

The Track Record of Correctional Education

**Paper Presented at the
International Forum on Education in Penal Systems Conference
Esplanade Hotel, Fremantle**

November 8 - 10, 1999

**Dr R A Semmens
Senior Lecturer
Youth Research Centre
University of Melbourne**

Acknowledgement

The work of Jenny Oldfield (1999) with the author, in compiling a literature review on vocational education and training in corrections for the NCVET is drawn on in the second half of this paper. Thanks too to the NCVET for the opportunity to undertake that work.

**IFEPS Conference Paper
Fremantle, November 8 -10, 1999**

The Track Record of Correctional Education

Abstract

The first part of this paper provides an historical overview of the role of education and training in corrections at different stages of this century. This analysis provides the foundation for discussion of recent developments in correctional education in Australia and overseas. The paper expresses concern at the lack of independent evaluation and the difficulties this presents for the future of education and training in corrections. A plan is developed for the future which includes a proposal for an informing education theory for policy and program development, implementation of minimum standards, and program evaluation.

Dr Bob Semmens
Senior Lecturer Youth Research Centre
University of Melbourne
ph 03 9344 9648; fax 03 9344 9632; e-mail: b.semmens@edfac.unimelb.edu.au

The Track Record of Correctional Education in Australia

Bob Semmens, BA, DipEd, Dip Crim, Dip Soc Studs, MEd, PhD
Senior Lecturer, Youth Research Centre, University of Melbourne

This paper overviews some major developments in the prison system in Australia. While each State has its own prison system, for the purposes of this paper, it will be assumed that their operation is fairly similar. From the beginning, there appears to be a theme running through the various developments in prison practice - a theme of hope that the prisoner will re-enter the community as a 'better' citizen. Despite the continuing difficulty of reducing recidivism below about seventy per cent, there have always been innovative programs, designed according to the latest 'theory', to improve the prisoner's chances of staying out of prison and becoming a productive citizen. Part of the reason for the small number of successful programs in any era, has been the continuing struggle to balance the twin aims of imprisonment, which are: to protect the community and, to change the prisoner. It is very hard to change the prisoner in isolation from the community context and it is very hard to protect the community from a small proportion of offenders without the isolation afforded by the prison.

There have also been differences of opinion about the best ways to 'change' prisoners. Punishment of the individual as deterrence for self and others is now generally seen as limited in effectiveness, and work as punishment seems to have given way to work as preparation for a more productive future career in the community. But these are more in the order of policy statements than theories of corrections. Perhaps a theory of causation may help to shape up a theory of correction, and who or what needs to be corrected and how. Or, possibly a theory of citizenship may provide a wider range of policy and practice for inclusion of all individuals in the life of society. Such a theory would start with a vision of the sort of society that we want to be, and could replace concepts of causation and correction with some short and long-term goals for a more harmonious society. A social vision would at least weaken the traditional emphasis on adjustment or re-adjustment of the identified misfit individual and place increased emphasis on changing social structures that currently marginalise some individuals and groups who tend to be disproportionately represented in the prison population.

It will be argued in this paper that theories and practices that focus almost exclusively on the identified individual have not had a lot of success and we have little to lose by thinking through the implications of social theory for preventive and corrective practice. There is little evidence that social theory has ever had much influence over correctional policy-making in Australia. There is one outstanding example which may be consistent with social theory at work in Australia, although it may also be an outstanding example of a humanitarian visionary at work. In 1840, Alexander Maconochie took over the management of Norfolk Island, the prison reserved for the most recalcitrant prisoners. This was at the time when the British Government had established several colonies in Terra Australis, still sixty years before Australia emerged as a nation, and eight years before the discovery of gold made this 'new' land attractive as a place of permanent residence for European families. Maconochie introduced some revolutionary reforms at Norfolk Island - classification of prisoners, education, indeterminate sentences, improved accommodation arrangements, and a parole system which allowed parolees to work for free settlers and possibly receive grants of land to establish their own farms. Maconochie sought to remove the destructive effects of the earlier regime of brutality, that had been internalised by the prison guards as well as the prisoners, and established his own more humane system for prisoner reform.

Prison reformers with similar zeal made similar reforms in other countries during the 1830's and 1840's (Gehring, 1993). John Howard and Elizabeth Fry in England, Sir Walter Crofton in Ireland, and Zebulon Brockway in the USA, all had confidence in education and fair discipline as effective strategies for reforming the individual and reducing recidivism. In Australia, provision of education was not a priority for government funding until well into the twentieth century. It was more common for volunteers of good character to visit prisons, possibly using the Bible as text for teaching reading, as reported by Hooper in his account of the Point Puer Boys' Establishment (Hooper, 1967).

After the Maconochie era, retribution returned to compete with reform of the individual although it is likely that Australian prisons did become less brutal as a result of his reform period at Norfolk Island. Work remained the major punishment as well as reform strategy within prisons. The most incorrigible offenders continued to be sentenced to long periods of 'hard labour' to deter them and others from their antisocial ways, and hopefully encourage them to character reform in the direction of more productive citizenship. So, for about

100 years up to the 1950's and 1960's the elements of retribution and reform were still present in tandem. To these was added a new dimension - rehabilitation.

