions which will not lead to further criminal activity. While the value of education as a rehabilitation strategy is well documented in the literature, Ignatieff (1981) warns that the inmate's own will plays a major role in his/her rehabilitation.

One aspect of prisoner learning is motivated by their desire to maintain ties with the outside by receiving and writing letters (Grainge and Kemp, 1981). Also, Kendall (1973) notes that in order to motivate prisoners it must be clear that they can get something out of the program. He writes:

If it [education program] does nothing more than motivate inmates to work and study, a program of correctional education will sell itself, and it will pay for itself because such a program will at least keep inmates constructively occupied, and enable them to gain in skill and knowledge (p.100).

Prison Education and Character Development

The development of each prisoner's character and sense of responsibility are associated aims of prison education programs. Duguid (1981a) suggests that by intervening with an educational experience aimed at developing thinking skills, moral reasoning abilities, social skills and political awareness, an individual's sense of culture and understanding of his biography can be achieved. Elaborating on prisoners' development through learning Whetstone (1981) writes:

Given the confidence of hard won intellectual abilities, and success at an enterprise positively regarded by all, from fellow convicts to family and society, the individual's self image appears to take a positive leap. Finally, the individual's perception of his relation to the future is dramatically altered (p.91).

Advancing the prisoner's sense of responsibility and moral reasoning further justifies the value of education for preparing the prisoners return to society. Hervieux-Payette (1981) notes that for prisoners to be free, to be able to

exercise their freedom, and to be good citizens, it is necessary that they use their mind. The first task of education in prison is to enhance the ability to handle freedom, with all the responsibility that freedom involves.

Contemporary education programs in prisons are fundamentally pragmatic: to make prisoners useful, to provide them with employable skills, to give them something to do, and to justify the notion of rehabilitation (Duguid, 1981b; Forster, 1981; Fox, 1987a; MacCormick, 1932; Shea, 1980). However, the intent of providing prisoners with practical skills is often viewed as a means of social control.

Prison Education as an Agent of Social Control

Ideally social control and social ordering function to maintain a cohesive society, whereby the existence and workings of various social institutions ensure that social stability is maintained (Wallace and Wolf, 1986). One institution that plays a prominent role in maintaining social stability is the penal system, of which prisons are an integral component (Sutherland, 1973).

Society's understanding of deviancy is based on comparing demonstrated behaviour to an accepted standard of behaviour; any variance from the standard is deemed deviant (Hirschi, 1969). Wallace and Wolf (1986) write that the critical variable in the study of deviance is the social audience. It is the audience which determines whether or not any episode or behaviour is labelled deviant.

Prison education programs can be seen as agents of social control from two perspectives. First, in their association with rehabilitation: prisoners need to be reformed in order to be acceptable. Second, being acceptable is achieved through education: social values are advanced through education (Nelson and Hoekema, 1981). This latter point is often associated with the provision of moral education.

Prison Education as Moral Education

Prisoners have broken specific rules (laws) that result in their incarceration. Discussing what is morally good for society requires an appreciation of moral principles and rules. Lickona (1976) writes that a moral principle is a mode of choosing which we want all people to use in all situations, and a rule refers to prescriptions of kinds of actions. For example, a rule is: no killing. A principle is: it is wrong to take another person's life. Fox (1989) suggests that equating morality with what is good is difficult in relation to many prisoners' perceptions for being good. The social consensus for being good is equated to obeying the laws whereas a prisoner may perceive that being good is not getting caught for disobeying the laws.

It is only in recent years that moral education has emerged as an additional educative objective within prisons (Duguid, 1981b). However, to understand moral education an understanding of what is involved in being moral is necessary (Peters, 1979).

Morality is based on principles or standards. When applied to the prison milieu questions about what these standards are arise. Atkinson (1969) believes that to be moral necessitates an understanding of universal moral standards; "moral standards must be in some way strictly universal, not subject to arbitrary exceptions or limitations of scope (p. 27)." Applying Atkinson's (1969) universal position on moral standards with respect to prisoners can be difficult because of cultural differences. For example, some Asian cultures execute individuals for crimes while some Western cultures would incarcerate individuals for the same crime. Both cultures view the punishment as moral, however one culture may see the other's punishment as immoral.

Another perspective for understanding morality is the social view advocated by Rest (1981). The social view is relative in nature and is based on the desires of society as opposed to the impact of the entrenched cultural influences. Rest (1981) writes that morality is a social enterprise involving the establishment of co-operative social structures which include: promises, institutions, laws, rules, and contracts. There are problems for accepting the social view of morality in light of its application to the Nazi society. Most within Nazi society believed that the ideals and principles of Nazism were good. That is, the extermination of the Jewish race was generally accepted and perceived as good. The tragedy of the holocaust is recognised in history; it has raised concern on how social structures deem something as good.

Acknowledging the shortcomings of the universal and social perspectives of morality does not justify ignoring their important role for determining an understanding of morality and moral education. The social perspective of morality allows for recognising wrongdoers and gives a foundation for determining their moral needs. Wrongdoers have violated co-operative social structures which lead to the well-being of the society being perceived to be threatened (Lickona, 1976). Thus, for a prisoner to return to society he/she should be exposed to moral education to be familiarised with the rules and co-operative social structures of the society (Sutherland, 1973).

Moral education is a challenging subject. Purpel and Ryan (1976) write that, "moral education is direct and indirect intervention of the school which affects both moral behaviour and the capacity to think about issues of right and wrong (p. 5)." In addition, Smith (1975) suggests that:

Two key ideas underlie moral education; understood as moral aspects of education: sensitivity to others and a feeling of obligation to act on principle rather than entirely on self-interest (p. 19).

Both definitions suggest the need to develop empathy, and direct or indirect intervention to affect behaviour. This twofold intent of moral education are in accordance with the need for inmates to develop his/her thinking skills.

An additional rationale for the justification of moral education in prisons according to Corcoran (1984) is that, if becoming a criminal is primarily a learning process, then the remaking of useful citizens is more the task of education rather than custody or punishment.

Acknowledging the importance of developing the prisoners' sense of moral responsibility, Ross and Fabiano (1981) suggest that crimes may be committed by people who have not learned to learn from what happens to them. Thus they tend to repeat their errors constantly. They write:

Those people whose thinking leads to crime, do not process information in the same way as others and, as a result, apply a different set of meanings to the world (p.14).

Ross and Fabiano's (1981) contention that prisoners are "different thinkers" validates the need to introduce educational programs in order to bring about more appropriate thinking skills. This position is supported by Roberts (1968) who argues that:

...education programs should be designed to encourage them [the prisoners] to think, to accept responsibility, and to undertake a leadership role if only the role of leading themselves (p.36).

Research examining the impact prison education may have on prisoners' attitudes and/or changes in behaviour has been criticised because of shortcomings in assessment procedures (Cheatwood, 1988; Collins, 1989;

Ferguson and Haaven, 1991; Linden and Perry, 1983). Contemporary prison education research is investigating education programming effects using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. In their study of offender perceptions Porporino and Robinson (1992) identified a number of reported benefits from ABE program participation; ABE was helpful in the offender's job search, useful for problems they encountered "on-the-job", and in dealing with their families. The majority of the offenders surveyed (n=38) indicated that their participation in ABE gave them a sense of being "more in control" of their lives. In a study determining why inmates attend prison classes, Stephens (1992) found the inmates perceived that education and/or vocational training would make a difference in their lives; to better themselves; to take the GED examination; and to get a good job when they were released. Prison education has been seen to have some influence on prisoners attitudes and behaviour, and adult moral education programs have also had some effect on prisoners.

The effectiveness of moral education as a means for changing thinking patterns and subsequently behaviour, has been a contentious research area for psychologists, educators and philosophers (Sizer and Sizer, 1978). Questions regarding curriculum content and projected outcomes of prison moral education programs were typical research areas during the early 1980s (Wiley, 1989).

Moral education programs have been based on values indoctrination,

values clarification, and the complex cognitive structures recognition need to satisfactorily reason (Sizer and Sizer, 1978). Undoubtedly, a significant researcher on moral reasoning was Kohlberg (1975). Wiley (1989) reports that Kohlberg's moral reasoning is a developmental process, and growth in moral reasoning is measured by progression through the hierarchical stages of reasoning ability. She writes:

...the study measured the effect of teaching style, independent of a moral education curricular component, on the development of moral judgment. Results indicated that a teaching style which allows for student interaction and produces a partners-in-learning arrangement between student and teacher produced significantly higher moral development than the "traditional" teaching style (p.13).

Research on moral education as an effective agent for attitude and behaviour change in adult education has focussed on teaching style rather than program content. Using the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) Wiley (1989) surveyed eighteen academic teachers to determine their teaching style. A Q sort technique was used to ensure the responses to the PALS reflected actual teaching behaviour. Ten subjects were used for the study. Pre and post testing students in the ten teachers classes for moral development using the Ethical Reasoning Inventory (ERI) showed that those teachers who tended to:

adopt a more andragogical teaching style - allowing student interaction in the classroom, promoting student responsibility for learning, and encouraging active participation in the learning process - produced students whose moral development scores rose significantly higher than those students in "traditional" classroom settings.

The study also included demographic factors such as age, gender, ethnicity, education level, and length of time served and their effect, if any, on moral development. The fact that no factor produced a significant effect on moral growth further emphasises the effect of teaching style (p.14).

These influences and considerations must be addressed when researching adult education in a prison context.

Adult Education

Adult education is difficult to define. Darkenwald and Merriam (1982) warn that it is important to recognise that no universally acceptable definition of adult education is possible: any definition must be based on assumptions and value judgements which are not acceptable to everyone. That the term "adult education" is defined in at least three different ways contributes to confusion according to Knowles (1980) who writes:

In its broadest sense, the term describes a process of adult learning....it encompasses practically all experiences of mature men and women....In its more technical meaning, adult education describes a set of organised activities carried on by a wide variety of institutions for the accomplishment of specific educational objectives....A third meaning combines all these processes...adult education brings together into a discrete social system all the individuals, institutions, and associations concerned with the education of adults and perceives them as working toward the common goals of improving the methods and materials of adult learning, extending the opportunities for adults to learn, and advancing the general level of our culture (p.25).

Moore and Waldron (1981) define adult education as all education that goes on after compulsory child education. Brundage and Mackeracher (1980) suggest that adult education is the institutionalised system which provides the programs, administrative structures, processes, settings, resources, and so on that facilitate adult learning.

A common, obvious characteristic for defining adult education is that the learners are chronological adults. Yet, Brookfield (1986) argues that using chronological factors to define adult education is an oversimplification.

Defining adult education as a process in which an individual pursues learning as a self-directed intent, Brookfield (1986) writes:

The external technical and internal reflective dimensions of self-directed learning are fused when adults come to appreciate the culturally constructed nature of knowledge and values and when they act on the basis of that appreciation to reinterpret and recreate their personal and social worlds (p.59).

Hence, for Brookfield (1986) being adult is demonstrated through the ability to be self-directed in one's learning.

For the purpose of this study Darkenwald and Merriam's (1982) definition of adult education will be used:

Adult education is a process whereby persons whose major social roles are characteristic of adult status undertake systematic and sustained learning activities for the purpose of bringing about changes in knowledge, attitudes, values, or skills (p.9).

Learning for adults can be difficult and personally demanding (Hayes, 1972). Consequently, there is need for facilitators to take control and direct or guide adult learners, Brookfield (1986) writes:

The particular function of the facilitator is to challenge learners with alternative ways of interpreting their experience and to present to them ideas and behaviour that cause them to examine critically their values, ways of acting, and the assumptions by which they live (p.23).

Facilitation in adult learning is founded on the principles of adult education

writes that the critical element in any adult education program is what happens when a teacher comes face-to-face with a group of learners. During this interaction process of adult teaching and learning, a foundation for the principles of adult education emerges.

Notable research aimed at investigating effective facilitation of learning by adult educators, is the Principles of Adult Learning Scale (PALS) developed by Conti (1979), and the Andragogy in Practice Inventory (API) created by Suanmali (1981). Brookfield (1986) notes that Conti created a forty-four item rating scale used to assess the effectiveness of collaborative modes in producing significant learning gains. Suanmali (1981) developed a ten-item inventory designed "to help adults enhance their capability to function as self-directed learners" (cited in Brookfield 1986; p.36). Moreover, Cross' (1981) seminal work Adults as learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning presented a multitude of ways to show how adults can learn in both formal and informal learning environments. Finally, Knowles (1980) devised seven principles pertaining to adult learning. While there are no clear cut rules in the practice of adult education, it is important to note that all of the researchers recognised that adult learning can be stimulated and advanced in many ways.

Prison Education and Adult Education

Advancing the principles and practice of adult education in Canadian

federal prisons are well documented in the literature (Bouliane, 1985; Bouliane and Meunier, 1987; Fox 1987b; and OISE, 1979). The guidelines and principles of adult education advocated by Knowles (1980) [see Table 1], can equip prison educators to address the numerous challenges associated with the restrictions of the institution, and the variance in prisoner academic characteristics. This observation is supported by Bouliane (1985) who writes that, because prisoners have demonstrated specific and unique needs, needs to which the principles of adult education attempt to cater, the rationale for adult education in a prison context becomes evident.

Prison educators, like every educator, must consider program planning and implementation, teaching strategies and skills, and the cognitive abilities of their learners. Yet, exceptional influences associated with the prison education milieu can place unique restrictions and demands on prison educators in their efforts to carry out programs (Cheatwood, 1988; Ferguson and Haaven, 1990).

Because of the idiosyncratic nature of the prison environment, it would be logical and, in some cases, necessary for prison educators to break away from "traditional" teaching practices which Freire (1970) equates to the concept of banking, he writes:

The teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalised, and predictable...His task is to "fill" the student with the contents of his narration - contents which are detached from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could

give them significance (p.57).

Freire's (1970) rationale concerning the narrative character and banking format of education led him to foster the concept of problem-posing education which he describes as:

Problem-posing education bases itself on creativity and stimulates true reflection and action upon reality, thereby responding to the vocation of men as beings who are authentic only when engaged in inquiry and creative transformation....A deepened consciousness of their situation leads men to apprehend that situation, resignation gives way to the drive for transformation and inquiry, over which men feel themselves to be in control (p.71-72).

Advancing Freire's (1970) notion of problem-posing education which compliments the self-directed intent of adult education, can be difficult for prison educators because of the limited cognitive processing skills and learning experiences held by most prisoners (Ross and Fabiano, 1981).

Additional influences which can affect the implementation of adult education in prisons include the attitudes, behaviour, and previous educational experiences held by many prisoners. Because most prisoners perceive that prison education is the same as their previous educational experiences, they are more likely to reject any education offered to them (Dell'Apa, 1973; Duguid, 1979; Fox, 1986; Knights, 1981).

Teaching Prisoners

Teaching prisoners can be demanding. A common feature in the adult education literature is that, the term adult refers to, or is perceived to be associated with age and level of maturity (Brookfield, 1986; Knowles, 1980). This raises a paradox in the realm of prison education. Prisoners are chronological adults yet they are somewhat emotionally and educationally immature (Ross and Fabiano, 1981; Nelson and Hoekema, 1981). Therefore, teaching adult prisoners is not the same as teaching adults. To address this issue some discussion on the concept of teaching is required.

While considerable research and much effort has been expended on improving the means and materials with which teachers teach, Moore and Waldron (1981) suggest that teachers teach as they have been taught, they write:

As adult educators most of us will see our role as teachers through our experience as students, and subconsciously we will likely make reference to the models of teaching which we have seen in our teachers (p.54).

In order to break away from the pedagogic model of teaching where the learning situation is teacher centred and directed, Knowles (1980) suggests three assumptions when teaching adults. The assumptions are:

1. Adults can learn. This is the central proposition on which adult education is based. Research to date on adult learning clearly indicates that the basic ability to learn remains essentially unimpaired throughout the life span.
2. Learning is an internal process. There has been a tendency to look upon education as the transmittal of information, to see learning as an almost exclusively intellectual process of storing accumulated facts. A growing body of research is in agreement that learning is an internal process controlled by the learners. Learning is described as a process of need-meeting and goal-striving by the learners. The implications of this observation for adult education is that those methods and techniques which involve the individual most deeply in self-directed inquiry will produce the greatest learning.
3. There are superior conditions of learning and principles of teaching, certain conditions of learning that are more conducive to growth and development (p.55-56).

The basis of adult education necessitates that the role of the teacher is not that of the traditional "information transformer" or as Freire (1970) suggests "depositor", but that of facilitator. The facilitator's role according to Brookfield (1986) is based on:

...a transactional dialogue between participants (teachers and learners) who bring to the encounter experiences, attitudinal sets, and alternative ways of looking at their personal, professional, political, and recreational worlds, along with a multitude of differing purposes, orientations, and expectations. The function of the facilitator is to challenge learners with alternative ways of interpreting their experience and to present to them ideas and behaviour that cause them to examine critically their values, ways of acting, and the assumptions by which they live (p.23).

The educational attainment level of a prisoner upon leaving school is a major influence on prisoners' attitudes toward education, self, and his/her role within society. Duguid (1981b) and Forster (1981) note that most prisoners are school drop outs, where continual failure has led them to voluntarily leave school; or they are push outs. This is where a school's administration can legally prohibit an individual from attending their school. Fox (1986) suggests that the lag of at least two grade levels behind the grade level at which many prisoners leave school, allows them to perceive themselves as being educationally inadequate or "dumb". This perception contributes to their negative attitude toward education. Jepson (1981) argues that prisoners' attitudes toward education can also be influenced by their perception that education is a form of control:

At its lowest it [education] is regarded as a valuable means of filling time; at a higher level it is seen as a vehicle through which prisoners maintain or enhance their self-esteem by choosing this kind of response to the losses of imprisonment, as compared with the responses which constitute positive threats to control (p.20).

Viewing education as a form of control is further discussed by Roberts (1968) who writes, "in prison there are always those who voice a loud-mouthed contempt for education, since it identifies with the conformity they have rejected (p.56)". Because of the influences associated with many prisoners' educational characteristics plus their negative attitude toward education, it is necessary to consider whether adult education principles and practice can benefit prisoners.

Through facilitation the prevailing negative attitude held by many prisoners toward education may be positively altered. This could lead to an appreciation of education as a valuable rehabilitation strategy in prisons.

Adult Basic Education, General Education Development and Prison Education

Adult Basic Education (ABE) has a broad terms of reference. Dickinson (in Brooke, 1972) noted that ABE was designed to assist adults who had not achieved success in pre-adult educational institutions. Beder and Valentine (1990) suggest that ABE aims to assist adults to "succeed" in programs which they previously failed or did not have the chance to participate

in. Hurley (1991) reports that for years ABE educators have heard that programs must meet the real needs of the people served. As a consequence, ABE's broad mission included individual education plans and referring learners to human service providers for family and personal problems. She concluded that:

The expectations of ABE programs today include a growing emphasis on increasing the adult's ability to learn - learning to learn. This emphasis requires a broader curriculum and additional training for managers and staff (p.20).

Many researchers have reported on the success of specific ABE teaching strategies utilised in numeracy and literacy upgrading, English as a second language courses, and GED classes (Dickinson in Brooke, 1972; Hurley, 1991; Kidd, 1981; Rossman, Fisk and Roehl, 1984). However, research concerning ABE programs and teaching in prisons is uncommon.

Ferguson and Haaven (1990) in discussing the prison environment's impact on prisoners' learning, suggested three fundamental phases for ABE lessons in prisons. The phases are:

1. Relax the pressure: the intellectually disabled work at a markedly slower rate.
2. Keep it simple: present directions one step at a time and work at a concrete level.

3. Provide multi-sensory lessons: the more sense involved in a learning activity, the higher the chance of it being remembered.
 - a. Group projects: role plays, produce a video-tape, design and/or play a game, write and/or sing songs.
 - b. Working in pairs: peer tutoring.
 - c. Individual: art projects, notebooks (p. 33).

Knowles (1980) and Brundage and Mackeracher (1980) have written extensively in the area of adult learning principles and their application to program planning. Their persistent message is that the nature of adult education does not permit any hard and fast rules in teaching strategies. This is reiterated by Beder and Valentine (1990), who concluded that:

...the diversity of outcomes of ABE might be a function of the diversity of learners - of different motivational and socio-demographic profiles which influence both the educational process of ABE and educational outcomes (p.80).

Moreover, Rossman, Fisk and Roehl (1984) suggest that ABE:

...requires commitment, coordination, and a sense of priority and urgency. The challenge is especially difficult because adults who need basic education are individuals who have not been well served by

existing school systems. Meeting their needs requires creative, original approaches to program development (p.4).

Appreciation of the diversity of learners and their needs is also considered in the General Educational Development (GED) certificate program. It is designed to allow participants to work independently in course workbooks. The GED program aims to test each student's ability against that of graduating high school students. The participants have a chance to earn a certificate that is the equivalent of a high school diploma (Beder and Valentine, 1990). The GED consists of a course of studies in five test areas; writing skills, social studies, science, interpreting literature and the arts, and mathematics. Each student progresses through the levels within the subject areas and upon successful completion of each level the student advances until he has finished. At the end of the program the student must write an exam in each course. If successful, the student qualifies for the GED.

There are very few studies dealing with GED programs in Canadian prisons. Grande (1987) developed a tutoring and motivational counselling program designed to encourage prisoners to complete the GED because a large number of inmates' were indifferent and apathetic toward the program. Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) working with adults from the community at large, concluded:

GED graduation is not a panacea, in that few if any, graduates

benefit "across the board". For the majority...studying for and passing the GED is a worthwhile endeavour, and credentialing appears to have powerful effects that enable adults to attain those benefits they are in a position to obtain (p.33).

Rationalising the benefits of the GED program Whitney (1991) concluded that:

For the student, GED clearly signals success (or lack of it).

However, the GED Diploma itself is the goal for only a minority of examinees - the 22 percent take the tests chiefly for personal satisfaction. For the others, the diploma is a means to an end. Nearly 33 percent take the tests to qualify for post secondary study and an additional 32 percent do so primarily for reasons related to employment (p.13).

Education Rituals and Marginal Status

There are very few investigations about the effect of education rituals on classroom behaviour and attitudes toward learning. Moore (1976) introduced the terms "avoidance" and "presentation" rituals and Clifton (1979) used "teaching rituals" and "control of behaviour rituals" while investigating aspects of classroom and learning behaviour. Lustz and Ramsey (1973) suggest that rituals are "non-directive cues" used by schools to reinforce policy assumptions. Some researchers postulate the political function of education rituals for encouraging students to accept and support the dominant school

culture (Illich, 1970; Kamens, 1977; Knight, 1974). Moreover, Gerhrke (1979) notes that rituals are a type of "hidden curriculum" socialising students into the dominant order. Finally, Shipman (1968) writes that rituals are valuable sources of academic motivation, involvement and identification.

