THE PEDAGOGICAL EXPERIENCES OF ONLINE CORRECTIONAL EDUCATION ENGLISH COMPOSITION FACULTY: A TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

by

Candace Chambers

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Charlotte
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Curriculum and Instruction

Charlotte

2022

Approved by:

_____
Dr. Janaka Lewis

_____
Dr. Meghan Barnes

_____
Dr. Consuelo Salas

_____
Dr. Beth Murray

ABSTRACT

CANDACE CHAMBERS. The Pedagogical Experiences of Online Correctional Education English Composition Faculty: A Transcendental Phenomenological Study (Under the direction of JANAKA LEWIS, Ph.D.)

In 2019, the United States incarcerated nearly 2.3 million citizens in correctional facilities across the country. One main issue with mass incarceration is the high recidivism rates of formerly incarcerated people. Correctional education has been proven to decrease recidivism rates for people who engage in this form of education while incarcerated. Therefore, there are many recent educational and political efforts to expand correctional education college programs. This expansion involves the modality in which instruction is delivered, whether in person, online, or hybrid. With these various formats, it is vital to gain insights into how correctional education instructors teach within different modalities. Past studies have gleaned the experiences of correctional education instructors who teach in face-to-face formats. But there is a gap in the literature concerning the insights of correctional education instructors who teach in online correctional education programs. Therefore, this study looks to address this gap by providing insight into the experiences of online correctional education instructors. Specifically, since many students must take gateway courses such as English and math for their college degree programs, this study will gather the insights of correctional education instructors who teach English composition.

The qualitative study followed a transcendental phenomenology methodology. The research questions were as follows: 1) What pedagogical strategies do online English composition correctional education faculty use in writing instruction?; 2) How do online English composition correctional education faculty cultivate relationships with their students in online

spaces?; and 3) What are perceived areas of needed professional development and support identified by online English composition correctional education faculty? Five correctional education instructors served as the sample population for the study. Data collection methods were semi-structured interviews, document collection, and a focus group. The researcher analyzed the data following four steps of transcendental phenomenology: epoche, phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis of meanings and essences.

Findings from the study showed that the instructors work to determine how to modify their teaching practices based on the online modality they teach regarding how they provide feedback and how they approach the focus of their writing instruction. The instructors also noted that they are aware of their tone when communicating with students and encourage them consistently due to their students being incarcerated. They also noted challenges with teaching within online correctional education regarding the difficulty in forming relationships with students. Lastly, the instructors provided suggestions for professional development in learning more about the technology that their students use to access their learning platforms, needing more cultural and sensitivity training, and their desire to form more professional bonds with their fellow online correctional education instructors. Therefore, this information can be utilized by correctional education program directors and writing program administrators of correctional education programs to improve the experiences of current online correctional education instructors and create training and development for new online correctional education instructors for the ultimate benefit of instructors and students.

Keywords: correctional education, English composition, online instruction

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In Michelle Obama's, *Becoming,* she referenced the people who formed a meaningful constellation in her life. She described them as her "boosters, my believers, my own personal gospel choir, singing, Yes, kid, you got this! all the way through." To the people who form my meaningful constellation, I want to thank you for being my boost of motivation, believer in my journey, and my gospel choir.

First, I'd like to thank my mama for instilling in me a love for learning and exploring the world. I want to also thank my daddy for his continued support and laughs along the way. I would like to thank my brother, Alton, for always being a voice of reason and a good travel buddy during stressful times of this doctoral program.

I would also like to acknowledge my committee. To my chair, Dr. Janaka Lewis, you were a glimpse of hope after my tedious search for a chair, and after I kept hearing "not this time," you offered to support me in my journey. Thank you for always providing holistic support for me during this journey from checking in with my health to offering great guidance during my writing process. Additionally, I want to thank Dr. Salas for being a support for me during major events in my life which occurred during this doctoral program. Your level of care was most appreciated. Lastly, I want to thank Dr. Barnes and Dr. Murray for always challenging me to critically think about my writing and for pushing me as a scholar.

My gospel choir is made up of so many people, from so many diverse backgrounds. I would like to thank my extended family at New Oak Ridge Baptist Church and at the Natural Resources Conservation Service in Mississippi. I want to acknowledge Dr. Robinson and dr. crump for being my cheerleaders who helped me to propel to my greatest heights and who were instrumental in me becoming a doctoral student. Lastly, I'd like to thank all of my close friends and family for the continued encouragement during this process.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the people who supported me during their physical existence and who continue to push me forward in their spiritual existence. I want to thank them for always seeing the best in me while motivating me to become the best version of myself. Lastly, their influence in my life helps me to always be my authentic self and always strive to serve others. All of these people knew I would be embarking upon a journey to the doctorate, and although they are not physically here to witness this accomplishment, I use their positivity as daily strength. Grandma, Dr. Chamberlain, Mrs. Debra, A.B., Regina —thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

As of 2019, the United States' criminal justice system incarcerated nearly 2.3 million citizens in correctional facilities such as state and federal prisons, local jails, and juvenile justice centers (Sawyer & Wagner, 2019). Compared to other countries, in 2020, the United States had the highest incarceration rate globally, with 655 incarcerated individuals per 100,000 persons (Statista, 2021). Two countries trailed the U.S., with El Salvador at 590 per 100,000 incarcerated persons and Turkmenistan at 552 per 100,000 persons of the national population (Statista, 2021). With the U.S. experiencing a 500% increase in incarceration rates over the past 40 years, there have been continuous discussions concerning ways to rectify the issue of mass incarceration (The Sentencing Project, 2020). High incarceration rates often caused by harsh sentencing laws, racial bias, and socioeconomic inequities result in the overcrowding of prisons, increased spending within the penal system, and disproportionate populations of racial minorities who are likely to be imprisoned or who are serving time (Schumake, 2019; The Sentencing Project, 2020).

To address mass incarceration rates, the National Institute of Justice (2021) has deemed recidivism as one of the most "fundamental concepts in criminal justice" (para. 1). Recidivism is defined and measured by criminal acts that result in a return to prison within a three-year period after a person's initial release from incarceration after committing a previous crime (National Institute of Justice, 2021). In order to reduce the recidivism of incarcerated persons, educational efforts have been one facet of rehabilitation approaches in the United States since the late 1800s (Correctional Education Association (CEA), 2020).

A main method in reducing rates of recidivism is correctional education (Davis et al., 2013; Esperian, 2010). Correctional education is defined by the United States Department of

Education (2021) as “a fundamental component of rehabilitative programming offered in juvenile justice confinement facilities, most American prisons, and many jails and detention centers” (para. 1). This rehabilitative programming is often categorized under two main umbrellas: “vocational,” which includes the offerings of employment skills training and certifications, and “academic,” which includes courses for Adult Basic Education (ABE), General Educational Development (GED), or Adult Secondary Education (ASE). ASE programming leads to a 2-year, 4-year, or postgraduate degree (Lee, 2018). Incarcerated persons who participate in correctional education programs have a 43% lower chance of recidivism (Davis et al., 2014).

Specifically for Adult Secondary Education, college programming has played a significant role in correctional education reform (Carver & Harrison, 2016; Costelloe, 2014; Gehring & Muth, 1985). Before the passing of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act in 1994, incarcerated individuals had access to utilize Pell Grant funding by the federal government to fund their college courses while incarcerated (Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, 1994). Due to tougher laws on crime, this privilege was revoked under the Clinton Administration, causing students who were interested in college programming to seek other methods to pay for their college education or lose the opportunity to engage with this form of education altogether (Gehring, 1997; Hobler, 1999). In 2016, the Obama Administration restored the privilege of accessing Pell Grants with the Second Chance Pell Pilot Program through its commitment to reduce recidivism and promote reintegration into society (White House, 2016). Through the pilot program, 67 colleges and universities partnered with more than 100 federal and state correctional institutions to enroll 12,000 students in educational and training programs (White House, 2016). Instruction was to be delivered through hybrid,

classroom-based, and online methods (White House, 2016). Three years later, the Second Chance Pell program had serviced approximately 17,000 students within 28 states across the nation (Delaney & Montagnet, 2020). Two thousand seventy-one certificates or diplomas, 2017 associate degrees, and 365 bachelor's degrees were awarded within the three-year time span (Delaney & Montagnet, 2020).

The Second Chance Pilot program was expanded in April of 2020 under the Trump administration inviting a new cohort of 67 schools to participate in the program (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). This expansion doubled the size of the program with the participation of 130 schools in 42 states, including the District of Columbia (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). Schools were selected based on their programmatic, institutional, and geographic diversity; eight schools planned to deliver instruction through distance learning, while 13 schools proposed instruction through hybrid methods (U.S. Department of Education, 2020). Then, in December of 2020, through a bipartisan effort, Congress restored the eligibility of federal Pell grants to incarcerated individuals in the 2021 Consolidated Appropriations Act, reversing a 26-year federal ban on access to funding for this population (Binkley, 2020).

Problem Statement

With the restoration of Pell grants and the expansion of college programs at correctional facilities across the country, there have been discussions surrounding the need for accountability and assessment (Cantora, 2020; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2019; Walter, 2021). The 2021 Consolidated Appropriations Act has set requirements for higher education institutions that provide programs for incarcerated individuals with the goal of assisting students in being successful after their release (Walter, 2021). Eligibility of initial and the continued determination of participation for these programs includes factors such as "job placement rates," "rates of

recidivism," "the offering of relevant academic and career advising services to participating individuals while they [students] are incarcerated, in advance of re-entry and upon release," and "the experience, credentials, and rates of turnover or departure of instructors" (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, p. 2002).

Specifically in the context of evaluating the "experience, credentials, and rates of turnover or departure of instructors," this element of evaluation has had continued measurements of study within the field of correctional education over the past two decades, including the seminal study of Osberg and Fraley (1993) which gleaned the experiences of college correctional education instructors in 67 facilities in New York state. However, with new advances in the delivery of courses, specifically distance learning and hybrid methods, there is a need to build upon the work of Osberg and Fraley (1993) within the context of the experiences of instructors who teach in online college correctional education programs. Since the Appropriations Act requires the reporting of "the mode of instruction (such as distance education, in-person instruction, or a combination of such modes) for each prison education program" along with "rates of instructor turnover or departure for courses offered in prison education programs," gathering information from instructors on the front-lines of instruction, especially digital instruction will provide necessary context behind the required rates to be reported by the U.S. Department of Education (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, p. 2003).

Additionally, when the global COVID-19 pandemic began in 2020, many colleges and universities that were providing correctional education college courses had to transition to virtual learning. With the spread of the virus at high rates at correctional facilities, visitors from college programs were not allowed inside correctional facilities (Burke, 2020; Klarreich, 2020; Tanaka, 2020). Therefore, many college programs across the nation transitioned to a paper

correspondence model which consisted of the drop-off and pick-up of educational materials (Ashford, 2020; Burke, 2020; Tanaka, 2020). Others switched to using any form of technology available such as existing email or telephone systems, to allow students to communicate with instructors, and many colleges and universities suspended their programs due to the lack of ability to continue in a digital environment (Burke, 2020).

Although some programs were not able to be maintained, there were a few programs that were able to continue their courses during the ills of the pandemic. With correctional education programs at the crossroads of wanting to provide quality education to their students in a new era of digital learning and the necessity to meet accountability requirements of the U.S. government, there is a need to determine best practices for implementing digital-based programs in facilities across the nation. Although there are concerns that online learning will not provide the same interpersonal interactions between students and their classmates along with their instructors (Burke, 2020; Tanaka, 2020), providing digital learning options is one mode of instruction that has now surfaced on the scene, especially due to the pandemic. Evaluation is needed to determine the effectiveness of these online programs, and correctional education teachers are the voices at the forefront of this assessment.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to learn of the experiences of correctional education instructors who have prior experience within online college programs, so they can provide their insight on how they deliver academic content and cultivate relationships with their students. The study also asked instructors to provide their perceived areas of needed support and professional development. Since instructors are often the faculty who experience the most direct contact with students rather than program administrators, gleaning their experiences can provide insight into

the effectiveness of online correctional education programs. More specifically, previous studies have specifically focused on how the origins of correctional education are based in the area of literacy and many college programs require their students to take gateway English/composition courses as a part of their degree program requirements. Therefore, the voices of online English composition instructors are paramount to discussions concerning this digital mode of instruction. These instructors are at the frontlines of many programs as they teach gateway, introductory level English courses, and therefore are able to encounter many of the students who enroll in correctional education programs. Therefore, this qualitative study gathered the insights of online English composition correctional education instructors concerning methods of pedagogies, challenges and successes to teaching within a digital environment, and their perceived needs of professional development. This information can provide insight for correctional education program administrators into the possible needs of instructors to be more effective in their teaching, methods to increase engagement with students in a confined environment, and ways that instructors' pedagogical identity can be constructed within these online spaces.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are as follows:

1. What pedagogical strategies do online English composition correctional education faculty use in writing instruction?
2. How do online English composition correctional education faculty cultivate relationships with their students in online spaces?
3. What are perceived areas of needed professional development and support identified by online English composition correctional education faculty?

Five online correctional education English composition instructors were selected from a correctional education program housed at a private, not for profit university in the Midwest, which is the longest-tenured face to face and online correctional education program in the U.S. Within the scope of the qualitative methodology, the research design of transcendental phenomenology was used for the study (Husserl, 1931). Instructors participated in semi-structured interviews and a focus group. Additionally, participants submitted documents in which they reflected upon their pedagogical practices within their correctional education courses. Themes were gathered from the data to provide insight into the phenomenon of the experiences of online correctional education English composition instructors. The collected data will be provided to writing program administrators and correctional education program directors of online correctional education programs to offer recommendations on ways to improve the effectiveness of these programs by supporting faculty and ultimately positively affecting students.

Definition of Key Terms

Key terms used in this study are as follows:

- *Correctional Education:* "A fundamental component of rehabilitative programming offered in juvenile justice confinement facilities, most American prisons, and many jails and detention centers" (U.S. Department of Education, 2021, para. 1).
- *Online Writing Instruction* (OWI)*:* The use of technology to communicate, share, and discuss writing techniques and learning for course completion (OWI Community, 2020).
- *Recidivism:* "criminal acts that resulted in rearrest, reconviction or return to prison with or without a new sentence during a three-year period following the prisoner's release" (National Institute of Justice, 2021, para. 1).

Significance and Relevance

This study adds to research that provides insight into instructors' experiences within correctional education programs (Bannon, 2014; Barringer-Brown, 2015; Michals & Kessler, 2015; Osberg & Fraley, 1993; Weaver et al., 2020). These previous studies have presented data concerning the experiences of teachers who teach within in-person correctional education environments. However, due to recent changes in the need for a variety of modes of instruction in correctional education and an increase in online instruction in traditional, non-corrections learning environments, the study of online instruction in correctional education environments is in need of extended research. Therefore, this study fills this gap of missing voices within the literature concerning the experiences of online instructors of correctional education. This research is critical for understanding faculty voice in the context of correctional education instructional programs.

Additionally, although there has been research conducted on teachers' experiences within college writing courses in face-to-face correctional education spaces (Berry, 2017b), there has been no research that has focused on English composition instructors' experiences within online spaces in correctional education. Therefore, this study will fill this gap. Considering an increase in online programming within correctional education, this study will inform correctional education program directors as well as writing program administrators on how to best support their current English composition correctional education faculty through professional development if their programs are currently 100% online or hybrid. Also, the study will provide tips and strategies from the instructors' perspectives for correctional education program directors and writing program administrators that may be considering a transition into digital learning or who are breaking new grounds for fully online or hybrid programs. Knowing the experiences of

current English correctional education composition instructors can provide ways for directors and administrators to combat challenges and foster working practices with their faculty members. This exchange of information will, in turn, yield more positive learning experiences for incarcerated students within correctional education programs.

Delimitations

This study was limited to only one correctional education program at one university. The program was selected due to its longstanding tenure of providing 100% online correctional education courses, so instructors will be able to provide their insight as they teach within the established program. While there are other programs nationwide that provide a form of online correctional education program, this study will only include the experiences of instructors at the chosen site. However, one program does not represent all programs throughout the United States in terms of programmatic structure and faculty support.

Also another delimitation of the study was the small sample size and recruitment method. Although there are many online English composition instructors within the selected correctional education program, the study only gleaned the experiences of five instructors. The sample size of five participants aligns with Polkinghorne's (1989) suggestion of using at least five participants for this type of qualitative study. I also only recruited instructors from the English department. Lastly, I recruited participants from a program with which I am familiar. This recruitment method could be a delimitation of the study since I am familiar with how the program is structured; this familiarity could cause potential bias in how I perceive the instructors' responses concerning improvements to the program. Potential researcher bias is attributed to my role as an English composition correctional instructor within an online correctional education program.

This bias may have affected my lens in interpreting the data. Therefore, I triangulated the data to limit potential bias.

Conclusion

The primary purpose of this dissertation research is to learn about the experiences of correctional education English composition instructors through their pedagogical practices, how they cultivate relationships with their students, and through their perceived areas of professional development. Chapter 2 presents a review of the related literature concerning the evolution of correctional education in the United States, along with key themes surrounding teacher and program evaluation along with student experience.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Correctional education offerings include classes for the attainment of a General Equivalency Diploma (GED), vocational education programs, life-skills courses, and access to college programs that yield higher education degrees (U.S. Department of Education, 2021). Previous literature has explored the benefits and challenges of correctional education for students within correctional facilities and how this access to education affects their lives after release (Esperian, 2010; Graffam et al., 2014; Vacca, 2004). Additionally, the modality of instruction within correctional education programs has been mainly delivered through face-to-face instruction, but with recent advances in technology, more programs are expanding their reach online (Burke, 2019; 2020). This literature review will explore the progression of correctional education in the United States, federal legislation that has influenced the delivery of correctional education offerings, college programs within correctional facilities, literacy efforts within correctional education programs with an emphasis on the impact of writing, the role of technology within correctional education, and correctional education teachers' perceptions and motivations in regard to pedagogy and practice.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Theory of Education will be employed as the theoretical framework for this study. Online correctional education English instructors are positioned as educators who teach using digital technology as a medium to provide access to education to incarcerated students. Technology influences the way in which these students learn and engage with educational material, and how online correctional education English instructors approach their pedagogy and practice speaks to a larger narrative of how technology can be used as a tool to democratize education.

Critical Theory of Education

Critical Theory of Education proposed by Kellner (2003) asserts that education should be democratized and revolutionized to meet the challenges of globalization within a technological society. The theory was created at the beginning of the new millennium, which influenced Kellner's approach to addressing the potential global, revolutionizing impacts of technology within the new time period. The theory was built upon Deweyan radical pragmatism, poststructuralism, Freirean critical pedagogy, and other theories which explore race, class, gender, and society which also criticize elitist and idealist concepts of education (Kellner, 2003). Although Kellner referenced the use of the term critical theory, which has roots from Freire's use of the terms to denote the complexities of power and privilege in society, Kellner presented a broader, more inclusive application of the term. He defined a Critical Theory of Education as a normative and utopian attempt to idealize the possibilities of what a democratic education could entail and how radicalizing education can change society. Within his definition, he continued to acknowledge the need for a Critical Theory of Education to conceptualize capitalist societies, relations of domination, and contradictions for social change in offer for transformations in education to occur.

The practicality of this transformation within education was articulated by Kellner with the emergence of three major tenets:

1. Changing Life Conditions, Subjectivities, and Identities: Educators must explore the ways technologies require multiple literacies and how revolutionizing global and technological changes in the global economy can lead to new ways of learning and a reconstruction of educational theory and practice (Kellner, 2003).

2. Expanding Technologies/Multiple Literacies: Tools and communities of learning should promote democracy and social justice, cultivating learning which promotes inclusivity for marginalized and diverse groups. Traditional literacies should be taught as well as computer and communication literacies to "empower students to develop their potentials, create communities of learning, and work toward democratizing society" without imposing a neo-liberal agenda on education (Kellner, 2003, p. 14). Educators should be able to propose their own pedagogical models and reconstruct education for progressive social change.
3. Toward a Radical Reconstruction and Democratization of Education: Education should be restructured, so that all students have access to new technologies and literacies to address the digital divide (Kellner, 2003). The digital divide acknowledges that individuals from privileged backgrounds have access to more advanced technologies than people from less privileged communities. Also, democratizing education should involve interactive and participatory forms of education with a mix of classroom pedagogy, information from books and reading material, and multimedia sources based on the age, locale, and needs/interests of the students and instructors.

Therefore, for the purpose of this study, Critical Theory in Education is employed as a lens of seeking how online correctional education English instructors teach using digital pedagogies and tools for learning within the context of the carceral system. Specifically, it is the instructors' approach to teaching incarcerated students online that will be explored using this theoretical framework to attempt to seek how the environment and medium in which they teach affect their approach to pedagogy, efforts of establishing relationships, and insight into additional professional development. This framework will be used as a lens to determine how the

instructors' positionality speaks toward a democratizing and revolutionizing approach to education, as proposed by Kellner (2013).

History of Correctional Education

Correctional education is recorded to have its beginnings during the Colonial Period of the late 18th century as people who were incarcerated were taught to read for religious purposes (Messemer, 2011). These efforts were a part of the missionary efforts of the Quakers, a Protestant religious organization that developed these educational opportunities during the early colonization period of the United States (Glaser, 1995). The prison programs of 1789 were referred to as "Sabbath School," and they mirrored the broader framework of religious education formulated by the Puritans, who believed that everyone needed to learn to read in order to be able to understand the Bible and seek salvation (Stubblefield & Keane, 1994). Similarly, the Sabbath School was where inmates could identify their sins, ask for forgiveness, and earn salvation (Messemer, 2011). Chaplains provided Bibles to inmates, assisted in the reading process, and were classified as adult educators (Messemer, 2011).

Throughout 1826-1840, more secular subjects were incorporated into the curriculum of correctional education including reading, writing, math, history, and geography (Messemer, 2011). Additionally, many correctional education programs were supported by colleges and universities through the formation of partnerships between the institutions. For example, in 1834, tutors from Harvard Divinity College worked with inmates at the Massachusetts State Prison (Gehring, 1997). One major occurrence during the 1860s was a survey conducted by activist Dorethea Dix (CEA, 2020). As a Sunday school teacher at a women's prison in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Dix discovered the ill-treatment of those experiencing mental health issues (CEA, 2020). After securing improvements at the prison, she traveled nationally to 300 prisons

and alums-houses discovering unsuitable living conditions for the mentally ill (Dix, 2006). Dix was able to lobby in her local state for prison reform to the legislature of Massachusetts, and her efforts increased a national need for more suitable living and physical conditions for incarcerated individuals (CEA, 2020). Her study was instrumental in garnering national attention to the conditions of correctional institutions and how those who were incarcerated were serviced while behind bars.

