

DIGITAL LITERACY PROGRAMMES FOR PRISON REHABILITATION

Dr. Riya Menon

Assistant Professor

Department of Social Work

Faculty of Social Sciences

University of Delhi, New Delhi, India

Abstract

Digital literacy has become an important condition for social participation, employability, access to public services, and personal independence. For people in prison, the absence of basic digital knowledge can deepen the disadvantages that already affect education, work history, family relationships, and access to civic institutions. As everyday activities increasingly depend on digital systems, individuals leaving custody may face difficulty using online job portals, digital identity services, banking applications, transport platforms, health information, housing systems, and communication tools. Digital literacy programmes within prisons can therefore contribute to rehabilitation by helping learners develop practical competence, confidence, responsible online behaviour, and readiness for life after release.

This review-based study examines the role of digital literacy programmes in prison rehabilitation. It considers the purpose, content, delivery models, institutional safeguards, and reintegration value of prison-based digital learning. The paper analyses core learning areas such as foundational device skills, information search, online safety, digital communication, employability platforms, e-government services, financial awareness, media literacy, and secure use of technology. It also examines the operational conditions needed for meaningful delivery, including protected learning environments, offline or restricted networks, staff preparation, needs assessment, accessible teaching resources, partnerships with education providers, and continuity of support after release.

The analysis indicates that digital literacy should not be treated only as technical training. In correctional settings, it is a rehabilitative capability that can support self-efficacy, informed decision-making, lawful participation in digital society, and transition to education or employment. Effective programmes require a balanced model that protects security while avoiding unnecessary exclusion from essential digital experience. When digital learning is linked with literacy, vocational education, counselling, case management, and community support, it can strengthen practical reintegration pathways and reduce the risk that individuals return to society unprepared for a technology-dependent environment.

Keywords: Digital literacy; Prison rehabilitation; Correctional education; Reintegration; Secure technology access; Digital inclusion; Employability skills; Prison education; Online safety; Social reintegration

1. INTRODUCTION

Digital technology now shapes many activities that were previously completed through paper forms, face-to-face offices, or personal assistance. Employment applications, government services, banking, health appointments, training courses, travel arrangements, and communication with organisations are increasingly conducted through websites, mobile applications, digital documents, and online accounts. People who do not understand these systems may experience practical exclusion even when they have the motivation to work, study, or

reconnect with their communities. This challenge is particularly serious for people in custody, many of whom have had limited access to technology before imprisonment or have spent several years away from rapidly changing digital practices.

Prison rehabilitation seeks to support lawful and constructive return to society. It is not limited to behaviour management within custody; it also involves building the knowledge, habits, relationships, and practical capabilities needed for life outside prison. Education has long been recognised as a central element of rehabilitation because it can

improve confidence, create pathways to work, and help individuals make informed choices. In a digital society, basic digital competence has become part of this educational foundation. Without it, a person may leave prison unable to navigate ordinary systems that are essential for employment, housing, benefits, family contact, and continuing education.

Digital literacy programmes in prisons are distinct from unrestricted internet use. Their purpose is to create structured, safe, and educational opportunities for learners to understand technology and use it responsibly. Depending on the security context, programmes may use supervised computer laboratories, closed networks, secure tablets, offline content libraries, learning management systems, simulated websites, or carefully controlled access to selected services. Such arrangements can provide practical experience while preserving institutional security, privacy, and public protection.

This paper studies digital literacy programmes as a component of correctional rehabilitation. It examines the educational rationale for prison-based digital learning, the skills that programmes should develop, the barriers that shape implementation, and the institutional measures required to create safe and useful learning environments. The discussion is intended to support prison administrators, education providers, social workers, policymakers, and community organisations seeking to strengthen reintegration through inclusive and realistic preparation for digital life.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on correctional education commonly links meaningful learning opportunities with improved prospects for rehabilitation and social reintegration. Education can help learners strengthen communication, problem-solving, self-management, and employability skills, while also creating a constructive daily routine within custody. Digital literacy adds a contemporary dimension to this work because it enables people to participate in the systems through which education, services, and labour markets increasingly operate. A learner who can use a keyboard, organise documents, identify reliable information, and complete a

digital application may be better positioned to act independently after release.

