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In January 2010, Prison Service Journal published a special edition exploring the issue of prison space. This discussed how architecture and place shaped the lives of people, but also that individuals and groups interacted with that, creating, reinterpreting and using space. This is a theme that is again relevant in this edition in Jennifer Sloan’s fascinating piece on cleanliness, spaces and male identity in prisons. In this she discusses how cleaning and cleanliness are ways in which prisoners create and maintain their identity and negotiate their daily lives. This is a captivating article which reveals the hidden transcripts that are present in an aspect of prison life which can easily be taken for granted. Themes of space and gender also permeate Barbara Rockell’s article on women’s imprisonment in the USA. This article dissects the gendered nature of imprisonment and how individuals attempt to adapt and survive.

The edition continues the discussion relating to identity, including gender identity, in further articles. The role of staff culture is particularly important, but often under-explored or misunderstood. In his article, David Scott discusses the notion of ‘working personality’, which attempts to capture the ways in which individual working practices and attitudes are shaped by the nature and experiences of the working lives as much as their personal characteristics. Scott proposes a typology of prison officers and contextualises this within a critical account of the prison system. His article is challenging in the sense that it confronts practitioners with some difficult issues but also challenging in the sense that it encourages those with humanitarian views to turn that into action. In complimentary but also contrasting piece, Neelama Kumari, Laura Caulfield and Michelle Newberry discuss their research on female staff working in the therapeutic communities at HMP Grendon. This work appears to suggest that the regime at the establishment has positive effects for staff and prisoners, including in breaking down entrenched gender barriers. Staff cultures are also discussed in the book review section, where Bethan Loftus’s excellent recent work on police culture is considered.

There are a number of current issues in practice and policy which are then examined. Paul Addicott publishes his research on the experiences of men serving indeterminate sentences. As this approach is currently being reviewed, it is helpful to include the prisoner voice in this debate. The current Government, advised by former Chief Executive of NOMS Martin Narey, is taking steps to speed up the adoption of children. The cost of failure is highlighted in the work of Hayley Cripps and Amy Summerfield who draw the main findings from an HM Inspectorate of Prisons thematic review of the imprisonment of children who are looked after by local authorities. Keiran McCartney picks up the Government’s high profile but contested vision of a ‘big society. McCartney discusses how this might be realised in relation to a controversial issue of criminal justice, in this case the management of sexual offenders in the community.

Closing this edition are three articles which illuminate the issues surrounding the riots of August 2011 in various English cities. Ian Fox-Williams and Ali Malik discuss the causes of the riots and set out various explanations including police misconduct, economic marginalisation and racial discrimination, whilst also recognising that many involved had rational motivations in engaging in looting for gain. Some of the underlying social issues are addressed in an excellent article by Tina Patel, which was researched and written before the riots but provides the background. In this work, Patel, interviewed those involved in car crime and unpicks the complex mix of social and personal factors that led people to get involved. As this research was carried out in one of the areas where riots took place, it has a particular salience. The edition closes with an interview with Professor Tim Newburn of the London School of Economics where he discusses the Reading the Riots research project, which has involved interviews with 270 people who participated in the summer disturbances. This provides a unique insight into their motivations, backgrounds and actions. This will be essential reading for anyone with an interest in crime and society.

All of these articles provide a means through which the relationship between prisons and society can be understood. The prison stands as a monument to the world we have created, founded upon our collective values and practices.
Cleanliness, Spaces and Masculine Identity in an Adult Male Prison

Jennifer Sloan is based at the University of Sheffield.

This paper is based upon a wider piece of research looking at the adult male prison experience from a gendered perspective, based in a category C prison. The research involved a period of semi-ethnographic research when the researcher was immersed in the prison setting, observing interactions between prisons and undertaking 31 semi-structured interviews into men’s day-to-day experiences of imprisonment. When analysing this data, the theme of cleanliness emerged unexpectedly yet frequently within interviews. Three sub-themes of cleanliness were drawn from the data — cleanliness of the self, cleanliness of space, and the cleanliness of others — and are discussed in terms of their combined implications in another paper. This paper builds upon that piece and focuses directly upon the state of prisons observed regularly referred to ‘housekeeping’ and maintenance of space. Within consisting of functions that can be seen as forms of research involved a period of semi-ethnographic looking at the adult male prison experience from a gendered perspective, based in a category C prison. The This paper is based upon a wider piece of research issue, albeit from the perspective of prison staff, the notion of cleanliness of space, a factor that tended well-being). Baer writes about the relationships between control, space and cleanliness within young offenders’ institutions, recognising the importance of the display of items such as cleaning products for individuals’ public displays of ownership, wealth and status. Crawley too, gives some consideration to the issue, albeit from the perspective of prison staff, recognising the ‘quasi-domestic sphere’ of the prison and the often domestic nature of prison staff regimes, consisting of functions that can be seen as forms of ‘housekeeping’ and maintenance of space. Within other institutions (many of which tend to be single-sexed in nature or organisation), the notions have also been recognised to some extent. Goffman notes the implications for individuals’ identities of the contaminative effects of living in institutions in close proximity with others, thereby recognising the implications of spaces and the locations of others for individuals’ identities; and Hockey has recognised the clash within the military between domesticity and routines of cleanliness, and the masculine ‘action image’ of soldiering. Rarely, however, do these accounts give a great deal of attention to the importance of the intersection of cleanliness and gender identity, despite Butler’s contention that acts and gestures (such as processes of cleaning):

… produce the effect of an internal core or substance, but produce this on the surface of the body, through the play of signifying absences that suggest, but never reveal, the organizing principle of identity as a cause. Such acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed, are performative in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are fabrications manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means.

Arguably, therefore, processes of cleaning spaces can have meanings and implications beyond simply hygiene and spatial management — they can be wider demonstrations of one’s gendered identity. Within the prison, mechanisms for demonstrating masculinity are, by the very nature of imprisonment, limited in their scope and social legitimacy. Indeed, through the commission of the crimes that placed individuals within the prison, men are often demonstrating their limited access to mechanisms of socially legitimate masculine performance — as Messerschmidt notes:

For many men, crime may serve as a suitable resource for ‘doing gender’ — for separating them from all that is feminine. Because types of criminality are possible only when particular social
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5. Ibid. p.130.
6. Ibid. p.129.
9. Ibid. p.50.
11. Ibid. p.173.
conditions present themselves, when other masculine resources are unavailable, particular types of crime can provide an alternative resource for accomplishing gender and, therefore, affirming a particular type of masculinity.\(^\text{13}\)

Within the prison itself, men’s masculinities are curtailed in various ways — described by Sykes\(^\text{14}\) as the ‘pains of imprisonment’, including the deprivations of liberty, autonomy, heterosexual relations, security and goods and services. As such, the means by which individual men within the prison are able to demonstrate their masculinities are limited, with those resources available to them taking on even greater levels of importance. This piece directly engages with the importance of cleaning to men in prison, and the ways in which such management of spaces by prisoners allows them to express and perform their masculine identities in quite distinctive ways, a subject that lacks attention in academic discourse yet has wide implications for interpreting and understanding the adult male prison experience. In particular, processes of cleaning and tidying spaces can be seen to allow individuals to differentiate themselves from the prisoner ‘other’, thereby mitigating the lack of individuality experienced in the prison and the contaminative effects that prison can have upon an individual’s identity:

*Participant:* I mean I always wear prison clothes, and it’s just because I feel, I feel prison’s dirty.

Men in prison tended to apply cleaning processes to two distinct sets of location — their personal cells (the prisoners who took part in this research all occupied single cells), and the wider prison environment experienced in their employment in cleaning jobs.

**Personal Spaces**

Men in prison often impose their personalities and masculinities upon their cells, be that through the display of photographs and pictures indicating their occupation of positions of masculine significance such as husbands, (heterosexual) partners, fathers, sons, (hetero)sexual men, etc.; or through the display of goods\(^\text{15}\) which signify wealth or ‘consumer masculinity’\(^\text{16}\). In addition to such overt signifiers of individuals’ selves, however, it seemed to matter to men in prison that such items of sentimentality and significance were situated within a specific cell environment, which was almost as important to them in terms of ownership and how their spaces were seen by others in the prison:

*Researcher:* ... have you made your cell your own, or is it...

*Participant:* Mmmhmm. Yeah, it’s mine, definitely.

*Researcher:* How have you done that?

*Participant:* Um... just... I just make it look smart, I clean, tidy.

The control of personal space acted as a means through which men could perform elements of their masculine selves, such as their abilities in caring for themselves, surviving the prison environment, and remaining independent from the institution. It was seen that being able to care for oneself and one’s personal environment sent very important signals to other prisoners, particularly with regard to notions of respect:

*Participant:* ... you know, some of them have zero respect for anything [...] Oh, some of them just, you know, if there’s a bin there they’ll throw stuff on the floor, if they spill something on the table they won’t think twice about cleaning it up, or... at least in my cell, I’m responsible, it’s mine, you know.

In addition, an individual’s personal space could be an indicator used by other aspects of the institution, such as staff, and would have implications for how an individual was seen on a more formal level with reference to their abilities to cope with imprisonment, or their attitudes towards the institution:

*Participant:* ... there was another guy on my wing, opposite me and he wouldn’t tidy his cell it was an absolute mess, he was like a tramp, so every week I’d go in and help clean it up and get it to a higher standard and the officers liked that...

Such indicators all implied levels of personal control, whether that be control over one’s performed identity, or control over one’s personal life course. Such control plays an immensely important role in the negotiation of the masculine self, as it indicates how independent an individual is — a key masculine trait — and whether they should be seen as vulnerable or weak, a label that can have quite serious implications for how an individual is perceived and treated by others, and for how they see themselves:

\(^{13}\) Ibid. p84.


\(^{15}\) See footnote 3.

Participant: I suppose the people I tend not to go too near are those who don’t wash. Because if they don’t respect themselves I just know they can never respect me in any way d’you know what I mean, and I tend to stay away from them a little bit…

A number of individuals involved in the research had already been granted such labels of weakness and vulnerability by virtue of other experiences within the prison, such as getting into debt, or being the victim of inter-prisoner harms, yet many of these men kept their cells impeccably clean and tidy, to such a degree that it seems to relate to something much more significant. Arguably, the process of maintaining one’s cell can be used to mitigate other labels, being an indicator of some form of masculine strength and control where other such identity resources are lacking. Cleaning is, therefore, one of the last resorts available to individuals through which to prove some degree of masculine dignity and self-sufficiency. In addition to personal spaces such as cells, the wider prison sphere was also used as a mechanism through which to display masculine signifiers through cleaning processes.

Communal Spaces

The cleanliness of the wider prison sphere was also seen to be important to individuals:

Researcher: Does that make a big difference whether a wing’s clean?

Participant: It does yeah, I think it brings a better atmosphere [...] If it’s like obviously these are new wings and it’s a lot more cleaner [...] It just makes the environment feel a lot more, more open if you know what I mean

As such, cleanliness played a part in shaping individual men’s well-being in general through aspects of their location and environment. Interestingly, however, individuals were often linked to such wider cleanliness though their employment as wing cleaners. Such forms of employment had implications for individual masculinities through their abilities to occupy working identities, seen by Tolson 17 to be a sphere of maleness in that:

For every man, the outcome of his socialization is his entry into work. His first day at work signifies his ‘initiation’ into the secretive, conspiratorial solidarity of working men. Through working, a boy, supposedly, ‘becomes a man’: he earns money, power, and personal independence from his family. 18

In addition, there were implications for men having jobs in the prison in terms of their abilities to use such employment as forms of ‘escape’ from the generic day-to-day prison experience. This escape emphasised male prisoners’ self sufficiency and a degree of individuality — men were able to escape from the ‘normal’ prison routine by being able to leave their cells — and sometimes their wings — during working hours in the day in order to do their cleaning jobs. This immediately differentiated them from the prisoner majority who were not trusted enough to be given such jobs — even more so for those who could go off the wing into more secure areas of the prison such as the offender management unit or the laundry area. Such acquisition of status and individuality allows individuals to distance themselves from the general prisoner identity and its associations with wasted time and the ‘dirtiness’ of the prisoner label. In addition, having such employment provides individuals with greater income for the accumulation of products signifying wealth and self-sufficiency. 19

Participant: I do it because it gets me out of my cell [...] Keeps me occupied, gets my time going a bit quicker [...] You know and plus you know it gives me a bit of money at the end of the week, ent it [...] for things I need.

Cleaning and Masculinities

Such processes of cleaning arguably raise issues regarding notions of gender identity (and its seeming subversion), control, differentiation and masculine performance. 20 Although activities of domesticity and processes of cleaning are generally seen to be the realm of women, they are regularly used by men in prison as a means through which they can achieve some of the norms of masculinity that are otherwise curtailed by the process of incarceration. Primarily, they provide men with a means through which to control their surroundings — the cleaning

18. Ibid. p47.
19. See footnote 3.
of one’s cell allows individuals to regain a degree of autonomy and responsibility over some aspects of their own prison experience. In addition, individuals are able to control their own senses of self through cleaning processes — by making one’s cell distinctively clean, a prisoner can differentiate himself from the incarcerated majority who he views not to take such care over their surroundings, thereby positioning his identity away from other ‘dirty’ prisoners:

Participant: A lot of people are unhygienic and just messy. Cos now, that’s what they’re trying to basically do, rehabilitate you for when you get back out, so if you’re just lounging around, you’re not doing anything, you’re sitting in your cell all day smoking fags, that’s all you’re going to do when you get out, you’re not motivated.

