

Experiences of Educators in Managing a School in a South African Prison

N. G. Mkosi and Vimbi P. Mahlangu

*Department of Education Management and Policy Studies, Faculty of Education,
University of Pretoria, Groenkoolf Campus, Pretoria, Republic of South Africa*

KEYWORDS: Correctional Education. Rehabilitation Programmes. Offender Education. Rehabilitation Tools. Education Behind Bars. Education and Crime.

ABSTRACT This paper focuses on educators' experience in managing a full-time school within the Correctional Services environment. It relates to Section 29 (1) in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa (Act No.108 of 1996) which stipulates that "everyone has a right (a) to a basic education, and (b) to further education, which the state, through reasonable measures, must make progressively available and accessible." Prison makes learning difficult as there are frequent lockdowns, headcounts and hearings that disrupt the consistency of classes and interrupt the education process. This study used inquiry mixed method. Semi-structured one on one interview, and document analysis were utilised as data collection instruments. Six educators employed full-time by the Department of Correctional Services were purposively sampled and interviewed. The culture within a correctional centre management is characterised by a focus on security measures such as lockdowns and head counts and these affect learning.

INTRODUCTION

This paper focuses on educators' experiences in managing a full-time school within Correctional Services environment in South Africa. Correctional education has deep roots in the American correctional system. It is believed that offender education has been part of the criminal corrections system for more than 200 years in the world.

The early aim 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). Education took second place to hard labour, and sometimes it was non-existent (Conrad and Cavros 1981). 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 were rehabilitated and sent back into society, as functional human beings (Shinji 2009). Nowadays, correctional centres have functions beyond punishing the convicted criminals, such as taking on educational mission while serving punishment (Ozdemir 2010). By the mid- 20th century, the aims of reformation and rehabilitation had come to be given equal status to those of deterrence and retribution. In the 1950s and 1960s the purpose of incarceration included the treatment and training of offenders and was accepted by the wider community (Griffin 2000).

In the Republic of South Africa, the Prison's Act No.8 of 1959 that governed correctional centres during the Apartheid era was characterised by an emphasis on the punishment of offenders and gross human rights violation (Rozani 2010). During the 1950s, 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 class-

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Vimbi P. Mahlangu
Department of Education Management
and Policy Studies,
Faculty of Education,
University of Pretoria,
Corner Leyds and George Storrar Avenue Groenkoolf
Campus, Groenkloof, Pretoria, 0002 South Africa
Telephone: + 27 12 420 5624
Fax: + 27 12 420 3581
E-mail: vimbi.mahlangu@up.ac.za

rooms inside correctional centres was lost on correctional centre designers at the time (Goyer 2004).

When the new Democratic government came into power in the Republic of South Africa in 1994, the Prison's Act No.8 of 1959 was replaced by the Correctional Services Act, No.111 of 1998 (Rozani 2010). After the introduction of Correctional Services Act, No.111 of 1998, rehabilitation of offenders became the priority within the Department of Correctional Services. "Rehabilitation is a process that has 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" (Republic of South Africa 2005). Currently, the South African Department of Correctional Services is providing education programmes to offenders according to the specific needs and as a rehabilitation tool in compliance with Section 29 (1) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa. Aligning with the Constitution (Act No.108 of 1996), the White Paper on Corrections in South Africa, stipulates 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" (Republic of South Africa, 2005). It is evident therefore that the South African Department of Correctional Services established full-time schools that are in line with the country's education system.

Theoretical Framework

This study is based on criminal justice theory. Bernard and Engel (2001) 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 dividing criminal justice theory into police, courts and corrections has become the standard and acceptable method of organising the field. This theory therefore is 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 that is appropriate to the study (Thomson and Walker 2009).

A criminal justice theory involves a well-organised and usable collection of frameworks targeted at making theoretical sense of criminal justice and crime control phenomena (Kraska 2006).

Furthermore, criminal justice theory could attempt to explain the behaviour of criminal justice policy, agency behaviour, and the why of practitioner and organizational decision-making (Kraska 2006). The objective of this study was to understand educators' experiences in using 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 is not a prelude to pain or retributive punishment but intended to perform an educative and re-integrative function. Aligning with this view, this study investigated and explored educators' experiences in managing a full-time school within Correctional Services environment.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHOD

The researchers used methods which produce data utilised for coding, analysis and interpretation (Adams St. Pierre 2010). In this study, the researchers used qualitative research and quantitative inquiry (mixed method). Bianco and Carr-Chellman (2000) assert that qualitative research inquiry is conducted in an attempt to understand experiences and attitudes of people in contextually bound settings. By utilising a mixed method, the researchers wanted to obtain an in-depth understanding of the educators' experiences in managing a full-time school within the Correctional Services environment.

