

BUILDING A PRISON ARTS PROGRAM
THROUGH THE EYES OF THE FACILITATOR

By
Nicole C. Warbis

A MASTER'S PROJECT
Presented to the Arts and Administration Program
And the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For the degree of
Master of Arts

June 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I Introduction	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Guiding Questions	4
Basic Assumptions	5
Limitations & Delimitations	5
Definition of Terms	5
Significance	6
CHAPTER II Review of Literature	8
Arts Programming	10
Leisure Experience	10
Art Therapy	11
Arts Programming in Prisons	13
Prison Art	14
Prison History & Culture	15
Penal Systems/Theories & Practices in America	17
Rehabilitation in Prison	18
Prison & Crime Statistics	19
Methodology, Qualitative Methods	21
CHAPTER III Methodology	22
Methods	22
Product	23
CHAPTER IV Results & Discussion	25
DATA	
Data Review & Procedure	25
Transcript for Interview with Sister Graziano	26
Data Synthesis & Procedure	30
FINDINGS	
Sustainability of Programs	31
Perceptions	32
Programmers/Facilitators	33
CHAPTER V Summaries & Conclusions	35
Summary of Procedures & Findings	35
Conclusions	36
Implications	37
Recommendations for Further Study	39
REFERENCES	41
APPENDICES	
Appendix A - Prison Arts Programming Model	43
Appendix B - Inmate Evaluations (copies from Sister Margaret)	44
Appendix C – Plates	47
Appendix D - Human Subjects Clearance	53

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Prisons are an often over-looked community within the arena of arts programming. Yet, arts programs in prisons continue to thrive, habilitate and reform prison communities through the efforts of a few determined arts program facilitators. Most arts programs in prisons are supported by their administration when the funds are available but are among the first activities to be cut when the budget falls short. In order to build awareness and familiarity with prison arts programming, it is necessary to educate both the community arts programmers as well as their counterparts in prison.

Historically, prison arts programs have a scattered and infrequent method of existing within prison walls due to their reliance on state and federal funding. It is moot in this country's penal system history to argue for the placement of arts programming, education or even rehabilitation *before* the issue of security and punishment due to the overarching goal of punitive institutions. There is room, however, for rehabilitative programs that reform, discipline, habilitate and contain actions and occurrences within an inmate's life within prison and upon release. A literature review has found that arts programming in prisons *is* taking place but sporadically, usually without consistency and without a strong public awareness in most cases (Bishop, August 31, 2003).

The cost alone to tax payers is just over \$60 billion a year, between Federal and State correction programs (Baumanne, 2003). Funds remaining after security, punishment and overhead are accounted for might most effectively be distributed to rehabilitative programs. Prison arts programming is one concrete method of rehabilitation that not only positively affects

the immediate environments of the prison community, but often continues to empower the offender after they are no longer institutionalized (Kornfeld, 2001). Arts programming in prisons also has the capacity to build life-long community arts supporters, artists, enthusiasts and participants due to the known perceived benefits of the arts on human life, expression and experience (Kornfeld, 2001).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to examine *how* current prison arts programmers organize, fund, develop, execute and maintain an arts program in prison. After answering these questions, the researcher summarized the data retrieved from prison arts facilitators and related literature, in order *to develop* a prison arts programming model to be utilized by arts programmers in both prison and non-prison settings.

GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. How do facilitators of arts programs in prisons define ‘prison arts programming?’
2. What are the perceived benefits for inmates, the institution and the community if arts programming is supported and implemented in a prison setting?
3. What prison arts programs are offered? Why?
4. How is ‘success’ defined, measured and evaluated?
5. Do collaborations occur between the prison and outside arts agencies? How? What is the process to initiate collaboration?

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The researcher was guided by the following assumptions regarding her subject matter: that respondents (administration) answered questions honestly and accurately, that arts programming is a beneficial and meaningful means of providing rehabilitative experiences to an imprisoned population, and that a ‘model prison arts program guide’ did not already readily exist to the general arts administering public nor to the prison community arts facilitators.

LIMITATIONS & DELIIMITATIONS

Sample Size:

The researcher chose to focus on two prison arts facilitators in a federal and state prison in Oregon. Opinions and further research were drawn from an extensive literature review but have not included a large portion of prison arts programs in America.

Lack of Direct Inmate Feedback:

The researcher chose to utilize an extensive literature review and second-hand narratives from administrators to replace directly interviewing and surveying inmate opinions regarding prison arts programming. Due to University time constraints, human subjects requirements, and the inability to easily access inmates in a timely fashion, the researcher chose not to include direct inmate feedback for this study.

DEFINITION OF TERMS:

Arts Programming – the method, frequency, diversity and breadth of programs and activities offered and sustained by an arts organization in order to fulfill their mission statement.

Art Therapy – the therapeutic process of creating art with a guided professional, as a means of exploring the creative processes for rehabilitation and communication (Malchiodi, 1998).

Habilitation – “teaching offenders to live lawfully in the first place (Fuller, 1998, pp. 128).”

Prison Art – otherwise known as “Outsider Art”, “Jailhouse Art” or “Folk Art” and it recognizes that artistic creativity is a shared human experience that transcends disability or environment (Kornfeld, 1997).

Recidivism – a term for offenders released and committing a crime again (Baumanne, 2003).

Rehabilitative Programs – prison programs such as drug/alcohol treatment, therapy, job/vocational training, skill building and arts programming (Fuller, 1998).

SIGNIFICANCE:

Prison arts programmers do not have an accessible, consistent or reliable source of programming information available to them either through literature, or web resources. Arts programming in any setting, relies on theory, models, evaluative tools and communication among fellow programmers. Prison arts programming continues to exist, but most often in vacuums within prison culture that do not communicate on best practices methodologies. A thorough literature review was needed in the areas of arts programming, leisure studies, art therapy, prison arts programming, prison art history, prison history, prison rehabilitation

programs, justice theories and methodology in order to grasp the relevant and intersecting issue areas within this topic.

Web resources are among the most current and reliable sources in prison arts programming. Organizations such as *the International Correctional Arts Network* (I-CAN) within the American Correctional Association (ACA) have attained a world-wide status but programming models, methods and sustainable tools have not been addressed (International, 2004). The existing literature regarding community arts programs that addresses prison communities via art exhibits and accompanying lecture series, but few of the sources indicate programs *occurring inside* the prison walls. This study collected, synthesized and produced an applicable and pertinent prison arts programming methods in order to build knowledge and cohesion in the fields of arts administration and corrections.

CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

The purpose of this study was to examine *how* current prison arts programmers organize, fund, develop, execute and maintain an arts program in prison. After answering these questions, the researcher summarized the data retrieved from prison arts facilitator, and related literature, in order *to develop* a prison arts programming model to be utilized by arts programmers in both prison and non-prison settings.

The purpose of materials collected within this literature review was to establish a diverse and adequate background in the field of criminal justice, corrections and arts programming in prison communities. The literature reviewed primarily reflects the researcher's knowledge acquired in the field of prison history, policy, theory and practices in America to supplement the researcher's lack of academic expertise in that field. Arts program theory as well as literature regarding community arts programs and the benefits of leisure, have provided an arts administrator's perspective to the issue of *prison* arts programming. Art therapy and its techniques were included, to further broaden the understanding of arts effects on human expression.

METHOD AND SOURCES OF REVIEW

The research was limited to those sources that were available through the University of Oregon. Numerous searches were conducted in library, web and journal databases looking for instances where arts programming and prisons intersected. The primary resource for this research derived from a 1997 Princeton published monograph, entitled, *Cellblock Visions* –

Prison Art in America, by Phyllis Kornfeld. Her personal perspective, wealth of artistic imagery and experiences are invaluable to this study, and knowledge of the subject. Kornfeld's work inspired the researcher's interest in the area, and reaffirmed the need to take Kornfeld's research and observations *farther* by utilizing the perspective of an arts administrator, to bring arts programming to prison communities.

Most of the collected current statistical crime and correctional information derives from a University of Oregon, Fall 2003 Graduate level Sociology class, '*Crime and Social Control*' taught by Professor Baumanne. Her lectures, quotes, statistics and research guided the process for selecting appropriate and the most non-biased methods of statistical information for this unique topic's purposes. Surveys, such as the United Crime and Victimization Survey is a highly informative, accurate and substantial tool for determining the current levels of crime reported in the community. A sociologist's perspective was highly valuable to this research's parameters and feasibility concerns.

Art is empowering, interpretive and the base of human expression and understanding. Sister Helen Prejean, author of *Dead Man Walking* believes that prisoners are: "...stripped of freedom, beautiful surroundings, and supportive community, these convicts draw pictures of what their souls see. They sketch their way past despair. They give us insight into what it means to be a Thrown-Away-One. Their pictures cry out: 'I, too, can see. I, too, can create. I, too, am a human being (Kornfeld, 1997, p. xix)." The literature review is organized by topic area, and its findings are summarized below.

Arts Programming

The researcher's most thorough knowledge and background experience resides in the field of arts administration and arts programming for museums, due to her field of graduate study at the University of Oregon in Arts Administration and undergraduate study in art history. Arts organizations are constantly searching for new and better ways of reaching a wider and more diverse audience, known as *outreach*. Outreach is the process of developing outside and community oriented relationships with shared goals and people in mind (Steuert, 1993).

Arts programming varies, according to the mission statement of the organizations and likewise, the programs offered by the organization should reflect goals held in the mission. The "Collaborative model" of art institutions consists of community involvement, outreach and targeted programming (Steuert, 1993, p. 220)." Steuert, writes that an arts administrator should: "understand your motivation...take cues from the community...be willing to try something new and don't become too heavily invested in your program ideas...remind yourself who the program is for and what their needs are...create long-term funding plans (1993, p. 193)." Programming activities and events in an arts organization requires balancing organization mission, community, stakeholders, knowing your audience, budgeting for success and sustainability *after* funding an idea that might work. Providing the services, skills and creativity of these organizations to the prison community fits surprisingly well into most mission statements, if their idea of "community" is expanded, or redefined.

Leisure Experience

Arts programming within prison can also be seen as a developmental leisure experience. Douglas Kleiber, a leisure theorist from the University of Georgia, defines leisure characteristics

as, “some combination of the perception of freedom of choice, intrinsic motivation, freedom from evaluation, relaxation, and enjoyment (1999, p. 20).” Experiencing “leisure” within prison walls is rare, and most probably believe that it should be. However, humans by nature need some outlet for expression and individual choice in order to remain socially active and healthy – “Too often free time is wasted time: energy dissipated without creativity or even restorative value, and in many cases with socially and personally destructive results (Kleiber, 1999, p. 37).”

A prison sentence won’t enhance opportunities for leisure, as most people describe them, but much more time *is* left idle and filled with routine, daily activities, creating an emerging new form of leisure emerges. Leisure in prison could consist of reading, self-education, exercise, art making, writing, religious study, or even card playing. The most rehabilitative and influential forms of leisure are those “activities that reflect individual potentials, that produce the intense involvement of flow-type experience, and that involve commitment to others who take the activity seriously [are] described as personally expressive and as being most influential in identity formation (Kleiber, 1999, p. 54).” Art making can be viewed as meaning making leisure experiences within the prison.

Art Therapy

Art therapy can be defined as, a guided art session where the patient is encouraged “to explore oneself imaginatively, authentically, and spontaneously, an experience that, over time, can lead to personal fulfillment, emotional reparation, and transformation (Malchiodi, 1998, p. 5).” Art therapists are trained professional therapists who use art as their medium for effective communication, understanding and exploration. The *process* of creating, is valued highest, while the product, art, is secondary. It is also important to understand that the “person who creates the

art determines what the image means (Malchiodi, 1998, p. 7).” This does not mean that art therapists do not interpret or search for common themes and symbols within the art, but emphasizes their role as a facilitator in that process.

Art therapy has many advantages as a means of communication, especially in disadvantaged persons, due to its ability to not force linear thinking/expression methods but represent many simultaneous complexities through art creation (Malchiodi, 1998). Expression can lead to catharsis, which is identified as the “discharge of strong emotion for relief” perhaps while describing a past traumatic event or depicting frustration of their personal state (Malchiodi, 1998, p. 13). Sometimes, patients without a wide range of communicative skills, vocabulary or self-confidence, find strength in the medium of art making. “Creativity is at the core of art therapy” and is often an aspect of...offender development that has not previously had much training or attention (Wadeson, 1992, pp. xiii). The *healing quality* of the creative process, invigorates the patient, promotes healthy expression and catharsis as well as establishing communicative skills with another person (Ulman, 1975). “Carl Fenichel points out that problems in socialization experienced by most seriously disturbed children, have roots within the interactive development of cognition, roots within the interactive development of cognition, language and perception (Williams, 1997, pp. 3).” The process of artistic *sublimation* as described by Edith Ulman “consists in the creation of visual images for the purpose of communicating to a group very complex material which would not be available for communication in any other form (1975).” Sublimation techniques can be achieved during one-on-one therapist to prisoner sessions, partner, group activities and even in a less formal workshop-studio.

