

**MANAGING A FULL-TIME SCHOOL WITHIN A  
CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ENVIRONMENT**

**BY**

**NTOMBIZANELE GLORIA MKOSI**

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of**

**MASTERS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

**In the**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION MANAGEMENT AND POLICY STUDIES**

**At the**

**UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA**

**Supervisor: Dr V.P. Mahlangu  
Co-Supervisor: Prof Chika M.T. Schoole**

**March 2013**

## DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my two children: Sakhe and Lulutho Mkosi.

## ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to investigate and analyse the educators' experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. Provision of education in the South African Department of Correctional Services is in terms of Section 29 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No.108 of 1996) which stipulates that “everyone has a right (a) to basic education, and (b) to further education, which the state, through reasonable measures, must make progressively available and accessible.” “This constitutional imperative for schooling is not a right that is curtailed by incarceration” (DCS, 2005:137).

The researcher used qualitative research inquiry. This is a case study of the educators' experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. To obtain an in-depth understanding and gain more insight on the research topic, this study focused on one full-time school within the South African Department of Correctional Services.

Literature reveals that “correctional centres are bureaucratic institutions that are characterised by a number of factors that can potentially encourage or impede education programme success” (Sanford & Foster, 2006:604). The environment makes learning difficult as there are frequent lockdowns, headcounts and hearings that disrupt the consistency of classes and interrupt the education process (Schirmer, 2008:29). Few learners attend classes and whilst in class they are not really listening, instead, they would be sleeping and unproductive. In most cases, learners would be present because they were forced to be in the education programme (Wright, 2004:198).

In this study, the researcher used semi-structured one on one interviews, and document analysis as data collection strategies. Purposeful sampling was utilized to select respondents. A total of six respondents who are full-time educators employed by the Department of Correctional Services were interviewed. The study reveals that managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment seems to be challenging because education is not respected and not prioritized. This finding appears to be consistent with literature which reveals that the uniqueness of correctional centre culture with a correctional centre management characterized by

a focus on security measures such as lockdowns and head counts constraints the possibilities of learning (Watts, 2010:57). Based on the findings in this study, the researcher recommends that educator development should be prioritized within the Department of Correctional Services and school management should be informed about learners that are released from the correctional centre. This study concludes that managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment is challenging due to Correctional Services environment being not conducive for teaching and learning and inadequate resources.

## **KEY CONCEPTS**

Correctional education, offender rehabilitation programmes, offender education, rehabilitation tools, recidivism, offender reintegration programmes, offender employment, education and crime, education behind bars, offender socialization

## **ABBREVIATIONS**

DCS: Department of Correctional Services

DOE: Department of Education

DHET: Department of Higher Education and Training

DoBE: Department of Basic Education

AET: Adult Education and Training

SACE: South African Council for Educators

REC: Research Ethics Committee

NSFAS: National Student Financial Aid Scheme

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe my sincere gratitude to a great deal of people whose expertise added value to my research project. I will forever feel indebted to the following people and institutions:

- My Supervisor, Dr V. P Mahlangu, for guidance and support and instilling a sense of resilience in me through mentorship.
- My late parents, especially my mother, who nurtured the spirit of resilience and hard work in me.
- The South African Department of Correctional Services Research Ethics Committee, for having confidence in me by approving my application to conduct research and afforded me an opportunity to venture into the correctional centre.
- All educators at the research site, who provided me with an opportunity to learn anew and expand my horizons of my knowledge base.
- My son, Sakhe, for assisting me with editing this work.
- The Almighty God, for giving me strength to finish this work, through trying times of my career.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER 1: AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Background on correctional education.....	1
1.2.1 Correctional education and rehabilitation .....	3
1.2.2 Correctional education and recidivism .....	5
1.2.3 Correctional education and crime .....	7
1.2.4 Correctional education and reintegration .....	8
1.3 Rationale/Statement of purpose .....	10
1.4 Research questions .....	11
1.5 Significance of the study .....	11
1.6 Theoretical framework .....	12
1.7 Limitation of study .....	14
1.8 Delimitation.....	14
1.9 Overview of chapters .....	14
1.10 Conclusion.....	16
 <b>CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW</b> .....	 <b>17</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	17
2.2 The status of teaching and learning in correctional centres .....	18
2.2.1 Teaching and learning in correctional centres: problems, challenges and prospects .....	22
2.3 Learners in correctional centres: profile and academic needs.....	27
2.4 Resources for education in correctional centres.....	32
2.4.1 Libraries.....	32
2.4.2 Funding.....	33
2.4.3 Learner Teacher Support Material .....	33
2.4.4 Educators .....	34
2.4.5 Classrooms .....	39
2.5 Curriculum .....	39
2.6 Correctional education programmes .....	42
2.7 Correctional education and employment opportunities .....	46
2.8 Conclusion.....	49

<b>CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>50</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	50
3.2 Research design.....	50
3.3 Research method .....	50
3.4 Sampling.....	51
3.5 Data collection instruments .....	51
3.5.1 Semi-structured one on one interviews.....	52
3.5.2 Document analysis .....	53
3.6 Data analysis .....	53
3.7 Ethical considerations .....	55
3.8 Trustworthiness .....	56
3.9 Conclusion.....	57
<b>CHAPTER 4: DELIVERY OF FORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES IN THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA.....</b>	<b>58</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	58
4.2 Background on formal education programmes .....	58
4.3 Educational programmes.....	61
4.3.1 Early Childhood Development (ECD).....	62
4.3.2 Literacy Programmes .....	64
4.3.3 Adult Education and Training (AET).....	66
4.3.4 Further Education and Training (FET).....	66
4.3.5 Higher Education and Training (HET) .....	67
4.3.6 Computer Based Training (CBT).....	68
4.4 Schools and Adult Education and Training centres within the Department of Correctional Services .....	69
4.4.1 Brandvlei Youth Centre.....	69
4.4.2 Barberton Town Youth .....	70
4.4.3 Drakenstein Youth Centre .....	70
4.4.4 Hawaqua Juvenile Centre.....	70
4.4.5 Durban Westville Youth Centre .....	71
4.4.6 North-End Correctional Centre .....	71



4.4.7	Rustenburg Youth Centre .....	72
4.5	Resources .....	72
4.5.1	Educators .....	73
4.5.2	Classrooms .....	73
4.5.3	Budget.....	75
4.6	Conclusion.....	75
<b>CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS .....</b>		<b>76</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	76
5.2	Teaching-learning environment .....	76
5.3	Learners.....	80
5.4	Curriculum .....	85
5.5	Resources .....	88
5.5.1	Educators .....	88
5.5.2	Budget.....	92
5.5.3	Learner-Teacher Support Material .....	92
5.5.4	Classrooms .....	93
5.6	Parents involvement.....	94
5.7	Partnership with the Department of Education and other stakeholders .....	95
5.8	Education as a rehabilitation tool.....	96
5.9	Conclusion.....	98
<b>CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION .....</b>		<b>99</b>
6.1	Introduction .....	99
6.2	Recommendations for policy and practice .....	99
6.2.1	Educator development.....	99
6.2.2	Educator recruitment.....	99
6.2.3	Transfer or withdrawal of learners from the school .....	100
6.2.4	School budget.....	100
6.2.5	Parents involvement .....	100
6.2.6	Incentive for participation in education programmes .....	101
6.3	Recommendations for further research .....	101

6.3.1	Learners attending school within correctional centre full-time schools .....	101
6.3.2	Learners who passed grade 12 within correctional centre school pursuing studies at the university .....	101
6.3.3	Education as a rehabilitation tool .....	101
6.4	Conclusion.....	102
6.4.1	Teaching-learning environment .....	102
6.4.2	Resources .....	103
	Bibliography .....	104

### **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 5.4.1:	Grade 12 year-end assessment outcomes (matric results) .....	90
--------------	--	----

### **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix 1:	Interview schedule .....	118
Appendix 2:	Request to conduct research .....	122
Appendix 3:	Approval/permission to conduct research .....	124
Appendix 4:	Request to participate in research and an informed consent .....	125
Appendix 5:	Ethics clearance certificate .....	128

## CHAPTER 1: AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

### 1.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of the study by outlining the background of correctional education, presenting the underlying principles of the method of investigation and a summarized layout of the dissertation.

### 1.2 Background on correctional education

The Department of Correctional Services (DCS) in compliance with Section 29 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa is providing education programmes to offenders according to the specific needs and as a rehabilitation tool. “International instruments indicate that education in a correctional environment must be in line with the educational system of the general society, and provision must be made for the continuity of the educational activity of people incarcerated in a correctional centre, and for those who are released on parole” (DCS, 2005:137). Furthermore, the participation of the incarcerated people in correctional education programmes appears to reduce recidivism (Gordon & Weldon, 2003:200). “Recidivism refers to offenders who have been previously incarcerated for more than two times in a correctional institution” (Flanagan, 1994:25).

While more research is needed to verify the role of correctional education in reducing recidivism rate, a recent study funded by the United States of America’s Department of Education discovered that participating in State correctional educational programmes reduces the likelihood of re-incarceration by 29% (Tolbert, 2002:7). Furthermore, the findings from studies assessing the value of correctional education programmes, reveal that society can save money and even earn a return on its investment from providing education to incarcerated individuals (Keeley, 2004:291). In addition, receiving higher education qualification makes finding employment easier, which decreases the criminal behaviour, and consequently reduces re-offending behaviour (Schirmer, 2008:25). However, Conrad & Cavros, (1981:13) argue that education to offenders is a privilege in most parts of the country, and the right of the offender to personal benefits not available to law-abiding citizens would have been regarded as strange by people in charge of the criminal justice system. Although the delivery of education programmes to incarcerated people is

a privilege in some countries, as mentioned earlier on, correctional education in South Africa is a constitutional right and should therefore be aligned to the country's education system.

It is evident therefore that “The constitutional imperative for schooling is not a right that is curtailed by incarceration, and between the Department of Education and the Department of Correctional Services in South Africa, literacy, schooling and basic adult education are priorities” (DCS, 2005:137). Within DCS, “the highlight of the new Constitution in post-apartheid South Africa is that for the first time it acknowledged the rights of offenders. Offenders’ rights are enshrined in the bill of rights along with the rights of other South African Citizens” (Rozani, 2010:1). Rehabilitation appears to be a right of the offender. Whilst the government has a right to punish for an offence, the offender has an equal right not to be disadvantaged by the experience of punishment (Robinson & Raynor, 2006:339). Therefore, any assessment of the success of specific programmes that lower offending behaviour, need to take into account the criminal aspirations of offenders at the time when they exit the correctional centre. The purpose of rehabilitation programmes is to turn bad people into good people or hardened criminals into law-abiding citizens (Matthews & Pitts, 1998:400).

In Serbia, just like in South Africa, “the legislation in criminal law that was passed in 2006 opened up opportunities for new solutions to many of the challenges in the field of correctional education. Equal opportunities policies allow the realization of guaranteed rights to all citizens in Serbia.” In terms of the Serbian law, “any offender has the right to primary and secondary education, which should be organized under the general regulations of the institution. Other aspects of education like vocational education for offenders should also be delivered by the institution. Furthermore, Article 111 of the Serbian law also states that the correctional centre administration can approve additional education for offenders, but costs for this are paid for by the offender.” (Jovanic, 2011:79).

Research reveals that correctional education assists in the rehabilitation of offenders, lowers recidivism rate, reduces crime and prepares offenders for reintegration in communities:

### ***1.2.1 Correctional education and rehabilitation***

Rehabilitation refers to a number of programmes which range from educational and vocational training to individual therapy and substance abuse counselling (Welch, 2008:1). Correctional centres are responsible for rehabilitation, punishment and incapacitation of criminal offenders. Education and training operating within most correctional centres are key components of the rehabilitation mission of correctional centres (Greenberg, Dunleavy & Kutner, 2008:27). “The United States of America’s Department of Justice, which oversees the Federal Bureau of Prisons, recognizes the importance of education as both an opportunity for offenders to improve their knowledge and skills and as a correctional management tool that encourages them to use their time in a constructive manner” (Tolbert, 2002:21). Literature reveals that offenders engaged in activities such as education are less likely to be riotous, plot escapes, or attempt to destabilize the system than offenders who are locked up in a cell the whole day with very little to do except give vent to their grievances against the system which put them there and the correctional staff who are then responsible for their containment (Ripley, 1993:9).

Research reveals that education can improve social psychological development through development of cognitive thinking. It is believed that involvement in education programmes can make a correctional centre a more tolerable experience, allowing offenders’ time in a structured and safer environment than the correctional centre court yard, therefore keeping them mentally and physically stimulated (O’Neill, Mackenzie & Bierie, 2007:314). Involvement in work and education programmes are believed to reduce problem behaviours within correctional centres by supplying constructive activities and tools that support positive behaviours (Wilson, Gallagher & Mackenzie, 2000:348). Keeping offenders active and engaged in meaningful activities during their incarceration results to the smooth running of a correctional centre. Correctional centre managers usually try to keep offenders busy through education programmes, working at menial jobs, or involved in some type of job training programme (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002:269).

With the increased numbers of offenders crowding correctional centres, the traditional view of incarceration by “locking them up and throwing away the key” needs to be reconsidered (Steurer & Smith, 2003:5). In agreement with this notion, Noad, (1998:88) asserts that “the lock them up, and throw the key away view is not in societies interests as offenders will always continue to be

part of the community.” Therefore the concept of caging offenders must be replaced with the concept of educating offenders and promoting literacy training for men in correctional institutions throughout the world (Forum on Corrections Research, 2011:7). Taking this view into consideration, “the South African Department of Correctional Services has adopted legislation that prioritizes rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.” (Rozani, 2010:4). “The objective of rehabilitation is to influence the offender to adopt a positive and appropriate norms and value system, alternative social interaction options, to develop life skills, social and employment-related skills, in order to equip him or her holistically and thus eliminate the tendency to return to crime” (DCS, 2005:20). There is sufficient scientific evidence that rehabilitation programmes have a positive effect in reducing recidivism particularly when programmes meet certain standards (Howells & Day, 1999:5). The rehabilitation of offenders therefore assists policy makers with a constructive opportunity to improve community safety (Howells & Day, 1999:6). However, Birgden, (2002:183) argues that rehabilitation becomes more effective only if offenders can see the value and benefits of participation, give consent and are motivated.

Literature reveals that education in a correctional centre can help the offender to adjustment to a custodial sentence. Incarceration results to life changes like isolation, institutionalization, reduced family contact, to mention a few. Participation in education, vocational training and library courses therefore can improve the offender’s quality of life during incarceration (Noad, 1998:88). According to the study conducted by Schimer, (2008:30) correctional officials had witnessed a change in behaviour between educated offenders and non-educated offenders. Correctional officials believe that tertiary education programmes provide offenders with goals, increase psychological well-being and keep them busy during the day, which decreases the chance of fights and other infractions and allows other students to be role models for other offenders. Furthermore, Noad, (1998:88) asserts that “education can assist the overriding purpose of security.” When offenders are kept busy through education, library study and recreation, they assist the purpose of security. Batchelder & Pippert, (2002:278) believe that if the offenders could remain engaged and kept busy during the day, the stress levels of the correctional officials could be reduced.

Successful rehabilitation is generally taken to mean that an offender will not return to crime when released. However, this may not be a realistic goal since the majority of offenders will need to change attitude, personality, behaviour and develop educational, vocational, social and living skills that will increase the likelihood that they can be successfully reintegrated in communities (Griffin, 2000:20). Therefore policymakers should consider ways to increase educational attainment, generate future economic growth, and reduce public expenditures, educational opportunities for incarcerated population should be a meaningful component of policy strategies (Gorgol & Sponsler, 2011:2).

### ***1.2.2 Correctional education and recidivism***

Literature reveals that offenders who acquire more education while incarcerated, have lower recidivism rates as compared to those who do not participate in educational programmes since education leads to stable lifestyle (Schirmer, 2008:30). Within the South African Department of Correctional Services, “provision of rehabilitation or correction service delivery focusing on human development and education and training for the youth is key to the prevention of recidivism.” (DCS, 2005:137). However, providing offenders with education has been a controversial issue, especially to tax-paying citizens. There are many conflicting opinions regarding whether society should focus on rehabilitation or merely punish offenders (Gordon & Weldon, 2003:200). Although there is sufficient evidence for the benefits of education, there are those who argue that correctional centres are for punishment therefore the taxpayer’s money should not be spent on educating offenders (Steurer, Linton, Nally & lockwood, 2010:41). Schirmer, (2008:32) affirms that correctional centres are places of punishment, but educational programmes can enhance offenders’ self-confidence that will contribute to stable lifestyles and reduce future crimes through programmatic support.

According to Burton, (1993:1) correctional education is one of many policies that can and should be used to reduce recidivism. “Recidivism is defined as a return to criminal offending after release from incarceration, re-arrest, re-conviction, and re-incarceration” (Steurer & Smith, 2003:12). Education therefore can reduce overcrowding since this is also important to the society (Burton, 1993:1). Furthermore, correctional centre education is effective and cost less than other recidivism-reducing programmes (Burton, 1993:2). Moreover, correctional education has a

potential to greatly reduce the costs associated with the destructive cycle of incarceration and re-incarceration (Mentor, 1994:2). Even little reductions in recidivism could reduce huge amounts of money than the cost of keeping offenders in correctional centres for longer periods of time (Mentor,1994:3).

Research reveals that recidivism rate in South African Correctional institutions is estimated to be more than 50% and this shows that offender rehabilitation in correctional centres is of limited success (Rozani, 2010:4). According to Dell’Apa, (1999:8) youth offenders in community schools and educational programmes in correctional institutions have generally not been provided an effective education. Correctional centres are by their very nature abnormal, and could destroy a person’s self-esteem. Education in a correctional centre therefore has a capacity of making this situation less abnormal, to limit somewhat the damage done to men and women through incarceration (Warner, 2005:1).

Although it cannot yet be determined the relationship between education and recidivism, there is increased evidence that acquiring higher levels of education reduces recidivism rate (O’Neill, Mackenzie & Bierie, 2007:314). Research suggests that educational programmes are one of the most effective tools in reducing recidivism rates (Brewster & Sharp, 2002:314). The survey conducted by Steurer & Smith, (2003:186) affirm that correctional education participants in Minnesota and Ohio had lower recidivism rates of re-arrest, reconviction, and re-incarceration than those who did not participate. Furthermore, education programmes could reduce recidivism and improve public safety for everyone. People who are no longer involved in crime are able to work in lawful jobs, become tax payers and support their families. After reviewing files of 238 ex-offenders of the Vienna correctional centre in Australia, the findings revealed that vocational training and education did improve post release ability to retain employment (Forum on Corrections Research, 2011:3). It is evident therefore that research reveals that recidivism rates decreases to those who participate in education (O’Neill, Mackenzie & Bierie, 2007:315). It is theorized that the majority of incarcerated individuals are in correctional centres because of a cognitive deficit. It follows, then, if offenders can cause a change to occur in the thinking patterns that brought them to correctional centres, the recidivism rate can be substantially lowered (Zaro, 2007:29). However, high recidivism rates show that efficient and effective



functioning for released offenders is not prioritized by correctional managers, since the majority of offenders do not receive an adequate education to change their attitudes before they are released back into society (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002:270).

### ***1.2.3 Correctional education and crime***

Correctional educators believe that education not only gives hope for their students but it also lowers the likelihood of future crime. Furthermore, “correctional educators have continued their efforts to convince the public and legislators of what they believe is a worthwhile contribution in the on-going battle to reduce the re-offending behaviour of incarcerated people to return to their homes, communities, and the workforce.” (Steurer & Smith, 2003:5).

Lochner & Moretti, (2001:3) argue that crime is bad with huge social costs, therefore if education reduces crime, then attending educational programmes have large social benefits that are not taken into account by the majority of people. Acquiring professional qualifications or finishing high school helps people to find employment and lowers offending behaviour (Jovanic, 2011:80). As indicated earlier on, due to the large social costs of crime, even small reductions in crime associated with education may be cost-effective (Lochner & Moreti, 2000:1). However, obtaining further education within the correctional centre does not mean that an offender will not commit crime again, but its absence escalates the risk and decreases the chances of quality reintegration of the offender after leaving the correctional centre (Jovanic, 2011:80). Offenders that make use of educational programming whilst incarcerated appear to have a higher success rate upon release (Hall, 1990:3).

Research has frequently affirmed that education prevents criminal behaviour, and offenders who realize their educational goals whilst incarcerated have reduced recidivism rates (Sarra & Olcott, 2007:69). It is believed that one of the most common ways to measure the effectiveness of correctional education programmes is based on the recidivism rates of participants. However, this method of measurement does not take into consideration that recidivism could be affected by a number of other factors, which are not education related (Jovanic, 2011:82). It is therefore important that the idea of offender rehabilitation by including educational opportunities, for successful social reintegration, should be continued, and that education should be modified to the

real needs of the learners (Jovanic, 2011:80). It is evident therefore that rehabilitation programmes should be tailor made to meet the type of offenders and requirements of the environment within which they will live (Birgden, 2002:183).

#### ***1.2.4 Correctional education and reintegration***

“Correctional environments are workplaces that embrace change and reform. Stakeholders such as policy makers, managers and administrators currently look for innovative ways to rehabilitate offenders and reintegrate them back into the communities, rather than incarcerating offenders to reduce harm to the community” (Hager & Johnson, 2007:1). Reintegration is a term that also has more practical connotations, meaning “attempts to involve offenders in networks of pro-social opportunities and relationships with the aim of helping them to achieve or maintain a non-offending lifestyle” (Robinson & Raynor, 2006:338). The purpose of providing education programmes for offenders is to improve education levels of those that are lacking the basic literacy skills to secure employment and increase their employment qualifications through tertiary education (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002:270).

The United States of America prison system was founded in the nineteenth century on the principle that Correctional Services could rehabilitate or correct offenders, in preparation for reintegration in communities (Liebowitz, Robins & Rubin, 2002:37). According to Wolford, (1986:4) “Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, colour or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any programme or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” In addition, Title IX of the education Amendments of 1971 states that “no person in the United States shall, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education programme or activity receiving federal financial assistance.” It is evident therefore that in the United States of America, offenders just like other citizens are entitled to benefit in any education programmes that receive financial assistance from the state.

Literature reveals that exposure to educational programmes is a critical issue in measures of effectiveness in reducing return to the correctional centre (Flanagan, 1994:7). Therefore collection of evidence on recidivism prior and after the establishment of standards for education

and vocational training programmes, can demonstrate the expected standards and impact for the common good as well as for the student (Semmens, 1998:33). The findings from the research conducted over the last two decades, reveal that offenders who are functionally illiterate upon entering the correctional centre may be successfully reintegrated to society if they participate in literacy programmes during incarceration (Forum on Corrections Research, 2011:1). Furthermore, the research conducted in Windham Correctional Centre in the United States of America revealed that offenders who spent more than 300 hours in Windham academic programmes had a 16,6 percent re-incarceration rate compared to a 25,0 percent of offenders with less than 100 hours in Windham academic programmes (Flanagan, 1994:7). Correctional education in this case advocates the use of re-incarceration rates to measure programmatic success (Schimer, 2008:25). In this instance, education helps in improving security, public safety and rehabilitation in Correctional Services (Steurer, Linton, Nally & lockwood, 2010:41).

Correctional education therefore enables offenders and equip them with skills for reintegration into society (Jovanic, 2011:79). It is believed that opportunities for personal growth and development will assist them to be positive, therefore education, both vocational and academic is for this purpose (Bhatti, 2010:32). According to Noad, (1998:88) correctional education should be added as an essential element of correctional centre management. It is believed that acquiring skills and changing attitudes can assist offenders build a better life on release and this could result in securing employment on release. This objective is to change offenders' offending behaviour, and prepare them for reintegration as better people. Steurer, et al, (2010:42) believe that granting parole to offenders based on educational achievement while incarcerated will assist them to return to communities as law-abiding citizens.

The findings from one of the first reports in the Serious and Violent Offender Re-entry Initiative evaluation revealed that “94 percent of state and federal offenders interviewed prior to release identified education as a personal re-entry need” (Steurer, et al, 2010:41). Literature reveals that there is a strong relationship between employment and crime prevention. There is sufficient evidence that shows that employment decreases the criminal behaviour (Jones, 1998:134). In addition, employment has a positive impact on behaviour and attitudes of young offenders. Burton, (1993:10) concurs that correctional centre education can provide a vital service for

incarcerated people. These people need help in attaining the competence that is required to succeed in life outside the correctional centre. Education helps compulsory school-going age juvenile offenders to participate in their local communities in a positive manner and acquire the social and academic skills required to compete in the job market (Zan, 1998:126). Literature reveals that for youth offenders, finding employment plays an important role in integrating them back into the community and reduces the criminal behaviour (Jones, 1998:133).

Research reveals that in the United States of America, about 700,000 offenders released annually do not have skills to meet the challenges of re-entering society. The majority of offenders released each year return within three years of leaving the correctional centre, in most cases, they are re-incarcerated since they lack marketable skills. In addition, offenders have a criminal record that makes them unable to find employment in many occupations, and therefore it becomes difficult to make adjustments in communities (U.S. Department of Education, 2009:1). In Swaziland, just like in many African countries, youth unemployment is very high; as a result most companies do not employ ex-offenders due to a criminal record. A stigma or label has been put on them. Another factor, with ex-offenders is a lack of skills. Literature reveals that in Nigeria ex-offenders can only engage in self-employment since it is the policy of government that they cannot be offered employment in government service (Imhabekhai, 2002:6). However, Biswalo, (2011:80) maintains that it is necessary that communities should be sensitized about what happens in the Correctional Services institutions so that offenders' services are utilized after release. It is believed that when offenders do not re-offend, the correctional educational programmes produce a national savings of hundreds of million dollars per year (Vacca, 2004:298).

### **1.3 Rationale/Statement of purpose**

The interest in this study was generated by the experience of the researcher since starting to work in the Department of Correctional Services. The researcher observed during monitoring and evaluation visits at the correctional centres that the environment appears not to be conducive for teaching and learning. The learners that are taught are youth offenders who are in conflict with the law. The educators teach in the presence of correctional officials and their morale seems to be very low. Unlike other educators in the Department of Education they have to wear uniform.

There are no proper staff rooms where educators have to do their preparations and marking. Educators use dining halls, cells, corridors and visiting areas as classrooms. Whilst educators are rendering classes, other offenders move up and down the corridors without supervision. In some instances searching of the offenders is performed whilst classes are in progress. The researcher also witnessed an incident where two offenders were caught with dagga and had to be turned away from the examination room. The aforementioned incidents and observations prompted the researcher to investigate and explore educators' experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. Literature affirms that identifying a rationale consists of specifying an issue to study, developing justifications for studying it and suggesting the importance of the study for select audiences (Creswell, 2008:8).

## **1.4 Research questions**

### **a) Main question**

- i) What are the educators' experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment?

### **b) Sub-questions**

- i) How is a full-time school managed within a Correctional Services environment?
- ii) How does a Correctional Services environment affect teaching and learning process in a full-time school?
- iii) What are the educators' perceptions with regard to using education as a crime control strategy or rehabilitation tool for offenders within a Correctional Services environment?

