The Good Guest – Reflections on Establishing a Narrative Dialogue with Women Writing in Prison as an Alternative Way of Knowing Through Relational Ethics as Epistemic Justice[1]

Rosalchen Whitecross, Senior Lecturer in Criminology, Bath Spa University, OrCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5591-9055

Abstract

"Stories live in culture" and mirror the culture within which they are forged (McAdams, 2001, p. 114). Different societies approach the telling of lives in various ways and hold different views on what represents a good story to tell (McAdams, 2001). In any given society, stories compete for acceptance and dominance because "life stories echo gender and class constructions in society", reflecting prevailing hegemonic patterns in cultural, economic and political contexts (McAdams, 2001, p. 114). In this paper, I reflect on how we reconceptualise creative writing, the "oft-maligned, strangely defined subject" (Ostrum, 1994, pp. xiii; xx1) when working with women in prison, considering the shared concept of creativity (Sarbo and Moxley, 1994) and their prison writing as alternate ways of knowing? Liebling (1999, p. 152) observes that the nature of prison research and the features thereof, "the institutions that we create" and the dialogue that follows with the human spirit living within the confines of prison, inform the choices about the communication of this dialogue – the dialogue emerging from the relational writing space, as well as the dialogue found in the textual space of the prison writing and the research writing about the process. It necessitates a wider understanding of the ethicality of prison research and creative writing beyond external procedural ethical validation (Van den Hoonaard, 2017) to consider the researcher's ethical epistemic standpoint (Fricker, 2007) working towards epistemic justice for the situated knowledge of women in prison and their lived experiences as told in their prison writing.

Keywords: *Prison and creative writing; epistemic justice; relational ethics in prison research; Critical reflection*

The Good Guest – Reflections on Establishing a Narrative Dialogue with Women Writing in Prison as an Alternative Way of Knowing Through Relational Ethics as Epistemic Justice

Amidst the silence, a familiar sound rings out, you glance up and see high above your head a pair of cranes, and for some reason you are overcome by melancholy. (Chekhov, [1895] 2007, p. 3)

Of Melancholy and Writing about Prison

Chekhov ([1895]; 2007) made this observation whilst documenting his journey to the penal colony on Sakhalin Island. The sense of melancholy resonates as I contemplate how to write this paper that pivots on a narrative reflection of women in prison writing their own life journeys in creative writing workshops and the narrative neglect of women's prison writing together with the researcher writing the research story. To this end, I employ narrative inquiry as lens for the exploration of the ways in which stories are constructed, their production, the means thereof and by whom, and how they work, how they are later consumed, accepted, contested or silenced, and what effects, "if any" this may have (Andrews et al., 2013, p. 2).

"Stories live in culture" and mirror the culture within which they are forged (McAdams, 2001, p. 114). Different societies approach the telling of lives in different ways and hold different views on what represents the good story to tell (McAdams, 2001). In any given society stories compete for acceptance and dominance, because "life stories echo gender and class constructions in society", reflecting prevailing hegemonic patterns in cultural, economic and political contexts (McAdams, 2001, p. 114). In this paper, I reflect on how to reconceptualise creative writing, the "oft-maligned, strangely defined subject" (Ostrum, 1994, pp. xiii; xxi) when working with women in prison, considering the shared

concept of creativity (Sarbo & Moxley, 1994) and their prison writing as alternate ways of knowing.

Liebling (1999, p. 152) observes that the nature of prison research and the features thereof, "the institutions that we create" and the dialogue that follows with the human spirit living within the confines of prison, inform the choices about the communication of this dialogue – the dialogue emerging from the relational writing space, as well as the dialogue found in the textual space of the prison writing and the research writing about the process. It necessitates a wider understanding of the ethicality of prison research and creative writing beyond external procedural ethical validation (Van den Hoonaard, 2017) to consider the researcher's ethical epistemic standpoint (Fricker, 2007) working towards epistemic justice for the situated knowledge of women in prison and their lived experiences as told in their prison writing.

Methodology

Narratives and people become what and who they are in "dialogue with other people and their stories" (Meretoja, 2018, p. ix). My research dialogue with other people and their stories commenced in the summer of 2018, when for a period of 10 weeks, I facilitated creative writing workshops in two women's prisons in England, namely HMP Downview in Surrey and HMP East Sutton Park in Kent. Here I worked with 18 women, the research participants, who became the writers as referred to in my writing. During this time, we wrote and read together in 10, two-hour workshops that I developed with the focus on reconceptualising the self as a process. My PhD research then proceeded from a reflexive participatory arts-based perspective within the framework of narrative inquiry to understand the lived experiences of incarcerated women writing their own stories in creative writing workshops as research method. In the participant information sheet (2018), I explained my approach to the prospective research participants as follows: My interest lies in storytelling

and writing, and how this process can help us to understand ourselves and the world around us. I am particularly interested in exploring your lived experiences through writing stories together - how this creative process can benefit your wellbeing, and at the same time tell a different story to the world about your experiences and prison.

Following the completion of my fieldwork, it was in the silence of reviewing how the research method and methodology moved from concept to practice, that a pensive melancholy took hold of me, prompted by the now familiar reactions to my study and research participants, when people would ask:

- How was it?

- What is prison like?

- Were they scary?

- When is society's patience going to run out with these people?

- You're not doing this because you were in prison? Were you? I hope not.

- But what about justice?

These questions held the perceptions, the story of prison and offenders, as reflected in dialogue with the outside world, with other people and their stories.

I remember thinking, well they all look normal and then the cell door opened, and I thought, What now? (Daisy Dove)

Even though incarcerated women benefit from creative writing fostering reflection and increasing feelings of self- and cultural worth, there is still widespread opposition from social communities who voice misgivings about the ability of arts-based prison programmes to produce lasting changes in this context (Mullen, 1999, p. 159). My pensiveness revealed a transformative moment in the research process when I noticed that I had become protective of the writing participants, of their stories and words that they shared with me, the difficult,

uncomfortable thing I had asked of them - to dig deep and excavate themselves, writing their experiences in their own words. As Raven Hawthorn (Whitecross, 2021, p. 35) writes, "living on the edge is a confusing place to be."

Through this dialogue and the conversations that followed in the wake of the reactions of the social community outside of prison, I found that I did not want to engage in anecdotes or what felt like gossip about the 18 women I had met who wrote as Yellow-horned Poppy ~ Oriental Redwood ~ Andromeda Marsh ~ Daisy Dove ~ Hearts ~ The Mallard ~ Baby Blue 79 ~ Sea-Coral ~ Purple Rose ~ Yellowhammer ~ Rainbow Rose ~ Raven Hawthorn ~ The White Cow ~ Foxglove ~ Snapdragon ~ Wood Lily ~ Periwinkle ~ Tall Melilot.