In an effort to increase widespread reform, various correctional education programs were established beginning in the late 1800s. In 1878 at Elmira Reformatory in New York, subjects such as history, geography, industrial arts, and ethics were introduced (Gehring, 1997). Additionally, the University of California partnered with San Quentin Prison to establish a college program at the facility in 1914 (Gehring, 1997). In 1931, Austin MacCormick, founder of the Correctional Education Association, completed a survey of 110 of 114 correctional education programs to assess their effectiveness of service for adults across the United States (CEA, 2020). He advocated for education in prisons to hold the same place as it did in the outside world, and he recognized that the value of education in prisons might be greater than thought by the general society since this form of education served a heavy concentration of under-educated adults within the prison population (MacCormick, 1931). MacCormick emphasized that each individual should be granted an opportunity for an education, and this opportunity should be suited to the individual's needs, desires, and capabilities, no matter their intellectual level (MacCormick, 1931). He also believed that education should be offered under a broad scope with high aims, be inclusive in offerings, and be "adultized" since it would operate within a larger plan of rehabilitation (MacCormick, 1931, p. 72). MacCormick's beliefs concerning individualization in the context of correctional education provided a framework for future correctional education

programs for the adult prisoner (Hunsinger, 1997). MacCormick's work is credited with having started the modern era of correctional education (CEA, 2020).

Various correctional education reforms occurred during the mid-20th century. In 1941, the American Prison Association adopted the "Standards of Evaluating Programs in Correctional Institutions," which provided standards for correctional education programs (CEA, 2020). During this time period, correctional education programs focused mainly on teaching basic skills of reading and writing (Hobler, 1999). Methods of basic skill instruction included early GED programs and college correspondence courses (Gehring, 1997). Also, rehabilitation became a focus during this time period as the murder rate was decreased nationwide (Chlup, 2005). This decrease in criminal activity was correlated with the increased educational programs and efforts in correctional facilities. 1953 marked the first prison-based college degree program in the United States provided through a partnership between the Menard State Prison and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale (Berry, 2017b). Also, college programs in Texas proved to reduce recidivism (Messemer, 2011). In 1954, the American Prison Association changed its name to the American Correctional Association and encouraged the use of the term "correctional institutions" rather than prisons (Chlup, 2005). On an international level, an emphasis on social rehabilitation was placed by the United Nations' "Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners" in 1955 (United Nations, 1955). The rules, later named the Nelson Mandela Rules, provided countries with essential elements of good principles and practices of the treatment of prisoners and prison management (United Nations, 1955; United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime, 2015).

Live college courses expanded in the 1960s, with Illinois as the first state to offer live college instruction to incarcerated persons (Gehring, 1997; Messemer, 2011). During this time

period, correctional education was based on the teaching of basic skills. However, in the 70s, amends were made to correctional education curriculums since there was the observation that adults who lacked basic academic skills were typically deficient in other areas, which could inhibit their social and employability skills (Hobler, 1999). Therefore, vocational training was deemed ineffective when implemented alone, but rather the combination of the teaching of life skills with academic skills would prepare incarcerated individuals for life after release.

The 1970s was also a time for enhanced support for correctional education, especially on the federal level (Hobler, 1999). The U.S. Office of Education aligned its efforts with the push for holistic educational approaches through grant funding. Despite opposition within the 1980s against the rehabilitation model of correctional education due to claims of poorly developed programs, new innovative approaches to prison education progressively developed (Hobler, 1999). One significant development was a focus on the functional illiteracy of the prison population. The Federal Bureau of Prisons supported mandatory education for all persons who functioned below the 6th-grade level and required them to enroll in Adult Basic Education for 90 days (Hobler, 1999). As a result of these efforts, the overall national achievement level for incarcerated individuals was raised to the 8th grade by 1983 and raised to high school equivalency by 1991 (Hobler, 1999).

United States Legislation for Higher Education Attainment for Incarcerated Individuals

Within the 20th century, the United States has made various moves to determine how to continuously address recidivism rates within its prison population, specifically through the education of its incarcerated citizens. In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Higher Education Act to increase and improve resources for students to pursue higher education while also providing financial assistance to students in postsecondary education (Pell Institute, 2003).

In a 1972 amendment to the act, Pell Grants or formerly known as Basic Opportunity grants were provided to students from low-income backgrounds; this amendment prompted the growth of the number of incarcerated students who participated in higher education (Wright, 2001). Additionally, literacy efforts through academic instruction were geared solely toward the goal of inmates acquiring a GED. Peer tutoring was supported as more correctional education programs included Adult Basic Education, GED prep, and college programs. Although there was progress, there were also critics of correctional education programs who deemed that corrections should be based on punishment and retribution (Hobler, 1999).

In 1991, the Office of Correctional Education was created by the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act to improve and support correctional education programs (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). This government initiative was designed to coordinate all correctional education programs within the Department of Education and work alongside states to ensure that correctional education programs were efficient in their coordination and outcomes (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). The federal government also provided grants to programs nationwide working to improve re-entry success and education (U.S. Department of Education, 2017). Also, during this period, incarcerated persons could use federal Pell Grants or personal funds to pay for college programs. Unfortunately, many colleges and universities were known for abusing Pell Grant funds and only housed correctional education programs for monetary and enrollment gains (Gehring, 1997). These institutions would accept Pell Grants and other funds without making improvements to their programs (Gehring, 1997). Student learning was often sacrificed for career development, program expansions, funding, and politics (Gehring, 1997).

In 1994, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act was passed under the

Clinton Administration and prohibited the awarding of Pell grants to incarcerated individuals (Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994). Section 401(b)(8) specified, "No basic grant shall be awarded under this subpart to any individual who is incarcerated in any Federal or State penal institution" (Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994). With harsher crime policies, overcrowding in correctional facilities occurred, which impacted the number of inmates who qualified for correctional education programs, especially without the assistance of the Pell Grant (Hobler, 1999). Since many college programs were unwilling to expand their programs without Pell Grant funding from the Federal government, many correctional education students were left without opportunities to finish their degree or certificate programs (Gehring, 1997).

After approximately 20 years, new interest began to arise in the benefits of allowing incarcerated adults to receive Pell grants. In 2016, President Obama launched a pilot study titled Second Chance Pell to provide incarcerated persons in more than 100 correctional institutions with Pell Grants to attend 67 colleges and universities across the United States (Wexler, 2016). The study limited the number of students who were able to participate in higher education courses to 12,000 students annually (VERA Institute of Justice, 2019). Since the launch of the pilot study, incarcerated students across the United States have had the opportunity to take college courses, with about 10,000 students enrolled during the school year 2018-2019 (United States Department of Education, 2019). The Second Chance Act, through bipartisan efforts, was reauthorized under the First Step Act in 2018 by the Trump Administration to provide 100 million dollars a year to continue the Second Chance Pilot Program and also provide funding to state and local programs that work to enhance reentry programs for people who were formerly incarcerated (Sinclair, 2018). As of 2019, the United States Department of Education has

reported that over 30,000 incarcerated students have benefited from this source of education (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). On December 21, 2020, Congress lifted the ban on the use of Pell Grants for incarcerated individuals (Cantora, 2020).

As of 2020, 130 schools located in 42 states and the District of Columbia are offering correctional education programs for students as they are allowed to use federal Pell grants to fund their education (United States Department of Education, 2020). Two-thirds of the 130 schools are two-year institutions, one-third are minority-serving institutions, and all are public institutions or private non-profits (United States Department of Education, 2020). Additionally, these institutions provide courses through distance education and hybrid modes of instruction (United States Department of Education, 2020). After completion of their programs, incarcerated students are able to attain postsecondary credentials such as certificates, associate degrees, and bachelor's degrees at two-year and four-year public and private colleges and universities that span across the United States (Kim & Clark, 2013; Steurer, 2001).

Benefits of Correctional Education

Seminal studies (Aos et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2000) have shown that students who participate in correctional education are less likely to recidivate than their peers who choose not to participate in correctional education opportunities. In an updated study conducted by the Research and Development (RAND) Corporation, a research-based global non-profit incarcerated adults who participated in correctional education had 28% lower odds of recidivating than those who did not participate (Bozick et al., 2018). For incarcerated adults without a high school diploma and who participated in high school/GED programs while incarcerated, the rate of recidivism was 30% lower than those who did not participate in these opportunities (Davis et al., 2013).

Also, many studies highlight the overall effects of correctional education programs, such as the integration of vocational programs, high school equivalency, adult basic education, and post-secondary education (Kim & Clark, 2013; Steurer et al., 2001). Specifically, for post-secondary education, individuals who participate in college programs or college courses are half as likely to recidivate than those who do not participate (Davis, 2019). Also, it has been shown that students who earned their GED or completed college courses were less likely to engage in violence during incarceration; on the contrary, there was no effect for those who completed vocational training and apprenticeship programs (Pompoco et al., 2017). Data to support the need for correctional education programs is rooted in student participation and/or completion within programs, and their involvement serves as the benchmark along with rates of recidivism.

Additionally, post-release outcomes for incarcerated adults who participated in correctional education reveal higher chances for employment. Post-release employment outcomes are 12% higher for those receiving correctional education than for those adults who did not (Bozick et al., 2018). Also, the completion of a GED or college diploma coincides with lower rates of recidivism within three years after release (Pompoco et al., 2017). Access to education has been at the crux of efforts to increase correctional education programs through policy initiatives due to the improvement of employment outcomes for participants and lower recidivism rates (Davis, 2019).

Evaluation of Correctional Education Programs

Studies have been conducted to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of correctional education programs. A seminal study in the field of correctional education was that of Gerber and Fritsch (1995), who reviewed adult academic, vocational, and life skills programs for men in correctional populations. The study found that the programs reduce recidivism and challenged

earlier notions by the 1974 Martinson Report that “nothing works” within correctional education (Jenson & Reed, 2008). Jenson and Reed (2008) furthered Gerber and Fritsch’s 1995 study through a comprehensive review of past research concerning correctional education programs. The researchers noted that the success of correctional education post-secondary programs might not be solely due to education but rather increased student motivation which in turn has been found to reduce recidivism rates (Jenson & Reed, 2008). From the student perspective, participants in a study conducted by Tewksbury and Stengal (2006) found that correctional education students who participated in academic programs felt better about themselves, while students in vocational programs were motivated to obtain employment after their release. Likewise, in 2017, the U.S. Department of Justice reviewed institutional interventions in state and federal prisons and reported that correctional education programs produced favorable outcomes for post-release (Duwe, 2017).

There has also been criticism of how programs are evaluated. Lewis (2006) argued that the macro-level, post-treatment, and quasi-experimental method of evaluation was inadequate to measure the effectiveness of correctional education programs since many factors could impact program implementation, delivery, student retention, and post-release factors. He suggested a holistic approach to evaluating the effects of correctional education, which involves specifying the model to measure the experience, qualifications, and teaching methods of correctional education teachers (Lewis, 2006).

Literacy- Focused Efforts within Correctional Education for Incarcerated Adults

Within correctional education, many efforts by program officials have focused solely on literacy as a gateway to increase learning in facilities that are and are not able to participate in higher education initiatives. Historically, from as early as the latter 1800s, literacy has been

positioned as a way to "save" individuals from a life of crime by rehabilitating them through the skills of reading and writing. These narratives were continuously perpetuated through rehabilitation programs for incarcerated individuals with a focus on education, literacy, and religious conversions (Berry, 2017b; Myrick, 2004). Conversations surrounding the goal of literacy programs are still situated in the idea that literacy can provide redemption, but recent studies have explored this power in opening doors of self-realization of students' roles within the correctional system (Appleman, 2019; Ginsburg, 2019; McQuaide, 2019).

Yet, caution has been discussed in the literature pertaining to literacy serving as a panacea to the social issues surrounding causes of incarceration in the United States (Appleman, 2019; Berry, 2017b). Literacy efforts are often described as a catalyst and cure of redemption through what philosopher Paulo Freire called a "Pedagogy of Hope" (Freire, 1994). This belief can distract policymakers from the socio-economic and political roots, which often contribute to rates of illiteracy and imprisonment, and also disproportionate rates of incarceration among minorities and low-income individuals (Berry, 2017b). Taking on a lens of hope is arguably a stance to ignore societal issues which contribute to the ills of the carnal system (Berry, 2017b). Therefore, the limits of these efforts must continuously be addressed to not shy away from the persistent social, educational, and economic problems faced by many people who become incarcerated (Karpowtiz, 2017; Trounstine, 2008).

Writing/Composition Initiatives in Correctional Education Programs

With efforts to focus on literacy-based initiatives in prisons, writing instruction has been at the crux of correctional education programs since its beginnings (CEA, 2020). Focuses on reading and writing serve as the basis for these programs, and writing has been used as a tool to assist incarcerated individuals with exploring how literacy plays an important role in their lives.

Appleman (2019) explained that a liberal arts education, which focuses on reading and writing, provides students with the ability to express their ideas through expository and creative writing. This form of education is a way to counter the dehumanizing effects of the prison environment through the cultivation of freedoms of thought and expression despite physical confinement (Appleman, 2019). Writing allows students to craft and explore their identities by reclaiming their personal power (Appleman, 2019).

One avenue of exploration for incarcerated students to engage in is the writing of literacy narratives. Literacy narratives allow writers to express their experience in learning how to read or write, and the compositions can also allow writers to explore a literacy they have in a certain area through narrative form (University of Central Florida, 2017). Through storytelling, as Berry (2017) explained, incarcerated students are able to tell their stories about how literacy impacts their lives and how their views of what literacy entails shape their worldview. As a rationale for selecting this form of writing, Berry (2017b) explained, "Literacy narratives, both written and enacted in the classroom, can help educators develop pedagogies that honor how students construct narratives of possibility in which literacy does connect- in modest ways- with social change" (p. 21). Literacy narratives can be classified as non-fiction writing, although they can contain elements of fiction. Other efforts of writing instruction in carceral environments have focused on the power of creative writing courses in these settings.

Through creative writing, students are able to express themselves through a sense of escape from their current environment. Shotland (2019) expressed that the essential part of the creative writing class was, in fact, the writing process. Students are able to engage in finding meaning in stories and poems and then discover meaning through making (Shotland, 2019). By allowing students to express their agency as writers, they can begin to understand writing as a

way of becoming through the development of their self-identity (Shelledy, 2019; Shotland, 2019). These writing experiences are designed to foster personal liberation and social change not only within prisons but allow for a mental escape outside of the confines of the space (Castagnetto & Shanley, 2020; McQuaide, 2020; Shelledy, 2019). An idea of hope as a critical rhetorical writing practice allows students to experience boundary-crossing as they use writing as resilience (Shelledy, 2019). Students are able to revise their sense of self through a "reconsideration of their histories, their current conditions, and their futures" (Appleman, 2019, p. 50). Thus, these programs are essential to correctional education and serve as a foundation for many programs across the country.

One example of a program that provides students with opportunities to express themselves through writing within a comprehensive English curriculum is the Bard Prison Initiative offered through Bard College in New York. Students enrolled in a degree program take a minimum of six academic writing courses focused on informal, exploratory writing techniques (Bard Prison Initiative, 2020). Some courses within the curriculum include Grammar, Rhetoric, and Style, Reading to Write, and Philosophy, and the City (Bard Prison Initiative, 2020). The goals of the courses are to create "habits of inquiry, dialogue, and engagement through a distinctive writing-based curriculum" (Bard Prison Initiative, 2020, para 3).

Other examples of partnerships between English departments at universities and correctional facilities include the Alabama Prison Arts and Education Project at Auburn University, the Prison University Project hosted at San Quentin Prison in conjunction with Patten University, and the Prison Creative Arts Project at the University of Michigan (Lockard & Rankins-Robertson, 2011). These partnerships are often housed in English departments with the goal of allowing students to learn the elements of writing through argumentation and narrative-

based compositions (Lockard & Rankins-Robertson, 2011). These correctional education programs focus on assisting students with expressing themselves through writing.

Use of Technology within Correctional Education

Incarcerated individuals are often exposed to digital technologies to find employment and housing, but solutions for a continuous decrease in the rates of recidivism also include access and exposure to digital technologies for the purpose of earning a college degree (Kim & Clark, 2013; Schaub & West, 2015). In 2015, the US Department of Education's Office of Educational Technology expanded its National Education Technology Plan to not only increase learning with technology use in traditional classrooms but also within correctional facilities (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). This plan hoped to assist with decreasing recidivism rates and prepare incarcerated students by providing them with digital access for re-entry into society (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). Overall outcomes of increasing student access to technology were to provide access to online college courses, online assessments, provide an education continuum, expand the reach of correctional education services, and provide technology-based instructional tools such as learning management systems (LMS) (U.S. Department of Education, 2015).

The United States Department of Education (2015) reported that out of 42 reporting states providing correctional education, 93% provided desktop computers for student use, 40% reported providing mobile laptops, and 24% provided mobile tablets. They also reported the type of network used to access the content. 62% provided a Local Access Network, while 26% used a statewide or wide area network for content delivery (U.S. Department of Education, 2015). However, the top issue within conversations surrounding technology use within correctional facilities is security. Only 14% of prisons nationwide allowed direct access to the Internet for

their students, which is a low number compared to the European correctional system (Lockard & Rankins-Robertson, 2011; U.S. Department of Education, 2015).

In countries such as Ireland, Denmark, and the United Kingdom, the focus of online education is on the quality of content and instruction rather than a restriction of access (Lockard & Rankins-Robertson, 2011). However, similar to the United States, Australia has imposed a strict ban on internet access for correctional education students, which limits their college programming availability and access to online research tools that are available to students who are not incarcerated but attend the same institutions of higher learning as traditional, non-incarcerated students (Harrison, 2014). Although external sources evaluate the necessity of technology within correctional education programs, the issues surrounding technology use have oftentimes been gleaned from the students themselves. In a project conducted by Monash University in Australia, incarcerated students reported their inability to enroll in various modules within their college programming, and they reported their continuous reliance on prison education officers to access their learning material (Harrison, 2014). Likewise, a study conducted in New South Wales found that students also relied heavily on prison education staff to access their material and print resources from the internet as supplements for their coursework (Harrison, 2014). Therefore, providing quality technological access in correctional facilities is an ongoing debate due to potential security breaches, a lack of state funding and is also often deemed to yield inferior educational offerings to students.

Online Learning within Correctional Institutions

As more correctional education programs are utilizing digital platforms for the delivery of coursework for students (Burke, 2019), there is overlap in conversations surrounding effective online learning in correctional settings and traditional educational settings with non-incarcerated

populations. Specifically for correctional education, there has been a charge to ask not if there will be an adoption of digital learning but when the global shift to digital formats will occur (Lockard & Rankins-Robertson, 2011). LMS are used within correctional education programs to deliver content to incarcerated students through online platforms provided by the college, university, or workforce development program providing the educational services. For example, although incarcerated individuals are not allowed to access the internet throughout Australian correctional jurisdictions, which inhibits them from participating in higher education courses online, one program has been able to use an LMS isolated from internet use (Farley, 2016). The Making the Connection program is funded by the Australian government and allows digital technologies that do not require internet access to be used for students to enroll in college programs through the University of Southern Queensland's LMS. At 13 sites across Queensland, Australia, students are able to use the LMS to access pre-loaded course materials (Farley, 2016).

Another example of the use of LMS and digital systems is at Ashland University in Ashland, Ohio, through their correctional education program. Students are able to access their courses through distance learning using tablets provided through technology vendors such as JPay/Securus and the American Prison Data Systems (APDS) (Ashland University, 2020). They are able to communicate with their professors, watch instructional videos, complete assignments, and take tests through a traditional online learning environment customized for the correctional setting (Ashland University, 2020). Furthermore, the adoption of online learning within a correctional program was also found within the Pen Project program of the New Mexico Corrections Department (Lockard & Rankins-Robertson, 2011). Student interns were able to provide feedback on writing samples submitted by incarcerated students. The hand-written samples were submitted through an LMS to be critiqued with comments by the interns over a 15-

week period. This use of the LMS was effective in delivering the course content from intern to student through this electronic method of delivery.

Since online learning has a general framework for traditional, non-incarcerated populations, many scholars have dedicated time to determine the effectiveness of this medium of instruction (Cook & Grant-Davie, 2013). Using the seminal work by scholar Frank Mayadas in 1997, the Online Learning Consortium created a framework titled the "Five Pillars of Quality Online Education" to serve as building blocks to support successful online learning (Online Learning Consortium, 2021). Mayadas, president of the consortium, affirmed that online programs must demonstrate quality in the areas of learning effectiveness, scale, faculty satisfaction, access, and student satisfaction (Mayadas, 1997). Using the OLS pillars, Bair and Bair (2011) determined that teaching online involves a shift in student learning and teacher expectations. They also found that teaching presence is necessary for online courses, and online instruction requires more effort than face-to-face instruction (Bair & Bair, 2011). Additionally, online learning has yielded conversations concerning the meeting of student needs, course design, and teacher insight (Cook & Grant-Davie, 2013). Some benefits of online instruction are that it can alleviate challenges for some students that could lead to dropping out of school, and it can pose challenges for instructors concerning limited knowledge with working with new technologies and access to reliable computer equipment or Internet connections (Griffin & Minter, 2013).

Online Writing Instruction

With an increase in digital-based learning within correctional education programs and a focus on literacy within many programs, there is a need to determine best practices concerning online writing instruction in correctional programs. Since there have been few studies that

discuss the effectiveness of online writing instruction within correctional education programs, this review will focus on best practices provided within traditional higher education spaces with non-incarcerated populations for online writing instruction to inform the study.

