

Shakespeare in Shackles: Pedagogical Experiment and Cultural Activity in a French Prison

Christine Evain, Delphine Saurier, Spencer Hawkrigde

► **To cite this version:**

Christine Evain, Delphine Saurier, Spencer Hawkrigde. Shakespeare in Shackles: Pedagogical Experiment and Cultural Activity in a French Prison. *International Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2018, 6 (3), pp.20. 10.11114/ijsss.v6i3.2972 . hal-01972435

HAL Id: hal-01972435

<https://hal.univ-rennes2.fr/hal-01972435>

Submitted on 7 Jan 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Shakespeare in Shackles: Pedagogical Experiment and Cultural Activity in a French Prison

Christine Evain¹, Delphine Saurier², Spencer Hawkrigde¹

¹Dpt. of Communication, Foreign Languages & Corporate Cultures, Centrale Nantes, France

²Communications and Culture Dpt., Audencia Business School, France

Correspondence: Christine Evain, Dpt. of Communication, Foreign Languages & Corporate Cultures, Centrale Nantes, France.

Received: January 2, 2018

Accepted: January 29, 2018

Available online: February 2, 2018

doi:10.11114/ijsss.v6i3.2972

URL: <https://doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v6i3.2972>

Abstract

As cultural activities in prisons expand, institutions are recognizing the need for research on impact in order to optimize these activities. In this article, our team presents findings on a recent teaching experiment concerning literature workshops that brought together male inmates and university students over an 18-month period at the Centre de Détention de Nantes in France. Our qualitative approach explores an ethical question: What are our responsibilities towards all the parties involved in this teaching experiment? Two important and apparently conflicting findings come to the fore. First, the responsibility of teachers is to accompany the desires of students and inmates in their permanent negotiation with the apparatus itself. Second, workshop organizers need to reflect on their own responsibility concerning the way the workshop contributes to the institutionalization of the prison.

Keywords: cultural activities, prison, responsibility, pedagogic innovation, literature workshop, apparatus

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

There has been rising enthusiasm among cultural institutions about collaborating with penal institutions to take cultural activities into prisons. Sociologists seeking to understand the impact of these cultural activities (Note 1) on inmates are confronted with numerous questions: how do inmates respond when they are given access to cultural activities? How do we measure the impact of such activities? How can this be achieved within the context of national institutions and penal legislation? An increasing amount of research in different countries has pointed to the benefits of cultural initiatives in prisons, e.g., USA (Brewster, 2014; Cohen, 2009), (Gussak, 2007), UK (Clements, 2004), (Tett, Anderson, McNeill, Overy, & Sparks, 2012), Japan (Weschler, Brown, & Kimzey, 1995), Africa (Schrift, 2006). As such activities in prisons expand, especially artistic activities, institutions are recognizing the need for research on the impact in order to optimize them in a responsible manner. The question of responsibility is a key focus of this paper. It is inspired by the cultural workshop program the authors conducted in a prison that enacts their own sense of social and psychological responsibility towards workshop participants.

These workshops encourage interaction between inmates and university students by taking the latter into prison cultural activities that centre on exploring literature. While many researchers have attempted to demonstrate the value of such cultural initiatives for inmates, it is also interesting to explore the value university students derive from their insight into “prison life” (Note 2). Higher education institutions such as Paris Ovest University (Note 3) are providing opportunities for students to interact with inmates in prison in order to challenge pre-conceived notions about the judicial system, prison population and prison life. The question of responsibility is thus twofold: what are the teachers’ responsibilities in relation to both the inmates and the university students? What kind of pedagogical framework best addresses this question of responsibility?

In this article, our team of inter-disciplinary researchers presents findings on a teaching experiment that took place over an 18-month period at the Centre de Détention de Nantes (CDN), in collaboration with the Ecole Centrale de Nantes (ECN). The initial question driving our research was ethical:

RQ: What are our responsibilities towards all the parties involved in this teaching experiment?

This research question is motivated by a desire to construct an ethically-responsible pedagogical framework, in collaboration with our University (ECN), Research Lab (Audencia Research) and the association in charge of the cultural programs in the prison (Ligue de l'Enseignement, LLE). The pedagogical framework was a literature workshop inspired by Laura Bate's example (2011), with an extra component, which, following in Guy Casadamont's footsteps (Note 4), was the ECN students' involvement. The special focus in our case was on the generation of ethically-responsible interactions between students and inmates (in a all-male prison).

The workshop we offered spanned the clearly-defined boundary between literary discussion and the more intimate and personal sphere. The challenge was to protect the private and personal histories of the inmates and students, and to ensure the latter's psychological and physical safety (Note 5). It is thus our responsibility to maintain these boundaries and to ensure that the discussions were kept within the defined framework.

The structure of this paper follows the unique logic of our research process. First, we describe the workshop and our workshop objectives. We then present the literature, especially Foucault, Deleuze and Guattari's theories, which provided the theoretical framework used to hone our research hypothesis and methodology. In analyzing the literature, the characteristics and efficiency of the pedagogical "apparatus" (Foucault, 1975) is discussed, leading us to raise the question of its evolution under given constraints (Note 6). We show how Deleuze and Guattari's theory (1972, 1980) concerning "lines of flight" and the "desiring production" at work explains the apparatus of our experiment and the way it is constantly evolving. Finally, we present our research findings. The discussion of these findings leads us to outline our future perspectives on cultural action in prison.

1.2 "Shakespeare in Shackles ECN Workshop": A Pedagogical Experiment

Before we present our research question in relation to our workshop, we will describe the general objectives of this project as well as the practical organization we put in place. The program ran for 18 months and included 2 sessions in 2015 and 12 sessions the following year. The purpose of these sessions was for ECN students and inmates to come together as a group and to discuss literature (on the principle of one Shakespeare play per session). For the students, this was an innovative pedagogical initiative, and for the prisoners, it was a cultural activity.