The funny, apprehensive, curious, helpful, nervous, exasperating and at times challenging research participants, hereafter referred to as the writers, who had shared their tears, laughter, anger, frustration, desperation and sadness with me. Who had shown me drawings received from their children in moments of joy.

The writers who had pored over the books of birds, flowers and trees that I had brought along to the creative writing workshops for them to choose their pseudonyms as illustrated in the names above - a writing name of their own, affording them their own reflective creative spaces sheathed in anonymity. I did not want to intrude in these reflective writing spaces and therefore did not elicit any information about the writers' convictions or collect demographic details. What is known about the writers and their life journeys flow from what they explored and revealed in their writing.

I would deflect from the questions mentioned above and instead focus on the grimness, the day-to-day realities of women's imprisonment. This deflection was at times met with amusement, but most often with irritation or annoyance because it did not reflect the accepted narratives of women in prison, and therefore challenged the social perceptions and

constructions of punishment and women's imprisonment. Appositely gleaned from the writing of Yellow-horned Poppy:

> *Come to prison I was so scared and cried a lot. I did not know what to think about being in prison. Bars everywhere. Lock up all the time. Bad food. Tea was terrible. I was so scared to even come out of my cell. Officer came into my room and said to me to stop crying and get on with it. But I was still crying and scared of the officer, which made it worse. Letters from my family and seeing them, cheered me up. It got a little bit better when the officer said, if they can get me into an open prison if I would like to go. Yes. Please I said. I did not know what it meant. But I stopped crying and cheered up, a lot better.*

As the writer, reflecting on the research process, I became aware of being reshaped, a researcher re-storied in the moment of stepping inside prison and spending time with the writers - a pebble, tossed and turned by the waves of the lived experience of doing research in prison. It formed the heart of my study in coming to know and write about another human being, the writers in prison as situated producers of knowledge through their writing. It led to an understanding of the dissonance I experienced in the outside world when revealing this empathy in the face of derogatory pre-existing narratives.

This pensive moment resonates with Gaudry's (2011, p. 113) work that conceptualises the dominant trend in academic research as an "extractive process". Due to the "expectations of the contemporary academic environment, research and publishing" researchers take "deeply meaningful information", often gleaned from "under-researched" or marginal communities, to present it to third or other parties, "whom have little staked on the preservation of the integrity of that extracted knowledge" (Gaudry, 2011, p. 113). In this extraction process, "the context, values, and on-the-ground struggles of the people and/or

communities that provide the information" are lost and researchers tend locate their responsibility towards the academy rather than towards the community from which the knowledge was drawn (Gaudry, 2011, p. 113). The extraction approach abides by "models of good academic practice" where the focus of the research outcomes is primarily directed towards academics or policy or "bureaucrats" rather than valuing the knowledge and the community from which the research outcomes were drawn (Gaudry, 2011, p. 114).

Gaudry (2011, p. 114) instead argues for an insurgent methodological approach that explicitly employs the situated knowledge or worldview of the community and participants engaging in the research, and for the researcher to direct their "responsibility almost towards the community and participants."

What follows is my research journey, moving from extraction towards insurgency, through a sustained practice of reflexivity considering the process of writing, both creatively and academically.

Narrative analysis in revealing context

One cannot simply write. Thus, it is the ways that in which the processes of textual production are hidden that allows texts to be construed as realist accounts. This obscures and limits understanding of the nature and the power effects of texts as discourse. (Dunne et al., 2005, p. 133)

The memory of the research time spent writing together is infused with the heat wave that stretched from June to mid-August. Yellowhammer writes:

This is my first summer in prison. The girls are all sunbathing on my wing, trying to get tanned, trying to wear as less as possible. I laugh when I see them run to get a spot on the grass. For me, I'm fasting as it's Ramadan and the fast is long over 18 hours. It is hot in our rooms. We don't have fans, and the windows are small and let only a little air

in. I stay in my room and sit out only one hour a day for air. We fight to sit on the

bench, which is funny. I do like the sun as it's bronzing my skin. The sky is a beautiful

blue with white clouds and the rays of the sun streaking through.

The heat and the women's writing extend the pensive, melancholy research reflection and resonates with observations about the nature of prison research and the features thereof that draw in the researcher, "the institutions that we create" and the dialogue that follows with the human spirit living within the confines of prison, and the choices we make about how we communicate this dialogue (Liebling, 1999, p. 152).

During this time, I noticed that a boundary had blurred within myself, and that I came to view my protective stance towards the writers in prison from both an ethical point of view as a reflexive researcher, but also as a human being, an outsider who had been given access to the hidden world of prison, who had come to see punishment and its effects in action. For me, it signalled a profound shift in acknowledging that the researcher does not only proceed from the plane of the intellect, but as a whole person also "engaging their feelings, and values, and needs in the research process" (Barnett, 2005, as cited in Attia & Edge, 2017, p. 34).

This would come to influence how I write about the research and the decision to braid the voices of women in prison into the academic discussion to provide a textual space for their experiences in their own words, to acknowledge their humanity and knowledge contribution as a marginalised group, and to unpick academic research writing and its concomitant conventions as a process that (in)directly continues the dehumanisation and silencing process. This moment of transformation is described as opening to the inner space that involves learning "through bodily-felt and emotional experience rather than just through conscious reason" because it necessitates feeling in the reflection on the writing process (Hunt, 2013, p. 15).

The view of methodology, as connecting element between epistemology in the theory about the development of knowledge, and method, as the techniques used for gathering and analysing the information, hinges on examining the choices made by the researcher in the implementation of the method and as such signifies "the terrain where philosophy and action" meets (Sprague, 2016, p. 5). This terrain in my research pertains to the reflexive participatory arts-based perspective employed within the narrative inquiry framework to understand the lived experiences of incarcerated women writing their own stories in creative writing workshops as research method. Reflecting on methodology in this way allows for technical details to enter social and political contexts in considering their consequences on people's lives (Sprague, 2016, p. 5). How we write about our research, the design, choices and action, shapes the contribution to knowledge within the philosophical framework. Writing the research then implies travelling through and in narratives that move and weave between abstract concepts and concrete voices.

Within the philosophical framework of narrative in the field of criminology, my approach is to seek textured narrative knowledge. To create knowledge that is less systemically biased, because "we need to ground each view of the social world in the standpoint from which it is created", namely the lived experiences of the research participants (Sprague, 2016, p. 2). This critical situated approach is framed as one where the focus shifts from "what is wrong with the person who is experiencing the problem" rather towards an evaluation of "what it is about the current social order that makes the problem likely" (Sprague, 2016, p. 15).