The 'Rehabilitation' Era

Again, it is hard to identify a driving theory for this more humanitarian period of change in corrections. It was a period of growing economic prosperity and optimism. Alexander Whatmore, the new Inspector-general of prisons in Victoria, introduced education, prison industries and recreation activities such as hobbies, art and craft, sport etc, during the 1950's. Parole and reduction of sentence for good behaviour (remission) were also introduced. Thus began the era, which could be called the 'rehabilitation' era, because there was a clear expectation that prisoners should not only be kept busy, but that they should be prepared for life after prison. Literacy, personal skills and social interaction were seen as important aspects of prison life as they are in the wider community.

The 'rehabilitation' period also saw the rise of psychological forms of individual deficit theory to explain criminal behaviour and provide guidelines for treatment. Locating the source of problematic behaviour within the individual was not new, but the decline of interest in biological theory as a model for explaining criminality, was matched by the rise of psychological theory as a model for correctional practice, particularly with young offenders.

Biological theory in its most extreme form had proposed genetic deficit as the cause of the character flaw that led to offending. However, there was no carefully conducted research to support a belief in criminality as an inherited characteristic although body type, size of the head, and level of intelligence were popular even up until fifty years ago (Halleck, 1960). Biological theory cannot be entirely dismissed because of the possibility that poor nutrition causes bad behaviour, or that inappropriate responses by parents, teacher and others to 'hyperactive' children, may cause children to become delinquent. Common sense suggests that nutrition and parenting may contribute to antisocial behaviour but not as the only causal factors. Some available evidence (Polk, 1972; Pink, 1982; Semmens, 1986; Knight, 1991) suggests that children who become labelled as delinquent tend to have lower levels of achievement at school, but that achievement levels are more related to school processes than to level of intelligence or other personal characteristics.

To this debate psychologists brought their tests. Personality disorders were sometimes inferred from antisocial behaviour and measured by objective tests such as the California Personality Inventory or the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Certain score profiles concerning habits, family, sexual attitudes, religion, political and social attitudes, were believed to be associated with an increased likelihood of delinquent behaviour.

The Interpersonal Maturity Level Diagnosis and Treatment Model (I-Level) was also introduced from the California Youth Authority to some States in Australia, most seriously in Victoria (Semmens, 1972). This model was based on the premise that the offender is unsocialised, under-socialised, or neurotically oversocialised and that each of these types of interpersonal interaction required differential treatment programs. The model came with strong support from evaluation data, and its enthusiastic application in Victoria led to optimistic predictions about reduction in delinquency. At the same time, community alternatives to detention were expanded in Victoria and this latter development has probably had more to do with the long-term decline in the numbers of young offenders held in detention, and the subsequent expansion of community alternatives to adult offenders, because the I-level Model is no longer used and remembered by few in the field of corrections.

While probation had been introduced in the 1950's as an alternative to fine or imprisonment, in the 1970's community work was also introduced, partly because it was cheaper and partly because it was thought that chances of rehabilitation may be better if minor offenders could be kept out of prisons altogether. Even if prisons were now more humane and productive, recidivism rates remained high and, despite the positive reforms, segregation of non-dangerous offenders gave them the negative label of 'jail bird' which compounded the problem of re-adjustment back into the community. Nevertheless, there would always be some offenders who would have to be incarcerated and from the mid-1980's renewed efforts were made to 'contain and train' prisoners. This 'era' continues up to the present day and it does appear to have a vision of community re-integration, or, at least acknowledges the need for offenders to compete in the market-place after release. It still places responsibility on the offender to make all other adjustments to community living - accommodation, family re-union, financial management and so on. The following paragraphs outline the development of the re-integration era and it is intended to demonstrate that re-integration is about as far as the individual

deficit model can be stretched in the direction of structural change, but without actually changing social structures.

Community Re-Integration

Community re-integration is a difficult concept to implement from the perspective of individual deficit theory. The handing back of full citizenship responsibility at the prison gate for newly independent adults, is difficult for the system and prisoners to manage, so it has been slow to gain acceptance in practice, even if obvious in theory. Who will take responsibility for what, is a much easier proposition while the prisoner is inside because the system is totally responsible. Upon release, the prisoner is often caught between the excitement of freedom and the pain of what to do next to act his or her age in a world that has grown different in the interim. The sense of being watched takes a long time to fade and this raises the anxiety level of ex-prisoners, particularly those who have no supportive relationships.

The major focus of community re-integration has been on the development of excellent vocational training programs which are modularised, co-ordinated and industry-accredited. The impetus for change and improvement was first noticeable in Victoria when the Ministerial Review of Educational Services to the Disabled (1984) contained a recommendation that Technical and Further Education (TAFE) Colleges 'assume full responsibility for education centres in prisons' (Rec 4.7.2). Action on this recommendation was to see prisoner education taken out of the special education section of the Education Department in 1989, and placed into the vocationally-oriented community colleges for post-school age students, called TAFE.

The Victorian TAFE recommendation came in the context of government policies at State and Commonwealth level for increased access to education and training for disadvantaged groups. Following Federal Minister Dawkins' *Skills For Australia* (1987), which placed strong emphasis on access to vocational training for economic adjustment, various programs were established to facilitate training and re-training for labour market opportunities, including considerations of possible implications for prison education. In 1988 the State Training Board commissioned the author to undertake a study of vocational training in Victorian prisons (Semmens, 1988). The report detailed how links could be established between prison education centres, prison industries, and local TAFE colleges so that prisoners could combine on-the-job and off-the-job

credit towards community recognised vocational qualifications. At the same time, a consultative committee was established, consisting of representatives of the State Training Board, the Office of Corrections, and the Technical Teachers' Union to work out co-ordination arrangements.