In 2015, two experimental sessions allowed us to test the workshop format and to refine it. These two initial test sessions helped us to determine group size, workshop content and classroom seating. We noticed for example that, in the first session, the inmates and students did not spontaneously sit together when they came into the classroom: the inmates came in first and occupied the back rows and therefore the ECN students occupied the front rows. In the second session, we removed the tables and arranged the chairs in a half-circle in order to encourage inmates and ECN students to mix. The format introduced in 2016 resulted from fine-tuning the 2015 program. The LLE helped us launch the program by coming into ECN in order to present the workshop requirements (in terms of dress code, behavior, etc.) and to respond to the students' questions. The LLE also helped us draft the schedule and signing up procedure for the coming year. Sixty ECN students thus signed up for the workshops. Because only 12-14 students at a time could be taken into the prison, a student group coordinator drafted and monitored a sign-up sheet for the 12 sessions scheduled over the year. The same student was also in charge of liaising with the LLE for prison pass requests (sending a scan of all the students' ID for a criminal record check). Prior to the workshop in the prison, a 1-hr preparation session was held at Ecole Centrale: the teacher introduced the play to the students, talking about the plot, the characters and focusing on some specific scenes, with readings of extracts from these scenes. This session also introduced video clips and video summaries of the plays. Following this one-hour meeting, the students went to the prison in the north of Nantes, where they were received and checked in by prison staff.

The students were provided with a 20-page document with a plot summary, a map of characters, scene summaries and extracts from the play in original Shakespearean English, as well as in modern day English. It was obviously not possible to work in the medium of English with the inmates and therefore it was necessary to produce a document in French that translated the text. The French version of the 20-page document was distributed to the inmates via the assistance of the cultural mediator of LLE, who printed out the teacher's document and put a printed copy in the internal mail for each inmate taking part in the workshop. In addition to this, the dramatized versions of the Shakespeare plays were brought into the prison session and viewed by the inmates in English with French subtitles. This did steal something of the character and atmosphere of the plays, but comprehension and engagement of the inmates held sway over textual authenticity.

Each in-prison session lasted two and a half hours, with the teacher running through the play from beginning to end, reading extracts and showing scenes from it. Both the ECN students and the inmates participated in the discussions about the play. For each extract, the teacher would map out analytical questions, at the same time allowing for spontaneous comments and reactions from the inmates and ECN students.

1.3 Objectives

Initially, the aim of the pedagogical innovation was to provide an English course aimed at mastering the language through the exploration of literature, since the students already had a high level of mastery of the language. When devising the program for our ECN students, after 2 initial pilot workshops held the previous Spring, we wondered what the students might learn from the pedagogical innovation and we discussed three major aspects: the workshops would offer more than literary analysis as they would provide proof to our students of how effective literature can be, provoking discussions with deep insights into human nature. The workshops would also provide an opportunity for metacognition, leading the students to reflect on how they, and the inmates, create a network of knowledge linked to Shakespeare's plays, and use this knowledge to examine "the human stuff we're made of". Finally, the workshops provided an opportunity for the students to understand how a pedagogical framework can function in 'extreme conditions', in other words, the prison context. Indeed, our literature workshops were designed to disseminate culture among publics considered as "prevented", i.e. to audiences that have been neglected or even traditionally excluded from cultural activities, and to publics considered as "non-publics" (Jacobi & Jason 2012), that is people who are simply not interested in culture. This is conducted within an institutional framework with a set of constraints. Consequently, the teachers in our team decided to get the ECN students to reflect on the workshop "apparatus" to help them to develop competencies beyond the field of literature and language. Our class touched on areas pertaining to human interaction, problem-solving and group dynamics. Thus, in the course objectives, we included such aims as the ability to:

- come up with creative, original and ingenious solutions
- recognize the specific elements of a problem
- identify the interactions and connections between elements
- propose/come up with several different solutions
- recognize the uncertainty inherent in complex situations/issues
- recognize/acknowledge the human dimension in the management of an organization
- develop an ethical and responsible style of management

We will come back to this list of competencies when we analyze the results of our experiment and research.

Moving on to the objectives for the inmates, let us first explain who the inmates in our workshop were. 20 inmates in the CDN doing university correspondence courses had been targeted by the cultural mediator (the other 270 inmates were not given the option because their educational level was below high school level, and they were being offered other courses). Eight people signed up for the workshop on a voluntary basis. These inmates explained their motivation during the feedback session. They said that their main objective was to learn more about Shakespeare's plays and that they were motivated by the idea of trying to read something challenging. They also indicated that they considered the workshop as a form of distraction or occupation to escape boredom. Although only one expressed an active interest in literature (the librarian inmate), the name Shakespeare had resonance and mystery for all the workshop members, even those who did not consider themselves literary. A considerable motivation for most inmates was the opportunity to interact with 'civilians' from the outside world and, although few of them admitted it directly, the presence of female students could not have been lost on them. It must also be said that inmates receive a good behavior report and are subject to remission for good behavior, so this is (or may be) another key incentive to participate in cultural and educational programs. It may even be the principal motivation for some, although this was not mentioned in the feedback session.

What are the institutional objectives? The CDN and the Penitentiary Service of Insertion and Probation (SPIP), who are respectively in charge of the supervision of the prisoners and their social reintegration, seek to fulfil the following missions: access to culture for all is a legal obligation. More specifically, for the CDN, cultural projects ensure "prison peace" thanks to their occupational dimension: in this, SPIP projects support the prison administration's mission of supervision. For SPIP, cultural projects are one of the instruments of social reintegration (alongside education and sports): they promote the acquisition of skills and know-how that are considered essential to guarantee employability. Moreover, the budgetary reality of the SPIP encourages them to forge partnerships with external structures: their objective is to enrich the cultural catalogue they have to offer and to do so with a limited budget. Collaborating with a university implies having access to rich cultural content at no financial cost.

When the ECN signed up for the prison session and when we launched the program with the LLE, the LLE specifically stated what the workshop would not be about. In the LLE's own terms: "The workshops would not be about providing therapy and psychological healing to the inmates. It would not be about "rescuing" anyone, offering the comfort inmates may need and long for. It would not be about gaining insight into the inmates' personal histories." The objectives of the LLE should be understood in the wider context of this institution. Indeed, the LLE is defined as follows:

“As a secular and independent institution, the League of Education brings together men and women who act on a day-to-day basis to support citizenship by promoting access to education, culture, recreation and sport.

Hundreds of thousands of volunteers and thousands of professionals are mobilized throughout France in nearly 30,000 local associations and a large network of social initiatives.

They provide the necessary resources, support and training in order to realize their initiatives and projects.

All wish to offer an alternative to the ‘everyone for himself’ motto.” (Note 7)

As a non-profit organization, the LLE has a humanist vocation and considers education and culture as levers to build a better world. It is in this perspective that the “Shakespeare in Shackles” project was adopted by the association. Taking students into prison means broadening their horizons, demystifying the place, and turning students into positive opinion leaders about the prison. The LLE mission is to put the prison on the city map, rather than ignoring its existence. That is why the LLE is also committed to informing students about prison life and following the experiment throughout the whole process.