A seminal work in the field of writing instruction with an emphasis on technology was the work of Hawisher and Selfe (1991) concerning the rhetoric of technology in the writing classroom. The authors emphasized how technology has influenced the way people write and also the ways people are taught writing. Additionally, they challenged practitioners to recognize how online writing classes have the potential to serve as sites of paradox and promise, and although they provide a sense of freedom in creating effective learning environments, they can also contradict notions of effective teaching (Hawisher & Selfe, 1991). Eight years later, in 1999, composition scholar Cynthia Selfe laid a foundation within writing studies that emphasized how technology is linked to literacy and literacy education. She argued that technology and literacy were linked in ways to "exacerbate current educational and social inequities in the United States rather than addressing them productively" (Selfe, 1999, p. 414). With her direction to "pay attention to technology," more studies within the field of writing instruction have focused on how technology plays a role within literacy education (Hewett, 2015; Rendahl & Breuch, 2013; Warnock, 2009).

In 2013, the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the flagship organization for college composition, released their Online Writing Instruction Principles and Effective Practices. The 14 principles and practices address pedagogy, institutional level concerns, teacher concerns, and research (Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), 2021). Some principles are listed below:

- OWI Principle 1: Online writing instruction should be universally inclusive and

accessible.

- OWI Principle 3: Appropriate composition teaching/learning strategies should be developed for the unique features of the online instructional environment.
- OWI Principle 7: Writing Program Administrators (WPAs) for OWI programs and their online writing teachers should receive appropriate OWI-focused training, professional development, and assessment for evaluation and promotion purposes.
- OWI Principle 12: Institutions should foster teacher satisfaction in online writing courses as rigorously as they do for student and programmatic success (CCCC, 2021).

These principles are the guiding forces behind many college writing programs throughout the U.S.

Teacher Perceptions of Online Writing Instruction in Traditional Educational Settings

Furthermore, there have been discussions concerning the writing teacher's experience within online instruction within traditional educational settings with non-incarcerated students. Henning (2012) emphasized that online professional development is essential to developing faculty to teach online. He learned that faculty members must be aware that online teaching may require them to experience a change in their teaching styles from that of an expert to a facilitator. He stated that they might have to work outside of traditional working hours, learn how to use technology for their pedagogy, and learn to teach without verbal and visual cues (Henning, 2012). Although new technologies are being integrated into writing spaces, high-quality training for faculty has been deemed the best and necessary practice (Griffin & Minter, 2013; Salisbury, 2018). Also, there have been concerns about college writing instructors' lack of technical training, which could serve as a major influence when creating their courses (Bair & Bair, 2010; Salisbury, 2018). Therefore, Salisbury (2018) suggested that instructors are trained on how to

implement best practices using this tool for writing instruction.

Teacher Perceptions of Correctional Education

Just as the perceptions of writing instructors have been gathered throughout the literature, it is also important to discuss the perceptions of correctional education instructors for the sake of the research. There have been no studies that have been located that discuss the experiences of online writing instructors within correctional education college programs, so the review will cover what is present in the literature: teacher perceptions of correctional education.

Before discussing the perceptions of teachers, the research warrants a discussion concerning the role of correctional education instructors within the scope of democracy and liberation. Carver and Harrison (2016) emphasized that correctional educators "stand at the crossroads of liberation and incarceration" (11). These educators have a unique position between education's yielding of mental freedom and a place that provides avenues of confinement of a loss of personal agency (Carver & Harrison, 2006). The researchers suggest Freire's theoretical work of Critical Theory as an underpinning to how the work of correctional educators can assist disenfranchised students in developing a sense of ownership in their learning, which could then counterbalance the structures of the prison with the liberating force of education (Carver & Harrison, 2006). There have also been discussions surrounding the parallel between educational and correctional reform. Gehring and Muth's (1985) seminal study, which spanned from 1840-1900, determined that correctional education and prison reform overlap through progressive corrections management. Both reform methods are concerned with developing better citizens and providing more opportunities for internalized responsibility (Gehring & Muth, 1985). Within this scope of reform, researchers have advocated for correctional education teachers to place citizenship as a key dimension within the learning experience for their students (Carver &

Harrison, 2016; Costelloe, 2014). Costelloe (2014) suggested that civic competency should be seen as an accompanying literacy to enable incarcerated students to conceptualize their place in society.

Furthermore, a seminal study in gathering the perceptions of teachers within correctional education was performed by Osberg and Fraley (1993). The researchers sought to determine faculty members' sources of motivation to teach in college prison programs, their suggestions for improving these programs, barriers to teaching, and their comparisons to programs with traditional, non-incarcerated students. After interviewing 67 faculty members across four prisons, Osberg and Fraley (1993) found that 24% of instructors noted the characteristics of their students as reasons why they chose to teach in prison college programs, 19.7% noted the pay, and 19.3% of instructors mentioned rehabilitation/helping as a motivation to teaching. Some barriers presented were limited teaching aids and negative student characteristics. The instructors suggested the improvement of learning resources and student services.

Similar studies have been conducted since Osberg and Fraley's (1993) study. Some instructors have noted intrinsic motivators to teaching in college prison programs, while others identify extrinsic motivations for their choice in the placement of pedagogy. Michals and Kessler's (2015) research determined that teachers love their work and think of their students as dedicated, hardworking, and hungry for knowledge. Additionally, they found that teachers deemed teaching in prisons to be more rewarding than traditional teaching. Furthermore, although many reasons for the establishment of college prison programs involve the outcome of a decrease in recidivism rates, none of the teachers in Michals and Kessler's (2015) study mentioned recidivism when answering questions about their motivation to teach in prison.

This idea of the enjoyment of the work was also expressed by Barringer-Brown (2015)

and Bannon (2014). Barringer-Brown (2015) found that 80% of instructors were satisfied with their job. Motivations for teaching included characteristics of the students, the pay, and rehabilitation/helping. Unlike Michals and Kessler's (2015) findings, instructors in Barringer-Brown's (2015) study perceived education in correctional facilities as substandard in relation to traditional colleges. Some reasons may be their reported obstacles of limited teaching aids and negative student characteristics, which was the same evaluation found decades earlier. In a similar study, Weaver et al. (2020) heeded the call to move beyond the outcome of recidivism but sought to determine how to better support correctional education instructors by gleaning their experiences. Faculty at Boston University's Prison Education Program reported they loved to teach in the program, but had challenges such as limited access to students, tardiness, and difficulty in accessing academic resources for students. Recommendations by faculty included the formation of better relationships between the department of corrections, program staff, and faculty, along with mentorship and support for new faculty (Weaver et al., 2020).

Another theme expressed in research concerning teacher motivations is the valuable interactions between students and instructors. Bannon (2014) included similar inquiries as previous studies in their research approach concerning levels of job satisfaction, perceptions of students, and access to instructional materials, but the researcher also included memorable messages received from students. Memorable messages included any feedback related to the evaluation of the course, evaluation of the instructor, gratitude, or an impact of their experiences. Bannon (2014) found that instructors reported messages from students that displayed a deeply emotional connection. Their messages reflected the value they saw in the relationships with their teachers as transformative compared to non-incarcerated students, who tend to view their relationships as transactional. Bannon (2014) concluded that the messages were not just about

recidivism but spoke to the life-saving experience of correctional education for their students.

Conclusion

Studies have explored the importance of literacy-based programs within correctional education. Specifically, scholars have conducted research on the power of writing-based courses, whether expository or narrative, in allowing students to cultivate their own identity while interrogating the world around them. The gathering of teacher perceptions has given insight into the experiences of instructors who teach within correctional settings. However, the gap in the literature involves the gaining of correctional education teacher perceptions, specifically those who teach English/writing composition courses, on their experiences teaching in a distance learning environment. Although there have been conversations within the field of composition studies concerning online writing instruction, there is a gap in the literature concerning the experiences of teachers who teach within the same digital medium but within correctional education spaces.

Therefore, this study will explore the pedagogical experiences of these instructors. The study will build upon the foundational work of Osberg and Fraley (1993) from the lens of gathering teacher motivations and perceptions of their experiences teaching within online correctional spaces. The work will also build upon Berry's 2017 study of the power of writing instruction within correctional settings. The study will carve a new path in the literature with the merging of the correctional education teachers' experiences within the field of writing, but with an added lens of the implications of operating within a digital space. This added lens also links to the theoretical framework of the study. It is the hope that the discussion will connect to past and contribute to ongoing and future discussions as it gleans the successes and challenges of these teachers' experiences and their approaches to instruction, motivations to teach the correctional

population within an online space, and how they cultivate identity with their students within the medium of digital technology.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 presents the research methodology for the study concerning the experiences of online correctional education English composition instructors. The chapter addresses the purpose of the study, research questions to be explored, the rationale for the type of design to be used, data collection procedures, and a discussion on my role as the researcher within the study. Since the 2021 U.S. Consolidated Appropriations Act requires the reporting of "the experience, credentials, and rates of turnover or departure of instructors" for all higher education programs which receive federal funding to provide correctional education programming, there is a need for research to gather these experiences from instructors (Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, p. 2002). Also, due to an increase in the transition to digital instruction within correctional education, learning of the experiences of online correctional education instructors is key to understanding the effectiveness of online correctional education programs (Cantora, 2020; Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020; U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2019; Walter, 2021). Additionally, since English composition courses serve as gateway courses for students who are earning associate's or bachelor's degrees, the instructors of this subject matter encounter a majority of students who enroll in correctional education college programs (Complete College America, 2021). Therefore, evaluation is needed to determine the effectiveness of correctional education programs, and English composition teachers are the voices at the forefront of this assessment.

Purpose

The overall purpose of the study is to address the gap in the research concerning the experiences of online correctional education English composition instructors. This study will utilize qualitative research methods to gather information concerning these instructors'

pedagogical methods of instruction, ways they foster relationships with their students within an online instructional space, and their perceived areas of needed professional development. The information gathered can be used to better support current online correctional education English composition instructors in the work that they do and make recommendations for future educators within correctional education programs that are transitioning to online instruction. Additionally, the study will provide insight into the perspective of English composition instructors to provide this knowledge to correctional education program directors and writing program administrators for potential enhancements or improvements to their programs.

Research Questions

The research questions used for this study are as follows:

1. What pedagogical strategies do online English composition correctional education faculty use in writing instruction?
2. How do online English composition correctional education faculty cultivate relationships with their students in online spaces?
3. What are perceived areas of needed professional development and support identified by online English composition correctional education faculty?

Research Design

A qualitative methodology was used for the study. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2011), qualitative research is an activity that is based on a set of interpretive and material practices to situate the observer in the world. In the context of this study, I employed qualitative practices to learn about the experiences of online English composition correctional education faculty. Similarly, Creswell (2013) emphasized the process of conducting qualitative research as it flows from philosophical lenses to interpretive lenses and encompasses procedures to studying

social or human problems. Within the procedures of the study, Creswell (2013) acknowledged different methodological frameworks to the approach to inquiry. He emphasized that qualitative research is used when there is a problem or issue that needs to be explored, there is a need for a complex, detailed understanding of an issue, or if the researcher wants to empower individuals to tell their stories (Creswell, 2013).

In the context of this study, I employed a qualitative methodology to address the three tenets provided by Creswell (2013). Since there is a gap in the research of the experiences of online correctional education instructors and a need to gather the experiences of English composition instructors in this space, the qualitative research design addressed the problem to be explored, allowed for the gathering of experiences to understand a complex, detailed understanding of the issue, and empowered instructors to tell their stories.

Transcendental Phenomenology

Within the scope of qualitative methodology, the research design of transcendental phenomenology was used for the study. The term "phenomenology" is attributed to its early use by philosopher Immanuel Kant in 1765, but the term was defined by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1807). Hegel (1910) described phenomenology as knowledge as it appears to one's consciousness and what a person perceives and knows within their own experience. Additionally, phenomenology draws heavily on the writings of German philosopher Edmund Husserl (1931), who believed that knowledge is based on intuition and essence rather than empirical knowledge. He viewed the purpose of research to be aimed at the discovery of essences, which are derived from meaning within knowledge (Husserl, 1931). He also described essence as a blending of the real and unreal, defining the real as things that appear in absolute reality and the unreal as things that appear as a result of learning (Husserl, 1931, Moustakas, 1994).

A specific focus within phenomenology is transcendental phenomenology which focuses on participants' meaning of a lived experience of a concept or phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994). Husserl (1931) emphasized that transcendental phenomenology involves the researcher's subjectivity and the discovery of the essence of an experience through a systematic methodology for the derivation of knowledge. Two main components of Husserl's classification of transcendental phenomenology are the researcher's intentionality and intuition. Intentionality includes consciousness to the experience of something and recognizing that a person and their world are intertwined in meaning (Husserl, 1931). Also, intentionality involves the researcher uncovering the meaning of an experience through exploring the textural and structural dimensions of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994). Intuition, according to Husserl, is essential to the researcher describing what is provided and presented (Husserl, 1931). Also, an emphasis on intuition distinguishes transcendental phenomenology from other research approaches because it allows for an understanding of how perceptions, feelings, thoughts, and awareness are grounded in consciousness regarding an experience (Moustakas, 1994). For this study, I followed Moustakas' (1994) logical process for transcendental phenomenological research, which will be explained further, to focus on the phenomenon of the experiences of online English composition instructors of correctional education.

Sampling

For effective phenomenological interviewing, Roulston (2010) emphasized that identified participants must have experienced the phenomenon and be able to discuss the lived experience of the phenomenon. Therefore, purposive criterion sampling was used for the study. Purposive sampling is used within phenomenology for identifying and selecting participants who are information-rich and are knowledgeable about or who have experienced a certain phenomenon

(Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2011; Patton, 2012). More specifically, criterion sampling aligns with the principles of phenomenology to select participants who meet predefined criteria through their experience with the phenomenon but who also vary in their personal characteristics and individual experiences (Moser & Korstjens, 2018). The number of five selected participants is based upon Polkinghorne's (1989) recommendation of five to 25 participants who have experienced the phenomenon in order to gather rich data from the experiences of the participants. For eligibility for this study, the English composition instructors were required be over the age of 19 and have taught in the selected correctional education program within an online capacity for at least one semester to be able to speak to their experiences. Participation in the study was voluntary, and participants received a $15 Amazon gift card for their participation in the study.

After gaining approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), I emailed the Director of Composition at the sample site to inform her about the study and its purpose. I asked her if I could email the study's information through the correctional education composition faculty's listserv. She agreed, and before I sent the email, she allowed me to give a brief overview of the study in the correctional education composition instructors' faculty meeting. After the meeting, I sent the initial email for the study, which detailed information about the study, including its requirements, benefits, and time commitment. The initial recruitment email is included in Appendix A. After the first email request for participation, I received one email response from an instructor. After one week, I sent a follow-up email to request more participants. Four more instructors responded, which brought the sample size to five participants. No other instructors responded to the email requests. Once the instructors accepted the invitation for the study, they received a consent form (Appendix B), and we determined a time for their semi-structured interview. They also were allowed to ask me any questions they had about the study.

Study's Participants

Five of the interview questions asked the instructors about their educational background, their teaching experiences, and of their introduction to correctional education. I chose to only ask about the instructors' identities in the context of how they engage pedagogically with their correctional education students in the online setting. Therefore, I did not ask questions regarding factors such as their race, socioeconomic background, or family life because I wanted to focus solely on their approach to teaching without external influences on how I would interpret the data. However, in addition to their pedagogical identities, I have included gender. Based on the instructors' responses, in the correctional education setting, the students only know of an instructor's educational background if provided by the instructor during their initial, written introduction to their students and/or their gender based on the instructor's name or request for their students to call them by a title such as Ms. Or Mr. Also, the instructors are only formally aware of a student's classification such as freshman or sophomore and their preferred gender if they ask for the teacher to call them a title such as Mr. or Ms. Therefore, these are the only identifiers I have included in describing my participants, and these will be the only identifiers I used in interpreting the data.

Four females and one male participated in the study. The five instructors' bachelor's and master's degrees were in the following subjects: creative writing, women's gender and sexuality studies, communication, English composition, English literature, philosophy, fiction, and psychology. Their years of teaching experience ranged from five years to 20 years. All of the instructors had previously taught face-to-face and online English composition courses at institutions prior to teaching at the sample site, including at community colleges and

colleges/universities. Also, all of the instructors had at least one year of teaching experience at the sample site.

One of the instructors was a site director at the site and an instructor, meaning that she also physically worked inside of the correctional facility overseeing the educational logistics of the correctional education program and served as a liaison between other instructors and their students. One of the instructors was also a subject matter, meaning that she oversees instructors for one of the English composition courses. Four of the instructors were introduced to correctional education from an introduction to the corrections program by the English department in which they were currently teaching in at the sample site. One instructor was introduced to correctional education from her husband's involvement as a correctional education program director at another site that offered a correctional education program.

Site Selection

The site selected for the study was a four-year, private, non-profit university in the Midwest. The university's correctional education program is the longest-continually running post-secondary program in the United States. The program offers face-to-face and distance learning instruction for students in more than 120 facilities across more than a dozen states. Their distance learning correctional education program predated the COVID-19 pandemic. Over 4,000 students are served within post-secondary education, and more than 175 adjunct and full-time instructors are employed each semester. Distance education courses are offered for students and instructors through a distance learning modality with a secure online connection and a secure device in the form of a tablet or computer.

The sample site offers ENG 100, ENG 101, and ENG 102 courses for their correctional education instructors. ENG 100 is titled College Writing Improvement, and ENG 101 and ENG

102 are courses in a two-part sequence that focus on the writing process, critical thinking, research skills, and the rhetorical nature of writing. Four of the five instructors had previously taught the ENG 100, ENG 101, and ENG 102 courses at the sample site. One of the instructors had only taught an ENG 100 course. All of the online correctional education courses in the English department at the sample site are asynchronous, meaning that the instructors and the students do not meet simultaneously for a course session. Additionally, they are also unable to meet with the students via video platform or speak to the students using audio voice methods. Lastly, the instructors are unable to know of their students' identities in regard to race, gender, or offense.

Methods of Data Collection

According to Creswell (2013), qualitative researchers gather multiple forms of data for their study and spend a considerable amount of time gathering information in the natural setting of the research. Four basic types of data collection within qualitative research are observations, interviews, document collection, and the gathering of qualitative audio and visual materials (Creswell, 2013). Specifically for phenomenology, individual interviews and focus groups are suitable, although documents and observations can be considered (Creswell, 2013; Moser & Korstjens, 2018). For this study, semi-structured interviews, document collection, and focus groups were used as primary sources for data collection.

Semi-Structured Interviews

The purpose of phenomenological interviewing is to generate detailed and in-depth descriptions of the human experience to understand the participants' perceptions and understandings (Roulston, 2010). Also, the interviewer is the instrument charged for listening and capturing the phenomenon (Guerrero-Castañeda et al., 2017). Within semi-structured

interviews, interviewers refer to an interview guide that contains open-ended questions (Roulston, 2010). After posing the prepared questions, interviewers probe to gather more detailed and descriptive information about the responses provided (Rouslton, 2010). Specifically, within phenomenological interviewing, the interviews are typically guided by only one or two open-ended interview questions (Rouslton, 2010). Moustakas (1994) recommends two broad questions as a guide: What have you experienced in terms of the phenomenon? and What contexts or situations have typically influenced or affected your experiences of the phenomenon?

For this study, the overall questions used to guide the interviews were as follows: What have you experienced in terms of being an online correctional education English composition instructor?; What contexts or situations have typically influenced or affected your experiences being an online correctional education English composition instructor? Using these overarching questions as my guide in creating the interview questions, I utilized an Interview Guide for the semi-structured interviews as seen in Appendix C. All of the questions from the Interview Guide were asked in each participants' one-on-one interview, with some variation in the follow-up questions that were asked. Furthermore, the interview questions connected with Kellner's (2003) tenet of Toward a Radical Reconstruction and Democratization of Education because they were specifically tailored toward the instructors' approaches to pedagogy with consideration to the locale and needs/interests of the students.

The interviews were conducted via the online video conferencing platform of Zoom. This video conferencing platform was most appropriate because the university's correctional education faculty live across the United States since the correctional education program offers a 100% online teaching position. Therefore, it would not have been viable for me to travel across the United States to conduct all of the interviews. All five participants completed their separate

semi-structured interviews of 60-90 minutes. Therefore, five interviews were conducted in the study, with an average interview lasting 60 minutes. All interviews were recorded using the recording option on Zoom, and then they were transcribed using the transcription service of Temi. I then stored the transcripts in a confidential Box folder.

Document Collection

For document collection, Creswell (2013) explained that this form of data collection enables researchers to obtain the language of the participants and represents data that the participants have given much attention to before submission. For this study, participants were asked to submit a reflection regarding their instruction within the correctional education program (Appendix D). Since the English department at the university required a self-assessment from the online correctional education English composition faculty, I asked the participants to either provide an excerpt from their self-assessment or write an original reflection. I asked them to reflect on their strengths and weaknesses as instructors and provide any other additional commentary regarding their pedagogy as an online correctional education English instructor. This request aligned with Kellner's (2003) tenet of Expanding Technologies and Multiple Literacies because it asked the instructors to reflect upon their models of pedagogy. Four of the five instructors submitted their reflections, and they were stored in the secure Box folder.

Focus Group

Lastly, a focus group was held with the participants. Focus groups allow participants to gather in a common space to discuss topics provided by the interviewer to generate a range of opinions and ideas (Roulston, 2010). The focus group format was chosen because I wanted the instructors to talk with each other about their experiences. Documenting their shared experiences could allow me to draw more conclusions from the data than I would have received only from

the individual interviews and reflections. I also asked broader questions in the focus group instead of specific questions as asked in the one-on-one interviews. Two examples of those questions are “When you think of teaching online, what comes to mind?” and “When you think of teaching in correctional education, what comes to mind?” The more general questions allowed me to potentially have more data to address my research questions because the instructors were able to give their insight without a structured question that could yield a more direct answer. Additionally, the broader questions, particularly those connected to the use of technology within the learning environment, connected to Kellner’s (2003) tenet of Changing Life Conditions, Subjectivities, and Identities as the instructors discussed how teaching online could lead to various ways of learning for their correctional education students.

All five participants were invited to the focus group session, and I used a focus group guide during the interviews (Appendix E). Three of the five instructors participated. To my knowledge, the instructors who participated did not know each other professionally before the focus group, although they taught within the same correctional education program. The focus group session lasted approximately one hour, and I used the insight provided to explore and examine findings from key points provided during the semi-structured interviews and document collection method (Rouslton, 2010). I served as the moderator for the group. Five focus group questions were created as guiding questions to allow for the discussion for each question (Krueger, 2000; Stewart et al., 2007; Rouslton, 2010). After the focus group session, I used Temi to transcribe the interviews. Therefore, the semi-structured interviews, document collection, and focus group served as the basis of data collection for the study.

