Form@re
Open Journal per la formazione in rete

Articles

Carceral pedagogy: avenging panopticism

Pedagogia carceraria: vendicarsi del panottismo

Mary Grace Vella[a]

[a] *University of Malta, marygrace.vella@um.edu.mt*

Abstract

Carceral pedagogy lies at the nexus of pedagogy and penology intertwined in a complex web of disciplinarity and panopticism. The role of punishment in education through punitive education and the role of education in prison through reformative education are examined within the context of carceral pedagogy. Adopting Willis' "learning to labour" and Bowles and Gintis' correspondence principle, the correlation between education and employment is extended to the area of corrections. This correspondence is sustained through the school-to-work-to-prison pipeline in a vicious cycle of disciplinary control within the wider neoliberal commodification of both education and corrections. Yet, in its restorative justice approach, through power/knowledge, carceral pedagogy offers a site of resistance and liberation as it appropriates panoptical surveillance to avenge its oppressors.

Keywords: pedagogy; penology; school-to-prison pipeline.

Sintesi

La pedagogia penitenziaria è un campo che combina la pedagogia e la penologia, intrecciate in una complessa rete di disciplinarità e panopticismo. Il ruolo della punizione attraverso l'educazione punitiva e il ruolo dell'educazione in carcere attraverso l'educazione riformativa sono esaminati nel contesto della pedagogia penitenziaria. Adottando il principio dell'"imparare a lavorare" di Willis e il principio di corrispondenza di Bowles e Gintis, la correlazione tra educazione e lavoro viene estesa all'area della punizione. Questa corrispondenza è sostenuta attraverso il percorso scuola-lavoro-carcere in un circolo vizioso di controllo disciplinare all'interno della più ampia mercificazione neoliberale, sia dell'educazione che della correzione. Tuttavia, nel suo approccio di giustizia riparativa, attraverso il potere/conoscenza, la pedagogia penitenziaria offre un terreno di resistenza e liberazione, poiché si appropria della sorveglianza panottica per vendicarsi dei suoi oppressori.

Parole chiave: pedagogia; penologia; percorso scuola-carcere.

1. Introduction: carceral pedagogy

"Is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons?" (Foucault, 1995, p. 228). Yet, despite this semblance, educational entities and correctional institutions are also "typically configured as opposites" (Simmons, 2014, p. 81) provoking contention as to their similarities or differences. Irrespective of whether their reciprocity lies in kind or in degree, an important link between the two derives from the praxis of carceral pedagogy.

Carceral pedagogy widely defined as any educational activity that occurs inside a prison setting involves consideration of "the hopes, limits, unique needs and transformative possibilities carceral contexts hold for learning and teaching" (Feyissa, 2021, p. 1). By its very nature it constitutes a multi-dimensional phenomenon ranging "from the logistical to the theoretical, spanning the pragmatic, ethical, and even the existential or transcendent elements" (Bruno, 2022, p. 2).

Carceral pedagogy offers a fusion of punitive education and rehabilitative correction. This paper explores the relationship between education and imprisonment within the context of carceral pedagogy by deconstructing its main components through appreciation of the similarities between the school and the prison – pedagogy and penology. In examining the reproduction of disciplinarity and docility within these institutions, such reflections envisage to counteract mechanisms and practices of social control and transform them into liberating forces.

Following an introductory overview of the intrinsic goals of penology and pedagogy by examining the ambit of prisons in terms of punishment and rehabilitation and the rationale of punishment in education, the article examines the links between schools and prisons. The panoptical parallels between education and corrections are contextualised within their commodification and pervasion of neoliberalism in wider society. Based on such reflections, the paper presents a number of proposals for decommodifying education and punishment and reimagining carceral education through the reappropriation of panopticism.

2. Penology and pedagogy

The intricate relationship characterised by both commonalities and differences between penology and pedagogy becomes apparent when one examines their scope and objectives.

Education, as the act of actively participating in organized learning with the purpose of acquiring knowledge, abilities or obtaining certification encompasses a wide range of activities, ranging from basic literacy to physical training to more complex acquisition of practical skills.

Universal access to education has been a fundamental tenet of social equity. The right to education is acknowledged as a universal entitlement irrespective of socio-economic or legal status and serves as an important vehicle to address socio-economic disparities and facilitate social mobility and advancement (Annamma, 2016).

Imprisonment as a form of criminal sanction has historically justified goals of retribution, incapacitation and deterrence. Yet, the evolution of penology has also led to the ascent of rehabilitation and restoration. Correctional rehabilitation aims to facilitate positive transformation and is the paradigm that is most frequently linked with treatment and

reformative programmes. Central to this concept is the belief that wrongdoers have the capacity to improve and the potential of resocialization through reintegration and resettlement. "If correctional rehabilitation is the journey, reintegration is the implied destination" (Burke et al., 2018, p. 6).

Whilst "rehabilitation dwells on the individual and the psychological, 'reintegration and resettlement' signals the sociological aspects of rehabilitation" (ibidem). This focus on both the social and the individual emphasises both the macro and micro elements of correction, whilst recognising that the etiology of crime resides in both individual and structural forces. Responsibilities for reform must thus be borne by both the individual and the state.

The rehabilitation of offenders is indeed legitimated through both welfarist and instrumentalist approaches (Raynor & Robinson, 2005) in the recognition that offenders should not be reformed solely for their own personal welfare but also in the collective interests. Such social utility includes reduction of recidivism and integration within the labour market.

The 'moral education' view of punishment holds that sanctions have an educational value, and that "wrong occasions punishment not because pain deserves pain, but because evil deserves correction" (Hampton, 1984, p. 238). From this perspective, punishment can lead to moral growth. Duff's (2003) analysis of punishment proposes a distinction between 'constructive' and 'merely punitive' castigation. Constructive punishment offers the means of "bringing offenders to face up to the effects and implications of their crimes, to rehabilitate them and to secure…reparation and reconciliation" (ivi, p. 181). This integration between punitiveness and rehabilitation transpires from "a new breed of 'hybrid' sanctions, which have coupled attempts to promote individual change with more controlling or exclusive strategies" (Robinson, 2008, p. 436), which ensure visibility and control through panopticism.