Mindful not to replicate power hierarchies in my research, I apply this framing to my research and writing with the reflexive focus on the four channels of narrative inquiry. These include the relationship between the researcher and research participants; my ethical approach to the creation of knowledge flowing from the realisation that the ethical process

started in practice when the research fieldwork commenced; my positionality as researcher; the shift in focus onto writing as research material, and the relational role of ethics as epistemic justice. This speaks to Gaudry's (2011) conceptual framework for an insurgent approach to research with marginalised communities.

Therefore, the instance of the reflective pause, far from being a mechanism for "information-processing", is viewed as a power "we choose to exercise in the analysis and transformations of the situations we find ourselves in" (Kemmis, 1994, p. 149). This point leads back to the argument that "one cannot simply write", precisely because if "the ways in which the processes of textual production are hidden… [it] allows texts to be constructed as realist accounts" (Dunne et al., 2005, p. 133). This hiddenness serves to obscure and limit the understanding of the power and nature of texts as discourse. Gaudry (2011, p. 116) argues for a deconstruction of methodological approaches that serves to "reinforce existing power relations" moving towards an approach motivated by the search for "more egalitarian and autonomous social, political and economic relations."

A Reflective Approach

A river passing through the landscape catches the world and gives it back redoubled: a shifting world more mysterious than the one we customarily inhabit. (Laing, 2011, p. 6)

My reflective approach applies reflexivity as a process that involves an "ongoing mutual shaping between researcher and research" and to which I add the mutual shaping between researcher and writers (Attia & Edge, 2017, p. 33). This moves away from the "view of research methods as objectified procedures to be learnt by researchers" towards the development of researchers "who craft procedures integral to the environments in which they operate" (Attia & Edge, 2017, p. 33). Development in this context is not treated as a side-effect of a reflexive research practice, but instead involves the conscious "stepping back from

the action" to theorise what is developing or occurring so that the researcher can "step up to be an active part of the contextualized action" (Attia & Edge, 2017, p. 33). An ongoing, continuous motion, now swimming in, then watching on from a distance, the waves breaking onto a shingle beach, moving backwards, pushing forwards, rolling stones when the tide comes in, changing the shape and physical features of the pebbly shore.

Stepping back from the action, I had days where I would sit staring at the sea after a workshop day, transitioning back into the outside world. A physical, personal liminal space of processing the intensity of the workshops in prison, thinking of the writers and their lived experiences - how they had become co-producers of knowledge in this study writing their words. I would contemplate the numbing, distancing effect of spending one day in the prison environment, how it had changed my perspective and relational experience of the social. I wondered about this dissonance and the effect on the incarcerated women who spent days, weeks, months and years within this environment. In this state of reflection, the world outside of prison would sometimes seem to be spun from candyfloss.

I reflected on how the prescribed research approach would require of me to maintain the barrier, i.e. the separation between my selves, that of researcher in the field of criminology and that of human being who witnessed the deep emotional intensity experienced by the writers during the shared creative process. This reflexive moment is described as an internal struggle, which becomes a further dialogue between "our criminological lives and our human lives" where this dialogical overlap reveals two states of being often kept separate from one another in writing and reading about prison (Liebling, 1999, p. 148). To this effect, it is pointed out that criminologists are "diverse human beings with a vast array of life experiences and complex histories" before they are scholars, researchers or academics (Wakeman, 2014, p. 719). The "self" becomes an "embodiment of

how we research, how we theorize and how we come to know and tell about our subjects"
(Wakeman, 2014, p. 719).

Research in prison takes place in "an intense, risk-laden, emotionally fraught
environment", precisely because of the complexity of human nature, both that of the
researched and the researcher (Liebling, 1999, p. 163). It is this acknowledgement of emotion
and human nature, both research participants and the researcher that steers my research study
away from neutral language into the sphere of reflexive writing to capture the intensity of
prison research and prison writing.

According to convention "scientific writing should express rationality without emotion
or humour, speaking plainly so that the unvarnished facts and truths will be obvious"
(Sprague, 2016, p. 27). However, this "emotional flatness" proceeds to hide the researcher in
the text, which at the same time impacts on the reader – "the audience [who] is supposed to
think and not to feel" (Sprague, 2016, p. 27). This scholarly norm of discrediting speakers
who reveal feelings such as "caring, anger or outrage within the context of scholarly
communication" at the same time serves to distance the reader, audience, "from caring about
the situation under discussion", which in turn leaves the reader, audience, feeling much "less
compelled to do something about it" or to consider prison writing produced in creative
writing workshops as an alternative way of knowing (Sprague, 2016, p. 27).

Research writing is drawn to the fore here with the requirement that the representation
of the research, in bridging the gap between thinking and feeling, focuses on the language,
tone and voice used. It touches on the concern "to move away from writing conceived merely
as a technical support for research activity" and instead to "examine the idea that researchers
are primarily writers", because it asks of the researcher to consider "the issue of
representation, the matter of how what we write relates to the realities our research aims to
portray" (Dunne et al., 2005, p. 129).

In the field of criminological research, when the researcher takes account of the "emotive self" it creates the possibility of presenting the research material in more "emotive and stylized" ways to enable readers to feel their way to an understanding in the process (Wakeman, 2014, p. 715). It becomes imperative that qualitative researchers engage with their ideas and what they attempt to do with these ideas through the act of writing by examining the use of words and the construction of sentences (Tierney, 1995, p. 386). The argument is made for a narrative scope as broad as that which exists in fiction, because the opposite would entail a scope as "narrow as what exists in the natural sciences" (Tierney, 1995, p. 386). This resonates with the argument against the separation of the self and views any methodological approach, which advocates for a disassociation between being a human being and criminologist, as "deeply flawed" (Liebling, 1999, p. 166).

The Ethos (or Ethics) of the "Good Guest"

Stories often grow in groves, with some stunted by the shadows of others (Narayan, 2012, p. 14).

Working with women in prison as co-producers of knowledge, the goal of research for critical and feminist scholars becomes one of understanding how oppression works in the production of knowledge and how the provision of this knowledge "will help fight against injustices" (Sprague, 2016, p. 9). This becomes significant in the specific social context of imprisoned women and the associated sets of "politically relevant interests" where "mainstream knowledge, more generally, tends to assume the position of privileged groups, helping to naturalize and sustain their privilege in the process" (Sprague, 2016, p. 2).

Considering women's prison writing and women writing in prison as the study of experience understood narratively (Clandinin & Huber, 2010, p. 436), I contemplate the question of what if stories emerge, are born and die prematurely before they can multiply?