Data Analysis

Creswell (2013) explained that data analysis occurs hand-in-hand with other parts of developing the qualitative study including data collection and composing the findings. For this study, I followed Moustakas' (1994) logical process for transcendental phenomenological research. Key methods within transcendental phenomenology include epoche, transcendental-phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis of meanings and essences (Moustakas, 1994).

Epoche

Epoche involves setting aside prejudgments about the research topic to present an unbiased and open presence to the research (Moustakas, 1994). Epoche allows the researcher to see the phenomenon through an original vantage point. Additionally, epoche requires that everything the researcher is knowledgeable about concerning the phenomenon be placed aside and that the researcher should exist in the moment to concentrate and reflect on any perceptions, preferences, or feelings (Moustakas, 1994). To practice epoche, Moustakas (1994) found a quiet place to review his current thoughts and feelings regarding the people, situations, or issues of his research. He also set aside biases and prejudgments with the goal of seeing the phenomenon with a new and receptive outlook. This process took several sessions for him to prepare for an authentic encounter. He also participated in reflective meditation, which allowed preconceptions and prejudgments to enter his consciousness and freely leave. He wrote down the prejudgments and reviewed his list until he was ready to enter the research fresh and renewed.

For epoche, I followed Moustakas' (2004) approach by reflecting on my experiences as an online English composition instructor within a correctional education program. I dedicated time during the morning hours to write reflections in a digital document concerning my

preconceived biases related to the research. I also included my thoughts and feelings about the phenomenon that could influence my data collection and analysis.

Phenomenological Reduction

Moustakas (1994) described phenomenological reduction as a process that involves a reflection on the description of things and a reduction to the themes presented. This method involves pre-reflection, reflection, and reduction to concentrate on the nature of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994, p. 91). The researcher perceives, reflects, imagines, and concentrates on the phenomenon to determine what stands out as meaningful. Then, the researcher participates in the process of horizontalization. In this process, each statement concerning the phenomenon has equal value when attempting to determine its essence. The statements are initially placed in a table in no particular order. Statements that are irrelevant to the topic and questions or are repetitive are deleted. The remaining statements are the horizons or textural meanings, which explain what was experienced. These statements are placed within themes.

Before conducting the phenomenological reduction, I reviewed each transcript of the one-on-one semi-structured interviews to refresh my memory of the conversations that occurred with the participants. I also read each submitted reflection from the participants. Lastly, I reviewed the transcript from the focus group session. Next, I identified non-repetitive, non-overlapping statements from the transcripts and documents that were related to the phenomenon and stated by the participants. I copied and pasted the statements into one document under the header of the pseudonym of the participant for their interview and submitted document, and then I placed the non-repetitive and non-overlapping statements collectively from the focus group on the same document. The statements were not grouped in a particular order or in a particular category. I then grouped the statements under the headings of each research question. If the statement was

related to the research question, I placed the statement in its respective header. Statements that were not directly aligned with a research question but were not repeated amongst the participants were placed at the bottom of the document. All statements that did not align with the study or were repetitive were deleted. The remaining statements were the horizons.

Imaginative Variation

Imaginative variation seeks to identify possible meanings of the phenomena in order to arrive at structural descriptions of the experience. Structural descriptions provide how and in what context the phenomenon was experienced. Moustakas (1994) asked: "How did the experience of the phenomenon come to be what it is?" This process involves reflection on the many potential possibilities that can be taken from the textural descriptions. The steps of imaginative variation are as follows:

> Systematic varying of the possible structural meanings that underlie the textural meanings; recognizing the underlying themes or contexts that account for the emergence of the phenomenon; considering the universal structures that precipitate feelings and thoughts with reference to the phenomenon; and searching for exemplifications that vividly illustrate the invariant structural themes and facilitate the development of a structural description of the phenomenon. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 99)

This process meant for me to understand the themes and contexts behind the descriptions and statements provided by the participants. For imaginative variation, I closely aligned my procedure with Moustakas (1994) and that of Moerer-Urdahl and Creswell (2004) by separating the textural descriptions of "what" from the structural descriptions of "how." I used a different document to label which statements represented the textural descriptions and which were structural descriptions. I made this distinction by labeling statements that discussed what the job

of being an online correctional education English instructor entailed as textural and how the teachers conduct their jobs within a larger context as structural. Afterward, I created categories or themes for each research question based on the remaining statements. These themes were developed from the statements provided by the participants as overall descriptions. After creating the themes, I aligned the participants' original statements from the transcripts with my structural descriptions, as Tucker et al. (2010) did in their study to make sure the statements spoke to the meanings I extracted.

Synthesis of Meanings and Essences

The final step of the transcendental phenomenological research process was the synthesis of the textural and structural descriptions into a unified, composite description of the phenomenon. Moustakas (1994) made note that the essence may never be fully exhausted since it is derived from the vantage point of the individual researcher and their study of the phenomenon. Moustakas' statement means that since the researcher is the sole person conducting the data analysis, then there could be meanings not included since the analysis is only through the vantage point of one person. Therefore, I defined essence as the characterization of what it means to be an online correctional education English instructor. I chose to intertwine the work of these instructors with their reasoning for their work. This approach was influenced by a mentor text by Moerer-Urdahl and Creswell (2004), who approached essence through the composite description of the phenomenon to capture the meaning which is attributed to the experience as suggested by Moustakas (1994).

For this step of the study, I layered additional meaning to the descriptions and findings of the research questions to define the essence of the experience of being an online correctional education English instructor. These themes were created from repeated statements by the

instructors. The final conclusion of the research process entailed an overarching descriptive statement of the phenomenon. The statement allowed for a deeper understanding of the phenomena of the experiences of online correctional education English composition instructors.

Ethical Considerations

For this study, risks were minimal. I practiced confidentiality amongst participants with all collected data. The IRB at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte approved the study. I emailed all instructors who met the study's criteria using the listserv provided by the Director of Composition. After the instructors volunteered to participate, I distributed a consent form to participants. The participants were asked to sign the consent form, which outlined the confidentiality of the study and their right to withdraw from the study voluntarily. Additionally, each participant was assigned a pseudonym to protect their identity during the data analysis process. Upon completion of the study, all identifiers will be removed, including the pseudonym key.

Role of the Researcher

The role of the researcher involves the attempt to gather the thoughts and feelings of the participants, and the researcher must safeguard the participants in the research process they will partake in (Sutton & Austin, 2015). In my role as the researcher, I gathered the thoughts and feelings of online English composition instructors who teach within correctional education programs. I did not have a current personal relationship with the participants, but I teach within the same program as the participants. Since the participants and I teach within the same correctional education program, there could have been potential bias when conducting the study. However, I triangulated the data through the use of one-on-one interviews, a focus group, and reflections to eliminate potential bias. Also, since I am an instructor in the correctional education

program at the sample site, there was familiarity with the modality of instruction within correctional education. This familiarity enabled me to pose detailed and specific probing questions to ensure that the research questions were addressed.

Therefore, I can be classified as an insider. Insider researcher refers to research conducted by a member of the sampled population (Kanuha, 2000). Being a member of this population can provide a level of trust between me and the participants (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). This level of trust could be framed as a benefit or asset since I also identified as an online correctional education English instructor at the time of the study, although I did not have a personal or professional relationship with the participants before the study. My lived experience as an instructor in this capacity could have allowed the participants to feel more comfortable and open for discussion, which is a benefit. Also, since the instructors and I taught within the same program, I had familiarity with the structure of the program. Therefore, I did not have to ask many questions about the logistics of how the students learn or how the curriculum is delivered. This prior insight allowed me to ask direct questions about the instructors' approach to their pedagogy. However, being an insider could have also caused my judgment to be clouded by my personal experience as a member of the phenomenon group of online correctional education instructors (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). I worked to set aside preconceived judgments about the population of the study to limit potential bias while also continuously acknowledging these judgments during data analysis (Fleming, 2018).

Validity

Typically, qualitative research employs methods such as triangulation, thick description, external audits, and peer reviews to establish validity within a study (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Additionally, Creswell and Miller (2000) explained that qualitative researchers bring their lens of

validity to their study, meaning that the vantage point of the researcher influences how the data is reported. Therefore, to develop a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon of online correctional education English instructors, I triangulated the data to assess validity through the alignment of the one-on-one interviews, reflections, and focus group session (Patton, 1999). Specifically, methodological triangulation was used, which involves multiple forms of data collection (Roulston, 2010).

Conclusion

In Chapter 3, I detailed the study's design and how it aligns with the research questions. I also discussed the research methodology to be used for the study. The objective of the study is to gather the experiences of online correctional education English composition instructors. Participants were selected based on set criteria and participated in semi-structured interviews, reflections, and a focus group. The data was coded and categorized into themes to describe the phenomenon of the instructors' experiences. Chapters 4 and 5 will review the results and discussion of the study.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

As stated in Chapter 1, the purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study is to explore the experiences of online correctional education English composition instructors. This chapter reports the study's findings as gathered by the interview questions from the Interview Guide, collected documents, and a focus group session. The responses to the collected data align with the study's research questions, which are as follows:

1. What pedagogical strategies do online English composition correctional education faculty use in writing instruction?
2. How do online English composition correctional education faculty cultivate relationships with their students in online spaces?
3. What are perceived areas of needed professional development and support identified by online English composition correctional education faculty?

The chapter presents the major findings of the research, including how the pedagogical strategies used by the instructors, ways they form relationships, and areas of perceived professional development. I developed the themes after rounds of coding from the participants' one-on-one semi-structured interviews, collected documents, and the focus group discussion. The themes are presented with their corresponding research questions.

Research Question #1

What pedagogical strategies do online English composition correctional education faculty use in writing instruction?

With this question, I sought to learn about the instructional practices utilized by correctional education English composition faculty with attention to how they employ teaching practices in their English courses. The participants all explained that their courses at the

university were pre-built, meaning that the curriculum is pre-designed and established when the instructors are assigned to their courses each semester. The instructors did not mention if they are included in curricular decisions, but only that the course's modules and lessons are pre-built by the department in the learning management system at the start of the semester. Therefore, the instructors are only charged with assisting students with the writing process, responding to their inquiries, providing suggestions for revision, and assessing their written compositions, all via written text. Although the correctional education department provides tips and best practices for the instructors to follow regarding feedback and communication, ultimately, the instructors' style of teaching with regard to their communication styles and approach to feedback related to their individual personalities. Therefore, the themes for this research question speak to the way in which these instructors present themselves to their students within a pre-built online course.

The methods that the instructors used were influenced by their medium of online instruction, the subject matter, and the corrections environment because this medium provides the only method of interaction between them and their students. Also, it is important to the study that all of the instructors taught English composition courses because these courses serve as gateway courses that a majority of the correctional education students are required to take for their degree programs. Therefore, with these instructors teaching a majority of students at the sample site through online instruction, they can provide insight to how they tailor their instruction to meet the needs of a variety of students at the school.

Pertaining to Research Question #1, the instructors mentioned how they utilize feedback, focus on higher-order concerns, and continuously encourage their students. From the data collection process, I developed the following themes from the instructors' responses to questions from the data collection methods concerning their pedagogical strategies: a) Teaching Using

Feedback; b) Focusing on Higher-Order Concerns for Assessment, and c) Continuous Encouragement due to Learning Circumstances.

Teaching Using Feedback

All five instructors expressed that their method of written feedback was influenced by their 100% online teaching environment. They also shared that they used various approaches to providing this feedback. The instructors' primary communication method with their students is through two forms: messaging through the learning management portals (LMS) or via comments on their students' assignments. One participant described, “The teaching that I do takes place in the written feedback on their assignments and via email.” Another participant stated, “Most of my actual intensive feedback is really in those comments.” The instructors emphasized the importance of these two methods of communication because these channels are how they are able to connect with their students in the 100% asynchronous online environment and due to the constraints of the LMS.

The participants also expressed that they are unable to interact with their corrections students as they would traditional online students due to technological and resource restrictions. The instructors have to teach with their students’ limited access to the internet in mind or remember that their students may not have access to a variety of learning material as traditional, non-incarcerated students might. The learning methods that are traditionally used in online learning environments such as synchronous class sessions, office hours, virtual meetings between the instructor and student, internet access, or the availability of library resources are not present within their online correctional education environment. One participant stated,

> I think what distinguishes correctional education for me is a lot of restrictions. I think of it as a different challenging form of teaching because you have to rely on written

> communication. You have to work around their lack of wifi access. You have to work within the materials they have access to.

This participant provides detailed insight into how the correctional education environment poses restrictions to the instructors' teaching methods. Therefore, written communication is important to their method of teaching. Methods of visually scaffolding content or providing verbal support through synchronous digital video platforms for traditional online students are inaccessible, as expressed by one of the participants: "The traditional students that learn online have access to more resources… they can use the library, they pursue tutoring, even if it's zoom or whatever." The thread of restrictions weaved through all five of the participants' responses. Since all of the participants had taught in traditional online environments outside of correctional education, they used those experiences as comparisons to their experiences in correctional education. Therefore, the correctional education instructors have to rely more on messaging and commenting to compensate for the lack of available comparable resources than if they were in a traditional, non-correctional online learning environment.

Furthermore, the participants expressed that they overcompensate for the restrictions in communication through written feedback. One participant stated that she provides feedback due to the asynchronous, restricted format. She stated, "I feel like I give too much feedback. I think we all do that. I think that's just in our nature. I think I don't focus so much on the nitty-gritty as I know some instructors do." It can be implied that this participant's reference to giving feedback as a part of her nature is in relation to her being a composition teacher who also teaches in an online corrections environment, where she has to rely on written text to communicate with her students. This idea of providing too much feedback was also expressed by another participant in the form of a "sandwich method." This sandwich method of feedback is still considered written

feedback, but it explains more of the technique of how the instructor provides feedback. This method layers constructive feedback between two positive forms of feedback. She stated,

> I think sometimes, in my efforts to give students as much help as possible, I actually overwhelm them with the amount of feedback I provide. Throughout the year, I have been taking advantage of discussions around grading to make some changes to my practices, including less marginal notation and using the 'sandwich' method of feedback more.

Marginal notations can be referred to as notes in the margins about various places in the writing which may need attention. These notes can span from improper comma use to a need for more descriptive details. However, the sandwich method of feedback involves a more summary approach instead of line by line feedback on individual places within the paper. When thinking of a sandwich, one slice of bread would be positive, written feedback, or an acknowledgment of the strengths of the student's writing. The middle ingredients of the sandwich would be constructive, critical feedback for areas that may need improvement. Lastly, the bottom piece of bread would be the ending of the feedback with potentially encouraging words to assist the student with moving forward in their writing process.

These two participants emphasized that they have worked to modify the feedback to meet the needs of the students' learning environment within correctional education. One participant discussed that she began to recognize that her students worked with a lot of "text," meaning that they spent their time reading their textbook, reading the material in the modules, writing their essays, and reading their instructors' messages and comments. Therefore, she decided to take a step back from using so much written feedback and began to use a similar method as the

participant who mentioned the “sandwich” method of feedback in her response by summarizing her feedback.

Another participant stated she relies on the textbook to provide guidance in order to limit her feedback. She stated,

> I tend to rely on the textbooks too. Like if there’s something they have that they’re really struggling with and there’s a section in the textbook that can do it better, I really rely heavily on referring them to those as well… They have to keep with emails; they have to read their textbooks. So, personally, I try really hard not to overwhelm them with too much text. So, that’s why I try not to go into detail about every single thing.

This was the only participant who mentioned the use of the textbook as a resource for her teaching. Her method of referring students to the textbook could be compared to how instructors support their teaching with external resources outside of this type of online, restricted corrections setting, where students may have access to more resources such as online websites or the use of a librarian.

The participants also discussed how they decide when to give more or less feedback. One participant stated

> I save almost all my feedback for rough drafts. I also give very limited feedback on final drafts because they can't fix it at that point. So really all I'm doing in final drafts is telling them what they lost points for in rough drafts. I give extensive marginal notes, as well as an endnote, giving an overview of my thoughts on their work.

This participant was the most explicit concerning her method of distinguishing between the amount of feedback she provides on rough drafts vs. final drafts. She puts more focus on developing her students’ writing skills by providing feedback on their rough drafts. This method

of feedback allows the students to make improvements from the rough draft to the final draft, with a final assessment by the instructor.

Therefore, the instructors' methods and approaches to feedback stem from their asynchronous and restrictive learning environment which often causes them to provide substantial amounts of feedback with regard to the amount of text feedback provided, use resources to supplement their teaching, and approach feedback through a lens of developing their students' writing whether through constructive criticism or through providing them with guidance on their rough drafts for improvement of their final drafts.

Focusing on Higher-Order Concerns for Students' Writing Development

All five participants shared that they strive to focus on higher-order concerns when helping students develop their writing. Higher-order concerns can be described as focusing on the content and organization of the writing, and lower-order concerns are a focus on grammar and mechanics (Bean, 1996). One participant described: "I focus chiefly on higher-level issues in their writing. So, a lot of the time, I find myself teaching like organization, and critical thinking, more of those skills." Another participant stated,

> I'm not as strict with the grammatical errors as I know some English teachers are just because of the way I was taught to teach is that we need to get them to write first. And that's number one, that's the first thing. That's the most important thing.

Another participant expressed a similar approach: "I think that my approach to teaching writing is often very content-focused compared to some of my peers… I usually do like one paragraph, and I'll correct their grammar. I'll be like, use this as a model." These instructors noted that they focus on the higher-order content of their students' writing as they approach their feedback and assessment. Their chief concerns are the students' organization, structure, and

overall content. Three of the five of the instructors mentioned that they might not approach their critique of students' writing as English instructors, in traditional and correctional spaces, since they focus on higher-order concerns, which could feed into notions that grammar tends to be a primary focus amongst the assessment of writing for other instructors. However, all five instructors did not mention how they learned to focus more on higher-order concerns than lower-order concerns. They only mentioned that their university's English Department has professional development workshops where the Director of the English Composition Program discusses time-efficient approaches to grading and strategies to focus more on the higher-order concerns of students' writing.

One participant also expressed the use of a rubric when assessing her students' writing. She expressed that the rubrics are determined by the English department at the university. She stated,

> I read their essays; I make notes on the rubric under each specific category, and add the points/values, then grade them. And then I attach the rubric in a word document with their essays.

The instructor did not elaborate on what is included on the rubrics she uses while grading in relation to point values for higher-order concerns or grammar-based concerns.

All of the instructors teach writing with methods in a similar way for correctional students as they do for non-correctional education students in the context of the focus of their instruction and assessment on higher-order concerns. One participant stated,

> I teach writing the exact same. I don't care if you're just out of high school and you're 18 to 21, your traditional-age student or you're in your sixties. You came because you want something to do and maybe learn something new.

Concerning the different writing challenges of online non-corrections students and online corrections students, the instructors stated a few challenges. One participant stated, “I do get more students who struggle with moving from writing in a conversational tone to writing in a formal tone. But, other than that, I think they’re pretty equitable.” The instructors teach writing in a similar way as they would their traditional students in the writing classroom in the context of their focus on how they assess writing and their focus on content-based suggested revisions on rough drafts. They acknowledged some of their students’ learning challenges due to being out of the school environment for several years or their understanding of the uses of different tones. But, they still work to help students develop their writing through a focus on higher-order thinking in the form of focusing on content and organization for assessment.

Continuous Encouragement due to Learning Circumstances

The five participants acknowledged the variety of life circumstances of their corrections students and discussed how their students’ circumstances influence how they approach their delivery of pedagogy. One participant stated, “Sometimes I will leave more like personal comments on their essays. If they dive into content that might be traumatic for them. I’ll say something like, you know, I’m honored you shared this, thank you.” Another participant encourages her students to ask questions. She stated, “I have found that the more they ask questions, obviously the better they do, but also the more positive experience they have because it gives us more chances to interact than with the students who don’t ask questions.” Additionally, one participant emphasized that she acknowledges the challenges that her students face as incarcerated online learners. She stated,

> And I say like, you know, look, you're not just learning this, you're learning the tech. You're learning how to exist in the institution that you live in while doing these really

> incredibly hard things, surrounded by noise. And that, you know, don't be so hard on yourself. Like you're going to get it, and P.S.: a great grade.

This thread of encouragement was evident throughout the participants' responses.

Providing encouragement also stems from the variety of learners the instructors encounter in their courses. One participant stated,

> Some of my corrections students, for the most part, haven't been in school for over 20 years, and maybe more, and some of them just got their GED inside. So, they haven't really been exposed to the classroom setting that they need to be a successful student. So, it's up to us to help them be that successful student especially with English you know 100 or 101 because those are your baseline classes to teach you the skills you need to succeed.

Another instructor viewed her students' circumstances as follows:

> I look at it as I would a non-traditional adult student who maybe has kids and a job, and that's what, like, they have other stuff going on, um, more than like you know, 18-year-old freshmen. Um, but I think that's what would be comparable, but the fact that they're in prison, not that doesn't really get put into much consideration other than that.

However, another participant acknowledged the penal environment by stating, "I assume that they are in a much more stressful environment than my college freshmen." This assumption guided this instructor's approach to how she taught her correctional education students in the forms of encouragement and motivation. Overall, the instructors' approach to their teaching is influenced by their perceptions of their students' position within corrections. They discussed that they rely on the feedback provided by their students concerning their individual life

circumstances and initial training by the Correctional Education department to understand how their corrections students are experiencing their education in a carceral environment.

Summary of Research Question #1

Overall, the participants' approach to their pedagogy is influenced by the environment in which they teach and the students they encounter. The participants utilize consistent communication when interacting with their correctional education students in consideration of the students' learning environment. They use feedback to guide students in improving their writing and often over-communicate in an effort to ensure students are grasping the material since they do not have the same type of access as in a traditional online environment. They focus on higher-order concerns to help students critically think through their thoughts concerning the subject matters of their compositions. Lastly, the participants use encouragement to motivate their students. Two points of departure from the other participants' experiences were one instructor's use of the textbook as a resource in her teaching and that another instructor does not consider that her students are in prison, but rather as non-traditional students. While the use of a textbook can be seen as a positive addition to supplement one's teaching, the lack of consideration of students' positionality within the carceral system can yield a lack of acknowledgment of what these students may face that a traditional non-incarcerated student may not face. This finding was particularly surprising since the other instructors acknowledged the setting of their students as important to how they approach their instruction.