A case study method was used in conducting this research. This study, focused on one full-time school within the South African Department of Correctional Services. 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 and Lawrence 2000).

A total of six educators who taught within the South African Department of Correctional

Services full-time school who had teaching experience of more than five years were selected as participants in this study. These educators were sampled from one full-time school out of seven educators employed full-time by the Department of Correctional Services at the school. The composition of participants was 50 percent (3 out of 6) females and 50 percent (3 out of 6) males. In this study, 83 percent (5 out of 6 participants) of the participants started teaching in the Department of Education before joining the Department of Correctional Services. The researcher therefore used purposeful sampling in selecting participants for this study. Purposeful sampling is when the researcher makes a precise judgment about a feature or features of a group of people. According to Murray and Lawrence (2000) the sample selection "can be based on the visibility of the feature of central interest to the research". In this study, the researchers used semi-structured one on one interviews in gathering data through probing questions and rephrasing, giving the researchers more opportunity to engage with the participants. Probing is to get the interviewee to expand on a response (Hove and Anda 2005). The semi-structured one on one interview gave the researchers and participants much more flexibility. Furthermore, the researcher was able to follow up particular interesting avenues that emerged during the interview, and the participants were able to expand. The researcher was guided by a pre-planned interview schedule to conduct all interview sessions. The duration of each interview session was 1 hour and the researchers transcribed field notes as a back-up. An audio-recorder was used to record all interview sessions. 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 and Anda 2005).

In this study, documents such as learner attendance registers, grade 12 examination schedules, examination timetables, school year planner, educators' subject allocation list and a school timetable were collected from the research site. The objective was to assist the researchers in gathering data pertaining to managing a full-time school within the Correctional Services environment. These documents were examined and analysed to extract the required data. Document analysis is not just reading and taking notes but, rather, the careful identification of key issues, labels and themes (Wisker 2008).

Data were analysed through coding based on the respondents' perceptions. 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 (Braun and Clarke 2006). The researchers in the current study had an opportunity of listening to the audio-recorder for all interview sessions which assisted in transcribing data verbatim. Furthermore, the researchers 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. The researchers typed the 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. Literature reveals 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 and Clarke 2006).

In this study, clustering together of concepts or themes that share the same meaning assisted the researchers in making comparisons during data analysis phase. Therefore, the researchers 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 and Clarke 2006).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this paper are presented and discussed under the following themes:

Teaching Learning Environment

In this study, all participants shared the same sentiment that managing a full-time school within Correctional Services environment appears to be challenging due to the lack of support from the management within the correctional centre. 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 (Mentor1994).

The findings from 33 percent of the participants in this study also revealed that education seems not to be respected within Correctional Services. Watts (2010) appears to be consistent with this perspective in that the absence of supportive environment, together with an emphasis on punishment rather than rehabilitation, has the effect of marginalizing education in a correctional environment to an extent that it is seen by some as being off-limits.

All the participants in this study shared the same view, that it seems that education is secondary to security in Correctional Services environment. Seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants 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) 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 effective and relevant to the needs of students within the correctional centre is challenging on a number of levels.

The uniqueness of correctional centre culture within a correctional centre management is characterized by a 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 seventeen percent of the participants 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. It was reported that it appears that school is just regarded as the place to keep offenders busy. Seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants 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.

Thirty-three percent of the participants in this study reported experiencing bureaucracy as a major challenge within the correctional centre. It was reported 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 and Foster 2006). In the study conducted by Watts (2010) one educator testified that one feature of this alien environment 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 to this perspective, the 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 were no correctional officials, teaching was negatively affected at the school. Sometimes educators had to fetch learners themselves. However, it was reported that this appears to be a challenge since educators are not allowed to handle the 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 depend on the cooperation and support of correctional officials who let the offenders out of their housing units and monitor classroom activities along with performing a number of other duties (Tolbert 2002). In the current study, seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants 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) who states that the reason why students fail to attend classes is because they are attending be-

haviour management courses to deal with frustrations of not being able to manage angry outbursts. Until students are safe to return to classes and to other activities they have to attend behaviour management. Other factors that were reported by educators in managing a full-time school within Correctional Services are security related. The findings from seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants revealed that a cell phone was not allowed inside the correctional centre due to security reasons.

It was reported that, this made it very difficult for the Department of Education District office to contact the school principal for emergencies whilst 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 was in class or attending management meetings appeared 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 is utilized as a mechanism for sorting, judging, and controlling (Shethar 1993).

Literature reveals that gaining access to the correctional centre for a face-to-face teaching is very difficult, particularly at high security correctional centres. Access often involved long waiting in outer and inner reception areas whilst identity documents were checked, mobile phones were lodged and contact made with staff in the correctional centre education section (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 and Foster (2006) 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 this study, seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants reported experiencing teaching within 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 Correctional Services environment appeared to be harmless, did not carry guns, knives or other weapons to school. The findings from seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants revealed that there were 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).