The outcome was the establishment of Corrections as an industry within the State Training Board and this facilitated training funds through TAFE colleges to prisons in the same way as funds would be provided to colleges for training in any other industry such as building construction or hospitality. Associated with this development was the re-constitution of prison education centres as campuses of an identified TAFE College. The Corrections Industry Training Board was officially constituted within the State Training Board in 1991 and since then it has produced an annual Corrections Industry Training Plan which sets out goals, program priorities and resource requirements for the next year as well as reporting on its achievements in the preceding year.

At the same time there was increased interest in correctional education in other States as well, most notably in Queensland where the Byrne Report (1991) strongly criticised the range and quality of education programs in Queensland prisons. While the criticism of inadequate resources and access was general, special mention was made of the need for establishment of task forces to develop appropriate programs for Aboriginal prisoners, women, and juveniles. There have been substantial improvements in education and work programs in Queensland prisons since 1991. These improvements have been part of an overall up-grading of out-dated facilities in that State and additional impetus has been derived from a number of other reports and conferences on the subject of education and training in corrections.

In 1991, the (Commonwealth) Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training conducted an Inquiry into Adult and Community Education. Its report, *Come In Cinderella*, observed that:

of all the disadvantaged people who face barriers to their participation in further education and training, those in the prison system are among the most neglected (p. 113).

The Report supported Byrne's recommendation that all prisoners, not just those in Queensland, be eligible for fee relief and a book allowance from the Commonwealth Government. This recommendation has yet to be acted on,

despite a similar recommendation being repeated at every national conference and report on correctional education since 1991.

In 1992 the National Board on Education Employment and Training (*NBEET Commissioned Report, No. 17*) recommended that the Commonwealth recognise prison time as unemployment time in terms of meeting criteria for inclusion in labour market programs after release. This would mean that ex-prisoners would not have to wait six to twelve months for admission to job training programs for long-term unemployed people. It was argued that most prisoners were long-term unemployed before going to prison and were likely to be long-term unemployed after release if they did not have immediate access to employment programs upon release. It was also recommended that States run properly accredited programs in correctional facilities to increase the chances of prisoners gaining employment upon release, thus reducing the numbers of ex-prisoners needing to move into Commonwealth labour market programs.

Later in 1992, the Commonwealth Department of Employment Education and Training (DEET) commissioned the Australian Institute of Criminology to undertake a national study of pre-release and post-release schemes to ascertain the best features of such programs. The project was funded from the Aboriginal Deaths in Custody budget to implement the findings of the Royal Commission. The report, *Keeping Them In, Keeping Them Out* (1992), stressed the need:

to improve co-ordination of education and training opportunities across Australia, and to enable pathways which provide continuity between the prison system and the outside world to operate. Until these changes are made, the desired impact of education and training on rates recidivism is unlikely to be realised (p. 71).

The report also recommended that high priority be given to improving prisoner access to education and training, continuity of participation between prisons and from prison to community, improved communication between custodial and education staff, and recognition of the value of peer tutelage, especially for Aboriginal prisoners. While the report indicated support for the NBEET study's recommendation that the Commonwealth increase prisoner access to Commonwealth labour market programs, no specific recommendation was made in this regard.

However, DEET did call together Heads of all State corrections departments, education providers, and three former Aboriginal prisoners to prepare a response to the education and training recommendations of the Royal

Commission Into Aboriginal Deaths In Custody. This two-day conference took place late in 1993 in Canberra and was attended by the former Royal Commissioner, Mr Hal Wootton. While the *Keeping Them In, Keeping Them Out* report aimed to address Royal Commission Recommendation 110, which related to best practice, the Canberra conference mainly addressed Recommendation 185:

That the Department of Employment, Education and Training be responsible for the development of a comprehensive national strategy designed to improve the opportunities for the education of those in custody.

The conference made similar recommendations to previous reports emphasising the need for program access, continuity, accreditation, and labour market relevance of credentials. It also stressed the importance of non-award personal development programs and drew attention to the need for culturally appropriate programs, quoting from the World Indigenous Peoples' Conference at Woollongong (1993), which was held at about the same time as the Canberra conference, and issued the following statement, known as the Coolangatta Statement (1993), which referred in part to the importance of self-determination in Indigenous education, including the right to:

control/govern Indigenous education systems; establish schools and other learning facilities that recognise, respect and promote indigenous values, philosophies, and ideologies; develop and implement culturally inclusive curricula; utilise the essential wisdom of indigenous elders in the education process; establish the criterion for educational evaluation and assessment; define and identify standards for the gifted and talented; promote the use of Indigenous languages in education; establish the parameters and ethics within which Indigenous education research should be conducted; design and deliver culturally appropriate and sensitive teacher training; participate in teacher certification and selection; develop criteria for the registration and operation of schools and other learning facilities; and, choose the nature and scope of education without prejudice (Rec. 2.2.4).

Unfortunately DEET did not act on the recommendations of the Canberra conference and a year later, the Commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs was strongly critical of DEET's tardiness as well as the limited nature of the Australian Institute of Criminology study, and called for a comprehensive national study of the education and training needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in custody, in consultation with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, not just prison administrators (Justice Under Scrutiny, paras 9.39 - 9.47). The study has not yet been undertaken although some Aboriginal liaison positions were created to support Aboriginal prisoner transition to community.

The positions have never been advertised. The change of Commonwealth Government in 1996, and consequent downsizing of DEET, makes the prospect of filling the positions appear unlikely in the short term at least.