The literature also identifies a persistent digital divide in prison populations. Some learners may have had little experience with computers or smartphones before custody, while others may have used technology informally but lack skills for employment, online learning, document preparation, or safe navigation of official services. Long sentences can widen this gap because software, communication norms, security practices, and public digital systems change quickly. The resulting disadvantage is not simply about access to devices; it concerns the ability to understand digital environments, judge information, protect personal data, communicate appropriately, and complete practical tasks.

Prison education scholarship stresses that technology programmes must be aligned with rehabilitation rather than presented as isolated technical courses. Digital learning is most effective when connected to literacy and numeracy education, vocational training, job readiness, family support, counselling, and release planning. For example, a learner may practise preparing a curriculum vitae, locating training opportunities, using a simulated recruitment portal, managing a digital calendar, or recognising online fraud. These activities combine technical skills with planning, communication, personal responsibility, and awareness of real-world demands.

At the same time, correctional settings require careful attention to security, privacy, and equitable access. Prisons cannot simply replicate open digital environments used in community colleges or workplaces. Learning systems must be designed with clear rules, supervised access, appropriate content controls, incident-response procedures, and safeguards against misuse. The literature therefore supports a balanced approach: digital exclusion may undermine rehabilitation, yet unrestricted access can create legitimate operational risks. The policy challenge is to build secure pathways to meaningful digital learning rather than assuming that security and education are incompatible.

2.1 MEANING AND SCOPE OF DIGITAL LITERACY IN CORRECTIONAL SETTINGS

Digital literacy in correctional settings refers to the ability to use digital tools, information, and communication systems in purposeful, safe, and responsible ways. It includes more than operating a computer. Learners need to understand how to create and store documents, use common applications, search for reliable information, identify risks, protect passwords, communicate respectfully, recognise misinformation, and complete routine online tasks. For prison rehabilitation, the scope also includes awareness of lawful digital conduct and the ability to make decisions that reduce vulnerability after release.

The required level of learning differs across individuals. Some learners need introductory support with mouse control, typing, file management, and basic reading of on-screen instructions. Others may need digital skills for vocational courses, job searching, online interviews, digital payments, email communication, or access to public services. Learners with disabilities, limited literacy, different language backgrounds, or anxiety about technology may require adapted materials, assistive tools, smaller learning groups, and patient practice. A useful programme begins with assessment rather than assuming that all participants have the same starting point.

The correctional context also requires programmes to teach the social and ethical dimensions of digital participation. Learners should understand privacy, consent, copyright, digital footprints, harmful online conduct, scams, misinformation, and the consequences of irresponsible sharing. This is especially important because online spaces can expose people to manipulation, exploitation, misinformation, and relapse into harmful networks. Teaching digital responsibility provides a preventive dimension: it helps learners recognise risk and develop habits that are compatible with lawful, respectful, and constructive participation in society.

Digital literacy should be considered across the full journey from custody to release. In the early stages, learners may gain confidence through structured practice in a classroom. During sentence planning, they can apply

skills to education and vocational goals. Near release, learning can focus on practical transitions such as applying for work, locating services, using digital identity systems, preparing documents, and accessing training opportunities. After release, community-based support can reinforce these skills through libraries, employment centres, adult education providers, probation services, and non-profit organisations.

2.2 CORE COMPONENTS OF DIGITAL LITERACY PROGRAMMES

Digital literacy programmes for prisons may be organised around four connected domains: foundational device skills, functional life skills, information and media literacy, and safe digital citizenship. Foundational skills include basic navigation, keyboard use, file handling, document creation, printing, and use of standard software. Functional life skills include completing forms, preparing a resume, reading digital notices, using calendars, understanding online appointments, and managing simple digital transactions. These areas help learners translate technological knowledge into practical daily capability.

Information and media literacy is equally important. Learners must be able to distinguish official sources from unreliable content, evaluate claims, identify scams, understand advertising techniques, and avoid sharing unverified information. These skills are relevant to employment, financial decisions, health information, legal processes, and community participation. In a prison classroom, instructors can use scenario-based activities, offline web simulations, mock advertisements, sample job postings, and guided comparison exercises to develop analytical judgment without relying on open internet access.