Not only does this allow individuals to differentiate themselves from the mass prisoner identity, but it also allows prisoners to see themselves as individuals within the prison by virtue of such differentiation. Such reclaiming of individuality goes some way to allowing men to achieve a sense of self which is separate from their imposed prisoner identities. Such appearances are of great importance to individuals in terms of their internalised senses of self, but also with respect to how they are seen (or feel that they will be seen) by others in prison who exert a masculine gaze. Kimmel21 discusses the fact that men in general tend to act for the benefit of the masculine gaze of other men who grant them their individual relative masculine status — processes of cleanliness and clean personal spaces create appearances that imply certain individual traits to others which often correspond to valued masculine qualities such as responsibility, self sufficiency, independence and control:

Participant: …the guy who had the cell before me, he must, he lived like a pig. The place was a pigsty, it really was a pigsty, I’m not joking […] So, you know, it would, just to clean it that bit better, if you could paint it and then it would be mine, you know? […] Not to be proud of, but, you know.

As such, the differentiation of the self from the prisoner majority can be seen particularly clearly through the cleaning of, and imposition of identity upon, the cell, making it look ‘new’. This is particularly important in that it goes some way towards mitigating the lack of ownership that can be associated with such constantly inhabited cells. Although cleaning processes could be argued to subvert gendered norms of behaviour, such as the division of labour that one typically sees between the sexes, this is, arguably, too simplistic a view. Cleaning allows a degree of normalisation to occur through individuals exerting ownership and dominance of spaces and thus their perceived identities of masculine control and self sufficiency. In this way, when paired with the respect that men align with cleanliness and the weakness ascribed to those whose spaces do not fulfil their expectations, spatial cleanliness is framed much more as a masculine accomplishment, accruing wealth, status and individuality in a positive — and socially legitimate (i.e. not criminal or harmful) manner.

Conclusion

This article has attempted to highlight the importance of processes of cleanliness of space for prisoners and their performances of masculine identity which tends not to be acknowledged in academic or policy debate. Prisoners’ manipulation of their cells through cleaning enables them to acquire a degree of differentiation and individuality through the imposition of their selves upon their cells, in addition to allowing them to feel like they are more individuals than part of an ever changing milieu of prisoners inhabiting the same space. Men in prison can also use cleaning processes to prove their masculinities through taking on working identities which, at the same time as providing recourses to signifiers of ‘consumer masculinity’22, distinguishes them from other prisoners whose access to different spaces in the prison are restricted. In this way, cleanliness tends to be situated in a subverted gender position within the prison — actually emphasising masculine traits such as control, individuality, dominance and independence. As such, when one participant proudly stated that ‘you can see your face in my floor’23, that reflection was, for all to see, the face of a man.

---

22. See footnote 16.
23. See footnote 1.
Traditionally, prisons are male dominated places. The majority of staff working in prisons are male and prison work has often been viewed as a ‘masculine’ occupation. However, the number of women working in these institutions continues to grow. As researchers, we are interested in the experience of women working in this traditionally male environment, particularly the experiences of those women working in therapeutic community (TC) prisons where there are numerous challenges to face. Little research literature exists concerning the role and experience of women in the Prison Service, let alone concerning the issues specific to a prison TC, and so to investigate these issues we decided to undertake research reviewing the experiences of female staff working at Grendon TC prison. This research is unique in that it is the first attempt to review the experiences of female staff working in a male prison TC and it has produced a number of interesting findings.

The research explored a variety of factors, including the experiences of women working in what is often perceived as an ‘authoritative’ role in a male-dominated environment, experiences of working with male inmates who may have issues communicating with women, risk and safety concerns, and the personal impact of working in such an environment. In addition, some research has suggested that female therapy staff may have a better attitude towards treatment and expectations than male therapy staff and so we were interested in exploring this further.

The research

This study aimed to review the experiences of female staff working at Grendon TC prison. HMP Grendon opened in 1962 and started out as an ‘experimental’ psychiatric prison to provide treatment for adult male prisoners with antisocial personality disorders. In recent years, it has adopted an approach more in line with the rest of the prison estate, whilst keeping its unique regime of therapeutic care for offenders. Grendon is a Category B establishment and accepts prisoners over the age of 21 with complex needs, such as personality disorders and psychopathy. Grendon houses mainly serious offenders serving life sentences and all inmates must give a commitment of 24 months to complete therapy to show that they have a genuine desire to change. Currently, Grendon accommodates up to 235 adult male offenders housed in six autonomous therapeutic communities on separate wings of the prison.

In accordance with the ethical guidelines of the British Psychological Society (BPS), and adopting a qualitative approach, interviews were conducted with ten female members of staff working at Grendon spanning the roles of: Forensic Psychologist; Trainee Psychologist; Assistant Psychologist; Art Therapist; Prison Officer; and Population Management Officer. Participants had worked at Grendon for between two and ten years and so were very familiar with the establishment.

Review of the literature

This research seeks to explore the specific experiences of female therapy staff at Grendon TC prison. Prison-based work has traditionally been male-dominated and so for females to fulfil an authoritative role in such an organisation (e.g. that of a Prison Officer), one could argue that they must adopt masculine traits such as assertiveness and detachment to be taken seriously, as opposed to feminine traits which are stereotypically emotional (e.g. ‘soft’ and caring). However, female therapists play an important role in a male prison TC, challenging the prisoners to adopt appropriate behaviour towards females in general or because they need to address their negative attitudes towards women during therapy.

Research has suggested that there is an element of gender segregation with regard to performance and recognition at work. For example, female psychologists tend to have a better attitude towards their client and display an appropriate level of empathy during treatment, although they make slower progress in their...
career than male psychologists. There are generally more males in managerial positions than females in most organisations, and it could be argued that ‘leadership style’ is a major contributor to this. Females typically have a democratic style of leadership and are concerned with trying to understand individual situations, and so have a more diverse approach to their leadership style. This was seen as a benefit at Grendon where female therapy staff may help to create a more balanced environment.

Research has suggested that workplaces with both male and female staff are likely to increase confidence and boost productivity; and gender appears to have a greater influence in the workplace than staff status. For instance, women tended to dominate the low level management roles, whereas the men dominated the senior management roles.

Given the special nature of HMP Grendon, and the issues that are relevant to women working with male offenders, the overall aim of the present research is to gain insight into the experiences of female therapy staff at Grendon. Specifically, to examine their approach to offering treatment, their experiences of working with prisoners at Grendon, and any differences in career progression between male and female therapy staff.

Discussion of findings
The findings are presented under the key themes that emerged from the research interviews: Gender roles and differences in approach; Feelings of safety and support; Inmate responses to female staff; and Personal experiences.

Gender roles and differences in approach
A number of themes emerged during the discussion of gender roles at HMP Grendon. Staff can find themselves playing the role of ‘parents’, where they ‘need to be firm but fair’ and ‘every staff member has a role to play, where the older female is the mother, the younger psychologist is the girlfriend, and the dominant therapist is the father.’ Indeed, other research has found that some prisoners report that they like male therapists to act as a father figure. Projection on to male prison staff can occur in a number of ways and can differ to projection on to females. For example ‘male therapists can experience projection from abused prisoners, where the perpetrator was a male’, whereas ‘women in control can be perceived as undermining and the men get confused because females should be approachable and not be writing reports.’ Participants felt that male and female staff tend to respond to an offender’s history in different ways. For example, ‘male staff seem to cope and shrug their shoulders, whereas females tend to be more empathetic.’ However, one participant had observed that ‘men cry to stories as well as women, and there is a mixed reaction.’

Some research participants stated that it is important to have a mix of female and male staff in order to understand and treat the prisoner. For instance, one participant felt that females highlight the ‘empathic factors, whereas the male staff pick on factual information.’ However, it was also noted that these differences are not just gender specific, but sometimes based on differing personalities. For example, one participant described some ‘male staff as controlling overtly, whereas other men are quiet and good listeners,’ and so different prisoners are likely to relate to different approaches of staff as much as gender differences.

The majority of the participants believed that they employ an approach which involves the use of feminine and masculine characteristics (e.g. they are empathetic as well as logical at work). Some of the participants reflected on what the prisoners had told them about their approach, with one participant claiming that she adopted a masculine approach to her work as she had been told that she is ‘analytical, closed off and shows less emotions.’

To avoid discrimination, participants stated that they ensure they are dressed appropriately around
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prisoners; the ‘men are denied sex in prisons, therefore it would be inappropriate to dress provocatively before them. It is about mutual respect’ and clothes must be worn which ‘are not revealing or low necked, and accessories cover bare skin’. The issue of appropriate dress was widely discussed by the participants with one describing how she ‘initially would wear dark and loose clothes, but now feels she can wear nice clothes without drawing inappropriate attention’. The latter point illustrates that reactions can be motivated by a number of factors: ‘the men notice new clothes on the staff all the time, for example new shoes or the male therapist’s new tie.’ It is noted that women are likely to adopt a range of measures to manage discriminatory issues at work.7

Gender differences were also discussed with respect to seniority within the prison. While research has shown progress in gender equality in the workplace with women often showing outstanding performance in their leadership style8 some participants felt that men still hold the majority of managerial positions at work: ‘senior officers and governors are predominantly male’ and the ‘western culture perceives men as dominant’. While some participants felt that men dominate senior roles because the Prison Service recruits more male staff, one participant claimed that success rates for female staff on promotion were lower ‘there are many females in psychology, but not so many females as Head of Psychology.’ Therefore, the perception here is that predominantly female professions are also dominated by males in managerial positions. Indeed, research still suggests that the gender of individuals affects status at work, with men dominating the senior roles, and women dominating the low level management roles. However, one participant explained that she ‘chose to work in a male dominated environment…but is not treated differently to any other staff and is not undermined.’ Additionally, participants did feel that management roles could be efficiently undertaken by men or women, as both are able to ‘take charge to hold things together and focus on the bigger picture’, and staff in senior roles ‘need to be strong and assertive’.

Feeling of safety and support

Overall the participants reported feeling safe at Grendon. One respondent commented that a prisoner’s previous offending was not necessarily a predictor of prison based offending: ‘the series of events which led to an offence will not repeat itself in the prison environment’. However in any prison environment there are likely to be some occasions when staff may fearful of their safety, which one participant stated ‘is healthy and realistic.’ Ground rules are put into place to influence prisoners’ actions, and if rules are broken there are particular procedures to be followed. For example, ‘an observation book records the prisoners actions, the prisoner is challenged directly, and there is the opportunity to speak to staff team for advice’. The staff were aware of the need to be vigilant and confident in their approach to avoid placing themselves in risky situations, and participants felt that ensuring they are communicating effectively with the ‘wholesome of the community and staff’ was the best strategy for avoiding such situations.

While there are safety procedures at Grendon (e.g. alarms, security staff, and appropriate staff numbers on the wing), staff reported that in addition to concerns over the potential for physical harm in the workplace, there is sometimes concern for its emotional impact. Many prisoners are or have been dangerous individuals and their difficult histories can affect staff in different ways. For example, one member of staff described herself as a ‘low reactor,’ whereas another described one instance where she read a rape account and was horrified, and since then she ‘briefly scans the offences to avoid false impression’. Furthermore, ‘the level of contact with the men can exploit painful things’, and the intensity of the job can lead to stress. It is therefore important to have support at work. Grendon offers a range of support, including, ‘group sensitivity, one to one supervision

with clinical staff, informal staff support, and the staff welfare care team who get involved after an incident’. Generally, participants claimed that there was adequate support and that the staff team seem to provide most of it. However, not all staff felt that the support at Grendon is useful. For example one participant claimed that the ‘staff can give their opinion but are not heard,’ and some reported that there is a lack of recognition at work. However, most of the participants felt supported by their senior managers. For example, ‘(I) had an issue with being the only female staff on the wing and requested for more female staff,’ and her senior manager is in the process of addressing this. Most of the participants felt that the resources at Grendon are sufficient, but that the people at Grendon are the best resources, because ‘there are lots of people who come from diverse range of experiences’. Indeed, it has been suggested that a mix of male and female staff can lead to an increase in self-esteem and confidence amongst staff.10

Most of the prisoners at Grendon have had bad life experiences, which in many cases has resulted in distorted thoughts about males and/or females. For example, one participant described how some ‘prisoners will perceive females negatively due to the female negative role models in the past.’ Indeed, high risk offenders can have a history of problems with a particular gender, which can also be linked to their offence11; because of these preconceived ideas about gender, it is inevitable that some prisoners will struggle with particular staff. Alternatively, ‘the men can be protective towards female staff’, which is something the male staff do not experience from the prisoners. Staff had also observed how prisoners can alter their behaviour, and will behave well and temper their language around females. For example, if the prisoners swear in the presence of a female, they will apologise immediately. However, the same prisoners do not do this for the male staff. The way the staff present themselves has an influence on the way the prisoners communicate. For example, on e participant described the ‘male therapist on the wing as palpable and the men will respect him.’