Clifton (1979) alludes to an understanding of education rituals, by writing:

...in the classroom situation, there are certain types of behaviour and expressions used and understood by both the teacher and the pupils which are not formally defined so that they relate to obtaining the pupils' best performances but they are thought, at least by the teacher, to assist in achieving that end. In other words, rituals are not the formally defined rules and regulations which apply universally to all pupils in the school, but they are the informally defined "customs" which apply within the classroom and are determined to some extent by both the pupils and the teacher through their mutual interaction (p.68).

A fundamental aspect of education rituals is founded on the concept of school as a culture. Deal and Kennedy (1983) write that pragmatically, culture is an informal understanding of the "way we do things", comprising of shared values and beliefs, heroes and heroines, rituals and ceremonies.

Understanding rituals in education, is discussed by McLaren (1986) who writes:

Rituals symbolically transmit cultural ideologies....They may be perceived as carriers of cultural codes that shape students' perceptions and ways of understanding; they inscribe both the 'surface structure' and 'deep grammar' of school culture (p.4).

While the research on education rituals clearly demonstrates variety in their application to the education milieu, there are few studies which illustrate the effects of education rituals on behaviour and attitudes toward education. Moore (1976) attempted to recognise behaviour patterns determined by education rituals in an urban classroom, and Clifton (1979) recognised the influences of education rituals on the roles and function of practice teachers. Yet, research determining how education rituals can enhance or diminish an individual's attitude or approach to education is rare. McLaren (1986) in his book Schooling as a Ritual Performance provides a concise overview on education rituals research. He reports that education rituals have been equated to schooling as a rite of passage for novice and inner-city teachers (Eddy, 1969; and Foster, 1974). Also, education rituals have an inherently 'hegemonic' or mystification function that encourages students to accept and support the dominant school culture. Education rituals have been seen as serving a political function, especially in higher education where students become 'certified' members of the corporate elite (Illich, 1970; Kapferer, 1981; and Kamens, 1977 cited in McLaren (1986) p.25).

In relation to this research, Moore (1976) uses the terms 'avoidance rituals' and 'presentation rituals' to discuss student-teacher interaction. Lustz and Ramsey (1973) connect rituals to belief systems operating in schools, describing them as 'non-directive cues' which schools use to reinforce policy assumptions (cited in McLaren (1986) p.26). Finally, in discussing the work of Clifton (1979) McLaren writes:

Clifton (1979) sees the concept of rituals as inextricably related to the performance of teaching itself; rituals are thus linked to classroom instruction, teacher organisation and 'pedagogical style' (p.24).

Marginal status according to Clifton (1979) is holding a position or role within the institution that is not essential to the main purpose of the institution. The aim of prisons is to withdraw, hold and punish offenders. Agents for maintaining these requirements include correctional officers, prison administrative staff, and the officers of the judiciary. Prison educators are to provide relevant learning opportunities to the inmates, they are not part of the "chain of command" according to Cressey (1977).

Clifton (1979) found that practice teachers are marginal to the workings of the school because they do not hold the status of teacher within the school organisation. Prison educators, although holding the

status of teacher, cannot claim any status within the prison organisation as their work is not related to the primary purposes of the prison. Their authority within the prison is marginal.

Authority in education has been aligned to teacher expertise. Teachers rely on a combination of expert authority, official authority which is concerned with the position of teacher in a school, and traditional authority; dealing with attachment to established customs and practices (Clifton, 1979). However, due to working in an unconventional environment prison educators may have a different combination of authority types. This disparity may require different education rituals to be performed in prison education classes. That is, given the nature and purpose of prisons, traditional authority concepts which are concerned with established customs and practices especially those dealing with law, enforcement, and incarceration may require education rituals that support these variables. Prison educators can be required to enact education rituals which support the institution's policy of enforcement when learners demonstrate inappropriate behaviour. These education rituals could be in opposition to the usual education rituals performed in behaviour problem situations.

Education rituals can also be altered because of the educational characteristics of the prisoners. Prison educators may have to perform rituals that are fundamental for interacting with the students. For example, given that a significantly high number of inmates are functionally illiterate, teaching

styles and strategies may have to be based on a pedagogic teaching program in order to encourage and motivate the students to continue in the classes.

For the purposes of this study, Clifton and Rambaran's (1987) definition of education rituals is used. They noted that the concept of rituals in the educational setting implies certain types of behaviours and expressions used by teachers and students which while not formally defined, are informal customs. Clifton and Rambaran (1987) divided education rituals into:

Teaching rituals include: rituals that apply to the teaching situation and can include the way in which teachers structure their lessons, their teaching style and motivational strategies.

Control rituals include: rituals that apply to the control of disorderly behaviour. For example, teachers' attempts to control inattentiveness, mischievousness, and other kinds of unacceptable behaviour (p.315).

Summary of the Review of Literature

In the early 17th century prisons were barbaric institutions in which dismembering, torture, and death were common. In the latter stages of the 17th century and into the 18th century, due primarily to the efforts of prominent prison reformers John Howard and William Penn, incarceration in prisons was established as a means for deterring crime.

Incarceration as a means for deterring would be criminals has undergone much criticism. Roberts (1973) wrote that dealing with criminals was historically based on revenge, restraint and reformation. Rehabilitation became another task of prisons in the early 20th century. Rehabilitation is based on the "medical model" whereby prisoners were considered to be "sick" needing a "cure" and wanting proper "treatment". Conrad and Schneider (1981) believe that the medical model minimises or normalises deviant behaviour by rationalising certain types of criminality without having to "deal" with them. In defence of the medical model, Singer and Statsky (1974) note that it allows for recognising that the offender whether acting knowingly or not must be helped back to a normal life.

Some researchers have argued that incarceration is a form of social control, in that social control assumes that a common social value system exists, and when the values have been violated there is a need to reform the perpetrators (Hirschi, 1969; Roberts, 1973). This argument is the basis for various forms of rehabilitation offered in prisons, one of which is education.

A prominent critic of prison rehabilitation programs was Martinson (1974), who determined that rehabilitative efforts from 231 treatment studies across the United States of America had no appreciable effect on recidivism. Ross, Fabiano and Ross (1988) argue that Martinson had failed to acknowledge that some methods had worked for some prisoners, and that his research methodology was flawed, and that Martinson withdrew his comments

that "nothing works".

Although prison education program effectiveness studies have been criticised primarily due to poor methodological processes (Linden and Perry, 1983; Wiley, 1989), it is wrong to generalise that rehabilitation programs in prisons are not effective. Contemporary researchers are producing both qualitative and quantitative research indicating varying degrees of program effectiveness and influence. Friedeman and Bice (1992) concluded that incarcerated adults can achieve comparable cognitive growth in a rehabilitative vocational education program to adults in public vocational-technical schools. Focussing on women's literature as a curriculum base, Miller and Carrington (1989) determined that there was significant improvement in female young offenders' self-esteem. Feelings of assertiveness, hopefulness and determination were reported in the participant's evaluation comments. Examining inmate retention rates Dufour (1989) concluded that there was a significantly higher retention rate of college inmate students compared to regular students in a community college. This study suggests that, given a chance, prisoner's capabilities for retention will exceed that of students who are not incarcerated.

Education as rehabilitation in prisons has been criticised because it does not appear to have any impact on decreasing recidivism. Yet, research shows that there are some education programs having significant affects on students. In order to examine what aspects of the education programs are affecting prisoner's learning, their attitude toward education, and behaviour in classes, it is necessary to investigate education rituals performed in the prison learning environment.

Chapter Three

METHODOLOGY

The purposes of this study were to establish what education rituals are used in a Canadian federal prison, why they are being used in this environment, and to learn which rituals are identified and rejected by the students. The study also attempted to find out if the prison educators and their students perceived that the educators are marginal to the workings of the institution. Finally, the research endeavoured to discern what adult education principles and practices [see Table 1] are used in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) programs. To investigate these areas a qualitative research methodology was employed.

This chapter is divided into three sections. First, a description of qualitative studies and a rationale for its application in this research is given. Second, the design of the study is presented. Third, a detailed description of the qualitative methodologies and data analysis used for this investigation is reported.

Qualitative research methods are often criticised because of issues concerning: validity, replicability, and value (Borman, LeCompte and Goetz, 1986; Ebel, 1967; and Goodwin and Goodwin, 1984). Therefore, it is important in any academic inquiry to have a clear understanding of the methodology used in research. The first section of this chapter presents a description of qualitative research.

What is Qualitative Research?

Qualitative research has many definitions. It is often labelled: ethnography; cultural interaction; fieldwork; anthropological inquiry; and symbolic interaction (Lofland, 1987; Johnson and Johnson-Lee, 1988; Pelto and Pelto, 1978; Prus, 1987; Shalin, 1986). The many labels associated with qualitative research are discussed by Bryman (1988) who writes:

...alternative labels for the qualitative approach have emerged...they all refer to the same thing: 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 (p.46).

Smith (1987) elaborates on this position suggesting that:

What sets qualitative research apart from other forms of research is the belief that...physical, historical, material, and social environments in which people find themselves have a great bearing on what they think and how they act (p.174).

Human behaviour as the locus of qualitative research provides a foundation for understanding its value, content, purpose and structure. However, investigating influences on human behaviour led Smith (1987) to warn that, "differing views of the nature of reality can impede the acceptance and utilisation of qualitative research" (p.176). To establish the nature of reality in qualitative research, various research methodologies have been developed.

Qualitative Research Methodologies

Qualitative research methods may include: participant observation, structured and/or open-ended interviews, perceptual investigations, sociolinguistics, content analysis, grounded theory, and life histories (Adler and Adler, 1987; Bryman, 1988; Evertson and Green, 1986; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Pelto and Pelto, 1978). The intent of qualitative research methodologies according to Rist (1984) are:

to allow the researcher to obtain first-hand knowledge about the empirical social world in question. Qualitative research allows the researcher to "get close to the data," thereby developing the analytical, conceptual, and categorical components of explanation from the data itself (p.4).

The research methodologies used in this study were: observations, interviews, and field notes.

Observations

Observational data describes the setting that was observed; the activities that took place in that setting; the people who participated in those activities; and the meanings of the setting (Evertson and Green, 1986). Lofland (1971) writes that observational data is concerned with, "the circumstances of being in or around an on-going social setting for the purpose of making a qualitative analysis of that setting" (p.93). Gans (1982) distinguishes three types of participant observer roles, they are:

Pagination Error

Text Complete

Erreur de pagination

Le texte est complet

National Library of Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Service des thèses canadiennes

Leaf blank to correct

numbering

Leaf blank to correct
numbering

Leaf blank to correct

numbering

Leaf blank to correct
numbering

1. Total Participant: the fieldworker who is completely involved emotionally in a social situation who only after it is over becomes a researcher again and writes down what has happened.
2. Researcher Participant: the fieldworker who participates in a social situation but is personally only partially involved, so that he/she can function as a researcher.
3. Total researcher: the fieldworker who observes without any personal involvement in the situation under study (cited in Burgess, p.54).

For the purposes of this study, the researcher's role was that of researcher participant. During classroom observations the researcher entered the room with the students and sat at the back of the classroom. Some students would at times engage in a conversation with the researcher asking, "What are you here for?" As the researcher became more familiar in the learning environment the students would greet the researcher and ask "How are things going?" The researcher did not teach any classes or offer any curriculum advice to the students. Observations outside the classroom setting were also carried out in a researcher participant style. The researcher did not participate directly when the students were having conversations with their teachers or their colleagues.

The second qualitative data collection strategy was interviewing.

Interviewing

Patton (1990) writes that interviewing people is aimed at finding out those things we cannot directly observe such as; feelings, thoughts, and intentions. He suggests three basic approaches to collecting interview data which require different types of preparation, conceptualisation and instrumentation, they are:

- a. The informal conversational interview: relies entirely on the spontaneous generation of questions in the natural flow of an interaction, typically an interview that occurs as part of ongoing participant observation fieldwork.
- b. The general interview guide approach: involves outlining a set of issues that are to be explored with each respondent before interviewing begins. The interview guide serves as a basic checklist during the interview to make sure that all relevant topics are covered.
- c. The standardised open-ended interview: consists of a set of questions carefully worded and arranged with the intention of taking each respondent through the same sequence and asking each respondent the same questions with essentially the same words. This interview technique is used when it is important to minimise variation in the questions posed to interviewees. This reduces the possibility of bias that comes from having different interviews for different people, including the problem of

obtaining more comprehensive data from certain persons while getting less systematic information from others (p.198).

This research used an open-ended interview technique (see Appendix A & B).

Field notes was the third data collection strategy used in this research.

Field notes

Berg (1988) suggests that field notes provide narrative accounts of what goes on in the lives of study subjects. Patton (1990) suggests that it is impossible to provide universal prescriptions about the mechanics of, and procedures for, taking field notes because different settings lend themselves to different ways of proceeding.

The process for collecting field notes in this study was based on the purposes of the investigation: to describe the education rituals performed in the ABE and GED prison classes, to determine their effect on the prisoner's likes and dislikes associated with teaching and learning, and to describe the interaction behaviour between the prison educators and their students in the learning environment. Aspects of educator/learner interaction were recorded in field notes while in the learning environment, not just in the classroom.

This interaction included: class requirements, conversations, directions, and behaviours that were demonstrated by both the educators and their students.

The day-to-day workings of the prison and the prison environment impacted on the process for collecting field notes. Classes were scheduled for forty-five minute sessions with a fifteen minute break given at the conclusion of each class. During the breaks students were permitted to smoke cigarettes

in the designated area, have something to drink, or socialise in the student lounge. The educators would either break for a cup of coffee, remain in their classroom working with a slower student, or remain in their classroom correcting submitted work. The daily timetable in the education wing was:

0845 - 0930	Class
0931 - 0944	Break
0945 - 1030	Class
1031 - 1044	Break
1045 - 1130	Class
1131 - 1300	Lunch
1315 - 1400	Class
1401 - 1414	Break
1415 - 1500	Class
1501 - 1514	Break
1515 - 1600	Class
1605	Return to ranges

At 1131 hours the students were lined up in the education wing corridor and released for lunch by the Chief of Education after he had received a telephone call from the duty correctional officer to unlock the main door. Students then singularly filed out and passed through a metal detector frame. At this time prisoners could be randomly stopped and searched by a correctional officer.

Approximately one hour per day was available to record any interaction between the prison educators and their students in the learning environment, outside the formal classroom setting. During this time conversations, interaction and behaviours demonstrated by either educator or student were observed. At the conclusion of the observation, the researcher wrote down the main points or highlighted any event in enough detail to record the interaction

during the luncheon break or at the end of the day. Field notes were also used to record any extraordinary events or occurrences that happened during the data collection phase of the study. For example, this included any shutdowns (when prisoners are required to return to their cells) or any altercations that occurred between prisoners, and between prisoners and staff.

The classroom observations, field notes, and interview transcripts were used in this research for providing a mixture of the various qualitative research methods; this is called "triangulation" (Denzin, 1978).

Triangulation

Triangulation is a means of exploring convergence of perception and analysis approaches. Evertson and Green (1986) write that:

...it [triangulation] permits exploration of differences in perception and/or description obtained from each perspective [of collected data] (p. 200).

Patton (1990) offers the following four purposes of triangulation, they are:

1. Comparing observational data with interview data;
2. Comparing what people say in public with what they say in private;

3. Checking for the consistency of what people in a situation say about this situation over time; and
4. Comparing the perspectives of people from different points of view - staff views, client views, other views, and views expressed by people outside the program (p.331).

This study compared observational data with interview data, and field notes. The data compared the prison educators' and the prisoners' perspectives regarding the prison educators' status in the prison, and the role of education in the prison.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Subjects

Federal prisoners who were involved in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) classes at a Canadian federal penitentiary, and their educators were the subjects for the study. The institution reported that there are on average nineteen students who take GED classes and thirty students take ABE classes. Four prison educators are responsible for the GED & ABE programs, and one prison educator is responsible for students undertaking correspondence courses only.

Student Participant Data

Twelve ABE students and ten GED students were interviewed for the study. This represented 80% of the ABE participants observed and 97% of the GED students observed. Student participation numbers vary. Some

students drop out, are not regular attenders, or choose to work in other work programs. In addition, students can be transferred to another institution, be involved in other rehabilitative programs, or are involved in court appearances. Table 2 provides a breakdown of student numbers observed and interviewed for the study.

The institution's reported number of participants in the GED (n=19) and ABE (n=30) classes represent the target population (n=49). However, during the data collection period student participation numbers varied. The number of students observed was less than the number of reported students in the classes. Prison administration procedures did not permit the Chief of Education to be appraised about reasons for prisoner absences until approximately 1030 hours. Generally, absences were due to prisoners being sick or opting to go to another work area in the prison.

During the afternoon class session, again the Chief of Education would not be told about prisoner absences until approximately 1400 hours. Failure to attend classes on a regular basis and the slow process in reporting absent student's whereabouts is a major concern of the prison educators.

This study provides a snapshot of educational practices in a federal prison over a specific period of time. The three day pilot study allowed the researcher to recognise some shortcomings in the data collection process. This resulted in adjustments and refinements for collection data.

Given that the purposes of this research were to: establish what education rituals are used in the ABE and GED programs; identify if prisoners accept and/or reject the rituals; and the prison educators' and prisoners' perceptions of the status of the prison educators, the three methods of data collection and the triangulation of the data provide a succinct picture of ABE and GED education practices in a prison for a specific period of time.

Table 2 provides an overview of student participants and number of students observed in each class. ABE (#) represents one of the three ABE prison educators. Each ABE educator was observed a total of four times and the number of students in each class is recorded. For example, ABE (1) was observed in four classes with 1,4,7, and 6 students in each class. During the observation phase this educator worked with eighteen students, averaging four students per class.

The twelve observed ABE classes averaged five students per class and the four observed GED classes averaged ten students in each class.

Twelve ABE students responded to the interview questions, this represented 40 percent of the ABE target population and 80 percent of the ABE observed population. Ten GED students were interviewed representing 52 percent of the GED target population and 97 percent of the GED observed population. The Chief of Education informed the researcher that prisoners who were to be interviewed were absent due to sickness; being involved in other prison programs; or changed their mind.

Table 2

Student Participants

<u>Reported Number of Student Population:</u>						
					GED	19
					ABE	30
	Total	Population				49
<u>Observed Number of Student Population:</u>						
	Obs. 1	Obs. 2	Obs. 3	Obs. 4	Total	Mean
ABE (1)	1	4	7	6	18	4.5
ABE (2)	5	6	7	7	25	6.2
ABE (3)	7	4	6	4	21	5.2
GED	12	6	11	10	39	9.7

Mean n observed participating in ABE classes = 5

Mean n observed participating in GED classes = 10

Participants interviewed for the Study:

ABE = 12 = 40% Target Population
80% Observed Population

GED = 10 = 52% Target Population
97% Observed Population

Canada has recognised that there are many natives in its federal prisons (Task Force on Aboriginal Peoples in Federal Corrections, 1988; Report of Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba, 1991). The implications and ramifications of cultural identity can have a significant influence on the participants' perception of, and attitude toward learning. Consequently, every student participant was asked, "Are you a Native?" All of the students responded to this question, and those who did identify themselves as Native

would elaborate on their response by mentioning what band they belonged to. Given that the issue of Native incarceration figures is currently a contentious issue it would be a major shortcoming of this investigation if cultural identity status was not included in the data collection. Tables 3 and 4 present details about the age, year level, and self-identified cultural groups of student participants in the ABE and GED programs.

Table 3

Age, Year Level and Self-Identified Cultural Group in ABE Programs

<u>AGE</u>	<u>YEAR LEVEL</u>	<u>SELF-IDENTIFIED CULTURAL GROUP</u>
56	3	Native
26	5	Asian
23	6	Black
32	6	Black
24	1	Native
22	3	Native
27	5	Native
23	9	Native
27	3	Native
28	1	Native
22	9	Caucasian
27	1	Native

Tally: 12

Average Age: 34

Table 4

Age, Year Level and Self-Identified Cultural Group In GED Program

<u>AGE</u>	<u>YEAR LEVEL</u>	<u>SELF-IDENTIFIED CULTURAL GROUP</u>
42	12	Native
22	12	Native
25	10	Native
27	10	Native
22	12	Native
32	10	Caucasian
31	12	Native
38	10	Native
20	12	Native
28	10	Native

Tally: 10

Average Age:

28

Explanations for the high number of self-identified Native respondents in this study may be due to the location of the research site. Situated in the prairie region of central Canada, the Native population is high in this area. Also, the high number of Native respondents may be due to their desire to participate in programs which prior to their incarceration may not have been available to them. Many reserves in central Canada are in remote areas and the Native students may not have had the opportunity to participate in ABE or GED programs.

Prison Educator Data

Three ABE educators and the GED educator were interviewed and observed for the study. Two ABE educators had been employed at the institution for 5 months; one as a federal employee and the other as a contract employee. The third ABE educator has worked at the institution for 3.5 years. Only one of the educators interviewed has formal training in adult education; being the holder of a "Certificate in Adult Education" from a local community college. Another ABE educator had previous experiences working with adults in an adult learning centre; and the GED instructor had worked as a professor during 5 summer sessions at a local university. Two of the educators are women.

Procedure

A letter was mailed to the Warden of the institution briefly describing the intended research with a request to undertake the study at the institution.

A telephone conversation between the Deputy Warden and the researcher scheduled a meeting for the Deputy Warden to clearly understand the intent of, and research requirements of the investigation. This was requested by the Deputy Warden before he would consider recommending that the study proceed. The researcher and Deputy Warden met to discuss these issues at the University of Manitoba.

At the request of the Deputy Warden, the researcher met with the Warden, Deputy Warden, and Chief of Education at the institution to discuss the purpose of the study. The Deputy Warden clarified the restrictions and

regulations directed by Correctional Services of Canada to ensure participant confidentiality. The researcher was informed that the names of the participants were not to be recorded, any participant could withdraw from the research any time, and that students were not permitted to edit their interview transcripts for security reasons.

Approval for the study was granted after the researcher had undergone a security check governed by the regulations of the Correctional Services of Canada, and the institution received documents verifying that the proposed study had passed university ethics requirements.

A letter was distributed to the prison educators describing the proposed research, and requesting their participation in the study (see Appendix C).

Students were invited to meet individually with the researcher by the Chief of Education. The researcher explained the intent of the study, ensured that they would not be identified in the research, and asked them if they would like to participate. Only one student declined the invitation stating, "I don't think that I care to do that."

Upon confirmation of the prisoners' willingness to participate in the study, students were granted permission to leave their classes and the interviews were conducted in the teachers' lounge with only the researcher and student present.