Moving beyond our pedagogical goals as teachers – i.e. ensuring an English course – , our hope, on a human level, was to contribute to a form of “Restorative justice” (Zehr, 2005; Trenczek, 2013). According to the UN Economic and Social Council, “restorative justice” is defined as a “process by which the victim and the offender and, where appropriate, any other person or other member of the community suffering the consequences of an offense, participate actively in solving the problems arising from this offense, usually with the help of a facilitator.” In this context, the “Shakespeare in Shackles” workshop ensures, by substitution, the presence of the victims for the prisoners, in two ways. First, the Shakespearean narrative includes many perpetrators confronted with their crimes: through a possible identification game whereby the prisoners identify with Shakespeare’s criminal figures, a confrontation between the two can be achieved in relation to the fiction. In the same way as a meeting between victim and perpetrator can help the perpetrator to reflect on his/her deed, the workshop offered the opportunity of a meeting where representatives of a ‘privileged class’ are prepared to come into a classroom and relate to inmates: if the encounter is non-judgmental and fruitful in terms of the cultural initiative, the inmates may be made to feel “acceptable to ordinary civil society”. This can contribute to the threefold forgiveness process: “I forgive society”; “Society has forgiven me (I completed my sentence)”; “I forgive myself”. Whether this threefold forgiveness process can truly take place is the unanswerable question. We are ill-equipped to research this question because we are aware that the inmates create “personas” for our benefit and we cannot reach into their private thoughts and feelings (Note 8). However, our experiment also prompts a more objective research question and our focus is therefore on the mode of functioning of our workshop apparatus, the feedback from participants and the evolution of the apparatus over time.

Consequently, we offer literature and, more specifically, Shakespeare, as a theme for our workshop. Our team of teachers believes that the cathartic effect of literature can be powerful (Note 9). Theater workshops on Shakespeare’s work have been developed for many years in certain American prisons (Pensalfini, 2015; Buntaine, 2015, Herold & Wallace, 2014; Wrays, 2011). The analysis of these cases tends to demonstrate how the dramatic power of Shakespeare’s work acts in a special way on detainees, whether it be their behavior in detention or their relationship to the crime they have committed. For the workshop that concerns us, literature permits us to discuss personal things (emotions, impulses, etc.) without slipping into personal anecdotes. In keeping with the recommendations of the LLE, we explained to the ECN students that they could discuss characters and situations passionately, without telling other group members about their own private life – and that would set the example for the inmates to do the same. In other words, one of the workshop rules was to avoid discussing the inmates’ guilt or personal issues but to discuss stories which we supposed would resonate with their experience.

1.4 Literature Review

In France, it is customary to speak of a pedagogical “dispositif” – or framework – when referring to the design of a teaching framework that involves the use of objects and techniques in an interactional situation. The aim is to create a link between the learner and knowledge, placing the teacher in a mediation posture. From this perspective, the pedagogical framework is reminiscent of Actor network theory (Latour, 2005) which was primarily developed by Bruno Latour, Michel Callon and Madeleine Akrich in the 1980s. Bruno Latour and Steve Woolgar initiated the research in a 1979 book focusing on laboratory life. They showed how scientific discovery does not result from the achievement of one genius alone, but from networking – the linking of actors, objects, and even procedures. By the same token, in the education system, knowledge emerges through the joint action of a spatial configuration, the action of a teacher and learners, and the tools and methods used. This theory not only opens up the sociological discussion to include technical issues, but also allows researchers to take into consideration all the participants engaged in a given social phenomenon. The actors are not fixed in social positions that dictate their behavior, and so the researchers’ objective is to closely observe the relationships between participants, and to potentially identify behaviors that are outside the imposed social norms. Authors such as Tara

Fenwick and Richard Edwards (2012) demonstrated how this concept of the pedagogical framework, when applied to a classroom, helps to enhance knowledge appropriation. Thus, the Shakespeare workshop teachers defined themselves as mediators promoting interaction between the participants and bringing knowledge into the workshop. This can be considered as a pragmatic position with regard to a population that is not the teachers' usual audience, that is situated in a very different institutional context, and whose codes and standards are foreign, namely, the prison. It also alludes to a methodological stance which offers a clear identification of the workshop participants and the links between these participants within the context of the workshop (H1).

However, from the perspective of social analysis, the main criticism that can be formulated against Actor network theory is that it levels the differences between the social actors and objects, while obscuring the issues of power and domination. Thus, in a classroom, for instance, what interests a researcher using an ANT framework is to identify the occurrence of learning and the corresponding learning processes. This implies that they leave to one side the question of given status – teacher/student – which involves power games, or the issue of the participants' cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1979); yet these are central issues in the knowledge construction process. Turning specifically to our research object, the participants (inmates), the place (a prison), the procedures and institutions (penal and punitive) intrinsically point to the question of power. Cultural capital appears as a key variable in understanding what is at stake and what occurs between the different players involved: it is worth noting that the workshop brings together prison inmates and students from the Ecole Centrale – a university considered as one of the most prestigious engineering schools in France. It is clear that reference to Foucault's understanding of the “dispositif” (Note 10) is essential in this situation. He defines apparatus in relation to the various institutional, physical, material and administrative knowledge mechanisms and structures which enhance and maintain the exercise of power within the social body. According to Foucault, there is not one holder of power or one given structure that consciously predefines the type of coercion that will prevail, but an amalgam of elements that makes sense and allows a power structure to be put in place and to remain powerful. Thus, in *Discipline and Punishment*, Michel Foucault writes: “The prison town, with its imaginary ‘geopolitics’ is subjected to all other principles. The text of the Phalange recalls some of the most important principles: at the heart of this city and in order for the city to prevail, lies not a ‘power center’, not a core strength, but a multiple network of diverse elements – walls, space, institutions, rules, discourse; as for the model of the prison city, it is not to be understood as the king's body, with its emerging power, nor as the contractual meeting of wills giving birth to a body both individual and collective, but as the combination of strategic elements of a different nature and various levels.” (Foucault, 1975, p. 359) The analysis of the apparatus thus shifts from the pragmatic view with ANT to a panoptic view with Foucault: questions regarding modes of functioning, which are more profound because of the multitude of participants, lead to questions concerning social control, techniques and procedures, policies and social issues (H2).