However, there were some positive developments at around the same time. In 1995, the Commonwealth Senate Employment, Education and Training References Committee established an Inquiry into Education and Training in Correctional Facilities. Submissions were received from around Australia and interviews were conducted in many places, including prisons. Secondly, during the course of the year, DEET extended its labour market program eligibility to prisoners during the pre-release phase of their sentence. Certain conditions applied but nevertheless this was a substantial breakthrough which acknowledged the recommendations of reports and representations from State governments over recent years.

The final Senate Inquiry report was published in April 1996. It recommended that the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) establish a secretariat to co-ordinate and monitor the implementation of a national strategy for offenders until the year 2000 (Rec 5c), and that ANTA fund the National Centre for Vocational Education Research to develop a database in corrections education (Rec 9b). Additionally, the Senate report recommended that the Australian Institute of Criminology develop a draft set of national standards for education and training of people in custody (Rec 4), and that the National Corrective Services Administrators' Conference establish a schedule of annual conferences of correctional educators (Rec 32b).

The above recommendations characterise the report. In various areas of concern the report proposes solutions through utilising or extending existing agencies and resources, even including contributions from prisoners in defining their education and training needs (Rec 1), and proposing that education and training of offenders be included in the accountability and performance requirements of prison managers (Rec 3). The co-ordination of existing agencies and resources theme also extends to the post-release period:

The Committee recommends that each State and Territory, with support from the relevant Commonwealth agencies (Commonwealth Employment Service, Department of Social Security etc), develop a 'through-care' strategy for offender management which extends into the post-release period, and which is predicated on the co-operation of, and co-ordination between, the corrections, education, welfare and offender-support agencies beyond the prison gate (Rec 26).

There is still some way to go before any of the Senate Inquiry recommendations are implemented. While the Committee had representation of the major political parties, the change of Federal Government in 1996 took some momentum out of the recommendations for changes to education and training in corrections. Additionally, the States are traditionally very protective of their own powers and will not have Commonwealth priorities imposed on them easily. It is therefore up to the various groups who contributed to the Inquiry to develop priorities, and collaborative strategies for convincing governments and agencies to implement key recommendations.

One change has been the increased interest in program evaluation, particularly in the Vocational Education and Training (VET) area. Unfortunately, there are few studies so far in Australia which could claim to be independent and reliable (Semmens and Oldfield, 1999). However, there have been some studies overseas which provide encouraging data. For example, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation (1995) found that participation in VET slightly reduces recidivism within some groups of ex-prisoners. Female offenders who had undertaken vocational education were one third less likely to recidivate than those who had not participated, and recidivism rates for 'serious' offenders were substantially reduced if they participated in education. The study also found that particular courses had more impact with particular groups, for example, Adult Basic Education (ABE) had more of an impact on older prisoners, whereas vocational education was more successful with younger inmates.

Other US and Canadian studies also claimed that vocational education leads to reduced recidivism. Saylor and Gaes (1994, 1996, 1997) conducted a study of more than 7000 inmates between 1983 and 1987, and reported in 1992 after all the offenders had been released for at least one year. They found that vocational or apprenticeship training can have short-term and long-term effects that reduce recidivism, particularly for men.

Schumacker et al. (1990) studied a group of 760 releasees for 12 months. A data collection tool was designed to take into account information on vocational enrolment and completion, academic background, employment and violation status. In comparison to a control group, they found that the vocational/academic groups had the highest employment rates (39 per cent as opposed to 24 per cent) and the lowest criminal activity rates 23 per cent as opposed to 32 per cent). The control group had the highest criminal activity rates.

Schumacker et al. claim that even those who had enrolled but not completed vocational courses tended to have higher rates of employment and lower rates of criminal activity than the control group. This suggests that vocational education is associated with lower recidivism rates.

Likewise, Gerber and Fritsch (1995:119) found positive outcomes for participants in VET. They conducted a review of a number of evaluated studies in America and concluded that:

adult academic and vocational programs led to fewer disciplinary violations during incarceration, to reductions in recidivism, to increases in employment opportunities and to increases in participation on release.

There were also other studies which indicate that pre-vocational education (literacy and numeracy education) leads to reduced recidivism. Adams et al. (1994) studied the effect of prison education programs of more than 14,000 inmates between 1991 and 1992. They found that intensive programs for the most educationally disadvantaged were most effective. And in Canada, Connor and Borrowman (1991) found that Adult Basic Education (ABE) has a positive impact on community adjustment.

Harer (1994) found positive outcomes for those who undertook education in US Federal prisons. From a 35 per cent random sample of prisoners released within a six month period in 1987, Harer concluded that:

Persons who were full time employed or attended school at least 6 months within two years of the time they entered prison had a recidivism rate of 25.6 per cent, compared to 60.2 per cent for those not engaged.... Recidivism rates were inversely related to educational program participation while in prison. The more educational programs successfully completed for each six months confined, the lower the recidivism rate. For those inmates successfully completing one or more courses per each 6 months of their prison term, 35.5 per cent recidivated, compared to 44.1 per cent of those who successfully completed no course during their prison term.

There are also positive signs for the effectiveness of higher education programs. A research study conducted in Canada and England (Duguid et al, 1998) tested the claim that a university liberal arts course was effective in reducing the rate of recidivism for its students. The project looked at the students who enrolled in the course over a period of twenty years, 1973 - 1993, and found that the program was particularly effective with many high risk offenders. This suggests that different types of education and/or training may be more appropriate for some prisoners than others and that in the interests of cost-

efficiency, ways and means of assessing suitability for participation and future success could be investigated in Australia. The Duguid study also suggests that educational programs other than VET may be more suitable for some prisoners if recidivism is accepted as the major criterion for program effectiveness.