3. Panopticism: visibility and control

During the Enlightenment era of the Classical school of criminology, Bentham's (1791/1988) design of the panopticon was an innovative feature symbolising the reform of carceral institutions.

In *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison*, Foucault (1995) explored the invention of the panopticon, emphasizing its inducement within "the inmate a state of conscious and permanent visibility" (p. 201). This awareness of surveillance promotes self-control through inmates' automatic adjustment of their behaviour, since "he is seen, but he does not see; he is the object of information, never a subject in communication" (ivi, p. 200). Indeed, the effectiveness of panopticism is such that one does not need to "constrain the convict to good behaviour, the madman to clam, the worker to work, the schoolboy to application, the patient to observation of the regulations", since such regulation is self-imposed (ivi, p. 202).

This architectural and "design's status-giving power is not limited to prisons" (Peñaranda, 2021, p. 15). Classroom design reinforces the notion that the pedagogue upholds "a monopoly on attention and is the voice of knowledge" (ibidem). In both contexts, discipline is achieved through observation, surveillance and examination. Correctional and educational institutions mirror each other, primarily not because of their panoptical physical structure, but due to their similarities in the examination, classification and

conformity of pupils and inmates.

Such impressive commonalities emerge from the fact that both schools and carceral institutions adopt a top-down authoritarian approach with educators and correctional officers respectively responsible not only for education and reform but also for establishing law and security. Decision making is largely top-down and students and inmates have little say in the decisions that affect them. Educational and carceral institutions mutually emphasise silence and order across both speech and demeanour. Scheduled timetables and regulations exist for basic necessities such as break time, emphasising structure and abridged freedom. Uniform dress codes are adopted for students and inmates so that these are homogenised yet differentiated from staff. Through its symbolic imagery, the uniform consolidates hierarchy whilst embodying the loss of individual autonomy. To safeguard those within from those outside in the case of pupils and those outside from those within in the case of prisoners, education and correctional settings set clear boundaries on authorisation, with various checkpoints in points of entry and departure. Despite various developments in pedagogy and reform, both learning and rehabilitation remain underscored by negative reinforcement through discipline and punishment rather than accolade and reward.

Through diverse manifestations of power, the techniques of control, investigation and classification permeate both institutions through the inculcation of docile self-controlled and regulated bodies. Though similarities could be drawn between all institutions based on common rules and structures (Jamestheo, 2017), the relationship between education and incarceration is particularly impressive as those with lower educational attainment are more prone to incarceration (Western, 2006).

Yet, despite these parallels, schools and prisons are also intrinsically different. Apart from the fact that most schools are not total institutions (Goffman, 1961), such that unlike prisons, “kids can walk out of once their relatively short day…is over” (Jamestheo, 2017, p. 19), schools and prisons differ in terms of their main objectives: learning/credentialism vs rehabilitation/incapacitation.

But are these objectives so disparate when the role of punishment in education and the role of education in prison are examined? Or do education and imprisonment converge across an encompassing spectrum of panopticism?

4. Punitive education: the role of punishment in education

Punishment, including corporal punishment held significant importance in education during the Victorian era. Punishment, and its threat thereof was meant to have a positive effect, urging compliance to learning. Corporal punishment “was a quick and effective, and thus desirable, form of motivation” (Middleton, 2008, p. 253). Indeed, corporal punishment was considered as an accepted pedagogical practice and a “fair and reasonable way of chastising” (ivi, p. 257). Physical punishment “was simply a hazard of school life, a painful correction to be borne with stoicism and which ultimately had little…long-term consequences” (ivi, p. 270). Yet, corporal and harsh punishment was ‘unjust’, ‘arbitrary’, and a form of ‘institutional bullying’ which provoked “feelings of resentment and hostility”, apart from being “ineffectual for its intended purpose” (ivi, p. 275).

Though the acceptance of corporal punishment came to an end in most Western democracies, different modes of punishment still largely define experiences of education,

as through disciplinary practices, "the prison [is] brought into the school" transforming it "into a variant of the penitentiary" (Peñaranda, 2021, p. 26).

This transformation pervades contemporary times as digitalism led to the infiltration of "technological surveillance" at schools as a way of ensuring 'security' and 'safety' (ivi, p. 30) with surveillance techniques extending to cameras, online monitoring and facial recognition. In addition to the monitoring and regulation of behaviour, contemporary educational institutions adopt a number of punitive measures, characterised by "exclusionary discipline" such as suspensions and expulsions (ivi, p. 36). Disciplinary practices are "deeply ingrained in schools' policies and teachers' instincts" (ivi, p. 39). Indeed, their pervasiveness suggests that "there is no level of education where carcerality has not breached" (ivi, p. 26). But "at what point does a school overstep its duty to safety and integrity and enter a state of oppression?" (ivi, p. 33).

5. Reformative education: the role of education in prison

Prisons have been described as "universities of crime" (Kropotkin, 1982) due to the intensification of criminal capital and entrenchment of criminal careers. Yet, correctional systems are not only schools of criminality, as worldwide many prisons adopt education as a means of rehabilitation and reintegration (Reese, 2019).

The transformative change of carceral institutions into schools is a historic milestone in correctional reform. Based on humanistic ideals, education began to be advocated as an important component of rehabilitation (Wright, 2008). Indeed, carceral education and carceral reform uphold the same goals; that of transforming both inmates and correctional institutions (Gehring & Eggleston, 2007).

Many incarcerated individuals enter correctional facilities lacking essential life skills, education and/or vocational training. Carceral education takes many forms ranging from courses which lead to the acquisition of formal academic credentials, the attainment of vocational skills to programmes that focus on promoting pro-social attitudes and behaviour. However, focus is primarily on the acquisition of basic skills such as literacy, numeracy and applied skills for the job market such that employability often takes precedence over holistic education.