There have been instances where prisoners will purposefully say or do things in order to differentiate between male and female staff. Some prisoners can also ‘be critical and punishing when they are overtly sexual and flirtatious, and the staff do not reciprocate’. A few of the participants described incidents where a prisoner touched a female prison officer on the bottom, and another described a situation where an inmate came out of his cell with nothing but a towel on in front of a female officer. However, these kinds of situations are rare at Grendon, and staff reported that only a few prisoners will break boundaries. Most of the prisoners become infuriated with those prisoners who create these situations, and are ‘over-protective’ of the females. Petrillo (2007) claimed that female staff are perceived to be at high risk when working with these types of offenders, although other research has found that female staff are capable of adopting reasonable measures to protect their safety.12

The prevalence of psychopathy in HMP Grendon is unsurprisingly high given the nature of the offences committed by the prisoners held there13 and so the level of manipulation among and by prisoners is an understandable risk. One participant claimed that the prisoners tend to target ‘anyone who has feminine aura about them, men or women,’ but ‘the degree to which the manipulation has an effect on the individual can vary’. Conversely, other research has found that if prisoners have an issue with females, then female staff can teach the prisoners about female perceptions.14

More generally, most of the participants stated that the duration of employment at Grendon can influence staff performance. One participant explained that the ‘intense and long relationships with prisoners has a positive impact on the treatment.’ Another claimed that the long duration in employment is beneficial, because then the staff have ‘seen it all before,’ whereas the ‘new

staff tend get horrified with offender histories.’ Following this, some participants believed that the longer the staff have been working at establishment, the more the prisoners start to understand the staff and form their opinion of them.

Typically, prisoners at Grendon are engaged and motivated to change, which in turn impacts positively on staff: ‘staff have respect for inmates, and the inmates have respect for the staff, which is positive in reducing risk’. Several participants reported having found it a privilege to work at Grendon, because of the ‘engaged rehabilitation process’, and the proven success of the therapeutic community approach. One participant recalled that she was attracted to the prison because ‘everyone wants to do the same thing and the whole prison works in the same way.’ Most of the participants felt they have changed personally since working at Grendon. For example, they have ‘become more vigilant and have realised people are not as innocent as they may look’. Some of the participants were parents, and seeing how some of the prisoners have had a difficult childhood which may have affected their offending behaviour, they ‘are more wary and over-protective of their children’. Participants generally felt that this was something which was more likely to be experienced by female staff. One participant described how she ‘has become more thoughtful, empathetic, compassionate and (her) general outlook on life has changed,’ and another described herself as ‘a good listener now, with more patience and confidence.’ Grendon is all about communicating and empathising with each other, and one participant stated that this ‘has enabled her to soften up and get in touch with her feminine side, allowing her to look at (her) personality issues and family dynamics.’ Similarly, another found that she has ‘started to look at myself more and question how I relate to other people.’

Conclusions

The majority of female staff who were interviewed for this research felt that Grendon is a safe place to work and that prisoners are generally well mannered and compliant in the presence of female staff. However, many participants reported that at times they can find certain aspects of the work distressing or challenging, such as listening to prisoners’ offence histories or the intensive level of contact with prisoners. It is likely that these issues are not specific to HMP Grendon, and may perhaps be typical of women working throughout the prison estate — particularly of those women working in male establishments. However, as noted previously, Grendon does house high numbers of men with psychopathy and personality disorders, and this combined with the unique regime of Grendon means that there are some factors likely to be unique to the experience of working in this particular prison. For example, most participants felt that they had changed since working at Grendon, including becoming more vigilant and protective of their children, and more thoughtful, compassionate and empathic. Female staff also reported being aware that prisoners do treat them differently from their male colleagues, but over time at Grendon they had learnt how to deal with this, for example by raising any issues in community meetings rather than individually.

Participants reported that they feel supported and are comfortable working in a TC environment. Those interviewed perceive that some gender differences at work still appear to exist — for example there are still predominantly males in senior roles, although this is not specific to Grendon or indeed the Prison Service as a whole — but participants did report feeling that their achievements are recognised at Grendon. The participants did not feel undermined at work, and any negativity from prisoners is not taken personally because staff understand that it has more to do with their past experiences than the gender of staff. Overall, HMP Grendon is perceived as a positive place for female staff to work, and furthermore, the characteristics of female staff are likely to have a positive impact upon the TC regime.
Women and Jail: Life in the Gendered Cage

Dr Barbara Rockell is an Associate Professor of Sociology at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, New York.

Introduction

Societal notions about gender have influenced the conditions of confinement and treatment afforded women offenders since prisons first appeared in the United States. During the early years at Auburn, for instance, because women who committed crime were considered so gender-unnatural and, as a result, morally depraved, the nature of their imprisonment was far worse than that provided males. Thus while provisions were made for the privacy and labor of men, women at Auburn were 'left to their own devices' cloistered together in a 'tainted and sickly attic' where food was provided and slop removed once a day, leading the prison chaplain to say, 'To be a male convict in this prison would be quite tolerable; but to be a female convict for any protracted period, would be worse than death.'

Scholars have commented on gender's influence in shaping women's corrections, both historically and currently. What is lacking in the literature, however, is an examination of women's thoughts about and reactions to this particular aspect of their imprisonment. Indeed, the gendered nature of correctional facilities and the gendering processes they promote are typically ignored as researchers focus solely on the influence of gender at the individual and group levels, to assess women's adaptations to confinement, the nature of which remains, in other words, implicitly gender-neutral.

Dana Britton (2003) has challenged this notion of the prison as gender-neutral. In doing so, she draws on a perspective in the sociology of work and organizations, the theory of gendered organizations, to explore processes of organizational and occupational gendering in the prison work setting. The theoretical basis of her analysis is that organizations are not neutral spaces shaped by the behaviors of workers' gender identities, but rather sites 'in which these attributes are present in pre-existing assumptions and constructed through ongoing practice.'

The present article extends Britton's thoughts and model to examine and interpret women's lives in a gendered confinement setting. It differs from her work in two ways. First, its focus is not on the institution as a work setting, but as a living environment for women confined there. Its interest, in other words, is to examine how women perceive and react to gendered-related practices in this setting. The second difference is the carceral site for research. Rather than a prison, this study took place within an American penitentiary, a county institution of social control that holds individuals sentenced to terms of under one or two years. Because of their short-term nature and problems of accessibility, research in these facilities has been somewhat limited, despite the fact that when compared to prisons, many more people pass through them annually, and for some, with lifetimes of repeat commitments, far more time is spent within their walls. The author also shares the sentiment of other recent scholars that criminal justice in the United States is primarily a local affair and believes that an examination of these community-level facilities is critical to understanding the actual day-to-day exercise of social control. Further, she will argue that penitentiaries, with their unique governmental, economic, and social contexts, evince far more profound and entrenched gendering practices and cultures than the state-administered prison.

The Current Study

Methodology

The site for this research was a county-run penitentiary in upstate New York. The facility held an average daily population of 350 locally-sentenced men and women. A sample of 35 women with at least five prior penitentiary confinements was selected for in-depth interviews. Interview questions were open-ended

and focused on the confinement experience, with women asked to comment on: the hardest and easiest aspects of doing time; the advice they would give a close female friend facing local confinement; interpersonal relationships; facility/staff practices; and the culture they experienced in this facility.

Qualitative methods were used to work with the data and two research questions directed the study. The first sought to determine the degree to which the women perceived their confinement setting as gendered. The second sought to assess and contextualize the ways in which they negotiated and, in some cases, resisted these gendered processes of social control.

Findings
Perceptions of the Penitentiary as a Gendered Environment

Britton conceptualized the process of organizational gendering as occurring on three levels: structure, culture, and agency. By structure, she meant formal/informal policies and practices directing daily operations. These were gendered, Britton said, to the extent they reflected general notions of men and women that were premised on and reproduced gender.6

There were several formal policies, directed only at women, that appeared grounded in gendered assumptions about the problems they, as women, posed in the correctional setting. One was ‘the uniform rule.’ This rule required women, not men, to be dressed in full uniform at all times, from the moment they rose to lights out. Men, in contrast, could wear sweats until they left the housing unit. When questioned about this rule, Robin said she thought it was probably to cut down on the ‘sex stuff.’ At the same time, she added, ‘there’s a lot of power in the uniform. Why can’t we be human for a while — where’s the problem with watching TV at night with your pajamas on?’

This was one example of how women, because of their sexuality, were viewed as a problem population, with the culture they experienced in this facility.

The stated reason for denying women access to the outdoors was that there is ‘some of them, a few years ago’ had flashed passing motorists by lifting their shirts. No reason was given for why women couldn’t use the gym, other than ‘they had their own.’ Once again, one could interpret this restrictive solution to an incident caused by a few as being gender-driven: women, a ‘problem population,’ were a sexual threat, who might display their sexuality at any time. This threat of sexuality also might explain the apparent security rationale of limiting their movement throughout the facility. It also seemed that gender was behind administration’s belief that women did not need the same level of physical exercise as men.

Every woman talked about these restrictions. Very few actually used their gym, saying ‘what’s the point — to shoot hoops by yourself? You can’t run or work-out like the men.’ Many had not been outside for months and all complained that the ‘no outdoor rec rule was not right’

The women mentioned other practices as ‘clearly discriminatory.’ None had received work release and the entire female population (120) saw just one counselor. Work opportunities were limited to the housing unit, because commingling in work sites was prohibited. Commingling in programs also was forbidden, so the women were serviced within their unit by outside religious and self-help volunteers. Even more troubling was the facility’s policy when the male count exceeded available housing: the women said they’d be herded into make-shift quarters without toilets or phones, with the men relocated to their former unit. The author witnessed this practice on several occasions.

In sum, it appeared, based on these discussions, that an underlying directive of operations in this facility was to make the women invisible or to return them, if you will, to the attic of Auburn days, where they were housed as one classification (i.e., female) in space not needed by men from which they rarely left for programming or other privileges engaged in by the men. The women clearly believed this facility was administered in ways to exclude and isolate them and described this during talks with the author. ‘We are just an after-thought,’ they said, ‘living in a facility run by men for men.’

The second level of gendering Britton identified was culture. Particularly powerful and relevant to describing the culture in this facility was the work of John Irwin. Irwin said that jail culture was shaped by its underlying purpose — the containment and maintenance of a community’s ‘rabble.’ This was a culture, he observed, that was characterized by ‘unintended consequences’ that prepared or maintained a person in the rabble class. These consequences, characterized as distinct processes of the jail experience, included disintegration, disorientation, degradation, and preparation for rabbledom. Irwin further said that the jail’s culture was shaped by its lowly status in a community’s social control apparatus, wanting of financial support, structural resources, and material amenities. These deficiencies, along with the ideological justification for them (i.e., that jails control rabble, and, therefore, deserve minimal funds), resulted in a management style that was unique to jails, Irwin claimed — a style of ‘malign neglect [with] a thinly disguised element of intentional meanness.’

Based on this study, it was clear that ideas about gender only heightened the unintended consequences and culture of intentional meanness Irwin attributed to jails. A sense of disorientation, by which Irwin meant anomic or alienation, permeated the answers of most questions asked. Women spoke constantly of silly rules in ways that reflected felt powerlessness, with saying they were treated like children or infantilized in the facility. Tina resented having to ask deputies for everything, ‘from soap and tooth powder to toilet paper — what can you do with toilet paper or sanitary products?’ she asked. ‘It’s embarrassing,’ Carmen said. ‘The hardest thing about jail was following the stupid rules; I’m an adult; I think I know I should use the bathroom before I go to bed.’

The women also spoke of jail culture in ways that demonstrated its role in preparing one for rabbledom, which consisted of ‘acquiring the rabble mentality…an attitude of mistrust or wariness about others; an outlook that was opportunistic; [and] a spirit of making do.’ This, too, was exaggerated by the gendered living environment. For instance, because women were not classified according to history or needs but were all housed together, the unit, according to many, was just a ‘milder version of the street, a place where no one could be trusted and you looked for new hook-ups for returning to it.’ And, among women who ‘had burnt their bridges on the outside,’ having lived lives marginalized by poverty and gender, ‘everyone tried to out-hustle everyone else,’ as if on the street, to better their own situation.

As far as the intentional meanness Irwin described, the staff were very vocal in their dislike of female inmates. Indeed, it seemed that women were reacted to solely in terms of their most negative stereotypical gendered traits. They were said to be obstinate and demanding, never taking no for an answer and always wanting to know why something was forbidden or taken away; they were described as overly emotional and hormonally imbalanced, particularly when living together where each tries to exceed others in terms of drama-laden accounts or outbursts; they were called catty, always getting into each other’s business and gossiping incessantly; and finally, they were thought to be bitchy with staff, never reluctant to fight, even weaponless, and always noisy and nasty when doing so.

This misogynistic culture of meanness was no doubt influenced by those who ran and worked in the facility. In the case of this penitentiary and probably most others in the US — these individuals are usually military/ law enforcement-oriented. The county Sheriff, who is charged with the administration of most American correctional facilities, is not typically interested in correctional settings or work. You also rarely find people working in penitentiaries as their chosen career path. Many are there because of not
being hired by their preferred choice — police agencies. Many others are getting into this work because of down-sizing or just not having other available options in their communities.

The women, themselves, commented on these staff attitudes, noting that they were often dismissed like children seeking attention when they approached housing unit supervisors with problems or complaints. They also noted the infrequent visits by ‘white shirts’ (lieutenants and above) to their unit, which were usually quick (to avoid interactions) and equally, if not more, dismissive. The nature and quality of medical care also disturbed the women, who repeatedly said, ‘you don’t want to get sick in here. The nurses say you’re whining and the doctors — they think you’re lying to get attention or drugs.’

Britton’s third level of gendering was at the micro-level of agency or how individuals did gender. Based on discussions with the women, it appeared that housing unit supervisors accomplished gender in three distinct ways, using gendered supervisory styles based on all-too common (and stereotypical) notions about women and the exercise of power.