Safe digital citizenship should include privacy protection, strong passwords, account security, respectful communication, cyberbullying awareness, consent, copyright, and responsible use of social media. Programmes should avoid purely fear-based messages. Instead, they can help learners understand how to make safer choices, ask for support, and recognise when a digital activity may expose them or others to harm. This approach treats learners as future citizens and workers who need agency as well as boundaries.

Programme content should also be connected to local reintegration systems. Digital skills have greatest value when learners can practise tasks similar to those they will encounter after release. Examples include navigating a sample employment portal, uploading a document, attending a mock online interview, locating public transport information, understanding digital banking terms, or accessing a service directory. Partnerships with community organisations can help ensure that course activities reflect actual local pathways instead of outdated or abstract software exercises.

3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The primary object of this study is to examine digital literacy programmes for prison rehabilitation and to understand how they can support successful re-entry into society. The paper focuses on the relationship between secure access to learning technologies, practical digital competence, employability preparation, personal responsibility, and post-release adjustment.

The study considers key programme elements including baseline skills assessment, structured computer learning, information literacy, online safety, document preparation, digital communication, employability tasks, access to e-government information, secure learning platforms, staff facilitation, and continuity of support after release. These elements are examined as parts of an integrated rehabilitation model rather than as stand-alone technical interventions.

A further objective is to identify the mechanisms through which digital exclusion can create obstacles after custody. These mechanisms include inability to apply for employment, difficulty accessing online services, dependence on intermediaries, vulnerability to fraud, lack of confidence in digital communication, barriers to further education, and reduced ability to manage routine administrative tasks. Understanding these barriers helps explain why digital literacy has become relevant to rehabilitation planning.

Finally, the study explores practical strategies for strengthening prison-based digital learning. These include secure infrastructure, curriculum design, training for educators and custody staff, individual learning plans, accessible resources, data-protection

safeguards, partnerships with employers and community providers, and outcome monitoring that tracks real reintegration needs.

3.1 LEARNING AND EMPLOYABILITY REQUIREMENTS

This subsection examines the educational capabilities that digital literacy programmes should support for prison learners.

- Baseline assessment of reading, numeracy, language, confidence, disability-related access needs, and previous experience with digital devices.
- Training in keyboard use, file management, word processing, spreadsheets, presentation tools, and safe use of approved learning devices.
- Practical employability tasks such as preparing a resume, writing a cover letter, searching for vacancies, understanding job descriptions, and practising online interview etiquette.
- Guided use of digital learning platforms for vocational modules, distance education, workplace certificates, and self-paced skill development.
- Support for creating, organising, and securely retaining essential documents needed for release planning and future applications.
- Accessible instructional methods for learners with low literacy, learning differences, disabilities, limited English proficiency, or anxiety about technology.

3.2 REHABILITATION AND REINTEGRATION DIMENSIONS

This subsection evaluates how digital learning can strengthen practical and social aspects of rehabilitation.

- Development of confidence, self-efficacy, patience, task completion, and problem-solving through progressive learning activities.
- Awareness of lawful and respectful online behaviour, including privacy, consent, copyright, digital footprints, and prevention of harmful communication.
- Preparation for online access to housing, health, benefits, transport, education, and community support services after release.
- Reduced dependence on informal intermediaries for routine digital tasks, thereby strengthening personal autonomy and privacy.

- Connection of classroom learning with sentence planning, vocational goals, family reintegration, counselling, and employment support.
- Post-release handover to libraries, community colleges, probation services, job centres, or non-profit organisations that can provide continuing assistance.

3.3 INSTITUTIONAL SAFEGUARDS AND PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE

This subsection considers the governance measures required to make prison digital literacy programmes safe, equitable, and sustainable.

- Use of closed networks, approved devices, filtered content, supervised sessions, and clear procedures for reporting technical or security concerns.
- Written policies on privacy, data handling, acceptable use, account access, incident response, and boundaries between education and security functions.
- Training for educators, prison officers, technical staff, case managers, and administrators so that programme goals are understood across the institution.
- Equitable access arrangements for women, young adults, older learners, persons with disabilities, people in remote facilities, and learners with limited prior education.
- Partnership agreements with accredited education providers, employers, libraries,

and community organisations to support relevance and continuity.