Research Question #2

How do online English composition correctional education faculty cultivate relationships with their students in online spaces?

The focus of Research Question #2 was to learn more about correctional education instructors' strategies in cultivating relationships with their online correctional students. The instructors discussed the tone they use with their students, how they form connections and barriers to forming relationships. The themes that developed from the research pertaining to this question were a) Friendly and Professional Tone with Responses, b) Forming Connections with Interested Students, c) Challenges and Barriers to forming Relationships.

Friendly and Professional Tone with Responses

All five participants expressed that they adamantly work to form an initial connection with their students at the beginning of each semester. They referenced that this contact is encouraged by their Correctional Education department at their university in order for them to help their students become acclimated to the online learning environment. The instructors send an initial message introducing themselves to their students to open the lines of communication on the students' tablets and to welcome them into the course.

One participant stated,

> The very first message I send out is that I talk about myself a little bit as an example for them to see what I want them to do. So, I tell them what my educational background is, what some hobbies are, and what kinds of things I like to read. And then they send me back similar messages. So, I try to follow up on those.

After the instructors make initial contact with their students, all five of them mentioned that they strive to keep a friendly and professional tone in their responses. One participant stated, "First of all, I keep my tone extra friendly because I don't know why, but I've observed that my correction students are a little bit more sensitive to tone." This participant also stated,

> I guess this is true for any teaching, but I try to maintain pretty strict like professionalism. So my students call me, Ms. Johnson, even though I'm younger than most of them, and I call them Mr. or Ms. Whatever.

This instructor did not provide her reasoning for maintaining strict professionalism. However, she only emphasized that she assumes that she is younger than most of her students, so she approaches her instruction from a stance of professionalism by asking the students to use a title along with her last name as she reciprocates this gesture. Another participant emphasized his use of an encouraging tone through grading. He stated,

> I remind them… that everyone is not a natural writer. Sometimes I tell them of how I failed math three times in college. Sometimes, they'll still email and be like, I feel like I did so bad on this piece. And I'll highlight like, well, don't forget you did good on this and this.

This form of feedback demonstrates the instructor engaging in dialogue with the student using positive encouragement. Since the correctional online instructors' primary mode of communication is through asynchronous written communication, these messaging spaces are where the interchanges of dialogue occur regarding positive, encouraging feedback.

Forming Connections With Interested Students

Since messaging is the primary mode of communication between correctional education instructors and their students, all of the instructors discussed how they use messaging to form relationships and connections with students who express interest in connecting with their professors. Although the instructors may send an initial welcoming email to their students at the beginning of the semester, they are only able to maintain a connection with students who take the initiative to maintain a connection with them. One instructor expressed that she cultivates

relationships with students who express interest in connecting with her. She stated, “I can only do it with students who communicate with me. If I have a student who never sends me a message, I don’t foster a relationship with them because there isn’t a method for me to do that.” This instructor pointed out that since textual messaging is the only method of communication, she can only foster a relationship with students who send her a message. Two other professors discussed how they form connections with students who inform them of their interests or who inquire about the coursework. One participant stated, “The corrections students often will email me and tell me they actually are passionate about writing already, so a lot of them are actually really eager for ample feedback and genuinely want to be excellent writers.” Another participant expressed the importance of her responses to her students:

> I think that having someone respond to them and having someone pay attention to their questions creates a certain sense of intimacy for someone who has nothing, you know, no one to connect with often. So, I do feel connected to my students.

Pertaining to frequent messaging by some students more than others, two other participants described the students as “lonely,” and another participant stated, “I tend to think that it’s just they’re bored and stressed and talking to another person would be nice.” These participants envision their students as needing companionship while incarcerated. Since the instructors did not state why they believe their students to be lonely, bored, or stressed, their responses carry some assumptions pertaining to how correctional education students live their daily lives within correctional facilities. Four of the instructors had no direct experience teaching inside of correctional facilities, so they learned about these environments through their own personal research, a new faculty training held by the Correctional Education department, and mainly through their students’ experiences as communicated through their writing. Therefore,

their viewpoint on how their students engage with them was based on their own perspectives concerning the importance of fostering relationships with their students. As demonstrated throughout this sub-theme, forming connections with students is often dependent upon the dual effort of the instructor and the students. The instructors form the initial connections through a welcome message to the course, but oftentimes, it is the decision of the students to maintain these relationships.

Challenges and Barriers to Forming Relationships

All five participants expressed that there were challenges and barriers to forming relationships with their students. They expressed difficulty in cultivating in-depth relationships due to the restrictions afforded by the correctional education online environment. One participant stated,

> I think with correctional teaching, it really lacks any of that social dimension. Especially the fun part. It's just grading and just answering emails. Without that face-to-face, it's sort of hard for me to get that emotional register.

Since the participants had all previously taught face-to-face courses, it can be theorized that they brought learning expectations influenced by their experiences in face-to-face courses to their task of teaching in correctional education in the context of forming relationships. From the participant's quote above, his classification of forming relationships as "fun" speaks to his previous enjoyable experiences of forming relationships with his face-to-face students. Perhaps, he had this same expectation of forming relationships with his correctional education students but has not achieved this level of satisfaction. Another participant expressed a similar concern:

> There're a lot of really great things about teaching online and especially with COVID. It's brought us a way to continue our programs and continue to stay in touch with our

> students. However, sometimes I think we really need that face-to-face interaction to really connect with them.

The face-to-face interactions were also suggested to occur by Zoom as relayed by this participant:

> I wish that we could have some sort of direct communication with the students like in real time. That would be so beneficial. If I could have an office hour and they could log in, even if it was by Zoom or something. I could be right there on hand to answer their questions in real time. That would be stupendous.

All five participants mentioned that extra security measures prevent them from engaging with their students in ways that would be available if they were teaching traditional students online. The lack of opportunity to teach via an online platform such as Zoom or through synchronous face-to-face, digital interactions was assumed by the participants to be because of security measures related to teaching correctional education students.

In comparison with traditional online students, one participant acknowledged the comparison between their online learning experience and that of correctional students. But she expressed a differing characteristic concerning interactions between students:

> So the students that are traditional students that are online face similar challenges, but they're able to interact with each other. So, we have opportunities for synchronous video learning. For example, my students really like their discussion boards for chatting with each other. So, those elements, I think help.

Another participant stated a similar thought:

> You don't really get to meet the students. You don't get to really ever see them. It's not like when I teach online at another university where we can do video chats and I can have open office hours. So there's a lot of ambiguity.

To address this challenge of communication and foster relationships, all five of the participants resort back to messaging to maintain open lines of communication, which often takes more effort than in traditional online courses. One participant stated,

> I do a lot of messages and I'm checking my messages every day. If I have students on JPay, those messages go straight to my email. So if I'm out, as soon as I get home, I'm going to answer those emails. I'm pretty much 24/7. If I'm awake and my phone goes off and I know it's an email, I'm going to read it.

This commitment of availability, as expressed by this participant, stemmed from her previous experiences teaching inside of a correctional facility. She witnessed the frustration of students who were not getting timely communication from their instructors. Therefore, this instructor is adamant about maintaining communication with her students. Her availability speaks to a larger notion that since the primary method of communication between correctional education students and faculty is through messaging, the students may have an expectation that their instructors should be available to answer their inquiries in a timely manner.

Summary of Question 2

The online correctional education English instructors work within the confines of correctional education to form relationships with their students. They set the foundation and encourage open communication at the beginning of the semester, and they actively encourage students through their grading feedback and messaging. There are barriers to communicating and forming relationships with students that the instructors wish were overcome with more means of

interaction with their students. However, they adapt to the students' methods of communication within the online carceral environment in order to provide the best learning environment for their correctional students.

Research Question #3

What are perceived areas of needed professional development and support identified by online English composition correctional education faculty?

This research question sought to learn of the instructors' perceived areas for professional development and support. All five participants mentioned that the Correctional Education department at the university provides training for all correctional education faculty at the beginning of each semester, which all five participants attended. The training entails an introduction to teaching in correctional education, information about challenges incarcerated students face such as lockdowns and violent occurrences, and best practices to teaching in correctional education pertaining to using the learning management platforms and communicating with the liaison or site director at each correctional facility. Pertaining to the training, one participant stated,

> If there are any updates in the technology and stuff like that, they teach you. Etiquette: how to communicate with site directors and students; they teach you. The technology and different challenges: they show you what the students' equipment looks like.

However, two participants noted the need for training for more seasoned instructors. One stated,

> They [the training] feel very remedial to me in that a lot of them are about here's how to grade, here's how to send messages again, and a lot of training for the platform. I'll maybe hear something new but a lot of that is kind of more for people who are doing it for the first or second time.

Therefore, the instructors, who all have taught correctional education for more than five years, provided a wide range of suggestions pertaining to training, access to learning resources, and building community. I developed the following themes from the data: a) Sensitivity and Cultural Awareness Training, b) Technology Assistance, and c) More Opportunities to Connect with Faculty.

Sensitivity and Cultural Awareness Training

Three instructors emphasized the need for more sensitivity and cultural awareness training for correctional education instructors. This theme was created based on the words provided by the participants in regard to "sensitivity training" and "training for cultural differences." They mentioned that they had not previously worked with incarcerated individuals before working at the university and that they had not received any training concerning working with the carceral population. Two of the participants noted that the culture of their incarcerated students was one that they or other instructors were usually unaware of concerning the details of their students' everyday lives. One participant focused on her own self-awareness concerning prison culture. She stated,

> I would like to know more about how prisons work. I would like to know the literal things like what is so and so's day look like. Or what kinds of problems are day-to-day for them. I'm learning over time with experience, but it would be great to get a more in-depth understanding of what you guys [her students] are alluding to. What specifically does it mean to teach this population? What can we bring that makes a more specialized experience for them?

Another participant noted the need for more training concerning gender identity. She stated,

> I think that we need more sensitivity training. I was kind of surprised that none of my peers asked their students if they have a pronoun that they prefer because you're not going to know just by looking at their name that Jack is really Susan.

Furthermore, an additional participant, who also leads one of the English composition courses as a subject matter expert, focused on instructors' awareness of how socioeconomics could affect their students' outlook on education. She stated,

> I think one thing that the corrections ed department could and really ought to provide training in is socioeconomic culture differences. Especially because so many of the instructors I oversee are middle-aged and middle-class White people and a lot of our students are not coming from that background. It really does make a difference because there are large cultural differences between thinking patterns in socioeconomic statuses. I know we like to pretend that class is not important in our country, but in fact, to psychology, it is very, very important.

This participant's input was the only reference to race and class by the study's participants during data collection. This reference to race and class potentially speaks to this instructor's dual position as an instructor and subject matter expert who comes in contact with many correctional education instructors in the program. Therefore, she is speaking on the race and class of the instructors in which she oversees. Also, this participant may have determined the difference in the racial and class demographics of correctional education students as shared in their writing. Furthermore, none of the participants shared any identifying information about their student population other than that many of the students were non-traditional in the sense that many were not college-aged. It is not known how this participant is knowledgeable about the race and class of her students; it was only documented from data collection that students share

their experiences through their writing and not that identifying information is available to instructors about their students from the Correctional Education department. However, since this participant oversees other correctional education faculty instructors, she may have gleaned identifying information from the various instructors' communications with their students through their writing or maybe assumptions of the demographic makeup of the prison population as demonstrated through statistical data.

Technology Assistance

All five participants mentioned that they often have frustrations with using the technology of Blackboard and JPay's Lantern to teach their correctional education courses, but they expressed that the technology was vital in being able to provide access to this form of education for their online corrections students. One participant mentioned that she had to teach herself how to use the JPay's Lantern platform before teaching a course:

> They [The Correctional Education Department] were like, here's Lantern. Play with it for a couple of days and see if you understand it. And I pretty much had to figure it out myself and there was no training and there was no support.

Another participant mentioned that he is often unaware of what his students have access to in terms of technological devices and word processing applications. He often feels "embarrassed" when his instructions on how to use platforms such as Microsoft Word do not transfer to his students because they have a different word processing application. He stated,

> It feels a little bit hard for me to ever feel fully sure that when I tell a student, oh in Microsoft Word, go up here and look in review and enable comments. I would like a little bit more uniformity in what my students have or do not have access to.

Due to differences in technology and an awareness of how the technology works for students, another participant mentioned that instructors should be given devices to experience how their students may experience engagement with the coursework. She stated,

> I think that every site director and I think every instructor should be given a tablet to play with. So, they understand what their students are going through. It's not going to happen, but I think that would help everybody with that disconnect with understanding what's going on on both sides because you can pull Lantern up here on your home computer, your desktop, your laptop, and it works great, but the tablets themselves are not always as reliable.

This participant and the other participants' concerns about the use of technology speak to their request to be more familiar with how their students experience their learning and education. Since there is a wall of access between the instructors and their students, the instructors are not able to understand the students' full experience of engaging with the learning management platforms, word processing programs, or their devices used with instruction. These students experience restrictive learning platforms, programs, and devices within the site's correctional education program, meaning that the devices are closely monitored for security purposes. This wall of access may not be present if these instructors were teaching in traditional online spaces or another type of correctional education program since they may have more access to the same learning management platform and word processing service as their students. However, the instructors believe more insight into the functionality of the technology will benefit their instruction.

More Opportunities to Connect with Faculty

All five participants expressed that they feel supported by the Correctional Education and English departments at their university. They all mentioned the support of the directors of both departments. One participant stated, “If we’re stuck, I don’t feel like I’m floating out on an island by myself. I know I’ve got a support team behind me.” Another participant stated a similar thought: “I feel really supported by the department. [The Composition Director] is such an instrumental part of the corrections program, and she is always willing to lend a helping hand with even things that are non-English oriented.” The Composition Director serves as a point of contact for English composition instructors.

In addition to the support by leadership, the instructors also mentioned their desire to connect with other faculty members. One participant stated, “I really love observing other professors, like in terms of professional development that I seek out. If they made us do something like that, like observing a partner too, once a year, I would love that.” Another participant who also has an in-person office on the campus of the university mentioned that she enjoys the in-person interactions with faculty, but also wishes for more interactions with online faculty who are often located across the country. She stated, “I do prefer our on-campus climate because we do tend to have at least semi-regular meetings where we can touch base. I do wish that there was a better way for us to connect.”

The instructors expressed their desire for more camaraderie with their correctional education faculty peers. Their concerns regarding connecting to other correctional education faculty members is an area that needs to be communicated with the English department faculty.

Summary of Question 3

While all five participants attended the initial professional development sessions provided by the Correctional Education department at the university, they all expressed their desire for more options of training for instructors who continue to teach in the program. Understanding how race, class, and environment play a role in their teaching was one suggestion from the participants. Receiving more guidance on using the learning management platforms was also suggested. Lastly, the participants requested more opportunities to learn from and connect with their fellow English correctional education instructors as a form of professional development.

Synthesis of Meaning and Essences: Impact

All five participants mentioned their desire to leave an impact on their students through the work that they do. They provided insight into what it means to them to teach English online to their incarcerated students. The three themes that were developed from their one-on-one interviews, focus group discussion, and documents regarding impact were as follows: a) The Power of English and Literacy; b) Combatting the United States Prison System; c) Rehabilitation and Recidivism.

The Power of English and Literacy

All five of the participants emphasized how being instructors of English entailed various nuances which relate to their students' experience with their education. When asked in the focus group, "When you think of teaching as an English instructor, what comes to mind?" two of the instructors pointed out the content that they teach as the main characteristic. One instructor stated: "When I think of being an English teacher, I think of the importance of reading and writing." Another instructor extended the previous instructors' definition by stating,

> I think that English is a rare subject where you get to, um, or the opportunity to teach a lot of different things. It's not just reading and writing. It's also, um, a lot of times you end up teaching sociology, um, you end up teaching culture, you end up teaching, um, you know, open-mindedness but really critical thinking is probably a number one top thing that I think people don't realize English teachers do is how much time we spend teaching our students.

Both instructors acknowledged that their position as English instructors entails the roles of teaching reading and writing, and also as the second instructor mentioned, the expansion into other topics such as sociology and critical thinking skills.

Another instructor mentioned how teaching students skillsets within the subject of English could assist them in formal and informal modes of writing. She stated,

> I do think that I make a positive impact as an instructor because for two reasons: first, the students have access to education. That in itself is beneficial to some degree, and then secondly, we teach English. Them having writing skills is valuable in a range of ways. I think they feel better about letter writing, which they do a lot. I think they feel better about journaling even. I think that that actually does have a significant impact on the students.

Understanding how the skills taught in the English composition courses create transferable writing skills for the correctional education students was the focus of this participant’s response. The ability to transfer these skills is what this instructor considered as impact in the teaching that she does.

Combatting the U.S. Correctional System

All five of the participants mentioned their disliking of the United States' correctional system's operations. One thing to point out is that none of the one-on-one interview questions, the document collection prompt, or focus group questions asked the participants of their direct thoughts concerning incarceration in the United States. Each participant voluntarily mentioned their personal thoughts concerning mass incarceration. However, they each had a different perspective in how they viewed mass incarceration and their impact on changing or combatting the system. Three of the five instructors described issues they believed needed to be addressed within the U.S. correctional system. One participant stated, "I'm not very happy with the prison system in the United States. It's over bloated; it's over populated."

Another participant stated,

> Well this is kind of personal, but I personally am a firm believer in prison abolition. I think that if anything, I hope that that gives me more empathy with them. Like I don't think any bodies should be caged. I think it's horrendous. That's how I feel.

Lastly, a participant stated,

> There's maybe even a little bit more of a philanthropic feel about working in the corrections program. So the idea that I am in some way kind of alleviating like an overly punishing machine and making it more recuperative, I think that's important even if I'm just doing a tiny little bit of that.

The three participants each stem from a critical position against the prison system. Describing the system as "overpopulated," and "horrendous" shows how their outlook on the setting in which they teach impacts their motivation to teach. One instructor mentioned that she hopes that correctional education programs will expand across the country. She stated, "I'm glad

that it's growing and more people are getting on that bandwagon and realizing it's about rehabilitation. It's not just about punishment." Her statement transitions into one of the last sub-themes.

Rehabilitation and Recidivism

The final sub-themes from the theme of impact were rehabilitation and recidivism. Only the one-on-one interview questions contained a question about these two topics that are present in the literature regarding correctional education. The question was as follows: "Correctional education has been tied to themes of recidivism and redemption. What are your thoughts?" All five instructors provided detailed responses to this question. Their responses mainly focused on how the teaching that they do can impact the students while they are incarcerated, which would speak more to rehabilitation and after the students are released, which speaks to recidivism. Regarding rehabilitation for the students, one instructor stated,

> I do hope that there's some level of personal enrichment. Maybe it will be being able to communicate better, being able to be a little bit more nuanced or interpretive about the world. Then, in some material way, you [the students] can look at the world and say like, no, I have a little more power, a little bit more agency than I would have before.

Another instructor spoke about how the students' engagement with their education can impact their behavioral patterns. The participant stated, "It's also about changes in behavioral patterns that they've made to be successful throughout the college experience. And then those behavioral patterns help them continue moving positively forward when they're no longer incarcerated." The learned behavioral patterns as a result of education can be utilized as they transition out of incarceration.

Two other instructors discussed how their teaching could make a difference or impact on their students' sense of self and identity. One instructor stated,

> It's the most important work that I've ever done. And it's hard to continue to do it because you know, there are other jobs that will pay more. But, I think that in terms of social justice, in terms of making people that have been called monsters their whole life and turning them into students and writers and giving them a sense of identity outside of whatever their prison number is, outside of however the guards treat them, outside of losing their role in their family often and losing a role in society to give them not just the tools that I hope they will take with them, but also a sense of self that is more confident. I want them to believe in themselves because I believe in them.

This instructor's quote was the only one of two times compensation was mentioned throughout the data collection process. The instructors only mentioned the pay they received as an afterthought and focused more on the work that they do. One instructor mentioned the flexibility of the role as "I continue to do it because it's flexible enough for my family, it's asynchronous, and I enjoy the opportunity to help improve the lives of the people who are taking the course." Her statement was still rooted in an equal balance of self-benefit and serving her students for the benefit of their lives.

Another instructor stated a similar statement, "You also get the reward of seeing within a semester, often you see the impact of the education on the student whereas in traditional education, you don't necessarily see that in a single semester." The instructors discussed how their students express how they have changed as a result of their involvement with education. This finding related to an entry in my epoche journal when I stated, "However, my incarcerated students at XXX are a different set of scholars. They are often very dedicated to their studies,

and they take learning very seriously. I see my role as their instructor as a duty or a positive contribution back to society." My insight into my instruction was similar to that of the instructors' insights. Therefore, the instructors are able to witness how their labor serves a larger purpose in providing their students with confidence and self-awareness of their personal identity outside of the identity provided to them by their past or current circumstances.

In relation to recidivism, the instructors' responses were similar to those of rehabilitation, but they focused more on how their students could be impacted after they leave their carceral settings and get acclimated to their lives outside of incarceration. One instructor stated,

> Typically statistically speaking, it [correctional education] is improving their lives because it's giving them options. They have finished this; they've gone back into the world. They have this degree, but not only that. They have new patterns for thought; they have new ways of thinking critically. So instead of looking at an obstacle and saying, I don't know what to do about that and maybe coming up with a bad solution, they look at that obstacle and say, okay, I can probably think my way around this or through this. Then, ending up moving forward in a more positive way.

Another participant stated a similar thought regarding the improvement of her students' lives.

> I'm giving them a base. I'm giving them a base to be successful for the rest of their academic and hopeful life, but definitely for their academic career. I mean, they may never write a paper again, depending on what their career is once they get out, but I'm also trying to teach them discipline and how important it is to stick with something. I think those are life lessons beyond just how to write a sentence. I think it's pretty much wrapped in our whole program.

Both instructors, although not using the word "recidivism" verbatim, described how their instruction and the correctional education program as a whole affect their students' practices, such as being disciplined and thinking critically through their decision making, which can be used to prevent their return into incarceration. Furthermore, two of the instructors mentioned how the work of correctional education programs helps to change their students to potentially start a new identity for themselves. One instructor acknowledged the upbringing and life circumstances faced by some of her students, and she stated,

> Most of them started from a place where how could we have ever expected that person to succeed in life, starting from where they did. So, I don't see that as redemption; there was nothing for them to redeem. There was nothing wrong with them in the first place. They were handed a plate and had to make do. And I'm just trying to wipe that plate clean and put something healthier on it.