The first and most frequently mentioned style was ‘Mommie Dearest.’ Many women said that certain deputies made them feel like children, not adult women, repeatedly telling them to comb their hair, eat everything on their plates, take a shower, or use the bathroom before bed. A second common style was ‘Bad Teacher,’ including several deputies who used questionable pedagogical techniques for enforcing orders. One made inmates write a 100 times that they would not violate a particular rule, after they had done so. Roberta, for instance, said that she had to write 100 times ‘I will not use the bathroom during fall-in time.’ ‘Can you imagine?’ she asked. ‘Not only does she treat you like a school kid, but she acts like the old nuns. I wouldn’t punish my own kid for using the bathroom if she had to, fall-in or no fall-in.’ It seemed highly improbable that such a supervisory technique would be used with male inmates. Just as improbable was another deputy’s use of ‘time-out’ for women who had difficulty accepting a restriction or order.

When asked how they did time, the women mentioned several strategies that reflected their gendered experiences prior to incarceration, as well as a degree of resistance to gendered oppression within the facility.

A third style often described was the ‘Abusive/Power-Focused Spouse.’ Malikah commented on ‘being talked down to,’ as did Carmen who said ‘they treat us like we’re lower than them — just inmates, that’s it.’ Even more telling were Audrey’s words. Audrey, a 37 year old mother of six, announced, with a large smile, that she was now separated, after 20 years of marriage, only five of which were free from physical abuse. When asked if jail was physically more comfortable, less comfortable or about the same as her life outside, she said it’s about the same — that she felt safe with the other inmates, but not the deputies. ‘They put me through what my husband put me through,’ she said. ‘They yell, treat you like dirt, and show you no respect. If they could shit on us, they would.’

Negotiating and Resisting Gendered Confinement

Many, if not most of the 35 women interviewed, had countless incarcerations, with rap sheets of 10 pages or more dating back to their teens. And, as an aggregate, they very much resembled similarly situated women profiled by other researchers, both personally and criminally. They were poor, undereducated, rarely employed single mothers, with a host of chronic medical and mental health problems, most of which had only been addressed in jail.

The majority had been abused as children, usually by family, and nearly all had offense histories limited to property and public order crimes, with some instances of simple assaults. Nearly all were drug-involved with most reporting crack as their drug of choice.

When asked how they did time, the women mentioned several strategies that reflected their gendered experiences prior to incarceration, as well as a degree of resistance to gendered oppression within the facility. The various ways in which women ‘did jail’ are described below.

Taking a Break — Penitentiary as a Safe Haven

As other researchers have found, many women saw time in the penitentiary as a respite, a break from the marginal circumstances they’d endured on the
outside or the street. Many said being in the facility gave them ‘a much needed break from the life’ or that it was a ‘relief, having the responsibilities of the world lifted off [my shoulders]… without causing my family any more problems with my bullshit.’ For just as many more, being in the penitentiary meant ‘not worrying about how you were going to eat or where you were going to sleep’ or even ‘if you would survive the night.’ For others, it was a ‘blessing in disguise,’ giving the woman a much needed respite of structure and substance to possibly ‘get right with my God.’ And, for a few, it was ‘just an [expected] interruption, a place to put my head down for a while,’ or as ET said it was like going into treatment — ‘I do it when I’m tired and need a break.’

Making the Most of It — Penitentiary as Service Provider

Along similar lines, many said they came to the penitentiary for the same reason they went to rehab — not just to rest, but to get the much needed services not available on the outside. These women evinced a sort of survivor mentality, born of a street existence and homelessness where they felt far less safe and comfortable than they did in jail. They expressed a ‘can do’ attitude about time, saying like ET, that ‘I can do jail — I have everything I need, three meals and a bed. I can do a year standing on my head.’ In addition to this survivor attitude, they also evinced a level of opportunism, as Irwin described. Tracy said the penitentiary was ‘easy — [she] could finally sleep and eat.’ Robin was able to get a pair of glasses and Elaine, who said her street name was Betty Crocker (because she ‘cooked cocaine proper’) said she had finally seen a dentist. Lana was ‘much more comfortable, not using, getting three meals a day, and your laundry done with a smiley face included in the bag.’

Non-Sexual Relationships — Penitentiary as Family

Relationships between incarcerated women, both sexual and non-sexual, have been an area of consistent and significant interest among researchers. With respect to the non-sexual, although most of the women doubted the sincerity of facility friendships, referring to them as ‘fake’ or ‘fiction,’ there were some that were recognized as ‘real.’ Many older women ‘looked out’ for daughters of outside friends. Some expressed genuine fondness for ‘bunkies,’ saying they always told each other good night and good morning. Many also reconnected with friends from the street and some, learning of the exploits of others, made new connections. Older women were moms to young first-timers. And, several of the openly gay women, referred to as ‘the brothers’ and ‘poppa,’ seemed to be advice-givers in the unit.

Hustles — Penitentiary as the Street

For many, the facility was but an extension of the street, and, how they functioned there was simply a mirror image of how they survived outside, and that was by their wits and their sex. They were in Owen’s ‘mixes’ and knew how to work time scamming or hustling to better their own conditions. There were three distinct hustles among the women.

The first hustle of homosexuality was primarily economic in motivation and the most common method of survival. For many, especially those who had ‘burnt their bridges,’ exchanging sex for commissary was just a transference of what they’d done on the streets to get drugs or other necessities to survive. For others in this population of abused, motherless women, the motivation was less material and more about ‘having someone hold you or having someone who cares.’

The second hustle, running stores, was referred to as ‘two for ones,’ a phrase highly descriptive of the nature of the exchange. Proprietors of stores would provide one item of something to a ‘buyer’ with the expectation of receiving two in return with the person’s next commissary. Given the jail menu, food and drink were the main commodities bought and sold with personal hygiene products running a close second.

Women who dealt in meds or ‘ran pharmacies,’ the third hustle, were self-reported frequent visitors to Medical, where they complained of a variety of ailments ‘to get something to numb them out.’ These druggists said that the best advice they could give someone coming to jail was — ‘to get all the meds you could,’ and given the number of women medicated in the unit, it appeared to be well-heeded. The pharmacy was less

13. See Owen (1998), who referred to mixes as behaviors in the prison that could result in trouble for the individual, such as drugs or fighting.
a store and more a bartering enterprise. Pills were exchanged for goods and favors, usually delivered through commissary or one’s tray. The goal was to get as many meds and combinations of meds as possible to ‘leave’ jail, if just for a while, and revisit the state of euphoria or detachment one had on the street.

Conclusion

It is not possible to mistake jails or penitentiaries in the United States as being anything more than a community’s miserly attempt to control and manage the rabble of its streets. Most are typically crowded, physically worn, under-funded, and programmatically-lacking institutions. It also is not possible to overlook the maleness of these facilities, both literally and figuratively. Women not only constitute an actual minority of staff and inmates, they also are made even more invisible within structures, cultures, and actions distinguished by institutional misogyny. Indeed, one could say that in many ways, these two characteristics — their deprived, male-dominated settings — parallel and even mirror the ghetto streets from which their inhabitants come.

Thus it is, perhaps, not surprising that women’s lives in the study site, with its isolating practices, minimal programming, and culture of alienation, mistrust, and meanness, simply produced a ‘milder version of the street,’ as one observed. What was both sad and heartening, however, were the ways in which women reacted to this setting. For many, the penitentiary had become integral to survival. For others, it was an expected occurrence, a part of lives spent boosting or prostituting, where they rested. Many opted for it rather than ‘rehab’ as an avenue to obtain much needed services and some, whose families were long gone, derived material and emotional support from ‘associates’ found inside. Others flourished in the setting, engaging in enterprising modes of survival in the underground economy, an activity usually considered an exclusive male preserve. In the end, the fact that these women who were primarily street-level offenders would exercise the wits, skills, and resilience born of that world to survive and resist the similarly gendered and marginalized setting of the penitentiary seemed both understandable and particularly fitting. The penitentiary was, after all, as ghettoized and misogynistic as the streets they walked.

Obituary — Kathleen McDermott: Prisons Researcher

Dr Kathleen McDermott, anthropologist and prisons researcher has died at the age of 67 after a long and debilitating illness. Born in the Bronx, the daughter of an Irish American policeman, Kathy first qualified as a Registered Nurse before graduating Summa Cum Laude in Anthropology and proceeding to an MA and PhD from the University of California, Berkeley. After a period spent in Hong Kong and the Far East, Kathy eventually found her way to the University of Wales, Bangor, where she directed a study evaluating the effectiveness of programmes to combat youth unemployment under the Thatcher government between 1981 and 1983. After a brief period farming sheep with her second husband in Vermont, where she quickly became a pillar of the community providing voluntary ambulance and other public services, she was enticed back to the University of Wales to play a leading role in two research projects. The first was a comparative study of the regimes in five prisons and the second a study of how prisoners, and above all their families, coped with long term imprisonment.

It was as a gifted prisons researcher that Kathy found her academic forte. As an American citizen she was able to play the anthropological stranger in the tightly closed world of prisons, communicating with both staff and prisoners from all races and ethnic backgrounds with an ease often denied to her British counterparts. Her intuitive feel for situations and what likely lay behind them meant that she was almost always the first to understand what was really going on. A sympathetic ear, an outgoing personality, inexhaustible energy and wise judgement made her the near perfect fieldworker and colleague. As a researcher Kathy McDermott made contributions to about a dozen articles, a research monograph and several book chapters, reports and conference papers about prisons in this country. Among other things they drew attention to the dramatic decline in the quality of prison life between 1970 and 1987 and to the need for a better way of dealing with difficult prisoners. These had a profound influence on the way in which prisons policy developed around the time of the Woolf report on the Strangeways riots in 1991. If some of those policies were later undermined by Michael Howard and successive New Labour Home Secretaries their significance remains and their lessons have not been forgotten by a much beleaguered Prison Service.

Kathy returned to the United States at the end of these research projects to take up a new career as an administrator at Columbia University as its first residential dean where she advised on the study abroad programs, eventually becoming the Director of the Office of Global Programs and an Assistant Vice President of the University. Her passionate oversight of the study abroad programs brought her to Oxford and Cambridge and other leading universities around the world on an annual basis.

Kathy’s life, however, was touched by tragedy. When she returned to the United States in 1991 her children from her first marriage remained in this country, Paul at Cambridge and Claire at Oxford. Paul Grandpierre, a brilliant PhD student at King’s College, suddenly collapsed and died from an undiagnosed heart defect after a strenuous workout in the College boat house. Four years ago, on one of her many trips to Cambridge and after a convivial dinner with distinguished criminologist colleagues and some of our brightest graduate students, Kathy told me she had just been diagnosed with Lou Gehrig’s disease, better known in this country as motor neurone disease. Kathy bore this devastating news, and the progression of the illness itself, with the same dignity and fortitude with which she had faced up to the loss of her son. Kathy continued working until a few months before her death by which time she was confined to a wheelchair. When she lost the power of speech, Kathy, who given half a chance could talk ninety to the dozen, continued to communicate by e-mail using eye pointing techniques.

She is survived by her daughters from her two marriages, Claire Grandpierre and Caitlin Bell, and granddaughter Charlotte Soubirous, as well as a sister and three brothers — and countless numbers of friends, admiring colleagues and grateful students — all of whom will miss her greatly.

Dr Kathleen McDermott,
born August 3rd 1944; died October 16th 2011
Professor Roy King
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Guarding the ghosts of time:
Working personalities and the prison officer-prisoner relationship

Dr David Scott is a senior lecturer at the Centre for Crimonology and Criminal Justice, University of Central Lancashire.

I think it used to be a question of switching on into a certain mode as you walked through the [prison] gates, and then, when you went out, you would switch off and be your normal self again. I remember in the first two or three years of the job, when my fortnight summer leave came around, half way through my wife would say to me, 'you’ve changed — you are back to your old self again'. She could not explain what it was, and I could not see it myself. But over the years that stops happening, because you actually become a different person. Talking to the lads generally, I do not think we are nice people. Prison does not change you for the better. Instead of switching on and switching off, we do it subconsciously. You become that same person all of the time.¹

Prison officer working personalities arise as a result of an officer’s shared experiences and social situation with other colleagues, leading to the development of a common way of interpreting actions and events. Collectively they create an occupational culture which informs ‘the way we do things round here’, determining the construction of what is, and what is not, considered suitable prison work. A number of different prison officer working personalities can co-exist in any given prison, each shaped by its historically contingent evolution, folklores, memories, identities, and practices. The existing literature points to four main prison officer working personalities: careerist, humanitarian, disciplinarian, and alienated ‘mortgage payer’.² Whilst working styles are likely to be more diverse than such simplistic categories allow, the above ideal types may prove helpful in indentifying distinctive prison officer orientations to their relationships with prisoners. This paper draws upon 38 semi-structured interviews with prison officers in a local prison in the North West of England to illustrate and evidence these four working personalities and to highlight their implications for the recognition of the shared humanity of those they guard in their daily interactions.³

Careerist

King and Elliot have described the central motivation of this working personality as ‘making a career’⁴. Careerists expected to be promoted quickly through the ranks of the Prison Service, wishing to make the right impression to their superiors through developing positive relationships with managers and embracing official thinking. Two prison officers who were interviewed adopted a careerist working orientation. For these officers there was little criticism of management decisions or personnel. Indeed quite the reverse: ‘I have got a fantastic boss and a really good job and I love my work’. There was also the adoption of management speak at times: ‘I think in the end we need to have more focus on joined-up services’, ‘our customer is the inmate’ and even talk of adhering to a ‘performance culture’. The careerist officer was concerned with meeting key performance indicators and targets, improving the quality of the regime and deeply concerned about the prison’s position in the league tables.