Art therapy in prisons operates best (like all prison programs) with adequate and consistent funding, or through court-mandated treatment (Malchiodi, 1998). Therapists can then more fully invest their time, energy and materials into the offender. It is recommended, that a special room be designed as the art therapy room, to house materials safely, provide confidentiality, familiarity and adequate space for creativity (Malchiodi, 1998). A consistent art therapist builds trust and helps to “maintain a connection” with the offender (Riley, 1999, pp. 15).

Once the therapist has established trust, treatment must be seen through multiple lenses: regional (urban/suburban), economic (poverty/wealth), gender, cultural and ethnic (Riley, 1999). The environment of prison causes added stresses and experiences to work through before tackling mental and social issues of the offender. Use of materials such as magazine pre-cut out collage pieces, blank roles of butcher paper (to allow freedom of size) and a range of markers and pastels are all relatively safe and can be easily accounted for at the end of the session. Providing art programs in high risk environments is always risky, but proper precautions can be taken. Staff should be involved, as well as family, with therapy needs, goals and expected outcomes to help assist with security issues. Art therapy can be useful, transitory, and a cathartic release to prisoners, which will benefit the individual, the facility and the community, upon release.

Arts Programming in Prisons

Arts programming in prisons is a relatively distinct field of arts programming that is difficult to identify in even a thorough literature review. The most plentiful resources are web-based articles, state and federal prison arts program descriptions and higher education prison

curricula collaborations. The related topic of prison art and its history is outlined in Phyllis Kornfeld's book, *Cellblock Visions – Prison Art in America* (1997). It provides an overview of prisoner's individual art, and references the significance of having a consistent arts program facilitator and a funding source, but does not specifically identify, characterize or outline such a program (Kornfeld, 1997).

However, the literature review did find instances where art *therapy* programs had outlined and justified within prison walls in *Art Therapy with Offenders* by Marian Liebmann (1994). Liebmann believes that the prison has to first define their role, if any, in rehabilitation and socialization of inmates, and then provide services and programs to prisoners based on this understanding (1994). "The making of art in prison provides an 'enabling space' for the prisoner overwhelmed by the clatter and disruption of prison life... and it opens the possibility of a more creative life for many after release (Liebmann, 1994, pp. foreward)." Although it is not easy to locate literature regarding current prison arts programming practices, the literature proves that it is occurring. Based on Kornfeld's account, websites for prison institutions, the formation of I-CAN (International Correctional Arts Network) and the researcher's personal involvement in prison art shows at a local level.

Prison Art

Prison art, often known as "outsider art" or "jailhouse art" has existed as long as there has been human suffering and captivity. *Cellblock Visions – Prison Art in America*, is the only existing collection of current prison artists and their works (1997). The author, Phyllis Kornfeld, an artist and a teacher, began working as an "artist in residence" in the correctional community

in 1983 (1997). Her book highlights the immediacy and humanistic qualities that art making possesses.

Prison art history is introduced and briefly alluded to in a tremendous foreword, entitled, “Foreword, A Brief History of Prison Art (Kornfeld, 1997, p. xvi).” Her six-page foreword is full of history, information, terminology, literature and artists. This section proved to be an invaluable starting place for further research. She addresses the common concerns with prison artists, which, in turn, also defines the genre: inmates lacking “exposure to visual models... substantially less access to materials” leads to a more strict, regimented style known today as “prison art (Kornfeld, 1997, p. xxi).”

Kornfeld describes prison artists and their art, “They tell the truth without pretense or self-consciousness, unfettered by concepts and theory. We can see a full picture of who they really are. The largest significance of the artwork is its convincing revelation of an unseen culture, not made up of faceless statistics or raging animals, as they are usually portrayed, but human beings...(Kornfeld, 1997, p. 3).” Prison art, is even more vulnerable and reactive to social and political movements than other forms of art, due to funding threats prohibiting access to art making and facilitating. The history of prison art can also be measured by studying the social and political history of America’s prison.

Prison History & Culture

“The ‘penitentiary’ has existed in America since 1790 and the Walnut Street Jail in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (De Rosia, 1998, p. 18).” The history of the U.S. has always included a penal system. The system has gone through many changes in our country’s short

history – always reflecting the social, moral and political change of its people. Understanding the prison history and its trends in America, helps to make sense of the policies of today.

“Modern” prisons, the system that resembles ours the closest, began in the 1950’s. The 1950’s prison was referred to as the “Big House,” where a strict social code and an even more powerful warden, ran the institution (Fuller, 1998). The era was beneficial for inmates, in that they were taught vocational and social skills while serving an *indeterminate* sentence (Fuller, 1998). This form of sentencing was popular because it gave the prisoner a chance for improvement-based release, based on prison administration review boards (Fuller, 1998). However, this system did not prove successful due to the amount of discretion left to the committee and not the justice system that initially sentenced (Baumanne, 2003). This mindset peaked in the 1960’s and 1970’s prison, known as the “correctional institution (Fuller, 1998, p. 117).” For nearly twenty years the prison mission, staffing and sentencing was aimed at rehabilitating and “correcting” the offender. Due to social and political changes in the 1980’s to present, we are seeing a progressively more punitive system - with longer sentences, due primarily to mandatory minimums, and intense over crowding due primarily to drug offenses (Kappeler, 1998). Our current prison is a product of the “Justice Model” which emphasizes punishment and focuses less on rehabilitation efforts (Fuller, 1998, p. 127).

Today’s prison is a direct reflection of society’s belief systems. Most sociologists would argue that crime, criminals, and prison are largely misrepresented, largely due to the influence of media and politics on culture (Kappeler, 1998). This shift in public opinion “toward a more punitive posture in dealing with the criminal offender... has been at the request or even demand of citizens who are affected by crime, but in many ways the move... has been motivated by politicians and the media (Fuller, 1998, pp. 25).”

Crime rates have significantly fallen since the mid-1990's – but punitive practices have only been getting tougher (Reasons, 2000). Prisons and prisoners are suffering. Without programs that prepare the offender for release, prisons aren't fully doing their job.