This instructor's comments potentially stem from the information shared by her students through their writing. Since the correctional education instructors do not receive any background information about their students, it seems as if this instructor bases her view of her students' circumstances on what they have shared with her regarding their life backgrounds or from outside representations of the prison population. In her opinion, by wiping the plate clean, the students have a starting point to identify themselves in a different way which can be useful after incarceration, preventing recidivism. The wiping of the plate could indicate hints of a deficit perspective by saving the students and making their lives better. But it can also be seen as a way for the instructors to want to provide students with tools for success to combat some of their previous life experiences, which may not have afforded them with these tools. Another instructor stated,

> I think just having a larger purpose outside of just being a caged animal. I think it has such a positive effect on their lives if we can call it that. And so I think that what I would say is that I think the work that we do is really important in terms of social justice. I think it's really important in terms of making humans feel human again, and that's what they deserve to feel.

This instructor's response related to an entry in my epoche journal which stated, "I am coming into the research process with a lens of positivity and a starting place that this profession is of value and honor. Therefore, this could influence how I see the value of the participant's responses." My initial reflections aligned with the instructor's response.

All five instructors emphasized the larger purpose of their instruction within the correctional education program and the U.S. correctional system. They focused on the humanity of their students and saw their role as instructors as impactful for not only their students while they are incarcerated but also for their students after they leave prison. The instructors saw their identities as changemakers within a larger institution of incarceration by the work that they do on the ground, with close contact with their students.

Summary

Through semi-structured interviews, document collection, and a focus group session, five participants shared their experiences as online correctional education English instructors. The interview process allowed me to gain the instructors' insights into their experiences, the document collection allowed the instructors time to reflect on their teaching practices by themselves, and the focus group session allowed the instructors to share their experiences in a group setting with other instructors in the same role.

This exploration of the participants' experiences identified recommended for teaching English composition within online correctional education programs, including teaching using feedback, concentrating on higher-order concerns for assessment, and using continuous encouragement as sought by Research Question #1. Also, this study, from Research Question #2, identified ways for instructors to form relationships with their students using a friendly and professional tone and to connect with the students who express interest in forming a relationship with their instructor. This research question also identified a challenge for the instructors in needing more ways to connect with their students considering restrictions imposed by the correctional education program. Lastly, Research Question #3 sought perceived areas of professional development by the instructors, and the instructors expressed a need for more sensitivity and cultural awareness training, assistance with the learning technology, and more opportunities to connect with other correctional education faculty members. The overall impact of the participants' responses was rooted in their thoughts on the powers of English and literacy in the lives of their students, their position in addressing issues within the American correctional system, and their thoughts on rehabilitation and recidivism.

In the next chapter, the results will be summarized and discussed as they relate to the literature on online English instruction and correctional education. The implications of the study, recommendations for future studies, and limitations will also be provided.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This chapter includes a discussion of major findings related to the literature on correctional education, online writing instruction, and literacy-based instruction within correctional education. This chapter also discusses connections to the theoretical framework of Kellner's (2003) Critical Theory in Education. Lastly, the chapter concludes with a discussion of the limitations of the study, practice-based recommendations, and areas for future studies.

The research questions that guided this study were as follows:

1. What pedagogical strategies do online English composition correctional education faculty use in writing instruction?
2. How do online English composition correctional education faculty cultivate relationships with their students in online spaces?
3. What are perceived areas of needed professional development and support identified by online English composition correctional education faculty?

A qualitative, transcendental methodology was utilized for the study. The study allowed the participants to be empowered by the telling of their stories which is an aspect of qualitative research (Creswell, 2013). Additionally, this study addressed the problem of a lack of research concerning the experiences of online English correctional education instructors by focusing on the phenomenon of the instructors' experiences (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). Five online correctional education English instructors provided insight into their experiences through individual semi-structured interviews, written reflections, and a focus group session. Major themes were developed which aligned with each research question. They were as follows:

1. ***Research Question #1*:** (a) Teaching Using Feedback, (b) Focusing on Higher-Order Concerns for Assessment, and (c) Continuous Encouragement due to Learning Circumstances;
2. ***Research Question #2*:** (a) Friendly and Professional Tone with Responses, (b) Forming Connections With Interested Students, and (c) Challenges and Barriers to Forming Relationships;
3. ***Research Question #3:*** (a) Sensitivity and Cultural Awareness Training, (b) Assistance with Technology, and (c) More Opportunities to Connect with Faculty.

In the context of the synthesis of meaning and essences, these themes were developed: (a) The Power of English and Literacy, (b) Combatting the United States Correctional System, and (c) Rehabilitation and Recidivism. All of the themes that were developed contribute to the phenomenon of an online correctional education English instructor. The themes for each research question and for the essence and meaning of the phenomenon will be discussed in an interpretation of the findings.

Interpretation of the Findings

This study connects with previous studies in correctional education in its approach to gleaning the experiences of instructors who teach in carceral environments. The seminal study from which this research draws is Osberg and Fraley's (1993) study which gathered the perspectives of correctional education instructors who teach within in-person environments. Their study was similar to this study in the aspect of gathering instructors' pedagogical approaches as in barriers to their teaching and suggestions for improvement, but Osberg and Fraley's (1993) study differed in its gathering of teachers' motivations to teach, their comparisons of the instructional environment for traditional environments and carceral

environments, and their perceptions of prison students' characteristics compared to traditional college students. Similarly, this study relates to Weaver et al. (2020)'s study, which had a similar purpose of learning how to support correctional education instructors. The study also answers Lewis' (2006) call for the evaluation of the effects of correctional education to focus on the teaching methods of correctional education instructors. Therefore, this interpretation of the findings will show how the study aligns with conversations in the fields of correctional education, online writing instruction, and literacy-based instruction and how the study adds to the literature through the addressing of the research questions.

Research Question #1: What pedagogical strategies do online English composition correctional education faculty use in writing instruction?

The correctional education English composition faculty provided a variety of pedagogical strategies used in their teaching of writing. These strategies centered on their use of feedback, focus on higher-order concerns for assessment, and continuous encouragement. This research question aligns with the Conference on College Composition and Communication's Online Writing Instruction Principals and Effective Practices (CCCC, 2021). The principles emphasize that "appropriate onsite composition theories, pedagogies, and strategies should be migrated and adapted to the online instructional environment" and that "composition teaching/learning strategies should be developed for the unique features of the online instructional environment" (CCCC, 2021).

Concerning the "unique features of the online instructional environment," the instructors acknowledged that the environment in which they teach plays a role in how they teach. First, the instructors have limited agency in curriculum development and assignment creation due to the pre-built online course modules. Second, the online correctional education environment is

situated within restrictions for students in the areas of a lack of access to internet connection and a variety of learning resources, and for faculty in the areas of a lack of access to learning materials. Osberg and Fraley's (1993) and Weaver et al. 's (2020) study also found that instructors within in-person correctional education settings noted limited teaching aids and materials as a challenge to their teaching practice. Specifically, the instructors who teach in-person in Osberg and Fraley's (1993) study noted limited library resources and limited time to spend with students outside of the classroom, such as in office hours due to frequent prison lockdowns.

Similarly, the instructors in the current study of online correctional education instructors mentioned limits to their teaching with a focus on a lack of ability to offer support through office hours or the ability to use online resources to aid in their teaching. This study found that the experiences of the online correctional education instructors differ from the experiences of correctional education instructors in previous studies because the online correctional education instructors do not get an opportunity to interact with their students face-to-face, whether virtually or in-person as the in-person instructors are able. Therefore, these instructors' pedagogical strategies are dependent upon their setting of instruction. The two themes of teaching using feedback and continuous encouragement were majorly influenced by the corrections setting, whereas, using higher-order concerns for assessment was mainly influenced by the instructors' personal teaching styles, regardless of if they taught in correctional or traditional education.

Teaching Using Feedback

Concerning feedback, the instructors are only able to provide text-based feedback through digital messaging and comments on written assignments because they are unable to interact with their corrections students through virtual face-to-face or oral communication. Their

available method of communication impacts their approach to giving feedback. Although they recognize the importance of providing feedback, they also mentioned that providing too much-written feedback can overwhelm the students since text is the primary vehicle of communication from the instructor to the student in this online corrections setting, which speaks to the effort they give in the online course, which as Bair and Bair (2011) found, online instruction sometimes requires more effort than face-to-face instruction. However, the instructors expressed that although they provide much feedback, they sometimes work to provide compacted feedback, provide more feedback on rough drafts than final drafts, or use the textbook as a reference to assist in delivering guidance other than an overwhelming amount of feedback coming directly from the instructor. Providing substantial, frequent, and timely feedback has been deemed an effective practice in online instruction to improve student achievement and motivation (Bigatel & Edel-Malizia, 2018; McCarthy, 2017; Webb & Moallem, 2016). This approach to online instructor feedback has also been shown to improve students' writing skills (Yang, 2018). Therefore, the instructors' approach to feedback has been supported in the literature and can be effective in students' growth as writers.

Focusing on Higher-Order Concerns

The instructors also discussed that they focus on higher-order issues or concerns when assessing students' writing. The terminology of higher-order concerns and lower-order concerns stems from Bean (1996), who developed definitions for both approaches to revising and editing writing. Higher-order concerns, as defined by Bean (1996), are "concerns of ideas, organizations, development, and overall clarity" (p. 243). Lower-order concerns are "grammatical errors, misspellings, punctuation mistakes, and awkwardness in style" (Bean, 1996, p. 243). Composition studies practices focus on higher-order concerns as a priority since these concerns

have the greatest effect on the communication between the writer and the reader (Purdue University, 2021; University of Nevada, Reno; n.d.). The online correctional education instructors in this study continuously stated that they tend to address higher-order concerns such as organization or the development of students' critical thinking in order to assist their students in producing substantial writing. Interestingly, some instructors made the assumption that other English instructors, whether in corrections or not, tend to focus more on grammar or lower-order concerns. Also, the instructors stated that they transfer their approach to teaching writing from how they teach writing for non-corrections students to how they assess writing using rubrics and focus on developing their students' writing skills. Their focus on higher-order concerns aligns with composition studies' seminal literature in the fact that these instructors are focusing on competency and content and not only for typographical errors or fluency (Bartholomae, 1980; Tabbert, 1984; Williams, 1981).

Continuous Encouragement due to Learning Circumstances

Lastly, from the findings, the instructors discussed how they provide encouragement due to the learning circumstances of their students and due to the variety of learners, they encounter in corrections. The instructors mentioned that they encounter students who share their past traumatic experiences and some who discuss what they are encountering in the present. Due to listening to their students' current circumstances, the instructors expressed how they are aware that many of their students are non-traditional in the sense that they are returning to school under stressful circumstances and may be residing in environments that are not always conducive to learning due to noise or other distractions. This consideration of the students' learning environment and circumstances speaks to Appleman's (2019) discussion of how a liberal arts education, which focuses on reading and writing, can counter the dehumanizing effects of the

prison environment. These instructors are key players in how education is provided to their students, and they serve as a channel to how students experience writing, as Appleman (2019) suggested, as a way to cultivate their freedoms of thought and expression despite physical confinement. The online instructors' method of intentionality in encouraging their students shows their subliminal recognition of how their students' learning environment influences how they are able to access their education.

Summary

Therefore, the overarching theme to address research question #1 is that the instructors maintain communication with encouragement and provide feedback to their incarcerated students within the confines of restrictions of the online correctional education environment. They teach writing using the strategy of placing much focus on higher-level concerns when addressing students' compositions. These strategies and approaches speak to the instructors' awareness of their teaching environment and how they adjust to the setting as practitioners.

Research Question #2: How do online English composition correctional education faculty cultivate relationships with their students in online spaces?

In this study, the online correctional education instructors discussed their methods of cultivating relationships with their online correctional education students. They discussed tone, motivations to connect with students, and challenges to forming relationships. Some of the instructors mentioned that it is sometimes difficult to establish relationships with their students since the correctional education environment often yields restrictions, but they still try to form a connection with them for the purpose of maintaining a mutually beneficial online learning environment.

In regard to tone, the instructors mentioned that they each provide a friendly yet professional opening message to their students at the beginning of the semester as encouraged by the Correctional Education department at the university. Throughout the semester, the instructors strive to maintain a welcoming tone with students for them to feel comfortable in asking questions or gaining clarity on their assignments. The focus on keeping their tone professional is important to cultivate relationships with their students as the instructors establish the boundary of teacher and student. Although there is a physical boundary between the learning device and the internet between the online instructor and their students, the instructors in this study discussed how they purposely create additional boundaries through professionalism and encouragement.

Friendly and Professional Tone with Responses

A welcoming and professional tone has been deemed effective in establishing a teaching presence in online courses (Berry, 2017a; Garrison et al., 2010) and in correctional education courses (Richard, 2017). To further this notion, the instructors' presentation of themselves through their presence could be influenced by their students' positionality within incarceration. Similar studies as this one have found that instructors' motivations to teach in correctional education were because they love their work and think of their students as engaging and dedicated to their education (Michals & Keeler, 2015; Osberg & Fraley, 1993; Weaver, 2020). Other studies have supported that incarcerated students often crave high levels of professionalism from their instructors (Hill & Killacky, 2008; Kallman, 2019). Therefore, with a combination of instructors being motivated to teach within correctional education and their students potentially responding in a positive way due to a desire for professionalism, this maintaining of a friendly and professional tone may be classified as a mutualistic relationship.

Forming Connections With Interested Students

Additionally, some of the instructors noted that they are often only able to make connections or cultivate relationships with students who communicate with them consistently. This forming of a relationship could be similar to that of a non-correctional environment or non 100% correctional environment, whereas teachers and students form relationships through a mutual exchange of communication. Their communication is mainly grounded in the students' frequent messaging for assistance with an assignment, to express interest in the subject matter, or in how the instructor provides guidance with assignments through messaging. This is the only way the instructors have the opportunity to form relationships with students due to the 100% textual form of communication between them. Other forms of online learning outside of the restrictive correctional setting could yield additional forms of engagement for instructors and students, whereas relationships could be formed in other ways. For example, breakout rooms have been places where online instructors have been able to learn more about their students and connect with them (Berry, 2017). However, in this study, the instructors are only able to attempt to form connections with students through written communication, which could cause less strong bonds to be formed between these online instructors and their students than in other online learning capacities where students and teachers may have a variety of options on how they can connect.

Related to the forming of bonds, it has been noted in the literature that students who take courses online often feel isolated or lonely due to a lack of direct interaction with their instructor or peers (Ali & Smith, 2015; Song et al., 2004). The lack of verbal cues and the asynchronous nature of online courses can present difficulties for students to relate and connect with their instructors (Walther, 2006). Similarly, one finding from this study is how a few of the instructors

classified their students as “lonely,” “bored,” or “stressed.” This finding could point to the nature of the online learning course, whereas interpersonal interactions between instructors and students and also peer-to-peer interactions are limited, which would align with previous research. However, this finding could also point to potentially deficit perspectives in how the instructors view their students. Deficit perspectives focus on students’ abilities or presence from a place of lack instead of a place of wealth to celebrate what students bring to the learning environment (Vélez-Ibáñez & Greenberg, 1992). Therefore, the aforementioned characteristics could impact how the instructors interact with their students and could speak to a need for additional training and education on the daily lives of incarcerated students.

Challenges and Barriers to Forming Relationships

Lastly, the instructors mentioned that there are challenges to forming relationships due to the restrictions in the correctional education online environment. Some instructors wanted more interactions with their students, such as face-to-face communication, in order to bond with them. They want the opportunity to have face-to-face interactions in the form of Zoom meetings, so they can connect with their students and allow their students to connect with them as well. They also saw this form of interaction as beneficial to students and their learning. Research has found that when students are able to interact with their peers or their instructor, they are able to overcome feelings of loneliness as they connect with others (Kehrwald, 2008). It has also been found that peer-to-peer interactions are sometimes more helpful in helping students overcome feelings of isolation (Kaufmann & Vallade, 2020). However, due to the restrictions of the correctional education environment, the instructors have to compensate for this lack of desired communication through consistent, written messaging.

Summary

Therefore, the overarching theme for Research Question #2 is that online English correctional education faculty cultivate relationships through the channel of messaging with students who maintain communication with them throughout the semester. The instructors cultivate relationships by messaging students by providing guidance on their assignments and by responding to individual student inquiries of the students who choose to maintain a relationship with their instructors.

Research Question #3: What are perceived areas of needed professional development and support identified by online English composition correctional education faculty?

From the findings, the instructors suggested professional development in the areas of sensitivity and cultural awareness training, technical assistance, and more opportunities to connect with faculty. They acknowledged the support provided by the Correctional Education department at their university. The training by the department provides training on topics such as how to use the learning management systems used in the courses and how to effectively communicate with students. This type of training aligns with what has been noted as necessary technical training in online learning (Griffin & Minter, 2013; Salisbury, 2018). However, the instructors explained that they wanted additional training as seasoned instructors who each taught over four years.

Sensitivity and Cultural Awareness Training

One category of training suggested by the instructors is sensitivity and cultural awareness training. The instructors mentioned that they wanted more information on prison culture, gender identity awareness, and how socioeconomics can play a role in students' experience with education. Kallman (2019) also found that correctional education instructors wanted more

training beyond security-focused training that the instructor who taught in prisons received. She also found that trauma-enforced teaching strategies and training may assist instructors with adapting pedagogies that are sensitive to the potentially traumatic experiences of their students (Kallman, 2019). This finding relates to the assumptions made previously by the instructors concerning their students' characteristics of being lonely or bored.

Also, this finding differs from previous studies in online writing instruction, which focused more on pedagogies of how correctional education teachers approach their teaching as in understanding how to teach without verbal cues, working outside of traditional working hours, and being a facilitator of learning rather than solely an expert of learning (Henning, 2012; Salisbury, 2018). However, this study differs in how the online correctional education English instructors focused on more professional development and training that could assist them in understanding the cultural context in which they teach. Jenson et al. (2019) have recommended that teachers understand the interplay between their teaching, practice, and context. Likewise, Lowenthal et al. (2019) found that teachers' perspective of the context of their teaching affects their practice. Therefore, the instructors' desire for more cultural training speaks to their recognition of the context of the teaching in correctional settings.

Assistance with Technology

Also, the instructors requested more training concerning the learning management platforms used within the correctional education program. They wanted more training in understanding their students' experiences with the technology they are given. For example, they want to learn more about their students' learning tablets to become more familiar with how their students are accessing the learning material. Henning (2012) and Salisbury (2018) have emphasized that online writing instructors are educated on how to utilize the learning

management platforms. Additionally, providing training aligns with Hawisher and Selfe's (1991) recognizing of how technology influences how students are taught writing because the instructors want to learn more about the avenue in which their students are learning writing.

More Opportunities to Connect with Faculty

Lastly, the instructors mentioned that they want more opportunities to connect with faculty members who teach in correctional education. Although they feel supported by the Director of English Composition, they wanted more opportunities to observe other faculty members' instruction and connect with faculty members who only teach online corrections. The need to observe other instructors' practices within asynchronous learning and to connect with other faculty members has been explored in the research as beneficial to improving online instructors' approaches to their pedagogy (Ferencz, 2017; Swinglehurst et al., 2008).

Summary

Therefore, the theme from this research question is that the perceived areas of professional development are in the areas of more cultural and sensitivity training, more assistance and awareness of the technology used by correctional education students, and more opportunities to connect with other faculty members who teach as online correctional education English instructors.

Overall Essence and Synthesis of Meaning

The instructors provided insight into the overall essence or synthesis of meaning which is the final step of Moustakas' (1994) method of analyzing transcendental phenomenological studies. Their insight connected to three major themes: The Power of English and Literacy, Combatting the U.S. Prison System, and Rehabilitation and Recidivism.

The Power of English and Literacy

This study adds to the literature that discusses how the teaching of English as a component of literacy is often viewed as a saving mechanism for incarcerated students. Although the instructors did not directly state that their role as English teachers is to save their students as perpetuated by narratives in previous studies (Berry, 2017b; Myrick, 2004), they stated that their role as English instructors is to have a "positive impact" on students' ability to transfer what they learn in the formalized English composition courses provided by the university to non-formalized methods of writing such as journaling or letter writing.

Additionally, the instructors discussed that their role as English instructors is versatile because they often have to teach other subjects in addition to English composition. They acknowledged that reading and writing were the foundational subjects they teach, but they also delve into topics such as sociology. Pertaining to writing, the instructors did not mention the types of writing, whether expository or creative, that were included in their curricula as online instructors. They focused more on the transferable writing and critical thinking skills that the courses taught students, which differs from other studies where the researchers focused on the impact of individual assignments such as literacy narratives and poems (Appleman, 2019; Berryb, 2017; Shelledy, 2019; Shotland, 2019).

However, previous studies align with the current study in the area of the development of self-identity. Shelledy (2019) and Shotland (2019) each discussed how writing provides students with agency as they develop their self-identity through composition. Similarly, in this study, the instructors mentioned how correctional education, in general, and also through writing courses, assists students in developing their self-identity. For example, one instructor referenced in Chapter 4 stated,

> in terms of social justice… making people that have been called monsters their whole life and turning them into students and writers and giving them a sense of identity outside of whatever their prison number is…gives them a sense of self that is more confident.

This quote aligns with how the instructor saw the role of shaping her students' self-identify or way in which they see themselves. However, while this instructor is intending to make a positive impact in their students' lives, she also provides a hint of reference to a deficit ideation. Attempting to turn a seemingly deemed "monster" into a "student" and "writer" could imply that the student did not previously have these identities until the teacher came to provide them. This attempt at transforming lives could also yield a deficit perspective in the approach of helping students shape their self-identities within the instructors' roles.

Combatting the U.S. Prison System

Berry (2017b) warned against the lens of Freire's Pedagogy of Hope in relation to literacy and correctional education because this viewpoint can distract lawmakers from understanding the political and socio-economical context behind mass incarceration. This lens can also cause people to ignore societal issues that are related to how people become involved in the carceral system and how the system impacts communities, especially minority and low-income families (Berry, 2017b). Interestingly, the instructors in this current study all voluntarily mentioned their desire to combat the U.S. Prison System, with hopes ranging from a focus on rehabilitation rather than punishment to a re-creating of the system in its entirety. They displayed an awareness of the ills of the carceral system from a social, economic, and political stance; this awareness heeds Berry's (2017b) warning of ignoring contexts of incarceration. Additionally, the instructors saw their work as teachers as an alleviation or positive contribution to society, which

also spoke their role as democratizing and revolutionizing within education as proposed by Kellner (2003).