- Regular monitoring of participation, learner progress, security outcomes, access barriers, and post-release relevance rather than relying only on device availability.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a review-based, descriptive, analytical, and comparative methodology to examine digital literacy programmes for prison rehabilitation. The methodology brings together literature on correctional education, digital inclusion, adult learning, rehabilitation, employability, secure technology access, and social reintegration.

The study is based on secondary evidence from international standards, prison education guidance, policy documents, research articles, programme reports, and institutional publications. The sources are interpreted through a thematic framework that considers learner needs, curriculum content, technology arrangements, institutional safeguards, staff capacity, reintegration pathways, and outcome evaluation.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

The research follows a descriptive and comparative design to synthesise evidence on the contribution of digital literacy to prison education and rehabilitation.

Component	Description
Research Type	Review-based, descriptive, analytical, and comparative study
Approach	Digital literacy, correctional education, rehabilitation, and social reintegration analysis
Data Source	Policy documents, international guidance, research literature, programme reports, and institutional publications
Analysis Method	Thematic synthesis and comparative programme assessment
Focus Area	Prison learning environments, secure technology access, employability preparation, and post-release continuity

4.2 SOURCES AND ANALYTICAL CATEGORIES

The study considers the following evidence categories for evaluation:

- International guidance on prison education, rehabilitation, technology use, and the rights of people deprived of liberty.
- Research on correctional education, digital exclusion, adult learning, employability, desistance, and social reintegration.

- Government and prison-service reports on education, skills, institutional digital infrastructure, and programme delivery.
- Practice-based publications on secure devices, offline learning resources, digital libraries, staff preparation, and community transition support.

Each source is analysed according to the following questions:

- What digital skill or learning need is addressed?

- Which group of prison learners or reintegration task is affected?
- What security, access, or implementation barriers may limit delivery?
- Which institution or professional group is responsible for support and oversight?
- What measures can improve continuity between prison learning and community reintegration?

5. DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis indicates that the value of digital literacy programmes lies in the relationship between skill development and real-world participation. Basic device operation is necessary, but it is not sufficient. Learners need opportunities to apply digital knowledge to meaningful tasks: reading a digital notice, preparing a document, locating a service, identifying a scam, making an appointment, or responding to an employer. When learning is connected to these practical outcomes, technology becomes a tool for autonomy rather than an abstract subject.

Foundational competence is especially important for learners who have low confidence or limited previous contact with computers. A course that begins with unfamiliar terminology or complex software can discourage participation. Step-by-step instruction, repetition, peer support, visual guidance, and achievable tasks can reduce anxiety and create early success. For example, typing a short letter, saving a file, completing a simple form, or finding information in an offline resource can help learners experience control over a technology environment that may initially feel intimidating.

Employability is a major pathway through which digital literacy supports rehabilitation. Many recruitment processes now require online registration, electronic documents, email communication, digital assessments, or video interviews. A person who cannot perform these tasks may be excluded before an employer evaluates their motivation or work ability. Prison programmes can respond by integrating digital skills with vocational education: learners may prepare a portfolio, practise sending professional messages, understand online workplace expectations, and learn how to search for realistic opportunities after release.

The analysis also highlights the importance of information judgment. People returning from custody may encounter misleading job advertisements, predatory lending, identity theft, misinformation, or online scams. Digital literacy programmes should therefore teach learners how to verify sources, recognise suspicious requests, protect passwords, and ask for help. These skills are closely connected to personal safety and financial stability. They can reduce the likelihood that a newly released person becomes dependent on harmful or exploitative digital networks.

Secure technology arrangements shape what can be delivered. Closed learning networks, pre-approved resources, restricted accounts, supervised classrooms, and audit mechanisms can enable substantial learning without providing unrestricted access. The appropriate model will depend on sentence category, institutional security, staff capacity, national policy, and available infrastructure. However, the analysis suggests that blanket digital prohibition can create a different type of risk: individuals may leave custody without the skills required to function in ordinary public systems. The objective should therefore be risk-managed access, not avoidable exclusion. Finally, programme outcomes depend on continuity. Digital skills can deteriorate if learners have no opportunity to use them after release. Transition planning should include referral to community learning centres, public libraries, employment services, local colleges, or mentoring organisations. Where possible, learners should leave custody with clear information about approved community resources, documentation requirements, and first steps for accessing further support. This creates a bridge between prison learning and practical reintegration.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that digital literacy should be recognised as a core rehabilitative capability. In contemporary society, many routine rights and responsibilities are mediated by digital systems. An individual who cannot access online information, complete a form, communicate with an employer, or protect personal data may encounter barriers that are invisible to people with regular technology access. These barriers can weaken the benefits of other rehabilitation efforts, including

vocational training, counselling, health support, and employment preparation.