Penal Systems/Theories and Practices in America

The current punitive system is a result of “correctional” efforts in the 1960's and 1970s that weren't implemented strategically, nor operated long enough to truly bring forth lower rates of recidivism with offenders (Fuller, 1998). The prison today, exists for four main reasons: (1) to *deter* future and past criminals from doing a crime because the threat of incarceration looms, (2) *incapacitate* the offender to stop the individual from possibly endangering others, (3) to *punish* the criminal by serving time and living a restricted lifestyle and (4) to *rehabilitate* them for release into society (Fuller, 1998, pp. 125-127). When funding is at its low, the least “necessary” role, rehabilitation, is often cut.

Some critics believe the term, “rehabilitation” is not correct at all when socializing offenders. Instead, the need to “habilitate” them, for the first time, is more accurate (Kappeler, 1998). Habilitation programs make logical sense, if a prisoner is ever going to be released into society. French philosopher, Michael Foucault's theories are still applicable when dealing with the role of prisons to habilitate: “Reanimate the useful, virtuous interest that has been so weakened by the crime. The feeling of respect for property – for wealth, but also for honor, liberty, life – this the criminal loses when robs ... abducts or kills. So [the prisoner] must be taught this feeling once again (1995, p. 107).” The key words are, “once again.” Did the offender *ever* feel or believe in this socially accepted way?

The most widely accepted solution, is to provide programming when applicable, useful and affordable within prison systems. “By making programs available on a voluntary basis to those inmates who wish to gain skills or insight, the problem of inmate deception is avoided. If offenders can seek help as they define it and participate for sincere reasons, treatment programs can be useful (Fuller, 1998, p. 140).”

First, a society must determine “what a prison can and should do: deter, isolate, inflict suffering and yet somehow ‘cure’ them of their anti-social attitudes (Kappeler, 1998, p. 234).” From this perspective, prison goals are hypocritical in theory and practice. Kappeler believes that “the assumptions that helped construct the system, assumes the problem is solved once this phase [incarceration] is reached (1998, p. 234).” Social techniques cannot be easily attained in this environment, “the longer the inmate’s stay, the more removed from conventional society s/he becomes and the stronger the influence of the antisocial prison society (and, by implication, the more difficult to reach and reform such an inmate) (De Rosa, 1998, p. 24).” If we are going to lock up more criminals for longer sentences, research suggest that society should invest in more habilitation and training programs in order *not* to promote further recidivism (Baumanne, 2003).

Rehabilitation in Prison

“There is evidence to suggest that positive program involvement acts as an intervening variable between inmate characteristic variables and institutional misconduct. Significant associations were found between low infraction rates and high levels of treatment program participation (De Rosia, 1998, p. 33).” Not only do prison programs help the offender, they

make *better* prisoners for staff. Programs don't necessarily act as the direct cause for behavior changes, but can provide an "avenue for inmates to avoid trouble (De Rosia, 1998, p. 33)."

Many psychological changes occur while in prison. Inmates experience: the loss of freedom, movement, choices, sexual activity, security, family, privacy, leisure and respect (Kappeler, 1998). Prison should not be a vacation, by any means, but these losses should be taken into account when creating prison programming. "The prison can psychologically destroy an inmate (Kappeler, 1998, p. 250)." This loss of control, and sustained isolation, can lead to violent and unruly behavior (Crooke, 1993). Idle time and lack of stimulation also greatly affects the way inmates think and their problem solving processes (Crooke, 1993). Prison programming can be both a means to offer human expressive experiences in a controlled environment, with the benefit of producing more orderly inmates.

Currently, most prison rehabilitation programs focus on job training through prison work programs (Baumanne, 2003). Education and alcohol and drug treatment programs are also common in minimum and medium security prisons (Fuller, 1998). Arts programming could easily be integrated and successful in conjunction with other habilitative program efforts. "Inmates who enter prison with inadequate ways of coping will leave prison with the same lack of adaptive capabilities (De Rosia, 1998, p. 40)."

Prison and Crime Statistics

There are at least 6,467,000 prisoners incarcerated in America's current correctional system (Baumanne, 2003). The majority of prisoners have committed crimes of violence (40%), and 25% have violated a drug law (Baumanne, 2003). Federal prisons have nearly 50% drug-related offenders, or 78,000 people (Baumanne, 2003). Even though the incarceration rate

remains at its highest ever, crime rates have dramatically fallen since 1995 (Kappeler, 1998).

This overcrowding “has had a detrimental impact on not only prisons but also on probation, parole, and diversion programs. There simply are not the resources to do what these agencies are designed to accomplish (Fuller, 1998, p. 25).”

There are over 1,500 federal and state prisons, 3,300 county operated jails and detention facilities and just over 100 privately owned prisons, contracted with federal and state agencies (De Rosia, 1998). “By the end of 1996, the federal prison system was operating at 37% above their highest capacity, while state prisons operated at 117% above their highest capacity (De Rosia, 1998, p. 6).” Of these over-crowded prisoners, 93.7% are male, 75% unmarried, over half did not come from a two-parent family and 80% are recidivists (De Rosia, 1998). State governments pay over \$50 billion, annually, for judicial, police and corrections, while federal costs total just over \$10 billion (Baumanne, 2003).

Prison programming efforts are determined usually at the state level, by reviewing criminal statistics of Oregon inmates: 79% need alcohol or drug treatment, 44% do not have GED, 25% are below functional literacy, 21% are in need of mental health treatment, 4% are mentally disabled and over half (51%) were unemployed at the time of the crime (Baumanne, 2003). Looking at these statistics, one can see how necessary effective and appropriate programming in prisons should be *if* we, as a society demanded recidivist crime rates to fall. “Nationally, about 64% of all inmates are involved in prison industry, 33% are receiving educational/vocational training, 13% drug treatment, 4% mental health therapy and 1% sex offender therapies (De Rosia, 1998, p. 20).”

It costs taxpayers approximately, \$30,000, annually, per inmate incarcerated (De Rosia, 1998). With this money, most is allocated to administrative and officer salaries, overhead

expenses, food and medical services (i.e. security & punishment) (De Rosia, 1998). “Security always takes precedence over treatment” in most U.S. prisons today, as the main goals to detain, incapacitate and punish are still pervading (De Rosia, 1998, p. 19). The demographics, economic backgrounds and traits of most inmates are shared surprisingly, in common: the poor, the ethnic minorities, the young, the male, the under-educated and the prior criminal (Baumanne, 2003). Statistics are useful in grasping a sense of the prison population as a whole, and also at determining the supposed, “blind equality” of our criminal justice system.