What does this reveal about the implicit epistemological understanding of what constitutes a tellable life with a tellable story, and who can write and tell it? Different societies approach the telling of lives in different ways and hold different views on what represents the good story to tell (McAdams, 2001, p. 114). These questions focusing on the circumstances under which knowledge can be produced and "about who can know what" then situates epistemology as a theory about knowledge (Sprague, 2016, p. 5). In the context of women's imprisonment, what constitutes a tellable life with a tellable story when the layers of submergence stretch so far and deep? In terms of progress since the 19th century, all the factors mentioned, particularly the low cultural capital because of socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds and the "cultural sanctioning of certain forms of knowledge over others" persists (Schwan, 2014, p. 4).

Reflections on the ethical tensions of narrative inquiry, identify two points of departure for the narrative researcher – on the one hand the researcher should aim to be a "good guest, who values humility and faithfulness in working with the research participant", and on the other hand, the narrative researcher should "not intrude on the freedom of the readers to judge the narrative on their own terms" (Van den Hoonaard, 2017, p. 590). This centres on the argument that external ethical validation is not the sole signifier of whether the research project is ethical or not, but rather that the ethicality of the research project also resides in the "personal virtues" of the researcher and the established practices of the discipline (Van den Hoonaard, 2017, p. 590).

I considered this point with reference to the external ethical approval process and the questions posed by, at the time, Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Services (HMPPS) (previously known as NOMS – National Offender Management Service). Before granting access to the two women's prisons, HMPPS questioned the research framework and approach. The queries in the main focused on what would be the primary benefits of the

research for HMPPS; the selection criteria of the research participants and the inclusion/exclusion of women with low literacy levels, dyslexia, aggression and mental health concerns such as self-harming or who were actively suicidal; whether the research sample would likely be representative and how the researcher would eliminate sampling bias; confidentiality and security risks, both to the research participants and the prison.

Considering the qualitative structure of my research and the research method of creative writing, I linked these questions by HMPPS to the assertion that "Oppressed groups are frequently placed in the situation of being listened to only if we frame our ideas in the language that is familiar to and comfortable for a dominant group" (Hill Collins, 2002, p. vii).

Upon reflection, these queries are interesting, because they link to Gaudry's (2011) argument and mimetically reflect the observation of the hegemonic approaches and androcentric lens through which women's experiences of imprisonment have historically been viewed, where the focus remains on the institution and the research is addressed in neutral and often scientific terms, as opposed to a focus on social change that starts with addressing human needs in a particular context (Gelfand, 1983, p.26). For HMPPS the focus of their questions started from the point of view of what would be of benefit to HMPPS, i.e. the macro, the status quo as opposed to the benefits of the research to the research participants - a question that was incidentally never asked.

This resonates with the case made for an imaginative criminology that should not be constrained by the conventional perspectives which primarily view it as the study of criminal justice and crime, defined by the social science methods of interviews and surveys (O'Neill & Seal, 2019, p. 1). In reference to Young's *The Criminological Imagination,* cultural criminology becomes an antidote to "criminology's lack of imagination, evidenced by an almost singular focus on positivism, 'quasi – scientific rhetoric' and administrative

criminology that works in favour of or legitimates neoliberal politics" (O'Neill & Seal, 2019, p. 1).

Relational Ethics and Positionality

This focus point calls for the empathic ability to relate to psychological and social realities that is other than the researcher's own - a mode of being which requires a humility that acknowledges the researcher's particular standpoint, but at the same time embraces an openness to risking the possibility that this standpoint might or might not change in the research process (Attia & Edge, 2017, p. 34). This openness is viewed as imperative and describes the adoption of a "strategy of disciplined empathy", because this capacity of the researcher to empathize with other minds and beings becomes an indispensable and distinctive capacity, particularly when the research takes place in difficult environments (Medlicott, 2000).

Reflecting on the inclusion of my own biography and how much of it was appropriate to disclose, particularly in the first creative writing workshop, I experienced a moment of ethical hesitancy. Because, through my reflections on voice, biography and narrative power I seemed to drift ever further away from my perceived idea of writing as a conduit which allows for others "to speak through us" (Hunt & Sampson, 2006, p. 47). Instead, this disclosure of the personal seemed to steer me into the opposite direction of "The ideal: less and less of me and more and more of you… to make room, to become not the hero of the scene, but the scene itself: the site, the occasion of the other" (Cixous, 1989, as cited in Hunt & Sampson, 2006, p. 47).

It was in the creative writing workshops, that I had to confront and work through these "uncomfortable, unclear and uncertain aspects of researcher subjectification" (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 24). "Hesitancy as ethics" is a strategy for research fieldwork that takes place in "zones of high intensity" (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 24). This strategy posits that

uncertainty is assumed as part of the researcher's approach and position, and that it becomes an ethical obligation to "not be too certain", particularly when faced with "affectively distressed, concerned, upset, action-orientated participants" (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 24). The emphasis on the researcher to "not be too certain" allows for the "analyses to emerge from uncertainty, rather than from previously established certainty about the requirements of a given field" (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 37).

A particular feature of research in high intensity zones is that the researcher is confronted with conflict, which is mostly explicit and articulated and often inspires the "urge to take action" and "contribute to the resolution of problems that characterise their field" (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, pp. 25-26). However, in the instance of employing ethical hesitancy as a research strategy in these situations, the researcher should be "guided by a different compass than unproblematized intervention" and instead that the focus should shift to the research contribution and how this can be informed by different ways of thinking about the conflict and its resolution (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 26).

In the initial stages of the creative writing workshops conflict between the writers simmered covertly and was not explicitly articulated. In the first creative writing session at Downview the air was thick with tension, the writing group split into cliques with a moment of accusation flaring up between research participants when one writer, on coming came back from the bathroom, looked around the table and agitatedly asked who had taken her purple pen. At East Sutton Park, the conflict contained a subversive dynamic exercised by a couple of writers, who, in trying to establish dominance and superiority in the group, would continuously laugh at the contributions and thoughts of an older writer and ignore the contributions of another more hesitant writer. In both writing groups, the writing space was not yet established as one bound by kindness and trust. Therefore, in returning to reflexivity in the research process, it is observed by Kofoed & Staunæs (2015) that:

Research reflexivity, or embodied thoughtfulness, as we prefer to call it, is not only a matter of gaze or cognition, but also of affectivity, i.e., the intensity and weight of the atmosphere, the moods, the feelings, senses and intuitions through which the researcher experiences and interacts/intra-acts with the object of study. (p. 37)

This initial discordance became the "unpredictable challenges presented by concrete encounters during fieldwork" and required me to step back, to pause in hesitancy and to reflect (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 37). Although I was told beforehand that there might be conflict and that I just needed to ask for help "in sorting them out," I did not want the prison world and its expressions of authority to enter the writing space during the time of its fledgling formation. Ethical hesitancy in this context involves "the momentary suspension of action" which results in the interruption of "one's own incentives to respond and enact embedded normativities and judgements" (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 25). Precisely because in this moment the consideration of ethics shifts from the procedural towards "the grey zones, the unpredictable, yet utterly important moments and issues" which leads to a third dimension of ethics, namely the relational (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 26). Relational ethics is described as the instance of valuing and recognizing mutual dignity and respect, and connectedness between the researched and the researcher, and the communities within which they work (Kofoed & Staunæs, 2015, p. 26).