One important issue is the difference between digital access and digital inclusion. Providing devices alone does not ensure that learners gain useful skills. Inclusive programmes need assessment, structured teaching, accessible materials, suitable pacing, practice, feedback, and relevance to post-release life. They also need to consider learners who feel ashamed about low skills, have negative experiences of schooling, or require additional support due to disability, language, trauma, or limited literacy. A learner-centred approach is essential if programmes are to reach those who are most excluded.

Security concerns are legitimate, but they should be addressed through design rather than used as a reason to eliminate learning opportunities. Secure local networks, approved applications, role-based permissions, monitored sessions, educational content controls, and staff training can reduce risk while retaining meaningful access. This approach requires coordination between education teams and security teams. When digital learning is viewed only through a security lens, it may become overly restricted; when it is viewed only through an educational lens, practical risks may be overlooked. Collaborative governance is therefore necessary.

The discussion also points to the importance of professional development. Educators may be skilled in adult learning but uncertain about secure prison technology systems, while custody staff may understand operational risk but not the rehabilitative purpose of digital learning. Shared training can improve communication and help both groups support programmes more consistently. Technical staff, social workers, probation officers, and community partners should also understand how prison-based learning connects to release planning.

A final consideration is evaluation. Participation rates and course completion are useful indicators, but they do not fully show whether programmes improve reintegration. Evaluation should examine practical capability, learner confidence, safe digital habits, transition to further education, employment readiness, and use of community

support after release. Qualitative feedback from learners, educators, and receiving organisations can reveal barriers that numerical data may miss. A strong evidence base will help policymakers distinguish between superficial technology provision and programmes that genuinely improve readiness for life outside custody.

7. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that digital literacy programmes can make a meaningful contribution to prison rehabilitation because they prepare learners for the digital conditions of everyday life. As services, employment, education, and communication move increasingly online, people leaving custody require more than traditional literacy and vocational training. They need the ability to use digital tools confidently, evaluate information, protect themselves from online harm, and complete practical tasks independently.

The analysis shows that digital exclusion can affect reintegration through multiple pathways, including difficulty applying for work, inability to use public services, limited access to education, vulnerability to scams, dependence on intermediaries, and reduced confidence in communication. These challenges are intensified when people have been separated from changing technology for long periods or had limited digital opportunity before imprisonment.

Effective response requires an integrated model that combines secure infrastructure, learner assessment, practical curriculum, accessible teaching methods, staff preparation, ethical safeguards, and community continuity. Programmes should not focus only on devices or software. They should develop functional life skills, responsible online behaviour, employability readiness, information judgment, and confidence in navigating ordinary digital systems.

Digital literacy should therefore be embedded within prison education and release planning as a foundation for social inclusion. By creating safe, relevant, and well-governed learning opportunities, correctional systems can help people return to society with stronger capacity to work, learn, access services, maintain lawful participation, and build stable futures.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the study, the following recommendations may strengthen digital literacy programmes for prison rehabilitation:

- Adopt a clear digital literacy framework for prison education that includes foundational skills, employability tasks, information literacy, online safety, and responsible digital citizenship.
- Conduct individual learning assessments at entry and review progress during sentence planning so that courses match learners' starting points and release goals.
- Create secure digital learning environments using approved devices, closed networks, filtered resources, supervised sessions, and documented acceptable-use procedures.
- Integrate digital learning with literacy, numeracy, vocational education, job readiness, counselling, financial capability, and case management rather than delivering it as a separate activity.
- Develop practical exercises based on realistic post-release tasks, including preparing documents, understanding online applications, identifying official services, and recognising fraud.
- Provide accessible learning resources and additional support for learners with disabilities, low literacy, language barriers, trauma-related needs, or limited confidence with technology.
- Train educators, prison officers, technical teams, social workers, and managers in both the rehabilitative value of digital skills and the safeguards needed for secure delivery.
- Build formal partnerships with community colleges, public libraries, employers, job centres, probation services, and non-profit organisations to support continuity after release.
- Include digital readiness in release planning, with clear referrals to community support, information about required documents, and guidance on accessing local learning or employment services.
- Monitor participation, skill development, access equity, learner feedback, security outcomes, and post-release relevance to ensure that programmes remain effective and accountable.