Qualitative Research Methods

One aspect of qualitative research includes interviewing critical subjects to the research with open-ended and exploratory questions, which this research specifically utilizes in order to extract the most current and relevant practices in the field of arts programming in prisons (Leedy, 2001). After the field notes are examined the researcher synthesized the information into the most useable format, a programming model. Building a useable product from exploratory research is a common outcome from qualitative research which in turn, has the opportunity to lead to further research and inquiry (Leedy, 2001).

Due to the exploratory nature of investigating two usually non-related fields, arts programming and corrections – the researcher utilized qualitative techniques to help build cohesion and relevance to both fields.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine *how* current prison arts programmers organize, fund, develop, execute and maintain an arts program in prison. After answering these questions, the researcher summarized the data retrieved from prison arts facilitators, and related literature, in order *to develop* a prison arts programming model to be utilized by arts programmers in both prison and non-prison settings.

DATA COLLECTION

The qualitative methods in this study for data collection included an extensive literature review and interviews. Techniques utilized are described in this chapter under the sub-headings of ‘Literature Review’ and ‘Interviews.’

Literature Review

Due to the exploratory nature characterized in qualitative research, the researcher began with an exploratory and extensive literature search. Information was collected online and at the University libraries using keyword phrases and subheadings which appear in the literature review: “prison art”, “outsider art”, “art therapy”, “prison arts programming”, “arts programming”, “prison history”, “prison rehabilitation”, “jail-house art”, “incarcerated art”, “prison art history”, “leisure in prison”, “prison culture”, “correctional culture”. One resource, Phyllis Kornfeld’s *Cellblock Visions – Prison Art in America*, proved to be an extremely useful collection of prison art history, prison arts funding trends and examples of one prison art

facilitator's experience over the past 20 years (1997). Kornfeld's research was drawn upon to assist in narrowing the research topic and choosing keywords to begin the literature search.

The researcher attended a Fall Term 2003 graduate level sociology class entitled, "Crime and Social Control" which provided the appropriate and current data and statistics needed to build an accurate view of the prison system, theories and its demographics and rehabilitative programs (Baumanne, 2003). Useful texts and additional information from this class were incorporated into the literature review pertaining to prison art programming and helped the researcher narrow the topic and to determine sub-questions used in the interview. The literature was organized into groups based on content, such as: 'art therapy', 'leisure theory,' and 'prison history' and then was later synthesized and combined to better address current concerns in the prison arts programming field.

Interview

Based on previous work conducted in 2001-2002 for prison art shows and in a juvenile detention center working with youth and art, the researcher chose the topic of prison arts programming. After speaking to those involved in the field of corrections and prison art shows in the community the researcher was recommended to interview two key arts facilitators with upstanding reputations, knowledge and experience to further enhance the research. It was also important to have two different types of prisons be represented to ensure a more balanced representation of current practices. One subject had worked 30 years at a County Jail and the other subject had worked 20 years at a Federal Prison.

Twenty open-ended and qualitative questions were formulated to address pertinent concerns related to literature findings and the researcher's experience in the field. Open-ended

questions with probes were used in order to promote a more narrative and qualitative method of interviewing that might extract more information based on examples and experiences within the field of prison arts programming. The questions were given to the interviewee, a week prior to the interview. The questions and proposal were approved by the University of Oregon on March 12, 2004, under listing #E395-04. These original questions and Protocol are noted in Appendix E.

INTERVIEW DATA ANALYSIS

Field notes were organized, analyzed and combined and compared to known sources in the literature and on the web. Follow up research was made in the instances where subjects recommended certain unexplored websites and sources to ensure a more thorough and all encompassing programming model product would be developed. Subjects were referenced in the findings in confidential terms: “Federal Prison Facilitator” and “County Jail Facilitator.”

Findings were drawn into a useable and accessible format, by grouping and organizing common themes into a theoretical model prison arts program. This model was created to be used in both the prison arts programming setting and in the community arts setting in the hope of creating partnerships, collaborations and establishing a wider definition of community arts programming. The model is the end product of exploratory research, utilizing qualitative research methods and open-ended interview strategies and is discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Results & Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine *how* current prison arts programmers organize, fund, develop, execute and maintain an arts program in prison. After answering these questions, the researcher summarized the data retrieved from prison arts facilitators, and related literature, in order *to develop* a prison arts programming model to be utilized by arts programmers in both prison and non-prison settings.

DATA REVIEW & PROCEDURE

Two arts facilitators were contacted about participating in this study. The first agreed, Sister Margaret Graziano of the Lane County Jail and the second, the Sheridan Federal Prison near Portland, Oregon was unable to assist due to time and federal constraints regarding research within the prison. The researcher contacted the first arts facilitator, a chaplain and thirty year volunteer from the Lane County Jail in Eugene, Oregon. After the questions were submitted to her, reviewed and signed, a meeting was scheduled for April 26, 2004.

The interview took place in a casual setting near the jail and concluded after two hours. Notes were taken and recorded as the facilitator answered the prepared questions with narrative and examples. The chaplain also brought with her many copies of hand-written notes given to her from inmates after art classes. These notes and remembrances are recorded below in question and answer format as transcribed from the researcher's hand written notes. Examples of prison art work, posters for art shows and photos of past shows were also shared at this time. Photographs were also taken of the chaplain to be used during the public presentation. Selected

pictures taken during the interview and artwork presented to the researcher appear in Appendix C and D.

Summarized Transcript for Interview with Sister Margaret Graziano, April 26, 2004

Q: What arts programming exists within this institution currently, past and future?

A: ...handkerchief, paper mache, cards, tissue art (tissue, glue and cardboard) piñata, soap carving (such as the Madonna, which was later identified as contraband), envelope art “the post office just loves that”, annual calendar, mural at the old jail, art therapy in drug rehabilitation programs in the Intensive Treatment Program (10 men/women, art twice a week included in programming). We don’t have art every week – twice a month in the ‘G-Dome’ which is for the GED inmates. All different kinds of media is allowed, certain types aren’t. For example, oil is not allowed due to its odor and that it could be inhaled. Chalk, pencil and watercolor are the most prominent. In the privileged ‘G-Dome’ educational dorm, everything is in a box, labeled for each table and the group is accountable for the items being returned at the end of the session. They don’t ever miss an art class! There are two weekly art classes done by two volunteer women which enable the prisoners to make crafts that they can send home to their families. They’ve never failed to come to this class either! Only one dorm has this special craft class and the rest of the jail depends on me [Sister Margaret]. Often, I am asked to “Come see my art.” I do visit them and talk about their work. I can also send 10 sheets of paper to anyone because I have been here so long and the administration and prisoners respect me so much. I even have collected art work from these pencil drawings. I think I’m keeping peace by allowing paper.