We need to deliver on our KPI’s and KPTS. Unless we actually achieve our KPTs we are seen as a non-performing prison. I think as a manager it’s a good tool because officers know that if we don’t perform we drop down the league table. I think the whole system could work but it needs to be looked at better integrated, and we need to decide as a service which way we want to go. But I do think it is

¹ The quotations from prison officers in this paper are all from an ethnographic study undertaken by the author. For further details and full references please see Scott, D (2009) Ghosts Beyond Our Realm: a neo-abolitionist analysis of prisoner human rights and prison officer occupational culture, Milton Keynes: VDM.
⁴ King and Elliot (1977: 269).
fair to say the new initiatives we are bringing in are quality initiatives not quantity initiatives.

Careerists had a reasonably positive appraisal of prison life and found their job an affirmative experience. The two careerist officers interviewed had the benefit of extensive specialist training and had amicable relationships with their managers. They believed that if they used their initiative they would go far in the Prison Service hierarchy. Careerists generally mirrored existing management commitments and this was reflected in their attitudes towards prisoners. The two careerist officers interviewed had a humanitarian ethos, promoting the rehabilitation of offenders and a commitment to the government goals to utilise the prison as a special place to reduce re-offending.

We should treat prisoners decently; we should treat them like human beings, because that is the only way that they are going to change their attitude. Don’t get me wrong; there will be a minority that will never ever change — but 60 per cent of prisoners will not take a lot of helping. We can make a big impact on their life.

It was therefore difficult to ascertain if the commitment to prisoner wellbeing was something they genuinely believed or if it was merely lip service.

Notably though, both of the careerists had developed specialist roles within the prison and now had only limited contact with prisoners. It was therefore difficult to ascertain if the commitment to prisoner wellbeing was something they genuinely believed or if it was merely lip service. Careerists, and especially those who entered the service on graduate entry schemes, met with considerable officer hostility from colleagues in the research prison. For example, one principal officer stated that such ‘careerists’ could be seen ‘running around trying to impress the governor, but they just don’t really know what this job is all about … we are promoting the wrong kind of people’.

Humanitarian

This working personality is underscored by a humanitarian commitment to ensure prisoners are treated as fellow human beings. Its adherents have been identified in the literature as, among others, ‘implementing rule 1’, ‘weathermen’ ‘reciprocators’ and ‘professionals’. The humanitarian prison officers worked within a human services framework valuing fairness, impartiality and the consistent application of the rules. The humanitarian aimed to help prisoners and was prepared to negotiate to maintain order. Seven officers, six of whom were senior officers, described themselves as ‘humanitarians’, though they were often referred to by other staff as ‘care bears’. Only two women prison officers were interviewed and both were part of this occupational orientation.

Humanitarian officers were friendly, open and operated through inclusionary stereotypes. Prison work was viewed as positive and rewarding and they welcomed outside scrutiny. Humanitarians looked for support and acknowledgement from both the Prison Service hierarchy and those on the outside. Unlike the careerists, however, humanitarians did have a general dislike for managerialism. There was some mistrust of management and recognition of the irrationality of some managerial policies. As one officer put it, ‘if prisoners have got a problem I might want to spend time with them but I’ve also got this audit tray’. Humanitarians focused rather on their professional role. They understood the term ‘professionalism’ to involve the duty of care and a commitment to help prisoners.

I find myself listening to human beings talking about experiences rather than prisoners. We should look upon them as if they are members of our own family and treating them as though they are our fathers and relatives because that’s one way that staff immediately see a way of justifying the humanitarian role. If the prison officer treats somebody the way he expects to have his brother or son treated in prison then it makes them look on prisons in a different light.

The humanitarian officers who worked on the wing in close physical proximity with prisoners were also likely to have a close sense of emotional or ‘psychic’ proximity with the prisoners. Breaking down the ‘us and them’

scenario, the humanitarian officers look to treat all prisoners the same with the recognition prisoners are not necessarily that different from themselves.

I go up on the wings and I can feel it when I am talking to the prisoners, I can feel that those prisoners have been neglected. I can tell with the questions they ask, they come with these questions, lots of them, and they are all little short questions that take two minutes to go and find an answer. It’s a bad thing in a prison when prisoners start to feel their requests are being totally ignored.

In the research prison humanitarian officers were relatively marginalised, experiencing hostility from other members of staff who believed that they were ‘outsiders’ or not proper prison officers. As one officer explained:

Yesterday another officer criticized me … he even suggested that I shouldn’t be wearing the uniform, that I should be wearing civilian clothes. That’s how he viewed my position, not as a prison officer anymore. I explained to him that wearing the uniform and being a humanitarian were very much tied in together and that I wouldn’t renounce the uniform because that would take me away from the prison officers and perhaps reinforce a traditional view of prison officers as disciplinarians.

Disciplinarian

Identified variously in the literature as ‘negatively detached’9, ‘black and whiter’10, ‘enforcers’11, or ‘authoritarians’12, this working personality privileges order, security, discipline, respect, control and personal authority. Of the 38 interviewed in the research prison, 23 officers identified with the terms ‘dinosaurs’, ‘traditional officers’, or most commonly ‘disciplinarians’. There was a strong sense of loyalty, solidarity and occupational identity among disciplinarian officers. For many disciplinarians their circle of friends was determined by the prison place and subsequent socialising with colleagues. ‘We all know what that feels like, so it does become a bit like an extended family with the prison staff. It’s your mates that keep you going’. The disciplinarian working personality was grounded in a trust deficiency of management, prisoners, and politicians which ultimately bred insecurities, cynicism and suspicion. The sense of occupational isolation was summed up by one officer, who stated ‘It’s us, them and them. Senior management, inmates and then us, it is like we’re getting attacked from two areas’. Some disciplinarians were concerned that managerial reforms were ‘not there to help the prisoners, but to make staff more accountable. It is so that we can say that somebody has done something’. The KPI’s were considered to be ‘meaningless garbage’, a ‘waste of paper’ and that the ‘tick boxes’ were used as a ‘management tool’.

KPI’s are a bag of shit to me. They don’t mean anything. It’s a governor’s problem. It’s all to do with their pay structure, their performance. I’m not interested in it because it’s all about them saying they’re doing their job right, and they’re not doing their job right.

Disciplinarian officers also proved to be cynical and reluctant to embrace change. As one officer stated ‘we have seen them come and go — this change will not work and will be replaced by something else that will not work’. Disciplinarians believed that they were doing an important and socially valuable job but failing to receive recognition. The prison officer was ‘under siege, under threat, under-valued’. Disciplinarian officers used the following terms to sum up their experiences and feelings about themselves and their treatment by the Prison Service:


As one prison officer argued, ‘all the shit lands on us because we’re at the bottom of the pile. We’ve basically become cannon fodder’. A macho sense of toughness, physicality, and invulnerability exemplified the disciplinarian working personality. This macho ‘front’ was seen as an essential for psychological survival in prison, especially when dealing with prisoners. In the words of one officer, ‘prisoners are superb at reading people, as soon as the inmates see a chink in your arm our, they’ll rip it wide open’.

Disciplinarians had little or no empathy with prisoners. The doctrine of ‘less eligibility’ fed the myth that prisoners are the only ‘criminals’ in society, and that they are weak, inadequate people. The starting point for relationships or interactions with prisoners was rooted within a stereotype that all prisoners are lesser and do not deserve to be treated as fellow humans. The devastating implications of the pains and suffering of imprisonment were clear to disciplinarians in terms of how it dehumanises officers, but such an understanding did not necessarily stretch far enough to encompass prisoners. In this way for the disciplinarian the prisoners’ needs and lived realities became virtually invisible in the daily penal regime.

Characterised by a sense of moral indifference and ambivalence, the alienated ‘mortgage payer’ had no sense of mission and did not appear to find their work rewarding.

**Alienated ‘mortgage payer’**

Described in the literature as ‘marking time’, ‘burn outs’, ‘easy lifers’, and ‘avoiders’, this working personality is characterised by minimum of work, officer interaction and prisoner contacts. Six of the prison officers interviewed had alienated working personalities, which were described colloquially as mortgage payers. Alienated ‘mortgage payers’ were looking for an easy ride and had no great attachment to their role. These officers were just going through the daily motions. Characterised by a sense of moral indifference and ambivalence, the alienated ‘mortgage payer’ had no sense of mission and did not appear to find their work rewarding. Though this working personality shared many similarities with the disciplinarian, the exposure to the inherent pains of prison life seems much more pronounced — these officers were often isolated and appeared to struggle to survive psychologically in prison. The alienated ‘mortgage payers’ were not just insecure. They were also profoundly unhappy. As one officer stated, ‘you’ve got no job satisfaction whatever’.

Staff on the landing just seem to come in on autopilot, go through the motions of doing it and come out. I think that is why probably the morale is so low because you don’t have the fulfilment you used to have.

The experience of alienation appeared to shape both their work and private lives and the job was seen as damaging personal relationships outside of the prison. Ultimately these officers prioritised being paid. ‘I’ll just take my money. Do the job and go’. For such officers the job was a ‘distraction to their primary aim of accumulating money in the bank’.

The only thing I’m loyal to is that account at the end of the month. It’s the state of the job now, I just keep thinking of the cash. I’ve only another 12 years before my mortgage is paid.

Though they found their work could be ‘unpredictable’, it was also ‘repetitive’, ‘routine’, ‘dull’, and ‘undemanding’ — they largely constructed their labour as ‘unskilled’, their role as ‘restrictive’ and lacking ‘autonomy’ or ‘choice’. Alienated ‘mortgage payers’ felt powerless, and some were also bitter, resentful, angry and quick to blame others.

The job is on its arse. The job is crap now. It’s not a job. We’re glorified bell boys. We’re at the bottom of the ladder. Above us is the inmates, then you’ve got the teachers and education, then on top of that there’s the governors. The job really is crap. Some people think ‘you miserable git’. But I’m just common.

---


Their sense of loyalty to the prison and fellow officers was limited whilst negativity became most pronounced in relationships with prisoners.

The most of them are just pathetic now. It pisses me off. It’s all this ‘I want! I want!’ It’s like dealing with your kids. You’re dealing with selfish adults and that’s it. If they weren’t so selfish they wouldn’t be in prison. That’s what they’re in for, for being selfish. Robbing and thieving instead of going out and getting a job. But then again why should they. They don’t have to do much to get by. If I had a choice I’d probably come back as a criminal in my next life, because it’s a piss easy life. Especially with all this human rights. ‘Excuse me. I’d like to make a complaint. It wasn’t actually hot enough when I got back to my cell.’ Then you’ll get some silly slap arse filling in papers, saying that they’ll see to it.

The alienated ‘mortgage payer’ saw no intrinsic value in developing pro-longed interactions with prisoners, demonstrating a high level of resistance to any forms of helping prisoners or responding to their requests. Such officers did the minimum, for example to ‘sit and read the newspaper’ on the wing, or ‘skive off, have a chat with other officers and drink tea’. Senior staff sometimes referred to alienated ‘mortgage payer’ as ‘lazy bastards’ and they were unpopular among more committed members of staff, whether it be to their career, humanitarian interventions, or maintaining discipline and control.

### Working personalities and the prison officer-prisoner relationship

The prison officer—prisoner relationship should not be underestimated though it must be located within the context of the inherent harms of the prison place and the damage it imparts. The dullness, boredom and saturation in time awareness characterising the prison place provides a threat to pre-existing meanings and sometimes the foundations of a person’s sense of who they are. The dehumanising penal context presents serious threats to the wellbeing of both prisoners and prison officers, yet acknowledgement of prisoner suffering by prison officers is not always forthcoming. In response to the painful immersion in time consciousness some prisoners psychologically and emotionally withdraw. At its most extreme, this concealment can lead to the virtual disappearance of their former personalities, creating or exacerbating mental health and other problems. Those prisoners who attempt to ‘invisibilise’ themselves are described by Stan Cohen and Laurie Taylor as the ‘ghosts of time’. Importantly, those guarding the ghosts of time can also invisibilise prisoners and it is here that the distinctions between the four prison officer working personalities become most significant.

In many prisons there is evidence of a strong occupational ethos emphasising distance and detachment in prison officer-prisoner relationships. The form and extent of distancing is likely to vary depending upon the working personality adopted. The relationship between the careerist prison officer and prisoners may in the long term be one characterised by physical distance. Through specialisation of tasks and greater engagement with ‘prison business’ direct contact with prisoners may

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working personality</th>
<th>Orientation to work</th>
<th>Relationships with prisoners</th>
<th>Key priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Careerist</td>
<td>Positive and often adopt official thinking</td>
<td>Official commitment to rehabilitation</td>
<td>Reflect management concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian</td>
<td>Positive but sceptical of management</td>
<td>Empathy and development of positive relationships</td>
<td>Duty of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinarian</td>
<td>Positive regarding group solidarity but disappointment and hostility towards management</td>
<td>Prisoners as lesser beings or othered as potential danger to officers</td>
<td>Control, discipline, respect, personal authority and safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alienated ‘mortgage payer’</td>
<td>Negative to all and aim for minimum of work and interaction</td>
<td>Moral indifference</td>
<td>Pay cheque</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. See for example Kauffman (1988); Crawley (2004); Carrabine (2004); Liebling (2004); Scott, (2009); and Liebling et al (2011).
become minimal and experiences of working face-to-face with prisoners somewhat limited The commitment to management policies, procedures and priorities may lead to the adoption of a ‘managerial morality’ where the interests of the prison bureaucracy over-ride the needs and welfare of prisoners, and perhaps also fellow officers. When people become merely numbers and figures the chances of dehumanisation increase.

The humanitarian officer is also likely to utilise some form of distancing when establishing the prison officer-prisoner relationship. Grounded in recognition of prisoner suffering, humanitarians empathise with prisoners and look to foster positive interactions as they undertake their duty of care. Humanitarians may find though that in the dehumanising prison place, whose main function is the deliberate infliction of pain, that there work is never done. Prison officers are employed to be ‘caretakers of punishment’ — that is to ensure that day in and day out prisoners remain prisoners21. In addition, in at least some prisons humanitarians will be in the minority facing considerable hostility from other prison officers.