Thus, Michel Foucault's theories go against the traditionally defined concept of power as a social relation between two agents. These agents may usefully be called the ‘powerful’ and the ‘powerless’ Traditionally, power is defined as the first agent exercising their will on the unwilling second, dominating, even silencing, the voice of the other. Foucault contests that power is based on a configuration dictated by the ‘powerful’ only. Foucault's theories replace a unitary and compact conception of power with a dynamic model in which power is seen as a network of relations that only exist in action. This power, which invests, in Foucault's terms, a social and individual body, then becomes not only a restrictive form of power but also a productive power, fostering the development of new institutional, organizational and subjugation modes. It is at this point that Foucault introduces the idea that power is linked to resistance: while submission models suggest compliance, they also contain actions likely to lead to resistance. These ideas can thus be applied to the analysis of our Shakespeare workshops: if the Shakespeare workshop apparatus can be considered as a framework for securing obedience and submission, can it also be considered as a strategic stage of power relations, carrying within it seeds of resistance (H3)? And, to follow Foucault, what type of resistance is at stake in this context: resistance to forms of domination? Resistance denouncing all forms of exploitation which separate the individual from his or her work? Resistance that fights against all forms of subjugation, and that separates the individual from him or herself? In order to tackle these questions, we examine the way the inmates and students respond to the framework and help to define it, even if they are not fully aware of their own contribution to its definition. Before completing this analysis inspired by the Foucauldian model, we will also incorporate Deleuze and Gattari's concept of “lines of flight” to highlight identifiable impulses by which participants express their individuality and seek to affirm it.

Indeed, Deleuze and Gattari's work calls our attention to the counter-normative processes that are set in motion within our experimental timeframe. According to Deleuze and Gattari, a counter-culture emerges when individuals or groups seek to escape the society of normalization and control that a previous generation helped to create. As Rayner says when analyzing the phenomenon of counter-culture through Deleuze and Gattari's critical lens, the driving impulse of counter-culture is not just to oppose the status quo: “it [is] to get free of it – to head for the horizon with bloodshot eyes on experimental lines of flight (fuite – which can mean leaking, fleeing, or escaping). “Lines of flight are bolts of pent-up

energy that break through the cracks in a system of control and shoot off on the diagonal. By the light of their passage, they reveal the open spaces beyond the limits of what exists.” (Rayner, 2013).

Indeed, in a series of books written with the militant psychotherapist Guattari, Deleuze linked human creativity to flight. “It is our desire to escape the status quo that leads us to innovate. Like the inmate, we dream of being anywhere but here. We coordinate, form alignments, combine our powers and innovate. We remake the world on creative new trajectories.” (Rayner, 2013). While this idea of “creative new trajectories” is attractive to project organizers and participants (as we will highlight in our results section), it is not the direction that we wish to follow – on the contrary, as the results of this experiment confirm, for reasons of caution, we seek to remain within the framework we defined when our workshop was first launched.

2. Method

Our research methodology is designed to test our hypothesis articulated around the following three points:

1. Our workshop is, in accordance with Foucault’s apparatus term, an ‘amalgam’ which involves the contribution of all participants: every partner (inmates, ECN students, teachers, researchers, CDN and the Ligue de l’Enseignement professionals’) plays a role in the co-construction of the literature workshop system.
2. The apparatus demonstrates its efficiency in disciplining “bodies and minds”. Indeed, the apparatus secures the active complicity of participants in the workshop and ensures that everyone is encouraged to toe the line.
3. Personalization processes (“subjectivation”, according to Foucault) are set in motion and generate further constraints on the apparatus: resistance. As Deleuze and Gattari point out, desiring-production are at work.

In order to examine these hypotheses, we collected information from the following participants: students, inmates, prison workers and cultural mediators, a prison researcher and the workshop teachers. Various forms of feedback were used which are outlined in the chart below and explained beneath the chart.

Table 1. Feedback formats

Feedback Participants	Students	Inmates	Prison workers	Prison researchers	Teachers
(Fa): Feedback meeting in prison (in 2016)	x	x	x	x	x
(Fb): Two written feedback reports from students (in 2015 and in 2016)	x				
(Fc): Two oral feedback sessions with students (in 2015 and in 2016)	x			x	x
(Fd): Review meeting (in 2016)			x	x	x
(Fe): Teachers’ observation journal (in 2015 and in 2016)					x
(Ff): Informal discussions after the prison sessions (in 2015 and in 2016)	x	x	x	x	x

(Fa): Feedback meeting in prison (in 2016): 2-hr focus group session where many participants discussed the workshops (20 participants were present). The main questions concerned:

- the inmates’ expectations prior to the workshops
- the inmates’ appreciation of the workshops (both in terms of content and interactions with ECN students and teachers)
- what the inmates learned from the experience
- suggestions for future workshop sessions.

(Fb): Two written feedback reports from students (in 2015 and in 2016). For the written feedback (60 questionnaires), the questions were grouped into four sections:

- students’ expectations
- perception of prison life
- what the students learned from the experience
- suggestions for future workshop sessions.

(Fc): Two oral feedback sessions with 40 students (in 2015 and in 2016): 2-hr focus group session. The oral feedback followed the same pattern as the written feedback. The discussion was led by the prison researcher in the presence of the

workshop teachers.

(Fd): Review meeting (in 2016). In this meeting, the participants were: the prison workers and cultural mediators (2), the prison researcher and teachers (3). The objective was to review the workshop experience of 2015-16 and map out the route for 2016-17. The main items on the agenda were:

- Analyzing the students' and inmates' feedback
- Analyzing the difficulties encountered during the year
- Finding ways to improve the workshop experience and avoid potential difficulties.

(Fe): Teachers' observation journal (in 2015 and in 2016). This Observation journal was divided into two parts: observing the inmates and observing the students (not only during the workshops, but as we traveled from ECN to the prison and back again)

(Ff): Informal discussions after prison sessions (in 2015 and in 2016) with all the participants except the inmates who went straight back to their cells.

Thus, the discussion sessions took place with the prison institution and the person in charge of cultural activities, and with our own team of researchers. These discussions were part of a global exploration with a sociological intervention logic (Tourraine, 1978), in the sense that the inmates and ECN students were considered as holders of a given understanding and knowledge of their own culture and environment.

3. Results: Collected Feedback

We first examine successively the different types of feedback from the point of view of the students, the inmates, the teachers and the workshop organizers. These points of view are then compared and contrasted in the second part of the results section, when we interpret the results in relation to our workshop and its future evolution.