9. REFERENCES

1. United Nations. (2015). *United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules)*. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
2. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2012). *Introductory Handbook on the Prevention of Recidivism and the Social Reintegration of Offenders*. United Nations.
3. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2026). *Handbook on the Use of Technology in Prison Settings*. United Nations.
4. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2017). *Roadmap for the Development of Prison-based Rehabilitation Programmes*. United Nations.
5. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2024). *Prison Matters: Global Prison Population and Trends - A Focus on Rehabilitation*. United Nations.
6. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2015). *Recommendation on Adult Learning and Education*. UNESCO.
7. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. (2020). *How Prison Libraries Support Rehabilitation Efforts*. UIL Policy Brief 11. UNESCO.
8. Krolak, L. (2019). *Books Beyond Bars: The Transformative Potential of Prison Libraries*. UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning.
9. Council of Europe. (1989). *Recommendation No. R (89) 12 of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on Education in Prison*. Council of Europe.
10. Council of Europe. (2020). *Recommendation CM/Rec(2006)2-rev of the Committee of Ministers to Member States on the European Prison Rules*. Council of Europe.
11. Council of Europe. (2021). *Ethical, Strategic and Operational Guidance on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Prison and Probation*. Council of Europe.
12. Coates, S. (2016). *Unlocking Potential: A Review of Education in Prison*. Ministry of Justice, United Kingdom.

13. Davis, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J. L., Saunders, J., and Miles, J. N. V. (2013). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-Analysis of Programs That Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults*. RAND Corporation.
14. Esperian, J. H. (2010). The effect of prison education programs on recidivism. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 61(4), 316-334.
15. Vacca, J. S. (2004). Educated prisoners are less likely to return to prison. *Journal of Correctional Education*, 55(4), 297-305.
16. Behan, C. (2014). *Learning to Escape: Prison Education, Rehabilitation and the Potential for Transformation*. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 1(1), 20-31.
17. Jewkes, Y., and Reisdorf, B. C. (2016). A brave new world: The problems and opportunities presented by new media technologies in prisons. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 16(5), 534-551.
18. Zivanai, E., and Mahlangu, G. (2022). Digital Prison Rehabilitation and Successful Re-entry into a Digital Society: A Systematic Literature Review on the New Reality on Prison Rehabilitation. *Cogent Social Sciences*, 8(1), Article 2116809.
19. Van De Steene, S., and Knight, V. (2017). Digital Transformation for Prisons: Developing a Needs-Based Strategy. *Probation Journal*, 64(3), 256-268.
20. United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute. (2024). *Digital Rehabilitation in Prisons*. UNICRI.
21. European Commission. (2020). *Digital Education Action Plan 2021-2027: Resetting Education and Training for the Digital Age*. European Union.
22. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *21st-Century Readers: Developing Literacy Skills in a Digital World*. OECD Publishing.
23. International Telecommunication Union. (2023). *Facts and Figures 2023: Measuring Digital Development*. ITU.
24. World Bank. (2016). *World Development Report 2016: Digital Dividends*. World Bank.
25. Government of the United Kingdom. (2023). *New Prison Education Service to Cut Crime*. Ministry of Justice and HM Prison and Probation Service.
26. Government of the United Kingdom. (2025). *Prison Education in England: Educational Background, Characteristics and Criminogenic Needs*. Ministry of Justice.
27. HM Inspectorate of Prisons. (2024). *Handbook for the Inspection of Education, Skills and Work Activities in Prisons and Young Offender Institutions*. United Kingdom.
28. Government of the United Kingdom. (2024). *Prison Education and Accredited Programme Statistics 2023-2024*. Ministry of Justice.
29. G3ict. (2020). *Digital Accessibility Rights Evaluation Index*. Global Initiative for Inclusive ICTs.
30. World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2014). *Prisons and Health*. World Health Organization.