For the disciplinarian officer distancing and detachment may arise through the belief that prisoners will view familiarity and empathy as a weakness and attempt to manipulate them. These officers are likely to try and use their personal influence to secure prisoner respect and create a safe, disciplined and controlled environment. Interactions and relationships with prisoners are likely to be fashioned, at least initially, through an unequivocal hierarchy placing the officer in authority. Consequently, the creation of emotional or psychic distance by these prison officers is likely to be grounded in the assumption that prisoners are lesser beings, often undeserving of their help or support. Though drawing some parallels with the disciplinarian, the alienated ‘mortgage payer’ officer aims for minimum commitments and prisoner interactions. Exposed to the dehumanised penal context without colleague solidarity these officers experience their own profound sense of pain, isolation and suffering, ultimately generating moral indifference to the plight of prisoners. Albeit for different reasons, for prison officers who adopt either the disciplinarian or alienated ‘mortgage payer’ working personalities, prisoner suffering once again become invisible.

It is easy though mistaken to point to the damage created through incarceration as the cause for incarceration. Prisoners are not a breed apart, just those people who have been caught and handled by the criminal process. These are often people with great needs or demands that society has thus far failed. Therefore it remains crucial that prison officers acknowledge the social backgrounds of prisoners and the painful realities of imprisonment for all and that every effort is made to foster feelings of psychic closeness with prisoners as fellow human beings. Yet, by its very nature prison work is brutalising and dehumanising. The negation of humanity is structured within the prison’s very existence. Prisons will always be painful places undermining human dignity, respect, autonomy, security, meaning and sense of self. All prisoners, by definition, remain vulnerable to dehumanisation through the negative stigma of the application of the label itself. Consequently, whatever the working personality adopted by prison officers it remains questionable whether the penal manufacture of human suffering can ever be deemed legitimate. Such an acknowledgment though does not remove the demand upon humanitarians, whether working within the system as members of staff or as critics, policy makers or interested observers on the outside, to do what they can when they can to mitigate the harms of imprisonment and facilitate the recognition of the shared humanity of prisoners.

The ever-increasing amount (in terms of both length and number) of post-tariff detention of IPP prisoners has contributed to the continuing growth of the prison population and is likely to accelerate the growth over time. For the Prison Service, the burdens imposed by the IPP sentence are not only a matter of additional numbers in prison, but also the logistical problems associated with the management of large numbers serving indeterminate sentences.

The introduction of the indeterminate sentence of Imprisonment for Public Protection (IPP) has had a significant impact on the Criminal Justice System, particularly in relation to managing the sheer number of these prisoners. Not only is the introduction of the IPP sentence a significant challenge for the Prison Service, but also the Parole Board, Probation Service, and the offenders who must serve this sentence.

The IPP sentence was introduced following the Halliday Report,

which highlighted the need for a new sentence for those offenders convicted of a dangerous sexual or violent offence; following this the Criminal Justice Act 2003 introduced a mandatory framework for the sentencing of ‘dangerous offenders’. The IPP sentence enables courts to imprison for an indefinite period of time offenders who are convicted of ‘violent’ and/or ‘sexual’ offences, who are considered to be ‘dangerous’, but whose offending does not meet the requirements for a life sentence. IPP prisoners are given a minimum tariff which must be served before release is considered, but are then kept in custody until the Parole Board is satisfied that they are no longer a ‘risk to life or limb’ and can be safely managed in the community.

When this sentence was implemented in April 2005 it became mandatory to impose it on those convicted of an offence with a maximum penalty of ten years imprisonment or more and where the court felt that there was a significant risk of serious harm to the public. This mandatory framework led to far more offenders being given IPP sentences than was originally anticipated,

placing the resources of both the Prison and Probation Services under strain.

In December 2007, Jack Straw announced that amendments would be made to prevent the imposition of the IPP sentence where the minimum tariff would be below two years. This came into force in July 2008 in the shape of the Criminal Justice and Immigration Act 2008, but only applied to offenders who were sentenced on or after this date. Following these amendments the courts have the power to impose an IPP sentence, but no longer have a duty to do so, giving judges more discretion in their sentencing decisions. These changes are not retrospective so there has been no impact on prisoners who are already serving IPP sentences.

The effect that the IPP sentence has on offenders has not yet been fully explored. This sentence aims to protect the public, but the potential negative side effects on offenders also need to be considered. Whilst some studies have made mention of the sentence and expressed concern for the well-being of those subjected to it,

not enough research has focused on the frustrations of these offenders. Concern about the impact of indeterminate sentencing is not a new phenomenon; early commentators such as Radzinowicz expressed similar reservations:

_Unless indeterminate sentences are awarded with great care, there is a grave risk that this measure, designed to ensure the better protection of society, may become an instrument of social aggression and weaken the basic principles of individual liberty._

This article explores the frustrations of the IPP sentence. This was achieved through an extensive review of the existing literature alongside eight semi-structured qualitative interviews with prisoners serving IPP sentences at HMP Kingston. This research was
undertaken as part of a part-time Masters degree at the Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge. The interviewees provided consistent accounts of their frustrations, which have been divided into three areas: The frustrations of receiving the sentence; living with the sentence; and seeking release.

Receiving the IPP sentence

Lack of Information

Seven of the eight prisoners sampled mentioned that the lack of information they received was a considerable pain of imprisonment. A concern was raised that information was not readily available: ‘Most of the information about the sentence came from the prisoners; they were the only source of information’ (Prisoner Two). It is also arguable that this lack of information was more prevalent among those who received the sentence in its infancy. There is now more information available, but one prisoner said that when he was trying to gather information about the sentence he: ‘never knew what was true, it is like Chinese whispers in jail’ (Prisoner One).

Although this sentence has only been in existence for a few years, there is still a clear gap in knowledge and an atmosphere of confusion surrounding it. Respondents at HMP Kingston reported that the lack of information seemed to be experienced by prisoners, staff and the whole Criminal Justice System: ‘When I first came into custody I did not really know what it meant to have an IPP sentence. I asked the staff, but they did not know…’ (Prisoner Seven).

Lack of legitimacy

Another frustration which was discussed with much intensity throughout the interviews was the feeling that the IPP sentence was unjust and unfair. One prisoner said: ‘I don’t think I deserve this life sentence, I don’t think the Judge or anyone thought I deserved it’ (Prisoner One). One of the main sources of frustration was that those with IPP sentences felt as though they were given a life sentence, and in many respects were actually treated as such. They felt that this was not deserved as it seemed disproportionate to their crime: ‘I have not taken a life, I have not threatened life or limb, so how have I ended up with a life sentence?’ (Prisoner Five). The frustration of unfairness seemed more pressing for two particular categories; those given a short tariff, and first time offenders.

During the IPP sentence

Uncertainty and Indeterminacy

One of the most striking themes which emerged during interviews was the frustration of uncertainty and indeterminacy. This has been touched upon in Crewe’s research, although this was not specifically focused on IPP prisoners. Many interviewees referred to the sensation of feeling lost and like: ‘there is no light at the end of the tunnel’ (Prisoner One). There appeared to be confusion about the sentence and ever-changing barriers to gaining release, with uncertainty about when this end would ever arrive. This led to feelings of hopelessness and helplessness; the future of an IPP prisoner is not in their hands, and interviewees felt that there was nothing they could do about it: ‘sometimes I wake up and just don’t want to get out of bed, I know that there is nothing I can do throughout that day to change anything, it is pointless even trying’ (Prisoner Eight). Six of the eight prisoners interviewed specifically mentioned feeling like they were serving ‘life on remand’ due to the uncertainty of their situation. This theme was consistent throughout the interviews: ‘I feel like I am still on remand now, I have nothing to lose’ (Prisoner One); ‘not ever knowing when I’m going to get out, I feel like I am on remand’ (Prisoner Five).

During interviews, I asked how this sentence differed to others, to gain insight into which frustrations appeared to be linked specifically to the IPP sentence. Unlike determinate sentenced prisoners an IPP prisoner cannot plan for their future, because they do not know their release date: ‘everything is just uncertain’ (Prisoner Six); ‘I don’t know when I will be out, and I can’t plan for my future’ (Prisoner Two). Offenders felt as though they were: ‘merely existing’ (Prisoner Three) or being ‘warehouse’ (Prisoner Five).

Five out of the eight interviewees said that this was the worst thing about the IPP sentence. One said: ‘it is like Groundhog day, it is just the same thing every day and you don’t know when it is going to stop’ (Prisoner Four).

Disruption to life course

An area identified in the literature review as causing considerable pain for indeterminate sentenced prisoners was the loss of significant events in their life course. All prisoners suffer this loss to a certain extent, but it can be argued that this pain is greater for those serving indeterminate sentences, as they have the burden of not knowing when or whether they will be able to continue their life course. One prisoner stated: ‘It feels as though my life is on hold’ (Prisoner Two); another said: ‘my life feels like it is over…’ (Prisoner Five). More specific fears were expressed by one prisoner:

With this sentence they are taking away my chances of having kids and settling down with a family of my own, achieving a house and a nice job, I know it could still be possible when I get out, but when am I going to get out there? (Prisoner Seven)

Interviewees described cutting links with the outside world, friends moving on, and only close family remaining for support. Unlike with a determinate sentence, these offenders were unable to suggest when they will be able to continue their lives. Four interviewees reported that they found it difficult speaking to family, because they did not understand when they will be able to continue their lives. Four sentence, these offenders were unable to suggest remaining for support. Unlike with a determinate interviewees reported that they found it difficult speaking to family, because they did not understand the sentence, and it made it harder being asked questions which could not be answered: ‘I don’t even ring them any more, because it hurts when they say ‘how you doing, when you getting out?’, and I just can’t tell them’ (Prisoner One). Research suggests that close family links and relationships are key contributors to desistence from crime, and that there is a link between social bonds and a reduction in criminal behaviour. With this sentence it is difficult to maintain these social bonds, and if anything the sentence puts undue strain on them.

Loss of Independence and reliance on others

A shared frustration for all prisoners is that they suffer the loss of freedom, and the opportunity of contacting family and loved ones whenever they please, becoming reliant on others for their basic needs. An additional burden for IPP prisoners is that they have to rely on others for progression through their sentence, and this creates many additional frustrations. One prisoner identified the need to complete courses, and do more than just serve his sentence to gain release: ‘Before I could just come in to prison, do my own time and that was it, now I can’t just keep myself to myself, that is not enough to get me released’ (Prisoner Four).

One frustration identified within this was the perceived subjectivity of those on whom prisoners relied and of the assessment process in general. All IPP prisoners are allocated an Offender Manager (OM) and an Offender Supervisor (OS), in order to manage their sentence plan and to guide them through it. Five of the prisoners interviewed reported poor relations between they and their OM, and the value of having an OS was questioned by four interviewees. The system put in place is theoretically sound, but in practice it is not sufficiently resourced to meet required standards. In addition, some offenders claimed that there were differences in the quality of offender management, stating that whether you received a good supervisor or a less supportive one was: ‘the luck of the draw’ (Prisoner Six).

Another area which troubled all of those interviewed was the loss of independence suffered because of reliance on prison-based forensic

psychologists. Crewe discusses the way that a wide range of prisoners recognise and resent the ‘power of the pen’. For IPP prisoners, this is even more important, as everything written down about them can count towards or against their release. Psychologists, and more importantly their reports, are feared because they can be a hindrance to release. These assessments are often written by trainee psychologists. Interviewees felt that psychologists often ‘twist things’ (Prisoner Eight), and were therefore unwilling to talk to them, owing to concern that what they said might be misinterpreted and used against them. One prisoner recounted his meeting with a psychologist as follows:

My mum likes to smoke cannabis… she said ‘would you like to see your mum still even though she smokes cannabis?’ and I have said, ‘well yeah I would’… Now she is my mum, I will tell her not to smoke it when I am with her, and not to have it in the house, because of the consequences for me, and I will make sure she doesn’t have any drug dealers or whatever around the house when I am there, but I am still going to see her, because that’s my mum… but in the paperwork she wrote ‘[Prisoner] states that he will still be associating with known drug dealers and drug takers on the outside’… that is the kind of thing I am having to deal with. No matter what she does, she is still my mum and I am still going to see her. (Prisoner One)

There was an overwhelming atmosphere of depression during my interviews, and many made it clear that they felt that they would never be the same again.

Loss of Identity
A further frustration identified by four interviewees was the loss of identity; they no longer felt like themselves, and for some it was as though part of them had died inside: ‘Half of me has shut down in here, it is hard keeping yourself alive. I often put on a smile so everyone thinks I am ok, but I am not’ (Prisoner One). There was an overwhelming atmosphere of depression during my interviews, and many made it clear that they felt that they would never be the same again. When asked how they felt they were treated during the course of their sentence, one prisoner said: ‘I think I am treated like a category, we are all treated the same’ (Prisoner Four). IPP sentenced prisoners are subject to various risk assessments and programmes, and are assumed to fit specific risk categories, therefore it is understandable why they suggested they were treated as a ‘risk’, rather than as individuals: ‘In here nobody looks at me and actually sees me, they just see my risk’ (Prisoner Five). When being assessed, five interviewees felt as though the various agencies: ‘just want to tick the boxes’ (Prisoner Two). Two offenders believed that they could not be themselves as this could be detrimental to their release. As one prisoner stated when talking about prison officers:

I cannot ask a simple question like ‘why are you talking to me like that?’ because they can write down that I have been confrontational, which can affect me when trying to gain release, so they can do what they like. (Prisoner Three)

Trying to gain release
‘Jumping through hoops’
Within the NOMS Offender Management Model, the IPP prisoner is allocated targets which must be achieved in order to gain release. Interviewees described these targets as ever-changing. One prisoner stated: ‘You have to work so hard and jump through hoops to get your risk down’ (Prisoner Four). A string of frustrations stem from the fact that an IPP prisoner needs to ‘prove’ that they are no longer a risk of serious harm to the public. Predominately, lowering risk involves completing a sentence plan, containing targets and objectives, including a number of offending behaviour programmes (OBPs). A pain identified was that many of the OBPs set were perceived not to be suitable or beneficial for that individual: ‘I was put down for [course15], but got a letter back saying I was not suitable’ (Prisoner Two); ‘They want me to do [course16], but this course is not going to benefit me, that is not what will help me’ (Prisoner Five). Similarly, McNeill17 claims that there is no generalisable rule of what works to alter a person’s behaviour. The offender also needs to want to change.