3.1 Student Feedback

In quantitative terms, the written student feedback clearly showed sharp differences between the students who had come to prison just once (50%) and those who came to several sessions over the course of the year (50%). Nearly half of those who came to the prison with us only once were frustrated because they felt they didn't get a chance to have an in-depth discussion with the inmates. The students who attended the sessions regularly had a very different attitude to the framework we put in place and to the "no-personal-questions" rule. They actually felt protected by this rule. Because their profile is on social media, ECN students are aware that they can be contacted by the inmates who attended the workshops once the latter have left prison. This happened on one occasion: a female student was approached on Facebook. She did not respond to the inmate and sought guidance from her teachers. This incident provided an opportunity for further discussion about the framework put in place and, above all, about the cautious distance the teachers and prison researchers felt we needed to maintain. The cultural mediators of the LLE gave examples of situations where too much "naivety" on the part of prison visitors had led to catastrophic results, putting innocent parties in physical or psychological danger. It was important for the LLE to take part in this discussion as the teachers do not have the necessary prison experience to help ECN students understand what is at stake in such situations. The LLE based their advice on concrete and thought-provoking examples.

In relation to the four feedback sessions outlined in the previous section above, the main difference recorded between the comments from regular students and non-regular students were to be found in the C and D sections of the feedback (concerning what the students had learned from the experience and their suggestions for future workshop sessions), rather than in the first two sections. Indeed, the students' expectations (section A) when embarking on the program were similar in both groups: the students said they wanted to "get to know prison life"; "understand the conditions of inmates"; and "understand how cultural activities were received". Their perception of prison life (section B) was that it was "impressive" ("so many gates"). The students were surprised to see how involved the inmates were when discussing Shakespeare: "They were even more eager to participate than we were."; "We felt intimidated by their enthusiasm."

What the non-regular students learned from the experience was expressed in rather vague terms: "It was the most interesting experience this year"; "It helped us realize what prison life was like"; "I learned that what you see about prison in TV shows or movies is very different in real life", etc. The most insightful comments came from the regular students who came up with remarks such as: "They're no different from us"; "We couldn't wrap our heads around why they were actually here"; "Their appreciation of Shakespeare's plays was insightful"; "They understood the characters' complexities almost better than we did."

The students also commented on the power of literature. In the workshops, discussions about many of Shakespeare's characters led the students to remark that "we are all made of the same human stuff": the desire to have power, the dark impulses (greed, jealousy, etc.), the manipulation strategies – these are all part of every human being. Our choice of

corpus gave us many opportunities to explore the theme of “why people go off the rails”. Our unspoken question was whether the inmates saw themselves in some of the “baddies”? Many tragic figures in the corpus (Note 11) are both good and bad, and the inmates can identify with them. As the ECN students equally identify with these figures, it can create a bond between the two groups – a sense that they are no different deep down.

The students who took part in more than one workshop understood why we avoided discussing the inmates’ guilt or personal issues, preferring to discuss stories which we imagine resonate with their individual experiences. As one student said: “Incarceration must bring about a desire to touch ‘normality’ and to feel like they are back in the mainstream. In prison, by definition, they are not themselves, but ‘changelings’ who must adapt to different environments throughout the prison day and their prison life. They can only ever be part of who they are and the parts that are displayed change with the context. In a way they are acting and there is obviously a little irony that they attend a class about a writer who has inspired the greatest actors. Perhaps some have a moment when the light comes on and they engage in the subject matter and start to value it for itself and not simply as a means to an end.”

The suggestions for future workshop sessions came mostly from the regular students. Indeed, while the non-regular students mainly suggested “more communication with the inmates”, the regular students’ feedback was more in-depth. In terms of practical organization, they suggested being more involved, and building up our group’s Facebook page to include a journal. The group coordinator came up with several ideas to improve the collaborative document system for the students to sign. This document is now being shared with the LLE direct, to simplify the administrative work.

In terms of the workshop itself, they suggested:

- a different seating arrangement, which was immediately put into place;
- a student-driven system for the preparation of the workshop content and document;
- an enlargement of the literary corpus for the following year.

To conclude with the student feedback, the prison project provided ECN students with the opportunity to develop the set of competencies listed in the first section of this paper and to do so in a very concrete manner. The suggestions summarized above revealed their ability to understand the complexity of putting into place such cultural initiatives in prison. When asked about their perception of the framework, the way it functions and its evolution, they pointed to the danger of “getting too close to the inmates” and “creating false hopes”. They found the framework devised for the prison workshop useful and suggested that any changes to the workshop should mainly involve enlarging the corpus and practical elements concerning the organization. For more in-depth preparation and study of the documents, our students demonstrated that they were capable of creative, original and ingenious solutions to overcome the previously mentioned practical barriers of communication in prison (which they easily recognized and understood). They also recognized the uncertainty inherent in complex situations/issues (the reaching out via Facebook, for example). Several students expressed an interest in taking on the role of organizer for the following year, acknowledging the human dimension in the management of this project and wishing to develop an ethical and responsible management style.

3.2 Feedback from the Inmates

The inmates spoke about their expectations prior to the workshops. They then commented on their appreciation of the workshops in terms of content. Their feedback concerning the interactions with ECN students and teachers fed into what the inmates had learned from the experience, and finally to suggestions for future workshop sessions.

The inmates did not have specific expectations when they signed up for the workshop. They said they felt a desire to discover Shakespeare, but they would also have been curious to discover other English language authors and books, not least contemporary authors, if this could be included in the following year’s program.

After 18 months of regular monthly sessions, they said that these Literature workshops had provided “a little window onto the world” which enabled them to discuss subjects they do not have the opportunity to talk about every day and which make them feel less excluded. The fact that they could see different faces, and especially young people, and share something intimate and enriching with them was very important.

The inmates regarded the Shakespeare workshops as “richer than other workshops as the Shakespeare presentations were an ensemble of things and gave us something we could take away with us [...] The workshops stimulate original debate, but in a way which is simple and comprehensible.” They were impressed by the quality of the presentations and the importance of the impact of Shakespeare in modern society.

Concerning interactions with ECN students and teachers, and suggestions for 2016-17, the inmates said they would like closer links with the prestigious ECN students, and to exchange ideas about their favorite passages, themes and questions. Perhaps an anonymous exchange of ideas, but not “tear-jerking navel-gazing and pity”, could be organized for this purpose. Another idea expressed was to adopt a thematic approach to Shakespeare, investigating themes which run

through many of Shakespeare’s plays, rather than just one play at a time.