## **1.5 Significance of the study**

The findings from this research:

- i) Could assist the Department of Correctional Services in addressing some of the identified challenges and therefore help in the rehabilitation of offenders by improving literacy levels of all incarcerated people in the country in preparation for reintegration in communities. Schirmer, (2008:32) asserts that correctional education programmes assist

offenders with the tools they need to communicate with others, think critically and respect themselves and other people, and assess their actions rationally.

- ii) Since this full-time school has been producing excellent grade 12 results within DCS, the findings from this study could also be utilized as a benchmark to help other full-time schools in improving grade 12 results thus contribute in the rehabilitation of offenders.
- iii) This research could also make an important contribution in the field of education. Thomson & Walker, (2009:296) assert that when knowledge is produced by researchers, it is accorded respect or formal academic recognition as a contribution to professional knowledge and not only to professional development.

## **1.6 Theoretical framework**

This study is based on criminal justice theory. Bernard & Engel, (2001:2) maintain that the simplest and most straight forward way to organize theory in criminal justice is to classify it by component of the criminal justice system. Therefore criminal justice theory is divided into police, courts and corrections. This theory therefore seems to be relevant to this study as it is undertaken in corrections. Theory forms knowledge and enables scholarly argument. The idea is not to be overtaken by theory but to locate oneself with confidence within a theoretical landscape appropriate to the study (Thomson & Walker, 2009:28).

According to Kraska, (2006:168) a criminal justice theory involves an organized and usable collection of frameworks that are relevant to criminal justice and crime control phenomena. Furthermore, criminal justice theory explains behaviour of criminal justice policy, agency behaviour, practitioners and organizational decision-making (Kraska, 2006:172). The objective of this study is to understand the educators' experience in the use of education as crime control phenomena within a correctional environment. This study has been influenced by Braithwaite's theory of restorative justice as crime control phenomena. In the context of Braithwaite's theory, the community's judgment does not result to pain or punishment but is intended to perform an educative and re-integrative function. Aligning with this view, this study seeks to investigate and explore the use of education in a full-time school within a correctional environment, as a rehabilitation tool to offenders in preparation for reintegration in communities.

According to Robinson & Shapland, (2008:337), Braithwaite's theory of restorative justice is different from other justice crime control methods like retribution, deterrence, rehabilitation and incapacitation. The focus of this study therefore is on the rehabilitation of offenders through education as one of the justice crime control strategies within a correctional centre. Rozani, (2010:1) affirms that rehabilitation, equips offenders with skills that assist them to find jobs so that they are able to support their families financially after release.

Moreover, Bernard & Engel, (2001:4) classify criminal justice theories into two groups: dependent variables, and independent variables. He further divides dependent variables into three broad types as follows:

- i) Behaviour of criminal justice organizations: The behaviour of police officers, courtroom officials, correctional officers.
- ii) The behaviour of criminal organizations: Behaviour of police departments, court organizations and correctional organizations.
- iii) Criminal justice system and its components: Police killings, tough sentences and incarceration rates.

Based on Bernard & Engel's view, this study is aligned with the first two types of dependent variables in criminal justice theory as it seeks to investigate the experiences of educators in managing education as a crime control phenomena within a correctional setting. Kraska, (2006:168) concurs that criminal justice and crime control model examines crime control phenomena in detail and the behaviour of crime practitioners. In the context of this study, the crime control model in criminal justice theory seems to be relevant as this is a detailed study of one full-time school where education is utilized as a crime control phenomena within a correctional environment. Laird & Chavez, (2005:2) affirm that education can decrease recidivism. This view is in line with the Welfarists view that sees criminal justice as an agent for improving the condition of offenders under its control through the utilization of behaviourist methods (Duffee, 1980:1). According to Behaviourists, "the only way to sway the nature and extent of crime, is to classify the forces that are causally linked to criminal motivation, eradicate or alter those forces, and thus change behaviour" (O'Shea, 2007:289). In line with this view, this

study seeks to investigate and explore educators' experience in managing a full- time school within a Correctional Services environment.

## **1.7 Limitation of study**

This study was conducted within the South African Department of Correctional Services. DCS is a security environment, therefore before an application to conduct research is considered by the Research Ethics Committee, Ethical Clearance Certificate from the institution to which one is registered should be attached. In this instance, the researcher encountered a challenge, since only the research approval letter from the University of Pretoria was available at the time. Literature affirms that constraints beyond the control of the researcher that may have to do with access to research venues, limits on sample size, ethical constraints but known to influence the objects of the enquiry should be outlined (Murray & Lawrence, 2000:48).

## **1.8 Delimitation**

This study was conducted in a full-time school within the Department of Correctional Services in the Republic of South Africa. The full-time school is situated inside the correctional centre within DCS. The correctional centre is housing sentenced male youth offenders between the ages of 14-21 years of age. The present study therefore was confined to one full-time school within DCS focusing on formal education programmes. Literature concurs that “delimitation means that the study is ring fenced or controlled on a scope that is determined by the researcher. It usually includes considerations of time available for fieldwork, systematic exclusion of extraneous, resource-related issues, and so on” (Murray & Lawrence, 2000:48).

## **1.9 Overview of chapters**

### **Chapter 1: An overview of the study**

This chapter gives a background on correctional education, rationale, statement of purpose, research questions, significance of study, theoretical framework, limitation of the study, delimitations, and the overview of chapters. It highlights the fact that correctional education plays a significant role in the rehabilitation of offenders, reduction of recidivism rate, reduction of criminal behaviour and preparation of offenders for reintegration in communities.



## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

Literature review provides the context for understanding a research problem. The main purpose of a literature review is to connect the researcher's problem with knowledge in the problem area (Sowell, 2001:31). In supporting this notion, in this chapter, views of other scholars in as far as educators' experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment are explored. Literature reveals that the correctional environment is not good for teaching and learning. In a correctional environment, education is secondary to security. The environment makes teaching and learning difficult since classes are dynamic in nature. Learner offenders are moved from one correctional centre to another to alleviate overcrowding. Other offenders do not attend classes due to medical reasons, court cases or other reasons that are beyond their control. It is very difficult to implement certain curriculum subjects that need laboratories like physical science due to security risk and the shortage of qualified educators. In a correctional environment there is also a high shortage of classrooms, textbooks, computers and other learning materials like stationery and pens.

## **Chapter 3: Methodology**

In this chapter, an in-depth report on the research design, research method, sampling, data collection instruments; one on one semi-structured interviews and document analysis, data analysis, ethical considerations and trustworthiness are discussed.

## **Chapter 4: The delivery of formal education within the Department of Correctional Services in the Republic of South Africa**

This chapter, outlines a brief background of formal education during the Apartheid era until the introduction of the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998. Different formal education programmes and objectives are outlined. It points the fact that correctional education under apartheid government was not co-ordinated since the focus was on punishment and hard labour. When the new South African government came into power, Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 was introduced and offender rehabilitation was prioritized within DCS. This chapter

highlights that education programmes within DCS are needs based, participation of offenders in education programmes is voluntarily and all education programmes are aligned to the country's education system.

## **Chapter 5: Findings**

This chapter outlines and discuss research findings in themes. The objective of this chapter is to give answers to research questions. This chapter outlines the following major findings of the study:

Correctional environment is not suitable for teaching and learning due to more focus on security than education. The findings in this study revealed that gaining access to the correctional centre is difficult due to security measures, as a result the volunteer educator arrives late at the school for tuition. It was also reported that bureaucracy seems to be a problem since any request for approval has to go through several people before permission is granted. It was revealed that this delay affects teaching and learning since the school principal is unable to purchase school textbooks without approval from correctional centre management. However, in this study, all respondents perceived education as a best tool for rehabilitation in a correctional environment since it can be measurable.

## **Chapter 6: Recommendations and conclusions**

This chapter outlines recommendations and conclusions, based on the findings in this study.

### **1.10 Conclusion**

In this chapter, an overview of the study was given. A background on correctional education and the rationale was outlined. The problem and the theoretical framework were formulated. The significance of study, delimitations, limitations, ethical considerations, trustworthiness and the overview of chapters were presented. The subsequent chapter outlines literature on experiences and findings of different scholars, pertaining managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment as derived from literature.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline and discuss the experience of managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment as derived from literature. Literature on correctional educational programmes is not extensive, but it is growing and acknowledged (O'Neill, Mackenzie & Bierie, 2007:315).

“The Department of Correctional Services is the state’s agency for rendering the tertiary and final level of correction to offenders within Correctional Centres” (DCS, 2005:97). DCS therefore is utilizing education as a rehabilitation tool for offenders or inmates. “The word offender or inmate refers to a person, whether convicted or not, who is detained in custody in any correctional centre or who is being transferred in custody or is en route from one correctional centre to another correctional centre ...” (DCS, 2008:4).

“Correction and development of offenders to reduce recidivism is prioritized within the Department of Correctional Services. Correction is the provisioning of services and programmes aimed at correcting the offending behaviour of sentenced offenders in order to rehabilitate them” (DCS, 2008:4). “Development refers to the provisioning of services and programmes aimed at developing and enhancing competencies and skills that will enable the sentenced offender to reintegrate into the community and reduce recidivism.” (DCS, 2008:4). As indicated earlier on, “recidivism is the return of an individual to criminal behaviour after he or she has been convicted of a prior offense, sentenced and presumably corrected within correctional centres” (Schirmer, 2008:25). In this study, literature with regard to managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment will be discussed under the following sub-headings:

The status of teaching and learning in correctional centres, teaching in correctional centres: problems, learners in correctional centres: profile and academic needs, challenges and prospects, resources for education in correctional centres, curriculum and correctional education and employment opportunities.

## 2.2 The status of teaching and learning in correctional centres

Rehabilitative environment covers all aspects of correctional environment, including regimes, programmes and correctional centre culture. Synergy between these different facets must be established and exploited in order to maximize the potential for successful rehabilitation (Griffin, 2000:20). According to Gordon & Weldon, (2003:201) the concept of rehabilitation has been rooted in the notion that if enough rehabilitative services are provided, the number of repeat offenders will be minimized. It refers to the result of “a process that combines the correction of offending behaviour, human development and the promotion of social responsibility and values” (DCS, 2005:71).

Education that is valuable and necessary to learners’ needs within the correctional institution is not easy. The correctional centre environment is unique, focus is on lockdowns and head counts and this makes teaching and learning difficult (Watts, 2010:57). “A correctional centre is any place established under the Correctional Services Act as a place for the reception, detention, confinement, training or treatment of persons liable to detention in custody or to placement under protective custody, and all land, outbuildings and premises adjacent to any such place and used in connection therewith and all land, branches, outstations, camps, buildings, premises or places to which any such persons have been sent for the purpose of incarceration, detention, protection, labour and treatment” (DCS, 2008:4). Certainly, correctional centre schools are situated in a culture that is hostile to education (Wright & Gehring, 2008:257). The environment “is not conducive to concentrating, and different student population with varying educational needs and motivation levels, too few spaces for the number of offenders who would benefit from education, and limited resources for educators” (O’Neill, Mackenzie & Bierie, 2007:312).

Correctional centres are bureaucratic institutions such that there are always a number of factors that can potentially encourage or impede education programme success (Sanford & Foster, 2006:604). Correctional centre management styles could also contribute to the culture in which teaching and learning takes place (Matthews & Pitts, 2006:402). Correctional centre culture can be very different in different facilities, or even in different parts of a single facility. For instance, some correctional centres may not offer offender educational programmes. Some correctional centre management may differ in degrees of support especially if education is a threat to security

(Mentor, 1994:4). The findings from the research conducted by Parrota & Thompson, (2011:168) reveal that in one correctional centre, management refused student and facilitator interactions before and after tuition time.

Research reveals that the correctional environment does not encourage learning since there are numerous lockdowns, headcounts and hearings that disturb the teaching and learning process (Schirmer, 2008:29). These headcounts “could take more or less time depending on the circumstances of the particular day, and in the event that an inmate is missing, the correctional centre goes on a lockdown and completes an emergency count to determine the missing inmate or inmate identities” (Sanford & Forster, 2006:606). Correctional officials sometimes disrupt classes to do head counts, fire drills and lockdowns. “Their intrusions into classrooms disrupts the interaction order and undermines efforts to create a democratic classroom” (Parrota & Thompson, 2011:171). According to O’Neill, Mackenzie & Bierie, (2007:313) drill instructors who manage daily routines prioritize drill, ceremony and obedience to authority more than education. The lack of support, and more emphasis on punishment than rehabilitation, marginalizes education in a correctional environment, as a result it is seen by some as not necessary (Watts, 2010:57). “In most cases, facilities may also go on lockdown unpredictably for other reasons, such as when a fight breaks out, when the facility conducts a surprise drug sweep through the housing units, or when external medical care is required for an offender and an ambulance must enter and exit the facility” (Sanford & Forster, 2006:606).

In correctional centres, due to security measures, access of visitors becomes difficult due to heavily monitored protocols that is applicable to official and all types of visitors (Watts, 2010:59). “Communication is distorted in correctional centre schools, contested terrains where power, authority, knowledge and identities are constantly negotiated” (Wright & Gehring, 2008:257). Entering a correctional centre for tuition purposes becomes a challenge, especially at high security correctional centres. Right of entry often requires waiting for a long time at the reception areas, checking of identity documents, blocking of cell phones and contact with the education section within the correctional centre (Watts, 2010:59). In a correctional environment, there are a number of areas or places where a decision is taken to promote or inhibit education programmes. There is no official and practical support to education delivery except a number of

obstacles like, if there is no official approval for an instructor or volunteer educator to enter the facility, there will be no clearance for that person to enter the first gate into the institution (Sanford & Foster, 2006:604). Literature reveals that one Open University tutor, experienced entering a high-security correctional centre over a period of three years characterized by different levels of mistrust on the side of correctional officials. “The requirement to be personally searched and the contents of the bag scrutinized were rigorously enforced. This also included careful inspection of the teaching materials and sometimes questioned about earlier visits and the progress of the students” (Watts, 2010:59).

For participation in education programmes to be promoted and strictly enforced by correctional officials, education programmes need to have strong and continuous support from the correctional officials and correctional centre managers (Tolbert, 2002:12). According to Conrad & Cavros, (1981:20) many educators report that correctional officials resent educational opportunities given to offenders. Sanford & Foster, (2006:602) contend that without correctional officials’ support, suitable classroom and space scheduling education programmes will not take place. In summary, without the support of the Department of Correctional Services, there will be no education programme.

As indicated earlier on, education programmes depend on the collaboration and support of correctional officials who fetch offenders out of their housing units and monitor classroom activities along with performing a number of other activities (Tolbert, 2002:12). It is believed that the attitude of correctional officials and conduct can either encourage or hinder the success of the Department of Correctional Services’ role of rehabilitation and correcting offending behaviour (Rozani, 2010:2). There is some supporting anecdotal evidence and the repeated claims from educators that correctional centre management and correctional officials are antagonistic to education (Semmens, 1998:34). In a study conducted by Watts, (2010:59) one educator testified that one feature of this strange environment is generally lack of co-operation and negative attitudes of correctional officials, this implies that education, particularly, tertiary education, may not be seen as a rightful activity for offenders. For example, “to be told to wait whilst the correctional official attended to something else or being ignored when asking a question affirms the negative or indifferent behaviour of correctional officials.” Contrary to this

view, Rozani, (2010:5) maintains that generally, correctional officials have a positive attitude towards rehabilitation and humane treatment of offenders.

In a correctional centre, offenders should have permission to withdraw from their jobs or housing units for class attendance. In most cases learners may be unable to attend classes or orientation periods, particularly when the facility verifies that all offenders are accounted for (Sanford & Foster, 2006:602). Correctional educators face a number of obstacles in the correctional institution, such as lack of access to technology, unfriendly correctional officials and lockdowns (Parrota & Thompson, 2011:166). Correctional educators, unlike educators who teach adults in communities or in full-time schools, they should adjust to work within an environment where lock downs, head counts, meetings with lawyers, and hearings frequently disturb classroom tuition (Tolbert, 2002:19). “Interactions in the classrooms are frequently conditioned by the presence or absence of correctional officials and proved to be a challenge to educators’ pedagogical approach” (Parrota & Thompson, 2011:170). Due to a number of challenges in the teaching-learning environment, occasionally, it becomes necessary to change lesson plans, taking into consideration surveillance aspects ensuring that the learners are not compromised during tuition time (Watts, 2010:60). “In fact, a critical part of establishing a democratic environment and interaction order of classrooms is imposed by correctional centre management. This included the negotiation of modes of communication, the arrangement of classroom furniture, and the ways in which students and teachers addressed one another” (Parrota & Thompson, 2011:168). The most difficult part, is that offenders, themselves, may not attend class tuition due to doctor’s appointments or disciplinary matters (Sanford & Foster, 2006:607).

In a correctional centre, classes are dynamic in nature, with learners entering and leaving programmes due to court commitments, institutional transfers, parole, and reassignments (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:130). Sometimes, although the school wants to enrol students, competition may exist between work, education, and behaviour programmes for the offenders’ time. Consequently, correctional centre management has to work out a plan to attract more learners for education programmes (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002:271). Sometimes, new offenders may be sent to the correctional centre school in the middle of the school term and this would mean that

educators would not have sufficient time to complete the syllabus to help these offenders prepare for the national examinations (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:135).

### ***2.2.1 Teaching and learning in correctional centres: problems, challenges and prospects***

“The correctional environment does not promote academic success. In correctional centres there is a lot of noise and free movement of sound. Offenders talk, sing, and express themselves for 24 hours and correctional officials instruct orders around throughout, public address systems disturb routinely, security gates ring, and televisions blare continuously” (Sanford & Foster, 2006:607). The findings from the research conducted by Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:135) at Kaki Bukit Centre (KBC) in Singapore, affirm that offenders indicated a lack of quiet place for studying (31%), a lack of a suitable place to study after school hours (29%) and a lack of space for group work (13%).

In most cases, correctional centres are too crowded for correctional officials to determine each offender’s needs and devise individual programme tailored to the conditions of each offender in preparation for reintegration in communities (Steinberg, 2005:16). Furthermore, students do not have quiet time to focus on their homework and study material. Moreover, there is insufficient infrastructure to finish work; cells are restricting and in most cases are shared with one or a number of roommates. In bigger housing units, there are bunk beds that are arranged with footlockers at the bases, but there is insufficient space for desks or tables for homework (Sanford & Foster, 2006:607). A designated area for private study after school hours planned as a reading room for individual work and group discussions, with proper security in place could give offenders more time to focus on their studies. If possible, the study area could be equipped with computers, printers and reference materials like dictionaries and encyclopaedias (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:142).

Overcrowding has also reached alarming proportions in South African correctional centres and makes it difficult for the Department of Correctional Services to provide any meaningful rehabilitation to offenders (Ntsohi, 2005:3). Overcrowding does not only pose a threat to physical and human resources, but also sacrifices the fundamental processes of health provision



and the rehabilitation of offenders within the correctional centres (Sithole, 2008:1). Steinberg, (2005:10 ) affirms that there is correlation between correctional centre numbers and the ability of the correctional centre management to perform its primary constitutional duties, managing programmes aimed at the rehabilitation of offenders. According to Watts, (2010:60) one of the educators revealed that for a number of teaching sessions presented with a student serving a life sentence for murder, his cell was the only space for teaching, while teaching lessons were conducted with the door open, a correctional official was standing outside doing guard duty. This teaching space was too small and messy, and it was difficult to settle down to teaching. The presence of the toilet in the far corner of the cell always reminded the educator that “this a living and sleeping space” that was not meant for teaching and learning. “Correctional educators therefore are challenged to bring inquiry and learning to places mainly designed for custody and control” (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:130).

Literature reveals that the oversight of learning environment issues in correctional education is for political reasons, refusing to confront correctional managers with the reality that correctional environment is not suitable for teaching and learning (Semmens, 1998:33). “To maintain order within the correctional setting dehumanizes the offenders such that recognizing their feelings under the setting defined by the institution is not permitted. This is further complicated in a women’s facility, where because of the prevalence of sexual assaults that have occurred in women’s correctional centres, most of the times by correctional officials, interacting with students as feeling persons is not permitted” (Parrota & Thompson, 2011:173). In addition, the trend of surveillance is the prevailing feature in the correctional environment, as a result everyone is watching one another (Watts, 2010:59). According to Parrota & Thompson, (2011:169) in the United States of America, educators are notified during Prison Rape Elimination Act induction that they should not reveal any personal information about themselves to learners. This meant that close relationships with students are strictly forbidden.

According to Steinberg, (2005:7) overcrowding results in declining correctional centre conditions, it is evident therefore that youth offenders leaving correctional centres are likely to return to crime than they would have been if they had been incarcerated in humane correctional centre conditions. Harr, (1999:52) affirms that although there are a number of educational and career programmes available to offenders, re-offending rate remains high. The correctional

environment has a negative impact to offenders as a result it is considered as one of key factors that escalates recidivism numbers. “Recidivism is an unstable measure that is calculated by different researchers in varied methods. Generally, it refers to one or a mixture of four different measures like re-arrest rate, reconviction rate, readmission rate, and reoffending rate” (Matthews & Pitts, 1998:398).

It appears therefore that overcrowding may also have a negative impact in the rendering of education programmes within the correctional environment due to insufficient resources. Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:142) maintain that an annual, independent programme evaluation should be conducted by educational consultants who are familiar with correctional education. This programme evaluation would help correctional centre schools to continue to improve the quality of existing educational programmes and services, as well as develop new programmes to meet the needs of both offenders and educators.

The admission in the correctional centre is a difficult transition for offenders. The nature of this situation is related to an accurate assessment of the offender population. The stress and depression associated with this difficult life change interferes with cognitive functioning (Piccone, 2006:247). According to Watts, (2010:62) participation in education programmes to obtain qualifications is not an immediate priority for offenders who have to go through some traumatic effects of being incarcerated such as isolation, separation from family and friends, bullying and court appearances. As a result the majority of school-going offenders dislike school and have difficulty in attending classes and have obedient social behaviour (Zan, 1998:127). Another factor that results to non-attendance of classes is that some are attending behaviour management courses to deal with frustrations of not being able to control angry outbursts. “Until students are safe to return to classes and to other activities they have to attend to behaviour management courses” (Bhatti, 2010:35).

Literature reveals that as soon as students begin to regularly attend classes in a correctional centre, they exhibit a number of learning deficiencies such as deep trauma, including addictions to crack cocaine (Lasevoli, 2007:20). Others have major criminal histories, unbalanced or severely damaged family relationships and may have been previously incarcerated, alternative care or substance abuse (Jones, 1998:137). According to Sarra & Olcott, (2007:70) “the majority

of student inmates demonstrate a broad range of abilities and learning styles. It takes years for some to raise their reading and mathematics levels to qualify for the General Education Diploma (GED) exam, but others make startling progress.”

Research reveals that the largest proportion of young and adult offenders are likely to have been in the correctional centre more than once and have very poor education and employment histories. It is believed that less than 7% of them have completed secondary school prior to incarceration, around 70% are likely to have been unemployed (Penaluna, 1998:197). Literature reveals that the level of education received before incarceration becomes a barrier to tertiary correctional education because most offenders have not completed high school or equivalent qualification (Schimer, 2008:25). “Many offenders lack motivation and there is a prevalence of individuals with learning disabilities” (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:130). However, Manger, Eikeland, Diseth, Hetland & Asbjornsen, (2010:538) believe that lack of education before incarceration may be one of the factors that motivate some offenders to think about furthering their studies in correctional centres, while language problems, cultural distance, and lack of basic education and knowledge can hamper participation in correctional education. This results in few learners attending classes and whilst in class they are not really listening, instead, they would be sleeping and unproductive. According to Lasevoli, (2007:21) other students come into classes depressed about their cases, Legal Aid representatives, girlfriends or newborn children. School becomes a distraction to these students. However, the correctional facility provides a controlled educational setting for offenders, some are motivated students. Other students in these programmes demonstrate a wide range of potential and have had different educational experiences (Lasevoli, 2007:21).

Literature reveals that correctional centre management and peer pressure can reinforce, challenge or destroy offenders’ self-image and future aspirations (Bhatti, 2010:31). However, Mentor, (1994:3) argues that offenders who lack education could also change their motivation during ideal correctional environment relations. It is believed that for offenders who in one way or another are forced to attend education programmes, a positive school experience or a favourable school performance and conditions in the correctional centre could encourage them to further their studies. Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:131) argue that administrators and educators in the

correctional setting may have the best of intentions when developing and implementing programmes that may help students improve learning, but if these programmes are not perceived by offenders as helpful, relevant, and respectful, they often are not considered as successful.

As mentioned earlier on, learners would be present because they were forced to be in the education programme (Wright, 2004:198). However, long-established methods that dealt with compulsory school-going age juvenile offenders who refuse to participate in education programmes did not succeed. These methods entailed prosecution and suspension from school resulting in truancy, removing difficult students from school (Zan, 1998:131). Furthermore, if any individual correctional official has a problem with an education programme, the learner will be forbidden to leave the housing unit to attend classes (Sanford & Foster, 2006:605). Moreover, during tuition time, learners may be taken out of class by correctional officials for reasons that are beyond for both the student and the teachers' control (Sanford & Foster, 2006:606). In most cases, offenders are also moved among correctional centres to ease overcrowding, disturbing individual school attendance and tertiary education programmes, especially if an inmate's new correctional centre does not offer educational classes or tertiary programmes (Schirmer, 2008:29). "Offenders are transferred often, and turnover is high" (Shethar, 1993:359).

The findings from the research conducted by Sanford & Foster, (2006:607) reveal that, in the United states of America, in a State with more than one state correctional centre, offenders are even transferred to other correctional centres without their permission and sometimes given hours or days notice. In these transfers, they are moved to correctional centres that have no similar educational or vocational programme. Furthermore, Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:139) affirm that sometimes new inmates are transferred to Kaki Bukit Centre in the middle of the school year and have to take examinations within a short period of time. Moreover, for reasons that are beyond the correctional centres' control, other offenders may be moved to half-way houses or intensive supervision programmes prematurely. For example, one educator discovered her class size cut in half when a new half-way house was opened. As a result all those learner - inmates did not finish their coursework to earn credits.

As indicated earlier on, offenders are released from the correctional centre whilst participating in educational and vocational programmes. In other words, one out of seven offenders enrolled in an educational or vocational programme exit the institution before obtaining a qualification. The decision to release offenders is an administrative one beyond the control of classification personnel and correctional educators (Flanagan, 1994: 28). However, offenders who commit an offence while attending correctional centre school, may be transferred out of school. In some instances, communication between educators and correctional officials regarding transfer of inmates could be addressed (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:139).

The research conducted by Court Alternative Program of Education at Arizona, in the United States of America reveals that the challenge encountered in the institution was the admission of a number of offenders on a daily basis. The duration for any offender is about 14 days. It became difficult therefore to implement traditional core academic subjects to the constantly changing student populations. It was also revealed that educators were assigned to a unit that housed twenty students and on daily basis they would find two or three new learners and two to three absent learners that had left the correctional institution (Jones, 2005:1). The findings from the research conducted by Parrota & Thompson, (2011:166) affirm that one educator testified that when the new semester started in the men's correctional centre, seventeen male students were enrolled, but in the middle of the semester a number of them were moved to different correctional centres or released and only nine remained during the course of the semester. According to Tam, et al, (2007:139) the length of student's stay in a correctional centre is determined by the courts, not by the academic needs. Students are likely to be moved from the facility without notice, and many sometimes miss a substantial part of school tuition while they attend court. Sharma, (2010:331) reiterates that the majority of learners at the correctional centre change on a weekly basis since they may be admitted or leave the correctional centre as mandated by the court system.