Details regarding observation schedules were determined by the researcher and prison educators. Observations were undertaken when the prison educators confirmed that the observation could be conducted. All of the prison educators were notified about the observation data collection period.

The Chief of Education and the researcher instructed them that they would be asked if their current class could be observed. If not, the educators were asked to suggest what classes for that day could be observed. Typically, an educator would not allow an observation if he/she knew that the students would not be attending or if they themselves would not be in class. The educators knew that observations would be carried out in their class on a daily basis. They did not know the time observations would be conducted. There is some variance in observation times because classes would either stop early or students would gradually vacate the room leaving it empty.

Observations were limited to comply with schedules; timetabling of classes; number of students attending classes; and availability of prison educators.

The duration of each class is 45 minutes; a daily total of 4 hours and 50 minutes (6 classes) per day. Classes are not conducted for one day in every 5 regular working days. This means that classes are scheduled for 4 out of the 5 days in a regular week. One day is allocated to prison educators for class preparation time. This means that in a regular week there are only 19 hours and 20 minutes scheduled class time in the education department.

During this time the four educators were observed in four separate observation sessions. Variance in observation time to scheduled class time (see Table 5) was due to classes ending early or students leaving. In addition, classes were cancelled if students failed to arrive, educators were absent or low student numbers led to classes being merged and video films being presented. One educator was absent for professional development during part of the

observation period; his classes were cancelled. Low student turn out resulted in classes being merged on four occasions with video films being shown. Therefore, classroom observations were conducted in relation to prison operations and the education department's practices during staff and student absences.

In one instance, an educator disallowed an observation because the students did not want to be observed for that particular class. Table 5 presents information about the observation schedule including: class time, subject, and total minutes observed.

Table 5

Observation Schedule:

<u>Class</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Minutes Observed</u>
ABE (2)	Writing	0845-0930	45
GED	Writing	0850-0930	40
ABE (2)	Reading	0945-1030	45
GED	Science/Maths	1045-1125	40
GED	Maths	1415-1445	30
GED	Writing	1315-1400	45
ABE (1)	Maths	0845-0930	45
ABE (1)	Writing	0945-1030	45
ABE (2)	Writing	0845-0930	45
ABE (1)	Maths	1050-1130	40
ABE (3)	Maths	1515-1600	45
ABE (1)	Reading	1415-1500	45
ABE (3)	Writing	0845-0930	45
ABE (2)	Maths	1055-1130	40
ABE (3)	Maths	1330-1415	45

Research Location

The research site is classified as a medium/maximum federal prison. This classification means that most of the prisoners are considered "dangerous" and may be harmful to society. The building is "Victorian" in architectural style having been designed and constructed at the turn of the century. The prison has a central domain and the prisoner's cells branch out from the core area. The cell areas are called ranges. Reagen and Stoughton (1976) and Rothman (1971) report that this architectural style dominated prison construction during the early 1900s.

The maximum capacity for the prison is 450 but with prisoner movement due to release or transfers the prison usually holds approximately 400 inmates. Over the years the prison has expanded its buildings to include: a kitchen and eating area, vocational trades workshops, and the education wing were completed in 1989 (Personal communication, Assistant Warden, January, 1991).

The education wing has four classrooms, a computer learning centre, staff lounge, the Chief of Education office, three small tutorial rooms, a library, washroom facilities, a student lounge, and three small offices for the educators.

In a personal communication, the Chief of Education reported that the institution offered some university courses, ABE classes, building maintenance courses, life skills sessions, and GED classes. Recruitment of potential students is undertaken during their orientation. New and returning prisoners

are required to spend two weeks in the reception range where they are familiarised with the rules of the institution and the services and programs which are available to them. All incoming prisoners are tested with the School and College Aptitude Test to determine their academic level. Prison educators then present details about the education programs. Potential students are required to submit an application to participate in any education program to the Chief of Education. No prisoner is denied the opportunity to take any education program unless he is in solitary confinement. After acceptance into the education program students are further tested using the Canadian Adult Achievement Test. The test results are used to place the students in ABE or GED classes.

The length of time a student remains in these classes can vary from two weeks to two years depending on each student's attitude toward the programs. The Chief of Education reported that it is not uncommon for many students in the ABE classes to undertake some learning then leave to go into a work program and return later. Also, some students move from the ABE to the GED program after successful development in ABE classes.

Data Collection Process Used in This Study

A three part qualitative data collection strategy was used in the study, these were:

1. Open-ended interviews (see Appendix A & B).
2. Systematic observations (see Appendix D).
3. Field notes.

A brief synopsis of results from the pilot study is discussed, and a rationale for the use, and design of an observation data collection sheet is presented. Finally, sections on interviews, observation data collection, and analysis are noted.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in May, 1991. Prison educators and their students were observed in the classroom and interviewed over a three day period. The pilot study led the researcher to experience fatigue during the observation data collection phase, this was due to not having any system or organisation for collecting the observation data. Consequently, to accurately record the interaction between prison educators and their learners an observation data collection sheet (ODCS) was created (see Appendix D). The ODCS allowed for a systematic recording of interaction using a checking and notation format. The pilot study also led the researcher to change some of "academic" terms used in the open-ended student interview questions. For example, "status held by" was changed to "who is the most important."

Interviewing Process

Prisoner and prison educator interviews were conducted in the educators' lounge with only the researcher and respondent present. Two interview question schedules were used in the study. One for the prison educators and the other for their students (see Appendices A & B). An interview schedule was placed in front of the researcher and used as a reference during each interviewing session.

A contentious issue in contemporary judicial/penal research is the high number of Natives currently incarcerated in Canada's federal prisons. Ascertaining the student's cultural identity and age were the first two questions fielded to them. The straightforward nature of the questions; "Are you Native?" and "How old are you?" familiarised the students with the interviewing process and appeared to put them at ease.

The interviews were recorded using a hand held tape recorder which was placed on a table between the researcher and respondent. All of the participants were assured that the interview data was for research purposes only and that their identity would not be recorded in the research.

The prison educators were told their transcripts would be sent to them to edit prior to the researcher analysing the transcripts. They were forwarded to all of the prison educators. A covering letter (see Appendix E) with the transcripts gave each respondent a three-week time limit for altering, withdrawing any or all of their comments, or adding more detail to the transcripts. If the researcher had not heard from the prison educators after the

three-week period, then the transcript would be analysed as reported. Three prison educators returned their transcripts with minor changes and alterations [see results section].

Observation Process

The value of observation data according to Irwin and Bushnell (1980) is that it: (a) is a means of answering specific questions, (b) provides a more realistic picture of behaviour or events, (c) helps us to understand behaviour, (d) evaluates educational efforts and, (e) is a means of generating hypothesis or ideas (p.5-6). It is these elements of observation data that compliment the purposes of this investigation. Specifically, how an educator controls disorderly behaviour; structures lessons; develops his/her teaching style and motivational strategies; interacts with students.

The criteria for determining what elements must be observed during interaction between the prison educators and their learners were based on two major influences. First, Knowles' (1980) principles and practices of adult education note specific learning expectations and teaching processes germane to adult educator/adult learner interaction. Second, Flanders (cited in Bushnell and Irwin, 1980), a pioneer in the study of the learning environment and classroom interaction, developed a category system that accounted for every possible type of classroom interaction. It should be noted that this research does not use Flander's FIAS as the research methodology, the study uses Flander's interaction analysis categories and descriptors only.

This study used the following criteria as a guide for observations:

1. Accepts feelings (learning environment).
2. Praises/encourages (need to learn).
3. Accepts/uses students ideas (learner's experience).
4. Asks questions (actively participates).
5. Lecturing (share learning experience).
6. Gives directions (responsibility, shares, actively participates).
7. Criticising or justifying authority (learning environment, responsibility).
8. Response (actively participate, experiences, sense of progress).
9. Initiation (learning environment, actively participate, experience, sense of progress).
10. Silence or confusion (learning environment, actively participate, experience, sense of progress).

One aspect for determining the elements of the observation data was based on the FIAS categories, they are:

Table 6

FIAS Categories

Teacher Talk

- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|
| A. | Accepts feelings. | Accepts and clarifies an attitude or the feeling tone of a pupil in a non-threatening manner. |
| B. | Praises and encourages. | Praises or encourages pupil action or behaviour. |
| C. | Accepts or uses ideas of pupils. | Clarifying, building, or developing ideas suggested by a pupil. |
| D. | Asks questions. | Asking about content or procedure, based on teacher ideas, with the intent that a pupil will answer. |
| E. | Lecturing. | Giving facts or opinions about content or procedures; expressing his [sic] own ideas, giving his [sic] own explanation, or citing an authority other than a pupil. |
| F. | Giving directions. | Directions, commands, or orders with a pupil, who is expected to comply. |
| G. | Criticising or justifying authority. | Statements intended to change pupils behaviour from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he [sic] is doing; extreme self-reference. |

Pupil Talk

- | | | |
|----|-----------------------|--|
| H. | Response. | Talk by pupils in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits pupil statements. |
| I. | Initiation. | Talk by pupils which they initiate. Expressing own ideas; initiating a new topic. |
| J. | Silence or confusion. | Pauses, short periods of silence and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer. |

(Adapted from Irwin and Bushnell, p.233-234).

The value of using the FAIS categories in this study was regarding their relevance and complementary relationship to Knowles' (1980) principles and practices of adult education; this is illustrated in Table 7. Capital letters in the FAIS column correspond to the FAIS categories in Table 6. Numbers in parentheses in the Principles/Practice of Adult Education column correspond to the numbered adult education principles listed in Table 1.

Table 7

Comparison of FIAS categories to Knowles' principles/practices of adult education

FIAS	PRINCIPLES/PRACTICE OF ADULT EDUCATION
Accepts feelings (A)	Learning environment is characterised by comfort, trust (2)
Praises and encourages (B)	Learners feel a need to learn (1), (2)
Accept or uses ideas of pupils (C)	Learning is related to learner's experience (6), and learners have a sense of progress toward their goals for evaluation (7)
Asks questions (D)	Learners actively participate (5), (6), (7)
Lecturing (E)	Learners accept a share of the responsibility for planning and operating the learning experience (4), (5)
Giving directions (F)	(1), (4), (5)
Criticising or justifying authority (G)	(2), (4)
Response (H)	(5), (6), (7)
Initiation (I)	(4), (5), (6), (7)
Silence or confusion (J)	(4), (5), (6), (7)

Based on the FIAS categories and the adult education principles and practices, an observational data collection sheet (ODCS) was created [see Appendix D].

Field notes

Field notes were recorded after each data collection session. This activity allowed the researcher to note any significant events, comments, or to record any inferences from either data collection strategy.

DATA ANALYSIS

Arguments for a systematic analysis of qualitative data have been rationalised based on providing proof, formalisation, credibility, and authority (Lofland, 1974; Lustz and Ramsey, 1974; Miles and Huberman, 1984; Patton, 1990; Stoddart, 1986). Establishing consensus for a systematic approach to qualitative data analysis requires a focus (Emerson, 21987; Gerhardt, 1988; Miles and Huberman, 1984; Prus, 1987; Stoddart, 1986). This rationale is best summed up by Prus (1987) who suggests a more concerted focus on the process for research analysis allows for developing conceptual schemes. These schemes will enable researchers to communicate their findings in a comparative, cumulative manner.

Analysis of the Interview Data

Analysing the interview data involved reading each transcript and gleaning patterns and themes from each response. In an attempt to examine and understand the themes raised by the prison educators and their students; recurring comments or issues which the participants emphasised were noted. Also, comments where the participants reiterated points or which were

personally meaningful were recorded. In order to encapsulate the themes a label was used to generate a conceptual framework to analyse the interview data. This allowed for specific categories and subcategories to be assigned to each transcript to determine: what was the nature of the interactions among participants? What were participant's attitudes toward the education program? What were the participants perceptions with regard to the status of the prison educators? What education rituals were performed in the education programs? What education rituals were rejected by the prisoners?

Analysis of Observational Data

Observation data collection sheets (ODCS: see Appendix D) constructed by the researcher were used to record the interaction between the prison educators and their students. The ODCS were constructed so that a systematic examination of the research questions could be applied. This is called a category system for data collection (Evertson and Green, 1986). The prison educators and their students interaction behaviour were checked in one of the 10 categories which were formulated in response to Knowles' (1980) adult education principles and practices, and the interaction components of education rituals found in the FIAS. Recording specific interactions that occurred in the classroom, the researcher was able to glean types of teaching and behaviour control rituals used by the prison educator, the most common form of interaction, and what education rituals were accepted or rejected by the students.

In addition, by comparing the interaction categories to the adult education principles and practices the researcher was able to make certain assumptions about the practice of adult education in this prison environment.

Chapter Four

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study were to examine the incidence of education rituals performed and rejected in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) classes in one Canadian federal prison. In addition, the research attempted to learn if the prison educators and their students perceived that the educators were marginal to the workings of the institution. Finally, based on interview responses, observation data, and field notes the study attempted to establish what, if any, principles and practices of adult education are used in the ABE and GED prison education programs (Knowles, 1980; see Table 1).

Clifton and Rambaran (1987) defined education rituals as: behaviours and expressions applied to the teaching situation; to the control of disorderly behaviour; or to the praise of acceptable behaviour. They are not formally defined and require a systematic analysis. Consequently, the chapter is divided into four major sections. Section one provides the analysis of the interviews; section two presents details about the observations; and, section three highlights details from the field notes. Section four "triangulates" major issues and themes generating from the three data collection methodologies; comparing different or similar points of view from the respondents, and comparing observational data with interview data. Finally, all of the research data provides the necessary information to deduce if any of Knowles' (1980)

principles and practices of adult education are used in the ABE and GED prison education programs.

SECTION ONE: ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEWS

A critical component of this research was to investigate the behaviours and expressions that apply to the teaching situation and to the control of disorderly behaviour, or praise of acceptable behaviour. The research indicates that these may be categorised as "education rituals." It suggests that an understanding of education rituals provides a basis for examining how the educators and prisoners relate, and if the relationship has any impact on student learning. To obtain this information from the respondent's interview data, patterns and themes were gleaned from the transcripts and labelled to generate a conceptual framework. In this section, the labels are emphasized and highlighted (**as demonstrated**). This enables the reader to recognize the specific categories emanating from the interview responses. These categories found:

- * the specific details of the interaction between the participants
- * the participant's attitudes toward the education programs
- * the participant's perceptions regarding the prison educator's status in the prison hierarchy

- * what education rituals, and why they were performed in the GED and ABE programs
- * what education rituals were rejected by the students.

Prison Educators Use of Educational Rituals

The interview questions dealing with what education rituals were performed by the educators included:

1. What teaching styles do you employ with your students?
How?
2. What strategies do you use to maintain appropriate student behaviour in the learning situation?
How do you implement these?

The prison educator's responses gleaned trends in both the teaching and control ritual categories. The basis for this trend was that all of the educators were influenced by their students circumstances, their educational needs, and the rigours associated with the workings of the institution.

Teaching rituals, which include how the educators structure their lessons, their teaching style, and motivational strategies appeared consistent in comments made by all of the educators. When asked, "What teaching styles do you employ with your students?" The ABE and GED educators said that their classes were based on **individualized programming**. Students worked independently on their work sheets with the educator monitoring their progress.

In tandem with the individualized lesson structure, one ABE educator and the GED educator, elaborated on their responses to the interview question, "What teaching styles do you employ with your students? How?" By noting that the students were expected to initiate questions or ask for help if they needed it. An educator rationalized this process based on efficiency, stating:

I tried group teaching with them because it almost appears as if I'm tutoring them....Often, different students are asking the same question and inefficiency is the feeling I get in the class quite a bit....It was difficult teaching with a group because there are such varying levels that, to try and teach a common class is not efficient either. Because then you are teaching them something they know and then of course they won't pay attention....The teaching style I use with them would be; they don't know how to do a question they come and ask me.

The other educator believed that the students initiating questions or asking for help was common in any individualized program, saying:

Typically, it is a help when you need it. Like watch for when they need the teaching moments and being there and put them in it. I do small group work but that depends if the people are at the same level. Largely, it is individualized. [Who initiates the individualized instruction?] In some instances, I think it is half and half because, I am going to people often when they ask for help. They will give a signal.

The remaining educators whose classes were also based on individualized programming discussed "how they implemented their teaching style," by saying, in their classes **more structure and teacher initiated strategies** were implemented. They suggested that the teacher initiation be based on the subject being taught and the educational levels of their students. In conjunction with these variables one ABE educator noted that because many of the students lack confidence, it was **necessary for the teacher to have control**. Highlighting literacy attainment, this educator reported that:

To get these fellows to see that reading, writing, and speaking the language is all combined and you can't really separate one from the other; so to get them to put their pen on paper right away, to use their own experiences. I use the whole language approach to reading. I talk to them a lot about what reading is; it is a process of getting meaning from the page. So I think that it is a mixture of whole language and getting them to believe in themselves.

The educators who discussed the impetus of teacher control, also mentioned that they attempted to **foster some flexibility in the running of their classes**. The reasons for the flexibility were based on "institution" and "personality" influences. Clarifying this point, one educator said:

It has to be a real flexible [teaching] style. It is very flexible but very demanding, very intense: individualized. It has to do with personality, grade level, administration of the institution.

You know, you've got to take into account all of this so you cannot let that frustrate you.

The notion of flexibility in classes was reiterated by another educator who reported that:

I want to give the guys some choices and flexibility. Flexibility around what they want to do, and when they want to do it. If they don't really want to do maths first thing in the morning that it is fine, they can do reading.

Control rituals, which apply to the control of disorderly behaviour such as; inattentiveness, mischievousness and other kinds of unacceptable behaviour, explain how the educators control learning behaviour. To find out this information the prison educators were asked, "What strategies do you use to maintain appropriate student behaviour in the learning situation?" And, "How do you implement these?"

An interesting aspect of the educators' responses relating to control rituals, was that two educators cited specific incidents of inappropriate behaviour and how they dealt with it. The other educators were more general in their discussions about dealing with students demonstrating inappropriate behaviour in the classroom.

A common control strategy was to ignore the behaviour. In the GED program the educator said:

You cannot be too authoritarian. If you are too authoritarian,

they will see it as a challenge and they will try to beat you. . . .
My best response was no response. If I let them say they would not write the test and if I didn't make a response to that, they would always write the test....[It's] like an argument. Like a conflict thing, if you don't make the last response then finally the person will not react or resist.

Complementing this position another educator reported that:

. . .at times I will ignore them and sit and not worry about it; ignore it for a couple of hoursSometimes it takes an hour or two . . .I don't take it personal; I try not to take it personal. . . , it just blows over after a while and we keep going. So, I ignore them. I think that ignoring is very good for a while.

Ignoring the behaviour was a control ritual used by another educator who discussed a specific incident of inappropriate behaviour demonstrated by a student. The educator mentioned that a learner in conversation, compared tutoring students to prostitution. The educator concluded that, "He had no concept on how to communicate with women at all." This educator reported that she had "quit talking to the student completely." This continued for about a month, and she stated that, "I am about ready to say good morning to him again, and to see if we can start again."

Another example of inappropriate behaviour demonstrated by a student which was discussed by another educator involved:

I have had one fellow that for the last couple of months has given me quite a rough time. He is very self-centred, which most of these guys are; and seems everything should be his way and done on his terms. This problem started when I was beginning to teach this method of writing. I wanted him to have the same instruction as the other students. He does write poetry. Some of his writing skills are fine. So he started to say No! No! No! Stating that we were always changing and it was too fast and he wanted to do something else. I tried to tell him that the reason why I wanted him to do this was to develop his skills but he left the classroom and stormed outMy basic approach was to let him cool down and if he had not talked to me I would have gone and talked to him and tried to straighten things out: to get a working relationship.

Usually, the educators' approach to dealing with inappropriate student behaviour was to ignore it, allow the student time to "cool down," and then to talk the problem through with the student.

Another control ritual which the educators used for dealing with student behaviour issues was the **utilization of the Chief of Education**. All four educators noted that if they were not succeeding with a student, or they believed that a student was not ready for classes, they called on the leadership and direction of the Chief of Education. One educator said:

If I have to I will go to the authority and use the administrative approach. But that is rare; that is very, very rare because I don't believe in that approachIt is a very rare time when I go to the Chief and say we have got to do something with this guy because I can't bring him around.

The office of the Chief of Education is comparable to that of a school principal. One respondent detailed the Chief's role when they were confronted with a student demonstrating inappropriate behaviour, stating:

I talked to the Chief. We gave the student a deadline, stating that, this is when you are to come to the classroom.

I made it clear all along that I wanted him back in the classroom and that he was welcomeI said I would make sure that I would acknowledge him when I heard him and we left it at that.

The role of the Chief in dealing with disciplinary problems is quite clear. He works with the educator to ensure that the problem is recognized, discussed and clarified. Typically, if a student is proving to be too problematic the Chief will re-assign him to other duties available in the prison. If, after some time that inmate wants to return to classes he must re-apply for admission.

Only one educator mentioned the use of a **personal alarm** as a control method for inappropriate student behaviour. This is a device that can be carried everywhere. When it is activated it alerts security personnel throughout the institution. The educator indicated that this would only be used if there was a threat of someone being hurt; saying, "...if it was a real problem, if I felt someone was going to be harmed I would press my personal alarm."

The GED educator mentioned the use of **humour as an important means for controlling and working with the students**, saying:

You must use a sense of humour without question. If you try to work with them without a sense of humour they won't be interested in you. You are just more boredom in their life and they will resent you.

All of the educators discussed the varying levels of attainment and educational deficiency demonstrated by their students. They compared their learner's needs to their experiences with learners in the community at large and concluded that, although the prisoners share similar educational problems to learners on the "outside"; the workings and procedures related to the institution, made their learners "different." One educator said:

. . . the sort of organization and the regimentation that the men go through is different. Remembering to check things out before you do it. To try to fit into the school and the rest of the institution, those are big differences. In terms of the students, you know, there are some differences that you sort of leave things alone and you don't ask, and you don't go into certain areas of their life unless they volunteer to talk to you about it. I would never ask or even open up certain topics.

The educational levels of their learners was reported to be varied. This description of the students provided by one educator was consistent with all of the comments discussed by the educators on this issue. The educator said:

. . .they are from beginning reader in an ESL sense; beginning or very close to beginning readers . . .people who are slow learners and they had little opportunity for

education, or did not take the education opportunities that were there; and those who have other handicapping [sic] problems.

Although all of the educators discussed the educational characteristics of their learners, they also reported that the students were subject to personal problems, frustrations, and concerns due to their incarceration. The GED educator indicated that:

. . . one difference [compared to regular students] that struck me immediately is that they are moody and frustrated quite a bit. On given days somebody will work well and I'll think it is going so well for him. Then, just like that he will have messed up the next day, and of course, I don't know why. . . .Here the prediction [of behaviour] is more difficult; dependant on their day to day situation or what is happening in their outside lives. That, I guess, a person should expect in here.