The inmates were particularly keen to know what the ECN students thought of Nantes prison, especially as the workshops provided a “commune of humanity”, where the difference between inmate and ‘civilian’ is less conspicuous. They felt it gave the students the emotional and psychological flexibility to shake off stereotypes about prison inmates and create a positive link which gave them something valuable and rewarding.

One inmate commented: “The workshops do not soften prison in any way, but they are a breath of fresh air. They shine a little light on us which says we are not too disconnected from the outside world [...]. If you think prison is soft, come and spend a week here! Prison is necessary and normal and we owe it to the victims and to society and I need to be able to say that I have paid for my crimes. There are no innocents in prison, we have done horrible things and therefore we have been removed from society. We deserve to be removed, but prison is extremely violent and it is a constant fight to find your place. And alongside that, there is the loss of liberty. We are removed from society because we have done wrong, but as a result there are suicides and depressive conditions and there are a lot of inmates who take pills, rather than drugs, to cope. There are drugs in prison, but the pills are legal and they are a route to destruction.”

3.3 Feedback from the Organizers

The workshop teachers took part in all feedback sessions, and processed the information collected. We discussed our perception of the inmates’ comments at the feedback session. The teachers reflected on their initial position and how it had evolved over the course of the year. Finally, this led them to map out the positions of both organizers and participants in the workshop.

In the workshop journal, one teacher commented on the fact that one of the most rewarding things about the workshop was that it “provided an opportunity for the inmates to feel accepted by students from a ‘Grande Ecole’, and not to be considered as pariahs. The ECN students are perhaps at the opposite end of the spectrum, in that they are the least likely population to find themselves similarly incarcerated, but they received the inmates as fellow human beings and fellow citizens and did not seek to judge them, but lived the moment with them as they would in any other classroom situation.” Another teacher remarked: “It is highly improbable that the inmates will follow in the footsteps of these engineering students, but the fact that they were able to talk and discuss an academic subject with them and be on an equal footing must help to restore some self-esteem and a sense of self-worth. Their ideas and opinions are valued.” The workshop teachers felt relatively optimistic about the value of the workshop. However, as previously pointed out, the inmates’ feedback is not to be taken wholly at face value. Both students and several teachers at first tended to think that the feedback was entirely reliable. The cultural mediators and prison sociologists in our team pointed out that many of the inmates in our workshop were career criminals. When we, as teachers, relate to them, we deliberately focus on relating to them at that moment. If they are cordial and discuss complex issues, we inevitably regard them as ‘normal’ human beings: “The context tends to immunize us to a certain degree,” one teacher pointed out. “You get yourself into a mind-set where you can’t imagine they could be psychopaths.”

The cultural mediators pointed out how easy it was for workshop managers to “allow their emotions to get the better of them”. The “liberal do-gooder mentality”, in other words, the mentality of those who have an idea that they can reform people, can be both “good-hearted and misguided”. When discussing with the cultural mediators, the teachers acknowledged that the prison professionals were better qualified to know whether or not the inmates’ discourses were “manipulative”. The caution principle when advising students on how to interact with inmates prevailed over all forms of generosity. As one cultural mediator pointed out: “The naivety of do-gooders can lead them to behave in a way that’s inappropriate and potentially dangerous.” Examples of the potential dangers were given by the LLE to both students and teachers during the feedback session.

Having reflected on their own optimism and on their ‘do-gooder’ mentality, the teachers mapped out the positions of both the workshop organizers and the participants. The chart below summarizes these respective positions.

Table 2. Profile of workshop participants

Students	Teachers	Cultural mediators	Inmates
Idealistic: The do-gooder mentality; some of the awareness issues listed in the Teachers column	Optimistic: Several teachers caught themselves being too optimistic, but there is awareness of: - Possible psychological disorder - Role-model theory - False memory theory	Cautious and sceptical: Awareness of possible manipulation strategies on the part of inmates	Committed and strategic: Predisposed to “say the right thing”, and moderate what they say to fall into line with the institution’s expectations

The teachers also mapped out the different interpretations of some of the inmates’ comments. The chart below of one particular comment serves to exemplify how interpretations differ:

Table 3. Verbatim interpretation

Verbatim	Student	Researcher	Cultural mediator
<p>“Serving time in prison is necessary and standard: we owe it to the victims and society. As for me, I need to tell myself I served my sentence (...) No-one is innocent in prison; we committed horrible crimes, therefore we are removed from society. We deserve to be (...) But prison is extremely violent, it’s a battle every day (...) Culture brings a breath of fresh air. It doesn’t soften prison life, but it helps us to adjust, and it prevents us from slipping into the abyss.”</p>	<p>The inmates experience a form of “restorative justice”</p>	<p>A form of rehabilitation was attempted and it is impossible to measure at this point the workshop’s impact. The feedback given to us cannot be taken at face value, but that doesn’t mean it’s not sincere in some respects</p>	<p>Total hypocrisy: no redemption</p>

When analyzing the inmates’ verbatim during the feedback session, the cultural mediators pointed out: “This is typical of a potential psychopath. Psychopaths like to feel that they dominate the scene”; “Inmates often go through this charade and they are manipulative. They exhibit the same strategies in the feedback session as the ones they use when relating to the institution.”

While the professors of literature involved in the program would have liked to believe in the totally redemptive power of literature, the cultural mediators’ comments relative to possible manipulation techniques did strike a chord: what the verbatim in the above chart indicates is that the inmates know how powerful it is to say to someone: “it’s thanks to you that I am saved”. Such discourses are perhaps what we – teachers – should be watching out for, for the sake of the safe continuation of the project between inmates and students.

4. Discussion

Hypothesis 1: Our workshop is, according to Foucault’s apparatus term, an ‘amalgam’ which involves the contribution of all participants

Let us first look at the context in which the workshop was constructed. The context is twofold since it involves two very different institutions. The first was the context of cultural activities offered to inmates by the prison institution. The characteristics of this apparatus are totalitarian (Foucault, 1975). In the prison institution, inmates are forced to hand over their freedom to the institution. Even when the inmates appear to comply with the system, there is considerable hidden resistance in the process, hence the formation of an internal prison hierarchy where the ‘tough guys’ are the most respected (Clemmer, 1958; Mathiesen, 1965). Because there is a stigma in taking part in prison cultural activities – inmates can be perceived as ‘collaborators’ who support the prison institution – we thought that perhaps no inmates would sign up for the literature workshops (Saurier, 2016). From what the inmates said, no such stigma exists in a university context with the ECN workshops.