### **2.3 Learners in correctional centres: profile and academic needs**

In the United States of America, offenders entering a State correctional centre differ in background in social and educational level, from functionally illiterate to a college graduate or higher (Hall, 1990:3). The findings from the research conducted by Burton, (1993:14) reveal that

the majority of correctional centres are filled with offenders who are members of the most illiterate class of the society. “About 19% of all adult offenders are absolutely illiterate and another 40% are functionally illiterate.” Shethar, (1993:358) affirms that lack of education among offenders is very high based on state records. Moreover, the United States of America’s offenders “have consistently tested at the lowest levels of educational achievement, and at the highest levels of illiteracy and educational disability of any segment in society.” More than half of the adults in the United States of America’s correctional centres have below an eighth grade education, and have difficulty in reading or writing effectively (Burton, 1993:7).

The majority of juvenile offenders have not completed their high school education in the United States of America (Woolard, Odger, Lanza-Kaduce & Daglis, 2005:12). Over two-thirds of offenders have not finished high school (Penny, 2000:123). According to McCann, McCormick, Delcourt & Preston, (2005:5), the majority of offenders in the juvenile justice system have experienced periods of school elimination and do not have basic numeracy, oral, literacy and social skills. Offenders’ academic needs are intense indeed, they seem overwhelming. Some enter the correctional centre school with merely a little grasp of alphabet sounds, others have never added up more than single digit sums (Lasevoli, 2007:21). “In summary, the overall picture that emerges from surveys is that offenders are undereducated class compared to the community and have lower literacy skills to handle everyday tasks they may confront” (Gaes, 2008:3). The possible solution would be to choose education instead of incarceration programmes for offenders from the age of 18 to 25 years, this will give them solid education and career opportunities to substitute the school of anger and criminal behaviour they acquire inside the correctional centre (Harr, 1999:52). “Offenders that are engaged in activities such as education are less likely to be riotous, plot escapes, or attempt to subvert the system than offenders who are locked up three to a cell for the whole day with very little to do except give vent to their grievances against the system which put them there and the correctional officials who are then responsible for their containment” (Ripley, 1993:9).

Most offenders are educationally behind their age group. The number of those who cannot read and write or who are educationally retarded is enormous (Dell’Apa, 1999:9). The majority of them have serious educational deficits (Conrad & Cavros, 1981:1). “Learners come to the

classroom carrying official labels given to them by the public schools they had previously attended, such as reading disabled, dyslexic, academically challenged, slow learners, at-risk, incorrigible, emotional disturbed, behaviourally challenged, promiscuous, deviant, abnormal, different, and delinquent” (Sharma, 2010:331). Furthermore, many offenders are incarcerated before receiving a second chance in education. They could not cope with education since their own parents could not read or write or else educators were not interested in teaching them the easy ways like their friends (Bhatti, 2010:33). Offenders come to school with inadequate skills, difficulty in learning, and a number of behaviour problems. The majority of them have no confidence in their potential to achieve academically, whilst some are unable to read (Sarra & Olcott, 2007:69).

Although correctional educational programmes exist, they are often ineffective because of poor programme development, lack of administrative support, or small numbers of offenders served. Furthermore, the majority of these offenders share a disabling characteristic such as a serious educational deficit (Conrad & Cavros, 1981:7). As a result, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, offenders are compelled to take the test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) on admission to the correctional centre. This test plays an important role in deciding an offender’s educational programming while incarcerated. However, anxiety and depression may impair offenders’ ability to accurately complete their assessments (Piccone, 2006:239). Literature reveals that at placement, juvenile students display a range of disabilities that have been estimated to be three to nine times more of the national average (Keeley, 2005:6).

High rates of mental disorder have consistently been found in correctional centre populations. A recent correctional centre mental health survey reveal that offenders are more likely than the general population to have illnesses like psychotic illness, major depression, and personality disorder (Butler, Allnut, Kariminia & Cain, 2007:429). It has also been discovered that very few offenders obtain high quality treatment or programming while incarcerated due to physical, mental health, and substance abuse problems (Mears & Travis, 2004:3). It is evident therefore that due to the prevalence of mental illness, studying becomes a barrier to the majority of offenders.



Literature reveals that low literacy is prevalent in correctional centres, and “the percentage of offenders with learning disabilities is estimated to be higher than in the general adult population” (Tolbert, 2002:1). The results from the research conducted by the American National Council on Disability reveal that approximately “12% of incarcerated juvenile offenders are mentally retarded, and approximately 36% suffer from some type of learning disability” (Mears & Travis, 2004:12). Moreover, an ethnographic study conducted in one of the training schools of young offenders in the United States of America reveals that most of the offenders “were severely behind academically but their time inside the institution forced them to attend school. After completing a diploma or General Education Diploma (GED), their opportunities for formal education essentially ended” (Inderbitzin, 2006:16). “The number of mentally ill inmates has also increased since 1990 due to de-institutionalization. In 2000, an estimated 191,000 or 16,2 % of state offenders were mentally ill” (Tolbert, 2002:16). Furthermore, people with learning disabilities are also affected by other factors like sensory impairment, mental retardation, and social and emotional disturbance. These added factors may be common with or without a learning disability and each factor can hamper an individual’s ability to study (Tolbert, 2002:18). Moreover, a number of States fail to provide for offenders with learning disabilities due to shortages in funding, staff, and equipment (Tolbert, 2002:14).

In addition, the study conducted by Tye & Mullen, (2006:266) at the Victoria correctional centre in Australia reveals that “female offenders had significantly higher rates of mental disorders investigated when compared with other women in the community.” Moreover, females that are incarcerated in Victoria come to the correctional centre with high levels of multiple mental disorders as compared to the general community (Tye & Mullen, 2006:271). In addition, “compared to the general community, offenders are reported to have higher rates of physical illness, educational disadvantage, social deprivation and most particularly mental disorders.” In one class, one may find offenders with a variety of educational competencies, ranging from non-readers to those with high school reading skills (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:139). One of the findings from the research conducted by Texas State Controller of Public Accounts report, (1992:46) reveals that many offenders have a history of failure and need strong positive reinforcement. In addition, some learner offenders have special problems, such as language, mental or physical problems which require special training and properly trained educators.



Youth, whether incarcerated in juvenile or adult correctional centres, go through the process of psychosocial development that is very central in defining their road to adulthood (Mears & Travis, 2004:15). “Juveniles may experience unique or magnified effects of incarceration such as emotional distress which staff may interpret as non-compliance or hostility” (Woolard, Odger, Lanza-Kaduce & Daglis, 2005:15). Literature reveals that, educational needs of adolescents and other developmental issues with regard to programming for juveniles have also been ignored. Moreover, in a correctional setting, “a youth’s mental disorder frequently will go undiagnosed and untreated, resulting in an even more diminished chance of successfully participating in schools, work, or other social activities” (Woolard et al, 2005:16). However, youth offenders have the potential of changing their behaviour and developmentally by obtaining high grade-levels during adolescence stage (Woolard, et al, 2005:6). It is believed that juvenile offenders, as learners require intensive support to develop skills that help them to progress in education in preparation for employment or further training (Zan, 1998:129).

Although safety is a concern in correctional centres it has been reported by educators and correctional instructors that learner discipline is not a problem, because the majority of offenders preferred to be in class than to be assigned other jobs within the institution (Tolbert, 2002:19). Teaching offenders can be a most rewarding and pleasing experience. Rarely are there discipline problems except in the case of young offenders. Young offenders, especially youth offenders on remand, tend to exhibit behaviour patterns which are not necessarily conducive towards an ideal educational setting (Ripley, 1993:11). However, Parrota & Thompson, (2011:175) maintain that one of the university facilitators interviewed testified that for the three hours they were in class each week, students were able to work together with someone who see them as people and learners, rather than just offenders. Sharma, (2010:345) argues that “as long as teaching in correctional centre classrooms fails to recognize the intimate yet complicated relationship of institutional discourse, history, and context to the struggles of the racialized and gendered experiences of students, teaching within the correctional centre will continue under the notion of effecting rehabilitation through standardized teaching and testing practices.”

## **2.4 Resources for education in correctional centres**

The capacity to deliver comprehensive educational programmes inside the correctional centre depends heavily on human, financial and material resources (Provest, Noad & Sylva, 1998:83). “A sensible combination of flexible timetabling, the provision of educators skilled in dealing with non-compliant, low achieving students and a collaborative relationship with other community agencies could result to suitable schools for juvenile offenders” (Zan, 1998:128). The findings from the research conducted by Texas State Controller of Public Accounts report, (1992:17) affirm that sufficient resources do not exist and almost certainly will never exist to educate offenders. Learners studying inside correctional centres, having no access to resources will have limited learning experience (Watts, 2010:61). Consequently, correctional officials and education officials make every day decisions about which offenders may be taught and which may not. The big problem for the correctional education system is the inability to admit more students. Each correctional centre school has a long list of learners who are interested to attend classes, and not all these offenders would be accommodated in education programmes to further their studies (Liebowitz, Robins & Rubin, 2002:38).

### **2.4.1 Libraries**

Literature reveals that “no account of correctional education would be complete without mentioning libraries. Libraries are a vital part of offenders’ lives and have been so since the days of prison hulks, when good-natured chaplains handed down books to offenders to enable them to while away the hours in those loathsome places. In correctional centres, all offenders are allowed to draw books from the library at regular intervals, unless specifically banned from doing so for some disciplinary reason” (Ripley, 1993:11). However, these basic facilities that are common to normal educational institutions or schools, such as comprehensive libraries and computer laboratories, are normally not available in a correctional environment (Allen, 2001:6). Although some correctional centres have some level of traditional library facility, these are not well resourced and have no funding (Watts, 2010:61). “The primary purpose of education section within correctional centres is to enable offenders to learn effectively. Educational vocational training and libraries are resources provided for this purpose and should be managed efficiently and effectively to meet the identified needs of as many individuals as possible and agreed in a contact between lecturers, educators and students” (Ripley, 1993:8).

Libraries are not just places of book exchange, but are becoming increasingly multi-information, multi-media centres with computers, magazines, newspapers, listening tapes and electronic mail systems available to support leisure and study activities (Ripley, 1993:11). According to Watts, (2010:61) tertiary education students within correctional centres cannot work effectively without access to modern technology. The availability of computers and storage media varies widely and depends on the culture within each correctional centre.

#### **2.4.2 Funding**

In the United States of America, collecting financial information on the resources spent on correctional education is a problem since money for correctional education programmes comes from different organizations like the State Education Department of Corrections, Local School Districts, Local or Country Governments, and Special Districts (Coley & Barton, 2006:14). According to Burton, (1993:10) educational programmes in a correctional environment have a long history, but decrease in participation and funding of these programmes has been a challenge. Increased dollars have funded operating costs for more correctional centres but not more rehabilitation programmes. Therefore, fewer programmes and a lack of incentives for offender participation results to fewer offenders leaving correctional centres having not participated in programmes to address work, education, and substance use deficiencies (Petersilia, 2001:363). Although educational programmes have been a success, budget for educational programmes had not been equivalent to the increasing correctional centre numbers (Burton, 1993:1). Correctional education budget therefore is not adequate for the growing number of correctional population (Tolbert, 2002:25). Funding therefore needs to be restored to increase correctional educational programmes, encourage greater offender involvement in education since some offenders can be rehabilitated (Burton, 1993:2). It is evident therefore that to provide offenders with the necessary foundation to become productive members of society, adequate funding is required (Hall, 1990:9).

#### **2.4.3 Learner Teacher Support Material**

Correctional centres often have inadequate fundamental resources for education programmes. The majority of correctional centres do not only not make computers widely available for student

use, but there is no internet access (Sanford & Foster, 2006:607). In the case of students studying inside the correctional centre, access to the internet is forbidden especially in high security correctional centres, “with this mode of study further excluding the already socially excluded” (Watts, 2010:61). The findings from the study conducted by Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:135) reveal that most respondents expressed concerns about the availability of resources in the correctional centre school, including internet access, audio-visual resources, use of Information Technology (IT) in classrooms, inaccessibility to study materials and guidebooks, and non-conducive study environment. Furthermore, correctional centres do not have an academic resource room where learners could receive tutoring assistance with coursework, however, others have literacy peer tutoring programmes. Moreover, “learner offenders also struggle with the lack of updated, relevant materials and simple supplies such as dictionaries, notebooks, pens or pencils, and access to a sufficient pool of qualified educators” (Sanford & Foster, 2006:608).

#### **2.4.4 Educators**

Research reveals that “education in a correctional environment is subordinate to the need for security and labour and is utilized as a mechanism for sorting, judging, and controlling” (Shethar, 1993:359). Conducting a classroom-based programme in a correctional environment entails working around the schedule requirements of the correctional centre (Sanford & Foster, 2006:606). According to Ripley, (1993:11) the role of education staff is more than that of just educating and helping to develop the offenders’ needs. Education staff has a marked influence by bringing inside the correctional centre influences and activities of the outside world. Correctional educators are a unique group of professionals. Some educators begin to work in correctional centres by teaching inside during a summer session and becoming trapped by the unusual teaching challenges they discover. Others retire from traditional school settings and start new careers by teaching offenders (Sarra & Olcott, 2007:68). The educators’ desire to work in correctional centres “makes them equally marginalized within the education service” (Bhatti, 2010:36). These educators perceive themselves as different and excluded professionals as compared to other educators who teach adults within the communities (Bhatti, 2010:320).

Educators in a correctional environment struggle to provide care within the institutionally prescribed prohibitions on relationships with offenders, for example, when an educator has a

caring approach, it can be perceived as personal interest (Wright, 2004:200). In a study conducted by Sharma, (2010:330) one educator testified that “in order to establish discipline in the classroom, she had to observe strict codes and rules. For example, no educator was allowed to exchange personal information with students, give rewards to students, and have any conversations with the students other than work.” However, the relationship that exists between the educators and the offenders is one of shared respect (Bhatti, 2010:34). Some correctional centre schools appear to be nice places where there is shared mutual respect, courtesy and assertion in the conversations between educators and learners. Correctional educators aspire “to create a culture or sphere of civility-sanctuaries where ethical conversations with learners are possible, even in one-to-one relationships” (Wright & Gehring, 2008:251). To improve and provide more opportunities for communication between correctional educators and offenders, a period of consultation is recommended, ranging from 30 minutes to an hour, to be made available outside of curriculum time (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:141).

In correctional centres schools, it is believed that educators must learn to care, but also know that caring relations have boundaries (Wright, 2004:201). The uniqueness of the correctional centre culture and the need for security present challenges for correctional educators. Correctional centres comply to rigid programmes that may not be perfect in an educational environment (Mentor, 1994:3). Due to these difficult cultural circumstances, practising democracy may seem overwhelming to educators. However, despite this disempowering environment, classrooms, schools and communication between educators and correctional centre management may avail opportunities for different forms of democracy to take place (Wright & Gehring, 2008:250).

In correctional centres, “it is a world of deliberate silence.” Educators know that if they divulge information which may have security implications, that will be reported to the correctional centre management. Educators “work in trust but it is trust inside the cage” (Bhatti, 2010:34). Good correctional centre educators understand that they should be committed to their students, or their trust may be betrayed (Wright & Gehring, 2008:256). However, educators are not allowed to have open friendship with their learners. They have to remain professional (Bhatti, 2010:34). In correctional centre schools, learners are labelled as offenders, to belittle them as human beings, due to the authority given to the staff by the correctional centre, with the communication styles

that turn offenders from subjects into objects. However, the majority of educators seem not to adhere to this. “As they do so, they create spheres of civility in the correctional centre social spaces where value, respect, worth, and even choice, appear” (Wright & Gehring, (2008:246). To attend learners’ needs, educators compliment, show concern, and use respectful forms of address by addressing their learners with their first names. This respect becomes evident when educators do not mention their students’ low grade levels or when they assign them with assignments that are below their level of capability as suggested by test scores (Wright & Gehring, 2008:255). In most cases, some educators protect learners’ self- esteem by not marking scripts or books with a red pen, since this colour stigmatizes and remind learners of their failures in traditional schools (Wright & Gehring, 2008:255).

For security reasons, educators or tutors are cautioned about manipulation during induction and informed not to disclose their last names or talk too much about themselves, and students are also careful not to lose the privilege of being tutored or being in class (Shethar, 1993:360). Furthermore, these educators are unable to discuss with learners their own children’s birthday parties, their homes, or the type of cars they drive. Most topics are prohibited and discussions should only be about the work in hand (Bhatti, 2010:34).

The findings from the research conducted by Galouzis, (2008:1) in the United States of America, reveal that more than half of all offenders serving a sentence of full-time custody on 20 March 2005 were convicted of a violent offence or had displayed violent behaviour whilst in custody. However, health related reports including “mental health or reports from psychologists are not given to educators, so they have to learn about their students on their own” (Bhatti, 2010:34).

Another factor that causes problems to address the educational needs of inmates is a shortage of qualified educators or other educational professionals in a correctional environment (Jovanic, 2011:80). The majority of correctional centre schools around the world, educators and learners face substantial challenges to educational achievement. “Many correctional educators struggle with an eclectic mixture of learners of various ages who have lower educational levels and a history of educational failure” (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:130). According to Zaro, (2007:28) the correctional educator has a low functioning offender student who was incarcerated for safe

cracking. But the majority of them “imagine what it must be like to be in the correctional centre, or what it must feel like to be unsuccessful at school in the past” (Wright & Gehring, 2008:254). After extensive work in the educator’s classroom, the offender can divide fractions, spell a list of words, and write in complete sentences (Zaro, 2007:28). In addition, the uncomfortable position which correctional educators occupy is that of being marginalized. “They do not feel included because they are not understood by other educators, including those who teach adults in colleges of education, or those who teach teachers in universities, or indeed their children’s teachers” (Bhatti, 2010:33).

Research on correctional educators conducted at Virginia in Australia revealed that educator preparation programmes focus on content only, equipping educators with little information about the reality of teaching in a correctional environment (Jovanic, 2011:80). More in-service opportunities are required for correctional educators. For example, academic and professional courses in teacher education or related areas may be offered at the university or teacher-training institution, which could provide in-service training for correctional educators who work with students with diverse abilities (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:140). In addition, a mentoring system should be in place for new correctional educators. Educators and counsellors with wide experience in public schools or those with experience working in a correctional environment could also help new colleagues understand the correctional school system (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:141).

Literature reveals that in a correctional environment, inadequate educator training could contribute to numerous challenges pertaining to the management of juveniles. Just like other adult educators, correctional educators become involved in a number of staff development programmes (Tolbert, 2002:19). However, as mentioned earlier on, correctional educators are not given induction with regard to teaching in a correctional centre. According to Bhatti, (2010:31) educators “have to learn to be teachers of offenders.” Educators without university qualifications are required to receive a Certificate in Education on the job. Furthermore, opportunities for promotions are extremely rare. However, there are a number of opportunities for educators and counsellors to upgrade themselves through in-service courses and workshops such as skills in counselling, Information Technology, youth management and anger



management (Tam, et al, 2007:135). In addition, today, new educators go through training that explains the basic expectations. They are also prepared by the Security Department, about the manipulative behaviour of some inmates. They are urged to think about their own safety while also imparting education (Bhatti, 2010:34). However, Tam, et al, (2007:141) recommends that an orientation programme be given to all new correctional officials and correctional educators. An orientation programme should include the philosophy of correctional education and the underlying thinking and the development of learning environment and educational programmes, as well as security measures to ensure all personnel understand their roles and responsibilities.

As mentioned earlier on, correctional educators should have different training, so that they should know how to deal with the constraints of the correctional environment and the circumstances of offenders' lives (De Sa e Silva, 2009:196). Educators who become successful in teaching within a correctional centre for a long time are those who have accepted and have an understanding about teaching in a closed environment. "They teach with humanity and humility and care deeply about the human beings who happen to be offenders" (Bhatti, 2010:33). One of the respondents interviewed at Kaki Bukit Centre in Singapore reveals that an effective educator is one who believes in the philosophy of education in correctional centres, rehabilitation and understands the correctional education system (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:135). Furthermore, the qualities of effective educators such as respect, care and concern for inmates, ability to communicate with inmates, serving as a role model in moulding inmates, and having an open mind and patience in working with inmates to seek change are recommended in the correctional environment (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:135). Moreover, self-actualization is a prerequisite for professional survival and fulfilment in correctional education because larger institutions often do not place a high priority on student learning (Zaro, 2007:27). The self-actualized correctional educator therefore employs teaching approaches which do not rely on the correctional institution for implementation. This educator is freed from bureaucratic and custody issues, which can impact educational programmes and impede the quest for professional identity (Zaro, 2007:27).

According to Semmens, (1998:31) in many countries, the shortage of educators is addressed by involving volunteer educators, tertiary students, university professors and teachers from other schools in the communities and universities. Furthermore, to address the shortage of correctional



educators in Melbourne in Australia, it was advised that correctional institutions must have a chief executive officer, written personnel policies for staff selection, retention and evaluation, a stated formula for teacher/learner ratios, and remuneration of educators should be similar to other educators in public schools. Moreover, Noad, (1998:90) affirms that the Department of Correctional Services in Australia recognizes the importance of inmates' skills in education by utilizing peer tutors. Peer tutors are offenders who are qualified and trained to help in presenting accredited education curriculum programmes.

Laird & Chavez, (2005:7) assert that correctional educators perform their duties through partnership. Without partnerships, attempts to help learners become insufficient. To meet the range of offender education needs Adult Education and Vocational Institute (AEVTI) utilizes a variety of service providers, like educators from "AEVTI and NSW TAFE", education programmes in the "Western Australia Midland College of TAFE, Queensland Distance Education College, NSW TAFE OTEN, St John's First Aid and Parasol" (Noad, 1998:93). In addition, correctional educators, provide vocational training that seems to be a valuable innovation that does not only benefit the offenders, families, industry and the communities but also saves the state huge amounts of money (Laird & Chavez, 2005:2).

#### **2.4.5 Classrooms**

In most correctional centres, educators teach in places that were never intended for teaching and learning. They teach without chalkboards and desks since classes cannot be conducted in suitable classrooms. Sometimes they teach in kitchens, gymnasiums, "converted housing spaces, religiously-affiliated space, and a space formerly used as a washroom." In a correctional environment, teaching often takes place in places that are not reserved for teaching, which correctional educators have no ownership (Sanford & Foster, 2006:606). Educational programmes in a correctional institution therefore, are programmes too often deficient in staff, resources, methods and facilities (Dell'Apa, 1999:9).

### **2.5 Curriculum**

There has been a significant increase in correctional education programmes within the last four years. Correctional centres are working towards relationship building and individualization of

sentences, and a career pattern for those convicted (Ripley, 1993:9). In Australia, education screening begins the inmates' education programme in case management. This interview process is arranged separately between the offender and the educator. After this screening, an offender's training plan is developed. This is integrated carefully with assessments conducted by staff from the Departmental of psychology, drug, alcohol, and welfare (Noad, 1998:89). According to Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:131) in planning and developing an appropriate curriculum for offenders, considerations should be given to prior knowledge, abilities and needs of students and the availability of teaching resources. Furthermore, educators in Kaki Bukit Centre (KBC) in Singapore had to take into consideration other factors including, diversity of age group and risk level of inmates, operational issues of the correctional system and varying times inmates would enter into and exit from the correctional school. Likewise, New York State use individualized instruction method as a core teaching method in education programmes. In addition, diagnostic tests are used to place offenders and materials that are fitting to individual inmates' specific needs are allocated. In addition, class size is limited to twenty students per classroom, and educators devote most of their time assisting each learner (Sarra & Olcott, 2007:69).

According to Semmens, (1998:35) an educator's method is the delivery of programmes to structure the current learning programme, that will make a difference in the learner's future application of the new content. However, one of the findings from the research conducted by Texas State Controller of Public Accounts report, (1992:17) reveals that educational representatives do not participate in the initial classification and unit assignment of incoming offenders nor are the offenders' educational needs and potential to benefit from education even considered when offenders are assigned to units. The education needs are considered only after an offender has been classified, assigned to and arrives at a correctional centre unit.

In Australia, all basic education and Vocational Education and Training (VET) delivery in the corrections and juvenile justice sectors should be accredited and should utilize modular delivery from curriculum frameworks where they exist. Correctional education programmes are probably the most comprehensive of any found in the country (Penaluna, 1998:205). Every day, offenders register in their classrooms, take their folders, and start working on materials that had been chosen for their individual needs. Tuition time is structured and programmed. When learners

study, educators are busy teaching, correctional officers are patrolling and monitoring offender movement in the halls. Disturbances are few during tuition time (Sarra & Olcott, 2007:70). However, offenders interviewed at Kaki Bukit Centre in Singapore reported three major challenges in studying at the centre such as limited choice of subjects available (19%), lack of IT and audio-visual resources (19%), and insufficient time to complete syllabus (18%). Other concerns included a lack of academic books (14%) and difficulty relating to what is being taught (12%) (Tam & Heng & Rose, 2007:135). In addition, “over the past thirty years, the education and training that female offenders have traditionally received in correctional centres has been criticized for increasing a narrow and conventional stereotype of women. Cooking, sewing and craftwork, laundering, gardening, personal hygiene and grooming have been identified by critics as mechanisms for the domestication of women who are perceived as unruly and deviant” (Cook & Davies, 1998:51).

In any correctional centre educators may work with people who may be illiterate and innumerate and have severe learning difficulties to students studying for post-graduate qualifications (Ripley, 1993:9). The nature of programmes must initially focus on those offenders with inadequate educational and social skills. Correctional education should provide help for offenders who have difficulty in reading and writing or are unable to do simple arithmetic. In addition, they should give offenders the opportunity to develop their artistic and other skills, to develop their personal achievement and self-respect (Ripley, 1993:12). Basic education skills like literacy and numeracy that contributes to life skills are prioritized (Watts, 2010:57).

The study conducted at Kaki Bukit Centre revealed that different teaching approaches were used to meet different learning needs of offenders. Large group, small group and individualized instructional approaches were used. These included lectures, peer coaching, cooperative learning, and opportunities to assess student learning, through different modes such as quizzes, presentations and demonstrations, use of class journals and different assignments (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:134). However, Zaro, (2007:30) maintains that curriculum traditionally reserved for pre-release and re-entry programmes should on a grand scale, be integrated into the regular adult basic education programme in correctional centres. The curriculum can be integrated to reinforce reading and writing as well as cognitive skills within the same lesson. In correctional centres,

furthering studies at tertiary level becomes a challenge, since this is seen by both inmates and correctional centre management as an elite activity. However, presently, the programme content is not designed to assist offenders when released, except the claim to enable them to find employment (Semmens, 1998:34). Information Technology (IT) is an emerging area of employment. Nowadays, IT programmes are available both within correctional centres and in communities (Greenberg, Dunleavy & Kutner, 2008:31).