Education decreases the rate of reoffending and enhances the probability of securing employment (Ellison et al., 2017). It can serve as a sanctuary within the prison system, offering a distinct emotional environment (Crewe et al., 2013). Educational activities in prison alleviate the tedium (Hughes, 2009), aid prisoners in managing the hardships and privations of prison life (Maruna, 2010) while creating an environment for good role modelling (Casey et al., 2013) and constructive social interaction (Waller, 2000). Carceral education helps to foster self-reflection and awareness (Szifris, 2016), offering a means of escape from prison culture whereby individuals can engage with others as learners rather than as prisoners. The adoption of a student identity upholds positive connotations and prevents "turning inmates into objects" (Bayliss, 2003, p. 160).

Skills and certification contribute to the development of one's identity by recognising and externally validating emerging self-identities (Healy, 2014). Carceral pedagogy encourages critical thinking and "intellectual exchange" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 6). Since it "encourages negotiation and choice, tries to build self-confidence and self-worth and develop critical thinking…it might be said to liberate" (Bayliss, 2003, p. 160). As a result,

carceral education provides individuals with the chance to expand their knowledge, aptitude and skills, and successfully reintegrate into the workforce and society. This in turn helps to mitigate risks and incidents of violence in prison (Farley & Pike, 2016) as well as reduce likelihoods of recidivism (Stickle & Schuster, 2023) and associated financial and societal burdens arising from crime. Yet, the importance of inmates' education remains largely underestimated.

6. Carceral pedagogy: an ideological venture

Given the positive impact on both the individual and institutional level, carceral education is rated very high in terms of cost-effectiveness as "even small effect sizes can produce substantial net cost-benefits" (Gaes, 2008, p. 1).

Carceral education attempts to challenge "everything that prison institutionalisation is about: control, minimising personal freedom and choice, elimination of decision-making, and reduction of self-esteem" (Bayliss, 2003, p. 160). Yet, despite these fruitful benefits, carceral pedagogy is not necessarily intrinsically radical (Atif Rafay as cited in Drabinski & Harkins, 2013). Indeed, its impact and effectiveness is largely reliant on the educator and ambience created; "a different space does not automatically imply a positive, pro-social space" (Szifris et al., 2018, p. 58). Despite its liberating potential arising from its deinstitutionalisation logic, carceral pedagogy may easily "become working within carceral logics" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 6). For example, imprisonment is structured "around blame" leading to the expectation that carceral education also sustains this sense of culpability (Rangel Torrijo & De Maeyer, 2019, p. 673). This demands ongoing self-reflection from educationalists on the rationale, processes and outcomes of their pedagogy and ongoing reflection on the nature of "working within corrections hierarchies and structures that inflict harm" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 6).

Indeed, 'apolitical' carceral pedagogy on its own, outside wider ideologies and progressive struggles for liberation may be counterproductive. As acknowledged by Bayliss (2003), prison education may easily be utilised "as a form of social control" (p. 169) with the main instrumental value of accreditation, reducing recidivism and enhancing employability. Moreover, results of educational programs need to be "interpreted cautiously" since enrolled individuals would already have exhibited a willingness to change, making it difficult to truly assess the impact arising from educational endeavours (Behan, 2014).

The assertion that 'nothing works' posed a highly negative impact on the endeavour of penal modernism (Garland, 1990) as it led to a departure from the previous positive outlook linked to rehabilitative measures (Allen, 1981).

7. The school-to-work-to-prison panoptical pipeline

The correspondence theory proposed by Bowles and Gintis (1976) suggests a strong connection between the social relationships that shape the structure of employment and those found within the educational system. This thesis expanded in *Schooling in Capitalist America* contends that the educational system is intrinsically connected to the requirements of the capitalist economy by perpetuating the hierarchies and processes that support it. From this perspective, through the illusion of meritocracy the education system is used as a justification for personal failure and sustained inequalities.

This correspondence between education and employment rests on several fundamental premises:

- reproduction of Labor Power: the school system is crucial in perpetuating the workforce by equipping individuals with the necessary knowledge, skills and attitudes for the continued operation of capitalist economy;
- hierarchy and Compliance: educational settings reflect the hierarchical systems present in the workplace. As managers possess authority over employees at the place of work, teachers possess influence over pupils inside the confines of the classroom instilling a culture of obedience and submission;
- reward and Motivation: the structure of rewards and punishments in the educational system closely resembles that of employment, whereby success through high grades and good pay mostly stems from adhering to rules and satisfying authority, rather than from intrinsic motivation or personal satisfaction;
- hidden Curriculum: the socialisation experience beyond the formal curriculum moulds internalisation and adherence to social norms and values;
- social Stratification: through the categorisation of pupils based on perceived aptitude and capability, education perpetuates existing social disparities.

This correspondence could easily be extended to the prison setting since the imprisonment also contributes to the workforce needed for capitalist economy often through cheap labour. Through its disciplinary control, education not only reproduces labour power but also processes juveniles into the correctional system. Prisons reflect the hierarchical systems present in both schools and workplaces whereby correctional officers, administrators and rehabilitation professionals possess influence over inmates inside the confines of the prison, inculcating obedience and submission. Remissions, parole or other rewards such as participation in programmes and leisure activities largely stem from adhering to rules and satisfying those in positions of power rather than from intrinsic motivation for reform. The prison setting is characterised by various socialisation experiences which mould inmates into adhering to prison norms and standards which are not part of the official penitentiary schedule. Moreover, prisons continue to reproduce social stratification as those from the lower social classes are more severely punished through longer and harsher penalties whilst holding less bargaining power within the criminal justice and prison setting. These “stark parallels” between education and carcerality highlight the disciplinary processes and strata that shape capitalist economy.