The second context is the ECN context which is superimposed onto the prison context. The ECN offers a ‘traditional’ teacher/student environment with its corresponding teacher/student hierarchy and knowledge transmission process. The resulting apparatus is one that promotes learning, all the while controlling the processes in which the learning takes place.

When the two types of apparatus are superimposed, as was the case with our Shakespeare workshop, the framework below appears, which is the result of a co-construction where both parent institutions impose their home rules and adopt those of the other institution for the sake of the workshop project.




Figure 1. ECN prison workshop pedagogical framework

The above diagram reflects the previously described pedagogical framework. We will comment further on the objects,

procedures and actors which give the workshop coercive power in Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 2: The apparatus demonstrates its efficiency in disciplining “bodies and minds”. Indeed, the apparatus secures the active complicity of participants in a workshop and ensures that everyone is encouraged to toe the line.

We first focus on the relationship between the cultural mediators and teachers. Both parties have respect for one another: the teachers comply with the physical and psychological safety instructions given by the LLE; at the same time, the cultural mediators do not interfere with the pedagogical content and modes of transmission implemented by the team of teachers.

As shown in the diagram above, a set of practices is articulated and developed in the context of the workshop and based on expertise that is unevenly shared between the different participants. These practices, in turn, fuel the power of specific actors. Thus, according to Foucault, the workshop hinges on two types of “knowledge-power”: a pedagogical “knowledge-power” on the one hand, and a “knowledge-power” which relates to prison life on the other.

This ensemble becomes a given apparatus that the different parties take part in: the educational and security principles are respected, the operating procedures remain stable, students and inmates read the educational documents before coming to the meeting, and punctuality is a shared value. If a student forgets his/her identity card, the student in question feels responsible for this mistake and accepts the corresponding sanction (i.e. he/she is prevented from entering the prison). If an inmate has not read the pedagogical document before the session, he/she feels at fault and does not dare take up as much speaking time as those who have prepared the session. Thus, bodies and minds are quickly and effectively disciplined by this apparatus made up of heterogeneous elements.

Hypothesis 3: Personalization processes are set in motion and generate further constraints on the apparatus: resistance. As Deleuze points out, transgression strategies are at work.

Are there any discernible patterns of resistance which are developed within the apparatus? Let us take the most obvious example in order to demonstrate that indeed there are. We noted how detainees have great consideration for the workshop and speak highly of it, in spite of the possible danger that could be incurred in relation to the way other inmates view this cultural activity. The inmates participating in the workshop claim that it is their love of literature and their cultural needs which motivate their participation: we could thus infer that the Shakespeare workshops function as an apparatus capable of disciplining individuals and getting them to adhere to a socially valued culture.

However, further discussion with the inmates quickly reveals other motives, mainly the desire to step out of their cell, to “escape from prison”, as well as the motivation to construct a positive self-image and to display such an image to the administration for early release. The workshop thus offers a mode of resistance to the imprisonment apparatus. However, the workshop is also diverted from its main objective as it becomes a tool of struggle against the deprivation of liberty. Therefore, we are in the presence of a dual resistance which confronts and exploits the Shakespeare apparatus: it is both diverted by a pseudo-normative culture (Houchon, 1969) and subjected to a secondary adjustment process (Goffman, 1961) in order to fight against the privations of confinement. (Note 12)

If there is resistance observed in the apparatus, then following Deleuze and Gattari, can we also say that this resistance promotes the desire to “escape” or flee from within (Deleuze, Gattari, 1972)? And that these flight lines offer many possible evolutions for the apparatus, which then becomes an object of creativity and innovation (Deleuze, Gattari, 1980)? Having complied with our workshop guidelines, is there a desire on the part of participants to escape the ‘apparatus’ framework? How is one to interpret the driving impulse behind the ideas expressed at the feedback session? Could these creative ideas signal pent-up energy leaking through Deleuze’s experimental lines of flight, powerful desires “breaking through the cracks of the system and shooting off on the diagonal”?

50% of students expressed their frustration at not having the opportunity to get to know the inmates. For their part, the inmates expressed their desire to be in closer proximity with the students. Despite the frustration produced and expressed within the context of the workshop, the apparatus works: the group strictly respects the “no-personal-question rule”. However, in the final feedback session, the inmates did suggest putting into place a mailbox that would allow inmates and students to communicate between the sessions (leaving comments on the corpus and discussion subjects covered during the workshops). This idea seems to run counter to the “no-personal-question rule” which all claimed to adhere to. Indeed, this free mode of communication signals a desire to move beyond the workshop set-up and develop a new form of communication with the ECN students, free from the constraints of our apparatus. To be aware of this is to be aware of the temptation to deviate from the system, expressed by all the participants, including our ECN students.

In the same way that Rayner signals that “having a ‘countercultural’ attitude and outlook does not necessarily imply that one is hostile towards the mainstream”, the ECN students who suggested possible changes are not necessarily hostile to the existing format of the workshop. Their suggestions signal “a desire [...] to grow creative (with new devices) with other like-minded people” (Rayner, 2013) who are perhaps willing to take greater risks and to be closer to the inmates. In

order to offer a means to be creative in relation to the prison project, we decided to adopt a structured approach to a collaborative journal, now open to student contributions. The students taking part in the workshop will now be asked to write about their perceptions of the workshop session on an ongoing basis (as opposed to only once at the end of the year). This collaborative journal, which will also allow discussions between teachers and cultural mediators, is the one line of flight that we feel we can safely put into place, but it does not include the participation of inmates and consequently remains outside the original apparatus.

Finally, the responsibility of teachers goes beyond the relationship with students and detainees, whose desires must be accompanied through a permanent negotiation with the apparatus itself. Indeed, to draw a comparison with Foucault, Deleuze and Gattari, could we consider that our workshop contributes to the institutionalization of the prison? Cultural activities in prison are micro-apparatus (compared to the macro-apparatus of the prison itself): these activities make prison life slightly less inhuman. Given the elements put into place to help inmates to cope with prison and the aftermath of prison, prison is justified and is a necessary institution within our society. Thus, we understand that the social machine can accommodate social desiring-production, but this desiring-production does not stem from the social machine itself (Deleuze, Gattari, 1980).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Audencia Research for supporting all of our research activities.