## **2.6 Correctional education programmes**

Correctional education started in the United States of America. Education programmes for offenders have been operating in the correctional system for more than two hundred years. The first government-sponsored American correctional centre started in Philadelphia in 1791, offender education programmes were introduced to this correctional centre in 1798 (Burton, 1993:9). In 1801, illiterate offenders were being taught by their better educated fellow-offenders in the New York correctional centres. But during this time, the majority of correctional officials were more interested in fostering the productivity of correctional centre industries, hoping to make it self-sufficient and sometimes succeeding.

Initially, the objective of incarceration was “to achieve the moral salvation of the offender through the provision of harsh, deterrent and retributive justice. Correctional programmes facilitated the aim by providing hard labour and religious indoctrination” (Griffin, 2000:17). Education took the second place to hard labour, and sometimes it was non-existent (Conrad & Cavros, 1981:13). It is evident therefore that in earlier times, correctional centres existed solely for the purpose of punishment. However, this perception is changing slowly as it is strongly felt that instead of punishing offenders, correctional centres could also be used as places where incarcerated people are rehabilitated and sent back into society, as functional human beings (Shinji, 2009:161).

Nowadays, correctional centres have functions beyond punishing the convicted criminals, such as taking on educational mission while serving punishment (Ozdemir, 2010:394). Literature reveals that educational programmes are prevalent, but observers have questioned the impact of these programmes on offenders, both during incarceration and upon release (Flanagan, 1994:10).

In 1990, research revealed that offenders who participate in educational programmes during incarceration are unlikely to return to the correctional centre after release (Vacca, 2004:297). Furthermore, the study conducted to educators working with Palestinian offenders around Israel, revealed that Israeli educators regard correctional education as a catalyst for change and development towards Western approaches to conflict resolution (Ben-Tsur, 2007:126). It is believed that the correct type of educational programmes reduces violence and makes offenders to be more positive in the correctional environment (Vacca, 2004:297). However, Wade, (2007:31) argues that if the objective of educational programmes in correctional centres is “to train individuals to become productive members of society, then future research should focus on measuring offenders’ educational gains, aligning job training with actual employment opportunities, updating vocational curricula, enriching quantitative data with qualitative research, and analysing statistics correctly.”

It is recommended that a wide range of education programmes such as curriculum statements and expected outcomes for each subject, equipment facilities equivalent to those provided in public schools and special education programmes for students with disabilities programmes should be implemented in correctional facilities (Semmens, 1998:32). The objective is to prepare for proper placement of offenders within schools in their communities when they exit the correctional environment. “Equipping offenders with skills that will assist them in securing jobs or reintegration in communities in a pro-social and lawful manner involves a gradual process of acquiring new skills and reducing an offending behaviour” (Griffin, 2000:20). Offenders need educational programmes that not only teach them to read effectively but gives them motivation that encourages a positive change to society when they are released (Vacca, 2004:297). However, the success and the failure of programmes may be disadvantaged by values and attitudes of people in management positions, overcrowding and insufficient budget for educators (Vacca, 2004:297).

Research reveals that correctional education programmes in a correctional setting are designed for the purpose of the rehabilitation of the offenders by changing their meaning structure. It is believed that correctional educational programmes reduce criminal behaviour than increasing incapacitation alone and these programmes are cost effective (Burton, 1993:18). Recently, the Federal Bureau of Prisons in the United States of America has designed the re-entry

programming used in their facilities. The main intention of the programmes is to help ease the transition back into society, as well as decrease the likelihood of recidivism (McKinney, 2011:175). Because illiteracy leads to poverty and criminal behaviour, correctional educational programmes should promote rehabilitation, help offenders to find jobs on release, therefore decrease poverty and assist them to be law-abiding citizens (Wade, 2007:27). It is believed that if one is not participating in education and does not have a job, correctional centres become chaotic (Noad, 1998:88).

Admission requirements for offenders in education programmes and circumstances when they are required to enrol differ. In addition, enticements to promote offender involvement in education programmes also differ. Some of the incentives may be receiving wages, gaining privileges, accumulating good time, or receiving a sentence reduction (Coley & Barton, 2006:16). In the United States of America, “it is the policy of the State Department of Corrections that all offenders must be engaged in some type of work while incarcerated. One exception to the mandatory work policy is for those offenders who have not yet received a high school diploma. They are required to attain their General Educational Development (GED) certificate and are paid the minimum wage of \$1.21 per day while they do so” (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002:273). However, offenders are not paid to attend college classes, attendance is voluntarily (Batchelder & Pippert, 2002:276). Furthermore, “programme requirements for offenders vary by State. New York requires all offenders without a high school diploma or GED (General Education Development) certificate to attend school and to work toward acquiring a GED, unless security or other issues take priority” (Sarra & Olcott, 2007:68). Offenders who left school early are assessed in terms of the placement tool (Kyparissis, 1998:55). At the New Hampshire correctional centre offenders are evaluated by the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) (Hall, 1990:3).

Literature reveals that correctional education programmes assist offenders to receive basic skills and motivation that will help them to be involved in positive activities after release (Griffin, 2000:21). It is believed that educational standards need to be framed taking into consideration the diversity and particular needs of specific groups of offenders, particularly women. Men and women’s experiences of offending and incarceration differ significantly and an awareness of

gender is critical in identifying and developing education and training programmes to meet their needs (Cook & Davies, 1998:51). Correctional educators therefore believe that school attendance could be the offender's first assignment within the correctional centre depending on his or her educational needs and sentence length (Jenkins, 1993:2). Literature reveals that in the college degree programme at Great Meadow Correctional Facility in New York State, the majority of offenders who obtained four year degrees from the college programme provided by Skidmore College's University Without Walls academic programme did not come back to correctional centre after release (Vacca, 2004:298). Furthermore, one participant offender interviewed testified that he believed that the courses that he took in the correctional centre would both boost his self-esteem, family life, social life and assist him to find a job after release. However, he was not certain if companies would hire them since some of them avoid negotiating with former offenders (Ozdemir, 2010:393). In addition, the majority of respondents in the research conducted by Winterfield, Coggeshall, Burke-Storer, Correa & Tidd, (2009:v) at Indiana, Massachusetts and New Mexico Department of Corrections in the United States of America, testified that Post-Secondary Education (PSE) has a positive impact on offender behaviour and that participating in Post-Secondary Education increases feelings of self-esteem.

Literature reveals that the best method of assessing correctional education programmes success revealed in research are recidivism and educational achievement (Wade, 2007:28). However, Fox, (1998:108) argues that judging the effectiveness of correctional education programmes based on recidivism numbers is problematic. Since there are other factors that causes the failure of correctional educational programmes such as overcrowding, insufficient budget for educators and shortage of teaching equipment (Vacca, 2004:300). Although it has not been determined that education necessarily leads to rehabilitation, there is general consensus by the correctional community that the education of offenders is an important and worthwhile endeavour (Parsons & Langenbach, 1993:38). Rehabilitation and education of offenders is a priority. However, "programmes targeted towards reducing offending behaviour are best provided in an environment that actively encourages offenders to use their time constructively, and provides basic standards of care" (Griffin, 2000:21).



In ensuring that more offenders are exposed in education programmes, in Ohio in the United States of America, “the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction connects correctional centres with the community college or university in the same education region, as designated by the State Higher Education Board. Only when a college or university is unable to participate, due to lack of sufficient instructors or do not wish to partner due to other reasons, does the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction pair correctional centres with post-secondary institutions in another Region” (U.S. Department of Education, 2009:8). Payment of tuition costs or partial payment of education expenses becomes a challenge for offenders. Currently, offenders have little or no access to student aid programmes to help pay tuition since they are no longer eligible for Pell grant and other Government financial aid resources. Furthermore, they do not have the personal money or receive sufficient wages from correctional centre work that will assist them to pay for their education. Moreover, “these wages often must first pay for other expenses such as room and board, medical services, phone service, food, and supplies” (U.S. Department of Education, 2009:8).

## **2.7 Correctional education and employment opportunities**

Literature that examines re-offending rates of offenders or recidivism since 1990, revealed that educated offenders are unlikely to return in the correctional centre if they finish an educational programme and are given skills to successfully read and write (Roper, 2005:14). It is believed that correctional education reduces crime, is cost-effective and helps in equipping most offenders with skills that will assist them to be law-abiding citizens, pay taxes and become positive parents (Tolbert, 2002:26). Providing offenders with the right to education involves more than simply increasing the delivery of a good, it involves contributing to the restoration of their self –esteem and to their peaceful reintegration in society. In other words, education in correctional centres should ultimately help offenders to become protagonists of their own life-stories (De Sa e Silva, 2009:195). Vocational education programmes are intended to prepare offenders for work after their release from the correctional institution (Greenberg, Dunleavy & Kutner, 2008:27). “The majority of incarcerated population consists of people in critical need of education to improve their post-release opportunities for employment and participation in civil society” (Gorgol & Sponsler, 2011:4).



It is believed that “the public suffered when the offender’s original crime was committed, the potential for damage increases when the offender returns to society without means of making it in the employment world” (Coley & Barton, 2006:4). Deducing from this notion, rendering education programmes to offenders whilst incarcerated contributes to the safety of the society because offenders that receive education return to communities as law abiding citizens that will contribute positively to the country’s economy. In agreement with this view Keeley, (2004:291) asserts that whether support for education in delinquent placement settings is done for righteousness or from economic motivation, the affected youth will benefit and from the benefit accumulated to these youth, society will benefit and a real increase in public safety will materialize. However, no one knows what value educational and vocational training programmes have for offenders after release from incarceration because no one has attempted to find out (Conrad & Cavros, 1981:8). Maybe “a more accurate way of assessing the effectiveness of educational programmes is to focus on measuring for positive changes in the personality and behaviour of offenders that have occurred as a result of education whilst incarcerated” (Jovanic, 2011:82).

Research reveals that many offenders are mentally and emotionally unstable with low self-esteem and negative and distrustful attitudes (Watts, 2010:62). Education helps those who did not think that they can succeed or improve their lives with skills that could give them positive attitude and become productive members of society (Ubah & Robinson, 2003:118). Whilst incarcerated, offenders “have time to obtain their high school diplomas, train for a job, and prepare to earn a living when they return to their communities. Having a GED or high school equivalency certificate or a high school diploma may be particularly important for offenders who expect to be released soon and will need to find a job outside the correctional centre” (Greenberg, Dunleavy & Kutner, 2008:27).

Correctional centres therefore should supply offenders with opportunities and encourage them to grab these opportunities (Coley & Barton, 2006:4). Correctional education, should assist offenders “to find the motivation to go on in their educational experience, and they may be able to improve their chances of staying out of the correctional centre after completing some courses” (Ubah & Robinson, 2003:119). However, the further challenges relates to the type of learners

who are completely bound up with their self-first and foremost as an offender. “This is because before the student could move into the student self, to be fully engaged in the learning situation, it is necessary for him or her to actively, if not temporarily, leave and unlock the offender self” (Watts, 2010:62).

Correctional education seems to be a valuable investment in correctional centre populations since it increases the chances of employability (Case & Fasenfest, 2004:26). “The correctional centre itself is a debilitating and stigmatizing experience. If the aim is to reintegrate offenders into society and to reduce the level of violence, constructive and imaginative interventions need to be developed” (Matthews & Pitts, 2006:403). Whilst education, especially post-secondary education, decreases re-entry rates, it is believed that education should be the first step in reintegration, rather than the final one (Case & Fasenfest, 2004:37). The idealistic theory suggests that correctional centre-based college education shows the right step in the right direction since the programmes can encourage change in some offenders, improve their psychological well-being, and offer them the qualifications for the labour market (Ubah & Robinson, 2003:119).

While this requires an increase in the budget required to provide offender education, the cost will likely be absorbed in time as fewer offenders return to the system and are able to maintain gainful employment which generates not only consumer dollars but also tax revenue. Increasing employment is likely the key to social reintegration (Case & Fasenfest, 2004:37). Adult education in correctional centres therefore could lead in two ways to a reduction in criminal behaviour, opens employment opportunities after release, and decreases disciplinary problems in correctional centres (Gerber & Fritsch, 1993:1). Furthermore, it should not be forgotten that as incarceration punishes the offender and “protects the public, its other purposes are rehabilitation and preparation for a return to the community” (Ripley, 1993:5). Education in the correctional centre reduces obstacles to reintegration by giving job skills, promotes life skills and boost self-esteem (Case & Fasenfest, 2004:25). Literature reveals that if more offenders “take up educational courses and training in skills programmes, they will have a better chance of leading a life free from crime when they are released” (Ripley, 1993:5). Employability has thus become central to the emphasis of post education within the United Kingdom (Watts, 2010:58).

Based on a reliable research finding, opportunity theory advocates that offenders' completion or studying in a college-level correctional-education programme can enhance upward mobility as it provides them with required human-capital resources of skills and knowledge that may help some of them to abandon criminal behaviour when released into their communities (Ubah & Robinson, 2003:119). "A large number of offenders find themselves excluded from employment opportunities due to low ability in literacy, numeracy and work related skills" (Watts, 2010:58). Disadvantaged by these obstacles, ex-offenders are less likely to become self-supporting and therefore unlikely to succeed in community (Coley & Barton, 2006:3). A number of trade and job-seeking skills are offered to assist offender reintegration (Watts, 2010:58). It is believed that partaking in education does not increase the probability of success in post release employment only, but it leads to greater participation after release (Gerber & Fritsch, 1993:13).

Research findings recommend that participation in education while incarcerated can help prepare offender reintegration and reduce recidivism rate (O'Neill, Mackenzie & Bierie, 2007:311). In addition, evidence collected from "33 comparison group evaluations of corrections-based education, and work programmes is that education participants are employed at a higher rate and recidivate at a lower rate than non-participants" (Wilson, Gallagher & Mackenzie, 2000:361). Out of twelve studies that were evaluated, eight showed that education appeared to have a positive impact on lowering recidivism rate (Tam, et al, 2007:129). In summary, the great majority of studies focusing on adult basic and secondary education show a great relationship between participation in education and recidivism (Gerber & Fritsch, 1993:11).

## **2.8 Conclusion**

This chapter discussed experiences and findings of different scholars with regard to managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. The subsequent chapter outlines methodology of this study.

## CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to describe methodology used to collect, analyse and interpret data in this study. In methodology, the researcher employs methods which produce data utilized for coding, analysis and interpretation (Adams St. Pierre, 2010:180). In this study, the researcher employed the following methodology in collecting data, data analysis, coding and interpretation:

### 3.2 Research design

In this study, the researcher used qualitative research inquiry. Bianco & Carr-Chellman, (2000:4) assert that qualitative research inquiry is conducted in an attempt to understand experiences and attitudes of people in contextually bound settings. Sowell, (2001:7) concurs that “researchers start with an idea or an intention for their study that captures the essence of what they want to research on in the research setting.” In addition, “qualitative research is carried out when one wishes to understand meanings, interpretations, describe and understand experiences, ideas, beliefs and values-intangibles” (Wisker, 2008:75). In this study, by utilizing qualitative inquiry the researcher wanted to obtain an in-depth understanding of the educators’ experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment.

### 3.3 Research method

This is a case study of the educators’ experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. Case studies “are the detailed analysis of singularities like a person, an event limited in time, a specific department within a larger organization, a particular form of occupational practice, an administrative sub-system, or a single institution with clearly defined boundaries” (Murray & Lawrence, 2000:113). In a case study there is a detailed analysis of systems like “events, programmes, communities, settings, schools, individuals, and social groups” (Mcmillan & Wergin, 2002:6). This study, focused on one full-time school within the South African Department of Correctional Services. Corcoran, Walker & Wals, (2004:11) concur that case study research contributes to practice by improving the reasoning of practitioners. “This improvement may be confined to one institution that uses the case study to improve their own practices or to other practitioners in other institutions who learn from the innovation.”

### 3.4 Sampling

In this study, a sample of six educators from seven educators who were employed and taught within the Department of Correctional Services full-time school for more than five years was selected. These educators were sampled from one full-time school out of seven educators employed full-time by DCS at the school. The composition of respondents was 50% females and 50% males. 83% of the respondents started teaching in DOE before joining DCS. Qualitative researchers “most often use purposive rather than random sampling strategies.” The objective is to design a credible qualitative study (Devers & Frankel, 2000:263). In the current study, the researcher used purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling is when the researcher makes a precise judgment about a feature or features of a group of people. Selection of a sample, therefore is based on the visibility of the feature of central interest to the research (Murray & Lawrence, 2000:140). According to Sowell, (2001:52) qualitative researchers frequently use purposeful sampling strategies because they provide rich data for answering their research questions. Sowell, (2001:31) argues that “to claim that a sample is purposeful, researchers present evidence that shows that the data collected from selected participants provides relevant answers to the research questions.” In this study, selected respondents enabled the researcher to gather sufficient data related to the research questions based on educators’ experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. In agreement with this notion, Devers & Frankel, (2000:264) assert that in a qualitative research, the researcher should make it more concrete and develop a sample frame that is capable of responding to the research questions.

### 3.5 Data collection instruments

In this study, the researcher used **semi-structured one on one interviews**, and **document analysis** as data collection instruments. Literature reveals that qualitative researchers often use different data collection instruments or collector as part of processes called triangulation (Sowell, 2001:70). Furthermore, data collection focuses on ways that individuals interact in a research setting. The researchers may observe the individual’s verbal and non-verbal behaviour or interview students about their unique ways of learning.

### **3.5.1 *Semi-structured one on one interviews***

In the current study, the researcher utilized semi-structured one on one interview in gathering more data through probing questions and rephrasing, giving the researcher more opportunity to engage with the respondents. Probing is to make the respondent to elaborate on the answer (Hove & Anda, 2005:7). In this study, the researcher utilized probing to obtain sufficient data from respondents on their experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. According to deVos, Strydom, Fouche & Delport, (2005:296) semi-structured one on one interviews are suitable where one is particularly interested in complexity or process, or where there is a controversial issue. Furthermore, “semi-structured one on one interviews are a resource-demanding data collection method; activities such as planning, conducting and analyzing, are time-consuming by nature” (Hove & Anda, 2005:7).

In this study, semi-structured one on one interviews gave the researcher and respondents much more flexibility. Furthermore, the researcher was able to follow up particular interesting avenues that emerged during the interview, and the respondents were able to expand.

During each interview session, the researcher used an audio-recorder. An audio-recorder “helps to keep a record of the interviews so that the analysis can be based on accurate renditions of what was said” (Hove & Anda, 2005:8). Furthermore, the objective was to enable the researcher to transcribe data verbatim during data analysis phase. Prior to the interview session, all respondents were briefed about the objectives of the study and thereafter an informed consent was signed.

In this study, the researcher was guided by a pre-planned interview schedule to conduct all interview sessions (**See attached, Appendix 1**). The duration of each interview session was one hour and the researcher transcribed field notes as a back-up. Devers & Frankel, (2000:268) concur that “the researcher could use a detailed interview protocol, a general topic guide that consists of eight to twelve broad questions and probes.”

After data was collected from the research site, the researcher, utilized **telephone interviews** to seek clarity to some responses since the researcher is staying far from the research site. Bianco & Carr-Chellman, (2000:4) agree that telephone interviews are advantageous in that the participant

can be interviewed at a remote location saving travel time and money, however, the researcher loses the opportunity to observe non-verbal communicative actions. Furthermore, telephone interviews help when participants in a study are geographically far apart and unable to come to the central location for the interview (Creswell, 2008:227).

### **3.5.2 Document analysis**

In this study, the researcher examined documents such as learner attendance registers, grade 12 examination schedules, examination timetables, school year planner, educators' subjects allocation list and school timetable that were collected from the research site. In the current study, documents collected from the research site enabled the researcher to extract data pertaining to managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment.

Document analysis is not just reading and taking notes but, rather, the careful identification of key issues, labels and themes (Wisker, 2008:320). "Documents consist of public and private records that qualitative researchers obtain about a site or participants in a study, and these include newspapers, minutes of meetings, personal journals, and letters. These documents are valuable sources of information in helping researchers understand central phenomena in qualitative studies" (Creswell, 2008:230). In this study, documents collected from the research site were utilised as a source of information with regard to managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment.

### **3.6 Data analysis**

The researcher in the current study had an opportunity of listening to the audio-recorder for all interview sessions which assisted in direct and accurate data transcription. Furthermore, the researcher tried to make sense of the data collected from field notes, interviews and document analysis into different themes by sorting it out and reducing it into manageable components that could be understood. This was done through coding based on the respondent's perceptions. According to Braun & Clarke, (2006:19) in coding, "one may initially identify the codes, and then match them up with data extracts that demonstrate that code, but it is important in this phase to ensure that all actual data extracts are coded, and then collated together within each code." Furthermore, coding can be done by hand or by utilizing one of the computer programmes. There

are three main ways to do coding. It can be done through multiple coding by attaching to one version of the data with coloured pens, highlighting, symbols, or thin slips of coloured paper sello-taped to the text sticking out over the edge or multiple copies of the data can be made, and physically cut up and everything relating to a particular category is filed together labelled with that code, alternatively, the data can be indexed, and the coding recorded on cards or slips of paper (Delamont, 2002:174). Coding entails “cutting up pages of text in order to sort those coded data bits into categories, which can either done by hand or computer, and produce knowledge based on those categories, which, in the end, are simply words” (Adams St Pierre, 2010:179).

Literature reveals that data analysis in qualitative research is not easy and fast. It is labour-intensive and time consuming. “Data analysis involves a constant moving back and forward between the entire data set, the coded extracts of data that you are analyzing, and the analysis of the data that you are producing” (Pope, Ziebland & Mays, 2000:116). In this study, the researcher started by transcribing data from an audio-recorder into text, put together all themes or concepts from different interviews to give meaning to the research topic (Braun & Clarke, 2006:15). Literature reveals that regardless of the degree of structure or type of instruments used, data must be captured and put in a format that is suitable for analysis (Devers & Frankel, 2000:268).

In this study, the researcher used thematic analysis. “Thematic analysis involves the searching across a data set, be that a number of interviews or focus groups, or a range of texts to find repeated patterns of meaning” (Braun & Clarke, 2006:15). The researcher in the current study typed data collected through interviews and document analysis manually and highlighted different themes with different font colours in the computer. The objective was to obtain correct interpretation of the research findings. It is believed that “if coding manually, one can code data by writing notes on the texts, by using highlighters or coloured pens to indicate potential patterns, or by using post it notes to identify segments of data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006:19).

In this study, clustering together of concepts or themes that share the same meaning assisted the researcher in making comparisons during data analysis phase. Pope, Ziebland & Mays, (2000:116) affirm that coding entails identifying all key issues, concepts, “carried out by



drawing on a priori issues and questions derived from the aims and objectives as well as issues raised by respondents themselves and views or experiences that recur in the data.” In the current study, the researcher utilized coding to identify and extract key issues and concepts raised by the respondents on the experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. Literature affirms that “good qualitative data analysis relies on the ability to locate information and keep it in context” (Devers & Frankel, 2000:268).

### **3.7 Ethical considerations**

Since this study was conducted in a security environment, the researcher had to be clear about all the processes required before a research is undertaken. Delamont, (2002:80) asserts that some topics can be seen to have ethical problems long before they are studied and the researcher has to be clear about them. Where the researcher doubts the impact of the research on participants, particularly those in vulnerable conditions, attempts should be made to ensure that participants are protected, and continue after notifying the affected individuals about the potential outcomes (Murray & Lawrence, 2000:20).

In this study, the researcher submitted an application to the Research Ethics Committee (REC) at the University. After receiving the research approval letter from the REC at the University, the researcher submitted a request to conduct research to the Research Ethics Committee (REC) within DCS (**See attached, Appendix 2**). An agreement was also signed to comply to all the research conditions as stipulated by the Department of Correctional Services Research Ethics Committee. However, it should be noted that the non-availability of Ethical Clearance Certificate from the University of Pretoria delayed the request to conduct research to be considered by the Research Ethics Committee in DCS. Had it not been the intervention of the Research Ethics Committee from the University of Pretoria, permission to conduct research in DCS was not going to be granted.

Consequently, an approval to conduct research in the Department of Correctional Services was granted (**See attached, Appendix 3**). The researcher contacted the research tour guide and forwarded a request to participate and an informed consent forms to be signed by each respondent (**See attached, Appendix 4**). However, on the first day of the field work the research

tour guide was not available and no other arrangement was in place. The researcher therefore had to wait for long hours for the school principal to be called from the Education Section before entry to the correctional centre was granted. In this instance, the researcher therefore could not have succeeded in interviewing all six respondents as planned if the school principal did not make an internal arrangement for the researcher to be fetched from the entrance on time on the other days. To compensate for the lost time on the first day, the researcher had to re-arrange the interview plan and negotiate with the respondents. Literature affirms that “if the researcher is unable to secure subjects’ participation, the research cannot take place” (Devers & Frankel, 2000:265).

In this study, confidentiality and anonymity was guaranteed in the letters requesting participation in research. Before each interview session began, the researcher briefed the respondents about the purpose of this study, use of audio-tape and voluntary participation in the interview session. Informed consent forms were signed by all respondents before each interview session. Josselson, (2007:538) argues that “it makes sense to have two informed consent forms, one at the beginning of the interview agreeing to participate, to be taped, and another acknowledging that the participant has a right to withdraw at any time.”

As indicated earlier on, all interview sessions were guided by a pre-planned interview schedule. Literature affirms that the researcher could “use a detailed interview protocol, a general topic guide that consists of eight to twelve broad questions and probes” (Devers & Frankel, 2000:268). In this study, once more, the researcher guaranteed at the end of each interview session to conceal identity of each respondent in the research findings. In this study, where direct quotations are utilized, the researcher used pseudonyms like Respondent: A, B, C, D, E and F, to conceal identity of respondents. Consequently, the researcher complied to all research conditions stipulated by the REC in DCS and the University of Pretoria, hence issued with the Ethical Clearance Certificate (**See attached, Appendix 5**).

### **3.8 Trustworthiness**

In this study, data and themes were correlated with literature to determine trustworthiness of the research findings. Furthermore, the researcher forwarded the research findings to the school

principal for verification of accuracy on the interpretation of research findings before submitting to the university. This was one of the conditions of the Research Ethics Committee that data should be verified within the Department of Correctional Services before publication for security reasons. Furthermore, literature reveals that throughout the process of data collection and analysis, researchers need to make sure that their findings and interpretations are accurate. Quantitative researchers use the term reliability to describe accuracy of data whereas qualitative researchers use the term trustworthiness to describe accuracy or credibility of data (Creswell, 2008:267).

In the current study, the researcher used triangulation by method to determine accuracy and authenticity of data. Triangulation by method is also known as methodological or multi-method triangulation (Meijer, Verloop, Beijaard, 2002:146). In triangulation the researcher examines each information source, finds evidence to support a theme to ensure that the study is accurate by extracting information from multiple sources (Creswell, 2008:266). In this study, the researcher utilized triangulation method by verifying data collected through document analysis and semi-structured one on one interviews with literature.

### **3.9 Conclusion**

The aim of this chapter was to describe methodology used in gathering, analysing and interpreting data in this study. The subsequent chapter outlines the delivery of formal education programmes within the South African Department of Correctional Services.