Available research from the United Kingdom suggests that the current focus of evaluation is not so much on outcomes or recidivism rates, but more generally on the programs offered. Recent research studies have focussed on the quality and value of the training offered and recommendations for the future have included: greater emphasis on provision of inmate training; an emphasis on links to industries outside the prison; and, sentence planning which involves consideration of vocational issues (Flynn and Price, 1995; Waldon, 1996; Simon and Corbett, 1996).

In Australia, program evaluation has not generally attempted to encompass the many variables which influence prisoner participation in programs, how they respond, the style of training and the support networks available (Pitman and Tregambe, 1996). Pitman and Tregambe's (1996) study of 39 males in Victorian prisons found that prisoners can be successful in gaining employment after release but it is not necessarily in the field in which they undertook studies. This matches the findings in New South Wales by Gorta and Panaretos (1990), who surveyed 80 parolees from prison VET courses. The parolees identified positive effects: learning about skills to obtain work, and the building of confidence and self-esteem. The parolees considered vocational courses useful for bridging the gap between life in prison and life in the community, particularly the courses with work-release programs. Most parolees found work, but the work was mostly unskilled as it had been before entry to prison, and it was often short-lived, perhaps indicating that the work was not rewarding or there were problems with keeping a job.

Halstead and Edwards (1992) noted that certain groups of prisoners seem to be associated with lower rates of recidivism. The groups included: those with work available on release, those with qualifications, those who participated in work release programs and those with post-release support (Broadhurst, 1992). They noted that these factors are often linked and that it is most likely that in combination, recidivism would be reduced.

However, in a recent review of the literature on program evaluation, Semmens and Oldfield (1999) found a lack of detailed program analysis in Australia and overseas, and concluded that without thorough and independent program evaluation there is no sure way of assessing whether programs equip participants with appropriate skills for life after release, whether the mode of delivery is appropriate, whether standards are maintained, whether assessment methods are appropriate, whether programs suit employer needs and whether educators are appropriately equipped with the skills and resources required. Furthermore, the lack of post-release information in Australia means that there is no objective way of assessing whether educational programs in correctional settings have enduring positive impacts.

From Re-integration to Reconciliation

While the available data suggest that education in corrections has an increasingly hopeful role in rehabilitation and re-integration of offenders, the lack of data about other aspects of community re-integration make it difficult to co-ordinate correctional education with other programs and services in creative ways to increase the total rehabilitative impact. For example, in mainstream schooling there has been a recent development which is called full-service schooling (Dryfoos, 1994; Semmens and Stokes, 1997), whose central concept is the co-ordination of student access to health and welfare services. Post-release follow-up studies of correctional clients would provide a basis for improving transition to community coordination of programs and services and, as with full-service schooling, improve the cost- efficiency and effectiveness in access to identified essential programs for post-release survival in the community. It has already been established that the first few months after release is the critical period for re-offending (Semmens, 1986, 1991, 1996). Current trial and error transfer of learning from prison to community is likely to be very costly with people who have an error-laden track record. Under such circumstances, it is possible to find plenty of evidence, that despite our best efforts, the prisoner failed.

The proposal outlined here is to develop programs for all prisoners clearly related to the goal of accessing full citizenship status. What is new in this current proposal is that prediction of future success combines: the level of personal responsibility taken by prisoners for their learning; the relevance of that learning to community living needs and requirements; and, the extent to which the correctional institution facilitates the achievement of curriculum

goals. By seeing the whole correctional experience as education for citizenship, program evaluation could take on a much more dynamic quality in seeking to explain post-release success and failure rates of participants.

The contention underlying the proposal is that it is possible to organise the correctional institution in ways that maximise the opportunities for all prisoners to take responsibility for decisions affecting themselves as preparation for responsible citizenship in the wider community upon release. For this to eventuate Australian corrections' systems will need to accept some responsibility for reconciliation of the penalised person with that society. Formal education, vocational training and industrial workshops have been the most common means provided, along with family contact, pre-release programs, and parole supervision. The resumption of life after detention is implicit in these activities, but full citizenship status may require more of the individual and of the correctional system. I propose four inter-related avenues to achieve the citizenship goal for offenders:

1. a statement of educational aims;
2. adoption of a teaching style consistent with achievement of those educational aims;
3. implementation of a correctional management style consistent with achievement of the educational aims; and,
4. program evaluation.

Educational Aims

Educational aims in correctional system are no different from those in the mainstream schooling system, that is, equal access to participation in the economic, intellectual, political, cultural and social life of the community (Pearl and Knight, 1999). In the economic area, this means not only literacy and numeracy preparation for vocational opportunities, but understanding how the market economy works, what might be called economic literacy, so that students may become active participants in the economic arena. Curriculum content would include basic skills such as reading, writing and arithmetic and how these might be applied to career aspirations, accommodation, nutrition, clothing, budgeting, hire purchase and other aspects of the banking and finance system. So literacy would be taught in the context of market forces which determine employment rates, availability of accommodation, and prices of food and clothing. Achievement of the aim of economic literacy, if taught

experientially, would enable the student to understand his/her options and facilitate choice of the most advantageous course of action.