Similar parallels may easily be made between how “working class kids got working class jobs” (Willis, 1977, p. 1) and how working-class kids get more, harsher and longer prison sanctions. The ‘lads’ in Willis’ (ibidem) study embraced ‘counter-school’ culture, having no interest in credentialism or progression to higher education leading to their academic failure which in turn facilitated their entry into working-class jobs. Thus, though the educational system may not be fully successful in producing docile and submissive students, it helps to reproduce the labour force necessary for capitalism. The lads’ rejection of the education system made them particularly useful for unskilled manual work to be exploited by the capitalist corporatist class. Through discriminatory practices both within the education and criminal justice system, working class kids are more harshly processed and penalised. As the lads aspired towards tough ‘real’ manual work akin to their family members and acquaintances despite their exploitations, so do they look up to the tough macho culture of criminality and delinquency despite its restriction of freedom and other deprivations arising from punitive penalties. It may be the case that as in the lads’ scenario, whereby their rejection and rebellion against the docility expected from them by the

education system leads them to exploitation by the capitalist labour market, juvenile 'delinquents' become a useful pawn for oppression by the corporate criminal justice correctional system.

In Bowles and Gintis' and Willis' Marxist analysis, education not only sustains inequality but reproduces and perpetrates it. This correspondence is mostly evident within the context of the 'School-to-Prison Pipeline' (Meiners, 2007), referring to a concerning trend whereby children, mostly from poor socio-economic backgrounds and disadvantaged communities are guided away from education towards criminal justice and corrections (Peñaranda, 2021, p. 38). This "carceral logic" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 5) characterised by "increased carceral reach, coupled with decreased support for quality public education" has disproportionately led to the criminalisation of working-class juveniles and minority groups leading to dismissal from schools and subsequent incarceration (Meiners, 2007).

Various security and control mechanisms such as "oppressive surveillance, school police, and excessive exclusionary discipline" (Peñaranda, 2021, p. 38) are part of a wider network of policies and practices which constitute the school-to-prison nexus. Many disciplinary measures in schools are indeed akin to those employed in correctional institutions. A case in point is the 'seclusion rooms' used in schools and solitary confinement used in prisons (ibidem). Through these measures, educational environments are increasingly becoming "more and more like carceral spaces…that criminalize diverse forms of youth activity previously addressed within educational settings" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 4).

From this perspective, incarceration may be different in degree but not in kind from education, since both are underlined by discipline and surveillance which compels those under their panoptical gaze to conform not because of perceived goodness or adherence to morality but due to fear of punishment and retribution. Due to its pervasive nature, "discipline may indeed be identified neither with an institution nor with an apparatus…it is a 'physics' or an 'anatomy' of power, a technology" (Foucault, 1995, p. 215).

8. The commodification of carceral pedagogy

Pedagogy and penology are intrinsically political (Bruno, 2022). Politics, with both a big 'P' and small 'p' shapes their scope, function, mode of delivery and governance, making carceral education as their nexus particularly politically charged. Indeed, "nothing is ever neutral…certainly not with regard to prison education, which, in its complexity, embraces a whole field of social, political and individual difficulties and contradictions" (Rangel Torrijo & De Maeyer, 2019, p. 673). Complexity and contradictions are undeniably very evident in prison education as both education and corrections are characterised by huge gaps and disparities between discourse on one hand, and policy and practice on the other.

Rehabilitation and reform are increasingly becoming defined and pursued in utilitarian terms, mainly as a penal "technology" for "crime reduction" and "risk management/public protection" (Robinson, 2008, p. 439). Cohen (1985) predicted a shift from the Freudian treatment approach to rehabilitation prevalent in the mid 20th century to behavioural modification. While the psychotherapeutic model endeavoured to holistically reform the person, the more "economically feasible, quick and administratively efficient" behaviourist model, focused on the production of "sullen citizens, performing their duties…and not having any insights" (Cohen, 1985, pp. 144-151). Through such a technocratic approach, reform primarily "benefits not offenders themselves, but rather the 'public at large'" (Robinson, 2008, p. 439).

Governments are increasingly implementing neoliberal strategies that involve the privatisation and commodification of education. Schools have transitioned from state institutions that serve a public good to marketplaces where education is purchased for a profit. Through such processes, "education and its acquisition takes on the metaphor of buying and selling of goods and services" (Fogbohun, 2018, p. 4) with edification becoming just another commodity to "those who can afford to buy it" (Lynch, 2006, p. 3). In such contexts, public educational entities are increasingly "serving the highest bidders" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 5) as the costs of education are divested from the state to the individual (Mbhele, 2017). Through such processes, schools become supermarkets and students, customers and consumers (Karpov, 2013).

This in effect means that a fundamental human right is being bought and sold on the market for the main purpose of profitability. Knowledge for its own sake and holistic education become depreciated and trivialised into "learning for accreditation" (Bayliss, 2003, p. 160) for the scope of employability. As a result, market-oriented education often undermines arts, humanities, and critical social sciences which tend to focus more on the provision of services for the public good rather than profit-driven interests (Lynch, 2006).

Corrections has also become increasingly commodified as components of the criminal justice system have become privatised with the dogma of reducing costs and overcrowding (Welch & Turner, 2007). This has led to the outsourcing of prison amenities such as medical and psychological services but also extended to ownership and management (James et al., 1997). Thus, 'tough on crime' initiatives contribute to increased profit to private corporations which operate within the 'corrections industry' (Downes, 2001). The greater the number of people incarcerated and the lengthier and harsher the sanctions handed out, the greater the profitability reaped by corporate entities. As aptly stated by Pranis (1998), "the tremendous profits accruing to the prison-industrial complex demonstrate that the free market works best when people aren't free" (p. 3).

Commodification results in the administration of institutions as "an enterprise, focusing on budgetary cost effect, seeking resources, product evaluation, and corresponding adjustments" (Yang, 2006, p. 9). This commodification of both education and corrections, as part of the wider expansion of global capitalism and the neoliberal agenda (Mbhele, 2017) is underlined by the premise that the market is more effective than the democratic state in inculcating knowledge in the case of education, and punishing and reforming offenders in the case of corrections. Neoliberalism and its accompanying privitisation of public services has indeed become normalised in contemporary capitalist society.

Privatisation and other forms of commodification bring various changes in the physical structures and operational cultures of affected institutions. The significance of commodification is such that transformation entails "not simply a technical change…but, it involves changes in the meaning and experience of education [and rehabilitation]… It changes who we are, our relation to what we do, and the framework of possibilities within which we act" (Yang, 2006, p. 1). The focus on profitability outweighs other objectives such as those of providing education as a public good and reducing poverty, crime and inequality (ibidem).