## **CHAPTER 4: DELIVERY OF FORMAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMES WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES IN THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

### **4.1 Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an analysis pertaining delivery of formal education programmes within DCS in South Africa. Currently, all formal education programmes are rendered voluntarily, to those offenders who show interest in education. Likewise, in the United States of America, correctional centre programmes were presented only if offenders required them and are interested to attend (Griffin, 2000:18). Research affirms that offenders who succeed in voluntary academic programming appear to have a lower rate of recidivism than those who do not enter programming (Hall, 1990:6). However, the South African Department of Correctional Services ensures that educational programmes are accessible to all incarcerated people as one of the rehabilitation tools.

### **4.2 Background on formal education programmes**

The Prison's Act No.8 of 1959 that governed correctional centres in the Republic of South Africa during the Apartheid era was characterized by an emphasis on the punishment of offenders and gross human rights violation (Rozani, 2010:4). During this period, offenders' education was not co-ordinated. Offenders had to study on their own through distance education. "The Prison Act No.8 of 1959 entrenched the correctional system as a quasi-military institution, with a military-style chain of command, uniforms complete with rank insignia, and a disciplinary code with many aspects usually associated with the armed forces. As rehabilitation and reintegration was not considered an important part of the mandate of South African correctional system, the idea of putting chairs, desks and classrooms inside correctional centres was lost on correctional centre designers at the time" (Goyer, 2004:79).

After the establishment of the Democratic government in the Republic of South Africa in 1994, the Prison's Act No.8 of 1959 was substituted by the Correctional Services Act 111 of 1998 (Rozani, 2010:4). Rehabilitation of offenders became the priority within DCS. "Rehabilitation is a process that attempts to address the specific history of the individual concerned in order to be

successful. Moreover, it requires the positive commitment and voluntary participation of the individual, as it is a process that others can facilitate, but that cannot succeed without the commitment of the individual” (DCS, 2005:128).

The South African DCS role therefore “is no longer about locking offenders away from society and enforcing punishment given by courts.” The Department of Correctional Services’ role is to correct offending behaviour through rehabilitation “in an environment that promotes the human treatment and human dignity of offenders” (Rozani, 2010:1). Similarly, in Swaziland, the provision of development and “rehabilitation services forms the cornerstone of the Department of Correctional Services’ objective since offenders are exposed to education and training which is aimed at providing them with academic, social and technically oriented vocational skills as well as the establishment of a learning culture and the promotion of work ethics” (Biswalo, 2011:73). Literature reveals that offenders must be entitled to the same rights as other citizens, unless the nature of incarceration necessarily needs some change (Griffin, 2000:17). As mentioned earlier on, DCS supports the constitutional principle that every person has a right to basic education.

The purpose of correctional education and training is to develop and enhance the educational levels, and improve the skills of offenders to assist their reintegration in their communities (SA Corrections in South Africa, 2008:13). “Offender development entails providing opportunities for social development and social consciousness, vocational and technical training, recreation, sports and education in order to promote the development of personal and social competencies that will enable offenders to reintegrate into communities as productive citizens” (DCS Annual Report, 2006/07:48).

Literature reveals that the basic premise of correctional education is three-fold. Firstly, by increasing the offenders’ level of knowledge and skills, it is hoped that they will become more qualified for employment upon release from the correctional centre. Secondly, while offenders are participating in the educational programmes, it is hoped that they will learn to think more responsibly. Finally, if offenders are qualified to work and are able to make better decisions, then it is hoped that they will be less likely to return to the correctional centre (Messemer &

Valentine, 2004:68). In Norway, just like in South Africa, offenders should have the same access to education as other citizens. The policy recommends ten years of primary education and three to five years of secondary education. In Norway, correctional centres adopt the import model for the provisioning of services to offenders through which normal school system is compelled to supply educational services in correctional centres (Manger, Eikeland, Diseth, Hetland & Asbjornsen, 2010:535).

DCS in South Africa, emphasize its commitment to offender rehabilitation and provide a good foundation for the acquisition of knowledge and skills required for social and economic development, justice and equality (Cilliers, 2006:540). Formal Education Directorate, under Incarceration and Corrections Branch, is one of the components through which the Department intends to realize its commitment to the rehabilitation of offenders and to provide a foundation for the acquisition of knowledge and skills required for social and economic development, justice and equality. The objectives of the Directorate, amongst others, are the following:

- To give offenders a second chance in our society through education and contribute to a literate society;
- Enhance the quality of education;
- Use education as a foundation for further development of offenders and life-long learning;
- Provide diverse education opportunities that are needs based and market related to offenders;
- Equip offenders with knowledge, skills and attributes for self-reliance and good citizenship. (Unpublished Brochure on Formal education Programmes, 2007:1)

All Formal education programmes in the South African Department of Correctional Services are provided according to specific needs to offenders. Similarly, at Melbourne in Australia, educational programmes are structured according to learners' needs, and it is recommended that programmes for females should be equal to those received by males (Semmens, 1998:31). Educational programmes in Australia "are developed within either the school or custodial venues. Where possible, compulsory school-going age juvenile offenders entering or leaving

detention have a sense of continuity with their individual educational programmes” (Zan, 1998:126). In Swaziland, between 1997 and 2009 the Department of Education, “in consultation with the prison service, conducted needs assessments. The needs assessments are conducted before any programmes are developed and are followed by a monitoring exercise.” The objective is ensuring that educational programmes address offenders’ needs (Biswalo, 2011:75). Correctional centres therefore play a significant role “in contributing to the lifelong learning needs of offenders who often have limited formal education and skills. It appears that the main function of correctional centres, among others, is the secure containment of offenders committed to their custody, and provision of skills and training in an effort to help them integrate more effectively into society after release” (Biswalo, 2011:71).

### **4.3 Educational programmes**

In the South African Department of Correctional Services, offenders are assessed by means of a placement tool to determine eligibility for participation in educational programmes. “A placement tool is a literacy assessment process that is used to assess the literacy competence of each offender. They complete a test that assists educators to determine their level of literacy competence” (SA Corrections in South Africa, 2008:12). However, there is currently no assessment process being routinely conducted on offenders after they finish any course of study in many correctional centres (Hall, 1990:6).

In order to ensure that offenders participate in formal education programmes, DCS in South Africa, gives offenders access to the General Education and Training Band (GET), Further Education and Training Band (FET), Higher Education and Training Band (HET) and Computer Based Training (CBT) Programmes in some correctional centres. (Department of Correctional Services Website: 16 April 2012). Likewise, “at Ankara Juvenile and Youth Closed Prison in Turkey, several educational programmes have recently been performed for Juveniles and adolescents. Some of these educational programmes are first and second grade literacy courses, supportive courses for open elementary education, open high school education and the faculty of open education, computer operation course, garden design course and welding business course” (Ozdemir, 2010:387). Similarly, the Correctional Services in Swaziland has commenced programmes which correct and prepare offenders for release. The majority of these programmes

are practical in nature and assist offenders in acquiring skills that they can utilize for a living (Biswalo, 2011:73).

All educational programmes in DCS are integrated and aligned with the education system of the country. To ensure that offenders are given new skills through education, the following programmes are offered under Formal Education Directorate within the South African Department of Correctional Services:

#### ***4.3.1 Early Childhood Development (ECD)***

The courts permit an offending mother to bring her young infant. The child-parent relationship is used as an incentive. Even correctional centres cannot ignore biology (Van Waters, 1995:80). Early Childhood Development programmes therefore “are a preferred intervention for policy makers wishing to provide cohabitation intervention for the incarcerated mothers with infant children under their jurisdiction” (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:290). These programmes have the potential of “promoting rehabilitation of incarcerated mothers, while also providing the physical closeness and supportive environment necessary for the development of secure attachment between mothers and their infants” (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:271). The child-parent relationship therefore is used as a natural incentive. The mother is also given education in child care (Van Waters, 1995:80).

DCS in South Africa renders Early Childhood Development programmes in partnership with the Department of Basic Education to babies staying with their incarcerated mothers up to the age of 2 years. Currently, about 70 babies are in South African correctional centres and 20 pregnant women in Pollsmoor Female correctional centre alone. The Department of Correctional Services’ authorities have opened another Early Childhood Development centre in Durban Westville Female Correctional centre and plan to open two more later this year (Gerardy & Majavu, April 2012). The Early Childhood Development centre “is a living arrangement located within a correctional facility in which an incarcerated mother and her infant can consistently co-reside with the mother as primary caregiver during some or the mother’s entire sentence” (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:271). In the case of mothers who are serving longer sentences, this concession is temporary, since children have to leave the correctional centre for foster care or families at the



age of two years (Gerardy & Majavu, April 2012:3). Similarly, in the United States of America, “infants in States without eligibility stipulations related to sentence length are discharged at 18 to 24 months regardless of their mother’s anticipated length of stay” (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:281). However, it is only New York State that has established an Early Childhood Development centre at the same centre, “established in 1901, although the structure of the nursery and of the correctional facility itself has changed over time” (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:273). Contrary, in Pakistan, babies that are born in correctional centres “are forcibly taken away from their mothers at the age of five, without her having any clue as to their whereabouts. In most cases, this becomes the last time the mother and child ever see each other” (Shinji, 2009:169).

DCS in South Africa therefore understands that although the delivery of educational programmes in most correctional centres focuses on incarcerated people, it has a responsibility of ensuring that whilst these babies are within the correctional centres, are given a good start in life through education to prepare for proper placement in the Early Childhood Development centres in their communities. Since “attachment is directly linked to child development, attention to creating environments that support age appropriate development” is an important part of Early Childhood Development implementation rather than just keeping the babies while their mothers are serving their sentences (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:288). Early Childhood Development programmes in the Department of Correctional Services is a positive intervention in the lives of both incarcerated mothers and their infant children (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:271). “Improving rates of secure attachment in infants with incarcerated mothers has the great potential to promote healthy development in the child’s life and prevent the negative outcomes linked to maternal incarceration” (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:280).

The South African DCS in partnership with the Department of Basic Education has ensured that Early Childhood Practitioners from the communities are trained and placed in Mother and Child Units in some correctional centres within the country. Goshin & Byrne, (2009:286) assert that resources and links with the community will always be needed in correctional centres despite the direction of policy developments for Early Childhood Development centres. Furthermore, “public-private partnerships are used by the majority of Early Childhood Development centres to

defray cost but also provide the advantage that external specialists and volunteers can help ensure that services meet standards” (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:277).

Partnership with the Department of Basic Education in South Africa helps with the payment of salaries to the Early Childhood Development Practitioners in some correctional centres whilst they render services within DCS. Similarly, in the United States of America, correctional officials managing Early Childhood Development programmes sometimes draft a contract between community service providers “specializing in infant and toddler care and development.” This civilian professional expertise helps to ensure that children are raised according to community standards within correctional mandates (Goshin & Byrne, 2009:288).

#### ***4.3.2 Literacy Programmes***

“Basic literacy and numeracy skills are offered to adults who were socially marginalized and economically disadvantaged prior to incarceration” (Bhatti, 2010:31). The Department of Correctional Services in South Africa offers literacy programmes in partnership with the Department of Basic Education through Kha Ri Gude Mass Literacy Campaign to offenders who cannot read or write. “The Kha Ri Gude Mass Literacy Campaign was launched in February 2008 by the Department of Basic Education to assist youth and adult learners who have little or no education to become literate and numerate” (Republic of South Africa, The Department of Basic Education Website: 16 November 2012).

Literature reveals that since offenders are “frequently school dropouts who have difficulties with reading, writing skills, poor self-concepts and negative attitudes toward education, literacy skills are important to them in many ways” (Vacca, 2004:297). Offenders need literacy skills to complete application forms, to submit requests and to communicate with family and friends outside the correctional centre (Vacca, 2004:302). One of the findings from the research conducted at “Ankara Juvenile and Youth Closed Prison in Turkey” reveal that one offender interviewed testified that he was illiterate before entering the correctional centre, because he withdrew from school. Consequently, he learnt how to read and write through literacy programmes presented in the correctional centre, as a result “he could read newspapers and write letters to his friends and family” (Ozdemir, 2010:393).

It is therefore believed that correctional centre literacy programmes should provide opportunities for offenders to see themselves in roles other than that of offenders (Vacca, 2004:303). Furthermore, correctional centre literacy programmes should be offender learner centred and designed to meet the needs of the correctional centre culture (Vacca, 2004:303). In addition, it is believed that literacy skills and programmes “with meaningful contexts that recognize the different learning styles, cultural backgrounds and learning needs of offenders are important to programme success and offender participation” (Vacca, 2004:297). However, it is only in a peaceful setting that literacy programmes succeed. “Reading and writing should be promoted, not as a means of dividing humanity, but as a web of understanding to link individuals and societies” (Shinji, 2009:166). Therefore all the key players like policy makers, correctional officials, and educators must encourage good programmes and treat offenders as valuable human beings with the potential of improving literacy skills (Vacca, 2004:301).

The majority of offenders within the South African Department of Correctional Services participate in literacy programmes since they cannot read and write. Research also affirms that “more than half of the adults incarcerated in American Federal and State correctional centres can neither read nor write, and they have less than eighth-grade education” (Vacca, 2004:300). Therefore, education programmes should first emphasise application of literacy skills to enable offenders to utilize these skills (Vacca, 2004:302).

Currently, the Department of Basic Education in the Republic of South Africa trains Kha Ri Gude facilitators, and deploy them to render services in some correctional centres. These facilitators are paid a monthly stipend by DoBE whilst facilitating within DCS. As mentioned earlier on, some correctional centres in DCS are utilizing offender tutors with teaching qualifications or matric as facilitators to offenders who cannot read or write.

Literacy programmes give offenders skills that will help them to secure jobs when they leave correctional centres. Offenders released from correctional centres “are frequently unable to find jobs because they either lack experience or literacy skills. With the high cost of incarceration and

the large increase in the correctional centre population, it seems that mastery of literacy skills may be a proactive way to address the problem of re-incarceration” (Vacca, 2004:301).

### **4.3.3 *Adult Education and Training (AET)***

AET programmes in DCS are delivered in partnership with DHET from AET Level (1-4) in some correctional centres. “Adult Education and Training (AET) is an outcomes-based programme that aims to provide basic learning tools, knowledge and skills, such as reading, writing and numeracy to participants” ( SA Corrections in South Africa, 2008:12). The objective is to ensure continuity and proper placement of offenders in Adult Education and Training centres within communities when they are released from correctional centres. According to Noad, (1998:94) “adult education in corrections goes further to address offender behaviour and their successful re-entry into the community.” In addition, Adult Education in correctional centres may lead to a reduction in criminal behaviour, enrolment in education after release, to improve employment history and lower disciplinary problems (Flanagan, 1994:11).

Currently, about 97 correctional centres are registered as Adult Education and Training examination centres with DHET within DCS. DHET deploys AET practitioners and pays them monthly salaries whilst working in some correctional centres within DCS. This initiative is an attempt to address human resource shortages and also ensures that quality education is rendered within the Department of Correctional Services just like in other AET centres within South Africa. “The Adult Education and Training programme has attracted strong support from offenders to the extent that some had to be put on the waiting lists for enrolment in some correctional centres” (SA Corrections in South Africa, 2008:12).

### **4.3.4 *Further Education and Training (FET)***

In DCS, youth offenders are given access to Further Education and Training programmes, (Grade 10-12). Currently, there are nine full-time schools registered with the Department of Basic Education, targeting youth offenders from the age of 14 to 18 years. The curriculum in these full-time schools is streamlined according to offender needs to give them market related skills in preparation for reintegration in communities. In 2011, all Grade 10 educators within the Department of Correctional Services received training in the newly implemented Curriculum and

Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS), simultaneously with other educators in the Department of Basic Education. The objective is to ensure that school curriculum within the Department of Correctional Services is aligned with the developments that are taking place in other schools within the country. Some adult offenders who are interested in obtaining a qualification in Senior Certificate (Grade 12) register as part time learners with DHET. “In May/June examinations, 2012, Hedelstroom Correctional Facility experienced the largest number of grade 12 candidates for the mid-year matric examination ever recorded in the history of the institution. The reason for this high turnout was partly influenced by the initiative by the South African Department of Higher Education and Training that phases out the old curriculum until 2014. Furthermore, this proved the commitment from the Department of Correctional Services to provide every South African citizen their constitutional right to education irrespective of where they are, even if they are incarcerated” (Overberg Voice, 2012:1).

#### ***4.3.5 Higher Education and Training (HET)***

In eliminating the lack of skills to create employment opportunities for offenders, the South African Department of Correctional Services encourages and supports offenders who are interested in furthering their studies with tertiary institutions. Offenders who register with tertiary institutions do so voluntarily since they understand the importance of higher education in securing employment when they exit the correctional centres. The findings from the research conducted at the North Carolina Workplace and Community Transition Youth Offender Programme affirm that offenders also understand that being incarcerated will make it hard to reintegrate into mainstream society. As a result the majority of students spoke of the likelihood of getting a job more quickly due to the courses they took through the programme (Anders & Noblit, 2011:91). To reflect on offenders’ positive attitude to education, the research findings affirm that, 97% of the students thought that school was important, and 93% care about how they do in school (Anders & Noblit, 2011:89). In addition, the most common long-term benefit to offenders reported was the perceived success and accomplishments in Post-Secondary Education which positively changes their self-concept and increases pride, often because many did poorly in school prior to incarceration (Winterfield, Coggeshall, Burke-Storer, Correa & Tidd, 2009:9).

In the Republic of South Africa, educators employed by the Department of Correctional Services help offenders in all administration work for their tertiary studies. Some offenders are registered through distance education with the University of South Africa (UNISA) for certificates, diplomas and degrees up to PhD level. The findings from the research conducted by Samuels, (2010:60) affirm that participant number fourteen testified that her son matriculated and studied through the University of South Africa and completed a computer literacy course whilst incarcerated. In the South African Department of Correctional Services, offenders who are furthering studies with tertiary institutions are responsible for payment of their tuition. But some of them are assisted by their families and others are funded by the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS). However, the majority of offenders are unable to further their studies due to financial constraints. Imhabekhai, (2002:7) recommends that parents and other relatives of offenders should show greater interest in the welfare and education of their family members in correctional centres. Offenders are still part of the family, the community and the entire society. Since resources at the disposal of government cannot adequately meet their needs, it becomes necessary that parents, guardians and philanthropists contribute to offenders' upkeep and education.

It is therefore believed that tertiary education helps offenders to secure jobs when they exit the correctional centre thus lower recidivism rates. Offenders who have low skills encounter difficulties in securing jobs since post-secondary education degrees or certificates are required. Research findings reveal that even offenders believed that participation in Post-Secondary Education would increase their employment prospects after release. (U.S. Department of Education, 2009:5).

#### ***4.3.6 Computer Based Training (CBT)***

The South African Department of Correctional Services established Computer Based Training Centres in some correctional centres. Currently, there are about ten Computer Based Training Centres in some youth and adult correctional centres. The aim is to develop and empower young offenders with Information Communication Technology (ICT) skills to enable them to function independently and to contribute positively when integrated back to society. Literature reveals that it is necessary to supply technology equipment in supporting programmes appropriate to

offenders' reintegration in communities. "This includes computers, with the related software, along with equipment for ceramics and vocational art" (Noad, 998:94). One participant offender at Ankara Juvenile and Youth Closed Prison in Turkey testified that education activities in the correctional centre are beneficial. "He learnt how to use a computer and was awarded the computer operation certificate whilst serving his sentence" (Ozdemir, 2010:393). Similarly, the South African Department of Correctional Services ensures that young offenders receive accredited computer training courses that will assist them to secure jobs when released.

#### **4.4 Schools and Adult Education and Training centres within the Department of Correctional Services**

As mentioned earlier on, currently there are nine full-time schools registered with the Department of Basic Education for youth offenders and about ninety seven Adult Education and Training centres registered as examinations centres with DHET within DCS nationally.

The findings from a survey conducted within DCS reveal the existence of educational programmes in the following correctional centres:

##### **4.4.1 Brandvlei Youth Centre**

Brandvlei Youth Centre in the Western Cape Region, has a fully equipped and staffed school, it was reported that half of the youth in the correctional centre are keen to attend school. At the time of the research there were ten educators employed by DCS, and school was attended by half of the juveniles at the correctional centre. It was reported that in 1996, the correctional centre obtained 70% pass rate for the matriculation examination. The school caters for the entire range from literacy teaching up to matric (Children in prison in South Africa, 1997:36). It was reported, "besides a strictly academic curriculum, Brandvlei Youth Centre also offers extensive training courses in its workshop classrooms. There is a metal shop, glass shop, woodworking class, leather works class, and basket-making and pottery" (Gast, 2001:2).

Findings from the research conducted by Muntingh & Ballard, (2012:35) affirm that at Brandvlei Youth Centre all children attend school with the exception of those facing other charges. To maintain security, all children are required to leave their units and attend school. School tuition

starts at 08H30 until 15H15 from Monday to Friday. It was also reported that children attend different periods and classes but the average class attendance time for each learner is two hours per day. The research findings also revealed that the library at Brandvlei is exemplary and well stocked. It was also reported that the correctional centre subscribes to some newspapers and magazines for the library and offenders are co-operating since damaging of books is not common. It was reported that offenders are allowed to utilize library twice every week (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:36).

#### **4.4.2 *Barberton Town Youth***

Barberton Town youth centre provides a comprehensive education programme, from literacy teaching up to matriculation level. Research shows that there are six qualified educators and only twelve pupils per class. Learners are likely to get plenty of individual attention in the classroom. Educators are assisted by custodial officials who have a teaching qualification and offender tutors (Children in Prison in South Africa, 1997:37).

#### **4.4.3 *Drakenstein Youth Centre***

Research reveals that Drakenstein Youth Centre is housing five hundred and twenty one youth offenders and is the only centre in the Western Cape Region with maximum offenders. School curriculum focus is Adult Education and Training framework. The correctional centre had inadequate physical resources, classrooms were tiny and textbooks for students were insufficient (Gast, 2001:1).

#### **4.4.4 *Hawaqua Juvenile Centre***

Hawaqua Juvenile Centre, in the Western Cape Region was built to accommodate two hundred and fifty offenders. Currently, it is utilized for juvenile offenders. Eight educators are employed at the school, with an enrolment of one hundred and twenty students. In Hawaqua, all students who attend school sleep in the same cell (Gast, 2001:2).



#### **4.4.5 *Durban Westville Youth Centre***

At the time of the research, Durban Westville Youth Centre had eight educators and used two others from the adult section of the correctional centre. At this institution researchers were informed that just over half of the sentenced children attend school. However, school attendance is voluntary (Children in Prison in South Africa, 1997:37). The research conducted by Muntingh & Ballard, (2012:35) reveals that at Durban Westville Youth Centre, children attend school daily. But, “only those children who are serving sentences of longer than a certain period receive education. The cut-off period appears to be two years but this was not confirmed to the researchers.”

#### **4.4.6 *North-End Correctional Centre***

Research findings reveal that North-End correctional centre in Port Elizabeth differs from other correctional centres in that all offenders including those who are remand detainees, were given the opportunity to attend school. There were limited facilities provided, researchers were told that the correctional centre receives assistance from AET offices in DOE, which provides resources, training and teaching equipment. It was reported that offenders at the North-End correctional centre were also allowed to apply for correspondence courses, and high school students were registered at the school in Magxaki. The school provided the syllabus, examination papers and monitored all examination processes (Children in prison in South Africa, 1997:40). However, since there was a planned closure of the correctional centre in September 2011, all educational programmes were not operating for two weeks before fieldwork (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:35). Furthermore, the existence of the library at the female section was confirmed, but children who were not yet sentenced were unable to utilize it (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:23).

In addition, the research revealed that there were libraries in the majority of correctional centres like Pollsmoor, Barberton and Thohoyandou. According to the findings from 41 correctional centres in South Africa, “that accommodated unsentenced children, 68% reported that they have a library and 17% reported that they did not. However, the existence of a library in a correctional centre does not necessarily mean that it is available to all unsentenced children” (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:23). It had been reported that the books in these libraries were mostly donated and

some bought by the Department of Correctional Services (Children in Prison in South Africa, 1997:38).

#### **4.4.7 Rustenburg Youth Centre**

At the Rustenburg Youth centre it was reported that children attend school daily. Classrooms and educators are available. However, learner attendance was reported by the officials as very low. It was reported that children claimed that they did not enjoy going to class. The reason reportedly given by the children was that the subjects were not the school subjects they were used to, but rather an Adult Education and Training curriculum (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:36).

However, the research findings revealed different information hence it was concluded that educational programmes are not accessible to all children in DCS contrary to the requirements of the Correctional Services Act. “The following centres, from 41 surveyed, are those recorded as having educational services for sentenced children: Barberton Town, Brandvlei, Cradock, Ekuseni Youth, Grahamstown, Mosselbay, Pollsmoor Medium A, Hawequa, Johannesburg Female, Emthonjeni (Baviaanspoort), Drakenstein Medium B, Caledon, Durban Westville Youth and Escourt (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:36). However, the survey data found that with the exception of few correctional centres like Pretoria Local, Escourt and King William’s Town, unsentenced children are not provided with access to any educational services” (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:22).

#### **4.5 Resources**

The provision of education in South African correctional centres is as uneven as many of the other services provided. Very few correctional centres have complete school facilities and cater for formal school education. Other correctional centres are beset by staff shortages, overcrowding and inadequate facilities and resources (Children in prison in South Africa, 1997:35). For example, the researchers discovered that at Stanger correctional centre, there was no education or training offered, no educators, and there was no access to books (Children in prison in South Africa, 1997:35). Imhabekhai, (2002:5) concurs that welfare services and correctional education activities are poorly provided because of inadequate human and material resources. The results of this state of affairs is costly to society since many offenders are not reformed and well prepared for crime free life on release.

#### **4.5.1 Educators**

The South African Department of Correctional Services has employed about 432 educators to render educational programmes to offenders (Department of Correctional Services, Human Resource Personnel Report, 7 May 2012). Educational programmes to offenders are rendered by qualified educators that are registered with the professional body, South African Council for Educators (SACE). However, there is still a high shortage of educators within the whole Department. Similarly, the shortage of manpower exists in most Federal Government establishments in Nigeria including the correctional centres. To redress the problem of inadequate personnel in Edo State correctional centres, part-time instructors for correctional education are used as an interim measure (Imhabekhai, 2002:7). As mentioned earlier on, in South Africa, partnership between DHET and DCS has resulted to the deployment of Adult Education Practitioners in some correctional centres, thus addressing human resource shortage. However, due to the shortage of educators in some correctional centres, the Department of Correctional Services is utilizing offenders with teaching qualifications or Grade 12 as tutors to those who cannot read and write.

Educators employed in the Department of Correctional Services also attend workshops with other educators in the Department of Education. All Grade 12 educators and Adult Education and Training Level 4 educators attend moderation cluster meetings organized by the Department of Education District offices nationally. In 2011, Grade 10 educators in full-time schools within the Department of Correctional Services were trained simultaneously with other educators in the Department of Basic Education for Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) which is implemented in Grade 10 for the first time in 2012 in all public schools within the country. In most cases, some educators within the Department of Correctional Services are appointed annually as examinations markers, senior markers and chief markers in the examinations marking centres organized for Grade 12 and Adult Education and Training Level 4 year-end examinations by DoBE and DHET.