Additional skills and understandings derive from the interaction between the economic literacy aim with another curriculum aim, that is the aim of political literacy, which includes content on how decisions are made in democratic societies. At the personal level this would involve participation in prison decisions in relation to oneself, and at the broader level, the meaning of government of the people by the people, and the implications for individual rights and action.

Connected to the political literacy and economic literacy aims is another aim, which might be called cultural literacy, and contains essential understandings for participatory membership of societies which are both democratic and pluralist. Students may unravel the heavy emphasis on white, middle class, male values in textbooks and the media, or they might study the values and traditions of various groups in society, and reflect upon the influence that these perspectives have on their own attitudes and behaviour. A prison classroom which could demonstrate that the constructive contributions of all members were valued equally, would be a good setting for the development of cultural literacy.

Achievement of all the above aims is interdependent with achievement in the area of social competence. While these other aims contribute to the social competence aim, a particular focus on inter and intrapersonal relationships would assist development of skills and understandings about the causes and effects of competition and co-operation in personal and societal arenas. The social competence strand of curriculum presents an opportunity to emphasise the importance of learning through interaction with others. Role-plays and simulations relating to the experiences of the students with a view to seeking alternative and responsible solutions to personal scenes and situations, should increase motivation to achieve in other areas of the curriculum.

It would be possible to develop a set of objective standards or levels of progress towards achievement of the stated aims of education in corrections. However, such standards would be different from current work being undertaken on standards for program delivery (Semmens and Cook, 1998). Standards for the educational aims stated in this paper are directed at arousing student curiosity in the world and making connections between the reality of their current

situation and the community they will sooner or later move into. So, it is the process of education through co-operative problem-solving that would be the focus of standards established to evaluate the curriculum aims outlined here.

Teaching Style

A teaching style most appropriate for achieving the educational aim of democratic citizenship would encourage student participation in a problem-solving approach to vocational, political, cultural and interpersonal issues. The model suggested here is not prescriptive, nor detailed, but is intended to provide the reader with an indication of a style of teaching designed to engage students actively in their own learning as preparation for citizenship in a democratic society. Rather than invent a new model, the jurisprudential inquiry model (Joyce, Showers and Weil, 1992, Ch. 4) can be adapted for the correctional environment. The jurisprudential enquiry model was developed by Oliver and Shaver (Joyce et al, 1992: 74):

to help students learn to think systematically about contemporary issues. It requires them to formulate these issues as public policy questions and to analyse alternative positions about them. Essentially, it is a high level model for citizenship training.

The model has some similarities to court procedure for forming a judgement on the basis of available evidence in that students listen to the evidence that is presented for and against, weigh these positions and the evidence within the framework of the law, and then make the best possible conclusion. The process involves clarifying definitions, establishing facts, and identifying the values important to each issue. Data can be gathered from a variety of media - newspapers, books, video, film, tapes, interviews etc.. Roleplays, simulations, debates and games can be developed to test ideas and possible solutions to problems. Students work in co-operative groups and the task of the teacher is to encourage tolerance of all views while keeping students focussed on hypothesis formulation, data collection, data analysis, and formulation of conclusions and courses of action. A similar approach can be used for enquiring into puzzling phenomena in science or mathematics as in social or personal issues.

The expected outcome of participation in a jurisprudential enquiry model for teaching is a clearer understanding of the norms and conventions of democratic society and the relationship of the individual to that society and other members of the society. It is likely that students will practice some of their new knowledge and understandings by challenging some of the rules and

procedures of the correctional institution. This is not unusual even in the most authoritarian institution. The difference will be whether the institution can increase its range of responses to include logic and evidence as preparation for citizenship in the wider community.

Correctional Management Style

In the 1960's some important work on the effects of correctional environment on inmates was published. Goffman (1961), studied the inmate world and staff-inmate relations in total institutions. Cressey (1964), reviewed research about prisons as organisations, especially the distinction between treatment orientation and custodial orientation. Street, Vinter and Perrow (1966) found that differences in institutional goals influenced staff perceptions about inmates, staff-inmate authority relations, and the patterns of social relations and leadership that emerged among inmates. Other researchers also published on the impact of institutional organisation on staff and inmates. Moos (1960) developed an instrument for measuring the social climate of correctional institutions. This early work indicates that it has been known for a long time that institutions influence behaviour. In the area of education it has been shown that schooling processes such as negative labelling and streaming affect student behaviour, often leading to delinquency (Polk,1972; Pink,1982; Symons and Smith, 1995). It has also been shown (Polk,1990; Maas,1990) how economic conditions affect the social behaviour of young people in the community.

What is suggested here is that a correctional management that has preparation for citizenship in the wider community as its primary goal, will organise itself differently than a correctional management that is pre-occupied with conformity of inmates to a set of rules and procedures that make little sense in the world outside the institution. The institution geared towards democratic citizenship will establish a code of behaviour that reflects the rights and responsibilities in the wider community. It will state clearly the limitations placed on those rights and responsibilities by the security rating of the prison but the areas of free speech, protection of property and person, and freedom of movement will be addressed. Procedures for appeal will also be clearly stated and communicated to all staff and inmates. Ideally, there will be provision for prisoner participation in the development of rules and the consequences for breaches as well as recognition for achievements in various aspects of the prison program. Overall, it is expected that this style of management will decrease the need to resort to imposition of external power and increase the opportunities for inmates to develop internal controls.

The trialling of unit management in some correctional institutions in Australia appears to be a move in the direction of greater inmate responsibility for managing domestic arrangements of their living units, and increasing access to personal files and a supervisory staffmember. If this management style can be connected to a set of institutional goals for responsible citizenship, then there will be negotiation and co-ordination of educational and custodial priorities that could lead to an agreed set of strategies for making full citizenship status possible upon release.