Q: Who runs, coordinates and supervises inmate arts programs and activities?

A: In the G-Dome, I observe a trained art therapist twice a month, in the Intensive Treatment Program I teach art and art therapy twice a week. My role is that of the Catholic Chaplain (appointed), my title is the Assistant Volunteer Coordinator. These positions require me to: respond to inmate requests, counseling, help them when things like their glasses, are broken, cashing checks, attaining postage for foreign mail, spiritual consultation and even vouchers for clothes from St. Vincent de Paul's once they've been released and don't have anyone else to go to. I also assist at 'Recovery Houses' which there are about 12 in Eugene. I try not to do things that they can do themselves – enabling or manipulative. There is also a community center house behind the jail that is a transitional house ran through the jail, where women have art once a month, and I buy the materials for that class as well. The Force Work Camps (FWC) in Alma, Oregon has a group that makes Christmas ornaments every year and occasional other art projects. Ninety men live there and are used sometimes to fight fires, plant flowers or even perform as musicians for some certain events.

Q: How long have you been involved in prison arts programs?

A: I started by teaching at the McLaren School for Boys in Woodburn, Oregon. I had nine boys the first year, and nine boys and one girl the second year. I would do art everywhere I could. Next, I worked for ten summers at the YMA – Young Musicians and Artist camps, which were two week sessions at Willamette University. At Lee Falls I took courses from an art therapist in town, "Expressive Therapies" and the work with the patients was displayed at a Eugene Hilton exhibit. I took my first art course as an adult at Marylhurst where I found that you can find something good in everybody's art. At the Waldorf school, where I worked next, I observed how they did everything in art. Students were given blank notebooks for taking notes

in class, one side designated for class-related notes and one for art. They connected art with everything. I've done art in every treatment program I've been in including McLaren, the Behanna House for Women, the children's house, Rainbows Unlimited. Most of the time I was observing art therapists and teaching. I don't have to have money to do things for the jail. If I have a creative idea – you start there, with small things.

Q: What noticeable benefits do rehabilitative programs have on inmate orderliness, general health and overall condition?

A: The beginning artist develops a skill they didn't know they had. Imagination – they draw things they miss: air, children, women... The Lane County Jail has offenders from anywhere from 2 days to over one year on average. There are approximately 358-410 prisoners in here on any given day. My art programs give them hope and serenity. Once, I had a project where these recovering addicts were to make ponderosa pine needle baskets for an art therapy project. I ran into one of the women years after she had recovered and she thanked me, telling me that she had kept her basket and it had kept her sober. I often run into people now on the outside who still have a piece of art from one of my classes, that they hated (sometimes) at the time, and now it is something very precious to them. Inmates that have art programs do not come back, less than 5% [referencing a study she recalls]. It also helps in building group experiences and accountability. Sometimes they just sit there in front of what they did, and stare. Often, arts programs show a change in attitude, help the inmate to cope with addictions or sadness, gives them a high similar to their addiction, and reduces recidivism. Sometimes when they first come, they draw from the dark-side and as they gain more peace while in jail, their pictures change, reflecting serenity. It just changes their lives. They need to be doing things. They need outlets.

I always remind them that, “Jail is not forever.” In the LifeSkills class, they read children’s stories and they take turns practicing their reading, expression and group speaking. Their favorite book is always the *Gingerbread Man*.

Q: Has your institution ever worked in conjunction with outside arts organizations to provide arts programming?

A: ITP-art program, and Art Bridge money, they just ask you what you need? Donations are often given – one man gave a whole garage full of arts supplies to the jail. The community needs to know that there is talent in prisons ... and that we do need to exhibit it. The Hult Center has exhibited some work and twice a year I attend the ACA (American Correctional Association), the ‘voice of corrections’ bring an art show from our inmates at the Lane County Jail. The courthouse, Maude Kearns (in collaboration with Sponsors), Morning Glory restaurant, other restaurants and I am hoping to seek out other museums and galleries in the community. I gave a stack of calendars to the post office and they always are popular. It is important for the people to see it. People think nothing good can come out of prisons. They’re wrong. There is also a volunteer that teaches poetry in the community. We exhibited art with poetry once in a restaurant. Last year, at I-CAN (International Correctional Art Network) a group brought 85 belts to sell that were made in prison and some bring framed pictures under glass for sale. Springfield City Hall displayed clay masks that were created by inmates under the supervision of a local artist. She took and fired their work and they colored them. This involved a treatment program where the inmates created one mask that showed them when they were addicted and one after they were recovered. This program was called, “Passages” and was very powerful and intimate.

Q: What concerns do administration and officers have regarding security and contraband issues relating to arts materials?

A: Some of the officers don't appreciate any type of treatment that defines them as human beings and other officers will seek out those inmate artists for me and tip me off. These officers often perceive the artists as unique and brilliant and are the most positive to work with. Some officers don't like volunteers, art programs or that my motives are much higher. We have mostly young deputies, they're being trained so well too. They do see a lot of me and build respect for what I know. I once had an argument over a bulletin board that some inmates made as a group that one of the officers believed carried gang-related references, so we had to take it down. Otherwise, most bulletin boards are holiday theme related and brighten up the place.

Data Synthesizing Process

The researcher reviewed and synthesized findings from both the interview and the literature by subject areas mentioned, within the frequency of the questions asked and the answers given. Regarding arts programming in prisons, these main subject areas arose within the literature and the interview:

- sustainability and funding sources,
- perceptions (prisoner/prison/community),
- identity of programmers/facilitators.

The researcher's findings were then broken down into the same categories.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

After combing the data collected from the interview with Sister Margaret Graziano and the literature review, three main subject areas arose: sustainability of programs, perceptions (both inside and outside the prison community), and the consistency in supporting a facilitator. The three areas are discussed in further detail below.

Sustainability of Programs

Prison arts programs are not sustainable due to the infrequency of funding, from both government and granting sources, resulting in inconsistent, often unpaid and unprepared arts program facilitators. Sustainability is crucial in developing consistent funding, community support and knowledgeable facilitators.