#### **4.5.2 Classrooms**

As indicated earlier on, education is not the mandate of DCS and therefore not all correctional centres have adequate infrastructure for the delivery of educational programmes. “The

responsibility of the Department of Correctional Services is first and foremost to correct offending behaviour, in a secure, safe and human environment, in order to facilitate the achievement of rehabilitation, and avoidance of recidivism” (DCS, 2005:73). Imhabekhai, (2002:5) concurs that a correctional centre is established by a state to provide safe custody for criminals and reforming them during their period of incarceration so that they can live crime-free life on discharge. Therefore the activities undertaken in correctional centres are a preparation for reintegration of youth offenders, are referred to as socialization of the individuals. It is believed that “individuals will be able to abide by rules in the society at their own will, they will internalize social values, overcome the feeling of being foreign and contribute to society as a result of the socialization process” (Ozdemir, 2010:394).

The findings from the survey conducted by Muntingh & Ballard, (2012:23) in 41 correctional centres within the South African Department of Correctional Services, reveal that although little education programmes are provided for remand detention, three centres from 41 centres surveyed had classrooms. In other correctional centres, different places are used as classrooms, such as kitchens at Johannesburg correctional centre and dining halls at Modderbee correctional centre. Furthermore, of the correctional centres housing sentenced children, “77% reported that there are classrooms and 23% reported that there are not” (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:37). The majority of correctional centres therefore utilize dining halls, cells, waiting rooms and other available spaces as classrooms. In addition, the survey also affirms that “half of the centres surveyed reported that they have multi-purpose halls. It became evident therefore that these dining halls are used for a variety of purposes, such as classrooms and programme facilities” (Muntingh & Ballard, 2012:23).

However, since the focus on offender rehabilitation in South Africa after 1994, newly built correctional centres are designed to have a separate education section with suitable classrooms. To address the classrooms shortage, the Department of Correctional Services has also utilized offender labour to build extra classrooms in some correctional centres.

### **4.5.3 Budget**

Managers in most correctional centres operate with limited budget to buy stationery and textbooks for educational programmes up to Grade 12. In addressing budget constraints, the Department of Correctional Services establishes partnership with other Government Departments and Private Sector to assist with funding for some educational programmes. “It is believed that the involvement of other role-players will encourage further rehabilitation, employment opportunities, support services and prevention of recidivism” (DCS, 2005:22). Imhabekhai, (2002:8) agrees that it is imperative that government, correctional administration and non-governmental organizations explore ways and means of improving the welfare of the offenders and offer them qualitative correctional education. This means that the Department of Correctional Services cannot achieve its objective of offender rehabilitation without the assistance of other government Departments, Non-Governmental Organizations, Faith Based Organizations, Institutions of Higher Learning and the community at large.

## **4.6 Conclusion**

This chapter outlined a brief background on the delivery of formal education programmes within the South African Department of Correctional Services. Different educational programmes rendered such as Early Childhood Development, Literacy, Adult Education and Training, Further Education and Training and Higher Education and Training were discussed. Some schools where education programmes are rendered within the South African Department of Correctional Services were identified and resources outlined. The subsequent chapter outlines the findings of this study.

## CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

### 5.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline and discuss findings of this study according to themes and sub-themes where applicable. As indicated in the previous chapter, semi-structured one on one interviews and document analysis were data collection instruments utilized in this study. This chapter therefore offer in-depth descriptions of data collected and critical analysis of literature in an attempt to answer research questions. The findings of this study will be presented and discussed under the following themes:

Teaching-learning environment, learners, curriculum, resources, budget, Learner-Teacher Support Material, classrooms, parents involvement, partnership with the Department of Education and other Stakeholders and education as a rehabilitation tool.

### 5.2 Teaching-learning environment

In this study, 100% of the respondents shared the same sentiment that managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment appears to be challenging due to the lack of support from the management within the correctional centre. The response from Respondent: A attest to this “The management is not supporting, school is just a place to keep offenders busy.” This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that correctional centre management “may also have varying degrees of support for education especially if they see it as a threat to the primary functions of security and control” (Mentor, 1994:4). The findings from 33% of the respondents in this study also revealed that education seems not to be respected within Correctional Services. Watts, (2010:57) appears to be consistent with this perspective in that the lack of support and focus on punishment more than rehabilitation, has the effect of sidelining educational programmes in a correctional environment to an extent that it is seen by some as being off-limits. The findings from 100% of the respondents in this study shared the same view, that it seems that education is secondary to security in Correctional Services environment. The results from 17% of the respondents revealed that it appears that teaching is not regarded as a profession. It was reported that sometimes offenders are taken to other places without informing the school management. This finding appears to be consistent with Schirmer,

(2008:29) who states that in the Department of Correctional Services, offenders are also moved among correctional centres to “alleviate overcrowding, interrupting individual class programmes and post-secondary degree programmes, especially if an inmate’s new facility does not offer educational classes or a degree programme.”

Literature reveals that the provision of education that is both necessary to the needs of learners within the correctional centre is difficult. The correctional centre culture is unique and correctional centre management focus on security measures such “as lockdowns and head counts constraints the possibilities of learning” (Watts, 2010:57). This view seems to be consistent with the findings in this study where 17% of the respondents revealed that sometimes there seems to be a conflict of interest when learners have to write examinations in the afternoon, starting at two o’clock, whilst correctional officials need to lock the units and go home at the end of the shift. The results from 17% of the respondents revealed that in terms of the organisational structure, reporting to someone who is not an educator makes managing the school very difficult. It was revealed that it seems that everyone wants to manage the school; as a result the school managers become powerless.

The report from 33% of the respondents in this study cited experiencing bureaucracy as a major challenge within a correctional centre. It was revealed that any request has to go through several people before approval is granted. It was reported that school managers appear not to be allowed to implement anything without approval from the correctional centre management. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that correctional centres are bureaucratic institutions such that there are always a number of factors that can potentially encourage or impede education programme success (Sanford & Foster, 2006:604). In this study, 33% of the respondents also reported that educators seem not to be given space to take decisions about the school. For example, 17% of the respondents cited a case when there are fights in the units. In this instance, learners may not be allowed to come to school for three days. In most cases the decision is taken without consulting the school principal. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that, in most cases, “facilities may also go on lockdown unpredictably for other reasons, such as when a fight breaks out, when the facility conducts a

surprise drug sweep through the housing units, or when external medical care is required for an offender and an ambulance must enter and exit the facility” (Sanford & Forster, 2006:606).

In the study conducted by Watts, (2010:59) one educator testified that one characteristic of this strange setting is generally the negative and uncooperative attitudes of correctional officials encountered, which suggests that education, in particular, higher education, may not be seen as a legitimate activity for offenders. Contrary with this perspective, findings in this study revealed the shortage of correctional officials to fetch learners for school from the units in the morning due to the current shift system as the factor that seems to hamper the school tuition programme. It was reported that if there are no correctional officials, teaching is affected at the school. Sometimes educators have to fetch learners themselves. However, it was reported that this appears to be a challenge since educators are not allowed to handle a key to the gates and cells. In this instance, the school programme seems to be affected, since tuition starts late. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that correctional education programmes rest on the cooperation and support of correctional officials who fetch offenders from the units and provide guard duty in classrooms and other activities (Tolbert, 2002:12). The results from 17% of the respondents revealed that another factor that seems to interrupt the school programme is psychologists, nurses and social workers who request sessions with the learners or have to prepare offenders for court cases. This finding seems to be consistent with Bhatti, (2010:35) who states that the reason why students fail to attend classes is because they have to attend behaviour management courses to manage frustrations and anger. Students return to classes after attending these behaviour management programmes.

Other factors that have been reported that seem to be experienced by educators in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment are security related. In this study, 17% of the respondents reported that a cell phone is not allowed inside the correctional centre due to security reasons. It was reported that, this makes it very difficult for the Department of Education District office to contact the school principal for emergencies whilst the school principal is attending to other matters within the school. It was reported that the absence of the Administration Clerk at the school section to attend to important calls from the Department of Education District office whilst the school principal is in class or attending management



meetings appears to be a challenge, since sometimes the school principal fails to attend important meetings organized by the Department of Education District office. This finding appears to be consistent with literature which states that education in a correctional environment “is subordinate to the need for security and labour and is utilized as a mechanism for sorting, judging, and controlling” (Shethar, 1993:359).

Literature reveals that entering correctional centre for teaching is very difficult, particularly at high security correctional centres. Admission entails long waiting at the reception checking of identity documents, blocking of cell phones and contacting the education section within the correctional centre (Watts, 2010:59). This perspective seems to be consistent with one of the findings in this study which revealed that due to security measures, it becomes difficult for people from the community to come and assist at the school, sometimes even the volunteer educator delays to be on time for class tuition since there are procedures to be followed before entering the correctional centre. Sanford & Foster, (2006:604) also seem to be consistent with this view in that in a correctional centre, there is no official and practical support to education delivery except a number of obstacles like, “if there is no official approval for an instructor or volunteer educator to enter the facility, there will be no clearance for that person to enter the first gate into the institution.”

In the current study, 17% of the respondents reported experiencing teaching within a Correctional Services environment as better than teaching in the Department of Education because of lower learner enrolment in the classrooms. In addition, it has been reported that unlike some schools in the Department of Education, learners attending schools within a Correctional Services environment appear to be harmless, do not carry guns, knives or other weapons to school. In this study, 17% of the respondents reported that there are also correctional officials who escort learners to school and provide guard duty whilst educators are presenting classes. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which states that teaching offenders can be a most rewarding and pleasing experience. Rarely are there discipline problems except in the case of young offenders (Ripley, 1993:11).

### 5.3 Learners

In this study, 17% of the respondents reported that learners at the school are different from learners in other schools within the Department of Education since they are people who offended the community. Literature reveals that in the Commonwealth of Virginia, offenders are compelled to take the test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) on admission to the correctional centre. This test plays an important role in deciding an offender's educational programming while incarcerated (Piccone, 2006:239). This perspective seems to be consistent with the findings in this study which revealed that learner recruitment entails educators moving from one Section to another marketing education programmes. The results from 67% of the respondents revealed that learners are recruited for school at the end of the academic year. It was reported that a placement test is utilized to place learners at different levels or grades. In this study, 17% of the respondents reported that there are three appointed educators at the school that are responsible for recruitment, conducting placement tests and placing learners in the admission register and different classes. This finding appears to be consistent with literature which reveals that in the correctional centres of New York State, diagnostic tests are used for placement and materials are assigned that are appropriate to each offender's specific needs. In addition, class size is limited to 20 students per classroom, and educators spend much of their classroom time helping students individually (Sarraf & Olcott, 2007:69).

The results from 17% of the respondents in this study revealed that the school seems to encounter a challenge in placing learners since some subjects in learner's school report cards are not offered at the school. It was reported that learners are given one month to submit school report cards. The findings from 17% of the respondents revealed that previous schools are also contacted by the school management for verification of information in the report cards. This finding seems to be consistent with the research findings in the study conducted on offenders at Kaki Bukit Centre in Singapore that reported three major challenges in studying at the centre such as "limited choice of subjects available (19%), lack of IT and audio-visual resources (19%), and insufficient time to complete syllabus (18%). Other concerns included a lack of academic books (14%) and difficulty relating to what is being taught (12%)" (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:135).

The findings from 33% of the respondents in this study revealed that a learner may be absent from school only when sick or attending a court case. It was also reported that in the case of a sick learner, correctional officials ensure that the learner is taken to the hospital. This perspective seems to be consistent with Sanford & Foster, (2006:607) who states that the most difficult of all is that offenders, themselves, may fail to attend classes for reasons beyond their control, due to appointments with doctors or disciplinary measures. Furthermore, one of the findings from the study conducted by Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:130) revealed that in schools within a correctional centre, classes are dynamic in nature, with learners entering and leaving programmes due to court commitments, institutional transfers, parole, and reassignments.

In this study, 17% of the respondents revealed that in some instances, one discovers a learner is absent in class and only to be told by other learners that particular learner had been released. This finding appears to be consistent with the findings from the research conducted by Parrota & Thompson, (2011:166) where one educator testified about finding “at the beginning of the semester that in the men’s correctional centre, there were seventeen male students enrolled, but during the course of the semester a number of them were transferred to different camps or were released and only nine remained throughout the duration of the semester.” However, 100% of the respondents shared the same sentiment that learner attendance seems not to be a problem at the school. 100% of the respondents revealed that the general learner attendance appears to be good at the school since learners stay within the institution. But respondents differed in terms of percentages, 17% of the respondents reported learner attendance at the school as 100% and 83% of the respondents reported learner attendance as 99%. In unison, 100% of the respondents reported that school registers are marked twice daily, in the morning and after break. Data collected from the school registers in this study also shows that learner attendance seems not to be a challenge at the school. For example, the evidence collected from school attendance registers revealed that for May 2012, the average learner attendance per class from Adult Education and Training (AET) Level 1 up to Grade 12 is 100% at the school.

The findings from 17% of the respondents highlighted that learners are not forced to attend school; they attend voluntarily and see school attendance as an opportunity. Contrary to this finding, Wright, (2004:198) states that in correctional centres learners would be present in class

because they were forced to be in the education programme. In the current study, 17% of the respondents revealed that voluntary attendance differs from the US model where correctional education is free but school attendance is compulsory. This perspective seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that currently in US, Federal offenders “who do not have a high school diploma or a General Education Development (GED) certificate are required to participate in literacy programmes until they obtain a General Education Development certificate or reach 240 hours of instruction” (Burton, 1993:10).

In this study, 33% of the respondents reported the availability of the code of conduct for learners at the school. It was reported that the code of conduct is read to all learners during the morning assembly. However, 33% of the respondents highlighted that children will always be children, just like other children in the schools outside the correctional centre, there may be learners with behavioural problems. The results from 17% of the respondents revealed that some learners may not submit school work or stay in the toilet during tuition time. 33% of the respondents reported that learners that attend school are housed in a separate unit inside the correctional centre. It was reported that learners doing the same grade stay together to give them an opportunity of continuing with their studies after school.

In this study, 17% of the respondents revealed that educators are not allowed to use corporal punishment at the school, since it is regarded as illegal by the government. It was reported that a learner who behaves well at the school is elected as a “Head Boy” and others as “Class Captains.” The results from 33% of the respondents revealed that the only threat to discipline at the school is gangsterism. This view seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that “gangsterism is one of the problems that has been identified by a lack of security measures in most correctional centres” (Sithole, 2006:58). However, 17% of the respondents reported that gangsterism does not impact negatively on learner performance. 17% of the respondents reported that gangsterism is not tolerated at the school, and cited an instance when one learner who was involved in gangsterism had to be withdrawn from school. This perspective seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that offenders, who commit an offence while attending correctional centre school, may be transferred out of school. In some instances, communication

between educators and correctional officials regarding transfer of inmates could be addressed (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:139).

One of the findings in this study revealed that moral lessons are emphasized daily during the morning assemble. The results from 67% of the respondents revealed that learners at the school need a lot of motivation and encouragement because of low self-esteem. It was reported that the absence of parents seem to affect some learners. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that many offenders lack motivation and that there is a prevalence of individuals with learning disabilities (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:130). In the current study, 17% of the respondents highlighted that educators play the role of parents, social workers and psychologists to learners at the school. This perspective appears to be consistent with literature in that teaching for re-offense prevention and helping others to lead a life free of incarceration holds awesome implications and immense rewards for the correctional educator (Zaro, 2007:28).

However, 50% of the respondents highlighted that although learners need to be treated with love, one needs to be firm. It was reported that educators develop a bond with the learners and end up attending to their personal problems. In this study, Respondent: E testified that “I see the boys as my sons, not as inmates.” This view appears to be consistent with Bhatti, (2010:33) who states that educators “who succeed as teachers and remain in the service within correctional centres are those who have internalized the knowledge about teaching in a closed environment. They teach with humanity and humility and care deeply about the human beings who happen to be offenders.”

In this study, it has been revealed that motivational speakers like pastors and external educators are sometimes invited to the school to encourage and motivate learners. This finding appears to be consistent with literature which reveals that “the admission in the correctional centre is a difficult transition for offenders. The nature of this situation is related to an accurate assessment of the offender population. The stress and depression associated with this difficult life change interferes with cognitive functioning” (Piccone, 2006:247). One of the findings from the school’s year plan reflects that the school also organizes activities like drama events, debate sessions and

matric dance for learners. In addition, it appears that the school observes and celebrates National days like Human Rights day, Freedom day, Youth day, Heritage day and World Teacher's day. In the current study, 100% of the respondents shared the same sentiment that learners at the school seem to be positive and eager to learn in class. 33% of the respondents reported that the majority of them appear to co-operate and seem to be enthusiastic about their studies since they participate in class during lessons. This finding appears to be inconsistent with literature which reveals that within correctional centre schools other students come into classes depressed about their cases, Legal Aid representatives, girlfriends or newborn children (Lasevoli, 2007:21). The results from 33% of the respondents in this study revealed that there seems to be a healthy competition amongst learners, they want to excel due to the success of other learners who preceded them and attracted media attention. Contrary to this finding, Tam, Heng & Rose, (2007:130) reveal that in correctional centre schools, few learners attend classes and whilst in class they are not really listening, instead, they would be sleeping and unproductive.

The findings from 33% of the respondents revealed that generally, offender learners seem to be gifted and intelligent. However, 17% of the respondents reported that some learners appear to be struggling with their studies but educators do their best to help them. It was reported that the majority of offenders are incarcerated because they have been failed by the community and related with sadness a story of a learner who was doing very well at the school and had to be released at the end of his sentence when he was doing Grade 12. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that offenders are released from the correctional centre whilst participating in educational and vocational programmes. In other words, one out of seven offenders enrolled in an educational or vocational programme exit the institution before obtaining a qualification. The decision to release offenders is an administrative one beyond the control of classification personnel and correctional educators (Flanagan, 1994: 28). In this study, it was revealed that after release, this particular learner went back to drugs and crime because there was no food and support at home. It was also reported that some School Governing Bodies, seem to be reluctant to admit learners who have been incarcerated. This finding appears to be consistent with literature which states that "the length of student's stay in a correctional centre in that facility's educational programme is determined by the courts, not by the academic needs.

Students are likely to be moved from the facility without notice, and many sometimes miss a substantial part of school tuition while they attend court” (Tam, Heng & Rose, 2007:139).

## 5.4 Curriculum

The findings from the school’s year plan reflect that the school academic year started on the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2012. In unison, 100% of the respondents reported that the school is registered with the Department of Education. The results from 17% of the respondents reported that curriculum policies that are used at the school come directly from the Department of Education and the school receives all circulars from the District office. It was also revealed that the school follows the same curriculum as other full-time schools and Adult Education and Training centres within the Department of Education. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that it is recommended that “a comprehensive range of programmes be available in correctional facilities, that there be curriculum statements and expected outcomes for each subject, equipment, facilities be of the same standard as those provided in public schools, and that special education programmes be available for students with disabilities” (Semmens, 1998:32).

In the current study, 17% of the respondents reported that training of educators in curriculum matters is done by the Department of Education District Office under which the school is registered. It has also been reported that examinations monitoring and subjects policies at the school is done mainly by officials and subject advisors from DOE. The research revealed that in some instances the principal invites subject advisors from the Department of Education to give guidance to educators in curriculum related matters. However, 17% of the respondents reported that the school is sometimes visited by officials from the Region and Head office within the Department of Correctional Services for monitoring and evaluation.

Evidence gathered from the school timetable shows that the school starts at 7H30 until 14H00 from Monday to Thursday and subjects listed are for both general and commercial streams from grade 10-12. It was reported that tuition time ends at 11H00 on Fridays. However, 33% of the respondents reported that since learners are staying within the institution, if an educator needs to catch up with the syllabus, one may teach over the week- end. It was reported that 1 hour is reserved for consultation with Social workers, Psychologists and Nurses in the school timetable.

The findings from 33% of the respondents in this study revealed that one experiences difficulty in teaching Business Studies at the school since learners cannot be taken out for educational tours and subjects like Physical Science cannot be included in the school curriculum. This perspective seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that “due to the shortage of space, security risks, and limited funding for necessary supplies, some academic subjects are less likely to be included into correctional education curricula than others. Furthermore, courses or subjects that require science laboratories, computers, extensive library research, and or internet access are difficult to offer due to available space and how that space must be changed for the course or subject to take place” (Sanford & Foster, 2006:606).

Literature reveals that in the case of learners who attend school inside the correctional centre, access to the internet is forbidden especially in high security correctional centres, “with this mode of study further excluding the already socially excluded” (Watts, 2010:61). This perspective seems to be consistent with the findings in this study where 17% of the respondents reported the non-availability of internet access that makes teaching at the school difficult. Sanford & Foster, (2006:607) also appear to be consistent with this view, in that, even when these challenges are reduced, due to security measures, there is a high shortage of resources for educational programmes in correctional centres. The majority of correctional centres do not only “not make computers widely available for student use, but also there is no internet access available.”

In this study, 33% of the respondents reported that Fridays are regarded as a sports day and therefore the school timetable ends at 11H00 due to sports activities. In unison, 100% of the respondents in the current study reported that school starts with a morning assemble prayers every day. Evidence from the school examination timetables reflect that learners write simultaneously with other learners in the Department of Education. 33% of the respondents also reported that learner assessment is done internal and external by the Department of Education. 17% of the respondents reported that Grade 12 learners at the school write common examinations in March, June and September simultaneously with other learners in DOE. It was revealed that the general learner performance at the school in March and June assessment results in 2012 was above 80%. The results from 33% of the respondents revealed that, some tests are



moderated by other schools within the Department of Education. It was reported that the moderation of oral marks and Continuous Assessment documents for Grade 12 learners is conducted by the Department of Education and educators at the school attend cluster meetings with other teachers in DOE.

Unanimously, 100% of the respondents in this study reported that Grade 12 year- end results have been good in the past. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which affirms that “in January 2010 when the 2009 matric results were announced, it was evident that the school delivered on its resolve to improve on its pass rate of the previous year. After achieving a commendable 75 percent in 2008, the school outsmarted many resource rich schools by pulling off a remarkable 97% matric pass rate for 2009. The school’s 75% pass rate in 2008 was an achievement too as that was the first class that wrote the newly implemented National Curriculum Statement (NCS) following a curriculum change by the Department of Education. Altogether the 29 achievers amassed 18 subject distinctions and 55 B-symbols” (SA Corrections Today, Nov.2009-Jan.2010). In this study, 33% of the respondents testified that the school is acknowledged by the Department of Education for its performance through achievement awards.

Table 5.4.1 below shows the school’s Grade 12 year - end performance since 2004.

**TABLE 5.4.1**

<b>ACADEMIC YEAR</b>	<b>GRADE 12 YEAR - END ASSESSMENT OUTCOMES (MATRIC RESULTS)</b>
2004	100%
2005	100%
2006	96%
2007	100%
2008	75%
2009	97%
2010	96%
2011	81%

## 5.5 Resources

### 5.5.1 Educators

The findings from the school records reflect a total of 26 educators teaching at the school. Eleven educators are allocated to teach General Education and Training Band, Adult Education and Training (Level 1-4) and fifteen educators allocated for Further Education and Training Band (Grade, 10-12). School records reflect that not all educators are employed by the Department of Correctional Services. Under General Education and Training Band, only two educators are employed full-time by the Department of Correctional Services, seven educators are employed by the Department of Education to teach at the school and two educators are employed as custodial officials but are assisting at the school. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that educators in correctional centres are assisted by custodial officials who have a teaching qualification and offender tutors (Children in prison in South Africa, 1997:37).

In this study, it has been found that under Further Education and Training Band, seven educators are employed by DCS to teach full-time at the school, eight of them are employed as custodial officials but are assisting at the school and one retired English Subject Advisor who volunteered to teach English Home Language and English 1<sup>st</sup> Additional Language at the school. In addition, it was revealed that the school is utilizing the services of a mathematics educator who has to renew contract on monthly basis. This finding appears to be consistent with Sarra & Olcott, (2007:68) who assert that some educators “get their start in corrections by teaching inside during a summer session and becoming fascinated by the unusual teaching challenges they find. Others are retired from traditional school settings and start new careers teaching offenders.”

The findings gathered from the school’s allocation of duty list reveal that educators seem to be specializing in their learning areas or subjects. It appears that there is fair distribution of work load. The school year plan reflects that the school timetable and the allocation of duties lists are compiled in the presence of all educators. Four educators are appointed as class teachers for Adult Education and Training Level 1, 2, 3 and 4 and five educators are appointed as class teachers under Further Education and training band for Grade 10A, 10B, 11A, 11B and 12. In

this study, 17% of the respondents revealed that another educator is co-ordinating Higher Education and Training (HET) activities like submitting assignments and conducting examinations for students studying with the University of South Africa (UNISA) and engaging with the Department of Home affairs to make arrangements for learners' identity documents.

In the current study, 33% of the respondents reported that the process of appointing educators in DCS seems to be very slow. An example cited was an educator who was interviewed in March 2012, but who had not been appointed in September 2012. It was revealed that the school has received a donation of 30 new computers from the Department of Education, an award for Top Achieving School. However, it was revealed that currently, there is no qualified educator to transfer computer skills to learners. This perspective appears to be consistent with literature which indicates that another factor that causes challenges in addressing to the educational needs of learners is a lack of qualified and skilled educators or other educational staff in correctional environment (Jovanic, 2011:80).

In the current study, 17% of the respondents reported that even advertisements for appointing educators are not in line with the school curriculum needs. It was revealed that there is a high shortage of educators at the school since educators who leave the school for greener pastures, retire or die are not replaced. In the current study, 17% of the respondents revealed that it becomes difficult for school managers to conduct class visits at the school due to workload. Furthermore, 33% of the respondents reported that the school experiences difficulty in utilizing custodial officials with teaching qualifications since they are not registered with SACE and are unable to attend workshops with other educators in DOE.

The findings, from 100% of the respondents in this study reported experiencing lack of support from the management within DCS. The findings revealed that the only time that Senior Managers from Head office and Regional Office become visible at the school is in January when Grade 12 results are released to congratulate educators. It appeared that all respondents are dissatisfied with this action. The response from Respondent B: attest to this: "We do not want hugs, but to support us in our work." It was reported that during these visits, educators have to brief the management about challenges at the school, but those challenges are not addressed.

The findings from 67% of the respondents reported that educator development appears not to be prioritized within the Department of Correctional Services. This perspective seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that in a correctional environment, “the lack of training among staff regarding developmental issues could result in a number of problems in the day to day management of juveniles” (Tolbert, 2002:19). However, it was reported that all educators at the school attend workshops and other development opportunities such as Curriculum and Assessment Policy Statement (CAPS) workshops and seminars with other educators in DOE. Furthermore, the findings revealed that educators at the school attend Assessment Moderation Cluster meetings organized by the Department of Education District office. 17% of the respondents revealed that four educators at the school have been awarded bursaries by DOE to further their studies. It was also reported that other educators pay for their development by furthering their studies in compliance to the South African Council for Educators requirements.

In this study, 100% of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which educators are treated within the correctional centre. 33% of the respondents reported experiencing lack of respect and negative attitude towards educators. It was revealed that, there seems to be a stigma attached to someone who is an educator within Correctional Services, one ends up not feeling important or discriminated. This perspective seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that the educators’ desire to work in correctional centres “makes them equally marginalized within the education service. They gain a sense of achievement through bringing sunshine into the lives of their students” (Bhatti, 2010:36).