From this relational ethics point of view, I realised that I had asked difficult things of the writers in their first writing exercise and that I needed to respond in kind. This moment resonates with Coogan's (2013) reflection on the dynamic relationship between research participants and researcher in the collaborative act of writing as research method:

But the gravity with which the men took up my invitation to shape their life stories for

publication amazed me. They not only rose to the challenge of going beyond their first

drafts, but they challenged me to write the same way that I taught: to tell my story of

teaching them to write their stories. (p. 73)

Traversing beyond the procedural Information Sheets and Consent Forms discussed in

the first workshop, I decided relationally to reciprocate and share the journey of how this

specific research project was conceived, over a period that stretched nearly 20 years, across

my student and working life. I also read out loud my writing in response to the first writing

exercises that the group had just completed. In that moment of sharing, of showing my own

vulnerability in contributing my story and writing, the energy in both groups snapped. It

switched and became still. Both groups took a step back from their covert conflicts. Conflict

of which I was aware but deflected by consciously rerouting and shifting the focus back onto

our writing together.

In telling my research story an unexpected and unanticipated space for dialogue

opened, a shared humanity, where the emotions of the writers in the workshops detangled as

they started to question me about the idea for the research project (research objective) and

where I was from and why my focus was on writing (research method). The Consent Forms

and the Participant Information Sheets, though they said they were interesting, remained

abstract concepts, the skeleton framework. The components of my shared biography in

coming to the research objective of understanding lived experience and writing as the method

became a grounding moment of why I chose to pursue the research project. Within the

groups, on the day, this somehow led to the simmering animosities to cool down whilst the

workshops were in progress as the mantra of kindness and respect towards one another's

words and writing was repeated. These housekeeping guides became an important anchor in the prison environment.

The Good Guest - You Can't Tell Me What to Do

The pivotal element of writing as a learning process, which seriously works with the experiences of life, is that it paradoxically "fosters that important and essential counterpart to experience: reflection" (Walker, 1994, p. 53). The symbiotic relationship between experience and reflection contained in writing then foster both a self-reflective learning experience in the personal sphere for the writers in prison, and for me as writer and researcher, but equally it also requires reflection on experience in the social sphere from the reader (Walker, 1994, p. 52). This moment presents the dual challenge: to oppose the traditions that have shaped this system, namely the silencing of the voices of incarcerated women reflecting in writing on their lived experiences, whilst at the same time, having to write within the system that has shaped the tradition (Greene, 1990, p. 84). To engage with this challenge, tradition can be opposed by making readers aware of how this system "has shaped their expectations of life" (Greene, 1990, p. 84).

To explore this notion of how the system shapes expectations, I return to writing of week three of the creative writing workshops. I had planned that the writers would turn their attention to the main character that they had been writing about in their story worlds. An introductory warm-up exercise required each writer to draw a postcard from a pile. They then had to describe a detail from the image on the postcard that stood out for them. Portrayed on the postcards were silhouette animation cut-outs, still images captured from the film, *The Adventures of Prince Achmed,* by Lotte Reiniger made in 1926. This exercise was a pre-cursor to the next writing exercise which first asked of the women to concentrate on the main character in their writing up to that point and to draw or make a collage, focusing on the unique characteristics of that character and then to write about it. I had envisaged this as an

exercise to explore the particular and the individual, the specific details or characteristics of the main character that the women had been focusing on in their writing in weeks one and two.

Whilst the postcards had proved unusual and prompted animated discussion and writing in Downview, the follow-up writing exercise did not translate well in practice as the women found it difficult, an uncomfortable exercise to describe their main characters in writing and drawing. One of the writers, The White Cow, refused to draw, and subsequently to write, and argued with me throughout the whole of the quiet time allocated to the writing exercise. The group discussion that followed was muted. Led by the women's reactions to The White Cow's agitated state, the difficulty of the writing exercise and by Baby Blue 79's removal mid-session for what would turn out to be a random drug test, I stepped back and refrained from this direct approach to engage with descriptions of their protagonists, the selves described in colours in the weeks before to determine a particularized individuality. Instead, we spent a bit more time resting in the biscuit break.

Afterwards, reflecting on the workshop in my notebook, I wrote, "*And maybe it is because of her trauma that she does not want to see or write about herself.*" Borg (2018) observes that trauma is a rupture which undoes the self and strips it of:

> Its familiar dwelling in the world and reveals a painful fragmentation at the heart of subjectivity. Oneself and one's relations to others are undone by trauma, leaving the survivor with the difficult task of recovering a sense of self, remaking one's world, and rediscovering meaningful attachments to others. (p. 449)

This follows, that "disempowerment and disconnection from others" constitute the "core experiences of psychological trauma" (Herman, 1992, p. 134). For recovery to take place, the survivor "must be the author and arbiter of her own recovery" based on the notions

of empowerment and the creation of new connections from the perspective that recovery cannot take place in isolation but only in the context of relationships (Herman, 1992, p. 134).

Reading this against the background of the state of imprisonment experienced as the mortification of the self, of the existential death of the self, particularly from the point of view of its disempowerment and disconnection from others, it seems consequently difficult to imagine recovery from trauma experienced pre-imprisonment within an institutionalised environment that also causes the further trauma of the erosion of the self (Rowe, 2011, p. 578). Thus, when The White Cow repeatedly said of the writing exercises, "Don't tell me what to do" and "You can't tell me what to do," even though I had explained quietly and continuously that these are just prompts for her to interpret in whichever way she wants and that she could write in any way she felt inspired to or that she could ignore them completely, I came to understand through reflection and reading of Herman's (1992) study on trauma and recovery, that fundamentally The White Cow was seeking to determine her own self-narrative pace and style in a relational context with me in the safe space created within the writing workshop situated within the wider context of the institutional environment of prison. The prominent and dominant relational context in which she had no or little power for self-determination. The White Cow connected with me in a relational context in making her resistance to the writing exercise known. In acknowledging her resistance, we talked again about writing and creativity, how there was no right or wrong way to write and tell her story, how she had the choice whether she wanted to participate or not and that whatever she chose would be good and fine.