Prison arts programs are not initiated through the prison system of administration, they are initiated through individual interest, matched with skill, donation or granted funds (Graziano, 2004). Prison arts programs are not directly sustained through the prison administration, they are sustained by motivated individuals, usually volunteers and artists in the community (Graziano, 2004). Due to the sporadic and dwindling nature of local, state and federal monies spent on any form of rehabilitation – prison arts programs are among the first to be cut or pushed aside. Not only do prison budgets lead to sporadic arts programming, but so does the characteristics of the facilitator. Most facilitators are volunteers, unpaid, retired or university students there for the short-term (Graziano, 2004). Funding that does not come directly from the prison's annual budget for arts programming most likely comes from state and federal grants that are short-term in length (1-3 years) and often do not have the ability to be renewed (Graziano, 2004).

Most agree that prisons are first and foremost a place of punishment, incarceration and community deterrence but rehabilitative facilitators, prison administration and granting agencies also understand the value of rehabilitation and socialization within prison but all would agree that it comes last when addressing the needs of a society.

Perceptions

A second common theme was the vital importance in building and shaping the community's perception of prison arts program. 'Community' encompasses the prisoner, the prison administration, and non prison-community members.

Sister Graziano believes that most likely, the general public does not fully understand the nature of prison arts programming, nor the positive effects it could have on the offender and the community (2004). Hence, misperceptions develop relating to rehabilitative prison programs and are socially manifested in the news, media and politics. The prison community (employees and administration) seems to understand and support most of the efforts and projects developed by prison arts programs but sometimes finds offense to some of the subject matter and freedom of materials which both could become an issue effecting overall prison safety (Graziano, 2004). In the appendix, Sister Margaret's inmate evaluations of her programs indicated a strong appreciation and growth from her programs and attentions [Appendix C]. Prisoners, in general, appreciate and benefit from time spent in a prison arts program or with the inherent therapy of art making itself (Graziano, 2004).

Perceptions and understanding of the immediate and long term benefits for a prisoner and the community are most fully understood within the prison system. The community at large, media and politics have a more reserved, punitive stance on prison rehabilitation in general most

likely due to the lack of positive and comprehensive knowledge regarding arts programming in prisons and the lack of funds for social programs state and nationwide.

The Programmer/Facilitator

Thirdly, the literature and interview data identified the need for consistency in facilitating and driving the arts program in prisons. Consistency in developing, evaluating and maintain relationships between the prison community and the outside community is vital to developing relationships and programming for this group of people.

Sister Margaret believes that due to the infrequent funding sources and the lack of community knowledge and awareness regarding the existence or the possibility of existence of prison arts programs, the position of facilitator is often inconsistent and variable (2004). Most arts programmers within the prison are volunteers, retired arts educators, artists in the community paid by a grant for a short term or interested university students studying the arts or art therapy (Graziano, 2004). Arts programming is usually labeled as an ‘education program’, available (when available) to those offenders that are eligible and needing GED requirements, such as the ‘G-Dome’ in the Lane County Jail (Graziano, 2004). If the GED instructor is knowledgeable about the arts or decides to combine the arts in his or her curricula, arts programming can occur (Graziano, 2004).

Essentially, arts programmers can be anyone – the variable seems to be the willingness of the institution to support rehabilitative efforts and the acceptance on the part of the facilitator that funds and materials are more than likely going to be scarce. The title is most often held by an individual volunteer, who has attained some level of arts education and is usually related to the overall education department of the prison. The most common characteristic of a prison arts

facilitator, hinges on the willingness and initiative of the *individual* to initiate, create, educate and sustain the program his or herself, relying on outside resource donation and materials (Graziano, 2004).

CHAPTER V

Summary & Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine *how* current prison arts programmers organize, fund, develop, execute and maintain an arts program in prison. After answering these questions, the researcher summarized the data retrieved from prison related sources (e.g. arts facilitators, documents) in order *to develop* a prison arts programming model to be utilized by arts programmers in both prison and non-prison settings.

After examining the role of a volunteer arts program facilitator, Sister Margaret Graziano, at the Lane County Jail in Eugene, Oregon and comparing her statements and observations with an extensive literature review, the researcher has summarized and characterized the key relationships and ingredients that make up a successful and functioning prison arts program. Prison arts programs are often only as successful as the perseverance of their volunteer facilitators. This research and summary can be used as a tool to initiate, educate, and sustain a prison arts program in a community.

SUMMARY OF PROCEDURES AND FINDINGS

The researcher began this project by conducting a thorough literature review in the areas of prison history, prison theory and practice, prison arts programming past and present, art therapy in prisons and arts program theory. After combing knowledge and resources from across the two fields of arts administration and prison administration, overall observations were noted. The literature pointed to a lack of understanding from both fields about prison art and its benefits and outcomes. Little was known about the facilitators of these programs, nor how they were

initiated, funded or maintained. The researcher was directed to make contact with a local prison arts programmer, Sister Margaret Graziano of the Lane County Jail in Eugene, Oregon.

After interviewing the volunteer and summarizing her statements into categories and identifying common themes of importance and relevance to the study, the researcher cross-applied the statements with the literature review and developed a Model Prison Arts Program. This program model was developed to be used as a procedural and accessible sample for future prison arts programmers to follow and for outside community collaborators (arts administrators) to understand and participate in its process.

CONCLUSIONS

The *Prison Arts Programming Model* [see Appendix B for diagram] begins with widespread community support and understanding. The ‘community’ includes prison administration, prisoners, community members and businesses and artists who will possibly participate. Positive and informed statistics and details defining and explaining to the general public regarding agenda of prison arts programming is necessary to initiate interest, promote understanding and gain continued support throughout the process. This can be accomplished through arts education in schools, partnerships and community campaigns that facilitate understanding and knowledge.

Next, the *Model Program* depends on this community support to manifest itself into consistent funding. Funding from all levels of government, on a reliable basis is determined by the trend and shift in prison administration, sentencing and many other legalities. However, prisons also can receive a large amount of monies from the city, county, state and federal departments simply by applying for grants and/or filing an unmet need that the community

(voters and taxpayers) deem valuable. Outside funding and collaborations can be formed, based on the extent of community support and understanding previously mentioned.