17. Course name omitted to assist anonymity of participants.
18. Course name omitted to assist anonymity of participants.
Interviewees argued that instead of just focusing on courses there should be greater emphasis on the causes of the crime: ‘It feels like they are just papering over the cracks instead of helping to address the actual problems’ (Prisoner Two). One prisoner in particular was concerned with his sentence plan:

*I do not agree with my sentence plan. I have been asked to do a course which is not designed for my sort of crime, but they feel that they have to give me a course, and they try to fit you into a category. Don’t give me a course which is not going to benefit me in any way, give me something useful to do…* (Prisoner Two)

A more pressing issue was that the interviewees claimed that unrealistic targets were given to IPP prisoners, especially those on shorter tariffs. Four of the sample stated that they had courses that they ‘needed’ to do, because they were on their sentence plan, but could not do for a number of legitimate reasons. Three of them even had courses on their sentence plan that were not run in the establishment they resided in, and regardless of their best efforts they were unable to secure a transfer to a suitable establishment. One IPP prisoner with a ten month tariff stated: ‘I came here to do [courses] but a month after I came here they stopped doing the courses. Two years on I still can’t get out to another nick to do it’ (Prisoner One). On top of this, for an IPP prisoner who had a relatively short tariff, there was too much on their sentence plan for them to possibly complete before the end of their tariff. For others, parole needed to be deferred in order to give them time to complete their courses:

*I am supposed to be having my parole next August, by that time I will be two years over tariff and I cannot access this course until the middle of next year. It is a six month course, then it takes anything up to six months for them to write the report, so I have to knock my parole back to August 2012, then at the end of that there is no guarantee that they aren’t going to turn around and say we think you should do this course now. Then they will not do that course here, so I have to be shipped somewhere else and start again, get yourself onto the list, you may be a priority, but you are a priority of the prioritised list.* (Prisoner Two)

**The Power of the Parole Board**

In terms of gaining release, the power of the Parole Board warrants its own discussion as a frustration for IPP prisoners. This frustration was highlighted by every interviewee. One prisoner described the difficulties of trying to prove that he was no longer a risk:

*I am now over my tariff owing to no fault of my own. I am serving extra time as they can not prove that I am still a risk to the public, but I cannot prove that I am not a risk.* (Prisoner Five)

A greater cause of frustration was that an offender could be given an IPP sentence based on previous offending. One prisoner asked: ‘How can you demonstrate a reduced risk when you can be sentenced based on a previous offence, it just does not make sense, how do you demonstrate a reduced risk that is no longer there?’ (Prisoner Two). The Parole Board is given ultimate power in decision making, which has instilled fear into IPP prisoners when they come up for parole, with one interviewee asking: ‘What happens if the board members do not like me?’ (Prisoner Seven). Another frustration was borne from the sheer numbers of IPP prisoners and under-resourcing of the Parole Board, which meant that boards were often delayed. There is now a sifting process to ease this strain, whereby prisoners may not even have a board if it is deemed that they are unlikely to be eligible for release. Parole Board hearings were seen by my interviewees as a chance for progression, so this new process was extremely frustrating and disheartening, as one prisoner reported: ‘I have not had a parole board for four years, I just get a piece of paper through my door saying that I am not going to be released’ (Prisoner Two). This process was experienced as impersonal: ‘The Parole Board is very important to me, they decide whether I get released, but they don’t know me, they don’t know if I am a risk’ (Prisoner Six).
Incarcerated for Life

The last clearly identifiable frustration was that of the life licence. For an IPP prisoner, this can be removed after ten years, but there has not yet been an example of this, and will not be for at least another five years. In terms of the amount of reporting a life sentenced prisoner needs to do after ten years in the community the difference between a life sentence and IPP is not significant. Nevertheless, if there is suspicion that an IPP offender is involved in a crime, they can be recalled to prison for an ‘indefinite period of time’. There was an overwhelming feeling during interviews that even when released an IPP offender would not be free: ‘My sentence is never going to be over. I will be constantly walking on eggshells’ (Prisoner Three). If after recall they are found not guilty, they still have to face the Parole Board in order to gain release. One interviewee argued that this sentence would create a society of ex-offenders always cautious of what awaits them:

Anyone who has any grudge against me could just make one call to the police and that would be me straight back to prison and my life is in someone else’s hands once again. All I can do is keep my head down and do what is expected of me and live a crime free life…there is nothing more I can do. (Prisoner Three)

The interviewees seemed to lack a full understanding of the purpose of the life licence, and this helps to explain some of their concerns and opposition to it. Again, lack of information and understanding seems relevant here. If the life licence is better understood, it is unlikely that it will instil so much fear in these offenders. However, some of the fears expressed are not without foundation. The life licence attached to the sentence does suffer from inflexibility, with automatic recall to prison being initiated even on a minor breach or for a wrongful arrest. This blanket response of recall further adds to the strain on the Prison Service and Parole Board, compounding the problems of this sentence.

‘The Rehabilitation Revolution’ and the future of the IPP

The future of the IPP sentence needs to be considered, given the complex difficulties identified. With all the attention this sentence has received, there is a real possibility of it being amended or even abolished. A Green Paper, ‘Breaking the Cycle’, was released in December 2010 for consultation, Kenneth Clarke stated:

The green paper is an important change of direction in penal policy which will put more emphasis on reducing reoffending without reducing the punishment of offenders.

This comprehensive paper makes many recommendations, with a central aim to: ‘make the public safer by breaking the cycle of crime’, and only use the IPP for those who ‘pose a very serious risk of future harm’. The recommendations include amending the minimum tariff length to five years, rather than two. This in itself would restrict the use of this sentence, reserving it for more serious offences, thereby reducing the number of IPP prisoners.

If changes are to be made to this sentence, there are some key areas which deserve particular attention. Some of the frustrations identified in this research appeared to be unnecessary by-products of the sentence, which could be addressed with relative ease. The most obvious of these problems related to lack of information. There is a need for training to be developed and delivered to staff to assist with the

management of IPP prisoners. In addition, more information should be distributed to all offenders given this sentence providing basic details about it. During interviews I gave all interviewees a guidance booklet\textsuperscript{25} and for all but two this was the first comprehensive explanation of the sentence.

Furthermore, the intention for offenders to experience ‘end-to-end offender management’ appeared not to have been realised; many of the sample felt unsupported and experienced a lack of overall management and guidance. Offenders expected to have had more contact with their offender manager, but few had received sufficient contact. Without further research, it is impossible to pinpoint the reason for this, but it is worth acknowledging the likely link between the strain on Probation Service resources and the problems outlined. The tightening of budgets throughout the Ministry of Justice is unlikely to complement effective management of an ever-growing IPP prisoner population. Similarly, my interviewees had difficulties accessing the courses named on their sentence plans, limiting their progression through the system. Setting unrealistic or unattainable objectives is de-motivating for prisoners, and makes it impossible for them to prove their willingness to address their offending behaviour. Cutting budgets is only going to escalate these problems, and the gap between resources and expectations needs to narrow. Without these changes, it is questionable what purpose this sentence serves. If the aim of the IPP sentence is to keep these offenders off the street, then it is clearly achieving this. However if the hope is for rehabilitation, this sentence still has some way to go.

This year, HM Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) published two separate thematic reviews: ‘Resettlement provision for children and young people: accommodation and education, training and employment’ and ‘The care of looked after children in custody’. Both were commissioned by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) and looked at provision in Young Offender Institutions (YOIs) holding 15 to 18 year olds. As there was some overlap in the methodology used for each thematic, findings from both reports are summarised below.

Background

Resettlement is one of the main tests against which HMIP judges the health of a prison. HMIP expects establishments to demonstrate a commitment to resettlement that starts on a young person’s arrival to custody and that ensures young people are well prepared for their release. Two of the key pathways, set out by the YJB for the effective resettlement of young people are accommodation and ETE (employment, training or education). It is recognised that living in unstable accommodation is a major risk factor in offending behaviour, and similarly, taking part in full time education or employment is known to prevent re-offending. Therefore ensuring that young people have suitable accommodation and ETE on release from custody is a vital first step for their effective resettlement. Our thematic review on resettlement examined how well YOIs worked with youth offending services to ensure the needs of looked after children were met while in custody and in preparation for their release. Looked after children refer to children in the care of the local authority, either because of a mandatory care order or by voluntary agreement between the local authority and the child’s parents. The main reason children become looked after is because of abuse or neglect, accounting for 61 per cent of looked after children. Unfortunately, looked after children are over-represented within the youth justice system, including in custody. Irrespective of their location in custody, local authorities must continue to fulfil their statutory responsibilities towards a child in their care. Importantly, this should include co-ordinating plans for release. Despite this, at the time of the review, very few YOIs had a designated social worker in post.

1. Findings from the resettlement provision thematic review

The findings for the resettlement review were largely based on fieldwork conducted at six YOIs holding young men between July and October 2010.

- Interviews were conducted with:
  - 61 sentenced young men approaching release
  - the case supervisors (or case records) of all 61 young men in our sample
  - Six heads of resettlement
  - Six heads of learning and skills

- In addition, case supervisors were asked to fill in a short questionnaire on the day of the young person’s release and one month afterwards to provide details of what accommodation and ETE were in place.

- Fieldwork findings were also supported by survey responses from 770 sentenced young men surveyed at all nine male YOIs.

Strategic management

HMIP expects establishments to have an informed resettlement policy in order to provide strategic direction and to coordinate resettlement work. While we found that all establishments had a policy, the needs analyses they were based on were often out of date, varied in quality and had not all consulted young people. External agencies had collaborated with the writing of only one policy and were involved with the resettlement committees at just two establishments. The collection of resettlement data to evaluate the implementation and impact of policies was inconsistent although all establishments collected what was required by the YJB and Prison Service. However, regardless of what was being collected, it was unclear how much this data was used to monitor the effectiveness of establishments’ resettlement work. No establishment, for example, collected qualitative data such as whether the accommodation to which young people were returning was sustainable and suitable or followed up the outcomes for young people following release.

Case management

It is essential that all relevant documentation, such as ASSET 6, arrives with a young person in order to inform their initial assessments. Staff explained that although they received adequate information in most cases, there were examples where information was incomplete or out of date. In our case sample, 84 per cent of the young men had an accommodation and/or ETE need identified in the initial information received. Planning for their release should begin on arrival to custody and the training planning process should be central to coordinating work to address young people’s individual needs. Staff explained that although they received adequate information in most cases, there were examples where information was incomplete or out of date. In our case sample, 84 per cent of the young men had an accommodation and/or ETE need identified in the initial information received. Planning for their release should begin on arrival to custody and the training planning process should be central to coordinating work to address young people’s individual needs.

Planning for their release should begin on arrival to custody and the training planning process should be central to coordinating work to address young people’s individual needs.

‘I had no choice. I was told in the meeting and not given a chance to say anything.’

The main problem for young people appeared to be the lack of clear direction — targets were generally too broad and generic rather than specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time limited (SMART). Young people were given limited guidance as to how to achieve them and where they were too broad, assessment against them was difficult. Targets were rarely directly related to plans on release and were rarely directed at anyone other than the young person, although other people such as the case manager would have action points to ensure arrangements were in place for the young person on release.

Case supervisors attended all training planning meetings and many had a good knowledge of each young person on their caseload but this was not always the case. Case supervisors reported good links with YOTs and establishments recognised the importance of facilitating the involvement of case managers; they were attending most training planning meetings and would often keep in contact with case supervisors between meetings. Attendance by families/carers at training planning meetings was relatively low, with some case supervisors estimating it to be about 40-50 per cent. A family support worker had attended meetings for only four young men in our case sample. Attendance by education staff and personal officers was often poor and meant that a young person’s progress in education and on the wing was not fed in to the training planning process or reflected in their targets.

Accommodation

Accommodation needs should be assessed when a young person first arrives into custody to ensure that any issues are identified and resolved prior to a young person’s release. Whilst we found that accommodation was often explored early in a young person’s sentence, if needs were identified, work to address them was often delayed until closer to the young person’s release date. Fifty-nine per cent of our case sample reported living with family prior to custody; the rest were in local authority accommodation, hostels, bed and breakfasts or ‘sofa-hopping’. Sixty-one per cent said that they would be living

6. ASSET is the standard assessment tool used by YOTs to collate information on a young person who has come into contact with the Youth Justice System.
with family on release (including 3 young people who had not been living with them prior to custody): the majority felt that they had been involved in the decision making process, were happy with this arrangement and several felt that the support they received from their family would help them to avoid reoffending in the future. For example, one young man said:

‘I could go and live by myself but I want the support of my family to stop me reoffending.’