The results from 17% of the respondents in the current study revealed that educators in the Department of Correctional Services feel discriminated by certain policies like overtime policy, since they are not allowed to work. This finding appears to be consistent with Bhatti, (2010:33) who asserts that the uncomfortable position which correctional educators “occupy is that of their enduring marginality. They do not feel included because they are not understood by other educators, including those who teach adults in colleges of education, or those who teach teachers in universities, or indeed their children’s teachers.” In this study, 17% of the respondents testified that educators find themselves crying in their little corner, praying together, hoping that

the wheel will turn into their favour one day. 17% of the respondents revealed that educators are always reminded that “This is a correctional centre not a school.” It was also reported that sometimes educators are blamed for spoiling offenders. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that educators in a correctional environment struggle to care within institutionally prescribed prohibitions on relationships with offenders, for example, when an educator has a caring approach, it can be perceived as personal interest (Wright, 2004:200). In this study, respondent E also testified that “They call them prisoners, we call them students.” This perspective seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that in correctional centre schools “it is easy enough to label learners as prisoners, to belittle their worth as human beings, with the power and authority invested in staff by the institution, styles of communication that turn offenders from subjects into objects. However, many educators appear to resist these tendencies. As they do so, they create spheres of civility in the correctional centre social spaces where value, respect, worth, and even choice, appear” (Wright & Gehring, 2008:246).

In this study, 100% of the respondents shared the same sentiment that promotions seem not to be for educators within the Department of Correctional Services. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that, for educators within Correctional Services environment, “promotions opportunities are extremely rare” (Bhatti, 2010:31). It was reported that the salary that educators receive in the Department of Correctional Services seems to be lower as compared to other educators working in the Department of Education. This finding appears to be consistent with literature which revealed that correctional educators “see themselves as different and excluded individuals as compared to other educators who teach at Adult Centres within the communities” (Bhatti, 2010:32). It was revealed that the structure within the school does not allow upward mobility as a result other educators end up leaving the profession. Evidence gathered from the school year plan revealed that educators’ meetings are held monthly at the school. 17% of the respondents revealed that the school principal motivates educators in these meetings. The 2012 school year plan also showed two planned team building sessions for educators at the end of the first quarter in March and at the end of the second quarter in June 2012.

### **5.5.2 Budget**

Literature reveals that, to provide offenders with the necessary foundation to become productive members of society, requires adequate funding (Hall, 1990:9). In this study, 100% of the respondents revealed that funding for the school comes from the budget allocated for the correctional centre. It was revealed that budget is centralized within the Management Area, not controlled directly by the school principal. The results from 33% of the respondents revealed that the centralized budget makes it very difficult for the school to operate since purchasing of school textbooks is not prioritized by the people who control it. It was reported that the school principal attends monthly finance meetings with other managers but is not accountable for expenditure. The findings from 17% of the respondents revealed that the school principal has to submit school needs to the Senior Managers within the correctional centre. 33% of the respondents reported that budget does not cover all the school needs. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which reveals that, although educational programmes have been a success, budget for education programmes is not equivalent to the growing correctional centre population (Burton, 1993:1). However, as reported earlier on, the Department of Education utilizes its budget by paying salaries to some educators that are teaching at the school, organizing workshops for educator development and award bursaries to some educators at the school to further their studies. This finding appears to be consistent with Coley & Barton, (2006:14) who state that “gathering financial data on the resources spent on correctional education is difficult because money for correctional education programmes comes from different agencies like the State Education Department of Corrections, Local School Districts, Local or Country Governments and Special Districts.”

### **5.5.3 Learner-Teacher Support Material**

In unison, 100% of the respondents reported that Learner-Teacher Support Material for the school is bought from the budget allocated to the correctional centre by the Department of Correctional Services. The school year plan reflects that issuing of stationery to learners was planned for the 13<sup>th</sup> January 2012. However, the respondents' responses differed with regard to the sufficiency of Learner-Teacher Support Material. 17% of the respondents reported that budget for exercise books and pens appear to be enough but the school does not have a photocopier, scan and fax machine. 33% of the respondents reported that currently, the school is

running short of textbooks, answer sheets and pens. 50% of the respondents reported insufficiency of textbooks since the order is placed through tender system. It was revealed that due to the delay of the tender system, in September 2012, the school is still waiting for the delivery of text books that were ordered in April 2012. This finding seems to be consistent with Sanford & Foster, (2006:608) who assert that learner offenders “struggle with the lack of updated, relevant materials and simple supplies such as dictionaries, notebooks, pens or pencils, and access to a sufficient pool of qualified educators.”

#### **5.5.4 Classrooms**

Literature reveals that, in most correctional centres, educators “have found themselves teaching in spaces that were never meant for teaching at all. They have to teach without chalkboards, and even desks in some cases, because class could not be held in a typical classroom setting. Sometimes they have to teach in kitchens, gymnasium, converted housing spaces, religiously-affiliated space, and a space formerly used as a washroom” (Jovanic, 2011:80). This perspective appears to be consistent with the findings from this study where 33% of the respondents revealed that teaching space appears to be a challenge at the school. 50% of the respondents reported that four cells have been sub-divided into eight classrooms for teaching and learning purposes. It was revealed that the existing classrooms seem not to be conducive for teaching and learning. In this study, 33% of the respondents reported pipes leakages, big holes on the walls and the toilet inside the classroom. This perspective seems to be consistent with the research finding in the study conducted by Watts, (2010:60) which states that one of the educators testified that for “several teaching sessions undertook with a student serving a life sentence for murder, the only teaching space available was his cell, with sessions conducted on the wing with the door open and a correctional official standing guard outside. This teaching space was claustrophobic and untidy, and one in which it was difficult to settle down to teaching. The toilet located in the far corner of the cell served to remind the educator that this was essentially a living and sleeping space that was a personal space and not conducive for teaching.” However, 17% of the respondents reported that classrooms were enough when the school started to operate but due to escalating number of learners, currently, one of the staff rooms has been converted into a classroom resulting to educators to be cramped in two small staff rooms.

## 5.6 Parents involvement

In this study, it has been found that quarterly parents meetings are incorporated in the 2012 academic school year plan. It was reported that the purpose of parents meetings was to give feedback on learner assessment outcomes by issuing school report cards. This perspective seems to be consistent with Mahlangu, (2005:33) who maintains that parental involvement entails linking the schools and the communities and developing worthy associations. Furthermore, it provides the school with a method of communicating with parents. It was reported that in these meetings, parents appeared to be enthusiastic about their children's progress. 17% of the respondents reported that parents also helped in motivating learners and assisted in solving disciplinary problems such as gangsterism at the school. This finding seems to be consistent with literature which affirms that parental involvement could help in improving learner attendance, behavioural change, as well as learner and school performance (Mahlangu, 2005:33). In this study, it was also reported that parental meetings also assisted in organizing volunteer educators and donations for text books since some of the parents are educators. This finding appears to be consistent with Semmens, (1998:31) who asserts that in many countries, the shortage of correctional educators "is solved by engaging volunteers, students, professors and educators from local schools and universities."

However, 100% of the respondents reported that although parents meetings were beneficial to the school, they had been stopped by the correctional centre management in 2012. However, 17% of the respondents revealed that this decision is in contradiction with the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa (2005) which stipulates that "offender rehabilitation is a societal responsibility." It was revealed that family members also pay for tertiary education. This finding seems to be consistent with the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa, (2005:71) which stipulates that "it is the Department's hope that members of the public will support internal rehabilitation programmes run within correctional centres. This support can be achieved through the provision of resources such as expertise, funding, participation on involvement in rehabilitation programmes, provision of facilities and equipment but within the parameters of the Department's strategic framework."



## 5.7 Partnership with the Department of Education and other stakeholders

Literature reveals that correctional educators “perform their duties within partnership context. In the absence of partnerships, their efforts to assist learners are sometimes limited by insufficient support for their programmes” (Laird & Chavez, 2005:7). This perspective seems to be consistent with one of the findings in this study which revealed that the school is registered with the Department of Education. In the current study, 17% of the respondents revealed that the school receives circulars on invitations for workshops, continuous assessment moderations, oral marks and any other matter that is curriculum related. It was revealed that sometimes the school principal invites Subject Advisors from the Department of Education to assist educators at the school. It was reported that all policies utilized at the school are supplied by DOE. It was also revealed that learners write the same examinations as other learners in other schools under the Department of Education District office.

The findings from 50% of the respondents in this study revealed that other government Departments like the Department of Home Affairs help by ensuring that learners who write Grade 12 examinations have identity documents. It was revealed that some learners who pass Grade 12 at the school are awarded bursaries by organizations such as the South African Institute of Chartered Accountants (SAICA), National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) and the Department of Education to further studies at tertiary level. 33% of the respondents revealed that non-governmental organizations (NGOs) like Sakhithemba and Young Man Christian Association (YMCA) help with the accommodation to offenders who do not have a place to stay after release, Anti-hunger Project helps with mentoring and supply monthly food parcels to released offenders that are furthering studies at tertiary level. This perspective appears to be consistent with the findings from the study conducted by Noad, (1998:93) who asserts that “to meet the diversity of offender education needs in Australia, Adult Education and Vocational Institute (AEVTI) uses a range of providers, such as educators from AEVTI and NSW TAFE, programmes from Western Australia Midland College of TAFE, Queensland Distance Education College, NSW TAFE OTEN, St John’s First Aid and Parasol.”

In the current study, 17% of the respondents revealed that the school has strong partnership with other schools in the communities. It was reported that educators from these schools help in motivating learners and educators in curriculum related matters at the school since it is believed

that “Professional interaction rubs off.” This perspective seems to be consistent with one of the findings from the research conducted by Texas State Controller of Public Accounts report, (1992:46) which reveals that “many offenders have a history of failure and need strong positive reinforcement. Moreover, some learner offenders have special problems, such as language, mental or physical problems which require special training and properly trained educators.”

## **5.8 Education as a rehabilitation tool**

In unison, 100% of the respondents in this study perceived education as a best tool and pillar to rehabilitation. 17% of the respondents reported that education has a proof, gauge and can be measurable. This finding appears to be consistent with literature which reveals that “providing offenders with the right to education involves more than simply increasing the delivery of a good, it involves contributing to the restoration of their self-esteem and to their peaceful reintegration in society. In other words, education in correctional centres should ultimately help offenders to become protagonist of their own life-stories” (De Sa e Silva, 2009:195). This perspective seems to be consistent with the finding in this study which revealed that education helps to boost offenders’ self-esteem since the majority of them when they start to attend school, cannot read and write and through education they could write their names.

In this study, 17% of the respondents testified that education can be used as a yardstick for parole. This finding seems to be consistent with Harlow, Jenkins & Steurer, (2010:86) who assert that “incentives in the correctional system may serve to involve offenders who would not otherwise have participated in education. Time off sentences and improved opportunities for parole are among the most powerful incentives available for incarcerated people.” 17% of the respondents reported observing change in behaviour and self-esteem to school going learners than other offenders who do not attend school within the correctional centre. It was revealed that daily prayers in the morning assemble and life orientation learning area, appear to contribute to behavioural change. This perspective seems to be consistent with the finding in the study conducted by Schimer, (2008:30) where correctional officials interviewed testified witnessing a marked difference in behavioural matters between literate and illiterate offenders.

In this study, 33% of the respondents testified witnessing education transforming one learner at the school, whom they regard as a living testimony, who belonged to number 26 gangsters and started school in Adult Education and Training level 2, progressed through all levels and passed Grade 12 with five distinctions. It was reported that, the “boy” was awarded a bursary by the South African Institute for Chartered Accountants (SAICA) to register at the university. It was revealed that currently, whilst the learner is studying at the university is helping other learners in accounting within the community. 17% of the respondents reported that even today the boy is well behaved, active in church and also involved in a number of projects in the community. In unison, 100% of the respondents testified with pride about another boy who entered the school in Grade 10 and managed to obtain seven distinctions in Grade 12. 17% of the respondents reported that this boy managed to pass Business Economics with 100% and everyone cried tears of joy since “He moved from zero to hero”. It was revealed that through the assistance of SAICA, the boy managed to study at the university and is currently busy serving articles to qualify as a Chartered Accountant. 17% of the respondents testified that nowadays the boy is visionary, focused and a disciplined individual.

The results from 33% of the respondents in this study revealed that through the assistance of the South African Institute for Chartered Accountants and NSFAS, currently twelve learners from the school are furthering studies at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University and the University of KwaZulu Natal. It was revealed that other learners are studying with the University of South Africa funded by the National Student Financial Aid Scheme. In this study, 17% of the respondents revealed that education seems to assist in giving offenders skills that enables them to find employment. 50% of the respondents cited examples of learners from the school that are currently employed at different institutions in the country like the University of South Africa, Capitec Bank and an engineering company in Johannesburg. However, 17% of the respondents revealed that learners studying at the school always ask whether they will be able to find jobs when released from the correctional centre. This perspective seems to be consistent with the findings in the study conducted by Ozdemir, (2010:393) where one participant offender interviewed testified that he believed that the courses that he took in the correctional centre would both advance his personal life, family life and social life and assist him find employment

after release. However, he was uncertain if companies would hire them because other organizations do not want to deal with ex-offender.

## **5.9 Conclusion**

In this study, all respondents were able to share common as well as contrasting viewpoints based on their personal experiences in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. This chapter outlined and discussed findings of the study based on the data collected. Most themes and sub-themes discussed correlate to what has been reported in literature. However, instances where data contradicts literature were highlighted. It should therefore be acknowledged that this study was conducted within the South African context although most of the literature emerged from international context. Based on the findings, the subsequent chapter outlines recommendations and conclusions.

## CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

### 6.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline recommendations and conclusions of this study.

### 6.2 Recommendations for policy and practice

Emanating from the findings in this study, the following recommendations are proposed for the Department of Correctional Services:

#### 6.2.1 *Educator development*

Priority should be given to educator development in the full-time schools within the Department of Correctional Services. The school principal should ensure that an educator development plan is available at the school. “As a human resource manager, the school principal needs to set up mechanisms for nurturing and unfolding of educators’ potential in order to enhance effective teaching and learning” (Mathibe, 2007:523). This recommendation is in line with the Personnel Administrative Measures policy (PAM), (1999:15, paragraph ii) which states it clearly that “one of the responsibilities of the school principal is the development of staff training programmes, both school-based, school focused and externally directed, and to assist educators, particularly new and inexperienced educators, in developing and achieving educational objectives in accordance with the needs of the school.”

#### 6.2.2 *Educator recruitment*

The process of educator recruitment should be prioritized by Human Resource Division to fill vacant posts timeously, since the absence of an educator impacts negatively on teaching and learning. In addition, advertised posts should be in line with the school curriculum needs and salary entry level aligned to the Department of Education. The school principal should be involved in the appointment process of educators. Furthermore, the structure for a full-time school should be aligned to the school curriculum to create additional posts that will assist in absorbing custodial officials with teaching qualifications. The appointment and determination of salaries for educators should be in line with the criteria stipulated in the Personnel Administrative Measures of (1999: paragraph 2). This will assist in attracting qualified educators

for scarce skills subjects like mathematics and accounting and prevent the migration of educators from DCS to DOE.

### ***6.2.3 Transfer or withdrawal of learners from the school***

Based on the findings from this study, it is recommended that school management should be notified about learners who have been released so that they should be withdrawn from the school attendance registers and issued with transfer letters for proper placement in schools within communities. In addition, School Governing Bodies should be approached by officials from the Department of Correctional Services before such learners are released for proper placement in schools within communities. Grade 12 learners should be released after completing writing final examinations. Literature reveals that classes are frequently interrupted by various correctional centre procedures, and students are always being transferred to other correctional centres before they can complete their studies (Yates & Frolander, 2001:4). In this study, one respondent testified that a learner was released from the correctional centre whilst studying Grade 12.

### ***6.2.4 School budget***

The school principal should manage the school budget to avoid a delay in the purchasing of school needs like textbooks, stationery and pens for learners. Section 16 (3) of the South African Schools Act No.84 of 1996, stipulates that “professional management of a public school must be undertaken by the principal under the authority of the Head of Department.” The school principal therefore, as an instructional leader, should ensure that educators have all the resources required for teaching and learning at the school.

### ***6.2.5 Parents involvement***

Parents should be given an opportunity to be involved in their children’s education by convening quarterly parents meetings with educators within the correctional centre. Literature affirms that parents have a role to play in the education of their children, by making sure that the environment at home, at school and also in the community is conducive for teaching and learning. It is believed that the moment children see parents show some interest in their education; they take their studies more seriously (Mahlangu, 2005:51).

### ***6.2.6 Incentive for participation in education programmes***

Learners should receive an incentive for participation in education programmes within correctional centres. This will increase the number of offenders participating in education programmes thus assists the Department of Correctional Services to achieve its objective of offender rehabilitation. Literature through Harlow, Jenkins & Steurer, (2010:87) affirm that “time off sentences and improved opportunities for parole are among the most powerful incentives for incarcerated people.”

## **6.3 Recommendations for further research**

This study focused on educators’ experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. The following are suggestions for further research:

### ***6.3.1 Learners attending school within correctional centre full-time schools***

Further research should be conducted to investigate learners’ experience in attending a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment.

### ***6.3.2 Learners who passed grade 12 within correctional centre school pursuing studies at the university***

Further research should be conducted to investigate experience of learners who passed Grade 12 within Correctional Services full-time schools and pursue studies with different tertiary institutions.

### ***6.3.3 Education as a rehabilitation tool***

Further research should be conducted to investigate the experience of learners who managed to find employment through correctional education. In this study, it was revealed that some learners have managed to find employment through the education they received from this full-time school. Fabelo, (2002:109) argues that “offenders with the highest education are more likely upon release to obtain employment, earn higher wages and have lower recidivism rate. Furthermore, literature affirms that “a college educated offender has a greater capacity to function within a social context. Once integrated, the ex-convict, educated at taxpayers’ expense,

becomes a taxpayer instead of being a burden on society. He or she can function as a productive member of the community. It is believed that education is one of the best investments a society can make within a penal setting” (Yates & Frolander, 2001:3).

## **6.4 Conclusions**

The purpose of this study was to investigate and explore educators’ experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment through the following research questions:

### **a) Main question**

- i) What are the educators’ experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment?

### **b) Sub-questions**

- i) How is a full-time school managed within Correctional Services?
- ii) How does a Correctional Services environment affect teaching and learning process in a full- time school?
- iv) What are the educators’ perceptions with regard to using education as a crime control strategy or rehabilitation tool for offenders within Correctional Services?

Answers to the research questions provided a refined understanding of managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. The following conclusions were generated from the findings:

#### **6.4.1 Teaching-learning environment**

Correctional Services environment is not conducive for teaching and learning. Literature affirms that teaching in a correctional centre “is a transformative experience for the educator. Just going into the correctional centre gives one a good idea of how it strips away a person’s individuality as it takes away his and her freedom. Each time educators go to teach, they are subjected to intensive scrutiny of their brief cases, metal detection, drug scans, and occasionally the mean-spiritedness of correctional officials. They go through a set of metal doors that slam shut behind



them just like in the movies, and once through another set of doors, they walk into the yard with its ever-present gates and gloomy atmosphere” (Yates & Frolander, 2001:7). In this study, the majority of respondents testified about the environment being not conducive for teaching and learning and education not respected and prioritized within a correctional centre due to security measures.

#### **6.4.2 Resources**

Correctional Services environment does not have adequate resources for the delivery of education programmes. The findings from this study revealed that there is a shortage of educators, textbooks, stationery and pens at the school. Literature reveals that “sufficient resources do not exist and almost certainly will never exist to educate offenders” (Texas State Controller of Public Accounts report, 1992:17). “In New York Horizon Academy, only five of twenty seven educators are trained in special education, despite the special needs of most of the students, and there is only one guidance counsellor in Indiana. There are only two of state correctional centres that offer high school courses, and in those that do, books are few and usually woefully outdated” (Yates & Frolander, 2001:7). “In Texas offenders cannot participate in educational programmes during the entire incarceration period due to limited educational resources. This limitation restricts offenders to participate in education programmes only two or three years before release” (Fabelo, 2002:109).

## Bibliography

- Adams St Pierre, E. November 2010. Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Volume 10 (2):175-189.
- Allen, R.2001. *An economic Analysis of Prison Education Programs and Recidivism*: available at: <https://law.resource.org/pub/reporter/court listener>.
- Anders, A.D. & Noblit, G.W. June 2011. *Understanding Effective Higher Education Programs in Prisons: Considerations from the Incarcerated Individuals Program In North Carolina*, Volume 62(2):77-92.
- Batchelder, J.S. & Pippert, J.M. June 2002. Hard time or Idle Time: Factors Affecting Inmate Choices Between Participation in Prison Work and Education Programs, *The Prison Journal*, Volume 82(2):269-280.
- Ben-Tsur, D. 2007. *Political Conflict Confronted Through Prison Education: A Case Study of Israeli Teachers Working with Palestinian Prisoners*, Volume 58(2):108-128.
- Bernard, T.J. & Engel, R.S. March 2001. Conceptualizing Criminal justice Theory, *Justice Quarterly*, Vol. 18(1).
- Bhatti, G. 2010. Learning Behind bars: Education in prisons, *Teaching and teacher Education*, Volume 26:31-36.
- Bianco, M.C. & Carr-Chellman, A.A .October 2000. *Exploring Qualitative Methodologies in Online Learning Evironments, Annual Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Papers Presented at the National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology*, Volume 1-2.
- Birgden, A. November 2002. Therapeutic Jurisprudence and “Good Lives” A Rehabilitation Framework for Corrections, *Australian Psychologist*, Vol.37(3):180-188.
- Biswalo, P. 2011. The Role of Adult Education in the integration of inmates into society after a jail term: Practical Experiences from Swaziland, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, Volume 30(1):71-81.
- Braun, V & Clarke, V. 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, Volume 3 (2):77-101.
- Brewster, D.R. & Sharp, S.F. September 2002. Educational Programs and Recidivism in Oklahoma: Another Look, *The Prison Journal*, Volume 82(3):314-334.
- Burton, H.D. 1993. *Reducing Recidivism through Prison Education*, available at: [joy.law.ou.edu/faculty/jforman/.../Burton Heather.doc](http://joy.law.ou.edu/faculty/jforman/.../Burton Heather.doc).

- Butler, T., Allnutt, S., Kariminia, A. & Cain, D. 2007. Mental health status of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal Australian prisoners, *Australian and new Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, Vol. 41:429-435.
- Case, P. & Fasenfest, D. March 2004. Expectations for Opportunities Following Prison Education: A Discussion of Race and Gender, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 55(1).
- Children in Prison in South Africa, A Situational Analysis.1997*. Pretoria: Community Law Centre.
- Cilliers, C. 2006. *The South African prison policy*, University of South Africa, Department of Penology: Pretoria.
- Coley, R.J. & Barton, P.E. February 2006. *Locked Up and Locked Out: An Educational Perspective on the U.S.P*: Princeton.
- Conrad, J.P. & Cavros, J. March 1981. *Adult offender education programs*, Department of Justice, Washington Dc: National Institute of Justice.
- Cook, S. & Davies, S. April 1998, *Setting the Standards. Whose Standards? The Education of Women in Prisons, A Research Paper presented at the International forum on education in penal systems held in Victoria, Australia: 5-7 April*.
- Corcoran, P.B., Walker, K.E. & Wals, A.E.J. February 2004. Case studies, make-your-case studies, and case stories: a critique of case-study methodology in sustainability in higher education, *Environmental Education Research*, Vol.10, No. 1:1-21.
- Creswell, J.W. 2008. *Educational Research, Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research, (Third Edition)*, New Jersey: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J.W., Hanson, W.E., Plano, V.L.C. & Morales, A. 2007. *Qualitative Research Designs: Selection and implementation: The Counseling Psychologist*: Volume 33(2): 236-264.
- Davis, M. November 2003. *Theoretical Foundations for Experiential Systems Designs*, University Of California: School of Information Management and Systems.
- Delamont, S. 2002. *Fieldwork in Educational Settings, Methods, Pitfall and Perspectives (Second Edition)*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Dell’Apa, F.1999. *Issues in education for the Youthful Offender in Correctional Institutions*, Washington DC:Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education:Boulder, Colo.
- De Sa e Silva. F. 2009. Education For All and The Dream of an Alternative Prison Policy in Brazil, *Convergence*, Volume 42:2-4.

- Devers, K.J. & Frankel, R.M. .2000. Study design in Qualitative Research-2: Sampling and Data Collection Strategies, *Education for Health*, Vol. 13(2): 263-271.
- Devos, A.S., Strydom, H., Fouche, C.B. & Delport, C.S.L. 2005. *Research at grassroots*, Pretoria: Van Schaik Publishers.
- Duffee, D.E. 1980. *Explaining Criminal Justice-Community Theory and Criminal Justice Reform*, Boston: Gunn and Hain Publishers, Inc.
- Fabelo, T. 2002. The impact of Prison Education on Community Reintegration of Inmates: The Texas Case, *JCE*, Volume 53, Issue 3:106-110.
- Flanagan, T.J. September 1994. *Prison Education Research Project Final Report*, Sam Houston State University:Texas State Department.
- Forum on Corrections Research. July 2011. *Correctional Service Canada*, Vol. 3(1):1-9.
- Fox, T.A. 1998. Adult Education Practices in a Canadian Federal Prison, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, Volume 27(1/2):107-121.
- Gaes, G.G. February 2008. *The Impact of Prison Programs on Post-Release Outcomes: Re-entry Roundtable on Education*.
- Galouzis, J. March 2008. Profile of Violent Behaviour by Inmates in NSW Correctional Centres, *Research Bulletin*, NSW Department of Corrective Services, Vol. 25:1-16.
- Gast, M. November 2001. *Education and the South African Juvenile Justice System, Reading for child and youth care workers*, Issue 34, available at:<http://www.cyc-net.org/cyc-online/cycol-1101-gast.html>.
- Gerardy, J. & Majavu, A. 12 April 2012. *Prison Babies Get Keys To Childhood*, Republic of South Africa: Sowetan.
- Gerber, J & Fritsch, E.J. July 1993. *Prison Education and Offender Behavior: A Review of the Scientific Literature, Prison Education Research Project: Report 1*, Texas: Submitted to the Windham School System Texas Department of Criminal Justice.
- Gordon, H.R.D & Weldon, B. 2003. The Impact of Career and Technical Education Programs on Adult Offenders: Learning Behind Bars, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Vol.54(4):200-209.
- Gorgol, L.E. & Sponsler, B.A. 2011. *Unlocking Potential: Results of a National Survey of Post Secondary Education in State Prisons*, Institute for Higher Education Policy: Washington, DC 20036.
- Goshim, L.S. & Byrne, M.W. 2009. Converging Streams of Opportunity for Prison Nursery Programs in the United States, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, Volume 48:271-295.