Evaluation of Program Effectiveness

The recidivism criterion would be retained as an overall product evaluation of prison programs. However, several indicators of correctional process would help to explain the outcomes more precisely. Firstly, with the consent of the inmate, an interview and a problem-solving exercise would be administered before and after program participation. The interview would assess the increase in knowledge about citizenship in the democratic society, while the problem-solving exercise would assess the inmate's processes of reasoning and formulating options for making the best possible decision within the law.

Teaching style would be assessed by once or twice yearly administration of a rating scale, from strongly agree to strongly disagree, for a series of statements about the teaching /learning process. For example, one statement may be:

Students learn a lot from debating issues here.

Students, teaching staff and custodial staff would complete the rating scale to provide comparative perspectives on teaching style.

For assessment of management style, another rating scale would be developed for once or twice yearly administration to a sample of institution staff, teachers and inmates. The statements would be rated from strongly agree to strongly disagree and relate to rights and responsibilities of inmates. An example of such a statement might be:

All decisions about the living unit are made by staff.

Analysis of responses from the teaching style and management style rating scales would be fed back to all sections of the institution for discussion and interpretation, leading to recommendations for action. Representatives of

inmates, teachers, and custodial staff would then meet and agree upon a plan for future development that would not compromise the security of the institution but enhance the learning context for responsible citizenship in the community.

Conclusion

Change to a more educative correctional experience extends the hopeful reforms established by Alexander Maconachie more than 150 years ago. His reforms were amazing given the context of his times and the vengeful basis of incarceration. Recent reforms in the area of vocational education need support from prison management and from community transition processes so that changes brought about by participation in education can be confidently generalised to actual community living situations, and hence reduce recidivism rates (Reuss, 1999). The proposal in the latter part of this paper attempts to show how this can be done. Implementing the proposal will not be easy. It will require some negotiation with the community which is hard in times of economic uncertainty. It will also require negotiation with inmates and negotiating with people who have little to lose is tough. It requires inmates to think and to support their demands with logic and evidence. Further, it encourages inmates to take responsibility for their actions, rather than to see the world in black and white, them and us terms. In practice, all participants in the correctional process are encouraged to explore new ways of thinking and alternative non-violent ways of responding to the attitudes and values of others. If implemented together with follow-through support to post-release destinations, it is predicted that independent evaluations will indicate a reduction in recidivism - on the basis of research which demonstrates that the potential for offending decreases in proportion to the strength of stake in society (Elliott et al, 1985).

References

Adams, K., Bennet, KJ., Flanagan, TJ., Marquart, JW., Culvelier, SJ., Gerber, J., Fritsch, E., Longmire, DR. and Burton, VS Jr. (1994) A Large Scale Multidimensional Test of the Effect of Prison Education Programs on Offenders' Behaviour, *The Prison Journal*, December, 74, 4: 433-449.

Byrne, E. (1990). *Unlocking Minds: From Retribution to Rehabilitation*, Queensland, University of Queensland.

Coolangatta Task Force (1993) *The Coolangatta Statement*, Paper to World Indigenous Peoples Conference on Education, September, Coolangatta, NSW.

Connor, D. and Borrowman, S. (1992) Where is the Correctional Service of Canada Taking Correctional Education?, *Forum on Corrections Research*, 3, 1: 24-25.

Cressey, D.R. (1964) *Delinquency, Crime and Differential Association*, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff.

Dawkins, J. S., and Holding, A.C. (1987). *Skills for Australia*, Australian Government Printing Service, Canberra.

Dryfoos, J (1994) *Full-Service Schools: a Revolution in Health and Social Services for Children, Youth and Families*, Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

Duguid, S. (1998) *Final Report: British Columbia Prison Education Research Project*, Simon Fraser University, Canada.

Elliott, D, Huizinga, D, and Ageton, S (1985) *Explaining Delinquency and Drug Use*, Sage, Beverly Hills.

Flynn, N. and Price, D. (1995) *Education in Prisons: A National Survey*, Prison Reform Trust, UK..

Gehring, T. (1993) Plain Talk About Correctional Education, in Semmens, R.(ed) *Yearbook of Correctional Education*, Correctional Education Association, Maryland.

Gerber, J and Fritsch, E. (1995) Adult Academic and Vocational Correctional Education Programs: A Review of Recent Research, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 22, 1-2: 119-142.

Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma*, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall.

Gorta, A. and Panaretos, H. (1990) Parolee Perspectives on Prison Education and Work Programmes, *Aust and NZ Journal of Criminology*, March, pp1-14.

Halleck, S. L. (1967). *Psychiatry and the Dilemmas of Crime*, Harper and Row, New York.

Halstead, B and Edwards, A (1992) *Keeping Them In and Keeping Them Out*, Report prepared for the Department of Employment Education and Training, Canberra.

Harer, MD. (1994) *Recidivism Among Federal Prison Releasees in 1987*, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research and Evaluation, Washington DC..

Hooper, F. C. (1967). *Prison Boys of Port Arthur*, Cheshire, Melbourne.

House of Representatives Standing Committee on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Affairs (1994). *Justice Under Scrutiny: Report of the Inquiry into the Implementation by Governments of the Recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody*, Parliament of Australia, Canberra.

International Taskforce on Indigenous Rights in Education (1993). *The Coolangatta Statement*, World Indigenous Peoples' Conference, Wollongong, NSW..