Educators

The findings from the school records reflect a total of 26 educators teaching at the school. 11 educators are allocated to teach General Education and Training Band, Adult Education and Training (Levels 1-4) and 15 educators allocated for Further Education and Training Band (Grade, 10-12). The 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. Some of the mentioned educators did not participate in the study.

In this study, it has been found that under Further Education and Training Band, seven educators are employed by the Department of Correctional Services to teach full-time at the school. On the other hand, the other eight educators 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 1st Additional Language at the school.

In addition, it was revealed that the school is utilizing the services of a mathematics educator that has to renew contract on monthly basis. This finding appears to be consistent with Sarra and Olcott (2007) 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 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. 17 percent of the respondents revealed that another educator is co-coordinating Higher Education and Training (HET) activities like submitting assignments and conducting examinations for students studying with the University of South Africa (UNISA) which is a distance learning institution and engaging with the Department of Home affairs to make arrangements for learners' identity documents.

In the study, thirty three percent (2 out of 6) of the respondents reported that the process of appointing educators in the Department of Correctional Services seems to be very slow. The example cited was an educator that was interviewed in March 2012, which has not been appointed in September 2012. The findings from seventeen percent of the participants 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 reported that currently, there was no qualified educator to transfer computer skills to learners. This perspective appears to be consistent with literature which indicates that another issue presenting difficulties in responding to the educational needs of offenders is an

absence of appropriately skilled experienced educators or other educational professionals in correctional settings (Jovanic 2011).

About seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants reported that even advertisements for appointing educators are not in line with the school curriculum needs. seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the participants revealed that there is a high shortage of educators at the school since educators that leave the school for greener pastures, retire or die are not replaced. Seventeen percent (1 out of 6) of the respondents revealed that it becomes difficult to conduct class visits at the school due to workload. Furthermore, 33% (2 out of 6) of the participants reported that the school experiences difficulty in utilizing custodial officials with teaching qualifications since they are not registered with the South African Council for Educators (SACE) and are unable to attend workshops with other educators in the Department of Education.

In unison, all the respondents reported experiencing lack of support from the management within the Department of Correctional Services. It was reported 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 sixty seven percent (4 out of 6) of the participants in this study revealed 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). 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 the Department of Education. Furthermore, it was revealed that educators at the school attend

Assessment Moderation Cluster meetings organized by the Department of Education District office.

About seventeen percent of the participants revealed that four educators at the school have been awarded bursaries by the Department of Education to further their studies. It was also reported that other educators at the school pay for their development by furthering their studies in compliance to the South African Council for Educators requirements.

In unison, hundred percent of the respondents in this study expressed dissatisfaction with the manner in which educators are treated within the correctional centre. Thirty three percent of the respondents reported experiencing lack of respect and negative attitude towards educators. Seventeen percent of the respondents reported 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 of wanting 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).

Seventeen percent of the same respondents 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) 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, seventeen percent 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. Seventeen percent 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 re-

veals 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).

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 and Gehring 2008).

In unison, all 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). Seventeen percent of the respondents reported that the salary that educators receive in the Department of Correctional Services seems to be lower as compared with 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). 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 reveals that educators' meetings are held monthly at the school. In the current study, seventeen percent 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 1st quarter in March and at the end of the 2nd quarter in June 2012.

Budget

Literature reveals that, to provide offenders with the necessary foundation to become productive members of society, requires adequate funding (Hall 1990). 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. In this study, 33 percent of the respondents reported 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.

Seventeen percent of the respondents revealed that the school principal has to submit school needs to the Senior Managers within the correctional centre. 33 percent of the participants 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, funding for educational programmes has not been equivalent to the exploding correctional centre population (Burton 1993).

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 and Barton (2006) 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.

Learner-Teacher Support Material

In unison, all the participants 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 13th January 2012. However, the respondents' responses differed with regard to the sufficiency of Learner-Teacher Support Material. Seventeen percent 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 a fax machine. Thirty-three percent of the respondents reported that currently, the school is running short of textbooks, answer sheets and pens. Fifty percent of the participants 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 and Foster (2006) 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.

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, a gymnasium, converted housing spaces, religiously-affiliated space, and a space formerly used as a washroom (Jovanic 2011). This perspective appears to be consistent with the findings from this study where 33 percent of the participants revealed that teaching space appears to be a challenge at the school. Fifty percent of the participants 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.

Thirty three percent of the participants reported pipes leakages, big holes on the walls and the toilet inside the classroom. This finding seems to be consistent with the research finding in the study conducted by Watts (2010) which states that one of the educators testified that for several teaching sessions he 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, seventeen percent of the participants 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.