Another educator reported that many students experience frustration with education saying, "Sometimes they get frustrated with the work and they take it out on me." In tandem with the concept of education being frustrating, a respondent concluded that the learners were poor in interaction skills, particularly in the classroom environment by saying:

At this level I see the inmates as not having experience dealing with people. They don't really know how to, so they rely on their own methods and their own ways of dealing with situations which are usually walking out or feeling hurt and all those sorts of things. I think part of our job is to work on changing those behaviours.

Perhaps the biggest influence on the teaching and control rituals performed in ABE and GED programs was a humanistic attitude toward the students maintained by the educators. They were not only familiar with the educational characteristics and needs of their learners, but also the problems they experience that go beyond the learning environment, and beyond the rigours of the institution. One ABE educator sums up this position and provided a rationale for recognizing the feelings, thoughts and intentions of the students, by saying:

If somebody doesn't want to work or is having trouble working and concentrating, and cannot sit at his desk; there can be so many different things happening to them that we aren't aware of. From trying to deal with their problems of dependence on alcohol or drugs; maybe they are in a course, that is really what they have to sort out in their minds. Also, family problems which can cause a problem for concentration here and maybe they will tell you about it. Just the odd person who does end up

telling you about it makes you realize that this is something that must prey on all of them at sometime or another. One fellow has told me recently that his child had been taken away from his wife who has not written to him for months because of her alcohol problem. He doesn't know where the child is and he hasn't heard from his wife and doesn't know where she is. Things like this can really take away from anything positive that can be done educationally. Some people use education to sort of override their business. They keep their minds busy so as they aren't dwelling on their problems. So it can work both ways.

The teaching and control rituals used by the educators in ABE and GED programs were founded on catering to the educational characteristics and needs of their students. Arising from this, the educators are aware of the personal trials and tribulations each student faces regularly. This can include; frustration with their personal predicament or the demands associated with their classes. The students' frustration can lead them to being moody, withdrawn, or apathetic to the education programs being offered to them. In recognizing that the students can at times be aggravated or depressed, one educator proudly noted that when it came time to do their tests, "every one of them was trying to do the best that he could."

Prison Educator's Perceived Status

An element of this research was to determine if the prison educators and their students perceived that the educators were marginal to the workings of the institution. In order to establish the prison educator's opinions about this issue, they were asked:

- * Do you ever feel, as a prison educator, that your status in the prison is not very high? If yes, why do you think this? If no, can you tell me why?
- * Who do you think are considered the most important personnel in the workings of the institution? Why?
- * Do you think education programs and participation are considered important activities in the prison? Why?

The four educators' responses to the interview questions concerning their status focused on two themes. First, they acknowledged that because the institution's function was primarily that of security; their status as educators was secondary to the security/safety regulations governed by Corrections Canada. One educator noted, "security is the most important thing in the prison, although it certainly is not high on my priorities." Because security dominates the purpose of the prison, an educator listed a hierarchy of personnel within the institution and concluded that, "I would probably say the guards [are the most important]. . . then the case managers. Guards first because of security. Security is considered very important." Another respondent said:

According to Corrections Canada, they say that safety is the most important part, and I think that they recognize the guards as probably being important.

Going beyond the institution's primary function of security, an educator suggested that establishing their status depended on their values, saying:

I don't think it is so much occupation but attitude. I have to go with those who have an attitude of healing. Their occupation isn't the issue. I guess the inmates feelings that they are learning more and being helped is the best measure; it doesn't matter what department. If they feel that the person is caring. It is a caring prevention attitude. If you are caring it doesn't matter if you are a guard, a teacher, or a pastor. What matters is if you care about the person. The inmates will recognize that and will want to learn or to get as much wisdom as they can, or get some idea of where you are coming from and how you are doing things, and why you are who you are so it can rub off on them. I think that is what they are looking for; leadership and values, and people that are showing not only teaching. Living a value system that will help them.

It is this contention which provided an understanding of the educator's second perspective for addressing the issue of his/her status within the prison.

The educators discussed the value of education suggesting that, because

education benefits the students, then their status within the education centre was important for prisoner development and rehabilitation.

All the educators mentioned the value of education as a means for substantiating their status in the prison. They rationalized that the prisoners benefit from education based on meritocratic principles. As the students succeed and attain more credentials they may be successful in finding employment. This was substantiated by an educator who said, "It is important for the people to be educated to find employment and to try to change their ways". The second value of education, was because it acts as a form of catharsis. The programs gave the students something to do or took their minds off their problems. However, one educator conceded that:

. . .one of the guys here sees education as a make work project because only two or three guys have gone through and got a university degree. . . .Guys are in here because they don't want to be in the tailor shop or in one place or another. They are not here for positive reasons.

However, going beyond the typical explanations about why the prisoners participate in education programs, the educators also mentioned that their status was improving because of a change in the administration's attitude toward education. One respondent noted that, "I still feel that Corrections and the institution here find that education is important, and as time goes on more and more important". Elaborating on the changing impetus of education in regard to the prison administration, another educator concluded that:

...programming is becoming more important in federal corrections and all across the board. Cognitive skills, Breaking Barriers, Chemical Co-dependency; and there has been literacy initiatives in the last little while. But I do not see the whole system as feeling that education and basic education is very important.

Reinforcing that there were some positive moves towards recognizing the impetus of education programming and scheduling in the prison, another educator reported:

. . .things have happened. Like we were asked for input on the scheduling as contract workers and we were asked how the prison schedule affected our work as teachers. To be asked for input on things like that, indicates there is an effort to make the things work together, and not to prioritize. . . .The things that we commented on were looked at by the administrators and I know they were looked at because the Warden showed up in the area I commented on.

Given that the educators were aware of the administration's effort to accommodate education programming within the workings of the institution; a more "down to earth" comment was noted by one educator who concluded that:

I guess you could say it [education programming] is in transition. The other side of me, well; you know society doesn't really think that education is that important. It does not put enough effort and enough money and resources into educating kids let alone adults; let alone adults in prison.

Another consideration in the question of the educators' status in the prison concerned their employment agreement. In response to the interview question, "Do you ever feel as a prison educator, that your status in the prison is not very high?" Two educators mentioned that contract personnel were often overlooked in the workings of the institution. One respondent said:

Yes, [there is marginality] because you are not part of the union so you are outside of that. It is like you are not part of the prison group, and personally you feel sort of a marginality because you are temporary you may or may not be hired, or the school division may not have the contract.

The educator indicated that this was not stressful as there had been many incidents in her career where job security "turned out not to be secure". In an anecdotal manner another educator discussed the "contract status" they previously held, saying:

When I was on contract, and the contract person really doesn't have any status in the organization, we were basically

overlooked and were forgotten. As an example, if there was a blizzard we weren't told to go home. If you are doing your job there is no problem if you are getting the results. For a federal employee, now I don't really know.

Summary of Prison Educator's Interview Responses

A common element in all of the prison educators' interview responses was that their programs were individualized. Consequently, their approaches to working with the students, and their interaction practices were influenced by the individualized nature of the ABE and GED programs.

At first glance, it appears that there is some inconsistency in the ways the educators conduct their classes. For example, two educators expected their students to initiate questions and seek help, whereas, their colleagues preferred to initiate questioning strategies. In addition, two educators rationalized that their classes necessitated "structure and teacher control" while another educator identified the need for "some flexibility in the running of their classes". However, it is very important

to realize that the educators' responses, are emanating from their appreciation of the individual circumstances, educational needs and experiences, and values held by their students.

The teaching rituals reported by the prison educators were presented in respect of specific strategies they use in numerous teaching situations. They were discussed in such a way to suggest that they were not adhered to as a "rule of thumb" rather, as teaching options and processes that are utilized in an ongoing and/or adaptable manner. The flexibility of the teaching rituals according to the educators, is based on the students not functioning in group teaching sessions, or they want the students to indicate that they need help.

Additional comments about the teaching rituals, showed that the educators appreciated the unique influences on their students in relation to their incarcerated status. They were aware that being incarcerated led to frustrations in their student's personal lives which often made them moody, angry, frustrated, and withdrawn.

The control rituals mentioned by the educators were consistent in all of their interview responses. In dealing with inappropriate behaviours they chose to work directly with the offending student, and if the educator felt that they were not succeeding, then they would utilize the role and function of the Chief of Education. This latter strategy was rarely used.

In the question of the prison educator's status within the hierarchy of the institution, they did on occasion, experience some frustration with the workings of the institution. This may have impacted on their perceived status based on their actual priority in the prison operations. Although the educators

reported that the organization within the institution had revamped the schedule to assist them in programming, some educators did express concerns regarding prisoner movement. When their students were required or directed to another service/program in the institution they were not consulted and found this to interfere with the flow of their classes. The education centre offers continual enrolments and because of prisoner movements, although recognized as necessary, causes problems for the educators. One educator noted that, "There is some frustration where you see you are getting some place with somebody and they leave". Another educator indicated that:

. . .some of them are shy and we have continuous intake. You get some of them going and you lose a couple of guys and you get a couple of new guys in; it takes a while to become comfortable, so it is hard".

Numerous influences affect the status of prison educators. First, an educator's professional responsibilities are to train and educate prisoners. These are tangential to the institution's primary purposes of providing security and safety for all personnel associated with the prison. Also, the educators' perception and perceived value of his or her role in the prison is concerned with the intrinsic/extrinsic value education provides the prisoners. Based on the overriding purpose of prisons being designed to punish wrongdoers and protect society; the social value of prison education is generally overlooked.

The comments provided by the prison educators indicate that they feel they are marginal to the workings of the institution.

Prisoner Students' Reasons for Class Participation

Current prison education literature indicates that prisoners are involved in education programs for something to do; to equip themselves with employable skills; and to develop their cognitive reasoning abilities. (Duguid, 1981; Ross, Fabiano and Ross, 1988; and Scrivastivae, 1983). The literature also suggests that, there is a prevailing negative attitude about education held by some prisoners because it is seen as a form of control, and that the negative atmosphere associated with the prison environment influences the prisoner's attitudes toward all programming (Cheatwood, 1988; Ferguson and Haaven, 1990; and Scrivastave, 1985). A major influence on the student's responses to the research questions about education rituals is determining why they are taking classes. Establishing their reasons for taking classes helps to clarify any of the ambiguities or biases that can arise in their explanations about the education rituals that they identify and reject. Consequently, the first interview question posed to ABE and GED students was, "Why did you decide to take classes"?

The twelve ABE students gave varied, unique and insightful explanations as to why they were taking classes in the prison. Most of the respondents appeared to regret that they had not finished their basic schooling and appreciated this opportunity to learn. Explanations offered by the students included: they had dropped out of school because of a drug/alcohol dependency problem, or they were not interested in learning. Two respondents identified themselves as "slow learners" and said they could not

"keep up" when they were in regular school. Some students referred to the practical aspects of taking education classes in the institution; it was easier to do it "inside" than out on the street. A student said:

. . .this is the place where I can get an education, because out there I have to work. . . .If I was out there I'd have to go to night school and I'd be all beat out. I don't think it would ever work.

The ABE respondents also expressed the view that their classes were useful. Many students concluded that education would help them get jobs upon release because it provided them with recognized certification. Some students reported that the education classes had helped them remember things they had forgotten. In addition, the value of education was expressed on an intrinsic, personal level. A respondent with literacy dysfunction reported, "I couldn't read. Well, I could read a bit but I couldn't understand the reading part. . .". Another student said:

I quit school when I shouldn't have. . . .But I started doing things like sniffing and drinking when I was a kid and I just totally forgot about school. . . .Now it is bothering me, I worked for one year at a mine there and some of the things they asked me. I didn't know how to read. So it was difficult for me, I would just go and grab something and drag it out. Because basically what I am looking at now is to read, so that I can do more work.

Some ABE respondents indicated that they had difficulty in learning when they went to school and because of this they had dropped out. One student said:

Years ago I used to find it [learning] kind of harder, and now I find it more easier to catch onto things that I never caught on before. I keep it in my head a bit longer than I used to.

The intrinsic value of participating in education was also based on the learners setting an example for their children. Responding to the question, "Why did you decide to take classes"? A student said:

Because I don't have an education. I went to grade 6 but I never learned anything. Like I didn't even know how to write but I am slowly learning. It will help me in the future. The main reason why I am taking school is to help myself and to offer something to my children when I get out of here...

Most of the responses by the ten GED students to the interview question, "Why did you decide to take classes"? were based on meritocratic reasons, in that they were pursuing acceptable certification. Coupled with this explanation was the rationale that they were preparing for future employment.

Three GED students said they were involved in classes to pass the time. One respondent said, "Because there is nothing else to do", and another said, "Because there is nothing much to do in this place. Here we work

because there is nothing much to do". Another student concluded that taking the classes was using his time "constructively".

Three respondents raised the issue of racism and their attempt to fitting into the "white man's" system. A native student said:

I thought I would have to adjust to "your guys" system and their ways. . . .I am not condemning your system, I still learn. . . .The kind of knowledge I am seeking is the knowledge as to the purpose for all of this. Knowledge that will put me in the right direction, like what I get from my elders.

Another native student said:

. . . at the moment education is mediocre. . . .To the natives, you take education, no matter how smart you get you are still denied access because of subliminal racism that exists.

Substantiating the perceived relationship between education and racism a native student indicated that as a young boy he had left school because of racism, saying:

. . .I felt out of place by my other fellow students. They were always knocking me down; there is a lot of racism in Dauphin. I was even beaten up one time just because I was smart and

native. At the time I thought I'd take a couple of years off, but I took ten years off. So now I was incarcerated and I got my GED.

The ABE and GED students' responses to the question, "Why did you decide to take classes"? Show that there are a myriad of grounds, both personal and circumstantial that have influenced their decision for taking classes. The reasons offered were:

- * personal regret for not having finished their basic schooling
- * an appreciation for the opportunity to learn while in prison
- * valuable for future employment and attaining recognized certification
- * intrinsic personal value: being able to read and being a good role model for their children

- * a means of accommodating to "the white man's ways".

Being aware of these reasons lays a foundation for understanding each student's rationale for rejecting some education rituals performed in the ABE and GED prison education programs.

Education Rituals Recognized/Rejected by Students

To ascertain the education rituals recognized and rejected by the students, the following interview questions were asked:

- * What do you **like** when your teacher is teaching you? Why?
- * What do you **dislike** when your teacher is teaching you? Why?
- * What do you **like** about your class? Why?
- * What do you **dislike** about your class? Why?

ABE Students' Recognition/Rejection of Education Rituals

The twelve ABE students recognized and appreciated that their learning experiences were individualized. Teaching rituals, which are those rituals that apply to the teaching situation and can include: the way in which teachers structure their lessons, their teaching style and motivation strategies were recognized by the ABE students.

The ABE students reported that they appreciated how their teacher helps them to understand and to find the answer. Elaborating on these themes the students referred to their teacher's teaching techniques and styles which

included; allowing the students to work at their own pace, being willing to assist a student if he requested it, using simple explanations, and encouraging the students.

A common response to the interview question, "What are the things you like that the teacher does when he[she] is teaching you"? Was:

". . .they don't rush you. They are patient with you, and they go out of their way to help you".

Another student said,

". . .when I make a mistake she lets me see where I went wrong. She encourages me and says you are doing good".

Two ABE respondents discussed the classroom atmosphere as being an additional influence that they liked when being taught. One respondent said, "He puts it plain and simple; simple to understand. I like the classes because it is quiet". Another student indicated that:

It's more like my environment here. Like supposing I went out there I would find it harder. At least here it is good for us.

My buddies are the same as me and that helps me; like I know them. We are together here, there are Indians and non-Indians.

The teaching rituals recognized by the ABE students were aligned to the individualized structure of the classes. One respondent said, "I like it when he works with me. . . .He explains it to me". Another student said, . . .they pay close attention to me and that is great, and she is not like the others if I have not done my work. She really cares and follows me along.

One ABE student recognized the teaching rituals by highlighting a teaching style used for literacy upgrading. He said:

Basically, she lets me do the reading. She lets me sound out the words. Well, if I come to a word and I can't pronounce it she will cover some words and help me say the syllables so I can pronounce it and stuff like that.

All of the ABE students expressed genuine appreciation and gratitude at their educators' efforts to cater to their individual educational needs. The students recognized that the learning opportunity provided for them in the prison was a chance to overcome their previous failures in education. This was exemplified in the educator's personalized, individualized classroom interaction efforts.

Given the dominance of the ABE students' appreciation and gratitude for their educators' individualized approach to their learning; few control rituals were rejected by the students. One student responded to the question, "Is there anything your teacher does when teaching, that you don't like"? By saying:

I don't like to be pressured, like this morning I had a conflict. I had one paragraph and he wanted the second one right away, and I wanted to go for a break. That made me angry.

Another student discussing a specific teaching method used in comprehension and writing classes mentioned:

Semantic mapping. Where she; whatever subjects she talks about we work through a circle and give her ideas. Now that is alright, but it doesn't seem to work for me because I got to more or less write everything out that I want to write about.

Also, a student indicated that, "she lets me down when she says this is no good".

Overall, the ABE students rejected control rituals that affected them personally. The predominant themes and comments from the ABE students were positive and encouraging. They liked their classes and they liked how they were being taught. However, one ABE student discussing the educator's ways of teaching and maintaining control in the classroom, concluded that the class was not important. This argument was based on the student's overriding desire to gain some certification to "get out of here and prove I can get a job." He concluded that:

I like it [learning] but I don't enjoy it. I just want to get the certificate because to do something in here is better than I do nothing. At least I go out with something. Teachers help.

But they are okay, but remember I want to learn. It is me who wants to learn so that I can even have a bad teacher, I will learn.

GED Students' Recognition/Rejection of Education Rituals

The GED students were more discursive in their responses than their ABE counterparts when answering the interview questions:

- * What do you **like** when your teacher is teaching you? Why?
- * What do you **dislike** when your teacher is teaching you? Why?
- * What do you **like** about your class? Why?
- * What do you **dislike** about your class? Why?

While most of the GED students acknowledged that the teaching rituals performed by their educators were helpful, some students expressed cynicism and indifference to the education programming in general. This apathy was based on cultural differences expressed by the native students, and the ever present reminder that all of the students were in prison.

The GED respondents reported that they believed that the educators were helpful in their learning. Like the ABE students the help was aligned to specific teaching methods and interaction practices adopted by the educators. All ten of the GED respondents mentioned that the educators used words and expressions to explain a problem that were concise and easy to understand. A typical comment was, "He explains it more. Because with me, I'm a slow learner and I don't really understand somethings, so he goes by steps and I can

understand more". Two GED students acknowledged that the educators directed them to the correct answer. A student reported, "Sometimes I don't understand and he will come over and explain it to me. But he doesn't do it for you". Another student noted that, "When I ask a question he explains it in such a way that you have to get the answer yourself".

The individualized learning practices in the GED programs were generally appreciated by the students. The students acknowledged that they were not pushed or rushed. One student mentioned that psychological tests showed he could not function in a structured classroom. He said, "I've got a lot of space and if it weren't for that reason, I don't think I would have been allowed to stay in school". This student concluded by saying, "I guess everybody has a space or speed that they work in". Most of the GED students mentioned that they appreciated having time to complete their tasks.

There was one GED student who indicated that he would have preferred more structure in the class. He described the structure as being similar to what he had experienced in regular school, saying:

The only thing I can say is, why can't a class go together? You know, when you go in school together and you follow it right through together. I think that would probably help a lot more. No. They make you do it on your own. Well, he tries to keep it in place, but I mean, I thought a teacher was like teaching step by step. This is not step by step. . . .What would help me and probably a lot of the other guys is to go through step by step with everybody.

This desire for traditional classroom experiences was not expressed by the other respondents, as many were aware of the varying education levels held by the class members. A student noted that, "All of us are learning different things. Like I'll be at page 112 or the other guys will be on page 50 or 120. So we are on different pages". Again, it was the overriding appreciation for the individualized focus of the GED program that led a respondent to say:

They [the educators] stop and take time out for the individual.
They are genuinely concerned that you see, learn, and
understand what they are teaching.

It was interesting to note that, as the respondent who had wanted classes to be more structured like his previous learning experiences, progressed through the interview, he recognized that regular teaching practices would be difficult. He concluded that:

. . . I thought maybe school was all about the teacher teaching you; not the books teaching you. You know when you're stuck you've got to go to the teacher and sometimes that doesn't help. But it would be pretty hard to organize and that is the tough part because people are coming in and out. That's the downer about it. Then, you know you get guys missing and they don't show up someday and they are doing something else.

Even though the GED students were appreciative of the caring and help demonstrated by their educators, some respondents indicated that the control

rituals used by the educators were pervasive. The control rituals were aligned to the dominance of the purpose of the institution and cultural influences.

Three GED students reminded the researcher that they were incarcerated or in a jail. One respondent said:

. . .there's a lot of underlying things that people have to deal with. The fact that you're in an institution for one thing. But you've got to get on with your life. . . . Everyday you are reminded that you're in jail. . . .I think the teachers are very aware of where they are at. They know that the student is doing time and they are aware of that in the classroom. There are a lot of things that I would like to be doing but because you are in a prison you are restricted and limited to what you can do.

Another student said, ". . .because we are all inmates here, they [the educators] like to think that they are superior to us because we're incarcerated". The third GED student indicated that, "you have to remember, this is a jail".

Cultural influences also affected the students' participation and attitude toward education. Although these cultural considerations are not part of the definition of control rituals, they do lay an important foundation in recognizing reasons for inappropriate behaviour in class, or individual attitudes toward education. One Native student said:

It is all very complicated but I thought that I would have to

adjust to "your guys" system and their ways. . . . Everything is so complicated in white society. I mean it is so structured.

You need a piece of paper if you want to be somebody, like you have got to have that piece of paper. It is inevitable I have to go and take it, I have to take the education that is given to me. . . . The kind of knowledge I am seeking is the knowledge as to the purpose for all of this. Knowledge like what I get from my elders.

Another Native respondent discussing the interaction between the educators and students, and the classes being offered said:

The teachers sometimes they have a head of their own. . . . That limits their mind to helping us. Some of them realize that they are here to help us and some of them are using this teaching to try to get better employment, higher paid employment. This is restricting them from teaching us what they really want to teach us, what we really want to learn and know. I want to get the history changed for us natives. What I have been taught from when I was going to school is confusing. I want that changed for the newer generation coming up. I want them taught the right history. Not what the government or the white population wants to instil in their brains to believe to be true.