After bringing together community support, and soliciting consistent funding, the final ingredient, a consistent facilitator can be recruited and maintained. It is important for any arts program to have good leadership, especially in an environment as volatile and political as a prison. A familiar facilitator will ideally know the administration, have built trust within the inmate community and be an advocate to the outside. Sister Margaret has been with the Lane County Jail for over thirty years – and her presence and reputation have given her many opportunities for arts program creation (2004).

These three ingredients, community support, funding, and a consistent facilitator begin the cycle of prison arts programming. First the institution and the facilitator should primarily (and continually) be trained on new techniques in art therapy and arts education. After training, the community and the prison can more readily work together to build collaborations and programming that brings mutual benefit to both parties. These collaborations must be evaluated by the inmates, the involved parties and the prison administration, to ensure a common goal has been reached. The cycle begins again, following this summative evaluation, but always focuses heavily on the main factors of consistent and successful arts programming in prisons: community support through knowledge building, consistent funding sources and a consistent facilitator of these programs.

IMPLICATIONS

This research is useful and unique to the field of arts administration and prison administration because it utilizes past and current trends in prison theory and discipline together

with past and current knowledge in the field of prison arts programming. The latter is a very un-researched, and undocumented field of our artistic society. Learning and understanding the environment from which this type of art is created can be helpful in building sustainable collaborations with community and art organizations interested in furthering their definition of ‘community outreach’ through prison art programming.

As the researcher has indicated, the first step in beginning the process of building and sustaining a successful prison arts program is building an accurate and honest body of community support and knowledge. This project, with its cross-discipline literature review, interviews and programming model can be viewed as initializing that first step in the arts programming process, by collaborating research in disciplines through a common goal. Building a knowledge base that appeals to, and identifies with both the prison administrations goals, the needs of the prisoner, the concerns of the greater community, and the goals and missions of arts organizations will forever be complicated and highly volatile due to the nature of prison ‘rehabilitation’ in the United States and the political aspects that surround its funding sources. However, this research can serve as a catalyst for ideas and a starting point for an arts organization involvement with the prison community.

The model program identified in this project can also be applied to other communities of people or collaborative programs that rely on interdependence and community understanding to initiate and sustain funding and support. Examples of this include, other rehabilitative programs such as drug treatment, abuse victim support centers, or juveniles in detention centers or foster homes. The model reinforces community interdependence by requiring community support and understanding at the front-end, as well as requiring a collaborative community organizational partnership to be sought midway through the programming process. This method assures that the

prison arts programming model is consistently a community-based and supported program.

Keeping the community involved and informed throughout the process is the best way to ensure stability in public support, and therefore funding.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The information generated by this research project provides essential information that would be useful in motivating an organization, a board, or a future prison arts volunteer to get involved, to make a change, or to simply learn more about the current situation in their local prison community. Above all, this information should create an awareness about this often overlooked population and reinforce the importance that outreach can play in creating a more understanding, tolerant and accepting community through arts programming in prisons.

This project can also serve as a springboard for new, more current and more extensive research. The literature review, alone can serve as a comprehensive overview of theories from both the arts and prison fields and can be used to more finely narrow future research in either field. Due to the time and scope of the research project, the author did not have time to research as many of the institutions or facilities, that have participated in arts programming first-hand. Additional interviews and accounts of prison arts programming can not only serve to enhance and strengthen the conclusions found in this study, but has the potential to also reach a larger audience, possible organizations, and administrators in the field which could lead to actual programming initiation.

The arts programming model, itself, can be utilized in a multitude of settings and organizations which depend on widespread community support and understanding to initiate funding and therefore, successful programming. The model also includes the concept of

‘collaboration’ as a key ingredient of community based programming. It is a unique model in that it depends so heavily on the community’s knowledge and involvement level, rather than that of the organization alone.

Overall, this research should be viewed as an expansion of the often pre-determined and overlooked definition of ‘community.’ Prisons are communities. Inmates are released from prisons and jails and become community members. It is necessary to include this group of people in our arts programming decisions and missions, if not only to truly provide outreach of a new and different kind to a very responsive and grateful group of individuals that have the possibility and capability of taking more from the experience than almost any other group an organization may seek out? The first step is acknowledging that prisons contain people. The second step is including these people in community programming efforts. The best way to accomplish this is through community support, education and collaboration.

REFERENCES

- Baumann, E. (2003). *Crime and Social Control*. University of Oregon
Department of Sociology. Lectures Sept-Dec, 2003: Eugene, OR.
- Bishop, Bill (August 32, 2003). "Many honor her handiwork: Sister Margaret Graziano's
help and art therapy for inmates are praised." Register Guard: Eugene, Oregon.
- Crooke, D. & Baldwin, P. (1993). *Psychology in prisons*. New York: Routledge.
- De Rosia, Victoria (1998). *Living inside prison walls – Adjustment behavior*.
London: Prager.
- Foucault, Michael (1995). *Discipline and punishment – The birth of the
Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Fuller, John (1998). *Criminal justice: A peacemaking perspective*. Boston:
Allyn and Bacon.
- International – Correctional Arts Program, I-CAN.
<http://www.state.de.us/correct/Data/Programs/PrisonArts.htm> Retrieved: 1/30/2004.
- Kappeler, V. & Blumberg, M., Potter, G. (2000). *The Mythology of crime and
Criminal justice*, 3rd Ed. Prospect Heights: IL: Waveland Press.
- Kleiber, Douglas (1999). *Leisure experience and human development – A
Dialectical interpretation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kornfeld, Phyllis (1997). *Cellblock Visions- Prison art in America*. Princeton,
NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Leedy, Paul D. and Jeanne Ellis Ormrod (2001). *Practical research – Planning and design*.
Seventh Edition. Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hill.
- Liebmann, Marian, Ed. (1994). *Art therapy with offenders*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Malchiodi, Cathy A. (1998). *The Art therapy sourcebook – art making for personal growth, insight, and transformation*. Lincolnwood, IL: Lowell House.
- Reasons, C. & Conley, D. & Debro, J. (2000). *Race, class, gender and justice in The United States*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Riley, Shirley (1999). *Contemporary art therapy with adolescents*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Stuert, Patricia A. (1993). *Opening the museum: History and strategies towards more inclusive institution*. Boston: The Children's Museum.
- Ulman, E. & Dachinger, P. (eds.) (1975). *Art therapy – In theory and practice*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Wadeson, Harriet (1992). *A guide to conducting art therapy research*. Mundelein, IL: American Art Therapy Association.
- Williams, G & Wood, M. (1997). *Developmental Art Therapy*. London: University Press.