Rehabilitation vs. Recidivism

This study speaks to studies that discussed recidivism and rehabilitation as sources of instructors' motivations to teach (Bannon, 2014; Barringer-Brown, 2015; Osberg & Fraley, 1993). However, the instructors in this study did not directly state that their students' recidivism and rehabilitation were their motivations to teach, which was similar to the instructors' responses in Michals and Kessler's (2015) study. The instructors in this study see their work as contributions to improving a larger penal system or a piece in a larger puzzle of work impacting their students with education, which in turn impacts the outcomes of rehabilitation and recidivism. They focused on the personal enrichment that their students potentially receive and the agency that they may gain through their education. Other instructors mentioned that their work in correctional education was self-fulfilling, despite the pay. However, this study differs in the area of compensation.

One finding from other studies that was not apparent in this study was a motivation to teach due to compensation. Osberg and Fraley (1993) and Barringer-Brown (2015) both found pay to be a motivation for correctional education instructors to teach. It is not clear as to the reason why instructors in the current study did not mention pay, but one reason could be that the research questions specifically asked about teaching strategies, forming relationships, and professional development, which could have left little room for a specific discussion regarding pay. However, this study provides a new direction in the literature since the instructors emphasized the larger purpose of their positions as motivations for the work that they do and that they gain satisfaction from impacting their students' lives. Lastly, the instructors placed great

emphasis on the impact of correctional education on their students' feeling of self-purpose and their sense of humanity, which aligned with Bannon's (2014) study that found the relationships between instructors and students as transformational due to the life-saving potential of involvement with correctional education.

Application to Theoretical Framework

Critical Theory of Education was utilized as a framework for this study since it focuses on the democratization of education within a technological society. This framework is important in analyzing the instructors' role in the providing of education to incarcerated individuals. Kellner (2013) sought to determine how education could be impactful in changing society, and the instructors of the study relayed how they saw their work as an influential contribution to affecting change in society.

Additionally, the tenets of Critical Theory of Education can be applied to the findings of this study. The tenet, "Changing Life Conditions, Subjectivities, and Identities" speaks to how the instructors utilize technology to facilitate ways of learning for their online students. Also, "Expanding Technologies/Multiple Literacies" speaks to how the instructors work within a correctional education program which serves marginalized people due to their incarceration status. Also, although their courses are pre-built, the instructors employ their own pedagogical models of guiding students through their learning while communicating with them via the online platform. Lastly, for the tenet, "Toward a Radical Reconstruction and Democratization of Education," the study demonstrates how the online correctional education environment provides access to students through technology using learning methods which are based on the needs and interests of the students. Overall, the instructors saw their roles and work within the correctional system as democratizing and revolutionizing due to the locale and needs of their students. They

operate within a field of online learning to allow technology to serve as a channel to instruct their students. Thus, Critical Theory of Education speaks to how the correctional education English instructors work within a program to help democratize education for marginalized incarcerated students through online instructional methods.

Implications for Professional Practice

This transcendental phenomenological study was designed to gather the experiences of online correctional education English instructors. Past literature has looked at the experiences of correctional education instructors who teach face-to-face settings (Bannon, 2014; Barringer-Brown, 2015; Michals & Kessler, 2015; Osberg & Fraley, 1993; Weaver et al., 2020), but no attention has been placed on the experiences of correctional education instructors who teach within 100% online settings. Therefore, this study fills the gap of the need for information concerning how the modality of online instruction contributes to the field of correctional education. The study adds to the literature on correctional education, online writing instruction, and English composition. It connects these three fields through the insight gathered from the online correctional education English instructors.

The study contributes to the field through the instructors' suggestions on changes that can assist correctional education programs with developing existing hybrid programs or with enhancing 100% online programs. It can also provide insight for correctional education programs that may be considering the start of online instruction for their incarcerated students. The implications will be provided for correctional education program directors and writing program administrators of correctional education programs.

Correctional Education Program Directors

The study's findings, especially for research questions 2 and 3, can assist correctional education program directors in the training and development of their online correctional education instructors. Some practices of the seasoned correctional education instructors that could be shared with other instructors included providing encouragement to their students, maintaining a friendly and professional tone, and working to form connections with students. Instructors can also be encouraged to frequently contact their students to establish a rapport. This establishment may include asking students about their favorite holidays, books, hobbies, etc. Instructors can also encourage students to message them about their progress in their other courses. These practices can foster relationships amongst instructors and their students and can be emphasized in monthly professional development meetings and training. It may be helpful for seasoned instructors to serve as special guests for these sessions to share their practices and model how they provide encouragement and maintain a welcoming tone with examples of written text.

Also, points of concern faced by the instructors in the study were mainly due to the restrictions of the correctional education environment along with the learning technology. Program directors can work to see if it is possible for correctional sites to increase the amount of interaction students have with online instructors. If this is not possible due to safety and security, program directors can work to inform instructors on how to send clear, effective messages to their students since written messaging is the only form of communication.

Also, program directors can provide continuous training for instructors once they have begun teaching in the online correctional education environment. One concern of the instructors in the study was that they wanted more training to deal with the challenges they were facing

semester to semester. One area of professional development mentioned was a need for sensitivity and cultural awareness training. It will be important for program directors to educate their online instructors about the context in which they teach. As noted by the study, one characteristic of correctional education online instructors that may differ from non-correctional instructors is the fact that the online correctional education instructors' students are incarcerated within correctional facilities. This added context, as told by the instructors in the study, is vital to the way the instructors engage with their students and how they deliver their instruction. Therefore, it will be helpful for program directors to integrate this type of training continuously for new and seasoned online correctional education instructors. Some approaches could be assisting instructors with learning more about prison culture, inviting formerly incarcerated people who experienced correctional education to speak about their experiences, or integrating a book club to discuss current literature on cultural diversity. Program directors can also encourage their online correctional education instructors to join professional organizations such as the Alliance for Higher Education in Prison and the Correctional Education Association.

Lastly, the instructors in the study mentioned a need for more training concerning the learning management platforms used by their students and more opportunities to connect with other faculty members. Again, these two suggestions are mainly based on the modality in which the instructors teach. Providing instructors with an opportunity to learn more about the way in which their students access their learning content will be helpful in how the instructors connect with their students, whether through the same form of a learning management system or technological device. Additionally, allowing the instructors an option to observe other instructors' interactions within their online course modules may be beneficial. Instructors can see

what type of feedback others provide to students on assignments or by messaging. These items can be located in a shared folder for accessibility.

Writing Program Administrators

The findings from Research Question #1 provide insight into how writing program administrators can support online English composition faculty by helping them balance the amount of feedback they provide and by helping them focus on guiding students with developing the content of their writing. The instructors of this study mentioned their challenges with providing feedback in their fears of providing too much feedback or their fear of providing too much written text. Writing program administrators of online correctional education programs can assist these instructors with helping them to develop strategies for providing feedback in the online setting. Some examples of strategies can include providing models of sample feedback on written assignments for instructors to utilize and training/workshops held for instructors to share their ideas on how they balance feedback. Also, the program administrators can train their instructors on how to determine when to focus on higher-order concerns versus lower-order concerns. Since the instructors of this study did not mention how they learned to focus on one type of concern than another, it will be important for writing program administrators to provide training for all online correctional education instructors because there could be a variation in their pedagogical background.

Limitations of the Study

This study has notable limitations. First, the sample size of the study was five participants. Only five instructors responded to the two requests for participation. This small sample size does not represent the full scope of the number of online correctional education instructors across the United States, and the small size provides limited insights into the

phenomenon. Another limitation of the study is that the study was conducted at one university, and the instructors all taught at the same university. Therefore, their insight is limited to how the correctional education department is designed at that learning institution. Also, the study's data was collected during the summer months which could have impacted the instructors who chose to participate in the study causing a decreased participant sampling pool. Another considerable limitation of the study was that I did not conduct member checking with the participants of the study. Member checking could have allowed the instructors to review my findings and improve the validity of the study.

Secondly, my positionality as the researcher could have had an unintended impact, either negatively or positively, on the participants in the study. I did not know any of the participants personally, but they knew of my past experiences as an online correctional education instructor. Their knowledge could have impacted their responses since I would be considered an insider, and they may not have known if I agreed or disagreed with their statements since I had a similar teaching background as them.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study opened the conversation regarding the experiences of online correctional education instructors. It is recommended that future research expand the study in various ways. One way for an extension of the research is for a larger sample size for the study. A larger sample size can assist in gathering more insights into the phenomenon of an online correctional education instructor. Although the sample size of the study fell within Polkinghorne's (1989) recommendation of five to 25 participants, adding more participants to the study would help in understanding more factors that contribute to pedagogy, relationships, and professional development. It is recognized that the small sample size of this study of five instructors does not

represent the number of instructors who teach in this capacity. Future research can also explore this phenomenon at a different university which houses a 100% online correctional education program. Furthermore, future research could study the phenomenon with online correctional education faculty members who teach additional subject areas other than English composition. Future research could also employ a quantitative or mixed methods approach to the study and collect survey data from the instructors along with interviews. Also, this study only focused on instructors who teach within online correctional education programs that serve adults. Future research could be valuable to learn of the experiences of instructors who teach incarcerated juveniles through online education programs. Lastly, this study could be re-designed to focus on how external factors such as race, gender, or socioeconomic status could influence how correctional education instructors teach whether in person or online.

Conclusion

This study gathered the perspectives of online English composition correctional education instructors. It addressed the problem that the insights of these instructors have not previously been included in the literature. Using a transcendental phenomenological methodology, the research questions were answered. The instructors approach their pedagogy by providing substantial feedback, delivering encouragement to their students, and focusing on higher-order concerns. They use a friendly and professional tone and work to form connections with students, despite challenges. Lastly, they desire more sensitivity and cultural awareness training, assistance with technology, and more opportunities to connect with faculty members for professional development. Overall, the instructors see their work as impactful as they hope to equip their students not only with writing and critical thinking skills but also with a sense of empowerment. Therefore, this study attempted to provide additional perspectives to the role of

correctional education instructors, with the focus on including the voices of those who teach online.

REFERENCES

Ali, A., & Smith, D. (2015). Comparing social isolation effects on students attrition in online versus face-to-face courses in computer literacy. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology, 12*, 11-20. http://iisit.org/Vol12/IISITv12p011-020Ali1784.pdf

Aos, S., Miller, M.G., & Drake, E. K. (2009). Evidence-based public policy options to reduce crime and criminal justice costs: Implications in Washington state. *Victims and Offenders, 4*, 170-196. https://doi.org/ 10.1080/15564880802612615

Appleman, D. (20191). *Words no bars can hold: Literacy learning in prison*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Ashland University- Correctional Education. (2020). *Ashland university's correctional education program*. https://www.ashland.edu/ce/program-overview

Bair, D. E., & Bair, M. A. (2011). Paradoxes of online teaching. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning, 5*(2), 1–15. https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol5/iss2/10/

Bannon, S. (2014). Why do they do it?: Motivations of educators in correctional facilities. *Saint Louis University Public Law Review, 33*(2), Article 5. https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/plr/vol33/iss2/5

Bard Prison Initiative. (2020). *The college*. https://bpi.bard.edu/our-work/the-college/

Barringer-Brown, C. (2015). Teaching college courses in selected correctional facilities in the commonwealth of virginia. *Journal of Education and Social Policy, 2*(2), 47-52. http://jespnet.com/journals/Vol_2_No_2_June_2015/6.pdf

Bartholomae, D. (1980). The study of error. *College Composition and Communication, 31*(3), 253-269. https://doi.org/10.2307/356486

Bean, J. C. (1996). *Engaging ideas: The professor's guide to integrating writing, critical thinking, and active learning in the classroom.* Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Berry, S. (2017a). Building community in online doctoral classrooms: instructor practices that support community. *Online Learning, 21* (2), 1-22. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i2.875

Berry, P.W. (2017b). *Doing time, writing lives: Refiguring literacy and higher education in prison*. Southern University Illinois Press.

Bigatel, P., & Edel-Malizia, S. (2018). Predictors of instructor practices and course activities that engage online students. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 21(*1), https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1173461

Binkley, C. (2020). *Spending bill to restore federal college grants for inmates*. The Associated Press. https://apnews.com/article/technology-prisons-legislation-coronavirus-pandemic-health-eb69014f6cc85f8384c180a441d94463

Bozick, R., Steele, J., Davis, L., & Turner, S. (2018). Does providing inmates with education improve postrelease outcomes? A meta-analysis of correctional education programs in the United States. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, *14*(3), 389–428. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-018-9334-6

Burke, L. (2019). *Blackboard behind bars.* InsideHigherEd. https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2019/12/10/online-education-comes-prisons

Burke, L. (2020). *College programs in prisons go remote*. InsideHigherEd. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/06/18/college-programs-prisons-adapt-covid

Cantora, A. (2020). *Congress lifts long-standing ban on Pell grants to people in prison*. PBS NewsHour. https://www.pbs.org/newshour/education/congress-lifts-long-standing-ban-on-pell-grants-to-people-in-prison

Cartwright, A.D., Avent-Harris, J.R., Munsey, R.B., & Lloyd-Hazlett, J. (2018). Interview experiences and diversity concerns of counselor education faculty from underrepresented groups. *Counselor Education & Supervision, 57*, 132-146. https://doi.org/10.1002/ceas.12098

Carver, L.J., & Harrison, L.J. (2016). Democracy and the challenges of correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 67*(1), 2-16. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26506624

Castagnetto, S. & Shanley, M.L. (2019). Women's writing groups inside: Healing, resistance, and change. In R. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on teaching in prison: Students and instructors on pedagogy behind the wall* (pp. 112-123). Routledge.

Chlup, D. (2005). *Chronology of correctional education.* National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy. http://www.ncsall.net/index.php@id=865.html

Complete College America. (2021). *Corequisite support.* https://completecollege.org/strategy/corequisite-support/

Conference on College Composition and Communication. (2021). *A position statement of principles and example effective practices for online writing instruction (owi).* https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples

Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2021, H.R. 133, 116 Cong. (2020). https://www.congress.gov/116/bills/hr133/BILLS-116hr133enr.pdf

Cook, K.C., & Davie, K.G. (Eds.) (2016). *Online education 2.0: Evolving, adapting, and reinventing online technical communication*. Routledge.

Correctional Education Association. (2020). *History*. https://ceanational.org/history/

Costelloe, A. (2014). Learning for liberation, teaching for transformation: Can education in prison prepare prisoners for active citizenship? *Irish Journal of Applied Social Studies, 14*(1). https://doi.org/10.21427/D7TM7H

Creswell, J.W., & Miller, D.L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 124-130. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Davis, L.M., Bozick, R., Steele, J.L., Saunders, J., & Miles, J. N. (2013). Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education. *Rand Corporation*. https://www.bja.gov/publications/RAND_Correctional-Education-Meta-Analysis.pdf

Davis, L.M., Steele, J.L., Bozick, R., Williams, W.V., Turner, S., Miles, J.N.V., Saunders, J., & Steinberg, P.S. (2014). How effective is correctional education, and where do we go from here? The results of comprehensive education. *RAND Corporation*. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR564.html.

Davis, L.M. (2019). Higher education programs in prison: What we know now and what we should focus on going forward. *RAND Corporation*. https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PE342.html

Delaney, R., & Montagnet, C. (2020). *Second chance pell: A snapshot of the first three years*. VERA Institute of Justice. https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/second-chance-pell-snapshot-first-three-years.pdf

Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Sage Publications.

Dix, D. (2006). "I tell what I have seen"—the reports of asylum reformer dorothea dix. *American Journal of Public Health, 96*(4), 622-624. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.96.4.622

Dwyer, S.C., & Buckle, J.L. (2009). The space between: On being an insider-outsider in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54-63. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690900800105

Duwe, G. (2017). *The use and impact of correctional programming for inmates on pre- and post-release outcomes*. National Institute of Justice-U.S. Department of Justice. https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/250476.pdf

Esperian, J.H. (2010). The effect of prison education programs on recidivism. *Journal of Correctional Education, 61*(4), 316-334. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23282764

Farley, H. (2016). Digital technologies for learning in prison: What one Australian university is doing. *Custodial Review, 77*, 19-21. http://eprints.usq.edu.au/id/eprint/29004

Ferencz, T.L.S. (2017). Shared perceptions of online adjunct faculty in the united states who have a high sense of community. *Journal of Educators Online, 14*(2), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.9743/jeo.2017.14.2.6

Fleming, J. (2018). Recognizing and resolving the challenges of being an insider researcher in work-integrated learning. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning, 19*(3), 311-320. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1196753.pdf

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of hope: Reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2010). The first decade of the community of inquiry framework: A retrospective. *The Internet and Higher Education, 13*(1), 5-9.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2009.10.003

Gehring, T. (1997). Post-secondary education for inmates: An historical inquiry. *Journal of Correctional Education, 48*(2), 46-55. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23294132

Gehring, T. & Muth, W. R. (1985). The correctional education/prison reform link: Part I, 1840-1900. *Journal of Correctional Education, 36*(4), 140-146. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41971575

Gerber, J., & Fritsch, E. J. (1995). Adult academic and vocational correctional education programs: a review of recent research. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 22*(1/2), 119-142. https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/adult-academic-and-vocational-correctional-education-programs

Ginsburg, R. (2019). *Critical perspectives on teaching in prison: Student and instructors on pedagogy behind the wall.* Routledge.

Glaser, D. (1995). *Preparing convicts for law-abiding lives: The penology of Richard A. McGee.* State University of New York Press.

Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., & Lavelle B. (2014). Recidivism among participants of an employment assistance program for prisoners and offenders. *International Journal Of Offender Therapy And Comparative Criminology, 58*(3), 348-363. https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X12470526

Griffin, J., & Minter, D. (2013). The rise of the online writing classroom: Reflecting on the material conditions of college composition teaching. *College Composition and Communication, 65*(1), 140-161. https://www.jstor.org/stable/43490811

Guerrero-Castaneda, R.F., Olivia-Menezes, T.M., & Ojeda-Vargas, M.G. (2017). Characteristics of the phenomenological interview in nursing research. R*ev Gaúcha Enferm, 38*(2), 1-5. https://doi.org/10.1590/1983-1447.2017.02.67458

Hall, R. S., & Killacky, J. (2008). Correctional education from the perspective of the prisoner student. *Journal of Correctional Education, 59*, 301-320. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ826280

Harrison, L. (2014). Prisoners and their access to the internet in the pursuit of education. *Alternative Law Journal*, *39*(3), 159-162. https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X1403900304

Hawisher, G.D., & Selfe, C. (1991). The rhetoric of technology and the electronic writing class. *College, Composition, and Communication, 42*(1), 55-65. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ422718

Hegel, G. (1807). *The phenomenology of spirit.* Bamberg and Wursburg.

Henning, T. B. (2012). Writing professor as adult learner: An autoethnography of online professional development. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 16*(2) https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v16i2.251

Hewett, B. (2015). *The online writing conference: A guide for teachers and tutors.* Macmillan.

Hobler, B. (1999). Correctional education: Now and in the future. *Journal of Correctional Education, 50*(3), 102-105. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23294868 https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375091

Hunsinger, I. (1997). Austin maccormick and the education of adult prisoners: still relevant today. *Journal of Correctional Education, 48*(4), 160-165. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23292257

Husserl, E. (1931). *Ideas: General introduction to pure phenomenology (D. Carr, Trans.).* Northwestern University Press

Jenson, E. L., & Reed, G.E. (2006). Adult correctional education programs. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 44*(1), 81-98. https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v44n01_05

Jenson, L., Price, L., & Roxa, T. (2019). Seeing through the eyes of a teacher: differences in perceptions of HE teaching in face-to-face and digital contexts. *Studies in Higher Education, 45*(6), 1149-1159. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1688280

Kallman, M.E. (2019). Living more through knowing more: College education in prison classrooms. *Adult Education Quarterly, 70*(4), 321-339. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741713619889589

Kanuha, V. K. (2000). "Being" native versus "going native": Conducting social work research as an insider. *Social Work, 45*(5), 439–447. https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/45.5.439

Karpowitz, D. (2017). *College in prison: Reading in an age of mass incarceration.* Rutgers University Press.

Kaufmann, R., & Vallade, J.I. (2020). Exploring connections in the online learning environment: student perceptions of rapport, climate, and loneliness. *Interactive Learning Environments*. https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820.2020.1749670

Kehrwald, B. (2008). Understanding social presence in text-based online learning environments. *Distance Education, 29*(1), 89-106. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587910802004860

Kellner, D. (2003). Toward a critical theory in education. *Democracy & Nature, 9*(1), 51-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/1085566032000074940

Kim, R.H., & Clark, D. (2013). The effect of prison-based college education programs on recidivism: Propensity score matching approach. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 41*(3), 196-204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2013.03.001

Klarreich, K. (2020). *We're not doing enough to address the coronavirus pandemic in prisons*. Miami Herald. https://www.miamiherald.com/opinion/op-ed/article242516741.html

Koenig, R. (2020). *Incarcerated students are used to distance learning. The pandemic still disrupts their education.* Edsurge. https://www.edsurge.com/news/2020-04-13-incarcerated-students-are-used-to-distance-learning-the-pandemic-still-disrupts-their-education

Krueger, R. A. (1988). *Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Lee, D.R. (2018). Correctional education of programs. *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5690-2_520

Lewis, J. (2006). Correctional education: Why it is only "promising". *Journal of Correctional Education, 57*(4), 286-296. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23282803

Lockard, J., & Rankins-Robertson, S. (2011). The right to education, prison-university partnerships, and online writing pedagogy in the US. *Critical Survey, 23*(3), 23-39. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41556429

Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study.* University of Chicago Press.