Finally, a Native student discussed his earlier education experiences and language programs reporting that:

When I was going to school I got strapped twice a day for speaking Cree. What makes me feel a lot better is that I have worked with European students like Ukrainians, Polish or German and they were strapped for talking their language. So I was not the only one. . . .What I am trying to tell them [native brothers] is that it has all the same emotions, if we say "thank you", but maybe the methods that we do things maybe different. For example, when I came into prison sixteen years ago, I didn't even know what "thank you" was in the European context. There was no feeling or emotions to it. Then someone asked me, "Are you remorseful for the crime you committed?" It didn't mean a darn thing to me. Like the word crime didn't mean a thing to me because I didn't have any emotional feelings to them. So I said, "No". I know answering like that I am going to be in prison for a few more years. Because nobody taught me these things. The natives encounter these problems all of the time. Because they don't have the same emotions to the language, they don't teach us the emotions to each word. It doesn't mean nothing to us.

Although these respondents did provide insightful information about the cultural implications associated with their incarceration and education offered to them in the prison, one native respondent concluded by noting that:

. . .things are going well. I think they [prison authorities] have shown good faith because of the native awareness and that. The Native Students' Association are respected too. They are aware, well both sides are aware that the education system failed natives, they didn't offer a true history of who we are. But I think the truth is out and everybody is feeling better. So traditional schools are learning.

In this research, eighteen of the twenty-two student respondents identified themselves as being native. The significantly high ratio of Natives in this study can directly and indirectly impact on accepting and rejecting education rituals, and in particular control rituals.

Control rituals are concerned with disorderly behaviour such as inattentiveness and mischievousness. In terms of native cultural influences regarding the value, worth, and appropriateness of education; what is perceived to be necessary in order to "control" inappropriate behaviour may be based on a biased cultural interpretation of the intent and worth of education. That is, the dominant culture's belief that in order to succeed an individual must be educated, can be in conflict with the subordinate culture's belief that success is based on family, friends, and freedom. Therefore, a native individual may demonstrate inattentiveness, mischievousness, and lack of

commitment to classroom demands simply because they cannot relate to the value or worth of the learning, as is postulated in the dominant culture's belief systems. Consequently, rejection of some control rituals will not be based on inappropriate behaviour rather, an opposing value system regarding education which is influenced by an individual's cultural identity.

The teaching and control rituals identified and rejected by the GED students were similar to those of the ABE students. The caring, helping, explaining and individualized programming was appreciated by all but one, GED student. Control rituals which are associated with disorderly behaviour, and that were rejected by the students were not witnessed in the classroom setting. Only one educator made use of a personal alarm in one situation. The educators reported that they usually ignore the behaviour or they will talk quietly and privately with a student who is demonstrating disorderly behaviour. Cultural identity and previous educational experiences provide a wealth of information that gives a basis for determining why some students would demonstrate disorderly behaviour.

In this study, two of the Native respondents expressed some frustration with their teacher's control rituals which focussed on disorderly behaviour. One of the student's comments dealt with a specific incident. The other student did not discuss control rituals with the researcher but his behaviour was observed during an incident with his teacher. In the first instance, the student expressed some frustration because the teacher wanted him to finish a paragraph before going for a break with the other class members. The student

was having trouble trying to finish the paragraph. The student was not working; sitting back from the desk and tapping his pencil on his notebook. The teacher advised him to finish the paragraph then go for a break. The student said, "No, I want to finish it after the break". After two minutes the teacher repeated his directions. The student said "No". He continued tapping his pencil on the notebook. After another two minutes the teacher asked, "Are you working on the paragraph?" The student stood up and threw his pencil down on the desk, swearing and cursing he left the room. Later, the teacher told the researcher, "It is best to ignore that kind of behaviour. I'll talk with him later". The student returned to the room after the break and found his pencil. During the afternoon the student said to the researcher. "Sometimes I loose my cool. Like I wanted to go for a break and he wanted me to finish my work. We talked it over, it's O.K. now".

Another incident reported to the researcher concerned a Native student who did not want to do a comprehension in a class. He raised his voice and yelled at the teacher. The teacher reported that she thought the student may have been tired and tried to get him to sit down. However, the student became angry and abusive and left the room. The researcher recorded his behaviour after he had left the classroom. Again, like the previous incident the teacher gave the student some time to settle down. She reported the incident to the Chief of Education; advising him that the student had been abusive. The student approached the teacher and asked if he could talk with her. This was arranged in her office. The teacher carried a personal alarm. The student admitted he was tired but he was sick of doing writing. The

teacher told him that the writing class was to help all of the students, some of whom could not write as well as he does. The student was released from the education department that day and returned to his cell.

The control rituals applied by both of the prison educators were used to control disorderly behaviour. The teachers at first ignored the student's behaviour. Allowing each student (and themselves) sometime to gain composure before discussing the incident with them. It did not appear that the control rituals were inappropriate for dealing with these incidents. However, in one instance, the teacher was female.

Cultural influences whereby Native men are from a patriarchal society, may influence their attitude to the decisions, guidance and processes they are given in the institution. This can be problematic because the overall purpose of the institution is (a) not part of their culture, (b) decisions and directions may, on occasion be given by a woman (women) which contradicts their patriarchal status, and (c) they are inherently indifferent to any services provided to them because they perceive society is racist toward them. This is based on their previous social and education experiences.

Prison Educator's Status - Student's Perspective

There was consensus in the ABE and GED student's responses to the interview questions concerning the status of the prison educators in the organization hierarchy of the institution. The interview questions regarding the prison educator's status posed to the students included:

- * Do you think the teachers are considered important workers in the prison? Why?
- * Who do you think are considered the most important workers in the prison? Why?
- * Do you think education programs and taking classes are considered important activities with the prison? Why?

Table 8 provides a statistical summary of the students' responses to the question regarding the status of the prison educators. It should be noted that in some instances responses were double counted because student's responses fit into more than one category. This was evidenced as students progressed in the interviews. For example, initially students would say that the educators were important. Then they would qualify their statements by saying that, the educators were important in the education department only. Or, they would say that they believed education should be the most important function in the prison. Overall, the guards, counsellors or caseworkers were considered to be the most important personnel in the institution.

Table 8

Students' Responses to the Prison Educators' Status

	ABE Students	GED Students
No comment	3	2
Did not know	1	2
Teachers important not sure of status	2	1
Important in education department only	2	4
Guards, counsellors, caseworkers more important	4	8
Equal importance	0	1
Political implications	0	3
Professional status	0	1

All of the students believed that because they hold education to be important, by way of association, the educators were also important. Four GED students and two ABE students indicated that they did not like commenting specifically about individual educators when asked the question, "Do you think the teachers are considered important workers in the prison?"

One student warned:

Yes, I guess they are important but if you don't like a person you're not going to comment on that person. That is what it's like here. You should know that.

Two ABE students indicated that they did not know and that they preferred to keep to themselves. Four GED students stated that they did not know about the educators' status because they did not think about those things.

A student said:

I don't know. I can't really judge the teachers like that. That's another thing, I don't really like to judge people because that is not the way I was brought up or taught.

Like the educators, most of the students concluded that their teachers are important because education is valuable, particularly for inmates, many of whom have educational deficiencies. The educational characteristics of the students was usually the basis for the students' validating the role and importance of education in the prison; in particular, literacy. One respondent said:

They definitely play an important role here because there are a lot of people who come in here and they're illiterate. I mean they are starting right from the bottom; from Grade 1 and 2 stuff.

Another student concluded, "teachers are important because everybody here hasn't finished school...they are street smart, not book smart". From a very personal perspective a respondent involved in literacy upgrading said:

Yes. They are very important. Well to me they are important.

Since I've been going to school she helps me out quite a bit like

more than I could imagine. Because I thought that I could never do it [reading]. But she inspired me that I could do it.

Although the majority of the respondents deemed that the educators were important for their learning, two respondents equated the educator's role as being influential to their social development and socialization skills. A GED student, responding to the question, "Do you think the educators are considered important workers in the prison"? Said:

Yes, . . . we interact with the teachers here and it helps the inmates to interact later on with other people who are not involved with the institution. Like we are surrounded by so many inmates all of the time, a lot of the time we get frustrated and we tend to be on that level all the time, because of the pressures with being around other inmates. But when we come to school we kind of leave those pressures back in the prison and just come to school and it is like a little haven away from the main population. The teachers help us through some of that pressure.

An ABE student concluded that the educators were important because they helped him "get along" with people. After experiencing negative events at his regular school because of his self-identified "slow learner" problem, this respondent had developed negative attitudes towards learning and education in general. However, because of the interaction between himself and the

educators he concluded that they were important because:

...they are helping us. It is the teachers. They make sure that we learn something at least. But for me I get along with my teacher. I get along with all of the teachers. When I was growing up I never got along with the teachers....They make me proud to work so that is more than what they are as teacher, they are like a friend. But in my own school they never did that. They were a teacher and that is all that they want to be; a teacher. Like I never joked around and never talked about anything else other than school....Like here, I can really talk to my teacher about other things....They are very open and they can help me relax.

The students usually equated the educators' as being important relative to the education department. When responding to the question, "Who do you think are considered the most important workers in the prison?" Overall, the educators were seen as being important only in the education department.

Most of the respondents indicated that because of the purpose of the prison, the guards, counsellors, and caseworkers were the most important workers. The students believed that the educators were important in respect of the education department but, they were not as important at the correctional officers. Table 9 provides an overview of the prisoners' rating of prison personnel. Six of the respondents indicated that they did not know saying, "I don't think about those things".

Table 9

Students' Ratings of Most Important Prison Personnel

Prison Personnel	ABE	GED	Rationale
Warden	1	0	He is the boss.
Correct. Officers	5	3	Security and Safety.
Educators	2	2	Help in rehabilitation. Do not like the Correctional Officers. Important in education services.
Correct. Officers & Educators.	2	1	They all help us.
Do not know	2	4	Do not think about those things.

A GED respondent best sums up the opinions of the students by noting that:

Everybody has their responsibility from the "keyman" [guard] right up to the Warden. They all play a role in the daily operations of the prison. . . .We are all lowered here from the court system and justice system. They put you in the hands of CSC. Then they have the responsibility. . . .I think their main priority is protecting society that is the key. I mean rehabilitation is second to public safety. Security is the priority. That is why they have got the wall, the guards, everything else, and the cells.

Some students indicated that they believed that the educator's status was equal to the other employees because of the notion of rehabilitation, which is associated to the purpose of incarceration. A respondent concluded:

Likely, I think they [the educators] are right up there because they are the one's teaching us. Like if they say, they send you to the prison to get rehabilitated, and I think this is the place [education wing] to get rehabilitated because they are trying to get you to do something; to get on with your life. The shops too, but they are all booked up. The Warden and everybody else like that do nothing for you, but the school and the school teachers here help you, that's if you want to learn.

Three respondents believed that there were "political" implications regarding the educator's status in the prison hierarchy. A respondent declined to elaborate on his response, "I'm not sure. I'm not really into the political side of the institution". Another student said:

. . .if you are put into an institution where the teachers are allowed to express their own opinions and to think freely and not siding with Correctional Services and not siding with the inmate. They express their ideas whether it is wrong or right. That kind of institution is beautiful and that is what the

instructors are like here. We get along really good, and if the student has a problem they can approach the teacher. . . .It [education] is a control factor, it is meant to control the inmates. The programs are designed to control the inmates; like our food and our laundry they are all meant to control us so that we don't escape. You are not given anything, you can get your Grade 12 or your B.A. while you're inside here. The moment that you are caught swearing at an officer because you had a bad day you can lose everything that you have worked for. You have to start all over again. You work two years to get your Grade 9 then the moment you get into trouble you have to start again.

Finally, based on educators' professional status a student said, "the teachers would like to consider themselves to be important by anybody: not just in the prison".

Generally, although the students believed that the educators were important to the education programming, they did not believe that their status was high in the overall organization of the institution. The basis for this reasoning was that the primary purpose of the institution was

security. Moreover, some respondents concluded that the educators' positions were politically based, and as a result the educators were agents of prison control.

Personal and individual testimonies indicate that the educators played a significant role in improving some students' abilities to learn and attitudes toward learning. However, because the students are incarcerated and are reminded of their incarcerated status every day, the correctional officers were viewed as being more important in the running of the whole institution compared to the educators.

Summary of the Student's Interview Responses

Most of the respondents participated in the classes because they believed that they would be beneficial to them upon release. The benefits included acceptable qualifications, and being "employable". Some students were taking classes to occupy their time.

The respondents recognized and appreciated the individualized nature of their programs. Typically, they enjoyed working at their own pace, the educators showing an interest in them as individuals, a sense of accomplishment and success, and the value of their learning for when they are released.

Three Native students believed that the curriculum was culturally biased, and that systemic racism prevails in the institution.

Although none of the respondents reported any specific education control rituals that they did not like in their interviews; incidents were

observed. All of the students mentioned the prison environment, the presence of guards, and the constant surveillance that they are subjected to is a constant reminder of the institutional control practices.

Overall, the students believed that because the institution's primary focus is to maintain security and control consequently, the correctional officers were perceived to be the most important workers at the prison. The prison educators were therefore, marginal to the workings of the institution.

Because of their academic requirements and professional enhancement educators are seen as being highly trained learning experts. Also, the high social value education and learning holds contributes to the important role educators have in society. The most common employment centres for educators are schools, universities and community colleges, and it is within these institutions that educators receive recognition for their skills and worth. This is not the case in prisons. Losing their social status and perceived value because of their association with a different organization, coupled with social indifference to their work; the educators' status and self-esteem can be placed in jeopardy. It is logical then, that if educators' self-esteem and perceived professional status were to diminish or disappear, then his or her effectiveness as an educator is also likely to decrease.

The prison educators in this study did not appear to be affected by their status in the institution. One educator discussed her status perceived by family and friends. Noting that because of her work location she did not talk about her students or their needs, or what she did at work when she at home. She believed that her family was a little "nervous" about her work location. She

decided that it was best that she rarely discussed what she did, her students, and what they were being taught with her family. Also, this same respondent mentioned how her friends asked her why she would want to work in a prison, and if she ever felt scared or threatened at times. She said that she had told them that there were occasions when she felt more threatened in a regular high school than in the prison.

Another explanation about why the prison educators did not appear to be affected by their status may be due in part to their relative "newness" to the institution. Two educators had five and a half months prison education experience. One of these respondents, who has substantial experience as a school principal and university instructor, discussed how he had to make adjustments from being a leader to being part of a group. Another educator indicated that he may finish his tenure at the end of the 1993-1994 school year in order to remain fresh and to allow himself new professional challenges. A contract employee; aware that her tenure limited her status and felt that at times she was seen as being "a temporary fill in" by prison administrators, mentioned that she was used to this predicament. She had many professional appointments on a contractual basis.

SECTION TWO: OBSERVATIONS

A critical component of this research was to observe the interaction practices between the prison educators and their students to determine: what education rituals were performed in the prison; what purposes they served;

what, if any, rituals were identified and rejected by the students; and what adult education principles and practices were used in the ABE and GED programs.

Drawing on the descriptions of the adult education principles and practices advocated by Knowles (1980), and the classroom interaction categories devised by Flanders (cited in Irwin and Bushnell, 1980), an observation data collection sheet (ODCS) was devised (see Appendix D). An analysis of the observations identifying the interaction processes associated with teaching and control rituals, and the adult education principles and practices were gleaned from the behaviours recorded in the observations.

Observation data notes provides the reader with a tally of typical events and recorded notations made under the specific ODCS categories.

Observation Data Notes

The interaction behaviours were tallied using a five notch marking system. This allowed the researcher to determine the typical interaction behaviours demonstrated between the educators and their students. Table 10 provides a concise breakdown of the interaction behaviours in relation to the ten observation data collection categories. Column 1 is the Flanders' Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) observation category with the related adult education principles (Knowles' 1981). Column 2 has the tally of each educator's interaction behaviours. Column 3 lists the students' interaction behaviours. Column 4 highlights typical interaction scenarios/comments and records specific events classified under the observation categories in the study.

Finally, the incidents/highlights column, provides the reader with observations and events which are unique to the purposes of the study.

The following terms have been used where enumeration of interaction behaviours observed became cumbersome:

* Not applicable -

tally of interaction did not to the category;

* Evident in all classes -

the interaction behaviour was observed regularly, however, the incidence was less than 20 times per class, per educator or student;

* Prolific and constant in all classes -

the interaction was observed regularly and consistently. The incidence of this interaction was more than 20 times per class.

* Enumeration of specific interactions are noted in the table.

Table 10

Observation Data Notes

OBSERVATION CATEGORY	INTERACTION TALLY EDUCATORS				INTERACTION TALLY STUDENTS	TYPICAL INTERACTION SCENARIOS/COMMENTS	INCIDENTS/HIGHLIGHTS
	1	2	3	4			
1. Accepts feelings (learning environment).	2	3	3	3	Not applicable	<p>"I don't know how to do it". Student indicates he is tired. "OK, don't worry I'll talk with him".</p> <p>Student sleeping at desk.</p> <p>Student laughing and accepts criticism for being re-tested.</p> <p>Student upset. How come I failed that shit? Can I write it over?</p> <p>No reaction when students left room.</p> <p>No reaction with late comer.</p> <p>Student anxious to hear about pending release. Teacher talked quietly with him. Declared he was frustrated.</p> <p>Used another student to communicate with shy student.</p>	<p>Student appeared agitated.</p> <p>Trouble settling down. Discussion regarding returning student who "broke parole".</p> <p>Two late comers.</p> <p>Teacher was wrong in demonstrating equation. Students alerted teacher. Used humour. Incident showed students were attentive.</p> <p>Asked researcher to sit in another location as shown desk belonged to a student.</p> <p>Teacher spoke native language to two students.</p> <p>Students asked to leave because he was tired.</p>
2. Praises/Encourages (need to learn).	Prolific and constant in all classes				Not applicable	<p>"Glad to see you use a dictionary". "Good, that is fine". Examined student's workbook. "I expected you to do better than that". "You did really well on the test. You must have cheated (joke)". "You're a very good writer. There's some problems with your spelling but you're a very good writer". Focussed when students were right. Constant reinforcement when student was reading.</p>	<p>Student agitated with negative comment then asked "How come I failed"? Shit! Can I write that over?"</p> <p>Student very excited with test result.</p>
3. Accepts/uses pupils ideas (learner's experiences).	2	1	0	0	Not applicable	<p>Students were involved in writing and comprehension exercises. Writing from their experiences. Some classroom questions were</p>	<p>Very low incidence of recognizing student's experiences or ideas. Teacher focussed and controlled.</p>

OBSERVATION CATEGORY	INTERACTION TALLY EDUCATORS	INTERACTION TALLY STUDENTS	TYPICAL INTERACTION SCENARIOS/COMMENTS	INCIDENTS/ HIGHLIGHTS
	1 2 3 4			
4. Ask questions (actively participates).	Prolific and constant in all classes.	Evident in all classes.	Students questioned about their progress, e.g., "What's wrong?" "How are you doing?" Teachers questioned how to do something, e.g., "What do I do here?" Students also keen for test results, e.g., "When will you mark them, when will I know?"	Interaction through questioning prevailed in all sessions observed.
5. Lecturing (share learning experience).	2 0 0 1	Not applicable	Lots of board work and demonstration (mathematics). Questioning and discussion with all students. Group discussion then directed to individualized program.	Only one session observed could be classified as a lecture. One teacher spoke to whole class then directed them to individualized programs.
6. Give directions (responsibility, shares, actively participates).	Prolific and constant in all classes.	Evident in all classes.	"Please take out your writing materials and continue on from yesterday." "Work from this section." "I've done this, can I go on to another book?" Individualized consultation. Lots of chalk and talk.	The individualized nature of the classes showed a lot of directions and guidance being given by the teachers. Teachers spoke directly with each student and were also very demonstrative with their directions.
7. Criticising or justifying authority (learning environment, responsibility).	0 0 1 0	1	Teacher urged students to class - "Come on it is time to learn". Student could not answer teacher posed question, responded by saying, "I don't know you're the teacher".	Generally no evidence of teachers establishing their authority. One student indifferent to perceived teacher authority; this was in relation to frustration to test result.
8. Response (actively participate, experience, sense of progress).	Prolific and constant in all classes.	Evident in all classes.	Students generated most of the questions in relation to their work. Peer tutoring and group work evident. Test results are eagerly sought. Competition among students, "What did you get?"	
9. Initiation (learning environment, actively participate, experience, sense of progress).	Evident in all classes.	Students very quiet but not shy in asking questions in all classes. Not evident in lecture presentation.	"What do I do next?" "What do you want me to do now?" "I don't know how to do this." "How do you spell ...?" Teacher initiated.	Individualized programs generates a lot of one-to-one interaction. Only time lecture was observed. Teacher centered.

OBSERVATION CATEGORY	INTERACTION TALLY EDUCATORS	INTERACTION TALLY STUDENTS	TYPICAL INTERACTION SCENARIOS/COMMENTS	INCIDENTS/ HIGHLIGHTS
	1 2 3 4			
10. Silence or confusion (learning environment, actively participate, experience, sense of progress).	Not applicable	Silence and quietness prevalent in most classes.	Students working individually. Silence during testing.	Rooms very quiet. One student agitated, teacher spoke quietly and directly to him. Told him to relax. Did not push him to work. Two students entered room late and began talking. One student said, "Shut up this is a test". They complied. Individualized programs generates a quiet/silent classroom.

Teaching rituals are those rituals that apply to the teaching situation. They can include the way in which teacher's structure their lessons, their teaching style and motivational strategies. In most of the ABE and GED classes observed the students worked individually and independently, only venturing to ask the educator for assistance when they had a problem or did not know what to do next. Another outstanding feature of each classroom's atmosphere was that they were very quiet. Generally, the students would work on their work sheets alone, and there was limited noise from the discussions they had with the educator. There was little interaction between class members unless there was a group exercise. Group exercises were observed twice.

Every educator was very keen motivating the students, expressions of praise and encouragement were heard when the educators interacted with their students. Comments that were heard frequently, included: "That's great, keep it up", "Yes, that is right", or "Well done".

Control rituals, that is those rituals that apply to the control of disorderly behaviour in the classroom were limited and dealt with in a very direct, systematic manner. The educators would monitor what some students were doing by asking, "What are you doing?", or "Have you finished that section already?" There was only one incident observed in the classes in which a student demonstrated his frustration. After the teacher had spoken with the student, who had thrown his

pencil to the ground and left the classroom angry and upset, the student did not appear to be affected by the incident. Later, on the day of the incident, the student admitted "loosing his cool" to the researcher.

Overall, it is surprising how quiet the classes are and how focused the students are working through their class sheets. The only disruptive behaviours demonstrated by the students were that they would enter and leave the room on their own volition. The students would leave for up to ten minutes. The educators did not react when a student entered or left a room. Another disruptive behaviour observed was that, if a student wanted to ask a question of the educator, or sort their guidance, no matter what the educator was doing, the student would interrupt the educator. Often, the educators were engaged in dialogue with another student. This did not appear to deter the inquiring student. Typically, the educator would ask the student to wait, or if the student with whom they were already working required a lot of attention at that particular time, they would stop and respond to the student's query. This occurred at least three times per class.