Not knowing what to anticipate the following week, whether she would return or not, The White Cow returned and smiled. Her continued participation in the workshops and support of the other writers became a revelation - she did not miss a single workshop and took part in all the writing exercises. She brought along to the writing workshops her poetry

for me to read - pages and pages that she wrote at night, particularly about the girls' scouts. She gave thoughtful, kind and considered responses to the other writers about their writing. The White Cow decided, namely the choice to continue as a participant in the writing workshops, committing to them and being a supportive workshop member towards the other writers in the group. This choice signalled a turning point in her writing journey with the rediscovery of "meaningful attachments to others" within the space of the workshop (Borg, 2018, p. 449).

Ethics as Epistemic Justice

> *The girl sank to her knees. You could almost feel the humility painted on her face as she silently asked for forgiveness. The woman touched her gently feeling her shame and sorrow. The room glowed with an abject pallor framed with muted shadows. It was an altogether sombre sight, heavy with sadness and expectation. The jewelled costumes of the two figures overshadowed by the tone of the unspoken conversation between them, the touch subsuming a thousand words.* (Periwinkle)

Periwinkle's writing here encapsulates the aim of this examination of the researcher's ethical standpoint to proceed with an awareness of what constitutes epistemic injustice, both at the macro-level and to avoid replicating it on the micro-level of the research study. This in turn underpins the endeavour to work towards epistemic justice for the structurally situated knowledge held by women in prison about their lived experiences found in their own writing, both for themselves as research contributors and for expansion of the collective social understanding.

For the ethical dimensions of our epistemic practices to be revealed, we must shift our focus onto the negative space of injustice, particularly epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2007). This adjustment of lens examines the entanglement of social power and reason to reveal two

forms of epistemic injustice, which slots into the wider patterns of social injustice (Fricker, 2007, p. 3). This is done to convey the ethical aspects of two basic epistemic practices namely that of "conveying knowledge to others by telling them" and "making sense of our own social experiences" on the other hand (Fricker, 2007, p. 1). It is termed as testimonial injustice and hermeneutical injustice and underpins the focus on epistemic injustice from the perspective of a wrong done to someone in their capacity as knower – the women as writer in prison (Fricker, 2007, p. 1).

Testimonial injustice transpires when a "deflated level of credibility is given to a speaker's word", whilst hermeneutical injustice takes place "when a gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their of their social experiences" (Fricker, 2007, p. 1). This encapsulates the neglect of women's prison writing as cultural resource. Both injustices centre on a capacity that is wronged - with testimonial injustice it is that of the "giver of knowledge" and with hermeneutical injustice it is as a "subject of social understanding" (Fricker, 2007, p. 7).

This ethical consideration forms the context of the "socially situated accounts of our epistemic practices", because all participants in the research are not conceived "in abstraction of relations of social power, but… as operating social types who stand in relations of power to one another" (Fricker, 2007, p. 3). Central to these socially situated conceptions and capacities are the question of identity and social power, with social power in its situated capacity viewed as the capacity to control others' actions (Fricker, 2007, pp. 1-4). From this, flows a sub-species of power, which is referred to as identity power "of which gender power is one instance" dependant on the shared social-imaginative conceptions of the social identities of those implicated in the operation of power (Fricker, 2007, pp. 4-9).

Testimonial injustice occurs when the speaker suffers prejudice on the hearer's part, i.e., if the research participant is given less credibility than would otherwise have been the

case, because of the shared social-imaginative conceptions of the social identities of the group that the speaker, as a woman in prison in this instance, belongs to (Fricker, 2007, p. 4). The reach and scope of testimonial injustice is extended if these testimonial injustices are connected to other injustice "via a common prejudice" to become systematic (Fricker, 2007, p. 27).

Systematic testimonial injustices are not the product simply of prejudice, but rather that they track the subject/research participant/woman in prison "through different dimensions of social activity", namely that of education, economical, professional, legal, political, sexual, gender and religion (Fricker, 2007, p. 27). In this instance, to be the subject of a "tracker prejudice" is to be rendered susceptible "not only to testimonial injustice" but also to a range of other injustices (Fricker, 2007, p. 27). Therefore, when a prejudice generates a testimonial injustice, it becomes systematically connected to these other types of injustice too (Fricker, 2007, p. 27).

The principal type of prejudice tracker is in someone's social identity due to a particular feature thereof, in this instance a woman (gender) in prison (social signifier) (Fricker, 2007, pp. 27-28). This constitutes a negative identity prejudice in the hearer's ability to give credibility to the speaker's testimony, culminating in identity power. Identity power concludes with one party controlling the other, in other words where the speaker is prevented from conveying knowledge, because of a dependency on the "collective conceptions of the social identities" of both parties concerned (Fricker, 2007, p. 28).

The collective conceptions of social identities exercised through identity power pervade the contribution of knowledge or ways of knowing in both the macro-level and micro-level. As such, the significance of testimonial injustice is revealed for the micro-level of the relationship between the researcher and the research participant. This relationship required an awareness of how the creative writing workshops were conceived and how they ran. It

informed the consent forms and participant information worksheets, together with the representation of the writing produced by the women in prison as co-producers of knowledge. It required reflection on the positionality of the researcher and continuous reflexivity throughout every step of the research process concluding in writing the research thesis and representing/hosting the women's prison writing. This is implemented to proceed towards the possibility of testimonial justice where the speaker as research participant/writer does not suffer further prejudice on the part of the hearer in the person of the researcher.

Hermeneutical injustice arises from a gap in the collective hermeneutical resources (Fricker, 2007, p. 6). This gap is defined as one that impinges on the "shared tools of social interpretation" because the cognitive disadvantage that it creates affects different social groups unequally (Fricker, 2007, p. 6). For the groups unequally disadvantaged, in this case women in prison, hermeneutical marginalization then follows because of their unequal participation in the practices that generate social meanings (Fricker, 2007, p. 6). This form of marginalization renders our collective forms of understanding structurally prejudicial when considering the "content and/or style" thereof because:

> the social experiences of members of hermeneutically marginalized groups are left inadequately conceptualized and so ill understood, perhaps by the subjects themselves; and/or attempts at communication made by such groups, where they do have an adequate grip on the content they aim to convey, are not heard as rational owing to their expressive style being inadequately understood. (Fricker, 2007, p. 6)

Drawing on feminism's long history of concern with the way that power relations constrain women's ability of understanding their own experiences in a "world structured by others for their purposes" and acceptance of the expressions thereof, Fricker (2007, p. 147) consequently expands hermeneutic inequality and marginalization in relation to the practice

of social power, arguing that "our interpretive efforts are naturally geared to interests" and an understanding of "those things it serves us to understand." From this, we observe that a particular group's – women in prison - unequal hermeneutical participation is revealed "in a localized manner in hermeneutical hotspots", where the powerful display "no interest in achieving a proper interpretation", and where instead, in some instances, it culminates in the "positive interest" of maintaining the misinterpretation (Fricker, 2007, p. 152).