The neoliberal trend of privatisation and commodification coincides with contemporary "institutional and structural paradigms of mass incarceration and the dismantling of access to affordable quality public education" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 3). This is not a coincidental relationship, as it reflects broader "governmental restructuring that shifted resources from education to incarceration" (ibidem), in the process reducing state responsibility for education whilst increasing investment in the "institutional mechanisms

and spaces designed to criminalize and control" (ivi, p. 4).

Thus, in both corrections and education, a huge disparity exists between public discourse and theoretical analysis, and between written policy and practice. In the education sector, "rhetorical calls for increased educational opportunities as a means for addressing social, political, and economic problems are belied by cuts to education funding" and privatization (ivi, p. 5). Policy discourse of inclusive education 'for all pupils to succeed' are belied by greater exclusionary measures for those who do not afford private education. Correspondingly, in corrections, the discursive value attached to rehabilitation and reform is addressed through greater investment and widening of the securitisation and carceral net, whilst establishing and enforcing more punitive penalties for the working classes and minorities.

These gaps and contradictions between theory and practice become understandable when "socially and spatially situated" (Annamma, 2016, p. 1212) within the logic of neoliberalism, as the school-to-prison pipeline helps to consolidate existing social strata through a self-sustaining vicious cycle. As "school security became a multibillion-dollar industry in the war on crime era and corporations that serve the correctional market began to focus their products on this new and profitable niche…punitive mechanisms in education have accelerated racially disproportionate school dropout and push-out rates and have substantially increased correctional risk" (Simmons, 2014, p. 92). The subsequent rise in incarceration continues to enrich "the punishment industry" through reaping "profit a second time" (ibidem).

Disciplinary power underlies neoliberal capitalist production and its requirement of docile bodies. Through its dual role of securing the docility of the student and the docility of the inmate, carceral education offers a strong site of disciplinary control and a perfect mechanism of 'panopticism'. Indeed, the disciplinary practices observed in the educational and carceral systems are not confined to the physical boundaries of schools and correctional institutions, but rather originate from the broader neoliberal trends of contemporary society. It is furthermore envisioned that public services including education and rehabilitation services will be progressively commodified (Rikowski, 2003) and panopticised.

Despite its repressive nature, disciplinary control offers the possibility of agentic action and resistance. Indeed, since "where there is power, there is resistance" (Foucault, 1990, p. 94), through power/knowledge, carceral education offers various "mobile and transitory points of resistance" (ivi, p. 96).

The history of punishment demonstrates that seldom were there clear and unambiguous borders between dominant modes of punishment (Loader & Sparks, 2012) since concepts and developments opposing mainstream discourse and practices were always manifest. Conceivably, in the contemporary era "when authoritarian rehabilitation is in the ascendancy, prison education is one of those developments" (Behan, 2014, p. 29).

9. Reforming carceral pedagogy

The correspondence between the educational and the carceral system presents insight into the pervasiveness of panopticism, highlighting the need "to end the practices that have expanded the carceral state into the education domain" (Peñaranda, 2021, p. 39), whilst valuing the expansion of education within the carceral system. This entails deconstructing dogmatic ideologies and practices of banking and punitive education and conceptions of

justice shaped by retribution, deterrence and incapacitation. It thus demands rejecting dominant practices with the aim of reconstructing a more progressive vision for education and penality.

Within this framework, education and reform is perceived by learners and inmates as an imposed but necessary evil, rather than a form of personal growth and contribution to the common good. This necessary evil becomes a way of relenting to the agenda of the oppressor in a vicious cycle of commodification, not only in terms of goods and services but of people themselves, as they are funnelled from education to work to imprisonment. Yet, despite this oppressive structure, resistance is both possible and inevitable. Through restorative justice, the unweaving of current practices of 'criminal pedagogy' by conceiving education and reform as personal development and the extirpation of prisons as schools of criminality, could lead to a truer and more effective form of carceral pedagogy. The educational and rehabilitative reform of individuals demands structural reform of the wider social structure.

Despite its clear links to rehabilitation, carceral pedagogy needs to remain anchored within its fundamental pedagogical principles and not being "lured into the evaluative and correctional milieu of modern penality" (Behan, 2014, p. 20). Thus, it can help to contrive sentencing care plans within an alternative form of rehabilitation based on restorative justice practices. The following provisions based on universal access and high-quality progressive forms of carceral education within a whole-of-prison approach should guide the delivery of prison education.

A fundamental aspect of education is universal provision. Yet, a significant amount of inmates are still denied this fundamental opportunity. Carceral education is often conceived as an unwarranted entitlement that should not be extended to offenders (Rangel Torrijo & De Maeyer, 2019), but also as a security hazard for carceral institutions. Ensuring universal access to carceral education is a first step, yet its positive impact drastically depends on the nature, context and rationale of its delivery.

Carceral education demands deeper focus on the broader aims of personal development. Personal development as the "process of growth an individual undertakes during their life course" (Szifris et al., 2018, p. 42) goes beyond academic qualifications or skilling for employability. In the context of carceral institutions, it intrinsically demands redemption as part of rehabilitative and reformative processes. As a means of enhancing the personal development of inmates, carceral pedagogy thus needs to be "inspiring and motivational" (Crabbe, 2016, p. 6).

Adopting a personal development approach to education and reform depends on a holistic and life course approach. As in the case of reform and rehabilitation, "one size in education does not fit all, whether for prisoners themselves or indeed for the persons" (ivi, p. 7). It is thus pivotal to appreciate equities and intersectionalities and how along with personal experience, these impact the educational and reformative trajectories of inmates both within and outside the prison.