Lowenthal, P.R., Nyland, R., Eulho, J., Dunlap, J.C., & Kepka, J. (2019). Does class size matter? An exploration into faculty perceptions of teaching high-enrollment online courses. *American Journal of Distance Education, 33*(3), 152-168. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1220254

MacCormick, A.H. (1931). Education in the prisons of tomorrow. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 157*(1), 72-77. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271623115700110

McCarthy, J. (2017). Enhancing feedback in higher education: Students' attitudes towards online and in-class formative assessment feedback models. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 18*(2), 127-141. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787417707615

McQuaide, S.B. (2019). "Go hard": Bringing privilege- industry pedagogies into a college writing classroom in prison. In R. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Teaching in Prison.* Routledge.

Mayadas, F. (1997). Asynchronous learning networks: A sloan foundation perspective. *JALN, 1*(2), 1-18. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/cd8a/650692b3f4a51bcbedd0304158310fea0761.pdf

Messemer, J. E. (2011). The historical practice of correctional education in the United States: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science, 1*(17), 91-100.http://www.ijhssnet.com/journals/Vol_1_No_17_Special_Issue_November_2011/9.pdf

Michals, I., & Kessler, S.J. (2015). Prison teachers and their students: a circle of satisfaction and gain. *Journal of Correctional Education, 66*(1), 47-62. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Prison-teachers-and-their-students%3A-a-circle-of-and-Michals-Kessler/d12361f26d640748a49b1d45ac1700d398db02d7

Moerer-Urdahl, T., & Creswell, J. (2004). Using transcendental phenomenology to explore the "ripple effect" in a leadership mentoring program. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 3*(2), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690400300202.

Moser, A., & Korstjens, I. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 3: sampling, data collection, and analysis. *European Journal of General Practice, 24*, 9-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375091

Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Sage Publications.

Myrick, A. (2004). Escape from the carceral: Writing by American prisoners, 1895-1916. *Survillence and Society, 2*(1), 93-109. https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v2i1.3329

National Institute of Justice. (2021). *Recidivism*. https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/corrections/recidivism

Online Learning Consortium. (2021). *Quality framework.* https://onlinelearningconsortium.org/about/quality-framework-five-pillars/

Online Writing Instruction Community. (2020). *All things OWI.* https://www.owicommunity.org/online-writing-instruction.html#:~:text=%E2%80%8B,writing%20for%20course%20completion%20purposes

Osberg, T.M., & Fraley, S. E. (1993). Faculty perceptions of teaching in a prison college program: Motivations, barriers, suggestions for improvement, and perceived equivalence to traditional college programs. *Journal of Correctional Education, 44*(1), 20-26. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41970945

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* Sage Publications Ltd.

Pell Institute. (2003). *The early history of the higher education act of 1965*. http://www.pellinstitute.org/downloads/trio_clearinghouse-The_Early_History_of_the_HEA_of_1965.pdf

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1989). Phenomenological research methods. In R. S. Valle & S. Halling (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological perspectives in psychology: Exploring the breadth of human experience* (pp. 41–60). Plenum Press.

Pompoco, A., Wooldredge, J., Lugo, M., Sullivan, C., & Latessa, E. (2017). Reducing inmate misconduct and prison returns with facility education programs. *Criminology & Public Policy, 16*(2), 515–547. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9133.12290

Purdue University. (2021). *Higher order concerns (hocs) and lower order concerns (locs).* Purdue Online Writing Lab. https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/general_writing/mechanics/hocs_and_locs.html

Rendahl, M., & Breuch, L.K. (2013). Toward a complexity of online learning: learners in online first-year writing. *Computers and Composition, 30*(4), 297-314. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2013.10.002

Richard, K. (2017). *College programs in women's prisons: faculty perceptions of teaching higher education behind bars* (Publication No. 10602422) [Doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University]. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Roulston, K. (2010). *Reflective interviewing: A guide to theory and practice.* Sage Publications.

Salisbury, L.E. (2018). Just a tool: Instructors' attitudes and use of course management systems for online writing instruction. *Computers and Composition, 48*, 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compcom.2018.03.004

Sawyer, W., & Wagner, P. (2019). *Mass incarceration: The whole pie 2019*. Prison Policy Initiative. https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2019.html

Schaub, H., & West, D.M. (2015). *Digital literacy will reduce recidivism in the long term.* Brookings. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/techtank/2015/10/06/digital-literacy-will-reduce-recidivism-in-the-long-term/

Schultz, J. (2021). *Ashland University's correctional education program helps inmates turn their lives around*. News5 Cleveland. https://www.news5cleveland.com/news/local-news/oh-ashland/ashland-universitys-correctional-education-program-helps-inmates-turn-their-lives-around

Shelledy, M. (2019). Writing for reentry: A few lessons from transfer theory. In R. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Teaching in Prison.* Routledge.

Shotland, S. (2019). No one ever asked me: Embracing embodied pedagogy in the creative writing classroom. In R. Ginsburg (Ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Teaching in Prison.* Routledge.

Selfe, C. (1999). Technology and literacy: A story about the perils of not paying attention. *College Composition and Communication, 50*(3), 411-436. https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/358859.pdf

Sellers, M.P. (2016). Online learning and recidivism rates. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 19*(5), 632-636. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1028462

Smagorinsky, P., & Barnes, M. (2014). Revisiting and revising the apprenticeship of observation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(4), 29-52. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1090769

Song, L., Singleton, E.S., Hill, J,R,, Koh, M.H. (2004). Improving online learning: student perceptions of useful and challenging characteristics. *The Internet and Higher Education, 7*(1), 59–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2003.11.003

Statista. (2020). *Countries with the most prisoners per 100,000 inhabitants, as of June 2020*. https://www.statista.com/statistics/262962/countries-with-the-most-prisoners-per-100-000-inhabitants/#:~:text=With%20655%20inmates%20per%20100%2C000,the%20United%20States%20in%202020.

Steurer, S., Smith, L., & Tracy, A. (2001). *OCE/CEA three state recidivism study*. Correctional Education Association. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED465886

Steurer, S. J. (2001). Historical development of a model for correctional education and literacy. *Journal of Correctional Education, 52*(2), 48-51. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23292213

Stewart, D.W., Shamdasani, P.N., & Rook, D.W. (2007). *Focus groups: Theory and practice* (Vol. 20). Sage Publications.

Stubblefield, H. W., & Keane, P. (1994). *Adult education in the American experience: From the Colonial period to the present*. Jossey-Bass.

Sutton, J., & Austin, Z. (2015). Qualitative research: Data collection, analysis, and management. *The Canadian Journal of Hospital Pharmacy, 68,* 226-231. https://doi.org/10.4212/cjhp.v68i3.1456

Swinglehurst, D., Russell, J., & Greenhalgh, T. (2008). Peer observation of teaching in the online environment: an action research approach. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 24*(5), 383-393. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00274.x

Tabbert, R. (1984). Parsing the question "Why teach grammar? *English Journal, 73*(8), 38-42. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ308222

Tanaka, K., & Cooper, D. (2020). Advancing technological equity for incarcerated college students examining the opportunities and risks. *ITHAKAS+R.* https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.313202

Tewksbury, R., & Stengel, K.M. (2006). Assessing correctional education programs: The students' perspective. *Journal of Correctional Education, 57*(1), 13-25. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23282685

The Sentencing Project. (2020). *Criminal justice facts*. https://www.sentencingproject.org/criminal-justice-facts/

Trounstine, J. (2008). Beyond prison education. *PMLA, 123*(3), 674-677. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25501886

Tucker, C., Dixon, A., & Griddine, K. (2018). Academically successful african american male urban high school students' experiences of mattering to others at school. *Professional School Counseling, 14*(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2156759X1001400202

University of Central Florida. (2020). *How to write a literacy narrative*. https://webcourses.ucf.edu/courses/1252400/pages/how-to-write-a-literacy-narrative

University of Nevada, Reno. (n.d.). *HOC and LOC in revising*. University Writing & Speaking Center. https://www.unr.edu/writing-speaking-center/student-resources/writing-speaking-resources/hoc-and-loc-in-revising

United Nations. (1955). *Standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners.* https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/UN_Standard_Minimum_Rules_for_the_Treatment_of_Prisoners.pdf

United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime. (2015). *The united nations standard minimum rules for the treatment of prisoners*. https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/Nelson_Mandela_Rules-E-ebook.pdf

United States Department of Education. (2021). *Correctional education*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/AdultEd/correctional-education.html#1

U.S. Department of Education. (2015). *Educational technology in corrections*. https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ovae/pi/AdultEd/policybriefedtech.pdf

U.S. Department of Education. (2019). *Federal student aid*. https://studentaid.ed.gov/sa/types/grants-scholarships/pell

U.S. Department of Education. (2020). *Secretary devos expands second chance pell experiment, more than doubling opportunities for incarcerated students to gain job skills and earn postsecondary credentials.* https://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/secretary-devos-expands-second-chance-pell-experiment-more-doubling-opportunities-incarcerated-students-gain-job-skills-and-earn-postsecondary-credentials

U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2019). *Federal student aid: Actions needed to evaluate pell grant pilot for incarcerated students*. https://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-19-130

Vacca, J. (2004). Educated prisoners are less likely to return to prison. *Journal of Correctional Education, 55*(4), 297-305. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23292095

Vélez-Ibáñez, C.G., & Greenberg, J.B. (1992). Formation and transformation of funds of knowledge among U.S. Mexican households. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 23*(4), 313-335. https://doi.org/10.1525/AEQ.1992.23.4.05X1582V

Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, H.R. 3355, 103rd Cong. (1993). https://www.congress.gov/bill/103rd-congress/house-bill/3355

Walter, M. (2021). *Appropriations act restores pell eligibility to incarcerated students, establishes eligibility guidelines for prison education program.* National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators. https://www.nasfaa.org/news-item/24541/Appropriations_Act_Restores_Pell_Eligibility_to_Incarcerated_Students_Establishes_Eligibility_Guidelines_for_Prison_Education_Program

Walther, J. B. (2006). Nonverbal dynamics in computer-mediated communication, or: (and the net: (‘s with you,:) and you:) alone. In V. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *Handbook of nonverbal communication* (pp. 461–479). Sage.

Warnock, S. (2009). *Teaching writing online: How & why.* National Council of Teachers of English.

Weaver, A., Rousseau, D., & Napior, A.J. (2020). Learning from teachers: A needs assessment of faculty in postsecondary correctional education. *Journal of Correctional Education, 71*(1), 18-56. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26915041

Webb, A., & Mahnaz, M. (2016). Feedback and feed-forward for promoting problem-based learning in online learning environments. *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction, 13*(2), 1-41. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1134728

Wexler, E. (2016). *Prisoners to get 'second chance pell'*. Inside Higher Ed. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/06/24/us-expands-pell-grant-program-12000-prison

White House. (2016). *Fact sheet: President obama announces new actions to reduce recidivism and promote reintegration of formerly incarcerated individuals.* https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/06/24/fact-sheet-president-obama-announces-new-actions-reduce-recidivism-and

Williams, J. (1981). The phenomenology of error. *College Composition and Communication, 32*(2), 152-168. https:doi.org/10.2307/356689

Wilson, D.B., Gallagher, C.A., & MacKenzie, D.L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 37*(4), 347-368. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427800037004001

Wright, M.C. (2001). Pell grants, politics and the penitentiary: connections between the development of u.s. higher education and prisoner post-secondary programs. *Journal of Correctional Education, 52*(1), 11-16. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23294027

Yang, Y.-F. (2018). New language knowledge construction through indirect feedback in web-based collaborative writing. *Computer Assisted Language Learning, 31*(4), 459-480. https://doi.org/10.1080/09588221.2017.1414852.

APPENDIX A: RECRUITMENT EMAIL

Greetings CE Comp Instructors,

I, Candace Chambers, am a doctoral student at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, and I am seeking participants for a research study.

You are receiving this email because you are an English composition faculty member who teaches within the online correctional education program. Your email address was obtained from the correctional education listserv provided by the Composition Program Director. To be able to take part in this study, you must be over the age of 19 and have taught college English composition in the online correctional education program at this university for at least one semester.

This study is about the pedagogical experiences of online English correctional education instructors. If you take part in this study, you would be required to participate in a 1 hour and a half one-on-one virtual interview and submit a 300-word minimum reflection about your teaching experiences. You will have the option to participate in a 2-hour focus group as a follow-up interview. The one-on-one interview and focus group will occur by Zoom and will be video recorded.

Your participation will allow for a better understanding of your experiences as an online English correctional education instructor. This study will allow you to provide your pedagogical practices and experiences teaching in this capacity. The data will be used to add to the fields of composition studies and correctional education for the use of instructors and program administrators as models of best practices.

You will receive a $15 e-gift card from Amazon for participating in the study.

Participants should respond by June 12 if they would like to participate in the study.

If you are interested in participating or have any questions about the study, please email me at cchamb32@uncc.edu.

Thank you,
Candace Chambers
Ph.D. Candidate, University of North Carolina at Charlotte
cchamb32@uncc.edu

Janaka Lewis, PhD
Associate Professor of English, Faculty Advisor

APPENDIX B: CONSENT FORM

UNC CHARLOTTE
Department of Middle, Secondary, and K-12 Education
9201 University City Boulevard, Charlotte, NC 28223-0001

Consent to be Part of a Research Study

Title of the Project: Pedagogical Experiences of Online Correctional Education English Composition Faculty: A Transcendental Phenomenological Study
Principal Investigator: Candace Chambers PhD student, UNC Charlotte
Faculty Advisor: Janaka Lewis, PhD, UNC Charlotte

You are invited to participate in a research study. Participation in this research study is voluntary. The information provided is to help you decide whether or not to participate. If you have any questions, please ask.

Important Information You Need to Know

- This study is considered research, and participation is voluntary.
- The purpose of this study is to learn of the experiences of online English correctional education college instructors
- You will be asked to participate in an individual Zoom interview and submit a reflection about your teaching practices. You will have the option to participate in a follow-up focus group session.
- If you choose to participate in all activities, it will require a total of 4 hours of your time.
- I do not believe that you will experience any risk from participating in this study.
- You will benefit from the study by being able to tell of your experiences as faculty. What we learn about how online English correctional education instructors may be beneficial to others.

Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before you decide whether to participate in this research study.

Why am I doing this study?
The purpose of the study is to learn of the experiences of online English correctional education (CE) college instructors. The primary long-term objective of this research is that it will inform current and future correctional education program administrators on best practices by instructors in CE programs. The study is aimed at: 1) learning of the English instructors' online pedagogies 2) exploring how these instructors foster relationships with their corrections students; and 3) learning of the English instructors' professional development needs with the goal of improving teachers' experiences within CE programs

Why are you being asked to be in this research study?
You are being asked to be in this study because you have taught college English composition in the online correctional education program at Ashland University for at least one semester. You are also over the age of 19.

What will happen if I take part in this study?
If you choose to participate in this study, you will be asked to participate in a one-on-one interview, document collection, and a focus group. The one-on-one interview will be conducted via the online video conferencing platform of Zoom, and will be video recorded. One semi-structured interview of 60-90 minutes will be guided by open-ended interview questions. The questions used to guide the interviews are as follows: What have you experienced in terms of being an online correctional education English composition instructor?; What contexts or

situations have typically influenced or affected your experiences being an online correctional education English composition instructor?

You will also be asked to submit a 300-word minimum reflection detailing your pedagogical experiences within the correctional education program. The following questions will guide the reflection: What type of pedagogical support do you receive from the English department?; What type of pedagogical support do you receive from the correctional education staff?; Do you receive technical support in regard to using the online platforms? If so, what type?; Do you need other areas of support to effectively teach in this capacity? If so, what type?

After the individual interviews are conducted and the reflections are collected, you will have the option to participate in a focus group. The focus group session, held on Zoom, will last approximately two hours and will be video recorded. It will be held in the later phases of the study to explore and examine findings from the analysis of the semi-structured interviews and document collection method. Two to five focus questions will be created with 10-20 minutes of allowed discussion for each question; the questions will also be ordered by level of importance.

Your time commitment will be about 1 hour and a half for the one-on-one interview and 2 hours for the focus group.

What are the benefits of this study?
You will be able to voice your opinions about your experiences as faculty within the online correctional education program. There is no research concerning this group of faculty members' experiences, so this study will benefit you through the telling of your stories. Others may benefit from the information you provide in the study.

What risks might I experience?
I do not believe there are any risks, including privacy or confidentiality risks, from participating in this research.

How will my information be protected?
I plan to publish the results of this study. To protect your privacy I will not include any information that could identify you. I will protect the confidentiality of the research data by changing all identifiers to pseudonyms, and the data will be stored in my UNCC DropBox account to which only I and my faculty advisor will have access. The transcriptions from your interview and from the focus group will be transcribed and housed in the DropBox account. The data will be destroyed after data analysis.

I will do everything I can to keep your identity private and your responses confidential. However, given the nature of focus groups, I cannot make guarantees about how others in the group might use your information. I ask that you respect the privacy and confidentiality of the group and group members to keep the discussion private and confidential.

Other people may need to see the information we collect about you. Including people who work for UNC Charlotte and other agencies as required by law or allowed by federal regulations.

How will my information be used after the study is over?
After this study is complete, identifiers will be removed from the data and the data could be used for future research studies or distributed to another investigator for future research studies without additional informed consent.

Study data may be shared with other researchers for use in other studies without asking for your consent again or as may be needed as part of publishing our results. The data we share will NOT include information that could identify you. All data will be stored in my Google drive, and I will only have access to the folder.

Will I receive an incentive for taking part in this study?

You will receive $15 total for an Amazon e-gift-card. You will receive the gift card after you complete the one-on-one interview and submit your reflection.

What are my rights if I take part in this study?

It is up to you to decide to be in this research study. Participating in this study is voluntary. Even if you decide to be part of the study now, you may change your mind and stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer. If you withdraw, your data will be deleted from the study and Google drive.

Who can answer my questions about this study and my rights as a participant?
For questions about this research, you may contact me at cchamb32@uncc.edu or my faculty advisor, Janaka Lewis, PhD at jlewi102@uncc.edu.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant or wish to obtain information, ask questions, or discuss any concerns about this study with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact the Office of Research Protections and Integrity at uncc-irb@uncc.edu.

Consent to be audio and visually recorded
With your permission, you will have the following done during this research (check all that apply):

__X__ video recording __X__ audio recording

To assist with accurate recording of participant responses, assessment, and follow-up appointments may be audio or visual recorded. Names will not be used during recording. Participants have the right to refuse to allow such recording without penalty. Please select one of the following options:

_____I consent to the use of audio/visual recordings for research purposes.
_____I do not consent to the use audio/visual recordings for research purposes

_____
Signature Date

Consent to Participate

By signing this document, you are agreeing to be in this study. Make sure you understand what the study is about before you sign. You will receive a copy of this document for your records. If you have any questions about the study after you sign this document, you can contact the study team using the information provided above.

I understand what the study is about and my questions so far have been answered. I agree to take part in this study.

_____
Name (PRINT)

_____
Signature Date

_____
Candace Chambers Date

APPENDIX C: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

Individual Interview Guide

The in-depth interviews in this study will cover the topic of your experience of being an online English correctional education instructor. However, the topic will be explored in an organic way. Questions will not be phrased in precisely the same way from one interview to the next; neither will the questions be asked in the same order. What follows are the key topics to be explored and examples of the types of questions that will be asked. It is possible that interviewees will raise unanticipated topics. These emergent topics will be explored at the discretion of the researcher and will be incorporated into future interviews if they prove relevant to the study.

Guiding Questions:

1. What is your educational background?
2. How did you start teaching English composition/first-year writing?
3. What other schools have you taught English composition/first-year writing at?
4. How long have you been teaching English composition?
5. How did you hear about correctional education?
6. What type of training did you receive before starting your position?
7. What type of training do you wish you received?
8. How does teaching writing differ in this environment than in others in the context of correctional education?
9. How does teaching writing differ in this environment than in others in the context of online learning?
10. How does your previous teaching experience inform your current teaching methods?
11. Describe your interactions with your students?
12. Do you feel connected to your students?
13. Do you believe the environment plays a role in your teaching?
14. What are best practices you implement in your teaching?
15. How do you approach feedback?
16. How do you approach the writing process when teaching?
17. How do you foster encouragement with your students?
18. How do you approach assessment?
19. Why did you choose to teach within corrections?
20. How do you view your role on a larger scale?
21. Correctional education has been tied to themes of recidivism and redemption. What are your thoughts?

APPENDIX D: DOCUMENT COLLECTION PROMPT

Please see me a 300-word minimum reflection about your experiences of teaching English composition in the online correctional education program. You can speak to your strengths and weaknesses as an instructor, or you can include what you would like concerning your experiences in general. It's open to your interpretation.

APPENDIX E: FOCUS GROUP GUIDE

Focus Group Guide

Welcome and thank you for being here today. The purpose of this gathering is to get your feedback on your experiences as an online correctional education English instructor.

Let me introduce myself. I am Candace Chambers, and I will be the moderator in today's discussion. The format we are using is a focus group. A focus group is a conversation that focuses on specific questions in a safe and confidential environment. I will guide the conversation by asking questions that each of you can respond to. There are no right or wrong answers to these questions. Just be honest. If you wish, you can also respond to each other's comments, like you would in an ordinary conversation. It is my job to make sure that everyone here gets to participate and that we stay on track.

Before we get started, I want to let you know two things. First, the information we learn today will be compiled into my dissertation. This compilation will include a summary of your comments. Secondly, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not feel comfortable with. This focus group today is confidential. Confidential" means that what we say in this session should not be repeated outside of this session

I cannot control what you do when you leave, but I ask each of you to respect each other's privacy and not tell anyone what was said by others here today. Although we hope everyone here honors this confidentiality, please remember that what you say here today could be repeated by another focus group member. So please, do not say anything that you absolutely need to keep private.

As you can see, I will be tape recording this focus group. The recording will only be used to make sure our notes are correct and will not be heard by anyone outside of this project.

Let's begin with introductions.
Opening Question: Please share with us your name and something you love to do in your free time.

Transition Questions:
When you think of teaching online, what comes to mind?
When you think of teaching in correctional education, what comes to mind?
When you think of teaching as an English instructor, what comes to mind?

Key Question: What are your overall pedagogical experiences teaching as an online correctional education English instructor?

Probing Question: Does anyone share the same experiences?

Key Question: Are there any needed improvements to your teaching in this capacity in the context of professional development?

Probing question: Does anyone share the same experiences?

Ending questions:

What advice would you give other online correctional education English instructors?
What advice would you give writing program administrators or correctional education program directors based on your pedagogical experiences?