Joyce, B., Showers, B., and Weil, M. (1992) *Models of Teaching*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Judd, B. (1998) *Recidivism and Open Learning Education (ROLE) Project - Evaluation, Report*, Open Learning Australia.

Knight, T. (1985) Schools and Delinquency: Integration or Social Segregation, in Borowski, A. and Murray, J. (eds.) *Juvenile Delinquency in Australia*, Methuen, Australia.

Martinson, R. (1974) What Works? - Questions and Answers About Prison Reform, *Public Interest*, 35: 22-45.

Moos, R. (1968) The Assessment of the Social Climates of Correctional Institutions, *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 5: 174-188.

Office of Corrections (1990) *Unit Management Guidelines*, Government Printer, Melbourne.

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections, (1995) *Highlights of the 'Evaluation of the Impact of Correctional Educational Programs on Recidivism'*, Office of Management Information Systems, Bureau of Planning and Evaluation, Ohio.

Oliver and Shaver (1971) as cited in Joyce, B., Showers, B., and Weil, M. (1992) *Models of Teaching*, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, Ch. 4: 76.

Pearl, A, and Knight, T (1999) *The Democratic Classroom: Theory to Inform Practice*, Hampton Press, New Jersey.

Piaget, J. (1952) *The Origins of Intelligence in Children*, International Universities Press, New York.

Pink, W. (1982) Academic Failure, Student Social Conflict, and Delinquent Behaviour, *Urban Review*, 14: 3.

Pitman, C. and Tregambe, J. (1996) *The Appropriateness of Vocational Education and Training in Victorian Prisons*, Unpublished report, Kangan Institute of TAFE, Melbourne.

Polk, K and Schafer, N E (eds) (1972) *Schools and Delinquency*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Reuss, A (May 1999) Prison(er) Education, *The Howard Journal*, 38: 113-127.

Roberts, J. and Wilmott, T. (1994). Where Do Penal Systems Begin and End for Offenders?: Recent Developments in Community-Based Corrections, *Conference Proceedings*, International Forum on Education in Penal Systems, Melbourne.

Royal Commission (1991) *Aboriginal Deaths in Custody: Report*, Australian Government Printing Service, Canberra.

Saylor, W. and Gaes, G. (1994) PREP Study links UNICOR Work Experience With Successful Post-release Outcome, *Corrections Compendium*, October, pp 5-8.

Saylor, W. and Gaes, G. (1996) The Effect of Prison Employment and Vocational/Apprenticeship Training on Long-term Recidivism, *Forum on Corrections Research*, January, 8, 1: 12-14.

Saylor, W. and Gaes, G. (1997) Training Inmates through Industrial Work Participation and Vocational and Apprenticeship Instruction, *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 1, 2: 32-43.

Schumacker, RE., Anderson, DB. and Anderson, SL. (1990) Vocational and Academic Indicators of Parole Success, *Journal of Correctional Education*, March, 41,1.

Schur, E.M. (1973) *Radical Non-Intervention: Re-Thinking the Delinquency Problem*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

Semmens, R (1972). *Community Treatment of Young Offenders in Victoria*, unpublished paper, Social Welfare Department, Victoria.

Semmens, R. (1986) *Curriculum Aims for a Youth Training Centre*, unpublished PhD Thesis, LaTrobe University, Melbourne.

Semmens, R. (1988). *Vocational Training in a Prison Environment: Report*, State Training Board, Melbourne.

Semmens, R. (1991). *Program Evaluation at Barwon Prison*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Semmens, R. (1992) Offender Employment, Education and Training: Current and Future Realities, in Sirr, P.(ed) *The Way Out: Conference Proceedings*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.

Semmens, R. (1992). *Employment, Education and Training Opportunities for Prisoners and Ex-Prisoners, Commissioned Report No. 17*, National Board of Employment, Education and Training, Canberra.

Semmens, R. (1994). The Case for a National Agenda for Employment, Education and Training of Offenders, *Conference Proceedings*, International forum on Education in Penal Systems, Melbourne.

Semmens, R. (1996). *Evaluation of Vocational Training at Fairlea Women's Prison*, University of Melbourne.

Semmens, R and Stokes, H (1997) Full-Service Schooling for Full Citizenship, *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 38, 2:115-130.

Semmens, R and Cook, S (eds) (1998) Setting The Standard, *Conference Proceedings*, International Forum on Education in Penal Systems, held in Adelaide, Published at Melbourne University, Melbourne.

Semmens, R and Oldfield, J (1999) *Consolidation Study on VET for Those in Correctional Institutions in Australia*, NCVET, Canberra.

Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training (1991). *Come In Cinderella: The Emergence of Adult and Community Education*, Senate, Canberra.

Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training (1996). *Report of the Inquiry into Education and Training in Correctional Facilities*, Commonwealth Government Printer, Canberra.

Simon, F. and Corbett, C. (1996) *An Evaluation of Prison Work and Training*, Centre for Criminal Justice Research, Brunel University.

Symons, Y., and Smith, R. (1995) Noticed but not Understood: Homeless Youth at School, *Youth Studies Australia*, 14, 1: 29-35.

Waldon, R. (1996) *Education in Prisons: A Brief History of Prison Education to the Present Time*, HM Prison Service, UK.

Wilson, R., and Penaluna, K. (1995) Training Pathways in Victorian Prisons: Results to Date, *Conference Proceedings*, International Forum on Education in Penal Systems, Hobart.