Because of the wide-ranging hermeneutic marginalization, a significant area of a person's or group's social experiences is persistently obscured from the collective understanding (Fricker, 2007). For the hermeneutic marginalization to culminate in hermeneutic injustice, Fricker (2007, p. 155) examines how marginalization causes a structural prejudice in the collective hermeneutic resource where prejudice resides against the members of a socially powerless group "by virtue of an aspect of their social identity."

Women in prison and the neglect of their prison writing based for example on low literacy levels, is one such exclusionary argument. For this identity prejudice to become systematic, just as in the case of testimonial injustice, it needs to track the subject/research participant/woman in prison through different and multiple spheres of social activity (Fricker, 2007).

Thus, using Fricker's framework of epistemic injustice as yardstick, the cultural sanctioning of women's prison writing revealed the epistemic practices of testimonial injustice and hermeneutical injustices in the context of women's prison writing. This occurs in the macro-level through time in the neglect and denial of their contribution to knowledge, based on the identity prejudice found in evaluating the preoccupations revealed in their writing as situated knowledge of their own experiences which differs from the preoccupations of the male prisoner as prison writer. It is further found in the connected systemic identity prejudice which then tracks them through their lives in multiple and different social

inequalities. This is highlighted in the gap of their writing as resource and the lack of critical

engagement with this writing as a means of expanding the social and collective understanding

of the lived experiences of incarcerated women within the penal system.

This awareness becomes imperative in examining how our epistemic practices and

conduct might become more just, precisely because "in matters of epistemic injustice, the

ethical is political", which becomes important for our own understanding of these phenomena

to bring about social change (Fricker, 2007, p. 4; p. 8).

Relevant to the context of criminology, Fricker (2007, p. 13) focuses particularly on the

social group of "delinquents" in Foucault's *Discipline and Punishment*, as the subjects of a

disenfranchised group within the structural operations of power to maintain social order and

control. She argues that with the term "'delinquent', a certain subject position is created as

the subject matter for a certain professionalized theoretical discourse" and within the

framework of the disenfranchisement of that particular social group, their interests "become

politically expendable" within the realms of the theoretical discourse (Fricker, 2007, p. 13).

Women's prison writing as a storehouse of lived experience with shared attributes over

time and space, stands neglected and unexplored because it is not viewed as a necessary

element in theorising punishment and as such not contributing to knowledge on the grounds

of either generally not being cerebral and/or theoretical, or historically described as

sensationalist, or of straddling all of these instances (Scheffler, 1984, p. 65). To this end, I

compiled and edited, *How Bleak is the Crow's Nest: An Anthology of Women's Prison Writing*

(Whitecross, 2021). The main purpose was to give a copy of the anthology to each of the

writers in prison as a tangible outcome of our work together and to say thank you. I also

considered how the publication of this prison writing in an anthology might demonstrate the

value of the creative process and output by providing encounters for understanding the lived

experiences of female incarceration to create a dialogue with cultural perceptions of the wider

community to recognise human dignity across the lines that divide and differentiate socially. Precisely because "publishing women's prison literature is one method of reminding society that incarcerated women exist" (Scheffler, 2002, p. xxi).

While reading the women's writing for the anthology, a new alchemic process took place. Retracing our creative journey, placing the individual fragments to form a whole, I got to know writers from a different perspective, reading not to analyse their words but to find the flow of the composite story comprised of individual reflections, thoughts, images and ways of expression. With this distance from the research process, I looked at their writing with new eyes and each writer story became more layered and textured. The more I read, the more clearly the writers and their characters and pre-occupations, loves and fears, hopes and dreams emerged.

It was a moving process, reading how they write themselves piecemeal, bit by bit, not all at once.

Towards a Dialogue of Stories

Liebling (1999, p. 152) writes that prisons are distinctive, "raw, sometimes desperate places," which "can also precipitate remarkable honesty." Within this raw desperate place, we encounter lived experience. Conaghan (2000, pp. 373; 385) observes that women's disadvantage in the context of imprisonment is to be understood as multiple, complex and intersecting, and she urges for an approach paying "close attention to the material lives of an oppressed" or dominated group, because it becomes a necessary task to the "intellectual goal of furthering knowledge and understanding the world we live in."

Sprague (2016, p. 22) writes that this framework, with the focus on research participants as agents developing knowledge through their own subjectivities counteracts the objectification of research "subjects," where people are turned into data "particularly those at

the bottom of social hierarchies – women, the poor, oppressed racial/ethnic groups, people from postcolonial nations, and people with disabilities."

The lived experiences of women in prison intersect at numerous points within these social hierarchies, and the danger in the practices of objectification lies in the fact that it comprises a "distancing effect," which can lead to justifying the continued existence of harmful institutional practices (Sprague, 2016, p. 22). From a narrative perspective, in coming to examine these raw, penal places through the experiences of women living within it, Andrews et al. (2013, p. 13) observe that the Latin etymology of narrative "lies in knowing, not telling". Proceeding from this vantage point, "without over-extending its remit, or treating personal narratives as universal theories", they write that the process of researching narratives as "ordered representations" holds the possibility of "mapping forms of local knowledge or 'theory'" (Andrews et al., 2013, p. 13). Because of the local situated knowledge produced, narrative research of storied lives, as a way of studying and understanding experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, pp. 19-20), both the personal and the institutional, holds the possibility of convergence where different knowledges can engage in dialogue with one another to create and produce a larger, yet still situated, narrative knowledge (Andrews et al., 2013, p. 13). For O'Neill and Seal (2019, p. 3) an imaginative criminological methodology pays attention to the "micrology of lived experience" and the ways and forms of telling with the focus on methods that expands the development of doing criminology imaginatively.