The success of carceral education and reform extend beyond individual motivations through a whole-of-prison approach to learning (ibidem). Both education and rehabilitation need to form an integral part of any sentencing care plan following the inmate throughout their imprisonment and post-imprisonment experiences through interventions across holistic domains of wellbeing. This approach demands that apart from prison staff, all prison structures, regulations and processes appreciate and value the significance of both education and rehabilitation. Through the embedment of education and rehabilitation, the

dynamic security of imprisonment is attributed priority over physical and procedural forms of security. This whole-of-prison approach to education and rehabilitation demands a transformative change to traditional conceptions of punishment. From notions of imprisonment as a form of retribution, deterrence and incapacitation to forms of punishment which inculcate personal development. Moreover, carceral education needs to extend beyond the prison through networking with various "alliances across different sorts of institutions" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 3) in such a way that education and rehabilitation move from personal development to community development.

Carceral education transforms prisons from schools of criminality to schools of critical and active citizenry, severing the school-to-prison pipeline and recasting it into a prison-to-school pipeline.

As punitive education through "carcerality as a solution to educational challenges demonstrates a lack of vision and a failure" (Peñaranda, 2021, p. 42), carceral education as a solution to rehabilitation and reintegration challenges denotes vision and success. As "abolishing carcerality in schools can be supported by a vision of education that does not support the carceral state" (ivi, p. 39), embedding education in custodial settings envisions punishment in terms of rehabilitation and reform.

As acknowledged by Peñaranda (ibidem), "to abolish carcerality in education and diminish the reach of the carceral state, we must first imagine that the school can be a place that is free of oppressive surveillance, policing, and punishment" (ivi, p. 44). This goes beyond the elimination of carceral practices (ivi, p. 53), demanding investment in an education process which does not see learners as empty vessels to be filled, where "oppressors prime students to submit themselves to the world designed, operated, and policed by oppressors" (ivi, p. 54). Current 'banking' methods of education (Freire, 1970), including within the prison system need transformation into problem-posing education. As proposed by Freire (ibidem), through such problem-posing pedagogy whereby learners are active participants in a creative process of inquiry, education becomes an act of liberation. Carceral education needs an integrated approach which values both formal and informal learning (Bayliss, 2003). Similarly, we must imagine punishment outside its connotations of incapacitation and retribution within a carceral setting through investment in an alternative view of correction based on rehabilitation, reform and restoration of harm through community-based sanctions. A rehabilitative approach which does not see offenders as individual aberrations who can be brainwashed into reform through behavioural modification. Conversely, reform through restorative justice practices could act as a form of liberation through redemption by repairing the harm done to victims and society.

Carceral educators must uphold a continuous "meta-cognitive awareness" and critical mindset of their duties and responsibilities within carceral institutions (Bruno, 2022, p. 2). This entails engaging in "meaningful inquiry" into the adopted pedagogy through "recursive practice" (ibidem) with the aim of improving their pedagogy but also enabling a more just and equitable environment both within and outside the prison.

Carceral education within the contemporary neoliberal context of the commodification of education and mass incarceration "exposes the contradictions and outright antagonisms of institutional life" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 5). However, awareness of such contradictions does not automatically result in "radical teaching" unless educators manage to address such macro-structural contradictions alongside the micro-individual needs of learners (ibidem).

In practice, carceral pedagogy needs to continue its vital pursuit of supporting inmate

learners to "cope with their sentence, limit the damage that the institution does to them and reflect on how to build on students' strengths" (Behan, 2014, p. 29). Carceral pedagogy demands the development of "the rather ambiguous and complicated process of building human and social capital" (ibidem) in contrast to the "instrumentalist indices of change that underpin authoritarian rehabilitation or more traditional educational measurements", thus establishing more "authentic indicators of change and transformation" (ibidem).

Given the 'status-giving power' of architecture (Pérez-Gómez, 2011) in influencing the 'theatre' of experience of those within (Moran & Jewkes, 2015), a reimagining of education and reform demands a new architectural vision for the design of institutions where carceral education takes place. Effective carceral pedagogy calls for a paradigm shift in education and penology beyond current dominant practices governed by commodification, credentialism, retribution, incapacitation and deterrence. It also demands reconciliation between the objectives and discourse of education and punishment based on wisdom and holistic wellbeing and current restrictive practices based on acquisition of skills for employability and behavioural models of rehabilitation and securitisation.

Re-envisioning education and rehabilitation from their traditionally authoritarian and punitive models to restorative justice approaches can take multiple forms in the context of a whole-of-school and whole-of-prison approach. Restorative justice thus offers an effective underlying framework for carceral education to act as a complementary agent of restoration and justice. Empirical evidence on restorative justice practices as an alternative to traditional punitive justice and exclusionary disciplinary measures in both educational (Fronius et al., 2019; Vah Seliskar, 2023; Webb, 2023) and criminal justice settings (Bouffard et al., 2017; Strang et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2018) suggest promising results. Restorative practices view learners and inmates as people with internal resources which can be directed at restoring harm in contrast to traditional justice models which view offenders primarily as perpetrators of harm. Carceral education forms an integral aspect of restorative imprisonment, whereby restorative practices inform and govern policy development, administrative decisions, and service provision in correctional institutions. Training for staff and inmates in restorative justice practice is thus pivotal (Kidde, 2017) for promoting restorative imprisonment.

Ongoing critical praxis in terms of both reflection and action is vital for improving carceral pedagogy. Though "there is no single solution for such practice, but asking meaningful and informed questions makes for a responsible and ongoing practice, one that can ebb and flow with the changes of the field as well as the progression of society" (Bruno, 2022, p. 2). It is only through such critical praxis that one can aspire towards offering "effective pedagogy within the prison's unique contradictions" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 6).

10. Conclusion: avenging panopticism

This paper discussed how pedagogy and penology are two sides of the same coin, interlinking in carceral pedagogy as those with lower educational attainment are more likely to end incarcerated. This inverse relationship highlights the dual importance of extricating education from carcerality, whilst liberating incarceration through education.

Through a pedagogy of liberation, the humanity of learners and inmates is recognized as their individual biographies shape their educational and rehabilitative trajectories. In this sense, education and reform become part of their personal development and biographical reconstruction of the self. This change at the individual micro-level is dependent on wider

transformative change at the macro-level, through a reconstitution of the structures and processes that currently define education and incarceration. Rethinking prisons and rethinking schools demand not only rethinking punishment and education, but primarily envisioning a new economic world order – a paradigm shift from an economic system which sustains and perpetrates inequalities and injustices to one which validates the intrinsic value of reform and education.