SECTION THREE: FIELD NOTES

The data obtained in the observation data collection periods for the purposes of this study provided specific details regarding classroom interaction practices. Field notes were used to record any events, comments, or discussions held between the educators and their students while outside the formal classroom setting. Only those discussions and events relevant to education rituals were recorded in the field notes. This included any

comments, advice or questions posed by the students and their teachers regarding class requirements, problems, or confusion. In addition, any inappropriate behaviours demonstrated by the students outside of the formal classroom setting were recorded. Finally, significant events such as "shut downs" or searches were noted.

The field notes provide anecdotal details about the environment, and the researcher's perceptions about her presence in the institution. They also present details about one major student behaviour incident that occurred within the education department during the data collection period.

Daily field notes were recorded during the two week data collection period in May/June, 1992. Educator numbers had increased by one after two educators had retired in March, 1992. Two women and one man had been added to the education staff.

The Chief of Education continued to be busy, and many students frequent his office. He commands and holds a great deal of respect from the students. He is very diplomatic in his interaction with the students. However, if any of them were rude he would ask them to leave. In the presence of the researcher he asked a student to put his feet down from his desk. The Chief was very supportive of the researcher's work and availed himself to answer any questions at anytime.

Only one educator indicated to the researcher that prior to observing one class, it would be necessary to ask the students. Indicating to the researcher that the students, "are involved in something special, and I would

rather ask them first. If you don't mind I will check with them". The educator then came to the researcher in the corridor and said:

"They don't feel confident and don't want you to watch. We are working on word pronunciation and I guess they find that embarrassing. I'm sorry but I can't let you in for this one".

The researcher reassured the educator that this was not a problem and noted:

- * excellent adult education - respecting students.
- * only educator to say - "I'll check with students first".

Many of the students would interact with the educators in the corridors. An overheard conversation between an educator and student concerned the student requesting more school work "to take home". The educator responded by saying:

You can continue with some reading, you can never get enough of that.

The student said:

No. Not too much, but I want to do some maths though. Stuff that makes me think you know.

The educator nodded to the student and indicated that he would have to check with him before he left. The educator then said, "that won't be a problem".

A student discussed the purpose of the research with the researcher during coffee break, at this time the student indicated that he has two brothers in the prison. He told the researcher:

I first took classes for something to do and now I really like classes. I wish my brothers could take the classes and then they could see. They are in here too. But they don't want to take classes. But that is not worth worrying about. I don't mind the classes except for maths.

Only one educator discussed his interview with the researcher after the interviewing sessions. Approaching the researcher early in the morning, the educator said:

I was thinking about our conversation yesterday. I said individualized programming. It's fair to say that I do 60 percent individualized and 40 percent group work. Individualized is mainly for reading and writing and the group work is for maths.

An incident of inappropriate student behaviour was observed by the researcher in the education department corridors. An educator elaborated on this incident and discussed it with the researcher after it had ended. The event occurred after an educator commented to one of the students that he looked tired. The student then entered the classroom and said to the same educator, "I don't want to do the work. I'm too tired". The educator instructed the

student to take his place and said, "Do as much as you can. You may be better off going home at break time". The student then yelled, "I don't want to do nothing", to which the educator then asked the student relax and said, "I'll be with you in a moment". The student stood, threw the book on the seat and said, "Fuck it. I don't want to do it". The student then moved out of the room and went to the washroom. The educator closed the classroom door and the class resumed.

At break time, the educator approached the Chief of Education and relayed the incident to him. Leaving the Chief's office the offending student approached the educator and asked, "Can we talk?" The educator said, "Yes, sure. Try my office; but wait for me". The student left and the educator returned to the Chief's office, told him that she was going to be talking with the student in her office, then asked for a personal alarm. The educator raised the alarm device to show the researcher that she was prepared and went to her office.

Five minutes later, she returned to the Chief's office and returned the personal alarm, and queried the researcher, "I suppose you saw all of that?" The researcher said, "Yes. Can you tell me if that happens often?" The educator said:

No. Not as a rule. I just noticed he was looking very tired and that comment seemed to rattle him. He looked to me as if he was ready to explode. I should be grateful though, he did want to talk with me. That is a first. He explained that he was really very tired, so he's been given a pass to go back to his

cell. You can never be too sure when they are like that. That's why I took the alarm. I am glad you got to see something though!

Field notes on the interaction practices witnessed between the educators and their students outside of the formal classroom setting, provide a realistic picture of the educator/student interaction free from the "expected" or "anticipated" interaction that occurs in a formal classroom.

The incident and the educator's comment, "You can never be too sure when they are like that. . . ." Exemplify the underlying implications of working with adults experiencing frustration and anger. These emotions can at anytime turn into aggression. In this case, the control strategies used by the educator were to alert the Chief of Education, and to carry a personal alarm.

SECTION FOUR: TRIANGULATION

The purposes of this study were to determine what education rituals are used in the ABE and GED programs; what purposes they serve; what, if any education rituals are rejected by the students; and what adult education principles and practices are utilized in the education programs. Finally, the research attempts to determine if the prison educators are marginal to the organizational hierarchy of the institution.

Utilizing three qualitative data collection methodologies which were: structured open-ended interview questions (see Appendix A & B), observations (see Appendix D), and field notes. This study determined that there were many consistencies between the educator responses and the student's responses, and those comments made among the educators and students.

The educators and students believed that the educators were important within the realm of the education department, but the overwhelming consensus was that the educators are marginal to the workings of the institution. This was based primarily on the security and safety aspects of incarceration.

In addition to advocating and advancing individualized programming, which was observed in both the ABE and GED classes, it was apparent from the majority of students that the individualized approach benefited their learning style and for many, their attitude towards education in general.

Two educators had commented that they did not like interruptions to their classes like when a student is withdrawn to participate in one of the self-help programs. Yet, no educator was too concerned with the constant student movement inside and out of their class. Neither did they appear to be perturbed by the regular interruptions and demands placed on them by the students. However, two educators did discuss the need for the students to learn "appropriate" interaction behaviours.

Overall, disciplinary problems were dealt with quickly. Generally, few students commented on control rituals used by the educators; the consensus being that there was not much of anything the educators did that the students did not like.

A very interesting, stimulating and insightful perspective regarding native incarceration issues was drawn from some of the native student's responses. While on the surface some of their comments sounded as if they were angry or bitter, this was not the case. Generally, their concerns were raised in regard to past racist experiences or in light of the recent Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba (1991). This report dealt with Aboriginal incarceration and the law. Only one educator recognized the cultural influences that impact on the learners. The remaining educators did not discuss or mention native issues. Scant reference was made to native wording in an ESL - Literacy upgrading class.

Adult education principles and practices are based on catering to the individual needs and differences of adult learners (Knowles, 1981). Seventeen of the twenty-two student respondents identified themselves as being Native. Yet, only one educator made any reference to cultural differences and the implications these differences could have on an individual's attitude toward learning. Native students reported previous racist experience in their educational histories and some frustration with the lack of Native studies in the existing ABE and GED programs. Based on the observations and interviews conducted in this study it appears that there is no concerted effort on the part of the education department or the institution to recognize that Native student

needs are culturally different to what is being offered in the existing programs.

Evidence of Adult Education Principles and Practices

All of the data collection strategies and the triangulation summary provided the basis for determining what adult education principles and practices [see Table 1] are utilized in the ABE and GED programs. Only those adult education principles and practices not found in ABE and GED programs are elaborated on. This is because the wealth of data gleaned from the interview responses, observations, and field notes provides an insight into those adult education principles and practices which were utilized in the ABE and GED programs. Table 11 provides a list of the adult education principles and practices used in the ABE and GED programs.

Table 11

Adult education principles and practices utilized in the ABE and GED programs

Learning	Teaching
1.Learners feel a need to learn.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teacher exposes the learners to new responsibilities and fulfilment. * Teacher helps the learners to clarify their aspirations. * Teacher assists the learner to recognize the gap between their aspirations and present level. * Teacher helps the learners identify the problems they experience because of the gaps.
5.Learners actively participate.	* Teachers help the learners to organize themselves for sharing mutual enquiry.
7.Learners have a sense of progress toward their goals for evaluation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Involves the learners in mutually determined measures for evaluation. * Helps the learners develop and apply self evaluation based on these criteria.

(Adapted from Knowles, 1980. pp. 57-58).

Table 12 provides a list of adult education principles and practices not found in the education programs, together with a brief explanation why this is so.

Table 12

Adult education principles and practices NOT utilized in the ABE and GED programs

Principle	Reason
2. Learning environment is characterized by comfort, trust.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Physical conditions are characterized by locks, bars, and restrictions to movement. * Inappropriate student behaviour breaks trust; forces educators to be alert.
3. Learners perceive the goals of learning to be theirs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Learning objectives determined by GED program and curriculum. * ABE students follow educators lead.
4. Learners accept a share of responsibility for planning and operating learning experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Some learners are not interested in education: It gives them something to do. * Set curriculum and sequential format of GED program prohibits student planning learning experiences. * Many students have had negative earlier educational experiences and as a result rely on the educator to lead them through. * Most students are not competent, confident, or responsible.
6. Learning is related to the learner's experience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Most students are drop outs and have limited educational experiences to draw on. * Some students experiences are negative and they do not like referring to them. * Presentations cannot be geared to their experiences because they are so varied.

Arguments throughout correctional education literature have postulated that, the prison environment, the anti-education bias held by the prisoners, and the prisoners' social disorders and associated idiosyncrasies predispose correctional education programs to failure (Cheatwood, 1988; Ferguson and Haaven, 1990; Hudson, 1981). The details found in this study show that the prisoners value education programs because they are seen as a means for their successful return to society, and they stimulate the student's self-esteem.

Chapter Five

SUMMARY AND FINDINGS

The purposes of this study were to find out prison educators' and their students' perceptions of, and behaviour toward, education rituals performed in one Canadian federal prison. The research also attempted to establish if the prison educators hold marginal status within the organisational structure of the institution. Finally, the study investigated what adult education principles and practices advocated by Knowles (1980) were in use in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) classes.

EDUCATION RITUALS

Education rituals according to Clifton and Rambaran (1987) are behaviours and expressions that apply to the teaching situation and to the control of disorderly behaviour; they are not formally defined. Education rituals are categorised into control rituals that include; the teacher's attempts to control inattentiveness, mischievousness, and other kinds of unacceptable behaviour; and, teaching rituals, which include; the way teachers structure their lessons, their teaching style, and motivational strategies.

Control Rituals Used By The Educators

The educators reported that they usually ignored inappropriate student behaviour. If there were any problems with a student's behaviour, typically the educators would talk to him to find out why. If their individual consultation with the offending student did not lead to improved behaviour, the prison educators would then seek assistance from the Chief of Education. Usually, the Chief would support the educator's disciplinary process, or the Chief would assign the student to another work activity until his attitude toward the prison educator or classes changed. In situations where a student displayed aggressive behaviour, or an educator perceived that a student may be a threat to their welfare or that of the other prisoners, a personal alarm was used. Engaging the alarm alerts security personnel throughout the prison.

Educators in any educational setting attempt to find out the reason(s) for inappropriate student behaviour. Consultation with the student is a common control ritual used to address unsuitable student behaviour, and according to Levin and Long (1981), it is an effective strategy for diagnosing learning problems. Therefore, this makes the prison educators' consultation strategy for inappropriate student behaviour a common control ritual used in most educational settings. However, the use of a personal alarm, which when engaged alerts all custodial personnel in the prison, can be classed as a unique control ritual.

The purpose of the personal alarm, and the consequences for offending student(s) if the alarm is activated are unique. In the prison environment student(s) who demonstrate inappropriate behaviour resulting in the personal

alarm being used are punished. This can include; being subjected to physical restraint, isolation, charges which can lead to an extension of their time to be served, limitation or prohibition of educational opportunities, and ostracism from staff and students.

Using a personal alarm for inappropriate student behaviour in prisons is a unique control ritual. It sets education programs in prisons apart from education programs offered in the community.

Teaching Rituals Used By The Educators

The educators' teaching rituals were based on the individualised programming in the ABE and GED classes. All of the educators reported that they maintained a one-to-one working relationship with their students. Two educators discussed the importance of humour during their interaction with the students they concluded that, being humorous helped them in their interaction.

The four prison educators mentioned the importance of encouraging the students to ask questions during classes. They concluded this helped them in gauging students' interest and commitment to learning. Generally, based on the learners' poor educational experiences the prison educators felt that they were responsible for structuring and initiating learning strategies. Two educators mentioned how large group presentations or class exercises do not appear to work in the prison, because the students tend to become disinterested if they maintain whole class teaching practices. Class worksheets and assignments were also discussed by the educators as ways they initiated and structured their lessons.

The prison educators mentioned the need to maintain a humanistic attitude toward the students, because they recognised that they faced unique and at times frustrating experiences due to their incarceration. Based on this awareness, the educators advocated some flexibility in the running of their classes. This flexibility included individualised programming and allowing the students to work at their own pace. In addition, monitoring the student's progress through feedback, encouragement and motivation.

The emphasis on individualised instruction as a teaching ritual in this prison environment, allows for some speculation about the teaching rituals used in this educational setting. One-to-one teaching/learning situations are an ideal process for the exchange of skills and knowledge. Moreover, the creation of specific "learner needs" designed worksheets enhances the learner's chances to learn (Levin and Long, 1981).

Recently, the teacher's role has moved from being that of, imparter of knowledge to facilitator of learning (Brookfield, 1986; Freire, 1970; Henri, 1992; and Knowles, 1981). The role of the facilitator according to Henri (1992) is to:

- * permit students to work in small groups or as individuals;
- * motivate students to locate, analyse and view information;

- * assist students to clarify their thinking through questioning techniques;
- * allow students to master the enquiry process;
- * evaluate achievement in process and content;
- * model appropriate learning strategies and techniques;
- * provide a range of opportunities for students to share learning achievements (p.5-6).

However, it appears that few if any of these facilitation guidelines are practised in this prison setting. Beswick (1987) has concluded that teachers go by personal experience, and Moore and Waldron have noted that teachers teach as they have been taught. Therefore, the teaching rituals being adopted in this prison education setting are falling short of providing educational opportunities guided by the principles and practices of adult education. Also, the teachers are not exploiting all of the teaching strategies and facilitation processes available to them. There needs to be ongoing staff development and experimentation with facilitation to include a range of learning resources and instructional strategies in their day-to-day teaching. Juchau (1984) concludes that, only in this way is it possible to do justice to the full range of preferred learning styles and thereby provide an appropriate climate for effective learning.

Prison Educator Interview Feedback

Three of the educators returned their transcripts with editorial notations and comments regarding their interviews. The three educators said that reading their response was either embarrassing, humbling, or devastating. This was

based on their assessment that the comments were; long winded, read like "goobly-gook," and according to one respondent "an appreciation of tolerance for any other listeners to anything I must say about anything is being developed."

The educators' interview responses were transcribed verbatim. The researcher had not provided them with any specific details about the interview questions until the interviewing process had begun. Consequently, most of their responses required them to reply directly with their self-imposed time limit. It appeared from the educators' comments that they were expecting details from their interview transcripts to be presented in a journalistic format.

The educators' transcript edits were changes to grammar and tense. Any notation by the respondents to remove what was recorded was carried out, and additional notes elaborating on, and/or clarifying specific issues were also included in the interview analysis.

Reasons Students Participated In The Classes

A major influence on the student's responses to the research questions about education rituals was finding out why they were taking classes. This information helped to clarify any of the ambiguities or biases that arose in their explanations about the education rituals that they identified or rejected.

The most typical reasons for taking classes included; a history of dropping out of school because of drug/alcohol dependency problems, or their previous educational experiences were negative because they reported that they are "slow learner." The students also indicated that they were taking classes

because they appreciated this opportunity to learn. They believed that they would not have taken ABE or GED classes if they were not in prison. It is easier to take classes "inside" than out on the street. Most of the students believed that their prison education would be useful in getting a job and their participation provided them with recognised certification. ABE students reported they were involved in classes because they could learn how to read. Two GED students said that they were taking the classes because there was nothing else to do in the prison. Three Native students reported that they were taking classes to fit into the "white man's" system.

Teaching Rituals Recognised By The Students

ABE and GED students recognised and appreciated the individualised learning experiences. The students reported that because of this style of teaching they perceived that their teachers help them and genuinely cared about them. Elaborating on this theme, the students recognised that their teachers were always encouraging them and motivating them to continue in their classes. The students enjoyed the fact that they could work at their own pace.

Teaching Rituals Rejected By Some Students

While the students recognised that their teachers allowed them to work at their own pace, there were instances when a teacher required them to complete a section in their workbooks. These students did not like being pressured to finish their work. There was a sense among some students of feeling "let down" if the educator told them that their work was not good. Although the

students appreciated the individualised format of the classes, some wanted more structure in certain subjects. Typically, they would compare their current learning experiences to their previous school experiences and expect the teachers to present some classes in a "chalk and talk" format.

Control Rituals Identified And Rejected By Some Students

All of the students were aware of their immediate surroundings and the limitations associated with the prison. The students reported that the prison environment and its restrictions affected their attitude to learning and their relationship with their teachers. They believed that the teachers were aware of the affects incarceration has on them. The students felt that this awareness affected the teachers' relationship with them. Three Native students were annoyed that the curriculum does not include native studies. They believed that this was further exploitation of their culture and an attempt to quell their desire to learn more about their cultural heritage.

PERCEIVED STATUS OF THE PRISON EDUCATORS IN THE PRISON

The educators held that **their status is marginal** in the organisational structure of the prison. They reasoned this was because the institution's primary function is security. However, all of the educators noted that because education was important to the students for employment opportunities, then this justified their status in regard to prisoner rehabilitation.

Most of the students also **held that the educators are marginal** in the organisational structure of the prison. Some students preferred not to respond

to this area of questioning. The students did conclude that the educators were important in terms of the value of education. However, the prisoners believed that, because the prison is meant to protect society, and security is a priority in the workings of the institution; correctional officers are considered to be the most important workers in the prison organisation.

ADULT EDUCATION PRINCIPLES & PRACTICES UTILISED IN THE ABE & GED PROGRAMS

Table 13

Adult education principles and practices utilized in the ABE and GED programs

Learning	Teaching
1.Learners feel a need to learn.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Teacher exposes the learners to new responsibilities and fulfilment. * Teacher helps the learners to clarify their aspirations. * Teacher assists the learner to recognize the gap between their aspirations and present level. * Teacher helps the learners identify the problems they experience because of the gaps.
5.Learners actively participate.	* Teachers help the learners to organize themselves for sharing mutual enquiry.
7.Learners have a sense of progress toward their goals for evaluation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Involves the learners in mutually determined measures for evaluation. * Helps the learners develop and apply self evaluation based on these criteria.

(Adapted from Knowles, 1980. pp. 57-58).

Chapter Six

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The intent of this study was to determine what education rituals are used in the Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) classes offered in a Canadian federal prison. Also, why they are used, and what education rituals were identified and rejected by the students. In addition, the study attempted to establish if the prison educators and their students perceived that the educators were marginal in the prison institution. Finally, the investigation attempted to find out what principles and practices of adult education advocated by Knowles (1980; see Table 1) are used in the ABE and GED programs.

This study used a qualitative research methodology involving; open-ended interview questions, classroom observations, and fieldnotes focussing on ABE and GED students and their educators. Details from the research data are presented in the following order:

1. Education rituals;
2. Perceptions about the prison educator's status in the institution; and
3. The adult education principles and practices used in the ABE and GED programs.

Information from these categories led the researcher to drawing some comparisons between prison education programs and adult education programs. This information is presented so as to assist the reader to understand the reasoning behind some of the recommendations that arose from the study.

Education Rituals

The core of both the GED and ABE programs were their individualized formats, which allowed the educators some flexibility in their teaching rituals. Overall, the students said that they appreciated the individual attention they received from the educators because they liked being recognised as individuals. Students who identified themselves as having a history of learning problems said that they enjoyed their classes because they could work at their own pace and not feel rushed.

One student said that he did not like the teaching rituals which involved the whole class. This was described as "semantic mapping" where the teacher uses class discussion and chalkboard writing to map out a plan to write a short story. This student argued that he preferred to write in his own style. A GED student mentioned that he would prefer "regular classroom activities" as opposed to work from books. However, as this student's interview progressed, he realized that the class members had varying educational abilities and that, "learning from the books was necessary."

Critical to the issue of teaching rituals and often overlooked in many educational settings, is the impact of cultural diversity and heritage on learning. Three Native students raised the problem of being involved in "white man's" education. They argued for the development and availability of classes dealing specifically with Native needs and heritage.

Control rituals used for addressing problems of inappropriate student behaviours involved the educator talking directly with the offending student, using the office of the Chief of Education, or in tense situations using a personal alarm. This latter control ritual is the only difference from control rituals used in other education settings such as schools, community colleges, or universities.

Perceptions About the Prison Educator's Status

Although both the educators and students concluded that the educators were important for learning and student development, they all agreed that in terms of the institution as a whole; the prison educators are marginal.

Recognizing that the federal institution is governed by Corrections Canada, and that the prison must maintain security and safety for the inmates, the consensus was that the correctional officers were the most important personnel at the institution.

Adult Education Principles and Practices Utilized in the ABE and GED Programs.

Based on the data collected in this study, the noted adult education principles and practices were followed:

1. Learners feel a need to learn;
2. Learners actively participate (5); and
3. Learners have a sense of progress toward their goal of evaluation (7).

(Numbers in parentheses correspond to Knowles' principles and practices of adult education. See Table 1).

These noted adult education principles and practices were not followed in this study. (Numbers in parentheses correspond to Knowles' principles and practices of adult education. See Table 1).

1. Learning environment is characterized by comfort and trust (2).

The physical conditions of the prison include locks, bars, and restrictions to movement. In addition, inappropriate student behaviour breaks trust and forces the educators to be alert.

2. Learners perceive the goals of learning to be theirs (3).

The learning objectives were determined by the GED program and curriculum. Also, the ABE students follow the educators lead.

3. Learners accept a share of responsibility for planning and operating the learning experience (4).

Two of the students were not interested in learning, citing that the classes gave them something to do. The set curriculum and sequential format of the GED program prohibit the students from planning their learning experiences. Many of the students have had previous negative experiences with education. As a consequence, they rely on the educator to lead them. Finally, most of the students are not competent, confident, or responsible for sharing a responsibility for developing their learning experience.