- Goyer, K.C. 2004. *Incarcerating and Rehabilitating Offenders, Private Muscule, Government and Social Development Centre*: University of Birmingham.
- Griffin, J.B. 2000. *Innovations in Correctional Services, an excursion through the changing prisons culture of Victoria, Core-the Public Correctional Enterprise, Resource Material Series No.56*, Australia: Department of Justice.
- Greenberg, E., Dunleavy, E. & Kutner, M. 2008. Literacy Behind Bars: Results from the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy Prison Survey, *The Journal for Vocational Special Needs Education*, Volume 30(2):27-34.
- Hager, P. & Johnson, C. 2009. Working outside the comfort of competence in a Corrections Centre:Toward Collective Competence, *Human Resource Development International*, Vol.12(5):493-509.
- Hall, R.A. 1990. *Technology Education & the felon (Teaching High School behind Prison Walls)*: New Hampshire.
- Harlow, C.W., Jenkins, H.D. & Steurer, S. March 2010. GED holders in prison read better than those in the household population:why?, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 61(1):68-92.
- Harr, D. Fall 1999. *A Plea from Behind Bars: Take a Chance on Education*, Social Policy: Criminal Justice.
- Hove, S.E. & Anda, B.2005. Experiences from Conducting Semi-Structured Interviews in Empirical Software Engineering Research, *Simula Research Laboratory*, Norway: Lysaker.
- Howells, K. & Day, A. 1999. The rehabilitation of offenders: International Perspectives Applied to Australian Correctional Systems, No 112, Canberra ACT 2601: Australian Institute of Criminology trends & issues in crime and criminal justice.
- Imhabekhai, C.I. 2002. An Appraisal of Prison Services in Edo State Nigeria, *JCE*, Volume 53(1):5-8.
- Inderbitzin, M. January 2006. *Lessons from a Juvenile Training School: Survival and Growth*, *Journal of Adolescent Research*, Vol. 21(1):7-26.
- Jenkins, D. July 2011. The Occupational Skills Training Center: Bringing The Community into The Prison, *Community into the Prison, USA*: European Prison Education Association.
- Jones, J. 1998. *The Role of the Employment Access Program Within the Juvenile Justice System, A Research Paper presented at the International forum on education in penal systems held in Victoria, Australia: 5-7 April*.
- Jones, M. 2005. *What to do? Curriculum Design for a Highly Transitory Juvenile Detention Population*, Arizona:Pima Accommodation District Tucson.

- Josselson, R. 2007. *The ethical attitude in narrative research: principles and practicalities*, in *Handbook of narrative enquiry: mapping a methodology*, Thousands Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Jovanic, G. 2011. The role of education in the treatment of offenders, *British Journal support for learning*, Vol.26(2).
- Keeley, J.H. December 2004. The Metamorphosis of Juvenile Correctional Education: Incidental Conception to Intentional Inclusion, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 55(4).
- Kraska, P.B. 2006. Criminal Justice Theory: Toward Legitimacy and an Infrastructure, *Justice Quarterly*, Volume 23(2):167-185.
- Kyparissis, P. 1998. Standards in the Design and Implementation of Programs for the Correctional Setting, *A Research Paper presented at the International forum on education in penal systems held in Victoria, Australia*: 5-7 April.
- Laird, C., Chavez, R. & Zan, M. 2005. Partnerships: How they have improved the delivery of Education and Vocational Training in WA Prisons, *A Paper presented at the Australasian Corrections Education Association (ACEA)*, Perth: Education and Vocational Training Unit Department of Justice.
- Lasevoli, D. July 2007. Behind Education: How Can You “ Be the Book” Behind Bars?, *English Journal*, Volume 96(6):19-23.
- Liebowitz, M., Robins. A & Rubin, J. 2002. *Rising to the Literacy Challenge: Building Adult Education Systems in England*, Massachusetts: Jobs for the future.
- Lochner, L & Moretti, E. 2001. *The Effect of Education on crime, Evidence from Prison Inmates, Arrests, and self-Reports*, U.S. Department of Education: Educational Resources Information Centre (ERIC).
- Mahlangu, V. P. 2005. The relationship between the School Principal and the School Governing Body, *Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Philosophiae Doctor in the Department of Education Management and Policy Studies*, Pretoria: University of Pretoria.
- Manger, T., Eikeland, O., Diseth, A., Hetland, H. & Asbjornsen, A. December 2010. Prison Inmates’ Educational Motives: Are They Pushed or Pulled? *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 54(6):535-547.
- Mathibe, I. 2007. The Professional Development of School Principals, *South African Journal of Education*, Vol. 27(3):523-540.
- Matthews, R. & Pitts, J. 1998. Rehabilitation, Recidivism, and Realism: Evaluating Violence Reduction Programs in Prison, *The Prison Journal*, Vol. 78(4): 390-405.



- Mentor, K. 1994. *College Courses in Prison*, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, Pembroke: University of North Carolina.
- Messemer, J.E. & Valentine, T. Summer 2004. The Learning Gains of Male Inmates Participating in Basic Skills Program, *Adult Basic Education*, Volume 14(2): 67-89.
- McCann, K., McCormick, N., Delcourt, K. & Preston, K. 2005. *Corrections Education in Victoria, A Research Paper on the Overview of Corrections Education in Victoria, Australia*, Victoria: Corrections Education Association.
- McKinney, D & Contronea, M.A. 2011. Using Self-Determination Theory in Correctional Education program Development, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 62(3):175-193.
- McMillan & Wergin, J.F. 2002. *Understanding and Evaluating Educational research*, (Second Edition), London: Merrill Prentice-Hall International Limited.
- Mears, D.P. & Travis, J. January 2004. *Youth Development and Re-entry, Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, Vol. 2(1): 3-20.
- Meijer, P.C., Verloop, N. & Beijaard, D.2002. Multi-Method Triangulation in a Qualitative Study on Teachers' Practical Knowledge: An Attempt to Increase Internal Validity, *Quality and Quantity*, Volume 36: 145-167.
- Murray, L. & Lawrence, B. 2000. *Practitioner-Based Enquiry, Principles for Postgraduate Research*, London: Falmer Press.
- Mutingh, L. & Ballard, C. 2012. *Report on Children in Prison in South Africa*, University of the Western Cape, Cape Town: Community Law Centre.
- Noad, B. 1998. *Achieving and maintaining Best Practice in Adult Corrections Education, A Research Paper presented at the International forum on education in penal systems held in Victoria, Australia*, 5-7 April.
- Ntsohi, M.P. 2005. *Privatization of Prisons and Prison Services in South Africa, A research report submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters in Administration in the School of Government*, Cape Town: Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences, University of the Western Cape.
- O'Brien, M., Dodd, J. & Bilney, B. 2008. A qualitative analysis of a progressive resistance exercise programme for people with Parkinson's disease, *Disability and Rehabilitation*, Volume 30(18): 1350-1357.
- O'Neill, L., Mackenzie, D.L. & Bierie, D.M. August 2007. Educational Opportunities Within Correctional Institutions: Does Facility Type Matter? *The Prison Journal*, Volume 87(3):311-327.

- O'Shea, T.C. September 2007. Getting the deterrence Message Out: The project state neighbourhoods Public- Private Partnership, *Police quarterly*, Volume 10(3): 288-307.
- Ozdemir, S.M. 2010. An Examination of the Educational Programmes held For Juvenile Delinquents in Turkey, *Education*, Volume 130(3):384-398.
- Parrotta, K.L. & Thompson, G.H. April 2011. Sociology of the Prison Classroom: Marginalized Identities and Sociological Imaginations Behind Bars, Teaching Sociology, *American Sociological Association*, Volume 39(2):165-178.
- Parsons, M & Langenbach, M. 1993. The Reasons Inmates Indicate they Participate in Prison Education Programs: Another Look at Boshier's PEPS, *Journal Of Correctional Education*, Volume 44(1): 38-41.
- Penaluna, K. 1998. *Pathways Planning in Vocational Education and Training for Adults and Juveniles in Custody: The Victorian Model, A Research Paper presented at the International forum on education in penal systems held on, Victoria: 5-7 April 1998.*
- Penny, T.S. September 2000. *Educating Prisoners, Lock them up, but don't throw away the Education key, Paper delivered to the GED graduating class, Rochester, Minnesota: Federal Medical Center.*
- Petersilia, J. September 2001. Prisoner Re-entry: Public Safety and Reintegration Challenges, *The Prison Journal*, Vol. 81(3): 360-375.
- Piccone, J.E. September 2006. Administering the Test of Adult Basic education at intake: A Biased Marker of Offender Ability, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Vol. 57(3).
- Pope, C., Ziebland, S. & Mays, N. 2000. Qualitative research in health care, Analysing Qualitative data, *Education and Debate*, BMJ, Volume 320: 114-116.
- Provest, G., Noad, B. & Sylva, C .1998. *Joint DCS/TAFE NSW Strategic Plan for TAFE NSW Provision for Aboriginal Inmates, A Research Paper presented at the International forum on education in penal systems held in Victoria, Australia: 5-7 April.*
- Republic of South Africa, Department of Basic Education Website,*The Kha Ri Gude Mass Literacy Campaign*:<http://www.kharigude.co.za>.
- Republic of South Africa. 11 November 2008. *Correctional Services Amendment Act*, Government Gazette, Vol. 521:No.31593, Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Republic of South Africa, May 2012. *Department of Correctional Services: Human Resources Personnel Report*: Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa, *Department of Correctional Services Annual Report for the 2006/07 Financial Year*, Department of Correctional Services: Pretoria.



- Republic of South Africa, *Department of Correctional Services Website, Development and Care Branch*, Formal Education Directorate: [www.dcs.gov.za](http://www.dcs.gov.za).
- Republic of South Africa .1996. *The Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act No. 108 of 1996*, Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Republic of South Africa. May 2012. *Overberg Voice, 0282151190*, Department of Correctional Services, Overberg Management Area, Volume 5: Issue 5.
- Republic of South Africa. February 1999. Personnel Administrative measures G.N 222. Pretoria: Government Gazette No.19767.
- Republic of South Africa, *SA Corrections Today*. November 2009-January 2010, Department of Correctional Services: Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa, *SA Corrections Today*. August-September 2008, Department of Correctional Services: Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa, *SA Corrections Today*. January-February 2007, Department of Correctional Services: Pretoria.
- Republic of South Africa. 1996. *South African Schools Act No.84 of 1996*, Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Republic of South Africa. 2007. Unpublished brochure on Formal Education Programmes, Department of Correctional Services, Pretoria :Formal Education Directorate.
- Republic of South Africa, *The White Paper on Corrections*, Department of Correctional Services: Pretoria.
- Ripley, P.1993. *Prison Education in England and Wales* (2<sup>nd</sup> Revised Edition), England: United Kingdom, Staff College.
- Robinson, G & Shapland, J. February 2008. *Reducing Recidivism, A Task for Restorative Justice*, *Brit. J. Criminol*, Vol.48: 337-358.
- Robinson, G. & Raynor, P. 2006. The future of rehabilitation: What role for the probation service? *The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, Vol.53(4): 334-346.
- Roper, S. 2005. APAC (*Communities and Restoration*) *Faith Based Prison Programs, Education & Work/Vocational Training Aspects, A Research Paper presented at the ACEA Conference*, Darlinghurst, New South Wales, Queensland: Prison Fellowship International Associate.
- Rozani, A.N. 2010. *Attitudes of Correctional Officials Towards The rehabilitation and Human Treatment of Offenders: Leeuwkop Correctional Institution*, Dissertation submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Magister Artium in Psychology in the Faculty of Humanities, Johannesburg: University Of Johannesburg.

- Samuels, J.A . 2010. *Challenges that offenders face upon release that contribute to recidivism in the Department of Correctional Services*, a mini-thesis submitted in part-fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Development Studies, Cape Town: University of the Western Cape.
- Sanford, R & Forster, J.E. 2006. Writing and prison education reform?, The trick and political process of establishing college programs for prisoners: perspectives from program developers, *Equal opportunities*, Volume 25 (7):599-610.
- Sarra, D. & Olcott, L. 2007. *A Day at Osborne School*, State University of New York, Cartland: Department of Social Foundations and Social Advocacy.
- Schirmer, S.L. 2008. Education Behind Bars: Lowering Recidivism through Post-Secondary Education in Correctional Facilities, *The Current*, Volume 1:23-37.
- Semmens, B.1998. *Vocational education and training*, Victoria, Australia: Oceania.
- Sharma, S. September 2010. Contesting institutional discourse to create new possibilities for understanding lived experience: life stories of young women in detention, rehabilitation, and education, *Race Ethnicity and Education*, Volume 13 (3): 327-347.
- Shethar, A. December 1993. Literacy and “Empowerment”? A case Study of Literacy behind Bars, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, Volume 24(4): 357-372.
- Shinji, T. 2009. Kiran Libraries For Children in Prison In Pakistan, *Convergence*, Volume 42, Numbers 2-4: 161-171.
- Sithole, M.S. 2008. *The impact of prison circumstances in perpetuating re-offending at Glencoe Correctional Centre*, Thesis submitted in fulfillment of Masters Degree, Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.
- Sowell, E.J. 2001. *Educational Research, an Integrative Introduction*, London: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Steinberg, J. January 2005. *Prison Overcrowding and the Constitutional Right to Adequate Accommodation in South Africa*, A Paper commissioned by the Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, Pretoria: Centre for the Study of Violence and reconciliation.
- Steurer, S.J., Linton, J., Nally, J. & Lockwood, S. August 2010. *The Top-Nine Reasons To Increase Correctional Education Programs*: Corrections Today.
- Steurer, S.J. & Smith, L.G. February 2003. Education reduces Crime: Three-State Recidivism Study. Executive Summary, *Correctional Education Association*: Centerville: Management & Training Corporation.
- Stringer, E. 2004. *Action Research in Education*, New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.

- Tam, K.B., Heng, M.A. & Rose, D. June 2007. Voices from Correctional Educators and Young Offenders in Singapore: A Preliminary Needs Assessment Study of the Kaki Bukit Centre Prison School, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 58(2): 129-144.
- Texas State Controller of Public Accounts Report. December 1992. *Schools Behind Bars: Windham School System and Other Prison Education Programmes, A Performance Review*, MGT of America, Texas: Inc., Tallahassee, F.L.
- Thomson, P & Walker, M. 2009. *The Routledge Doctoral Student's Companion, Getting to grips with research in Education and the Social Sciences*, London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tolbert, M. 2002. State Correctional Education Programs. State policy Update, DC, Washington: National Institute for Literacy.
- Tomal, D .R. 2010. *Action research for Educators*: Plymouth: Rowman and Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
- Tye, C.S. & Mullen, P.E. 2006. Mental disorders in female prisoners, *Journal of Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatry*, Volume 40: 266-271.
- Ubah, C.B.A. & Robinson, J.R.L. June 2003. A Grounded Look at the Debate Over Prison-Based Education: Optimistic Theory Versus Pessimistic Worldview, *The Prison Journal*, Volume 83(2): 115-129.
- U.S. Department of Education. 2009. *Partnerships Between Community Colleges and Prisons: Providing Workforce Education and Training to Reduce Recidivism*, Office of Vocational and Adult Education: Washington DC.
- Vacca, J.S. 2004. Educated Prisoners Are Less Likely to Return to Prison, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 55(4): 297-304.
- Van Waters, M. June 1995. Incentive and Penalty in Education, *Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 46, Issue 2:79-82.
- Wade, B. Spring 2007. Studies of Correctional Education Programs, *Adult Basic Education and Literacy Journal*, Volume 1(1): 27-31.
- Warner, K.October 2005. *Against the narrowing perspectives: how do we see learning, prisons and prisoners? A research paper presented at Australasian Corrections Education Association Conference*, Dublin 4: available at [www.pesireland.org](http://www.pesireland.org).
- Watts, J.H. February 2010. Teaching a distance higher education curriculum behind bars: challenges and opportunities, *Opening learning*, Volume 25(1):57-64.
- Welch, M.1995. Rehabilitation: Holding its Ground in Corrections, *HeinOnline*, Volume 59(4).

- Wilson, D.B., Gallagher, C.A. & Mackenzie, D.L. 2008. A meta-analysis of Corrections-Based Education, Vocation, and Work Programs for Adult Offenders, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, Volume 37(4):347-368.
- Winterfield, L., Coggeshall, M., Burke-Storer., Correa, C. & Tidd, S. May 2009. *The Effects of Postsecondary Correctional Education: Final Report*, Washington, DC20037: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center.
- Wisker, G. 2008. *The postgraduate research Handbook (Second Edition)*, New York :Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wolford, B.I. 1986. *Correctional Education: Perspectives on Programmes for Adult Offenders. Information Series No.310, Eric Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education*, Columbus, Ohio: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED).
- Woolard, J.L., Odgers, C., Lanza-Kaduce, L. & Daglis, H. 2005. Juveniles within Adult Correctional Settings: Legal Pathways and Developmental Considerations, *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, Vol.4(1): 1-18.
- Wright, R. September 2004. Care as the “heart” of Prison Teaching, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 55 (3): 191-207.
- Wright, R & Gehring, T. 2008. From Spheres of Civility to Critical Public Spheres: Democracy and Citizenship in the Big House (Part I), *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Volume 59(3): 244-260.
- Yates, M.D. July-August 2001. Teaching in prison, *Monthly Review*, Volume 53(3):1-11.
- Yates, M.D. & Frolander, M. July-August 2001. Teaching in Prison, *Monthly Review*, Volume 53, No.3:1-11.
- Zan, M. 1998. *Working with the Education needs of Juvenile Offenders in a Community Context, A Research Paper presented at the International forum on education in penal systems held in Victoria, Australia: 5-7 April.*
- Zaro, D. 2007. Teaching Strategies for the Self-Actualized Correctional Educator: The Inside Person vs. the Outside Person, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, Vol. 58(1):27-41.



**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE: N.G.MKOSI: REFERENCE  
NUMBER EM 11/11/04**

**1. QUESTIONS FOR DIVISIONAL HEAD AND SECTION HEAD (SCHOOL  
PRINCIPAL/ DEPUTY PRINCIPAL)**

**SECTION A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

GENDER

EXPERIENCE

QUALIFICATIONS

**SECTION B: EXPERIENCE IN MANAGING A FULL-TIME SCHOOL WITHIN A  
CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ENVIRONMENT**

1. How long have you been the principal/deputy principal in this school?
2. Where did you work before you became the principal/deputy principal in this school? For how many years?
3. Can you share with me your experience in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment?
4. What are the highlights as a school principal/deputy principal in this school and why?
5. Can you recommend a teaching job in this school to a friend or colleague? If so, why if not, why not?

## **SECTION C: MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE**

6. Which school policies do you have in place in this school? Who is responsible for crafting these policies?
7. Who is assisting you in managing and governing this school? Explain the role of these people?
8. How do you make sure that school administration is efficiently managed?
9. How do you co-ordinate school activities and timetable in this school?

## **SECTION D: RESOURCES**

10. How many educators do you have in this school?
11. Are they qualified and registered with the South African Council for Educators (SACE)? What is the average qualification of these educators and how do you ensure that all educators are registered with the professional body?
12. Since this school is not within the community, how do you ensure that your educators receive the same training as other educators in the community?
13. Who is responsible for funding in this school? How is budget managed? Please explain the processes.
14. How many classrooms do you have/ do they serve all your school needs? If yes how and if no, why not?
14. Briefly explain to me the whole school organization, learner teacher support material etc.

## **SECTION E: LEARNERS**

15. Can you give more information about the type of learners present at the school?
16. How do you ensure that there is discipline at the school?
17. Can you explain briefly, what processes do you have in place for admission of learners in this school?
18. How is the general performance of learners?
19. What is your perception about using education as a rehabilitation tool in this school?

## **SECTION F: STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT**

20. Who are the partners or main stakeholders involved in this school and what is their role?
21. Are the parents involved in the education of their children? If yes, how? If not, why not?
22. Which additional information you would like me to know about managing this school?
23. Who is responsible for monitoring and evaluation of education programmes in this school?

## **2. EDUCATORS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE**

### **SECTION A: BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION**

GENDER

EXPERIENCE

QUALIFICATIONS

### **SECTION B: EXPERIENCE IN MANAGING AND TEACHING IN A FULL-TIME SCHOOL WITHIN A CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ENVIRONMENT**

1. How long have you been in the teaching profession?
2. Where did you start teaching, and for how long?
3. Is teaching in this school different from teaching in your previous school? If so, how? If not, what are the similarities?
4. Would you recommend this school to your friend or previous colleague? Yes or No and why?
5. What are your memorable experiences about teaching in this particular school?
6. Can you tell me more about your daily activities at the school?

### **SECTION C: RESOURCES**

7. Do you have sufficient resources (budget, classrooms, textbooks, stationery etc) and support for rendering education programmes in this school? Yes/No. Please motivate your answer.

## SECTION D: STAFF DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

8. Which staff development opportunities or workshops do you attend as educators within the school?
9. Is the assessment of learners performed internal or external? Please explain
10. How do you rate the general learner performance at the school? Excellent, Good or Poor? Please motivate.

## SECTION E: MANAGEMENT AND LEARNERS

11. Tell me more about the management and learners in this school?
12. Do you think that these learners are different from the other learners in the community? If so how? If not, what are the similarities?
13. Do you have any discipline related problems in your school? Yes or No. If yes how do you handle it?
14. How is learner attendance managed in this school?
15. Do you think that education can change a learner's behaviour? Yes or No. Please support your response with an explanation.
16. Which other things you would like to share with me about teaching in this school?

RESEARCHER: N.G. MKOSI

SIGNATURE: .....

DATE: .....





**REFERENCE NUMBER: EM 11/11/04**

The National Commissioner  
Department of Correctional Services  
National Office  
P/B X136  
Pretoria  
0001

Dear Sir

**RE: APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH AT  
USETHUBENI YOUTH SCHOOL: DURBAN WESTVILLE CORRECTIONAL  
CENTRE, KZN REGION**

I am a Masters in Educational Leadership student at the University of Pretoria. My intention is to conduct research with educators at Usethubeni Youth School about their experiences in managing a full-time school within a Correctional Services environment. My research topic is:

**MANAGING A FULL-TIME SCHOOL WITHIN A CORRECTIONAL SERVICES  
ENVIRONMENT.**

The research will require educators to be involved in semi-structured one on one interviews and an audio-tape will be used to assist in transcribing data verbatim during data analysis stage. The duration of the interviews will be 60 minutes arranged at a time convenient to the educators and documents related to school management will also be collected and analyzed.

Please note that the names of the educators will not be identified in the findings and the report of my research. I will use pseudonyms to ensure anonymity and confidentiality. The educators are

free to withdraw from this research at any time. Participation is voluntary. I promise to abide to all conditions applicable to research done in the Department of Correctional Services.

Please find attached an interview schedule that will be used during the interview process as well as the copy of the Research Proposal that outlines procedures of the research.

Your positive response in this regard will be highly appreciated.

Sincerely

RESEARCHER: MKOSI N.G.

SIGNATURE: .....

DATE: .....



## correctional services

Department:  
Correctional Services  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X136, PRETORIA, 0001 Poyntons Building, C/O Church and Schubart Street, PRETORIA  
Tel (012) 307 2000, Fax (012) 328-5111

Ms. NG Mkosi  
PO Box 9197  
Pretoria  
0001

Dear Ms. Mkosi

**RE: APPLICATION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ON: "MANAGING A FULL TIME SCHOOL WITHIN CORRECTIONAL SERVICES ENVIRONMENT."**

It is with pleasure to inform you that your request to conduct research in the Department of Correctional Services on the above topic has been approved.

Your attention is drawn to the following:

- The relevant Regional and Area Commissioners where the research will be conducted will be informed of your proposed research project.
- Your internal guide will be **Division Head: Training and Education (Durban Westville), Mr P Pillay**. You are requested to contact him at telephone number (031) 204 8944 before the commencement of your research.
- It is your responsibility to make arrangements for your interviewing times.
- Your identity document and this approval letter should be in your possession when visiting.
- You are required to use the terminology used in the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa (February 2005) e.g. offenders not prisoners and Correctional Centres not prisons.
- You are not allowed to use photographic or video equipment during your visits, however the audio recorder is allowed.
- You are required to submit your final report to the Department for approval by the Commissioner of Correctional Services before publication (including presentation at workshops, conferences, seminars, etc) of the report.
- Should you have any enquiries regarding this process, please contact the Directorate Research for assistance at telephone number 012-307-2770/2359.

Thank you for your application and interest to conduct research in the Department of Correctional Services.

Yours faithfully

ND SIHLEZANA  
DC: POLICY CO-ORDINATION & RESEARCH

DATE: 14/08/2012



**REFERENCE NUMBER: EM 11/11/04**

Dear Sir/Madam:

**RE: REQUEST TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH:**

My name is Ntombizanele Gloria Mkosi a Masters in Educational Leadership student at the University of Pretoria. I wish to ask your permission to participate in my research. Please read this consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

**Research Topic: Managing a Full -Time School within a Correctional Services Environment.**

**Purpose of the research study:**

The purpose of this study is to investigate and explore the educators' experiences in managing a full time school within a Correctional Services environment. **This study is part of the completion of a Med (Educational Leadership) programme and the information collected will be used for research purposes only.**

**What you will be asked to do in the study:**

You will be asked to volunteer to participate in semi-structured one on one interviews, and one follow-up telephone interview. Semi-structured one on one interview guides will be designed in the form of worksheets to guide the interviews. During the interviews, you will be requested to interact and share your experiences with me.

**Time required:**

A sixty minutes (1 Hour) session each individual interviews.

**Risks and Benefits:**

**Risks:** There are no potential risks or harm to participants.

**Benefits:** The benefit from this study is that your experiences and perceptions will be documented and published. The findings from this study could assist the Department of Correctional Services in addressing some identified challenges and therefore help in the rehabilitation of offenders by improving literacy levels of all incarcerated people in preparation for reintegration in communities. Furthermore, since this school has been producing excellent Grade 12 results within the Department of Correctional Services, the findings from this study could also be utilized as a benchmark to help other schools within the Department of Correctional Services in improving Grade 12 results thus contributes in the rehabilitation of offenders within the Department.

**Confidentiality:**

I will make every effort to protect your privacy and confidentiality. I will not use your name or any information that will allow you to be identifiable. **Anonymity and confidentiality of participants is guaranteed in this study. I will use pseudonyms in order to identify participants.**

**Voluntary participation:**

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

**Right to withdraw from the study:**

You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

**Agreement:**

I have read, understood and considered the above information which explains your intent, mission, and request for my participation in your research. I voluntarily agree to participate in the research and I have received a copy of this description. I understand that anonymity and confidentiality will be maintained throughout the research. My name will not be divulged to anyone. I also understand that I reserve the right to withdraw from this research at any time.

Participant: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Researcher: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

After having been asked to give the researcher permission to use audiotape, I understand that there will be no release of any identifiable material.

I agree to audio and at \_\_\_\_\_ on \_\_\_\_\_.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

I have been told that I have the right to hear the audio tape before it is used. I have decided that I:

\_\_\_\_\_ want to hear the tapes.

\_\_\_\_\_ do not want to hear the tapes.

**Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:**

-----

Dr Vimbi Mahlangu (Supervisor)

Professor Chika Schoole (Head of Department)

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: + 27 (0)12 420-5624

Telephone: +27 (0) 12

4202327

Email: vimbi.mahlangu@up.ac.za Email: chika.schoole@up.ac.za

RESEARCHER: NTOMBIZANELE GLORIA MKOSI

Signature :.....

Date: \_\_\_\_\_