Through its influence on both the individual and structural level, carceral pedagogy helps the incarcerated to gain insight, but also to "resist the systems that have led to their incarceration, bringing their voices into the resistance and interrupting intergenerational routing from education to incarceration" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 6).

Though the challenges, both theoretical and practical of carceral education require drastic action, incremental steps can lead to enduring long-term transformation. By regarding incarceration from an educational lens and education from a rehabilitative lens, the ineffectiveness of current carceral practices become better illustrated. Abolishing carcerality from education and achieving liberation from incarceration demands envisioning a world beyond current notions of imprisonment and education. The established paradigm views prisons as places where 'criminals' are sent for reform isolated from society, and schools as places where 'students' are sent to learn, isolated from society. Both reform and learning do not belong in the community but in specialised contained spaces. Expanding the 'spaces' where and how reform and education take place helps to break and transcend the barriers created by current disciplinary practices. Yet, broader society lies not outside the panoptical gaze of surveillance, as through neo-liberal practices, disciplinarity permeates institutional life through "technologies of the self" (Foucault, 1988).

Positioned at the nexus of the underlying parallels between the oppressive and repressive nature of educational and carceral institutions operating within the wider neo-liberal framework, but also the resistance of pedagogy and rehabilitation, this analysis explores the potentialities of carceral education for counteracting oppressive and repressive practices within the "broader political projects of dismantling mass incarceration and increasing access to education" (Drabinski & Harkins, 2013, p. 5). In this context, abolishing carcerality in both education and rehabilitation underlines the wider struggle against the neoliberal commodification of education and criminal justice systems. Abolishing carcerality demands recognition of the panoptical congruities of pedagogy and penology in the creation of docile bodies and minds, whilst striving for educational and correctional systems that promote holistic wellbeing rooted in social and economic justice! Through such framework, 'technologies of the self' offer the possibility of reconceptualising the self as a site of resistance.

Carceral education has the potential of undoing and resisting repressive practices "to empower people and provide them with a newfound sense of hope and confidence, which can positively affect the communities in which they live, including those within prison and those outside of prison, to which many will return" (Turner & Edelman, cited in Oakford et al., 2019, p. iv). Through carceral pedagogy, education becomes embodied rehabilitation and rehabilitation becomes embodied education. In this strive towards fulfilling the potentialities of carceral education, anti-panopticism epitomised through transparency, accountability, and grassroots participation unifies the learning and reform of disciplined bodies. Through acts of resistance, panopticism also empowers these 'disciplined' bodies to bring "power to account, because the most dangerous people in society can be rulers. It is important that they, as well as prisoners, workers and children, feel watched" (McMullan,

2015, p. 29).

Reference list

Allen, F. A. (1981). *The decline of the rehabilitative ideal: Penal policy and social purpose*. Yale University Press.

Annamma, S. (2016). Disrupting the carceral state through education journey mapping. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, *9*, 1210–1230.

Bayliss, P. (2003). Learning behind bars: Time to liberate prison education. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *35*(2), 157–172.

Behan, C. (2014). Learning to escape: Prison education, rehabilitation and the potential for transformation. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, *1*(1), 20–31.

Bentham, J. (1988). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Prometheus Books. (Original work published 1791).

Bouffard, J., Cooper, M., & Bergseth, K. (2017). The effectiveness of various restorative justice interventions on recidivism outcomes among juvenile offenders. *Youth Violence Juv. Justice*, *15*, 4465–80.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. Basic Books.

Bruno, G. (2022). Asking meaningful questions: Introducing an inquiry into carceral pedagogy. In G. Bruno (Ed.), *Theory and practice for literacy in the prison classroom* (pp. 1-25). Brill.

Burke, L., Collett, S., & McNeill, F. (2018). *Reimagining rehabilitation: Beyond the individual*. Routledge.

Casey, S., Day, A., Vess, J., & Ward, T. (2013). *Foundations of offender rehabilitation*. Routledge.

Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of social control*. Polity Press.

Crabbe, M. J. C. (2016). Education for offenders in prison. *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, *6*(3), 3–17.

Crewe, B., Warr, J., Bennett, P., & Smith, A. (2013). The emotional geography of prison life. *Theoretical Criminology*, *18*(1), 1–19.

Downes, D. (2001). The macho prison economy: Mass incarceration in the U.S.: A European perspective. *Punishment and Society*, *3*(1), 61–80.

Drabinski, K., & Harkins, G. (2013). Introduction: Teaching inside carceral institutions. *The Radical Teacher*, *95*, 3–9.

Duff, A. (2003). Probation, punishment and restorative justice: Should altruism be Engaged in punishment? *The Howard Journal*, *42*(1), 181–97.

Ellison, M., Szifris, K., Horan, R., & Fox, C. (2017). A rapid evidence assessment of the effectiveness of prison education in reducing recidivism and increasing employment. *The Probation Journal*, *64*(2). 108–128.

Farley, H., & Pike, A. (2016). Engaging prisoners in education: Reducing risk and recidivism. *Advancing Corrections: Journal of the International Corrections and*

Prisons Association, *1*, 65–73.

Feyissa, S. (2021, May 15). *What is carceral pedagogy?* Solen Feyissa. https://solenfeyissa.com/technology/2021/05/what-is-carceral-pedagogy/

Fogbohun, O. A. (2018). *Commodification of education. What imperatives for transforming university education in Nigeria*. Lagos State University.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Fronius, T., Darling-Hammond, S., Persson, H., Guckenburg, S., Hurley, N., & Petrosino, A. (2019). *Restorative justice in US schools: An updated research review*. WestEd.

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*, *18*, 170.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: An introduction, volume I* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage.

Gaes, G. G. (2008, March 31). *The impact of prison education programs on post-release outcomes*. Reentry Roundtable on Education, John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and modern society*. Clarendon.

Gehring, T., & Eggleston, C. (2007). *Teaching within prison walls: A thematic history*. California State University.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patient and other inmates*. Anchor Books.