4. Learning is related to the learner's experience (6).

Most of the respondents indicated that they were drop outs and had a history of being unemployed. They have limited educational experiences to draw on. Some of the students have had a history of negative life experiences and they do not want to refer to them. History has shown that Canada's advancement of education in its federal prisons has been long and fluctuating. Undoubtedly, the most detailed and forthright examination of Canadian prison education programming was the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education's report on education programs in Canadian Corrections, requested by the Solicitor General of Canada (1979). Two components of the OISE research that are germane to this study were its recommendations regarding prison educators and their professional development. Table 14 provides an overview of these recommendations.

Table 14

O.I.S.E.'s 1979 recommendations regarding prison educators and professional development

Category	Focus
1. Teaching personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. receive ongoing training b. education must be based on the principles of adult education c. increased communication with peers d. should include both Corrections and contract personnel.
2. Professional Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. regular review of programs b. increased communication between institutions c. increased communication within institutions

(Adapted from: Report to the Solicitor General of Canada concerning: The education programs of the Canadian Corrections System (Phase 2). O.I.S.E. (1979).

It is disappointing that the federal institution used for this study has paid scant or no attention to the issues raised in the focus section of the recommendations made by O.I.S.E in 1979. Only one educator has had any formal training in the study of adult education; another had worked with adults in a learning centre, but indicated that their professional training was at the elementary level. Finally, one educator discussing their educational experiences, indicated that he had worked at all levels of education, and referred to adults based on the chronological definition only.

Prison education and adult education: Program differences

The similarities between prison education and adult education programs is generally based on the categories of: basic, vocational, and tertiary education, and

training programs. However, these similarities are superficial and do not address the differences in operations, learner characteristics, and reasons for participation in prison education programs compared to adult education programs. Prison education programs have traditionally been seen as institutionally managed rehabilitation programs. Adult education programs are viewed as a means for an individual to pursue and achieve self-actualization (Brookfield, 1986). There is a fundamental difference in the 'locus of control' between adult education and prison education programs.

Knowles' (1981) assumption is that adults are "voluntary" learners. That is, they are involved in education programs for their self interest on a voluntary basis. Learners participating in prison education programs may do so as a means of adjusting to the restricted environment; self interest; evading other mundane prison occupations such as the laundry, or as a process for appealing correctional reform practices such as; probation, parole or early release schemes. This indicates that prisoners participate in education programs on a semi-volunteer basis.

Adult education programs are founded on some intrinsic pursuit for self fulfilment or extrinsic reward through promotion and increased salary (Cross, 1981; Brookfield, 1987; Knowles, 1981). Prison education programs are seen as a means for prisoner control. Ericson & Baranek (1982) suggest that:

Regardless of how token an educational program in prison might be, it is useful as a device to take care of the excess labour pool who cannot be put to work elsewhere in the institution...major issues and exciting reforms...are translated into mechanisms of convenience...and relegated to their pragmatically appropriate place within the agents' scheme of things (p.231).

Reasons for participation and learner characteristics are also major differences between

prison education programs and adult education programs.

Who participates, why they participate, and what programs they are participating in, are contemporary areas being examined in the discipline of adult education. Courtney (1982) has argued that, "'Adequate' or 'successful' participation is a chameleon set against a background of quick-changing groups, courses, centres, areas and times" p.105. Although, size, diversity and complexity of post-school education makes the concept of participation impossible to pin down; the research regarding adult education program participation does raise some salient issues when comparing adult education programs to prison education programs.

Participation in adult education programs is associated with the middle class (Cross, 1981; Woodley, 1987). In a substantial investigation in the United Kingdom, the Advisory Council for Adult and Continuing Education (ACACE, 1982) determined:

...indications show that those with the longest initial education...are in the higher social classes, ...seeking vocational education...are consistently better able to take advantage of existing opportunities for continuing education

(cited in McGivney, 1993; p.12).

The influence of sociological factors on reasons for participation in adult education programs has also been investigated in lower occupational groups. Hedoux (1982) studied participation in targeted programs in several French mining communities. He discovered that participants in the programs comprised an "active social minority" characterized by the following attributes:

good material circumstances (higher income and occupational levels); greater

mobility (ability to anticipate and instigate social change); cultural familiarity (higher level of schooling, extended social relationships and cultural practices).

(cited in McGivney, 1993; p.13).

These sociological factors are generally not attributed to those who participate in prison education programs. While the majority of prisoners are from the lower classes, they also have a long history of school failure (Forster, 1981). It can be argued that adult education programs do not attract certain groups within society. Therefore, prisoners who are usually from the lower end of the social scale and have a history of being school dropouts, are not going to be attracted to adult education program participation under normal circumstances. This is supported by West (1987) who writes that:

There are substantial numbers of people who have been defined as failures by the schooling system and who remain outside the world of adult education. The lower you go down the social hierarchy, the more there are p.11.

This is not to undermine the impetus of adult education programs in a prison context. It does however, provide some understanding as to why adult education in Canadian prisons has struggled to be recognized as a viable rehabilitation strategy.

Research has determined that there are certain sections of the community who do not engage in any form of educational activity after leaving school and Forster's (1981) characteristics of prisoners supports this argument. Therefore, the challenge for contemporary prison educators may be to attract prisoners to prison education programs catering to their educational needs and interests. The principles and practices of adult education can assist them in achieving this objective.

Recommendations From The Study

Research has shown that working with adults in any education environment demands appreciation of the many unique aspects associated with being "adult." This can include: adult learner needs, characteristics, experiences, expectations and fears. As a consequence, these variables can influence an adult's learning style, educational requisites and interests (Brundage and Mackeracher, 1980; Brookfield, 1986; Darkenwald and Merriam, 1982; Freire, 1970; Kidd, 1981; Knowles, 1980; Shea, 1980, and Whetstone, 1981). Therefore, the first recommendation is:

Recommendation 1: All prison education staff undertake a mandatory training course designed to help them to become familiar with basic adult education theories, the characteristics of adult learners, and facilitating adult learning.

The education rituals performed in the institution were influenced by the individualized format offered in both the ABE and GED programs. Students appreciated their educators focusing on them as individuals. However, there was a tendency by some students to demand their educator's attention with no regard for what he/she was involved in at the time. These demands would on occasion, disrupt the interaction between the educator and the student he/she was attending to, or interfered with the workings of other students. Some researchers have concluded that prisoners lack socialization and interaction skills (Duguid, 1981a; Ross and Fabiano, 1981). Basic training and demonstration of appropriate interaction methods could assist the students in working with their peers, other institution workers, and the educators. Therefore, the second recommendation is:

Recommendation 2: Prison educators establish a pattern of interaction expectations to demonstrate to the students what is appropriate, acceptable and not disruptive.

The predominance of the individualized structure of the ABE and GED classes prohibited the utilization of varied teaching methods in the classes. There was a tendency for many students to vacate the classroom frequently for approximately 10 minutes. When they returned they were disruptive and noisy. This behaviour indicates that the students are not working due to a number of reasons that can include; boredom, loss of interest, struggling with a problem, or not wanting to seek the educator's assistance for fear of ostracism. In order to maintain student interest and participation in the learning environment there should be more variance in teaching methods and the lesson structure. Therefore, the third recommendation is:

Recommendation 3: Prison educators use more variance in their teaching style to include: class discussion, small group activities, class presentations and peer tutoring.

There is no doubt that Canada has recognized that a disproportionately high number of natives are in its' federal prisons. The 1991 Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba, and the 1989 Royal Commission on the Donald Marshall Jr. Prosecution concluded that; racism prevails in the justice system. Moreover, the reports indicated that efforts should be made to accommodate native inmates by providing access to elders, and granting permission for traditional customs and rituals associated with the native culture to be performed in prisons.

There was little evidence that the Education Department in the institution recognized any cultural considerations when working with their students. One educator could speak Cree. He learned it during his first few years teaching on a reserve. There were no Native educators in the institution, and there was no evidence of class materials or references dealing with native culture, history, or folklore. In addition, some Native students mentioned the need for more native orientated programs being made available to them. Therefore, the fourth recommendation is:

Recommendation 4: Native studies classes conducted by Native educators should be added to ABE and GED programs.

Although the prison administrators had attempted to revamp the prison schedule so as to accommodate the education programming, comments from the students and educators indicate that, education and the educators are marginal to the workings of the institution.

Schools and educators in the community at large have the opportunity to "show themselves off" on an annual basis with the "parent/teacher day." The Education Centre at the institution should hold an annual "education day" where prison personnel, other inmates, and possibly the students' family could become familiar with the education programming, the student's work, and the efforts of the educators.

Therefore, the fifth recommendation is:

Recommendation 5: An annual "education day" be organized and co-ordinated by the educators and students to show prison personnel, inmates and families what happens and is being produced in the Education Centre.

The institution used for this research is committed to offering education programs to any inmate who wants to take part. Yet, as is common in contemporary government services, funds are scarce and resources are minimal. These external influences can have major repercussions on existing or future prison education programming. The annual cost to Canada for the incarceration of one adult in a federal prison is approximately \$48,000 (Statistics Canada, 1990). Given the increase in inmate numbers and the decrease in funds, it would seem logical that to increase funds for service and education programs to accommodate student needs could, in the long term, alleviate prisoner numbers. More money and commitment to prison education on the part of the federal government is needed.

Recommendations for Further Research

This research investigation has substantiated and expanded on prison education studies concerning the impact of the institutional environment, the educational characteristics of prisoners, and their reasons for participating in education programs (Cheatwood, 1988; Ferguson and Haaven, 1990; and Martin, Sehrest, and Redner, 1981). However, the findings in this investigation indicate the need for additional research in several critical areas.

In determining the prisoners' acceptance or rejection of education rituals this study has established a network of influences on the students' attitudes toward, and participation in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Educational Development (GED) programs. The influences are intrinsic; concerned with previous educational experiences (location and attainment), values, goals and aspirations, length of sentence, cultural identity affiliation, and psychological make up. The influences are also

extrinsic; concerned with peer pressure, interaction abilities, and ability to listen.

It is difficult to generalize what education rituals will be accepted or rejected by prisoner students based on the myriad of intrinsic and extrinsic influences found in this study. It is proposed that a systematic analysis of the intrinsic and extrinsic influences on students would posit a more focussed, specific awareness of the contributing factors in a student's rejection or acceptance of education rituals. Also, **how** they impact on the students attitude toward, and ability to learn.

This study determined that the educators and students deemed the educators to be marginal to the workings of the institution. Research focusing on prison organization structure and administrative procedures could enhance the professional relationships between prison authorities and educational personnel. Joint staff meetings, universal employee policies, and utilization of specific employee skills are a few examples of how the working relationship between prison administrators and prison educators can be developed.

Knowles' (1980) adult education principles and practices are a cornerstone in the study of adult education, whereas, the study of education rituals is small in educational research. Given the unique nature of this investigation it is necessary to ask if adult education principles and practices are viable for prison education programs. In that, the restrictions associated with the learning environment, and the variance in learner needs warrant significant educator control and direction as opposed to, education experiences being learner initiated and designed. The concept of adult education in Canadian prisons was first advanced in 1836 (Weir, 1973), and endorsed in the 1979 O.I.S.E Report to the Solicitor General of Canada. Yet, this study shows only one prison educator has training in adult education principles and practices. Therefore in order to

demonstrate the value adult education can play in fostering student learning in prisons; prison educators must be trained and familiar with adult education principles and practices. If prison educators were to be trained in adult education, research advancing adult education in prison would be more concrete. Unfortunately, like similar studies, data from this research allows speculation only about the unique value adult education principles and practices can play in prison education programs.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P.A. and Adler, P. (1987). The past and the future of ethnography. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography 16(1), 4-23.
- Angle, T.G. (1989). An examination of the evolution of correctional education in Upper Canada and Ontario: 1835-1900. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, School of Education and Allied Professions, University Miami, Miami U.S.A.
- Atkinson, R.R. (1969). Conduct: An introduction to moral philosophy. Toronto: MacMillan.
- Beder, H. (1990). Reasons for non-participation in Adult Basic Education. Adult Education Quarterly, 40(4), 207-218.
- Beder, H., and Valentine, T. (1990). Motivational profiles of adult basic education students. Adult Education Quarterly 40(2), 78-94.
- Berg, B. (1989), Writing research papers. In Berg, B. (1989) (Ed.), Qualitative Research Methods (p.145-161). Toronto: Unwin
- Beswick, N. (1987). Re-thinking active learning. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Borman, K., LeCompte, M., and Goetz, J. (1986). Ethnographic and Qualitative Research design and why it doesn't work. American Behavioural Scientist 30(1), 42-57.
- Bouliane, R. (1985). Education in prison: A new challenge for adult educators. Learning, 4(3), 4-7.
- Bouliane, R. and Meunier, C. (1987). Prison education: Effects of vocational education on rehabilitation McGill Journal of Education 21(30), 217-226.
- Brooke, W. M. (Ed). (1972). Adult basic education. A resource book of readings. Toronto: New Press.
- Brookfield, S. (1986). Understanding and facilitating adult learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Brundage, D. and Mackeracher, D. (1980). Adult learning principles and their application to program planning. Ontario: Ministry of Education.
- Bryman, A. (1988). Quantity and quality in social research. London: Unwin Hyman.

Burgess, R. (Ed.), (1982). Field research: A sourcebook and field manual London: Allen and Unwin.

Cheatwood, D. (1988). The impact of the prison environment on the incarcerated learner. Journal of Correctional Education, 39(4), 184-186.

Clifton, R.A. (1979). Practice teaching: Survival in a marginal situation. Canadian Journal of Education, 3(4), 60-74.

Clifton, R. and Rambaran, R. (1987). Substitute teaching. Survival in a marginal situation. Urban Education 22(3), 310-327.

Collins, M. (1988). Towards a distinctive vocation for prison educators: Some key concerns and relevant strategies. Journal of Correctional education 39, (1), 24-28.

Conrad, P. and Schneider, J. (1981). Deviance and medicalization. Toronto: C.V. Mosby.

Conrad, J.P. (1981). A lost idea, a new hope: The way toward effective correctional treatment. The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 72(4), 1699-1734.

Corcoran, F. (1984). Teaching media studies in maximum security prisons. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech communication Association, Chicago: IL.

Courtney, S. (1981). The factors affecting participation in Adult Education: An analysis of some literature. Studies in Adult Education 13,(2), 104-105.

Cressey, D.R. (1977). Sources of resistance to innovation in corrections (p.492-512). In Carter, R.M., Glaser, D. & Wilkins, L (Eds.). Correctional institutions (2nd ed.). New York: Lippincott.

Cross, K.P. (1981). Adult learners: Increasing participation and facilitating learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darkenwald, G. and Merriam S. (1982). Adult education foundations of practice. New York: Harper Row Publishers.

Darkenwald, G. and Valentine, T. (1985). Outcomes of participating in adult basic skills education. Lifelong Learning, 8(5), 17-22.

Davidson, H.S. (1988). Meaningful literacy education in prison? Problems and possibilities. Journal of Correctional Education 39(2), 76-81.

- Deal, T. and Kennedy, A. (1983). Culture and school performance. Educational Leadership, 40(5), 14-15.
- Dell'Apa, F. (1973). Educational programs in adult correctional institutions: A survey. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. Boulder, CO.
- Denzin, N.K. (1978). The logic of naturalistic enquiry in N.K. Denzin (Ed.) Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dufour, M. (1989). Retention rate for inmates in Higher Education programs. Journal of Correctional Education 40(1), 28-33.
- Duguid, S. (1979). History and moral education in correctional education. Canadian Journal of Education, 4(4), 81-92.
- Duguid, S. (1981a). Prison education and criminal choice: The context of decision making (p.421-437). In Carter, R., Glaser, D., & Wilkins, L. (Ed). Correctional Institutions (2nd edition). New York: Lippincott Co.
- Duguid, S. (1981b). The prison as school. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on Prison Education (p.95-103). Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.
- Ebel, R. (1967). Some limitations of basic research in education. Phi Delta Kappan, (October), 81-84.
- Ericson, R. and Baranik, P. (Eds.) (1982). The ordering of justice. A study of accused persons as dependents in the criminal process. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Evertson, C. and Green, J. (1986). Observation as inquiry and method. In Wittrock, M. (Ed.). Handbook on research on teaching. (3rd ed.). p.162-213. New York: Macmillan.
- Ferguson, E. and Haaven, J. (1990). On the design of motivating learning environments for intellectually disabled offenders. Journal of Correctional Education, 41(1), 32-34.
- Fingeret, A. (1983). Social network: A perspective on independence and illiterate adults. Adult Education Quarterly, 33(2), 133-146.
- Forster, W. (Ed.). (1981). Prison education in England and Wales. Leicester: NIAE.
- Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punishment. The birth of the prison. New York: Pathenon Books.

Fox, T.A. (1986). Justifying education programs as a form of rehabilitation in prisons. Journal of Educational Administration and Foundations, 1(1), 49-55.

Fox, T.A. (1987a). Prison educators' perceptions of adult education in a prison context. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Fox, T.A. (1987b). Teaching in prisons: Consideration of the concept of adult education. Saskatchewan Association of Lifelong Learning Journal (Summer, 1987). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 070).

Fox, T. A. (1989). The necessity of moral education in prisons. Journal of Correctional Education, 40(1), 20-25.

Friedman, T. and Bice, G. (1992). Cognitive learning growth in occupational achievement. Journal of Correctional Education 43(2), 66-72.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Continuum.

Gans, H. (1982). The participant observer as a human being: Observation on the personal aspects of fieldwork. In Burgess, R. (1982), (Ed.), Field research: A sourcebook and field manual (pp.53-61). London: Allen and Unwin.

Gehrke, N. (1979). Rituals of the hidden curriculum. In K. Yamamoto (Ed.), Children in Time and Space. (p.103-127). New York: Teachers College Press.

Glaser, D. (1969). The effectiveness of a prison and parole system. Indiana: Bobbs Merrill.

Glaser, D. (1973). The effectiveness of correctional education. In A.R. Roberts (Ed.), Readings in prison education (p. 351-363). Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Adline Publishing.

Goodwin, L. and Goodwin, W. (1984). Qualitative Vs quantitative research or qualitative and quantitative research. Nursing Research 33(6), 378-380.

Grainge, A. and Kemp, M. (1981). Remedial education in prisons. In W. Forster, (Ed.), Prison education in England and Wales (pp.65-74). Leicester: NIAE.

Hayes, A.P (1972). Adult education association of the U.S.A. Commission on ABE: New dimensions in adult basic education research and demonstration in ABE. In Brooke, W.M. (Ed). Adult basic education. A resource book of readings (p.141-150). Toronto: New Press.

Hertzman, A. and Putman, M. (1980). Token reinforcement and adult basic education. In Karnes, F, Ginn, C. & Maddox, B. (Eds). Issues and trends in Adult Basic Education: Focus on Reading (P.157-162). University Press: Mississippi.

Hervieux-Payette, M. (1981). Address at the banquet. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on Prison Education. Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.

Hirschi, T. (1969). A control theory of delinquency. In Traub, S. and Little, C. (1985). Theories of deviance (3rd. ed.). (pp.257-273). Illinois: Peacock Publishers.

Homans, G. (1979). Anxiety and ritual: The theories of Malinowski and Radcliff-Brown. In Lessa, W. and Vogt, E. (Eds.) Reader in comparative religion. An Anthropological approach (4th edition). (pp. 57-62). New York: Harper Row.

Hudson, J. (1981) Prison programming and program evaluation: Trends, issues, and observations. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on Prison Education (pp.155-173). Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.

Hurley, M. (1991). Empowering adult learners: NIF literacy program helps ABE accomplish human development mission. Adult Learning, 2(4), 20-27.

Ignatieff, M. (1981). Moral education as a reform movement: A historian's perspective. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on Prison Education (p.3-22). Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.

Illich, I. (1970). Schooling: The ritual of progress. New York Review of Books, 15(10), December. 20-26.

Irwin, J. (1987). Reflections on ethnography. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 16(1), 41-48.

Irwin, D.M. and Bushnell, M.M. (1980). Observational strategies for child study. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Jarvis, P. (1988). Adult and continuing education. Theory and practice. London: Croom Helm.

Jepson, N. (1981). Education in prison - the relevance of criminological theory. In W. Forster (Ed.), Prison education in England and Wales (p.17-26). Leicester: NIAE.

Johnson, N.A. and Johnson-Lee, B. (1988). Ethnographic research in education: Strategies for reappraisal. McGill Journal of Education 23(3), 231-241.

Juchau, M. (1984). Teacher's information needs and the school library
Sydney: School Libraries Section

Kamens, D. (1977). Legitimizing myths and educational organization: The relationship between organizational ideology and formal structure. American Sociological Review, 42, 258-275.

Kauffman, K. (1981). Prison officer attitudes and perceptions of attitudes: A case of pluralistic ignorance. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 18,(2) 272-294.

Kendall, G. (1973). What makes correctional education correctional? In A.R. Roberts (Ed). Readings in prison education (p.95-130). Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Kidd, R. (1981). The adult prisoner as a student. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on Prison Education (pp.47-64). Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.

Kerr, H. (1970). Sociological bases of learning for offenders. pp.323-336. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 068 791)

Knight, T. (1974). Powerlessness and the student role: Structural determinants of school status. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology,10(2), 112-117.

Knights, W. (1981). Moral education and teaching practice: Heuristic or hidden curriculum. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference in Prison Education (pp.321-344). Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.

Knowles, M. (1980). The modern practice of adult education. (Revised Edition). New York: Cambridge: The Adult Education Company.

Kohlberg, L. (1975). The cognitive developmental approach to moral education. Phi Delta Kappan, 56(10), 670-677.

Levin, T. & Long, R. (1981). Effective instruction. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Lewis, J. and Samuda, R. (1989). Non-discriminatory assessment of culturally different students. McGill Journal of Education, 24, (3), 253-266.

Lickona, T. (1976). Critical issues in the study of moral development and behaviour. In T. Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behaviour: Theory, research and social issues (pp. 3-27). Toronto: Holt, Rhinehart and Winston.

Linden, R. and Perry, L (1983). The effectiveness of prison education programs. Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, 6 (4), 43-57.

Lofland, J. (1971). Analyzing social settings. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Lofland, J. (1974). Styles for reporting qualitative research. The American Sociologist, 9, 101-111.

Lofland, J. (1987). Reflections on a thrice-named journal. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 16(1), 25-40.

Lustz, F. and Ramsey, M. (1974). The use of anthropological field methods in education. Education Research, 3(10), 5-7.

Lustz, F. and Ramsey, M. (1973). Nondirective cues as ritualistic indicators in educational organizations. Education and Urban Society, 5(3), 345-365.

MacCormick, A.H. (1932). The education of adult prisoners. New York: AMPS Press.