References

- Adler, M. J. (1939). The Crisis in Contemporary Education. *The Social Frontier*, 5(42), 140-145.
- Bates, L. (2013). Shakespeare saved my life: ten years in solitary with the bard. Naperville, Illinois: Sourcebooks.
- Bourdieu, P. (1979). *La Distinction : Critique sociale du jugement*. Paris : Éditions de Minuit.
- Brewster, L. (2014). The Impact of Prison Arts Programs on Inmate Attitudes and Behavior: A Quantitative Evaluation, *Justice Policy Journal*, 11(2), 1-28.
- Buntaine, O. G. (2015). Howls on the Heath: Shakespeare Ensembles in American Prisons. Scripps Senior Theses. Paper 714.
- Clements, P. (2004). The Rehabilitative Role of Arts Education in Prison: Accommodation or Enlightenment? *The Journal of Academic Development and Education*, 23(2), 169-178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1476-8070.2004.00395.x>
- Clemmer, D. (1940). *The Prison Community*. New York: Rinehart. 1958.
- Cohen, M. L. (2009). Choral Singing and Prison Inmates: Influences of Performing in a Prison Choir. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 60(1), 52-65.
- Deleuze, G., & Gattari, F. (1972). *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 1, L'anti-oedipe*. Paris: Minuit.
- Deleuze, G., & Gattari, F. (1980). *Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2, Mille plateaux*. Paris: Minuit.
- Fenwick, T., & Edwards, R. (eds.). (2012). *Researching Education Through Actor-Network Theory*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118275825>
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Surveiller et punir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Gussak, D. (2007). The effectiveness of art therapy in reducing depression in prison populations, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(4), 444-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X06294137>
- Herold, N., & Wallace, M. (2014). Time Served in Prison Shakespeare. In: *Selected Papers of the Ohio Valley Shakespeare Conference*; United States: IdeaExchange@Uakron.
- Houchon, G. (1969). Ricerca sulle strutture sociali penitenziarie e sulla cultura carceraria. *Quaderni di Criminologia Clinica*. III.
- Jacobi, D., & Jason, L. (dir). (2012). *Looking for non-publics. Collection Publics et culture*, Montréal (Québec) : PUQ.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory Life: the Social Construction of Scientific Facts*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Mathiesen, T. (1965). *The Defences of the Weak. A Sociological Study of a Norwegian Correctional Institution*. London: Tavistock.
- Pensalfini, R. (2015). *Prison Shakespeare: For these deep shames and great indignities*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Rayner, T. (2013) Lines of flight: Deleuze and nomadic creativity. *Philosophy for change*, 18 June 2013. <https://philosophyforchange.wordpress.com/2013/06/18/lines-of-flight-deleuze-and-nomadic-creativity/>
- Saurier, D. (dir). (2016). Culture et Musées. Entre les murs. Entre les murs. Culture et publics empêchés. N°26. pp. 13-20
- Schrift, M. (2006). Angola Prison Art: Captivity, Creativity, and Consumerism. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 119(473), 257-274. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jaf.2006.0035>
- Tett, L., Anderson, K., McNeill, F., Overy, K., & Sparks, R. (2012). Learning, rehabilitation and the arts in prisons: a Scottish case study. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 44(2), 171-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02660830.2012.11661631>
- Touraine, A. (1978). *La voix et le regard*. Paris: Seuil.
- Trenczek, T. (2013). Beyond Restorative Justice to Restorative Practice. In Cornwell, D., Blad, J., & Wright, M. (eds.) *Civilizing Criminal Justice*. Hampshire (UK): Hook, 409-428.
- Weschler, J., Cynthia, B., & Kimzey, R. (1995). *Prison conditions in Japan : Human Rights Watch. Asia : Prison Project*. New York, Washington: Human Rights Watch, 1995.
- Wrays, R. (2011). The Morals of Macbeth and Peace as Process: Adapting Shakespeare in Northern Ireland's Maximum Security Prison. *Shakespeare Quarterly*, 62(3), 340-363. <https://doi.org/10.1353/shq.2011.0065>
- Zehr, H. (2005). *Changing Lenses – A New Focus for Crime and Justice*. Scottsdale PA: Herald Press. pp. 268-269.

Notes

Note 1. By cultural activity, we mean any activity involving literature, visual arts, performing arts, constructive arts and heritage-related activities, as defined by the Ministry of Culture and Communication in France.

Note 2. The concept of what 'prison life' encompasses in terms of social and societal justification will be explored in our literature review.

Note 3. In France, see, for example, Guy Casadamont's pilot programs in Paris Ouest – Nanterre la Défense. Note 4. For more information, see:

http://www.liberation.fr/societe/2012/04/23/un-cours-de-science-humaine-entre-les-murs-de-la-prison_813829

Note 5. The students' physical safety is ensured by the emergency button that the prison visitor can press in the unlikely event of a physical aggression during the workshop session.

Note 6. "Apparatus" is Foucault's concept. This will be elaborated upon in our literature review.

Note 7. Reference: <http://www.laligue.org/qui-sommes-nous/>

Note 8. See Goffman, 1959: *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre. ISBN 978-0-14-013571-8. Anchor Books; Le Caisne (Léonore), 2000, *Prison. Une ethnologue en centrale*, Paris, Odile Jacob

Note 9. This corresponds to Adler's theory about great works of literature: If there is philosophical wisdom as well as scientific knowledge, if the former consists of insights and ideas that change little over time, and if even the latter has many abiding concepts and a relatively constant method, if the great works of literature as well as of philosophy touch upon the permanent moral problems of mankind and express the universal convictions of men involved in moral conflict - if these things are so, then the great books of ancient and medieval, as well as modern times are a repository of knowledge and wisdom, a tradition of culture which must initiate each new generation. The reading of these books is not for antiquarian purposes; the interest is not archaeological or philological [...]. Rather the books are to be read because they are as contemporary today as when they were written, and because the problems they deal with and the ideas they present are not subject to the law of perpetual and interminable progress. (Adler, 1939: 63)

Note 10. The English translation for the concept of "dispositif" is "apparatus". We will use this translation henceforth.

Note 11. E.g.: Othello, Romeo killing Juliet's cousin, Richard III. Richard III is deformed and if he hadn't been, maybe he would have been a nice character. The way you turn out is partly a matter of circumstances over which you have no control. Many "villains" are haunted by their deeds (Macbeth).

Note 12. This culture is characterized by behaviors dictated by a desire for early release.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the [Creative Commons Attribution license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.