This observation chimes with Ferrell's (2004, p. 297) arguments for criminological methodologies that reclaim the "criminological enterprise from a courthouse criminology of scientific rationalization and methodological objectification", which instead offers researchers deep involvement with their research participants through humility and vulnerability. For Ferrell (2004, p. 296) the energy and vigour of criminological research

comes from the engagement with the research participants and not essentially in the subject matter, precisely because the subject matter and research participants "could just as easily be reduced to tabulated abstractions […] by any good abstract empiricist". He sees this, in part, as an intellectual resistance in the process of rehumanizing criminological inquiry and analysis, by confronting these cultural and social conditions that "pervade mainstream criminology" (Ferrell, 2004, pp. 296-297). To avoid this expendability of knowledge and to expand the concept of justice, O'Neill and Seal (2019, p. 2), in their review of Carlen's (2010) book, *A Criminological Imagination,* which spans over 30 years of Carlen's work on prison, punishment and penal reform, point to her bidding her readers to "Imagine a better world, serving the interests of justice and where the ordering of things can always be otherwise."

This bidding underpins Carlen's (2010), and by virtue O'Neill & Seal's (2019), argument for the "practice of imaginative criminology" (p. 2) starting with the belief that everything in the social world could also be different from an ontological viewpoint and that as such with the task of social science and academic criminology it becomes "more important to account for social phenomena than to count them" (p. 2). What is of individual benefit in the exploration of feelings and the expression thereof in writing becomes transformative in the collective response to the shared experience of incarceration and how the women related to and communicated with one another. The White Cow expressed what writing together as a group meant and how it benefitted the group of writers at Downview at the end of the project:

To Miss, You

> *Thank you for all the time that you've taken.*

> *Giving us due care and attention.*

> *Letting us know there is no need to shout.*

> *Quietly helping to point things out.*

The way you slowly bring us together.

No matter the mood at the time.

We walk together in sunshine and happiness

Due to your calming ways.

There is a fight deep within that's raging,

Yearning to escape.

With the careful nurture of our creative skills,

We've harnessed the power and found ourselves.

There is no longer a need to always bee shelved,

Like tiny walls of honey.

Thanks to days like these

And fun, vibrant classes,

We'll understand distinction and,

Claim our passes.

A toast to spreading and sharing

The skills released from within.

From Us

With this paper, I concur.

References

Andrews, M., Squire C., & Tamboukou, M. (2013). *Doing narrative research, 2ⁿᵈ ed.* SAGE.

Attia, M., & Edge, J. (2017). Be(com)ing a reflexive researcher: A developmental approach to research methodology. *Open Review of Educational Research 4*(1), 33 – 45. https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2017.1300068

Borg, K. (2018). Narrating trauma: Judith Butler on narrative coherence and the politics of self-narration. *Life Writing, 15*(3), 447 – 465. https://doi.org/10.1080/14484528.2018.1475056

Chekhov, A. (2007) *Sakhalin Island.* (B. Reeve, Trans.) Alma Classics. (Original work published 1895).

Clandinin, D. J., & Huber, J. (2010). Narrative inquiry. In B. McGaw, E. Baker, & P. Peterson, (Eds.), *International encyclopaedia of education* (3ʳᵈ ed., pp. 436 – 441). Elsevier.

Coogan, D. (2013). Writing your way to freedom: Autobiography as inquiry in prison writing workshops. In S.J. Hartnett, E. Novek, & J.K. Wood (Eds.). *Working for justice: A handbook of prison education and activism* (pp. 60 – 80). University of Illinois Press.

Dunne, M., Pryor, J., & Yates, P. (2005). *Becoming a researcher – A companion to the research process.* Open University Press.

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice – Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press.

Gelfand, E.D. (1983). *Imagination in confinement*. Cornell University Press.

Greene, G. (1990). Feminist fiction, feminist form. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies, 11*(2/3), 82 – 88. https://doi.org/10.2307/3346828

Herman, J. (1997). *Trauma and recovery, the aftermath of violence – From domestic abuse to political terror.* Basic Books.

Hunt, C. (2013). *Transformative learning through creative life writing – Exploring the self in the learning process*. Routledge.

Hunt, C., & Sampson, S. (2006). *Writing – Self and reflexivity*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Kofoed, J., & Staunæs, D. (2015). Hesitancy as ethics. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology, 6*(1), 24 – 39. https://doi.org/10.7577/rerm.1559

Liebling, A. (1999). Doing research in prison: Breaking the silence? *Theoretical Criminology*, *3*(2), 147 – 173. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480699003002002

McAdams, D.P. (2001). The psychology of life stories. *Review of General Psychology*, *5*(2), 100 – 122. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.5.2.100

Medlicott, D. (2000). Don't think this stuff: An analysis of prisoners' accounts of being suicidal in prison. Papers from the British Society of Criminology Conference: Selected Proceedings, Volume 3. July 1999. https://www.britsoccrim.org/volume3/007.pdf

Meretoja, H. (2018). *The ethics of storytelling*. Oxford University Press.

Muldoon, M. (2002). *On Ricoeur*. Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, Inc.

Mullen, C.A. (1999). Reaching inside out: Arts-based educational programming for incarcerated women. *Studies in Art Education – A Journal of Issues and Research*, *40*(2), 143–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.1999.11650

O'Neill, M., & Seal, L. (2019). *Imaginative criminology – Of spaces past, present and future*. Bristol University Press.

Ostrum, H. (1994). Introduction: Of radishes and shadows, theory and pedagogy. In W. Bishop & H. Ostrum (Eds.). *Colors of a different horse: Rethinking creative writing theory and pedagogy* (pp. xi - xxiii). National Council of Teachers of English.

Palmer, P.J. (1987). Community, conflict, and ways of knowing: Ways to deepen our

    educational agenda. *Change, 19*(5), 20–25.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.1987.10570153

Sarbo, L., & Moxley, J.M. (1994). Creativity Research and Classroom Practice. In W.

    Bishop., & H. Ostrum (Eds.). *Colors of a different horse: Rethinking creative writing

    theory and pedagogy* (pp. 133–145). National Council of Teachers of English.

Sprague, J. (2016). *Feminist methodologies for critical researchers, 2ⁿᵈ ed.* Rowman &

    Littlefield.

Van den Hoonaard, W. (2017). Lingering ethical tensions in narrative inquiry. In I. Goodson,

    A. Antikainen, P. Sikes, & M. Andrews, (Eds.). *The Routledge international handbook

    on narrative and life histor*y (pp. 581–592). Routledge.

Wakeman, S. (2014). Fieldwork, biography and emotion. *British Journal of Criminology 54*,

    705–721. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu039

Walker, D. (1994). Writing and reflection. In D. Boud, R. Keogh., & D. Walker (Eds.).

    Reflection: Turning experience into learning (pp. 52–68). Routledge Falmer.

Whitecross, R. (Ed.). (2021). *How bleak is the crow's nest: An anthology of women's

    prison writing*. Muscaliet Press.