CONCLUSION

Emanating from the findings in this study, this research article argues and concludes that Correctional Services environment does not have adequate resources for the delivery of education programmes. There is a shortage of educators, textbooks, stationery and pens at the school. Correctional Services environment is not conducive for teaching and learning. 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 the correctional officials. 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that: professional educator development should be prioritised by empowering educators within Correctional Services full-time schools. The school principal should ensure that an educator development plan such as communication skills, conflict management skills, management by objectives should be adopted from public schools. It should be gradually implemented by the school principal and be made available at the school. As a human re-

source manager, the school principal needs to set up management mechanisms for nurturing and unfolding of educators' potential in order to enhance effective teaching and learning.

REFERENCES

- Adams St. Pierre E 2010. Methodology in the fold and the irruption of transgressive data. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 10(2):175-189.
- Bernard TJ, Engel RS 2001. Conceptualizing criminal justice theory. *Justice Quarterly*, 18 (1): 1-30.
- Bhatti G 2010. Learning behind bars: Education in prisons. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26: 31- 36.
- Bianco MC, Carr-Chelman AA 2000. Exploring Qualitative Methodologies in Online Learning Environments, *Annual Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Papers Presented at the National Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology*, Volume (1-2):1-7.
- Braun V, Clarke V 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2): 77-101.
- Burton HD 1993. Reducing Recidivism through Prison Education, From <joy.law.ou.edu/faculty/jforman//Burton Heather.doc.>
- Children in Prison in South Africa, A Situational Analysis.1997, Pretoria: Community Law Centre. (Retrieved on 25 June 2015).
- Coley RJ, Barton PE 2006. *Locked Up and Locked Out: An Educational Perspective on the U.S.P.* Princeton: Educational Testing Service.
- Conrad JP, Cavros J 1981. *Adult Offender Education Programs*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Rockville MD: National Institute of Justice, National Criminal Justice Reference Service Microfiche Program, No. 75650.
- Goyer KC 2004. *Incarcerating and Rehabilitating Offenders. Private Muscule. Government and Social Development Centre: Birmingham: University of Birmingham.*
- Griffin JB 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.
- Hall RA 1990. *Technology Education and the Felon (Teaching High School behind Prison Walls.* New Hampshire: U.S. Department of Education.
- Hove SE, Anda B 2005. *Experiences from Conducting Semi-structured Interviews in Empirical Software Engineering Research*, Norway: Simula Research Laboratory.
- Jovanic G 2011. The role of education in the treatment of offenders. *British Journal Support for Learning*, 26(2): 125-137.
- Kraska PB 2006. Criminal justice theory: Toward legitimacy and an infrastructure, *Justice Quarterly*, 23(2): 167-185.
- Mathibe I 2007. The professional development of school principals, *South African Journal of Education*, 27(3): 523-540.
- Mentor K 1994. *College Courses in Prison.* Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, Pembroke: University of North Carolina.

- Murray L, Lawrence B 2000. *Practitioner-based Enquiry, Principles for Postgraduate Research*. London: Falmer Press.
- Ozdemir SM 2010. An examination of the educational programmes held for juvenile delinquents in Turkey. *Education*, 130(3): 384-398.
- 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 February 1999. *Personnel Administrative Measures G.N 222*, Pretoria: Government Gazette No.19767.
- Republic of South Africa 2005. *The White Paper on Corrections*. Department of Correctional Services: Pretoria.
- Ripley P 1993. *Prison Education in England and Wales*. 2nd Revised Edition. England: United Kingdom, Staff College.
- Rozani AN 2010. *Attitudes of Correctional Officials towards the Rehabilitation and Human Treatment of Offenders: Leeuwkop Correctional Institution*. Dissertation Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the degree of Magister Artium in Psychology in the Faculty of Humanities, Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.
- Sanford R, Forster JE 2006. Writing and prison education reform? The trick and political process of establishing college programs for prisoners: Perspectives from program developers, *Equal Opportunities*, 25(7): 599-610.
- Sarra D, Olcott L 2007. *A Day at Osborne School*. State University of New York, Cortland: Department of Social Foundations and Social Advocacy.
- Schirmer SL 2008. Education behind bars: Lowering recidivism through post-secondary education in correctional facilities, *The Current*, 1: 23-37.
- Shethar A 1993. Literacy and "empowerment"? A case study of literacy behind bars. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 24(4): 357-372.
- Shinji T 2009. Kiran libraries for children in prison In Pakistan. *Convergence*, 42(2-4): 161-171.
- 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.
- Watts JH 2010. Teaching a distance higher education curriculum behind bars: Challenges and opportunities, *Opening Learning*, 25(1): 57-64.
- Wisker G 2008. *The Postgraduate Research Handbook*. 2nd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wright R 2004. Care as the "heart" of prison teaching, *The Journal of Correctional Education*, 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*, 59(3): 244-260.