Hampton, J. (1984). The moral education theory of punishment. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *13*(3), 208–238.

Healy, D. (2014). Becoming a desister: Exploring the role of agency, coping and imagination in the construction of a new self. *British Journal of Criminology*, *54*, 873–891.

Hughes, E. (2009). Thinking inside the box: Prisoner education, learning identities, and the possibilities of change. In B. M. Veysey, J. Christian & D. J. Martinez (Eds.), *How offenders transform their lives* (pp. 87-103). Willan Publishing.

James, A., Bottomley, A., Liebling, A., & Clare, E. (1997). *Private prisons: Rhetoric and reality*. Sage.

Jamestheo. (2017, May 6). *The 5 worst education arguments by graphics*. Othmar's Trombone. https://othmarstrombone.wordpress.com/2017/05/06/the-5-worst-education-arguments-by-graphics/

Karpov, A. (2013). Commodification of education. *Russian Education and Society*, *55*(5), 75–90.

Kidde, J. (2017, December). *Whole-school restorative approach resource guide*. Agency of Education.

Kropotkin, P. (2015, originally published in 1892). *The conquest of bread*. Penguin Classics.

Loader, I. & Sparks, R. (2012). Beyond lamentation: Towards a democratic egalitarian

politics of crime and justice. In T. Newburn & J. Peay (Eds.), *Policing: Politics, culture and control* (pp.11-41). Hart.

Lynch, K. (2006). Neo-liberalism and marketisation: The implications for higher education. *European Educational Research Journal*, *5*(1), 1–17.

Maruna, S. (2010). *The great escape: Exploring the rehabilitative dynamics involved in 'Changing Tunes'*. https://www.artsevidence.org.uk/media/uploads/evaluation-downloads/great-escape-changing-tunes.pdf

Mbhele, N. H. (2017). *Commodification of higher education? An analysis of education and training sector improvement programme*. University of Jyvaskyla.

McMullan, T. (2015, July 23). *What does the panopticon mean in the age of digital surveillance?* The Guardian. https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/jul/23/panopticon-digital-surveillance-jeremy-bentham

Meiners, E. R. (2007). *The right to be hostile: Schools, prisons, and the making of public enemies*. Routledge.

Middleton, J. (2008). The experience of corporal punishment in schools, 1890–1940. *History of Education*, *37*(2), 253–275.

Moran, D., & Jewkes, Y. (2015). Linking the carceral and the punitive state: A review of research on prison architecture, design, technology and the lived experience of carceral pace. *Annales de Géographie*, *2*,163–184.

Oakford, P., Brumfield, C., Goldvale, C., diZerega, M., & Patrick, F. (2019, January). *Investing in futures: Economic and fiscal benefits of postsecondary education in prison*. Vera Institute of Justice. https://vera-institute.files.svdcdn.com/production/downloads/publications/investing-in-futures.pdf

Peñaranda, G. M. (2021). *Reimagining education without carcerality*. [Unpublished master's thesis]. San Diego State University. https://digitalcollections.sdsu.edu/do/1c64faeb-11f2-4986-985f-639d34b2be69#page/38/mode/2up

Pérez-Gómez, A. (2011). Built upon love: Towards beauty and justice in architecture. *Mosaic*, *44*(3), 43–59.

Pranis, K. (1998). "Letter to the Editor." *The Nation* (March 16), 2-3.

Rangel Torrijo, H., & De Maeyer, M. (2019). Education in prison: A basic right and an essential tool. *International Review of Education*, *65*, 671–685.

Raynor, P., & Robinson, G. (2005). *Rehabilitation, crime and justice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Reese, R. (2019). The prison education project. *International Review of Education*, *65*, 687–709.

Rikowski, G. (2003). The business takeover of schools. *Mediactive: Ideas-Knowledge-Culture*, *1*(1), 91–108.

Robinson, G. (2008). Late-modern rehabilitation: The evolution of a penal strategy. *Punishment & Society*, *10*(4), 429–445.

Simmons, L. (2014). Profiting from punishment: Public education and the school security

market. *Social Justice*, *41*, 4(138), 81–95.

Stickle, B., & Schuster, S. S. (2023). Are schools in prison worth it? The effects and economic returns of prison education. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *48*, 1263–1294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-023-09747-3

Strang, H., Sherman, L. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., Woods, D., & Ariel, B. (2013). Restorative justice conferencing using face-to-face meetings of offenders and victims: Effects on offender recidivism and victim satisfaction. A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, *9*, 11–59.

Szifris, K. (2016, May). Philosophy in prison: Opening minds and broadening perspectives through philosophical dialogue. *Prison Service Journal*, *225*, 33–38.

Szifris, K., Fox, C., & Bradbury, A. (2018). A realist model of prison education, growth, and desistance: A new theory. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, *5*(1), 41–62.

Vah Seliskar, H. (Ed.). (2023). *Restorative justice and practices in the 21st century*. IGI Global.

Waller, E. (2000). Disjunction and integration in prison education. In D. Wilson & A. Ruess (Eds.), *Prisoner(er) education: Stories of change and transformation* (pp.106-137). Waterside Press.

Webb, P. (2023). Higher learning: Restorative justice and higher education. In H. Vah Seliskar (Ed.), *Restorative justice and practices in the 21st century* (pp. 104-130). IGI Global.

Welch, M., & Turner, F. (2007). Private corrections, financial infrastructure, and transportation: The new geo-economy of shipping prisoners. *Social Justice*, *34*(3/4), 109–110.

Western, B. (2006). Punishment and Inequality in America. *Russell Sage Foundation*.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs.* Saxon House.Wilson, D. B., Olaghere, A., & Kimbrell, C. S. (2018). *Effectiveness of restorative justice principles in juvenile justice: A meta-analysis*. Bur. Justice Stat. Rep. NCJ250872 Off. Justice Progr. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/grants/250872.pdf

Wright, R. (2008). *In the borderlands: Learning to teach in prisons and alternative settings*. California State University.

Yang, R. (2006). *The commodification of education and its effects on developing countries. A focus on China*. University of Hong Kong.