Martin, S., Sechrest, L. and Redner, R. (1981). New directions in the rehabilitation of criminal offenders. Washington: National Academy Press.

Martinson, R. (1974). "What works?" In Cullen, F. and Gilbert, K (1982) (Eds.), Reaffirming rehabilitation. San Francisco: Anderson Publishing.

McLaren, P. (1986). Schooling as a ritual performance. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

McLaren, P. (1988). The liminal servant and the ritual roots of critical pedagogy. Language Arts, 65(2), 164-179.

Miller, D. and Carrington, R. (1989). Teaching women's literature to adolescent female offenders. Journal of Correctional Education 40(1), 6-9.

Moore, A. (1976). Realities of the urban classroom. In J. E. Roberts and S. Akinsanya (Eds.), Schooling in the Cultural Context: Anthropological Studies in Education. (pp.238-255). New York: McKay.

Moore, G. and Waldron, M. (1981). Helping adults learn. Ontario: Office for Education Practice, University of Guelph.

Morin, L. (Ed.), (1981). On Prison Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 685)

Nelson, J. and Hoekema, H. (1981). Kohlberg concretized: The practice of moral development in the prison university. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on Prison Education (pp.305-320). Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (1979). Report to the Solicitor General of Canada concerning: The education programs of the Canadian Corrections System. (Phase 2). O.I.S.E. Ontario.

Owens, M. (1985). An historical analysis of correctional education in Canada. Proceedings of the 26th Education Research Conference (p.236-241). Tempe, ARE.

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitative evaluation methods. London: Sage Publications.

Pelto, R. and Pelto G. (1978). Anthropological research. The structure of inquiry. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Peters, R.S. (1979). Moral principles and moral education. In D.B. Cochoran, C.M. Hamm and A.C. Kazepides (Eds.), The Domain of Moral Education. Toronto: O.I.S.E. Press.

Poonwassie, D. (1989). Challenging the university: Aboriginal students in higher education at Manitoba universities. Paper presentation. Association for Continuing Higher Education. South Carolina

Porporino, F. and Robinson, D. (1992). The correctional benefits of education: A follow-up of Canadian federal offenders participation in ABE. Journal of Correctional Education 43(2), 92-101.

Prus, R. (1987). Ethnographic research in process. A reply to Professor Robboy. Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 16(3), 301-307.

Purpel, D. and Ryan, K. (1976). Moral education: What is it and where are we? In D. Purpel and K. Ryan (Eds.), Moral Education. It comes with the territory (pp.44-54). California: McCutchan.

Reagen, M. and Stoughton, D. (1976). School behind bars. NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Report of the Aboriginal Justice Inquiry of Manitoba (1991). Vol.1. The Justice System of Aboriginal People. Manitoba: Government Printers.

Rest, J. (1981). The major psychological processes in moral behaviour. In L. Morin (Ed.), On prison education (pp.245-267). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 685).

Rist, R. (1978). On Qualitative Research. Issues of Design, Implementation, Analysis, Ethics, and Applicability. Paper Presentation; College of Human Ecology: Cornell University.

Roberts, A.R. (Ed.), (1973). Readings in prison education. Illinois: Thomas.

Roberts, R. (1968). Imprisoned tongues. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ross, R. and Fabiano, E. (1981). Time to think, cognition and crime: Link and remediation. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, Department of Criminology.

Ross, R., Fabiano, E. and Ross, R. (1988). (Re)habilitation through education: A cognitive model for corrections. Journal of Correctional Education, 39, (2), 44-47.

Rossman, M., Fisk, E. & Roehl, (1984). Teaching and learning basic skills. A guide for adult basic education and developmental education programs. New York: Teachers College Press.

Rothman, D.J. (1971). The discovery of the asylum. Social order and disorder in the new republic. Toronto: Little, Brown & Co.

Royal Commission on the Donald Marshall, Jr., Prosecution (1989). Vol.1. Commissioners' Report: Findings and recommendations. Nova Scotia: Government Printers.

Scrivastave, R. (1985). Educating incarcerated adults. Proceedings of the 26th Education Research Conference (p.281-285). Tempe, ARE.

Shalin, D. (1986). Pragmatism and social interactionism. American Sociological Review, 51, 9-29.

Shea, E. (1980). Teaching prisoners. Education Canada, 20(2), 40-47.

Shipman, M. (1968). The Sociology of the School. London: Longmans Green and Co.

Singer, R. and Statsky, W. (1974). Rights of the imprisoned. New York: Bobbs Merrill.

Sizer, N. and Sizer, T. (1978). Five lectures on Moral Education. London: Harvard University Press.

Smith, M.L. (1987). Publishing qualitative research. American Educational Research Journal 24(2), 173-183.

Smith, P. (1975). What is moral education? Viewpoints, 51, 17-29.

Squires, G. (1987). The curriculum beyond school. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Stephens, R. (1992). To what extent and why do inmates attend school in prison? Journal of Correctional Education 43(1), 52-57.

Stoddart, K. (1986). The presentation of everyday life. Some textual strategies for "adequate" ethnography. Urban Life, 15(1), 103-121.

Sugai, G. and Maheady, L. (1988). Cultural diversity and individual assessment for behaviour disorders. Teaching Exception Children (Fall, 1988).

Sutherland, E. (1973). On analyzing crime. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sykes, G. (1978). Criminology. San Francisco: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Task Force on Aboriginal Peoples in Federal Corrections (1988). Final Report. Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada.

Usher, R. and Bryant, I. (1989). Adult Education as theory, practice and research: The captive triangle. London: Routledge.

Valentine, T. and Darkenwald, G. (1990). Deterrents to participation in adult education: Profiles of potential learners. Adult Education Quarterly, 41(1), 29-42.

Wallace, R. and Wolf, A. (1986). Contemporary sociological theory: Continuing the classical tradition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Weber, M. (1958). The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Weir, J.D. (1973). A history of education in Canadian federal corrections. In A.R. Roberts (Ed.), Readings in prison education (pp.39-47). Springfield, IL: Thomas.

West, L. (1987). Challenging the WEA: Crisis, learning and purpose. Workers Education 1(2) p.7-11.

Whetstone, K. (1981) How the prisoner sees education. Proceedings of the 1st National Conference on Prison Education (pp.79-93). Victoria, British Columbia, Canada: University of Victoria.

Wiley, L.J. (1989). The correctional educator as moral change agent. Journal of Correctional Education 40(1), 12-15.

Wiley, L.J. (1987). The effect of teaching style on the development of moral judgement in prison inmates. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Texas A&M.

Woodley, A. (Ed.) (1987). Choosing to learn: Adults in education. Milton Keynes: Open university press.

Wolcott, H., (1985). On ethnographic intent. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21(3), 187-203.

Wylie, P. (1974). Development of a systematic automotive education program (Final Report) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 131 232)

Young, J. (1984). Education in Multicultural Society: What sort of education? What sort of society? In J. Mallea and J. Young (Eds.), Cultural diversity and Canadian education (pp.412-430). Ottawa, Canada: Carleton University Press.

Young, J. (Ed.) (1987). Breaking the mosaic: Ethnic identities and Canadian Schools. Goromond Press: Toronto.

APPENDIX A:

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR THE
EDUCATORS****PRISON EDUCATORS**

As a means of introduction and allowing the educator an opportunity to adjust to the interviewing process, the following questions were asked.

- * How long have you been teaching? How long here?
- * Have you noticed any differences to teaching in a regular environment? If so, what are they.

In relation to the research questions, what education rituals are performed and why those particular rituals are performed, the following questions were asked.

- * What teaching styles do you employ with your students? How?
- * What strategies do you use to maintain appropriate student behaviour in the learning situation? How do you implement these?

The second focus of the study is concerned with the status of prison educators in the prison hierarchy. In order to determine if the prison educators are marginal, the following questions were asked.

- * Do you ever feel, as a prison educator, that your status in the prison is not very high? If yes, why do you think this? If no, can you tell me why?
- * Who do you think are considered the most important personnel in the workings of the prison? Why?
- * Do you think education programs and participation are considered important activities within the prison? Why?

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR THE STUDENTS

Having a basic understanding why the students were taking classes enabled the researcher to determine a foundation for establishing why the students reject education rituals. The first question posed to the students was:

- * Why did you decide to take classes?

In order to determine those education rituals that are recognized and rejected by the students, the following questions were asked.

- * What do you **like** when your teacher is teaching you? Why?
- * What do you **dislike** when your teacher is teaching you? Why?
- * What do you **like** about your class? Why?
- * What do you **dislike** about your class? Why?

Questions concerning the students' perceptions of the prison educators status in the prison hierarchy will include:

- * Do you think the teachers are considered important workers in the prison? Why?
- * Who do you think are considered the most important workers in the prison? Why?
- * Do you think education programs and taking classes are considered important activities within the prison? Why?

APPENDIX C:

LETTER TO PRISON EDUCATORS
FACULTY OF EDUCATIONTHE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
Department of Educational Administration & Foundations

January 8th, 1992

Dear Prison Educator,

Recently I visited the prison and discussed with you my research concerning prison education.

I would like the opportunity to interview you in regard to teaching and working with prisoners. The information that you report to me will be **confidential**. This means that I will not reveal your identity by referring to you in the dissertation, and I will not disclose your identity to any prisoner or prison official.

The interview will take no longer than 30 minutes. Prior to using the contents from the interview I will be forwarding a complete copy of the transcript for your perusal, editing and clarification.

You can withdraw your permission for me to use the details from the interview completely, you can note any sections of the interview that you do not want me to use, and you can edit the transcript to your expectations. **I will not proceed** with using the information until you have given me permission.

I know that this is a busy time of year for you, however, I would ask that you complete the enclosed consent form and return it **sealed** in the envelope provided to the Director of Education at the prison. This information will be forwarded onto me at the University. I thank you for your interest in my research and I look forward to hearing from you in the not too distant future.

Sincerely,

Tricia A. Fox
University of Manitoba.

APPENDIX C: (CONT'D)

NOTICE OF CONSENT

I am/am not (please circle appropriate response) willing to be interviewed in regard to my work as a teacher of prisoners.

I understand that the details that I relay to the researcher will be completely confidential.

I understand that the researcher will forward me a copy of the interview transcript and that I can deny use of the whole transcript, or part of the transcript for research.

Signed:.....

Print name here:.....

Teaching Position:.....

Date:.....

APPENDIX D:

OBSERVATION DATA COLLECTION SHEET

Date:	Class:	Teacher:	No. students
No. Mins. Observed:		Time Observed:	
OBSERVATION CATEGORY	INTERACTION TALLY	RECORDED COMMENTS	INCIDENTS/HIGHLIGHTS
1. Accepts feelings (learning environment)			
2. Praises Encourages (need to learn)			
3. Accepts uses pupils Ideas (learners experience)			
4. Asks questions (actively participate)			
5. Lecturing (share learning experience)			
6. Give directions (responsibility, shares, actively participates)			
7. Criticizing or justifying authority (learning environment, responsibility)			
8. Response (actively participate, experience, sense of progress)			
9. Initiation (learning environment, actively participate, experience, sense of progress)			
10. Silence or confusion (learning environment, actively participate, experience, sense of progress)			

APPENDIX E:

**LETTER TO EDUCATORS REQUESTING THEIR
COMMENTS/EDITS**

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

Department of Educational Administration & Foundations

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

8th June, 1992

Dear Prison Educator:

Please excuse the informality of this "form" letter. Enclosed is a copy of your interview transcript which I recorded during my most recent visit to Stony Mountain.

I would appreciate it if you would read the transcript through. If there are any comments you would like to add or delete please feel free to do so; then forward the transcript with you changes back to me no later than Friday, July 3rd, 1992. If I do not receive any changes after this date then I will use the data as presented.

Also, if you have any problems or concerns with the data which you want to discuss with me please do not hesitate to call me

I would like to take this opportunity to again thank you for your contribution to my dissertation. I would also like to congratulate you on your efforts in helping your students attain levels of learning and understanding which they have never had before. Bravo!

Sincerely,

Tricia A. Fox
Graduate Student
The University of Manitoba

enclosure.

APPENDIX F

EXAMPLE OF A PRISON EDUCATOR'S INTERVIEW RESPONSE

How long have you been teaching?

Not just in the prison? I taught for a few years in the 70s in a new careers program. I taught mentally handicapped adults.

Is your teaching experience just related to working with adults?

Pretty much so. Except for my practicum work at the university plus a little bit of substitute teaching.

Did you undertake any formal adult education training?

I have a certificate in adult education from the Red River Community College.

In your experiences of working both outside and inside the prison are there any major differences that you can identify for me? In terms of both the environment and the students?

I have worked in prisons for 7 years and a few months. Having worked in literacy on the street and then working for a careers program with disadvantaged adults I find that they are pretty much the same as prisoners. They share most of the same multiple problems. Also, from what I have heard from other literacy programs they bring multiple problems to the classroom situation. You know a crisis will arise and it consumes a lot of time and energy so they can't keep on task or work with what they are doing because they have difficulty with what is going on in the classroom. So the prisoners and these types of learners are very similar.

What teaching styles do you use?

Probably the whole language approach to teaching reading. To get these fellows to see that reading, writing, and speaking is all combined and you can't really separate one from the other. So to get them to put their pen on paper right away, to use their own experiences..that whole approach. I will use phonetics for reading especially if we have a fellow who can't read at all or who hasn't had any success in reading to get them to read immediately so that they can see that they can read just a few words. Basically, that is one step to reading.

I talk to them a lot about what reading is; it is a process of getting meaning from the page. So I think that it is a mixture of whole language and getting them to believe in themselves. It is explaining and talking about learning so it is experiential in its foundation.

About how many students do have in your class?

I am supposed to have about 10. 10 is quite a few. 6 would be nice although here it is interesting because we will have guys who are enrolled in different programs and doing different things. So lots of times we will only have 6. This can be frustrating because I could be planning to do something and someone will plan not to be there or they will just drop the class at times. Overall, I think its fair to say that I average 6 students.

Do your students typically balk at having to write, or do they balk more at having to read?

Write. Writing is the most difficult, that is what I have found over all of the years. That is why I have found this method to work really well. You can really get some good things going. There are some discussions beforehand, they are really stimulated when they are thinking about the topic, and it is a lot easier to put your pen to paper and to get something down.

A lot of these guys have never written anything; they will say that I cannot spell so I cannot write.

How do you deal with inappropriate student behaviour in the classroom?

Well I have had one fellow for the last couple of months who has given me quite a rough time. He is very self-centred which most of these guys are, and it seems that everything should be his, and everything done his way. That is fine to a point.

I want to give the guys some choices and flexibility. Flexibility around what they want to do and sometimes they do not want to do it. If they don't really want to do maths first thing in the morning that is fine, we will do reading.

All of this started when I was beginning to teach this method of writing. He had the instruction like the others, but I wanted him to work on his reading because his writing skills are quite good. He does write poetry. So his writing skills are fine. He to started to go no! no! no! He argued that we were always changing and it was too fast and he wanted to do something

else, so I tried to tell him that the reason why I wanted him to do this was to develop his reading skills but he left the classroom and stormed out.

I let him go of course at that point, he came back a little bit later and talked to me. My basic approach was to let him cool down and if he had not talked to me I would have gone and talked to him and tried to straighten things out to get a working relationship. What came out of it is that he came back to the classroom slowly and I talked to Winston about it and let him know what was going on. We just gave him a deadline, this is when you are to come.

I made it very clear all along that I wanted him back in the classroom and that he was welcome and there were some things that we could do around organizing his time. His complaint was that I never responded to him but I responded to everybody else. I said I would make sure that I would acknowledge him if I heard him and we left it at that.

At this level I see them as not having had experience dealing with people. They don't really know how to so they rely on their own methods and their own ways of dealing with situations which are usually dealt with by walking out or feeling hurt and all those sorts of things. I think part of our job is to really work on those behaviours.

Do you think with this group that you could venture into things like role playing and skits?

Well yes, but only with part of this group. But there is a problem I would loose Billy and he needs the class. The other thing is that some of them are shy and we have continuous intake. You just get something going and you lose a couple of the guys and you get a couple of new guys in, and it takes them a while to become comfortable, so it is hard. But I think that with a few of these guys they would be willing to risk a lot.

As a prison educator where do you think your status within the prison organization is?

I don't know. I have only been here for such a short time. When I worked for Red River we did not have a strong association here. I was on contract and the contract person really doesn't have any status in the organization. We were basically overlooked and were forgotten about when there was a blizzard and told to go home. If you are doing your job there is no problem if you are getting the results. For a federal employee now really I don't know.

In terms of the institution's personnel responsible for the workings of the prison who do you think that the administrators rate as the most important?

I would probably say the guards, then the CO2s, and then the case managers. Guards first because of security. Security is considered very important.

What about education programs and participation?

I don't know about this institution. In minimum security institutions, no, I don't think that it is all that important. I think that programming is becoming more important in federal corrections and all across the board. Cognitive skills, breaking barriers, co-dependency and there have been literacy initiatives in the last little while but, I do not see the whole system as feeling that education and basic education is very new.

I guess you could say it is in transition. The other side of me, well you know, society doesn't really think that education really is that important it does not put enough effort and enough money and resources into educating the kids let alone adults and let alone adults in prison.

Can you tell me if you have felt any concern or comments with regard to your gender when working with men, teaching men, and in an institution that is run by men?

I have never felt gender issues directly but I have had one student very early in my career who did not like me at all and that was because I was not Native. I have probably had more trouble because I am not Native with some of my Native students.

I have had one student who fell in love with me. I realized that after I had read something that he had written, so I had to talk with him and it was fine after that but I spoke with the staff in the prison and I was told that this had happened before.

I think that in some ways women working in the prison are not taken as seriously as the men. They don't get the recognition from what I have seen. There are a few of us that do advance. I think that it is great to have women working in a prison personally and I think that we can have a greater impact on the fellows because we are not at all threatening. We are never encroaching on their personal space.

You know, I can say, I want you to do this because this is what we are doing and it is important for you to be involved in the group, and I can be that little more forceful and stand there and say that and they will take it.

Whereas, I don't think they would listen to a man if a man did that. It would be very difficult. I also think around manners and behaviours, they don't swear and if they do they excuse themselves. The spitting has really slowed down in my classroom. There are those kinds of things.

What would you like to see in here in terms of other programs and equipment. Is there anything you have thought, "I wish we had that"?

I could use more materials and books, computers and word processors. That is very important. That is the "biggy" to have these guys on computers doing their writing, doing their editing, doing just everything that is what I would like. You cannot buy a pair of shoes without being exposed to computers. They are everywhere. It is not just for literacy, I think it is also a question of learning for computer awareness. There are so many advantages in saving, changing, and doing spell checks, and all that awareness brings is worth pushing for.

Is there anything else you would to share with me about teaching in prisons or problems that you experience that you think will be beneficial to my study?

I will have to think about that. I can't think of anything. I need to think on that.

APPENDIX G

EXAMPLE OF A STUDENT'S INTERVIEW RESPONSE

Are you a native?

Yes, I'm a Peguis from North Winnipeg, here.

Why did you decided to take classes?

Well, I'm a regular in the system, and for this term I felt that the most positive way to do my time was to upgrade, to achieve any goal education is important. It is the best and most constructive way of doing my time.

Did you go through the system by starting off with ABE or did you begin with GED?

No. I have been in the system for quite some time and I did some upgrading for this, actually I completed GED12 in 1973. So, that was the last time I was in the classroom. Then when I came back in 1986, I was in the B.C. system and took some tests there, and I was about 6 or 8 level in math and english. They were all low so I never really upgraded myself until I was transferred this way. I received some credits for the GED from there and now here. Now, I'm doing some more upgrading in GED Math and English.

Are you enjoying them?

It is tough, it is a challenge to me, and I'm 42, and you know it is never too late to learn.

What are the things that you like in the education classes?

I know they only offer the basics. After that you are pretty much on you own as far as any university is concerned. There is a university program here but I mean if a fellow wants to go that route the opportunities are there. I guess I don't know from my course or anything but I understand that there are people that do.

What about the teachers? Not so much the people, but the things they do in class, do you like that?

Well, I've done a lot of testing to find out what I'm like and how I study in certain situations and well, I can't remember any names or anything by for myself, I always have problems in a structured classroom. If I have to be there for an hour and half or stuff like that, but here I've been given a lot of space and if it weren't for that reason, I don't think I would have been allowed to stay in school.

I guess everybody has a space or a speed that they work in and they give me a lot of time.

Anything else, other than the fact the teachers give you some space?

Well, I only have one teacher or one tutor. We have a small classroom. We don't have long periods of talking, which is kind of disruptive. He's been pretty helpful and I found him interested enough to help me. Yes, it is the one-to-one and he definitely has an interest in you.

Anything else you like?

Well, you don't get the strap!

What about things that you don't like?

Well, there are a lot of underlying things that people are going to have to deal with. The fact that you're in an institution for one thing. But you have got to get on with your life. I've tried to do that you know, the fact that I'm in an institution I've tried to put that behind me.

Do you think that coming to the Education Wing helps you do that?

No. Everyday you are reminded that you're in jail. I don't know, I think it might be helpful here in the dress code. They have got a strict dress code about wearing prison issue. Sometimes I think if a guy was able to wear his own clothes he could perform just a little better here in prison and feel a little better about himself. He is made to feel like a con.

Anything else you dislike?

I think the teachers are very aware of where they are at. They know that the student is doing time and they are aware of that in the classroom. There are a lot of things that I would like to be doing but because you are in prison you are restricted and limited to what you can do. I mean you can do things out on the street that I cannot do here.

Do you think the teachers are considered important workers in the prison? Do you think the people responsible for the prison view the teachers as being important?

Oh yes! They definitely play an important role here because there are a lot of people who come in here and they're illiterate. I mean, they are starting right from the bottom from Grade 1 & 2 stuff. If it weren't for the teachers, I mean if they weren't able to get along with the students they would fail. I have seen several teachers come through here, one in particular a Native woman. A lot of her class; it was like no other class I've ever seen. It was all Native traditional stuff which she introduced to the guys and I think she had a very successful class.

In terms of the whole place and in terms of who is responsible for the things, who do you think is considered the most important workers in the prison?

Everybody has their responsibility from the "Keyman", you know, the guard right up to the Warden. They all play a role in the daily operations of the prison. But the principal is the key to successful education programming, and I think he is doing that because of the number coming to school. He has provided a lot of space so as people are able to do the work.

Do you think the people who run the prison see the classes as being important within the prison?

Well, you've got to go back because we are all lowered here from the court system and justice system, they put you in the hands of CSC. Then they have the responsibility. I don't know, it seems to be a revolving door situation. I mean I've seen guys here get a good education and get trained but they come back in: they go back out and they come back in. I don't think anybody really cares if a guy stays out or not. Whether or not you've got a university degree or not that is secondary. I think their main priority is