However, it was our assessment that in some cases the accommodation these young people would be returning to was not suitable as it was clear that the family members would struggle to provide them with a stable and safe environment to live without support. These issues were not addressed, possibly because of the difficulties in arranging alternative accommodation. Some YOTs and establishments did have family intervention or liaison officers who provided support for families but in our sample, they had only attended training planning meetings for four young people.

Arranging accommodation for young people not going to live with families on release was problematic. Case supervisors relied on YOT case managers or, for looked after children, social workers to make arrangements and these were often not finalised until close to a young person’s release which, understandably, frustrated case supervisors. Common problems reported included a lack of local authority accommodation or difficulties placing those who had committed arson or sex offences, or those who had already ‘burnt their bridges’ in a number of placements. The delay in resettlement planning and subsequent lateness of confirmed accommodation placements could impact on a young person’s chances for early release.

In our sample, 24 young men said that they would not be living with family once released and at the time of our interview, 17 did not know where they would be living (including five who were due to be released within the next 10 days). These young people were understandably concerned about where they would be living and knew that there was a possibility that they would have to report as homeless on release. One young person explained:

‘Don’t know [where I’ll be living]. I’ve had four different YOT case managers in two years and

no one has sorted out accommodation after the last one quit. I will be taken to a homeless centre (hostel) on the day I leave’ [Due to be released in four days.]

Those who did know where they would be living reported a range of arrangements including semi-independent living, hostel and bed and breakfast accommodation. These young people were often unclear about what financial support they were entitled to or how to arrange this prior to release.

Education, training and employment (ETE)

Young people arriving into custody have often been disengaged from ETE for some time prior to their arrival and so many have complex needs. In our survey, 86 per cent said they had been excluded from school and three-quarters said they had truanted at some point from school. HMIP expects that every young person should be allocated to education or training according to their individual needs and preferences and it should be linked to plans for release. In our case sample, 54 per cent had a clear ETE resettlement need which was often due to previous poor attendance or a lack of formal qualifications. Whilst most were engaged in ETE at their establishment, of the 47 who said they had achieved or were working towards a certificate, qualification or accreditation, only 29 felt that it would help them get a job or college placement on release. One young person who felt they had done something useful said:

‘Health and safety is useful to get a job; education is useful in general. I’m dyslexic so could not read or write, but education has helped me with this.’

Significantly, young people felt that having something to do, such as a job or education placement, was key to stopping them reoffending on release. Forty eight young men in our sample told us that they wanted to return to education once released though only 14 said something had been arranged for them at the time we interviewed them. As with accommodation, arranging ETE placements was viewed as the YOT case manager or social worker’s responsibility. There were a number of barriers to arranging education including the young person not having a confirmed address, insufficient
availability or start dates of courses being prior to or a long time after their release.

'I've got the option of doing key skills — don't know what that is but I would rather wait until next year to start a college course. I know though that if I don't do something I will come back to jail but I want to do something worthwhile.'

Many of the young men in our sample said they would like to work once released, including part-time work alongside education, but very little was being done to support them with this. Only nine young people said they had a job arranged for their release and for seven this had been arranged by their families.

2. Findings from the looked after children thematic review

Fieldwork for this review was conducted alongside that for the resettlement thematic review.

☐ Interviews were conducted with:
  • 12 looked after children
  • six advocates

☐ Interviews (at fieldwork sites) or questionnaires (for non-fieldwork sites) with a safeguarding team representative at all YOIs, including those holding young women.

☐ Findings from the case supervisor interviews and follow-up information for looked after children within our resettlement thematic review sample were also used, as well as survey responses from 623 young people across seven YOIs, including two young women’s units.

Management

Ensuring the needs of looked after children are met during their time in custody is dependent on the effective joint working between the local authority, YOI and YOT. Previous research has suggested that the lack of awareness of the needs of looked after children and confusion about the roles of different agencies has a negative effect on looked after children in custody.

The policies tended to outline the responsibilities of local authorities towards looked after children but offered no practical guidance for establishment staff on their role in liaising with local authorities to ensure these entitlements were met.

Identification

There was no central record of the total number of looked after children in custody. In our survey analysis, 27 per cent of young people reported that they had spent some time in care. This equated to 27 per cent of young men and 45 per cent of young women. The proportion was higher in specialist units within establishments. The accurate identification of looked after children on arrival into custody is the first step to ensuring that their needs in custody are met and that they receive the support they are entitled to on release. The majority of establishments held records of the current number of looked after children in their establishment, yet there were concerns about the accuracy of this information. Safeguarding teams told us that they would identify looked after children through ASSET, although a third said that the information contained in ASSET was often incomplete.

inaccurate or lacking in sufficient detail. Over half of safeguarding teams said they would also use the induction process to identify looked after children which generally relied on self-reported information. Combined with the complex definitions of a looked after child and a lack of staff awareness, the concerns over accurate identification meant it was likely that some looked after children were not being identified.

Meeting the needs

Our survey analysis highlighted the vulnerability of looked after children in custody. Young people who had spent some time in care reported more problems on arrival into custody, including problems with drugs or alcohol, and were more likely to say they had mental health issues. Over half of safeguarding teams said it was the YOI who took the lead role in managing the care of looked after children in custody. Although the care of the looked after child should be coordinated between the YOI and the local authority, three-quarters of safeguarding teams said that there were barriers that prevented effective and ongoing communication. This included the perception held by a third of safeguarding teams that social workers tended to discharge their duties when a looked after child in their care enters custody. Safeguarding teams told us that there were inconsistent practices between local authorities and communication was often dependent on the commitment of individual social workers. One safeguarding representative said:

‘We try to encourage the local authority to accept that they are still the parent. We explain that we are just a foster carer.’

Looked after children are entitled to a statutory review of their care or pathway plan by the local authority during their time in custody. The vast majority of safeguarding teams told us that these reviews generally took place as required, although only two explicitly said that they formally monitored this. A third of safeguarding teams said that reviews only took place because of the tenacity of establishment staff and this was largely dependent on whether the establishment had a dedicated lead. Of the young people we interviewed, seven (58 per cent) said they had received a review during their time in custody.

In addition to the statutory reviews, social workers are required to regularly visit looked after children. Only half of the young people we interviewed said they had been visited by their social worker. The frequency of these visits ranged from weekly to once in three months. Those who had received visits told us they found them useful. The young people who had not received a visit expressed concerns that they were not being kept informed of what was happening outside prison, for example one young person said:

‘I haven’t had any [visits], I would like to see [my social worker] because I would like to be kept up to date with what’s going on outside. I don’t know what is happening.’

Only half of young people said they were receiving financial support from their local authority.

Resettlement

Young people who said that they had been in care were more likely to report in our survey that they thought they would have problems on release than those who had not been in care. Specifically, they were more likely to say they thought they would have a problem finding accommodation and getting a job.

Interviews with safeguarding teams suggested that there was a lack of clarity about who should take lead responsibility for the resettlement planning for looked after children. Case supervisors told us that social workers for only a third of looked after children were fully involved in their resettlement planning. Although the majority of safeguarding teams said that social workers were routinely invited to training planning meetings, their attendance was relatively poor. Only a third of safeguarding teams said social workers regularly attended.

Several case supervisors felt that the resettlement planning was often left too late in the young person’s sentence and half of the young people we interviewed expressed significant concerns that they didn’t know what plans were in place for their release. One young man said:

‘It’s down to me really but thinking in here about the future is like being caught up in a whirlwind — so much goes around in my head and there is so much I don’t have control over’
As with the young people interviewed for our resettlement thematic review looked after children were worried that accommodation and ETE arrangements would be left too late as they saw these as key to their chance of effective resettlement. At the time of interview, half of the young people did not know where they would be living on release. Of these, one young person was being released in four weeks and said he had been told by his social worker that he would find out where he would be living on the day of his release. Although all young people had an idea of what they would like to do in terms of education or employment on release, only two of the 12 young people interviewed told us they had confirmed plans for education or employment. Looked after children should know who will be collecting them on the day of their release, yet only half of young people knew who would be there to meet them.

Despite the concerns about release plans, and perhaps surprisingly, three-quarters of young people felt quite optimistic that their resettlement arrangements would work out for them. Seven young people did state that their success would be at least partly dependent on the amount of support they would receive from their social worker or YOT case manager. Three young people were not hopeful about their resettlement plans because they had been let down in the past by local authorities. One child who had been let down previously said:

‘I just try not to get happy any more. I’ve learnt not to get my hopes up. I’ll just wait and see.’

3. Findings from the follow-up questionnaires

Case supervisors were asked to complete a questionnaire for each young person in our resettlement thematic review sample on the young person’s day of release and a month later. This was requested to enable us to look through the gate at what accommodation and ETE young people actually went out to. Questionnaires for 41 young people, including 12 looked after children, were returned for their day of release. A month after release questionnaires were returned for 37 young people, including 9 looked after children. Findings for looked after children were pulled out for our looked after children thematic review but both are covered below.

**Accommodation**

Table 1 outlines the type of accommodation case supervisors told us young men were released to and where they were living one month later.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of accommodation on release</th>
<th>Number of young men</th>
<th>Type of accommodation a month after release</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With family members</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>• 20 were still living with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Three had been recalled to custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One was ‘on the run’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information was not provided for two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• One was still in bed and breakfast lodgings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One was living with his brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information was not provided for one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported housing provided by local authority</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>• Two had been recalled to custody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One had been arrested at the gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One was in bed and breakfast lodgings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One was in a hostel after a series of moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>due to gang issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One was living with his mother and had lived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>there since his day of release</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided by local authority but not clear on nature of it</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>• One was still residing there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• One was in a hostel following a series of unsuccessful moves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Information was not provided for one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of accommodation not described</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Information was not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No address</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Information was not provided for either</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 12 looked after children, case supervisors told us that one child was released without an address and one into bed and breakfast accommodation. Seven were released into local authority accommodation. Within one month of release, case supervisors said three looked after children had returned to custody. This was disproportionately higher than the other young people in the sample.

Case supervisors felt that a fifth of these places were not suitable and/or sustainable, including the bed and breakfast accommodation and two cases where young men had gone to live with family members.

**ETE**

On their day of release case supervisors told us that only 13 (32 per cent) had an ETE placement to go to which included two looked after children. However, one month later, seven had stopped attending and only six of 28 young men who had not had a placement arranged for them on release were engaged in ETE, one of whom was a looked after child. Case supervisors commented that unsuccessful placements were often associated with unstable accommodation — it is of note that all 13 young men who had a ETE placement on the day of their release also had suitable accommodation — and that they were most successful when young people were motivated, engaged in something they wanted to do and had the support of their family.

**Conclusion**

Children and young people need to be supported whilst in custody to ensure that they are well prepared for their release into the community. The findings from our two thematic reports raise some concerns about the effectiveness of resettlement planning, particularly for vulnerable groups such as looked after children. There were some positive findings — establishments had developed good working relationships with YOTs and many case supervisors had a good knowledge of those on their case loads. Most young men were engaged in ETE and three-quarters said they had received or were working towards a qualification. Establishments were trying to ensure that the entitlements of looked after children were being met. However, this was often hindered by a lack of specialist knowledge and links with local authorities were not as developed as those with YOTs. The strategic direction of resettlement work needed strengthening and the actual outcomes for young people on release were very disappointing.

As well as highlighting examples of good practice, both thematic reports made recommendations which are summarised below. Action plans are being co-ordinated in response to these. Funding has already been announced by the YJB for social workers in each young people’s establishment. This is an important and very encouraging first step. Our recommendations were to the YJB, Ministry of Justice and/or NOMS but both reports recognise that building links with other relevant government departments and external agencies will be vital to ensure progress and to overcome the barriers routinely faced by those working to meet young people’s needs while in custody and on release.

All reports published by HMIP are available on our website: http://www.justice.gov.uk/about/hmi-prisons/index.htm

### Summary of recommendations

**Resettlement provision for children and young people**

1. The Ministry of Justice should work with other government departments to ensure that young people leaving custody are treated as children in need and, in accordance with s17 of the Children Act 1989, are assessed for the provision of services to meet their needs.
2. The YJB should work with the Department for Education to agree a strategy that ensures that resettlement planning for
young people leaving custody is effective. The strategy should include arrangements for the collaboration and coordination of all relevant agencies.

3. The YJB should develop procedures to effectively monitor resettlement outcomes for young people following their release from YOIs. The National Offender Management Service (NOMS) should provide YOIs with clear guidance on how to collect the necessary data as well as guidance on how to use the data to develop and improve resettlement strategies.

4. NOMS should develop guidance for YOIs to help them carry out a comprehensive needs analysis and develop an age appropriate resettlement strategy that is informed by the needs analysis, consultation with young people and data relating to resettlement outcomes. Guidance should address the role of Release on Temporary Licence, and the role of families or carers and external agencies.

**The care of looked after children in custody**

1. The YJB should work with the Department for Education to agree a strategy for the coordination of services for looked after children in custody that ensures that all agencies with statutory responsibilities for looked after children fulfil their obligations.

2. NOMS should develop clear procedures, incorporating relevant legislation and guidance, relating to the care and management of looked after children in YOIs. There should be a comprehensive dissemination programme to assist staff in YOIs to properly implement the procedures.

3. There should be a national lead within NOMS with a role for ongoing review and development of the national procedures on the care and management of looked after children in YOIs, to ensure that they are kept up to date and that they are properly implemented.

4. There should be a designated social worker within each YOI with responsibility for implementing agreed procedures for looked after children. This should include offering advice and guidance to relevant staff in the YOI, and establishing and maintaining working links with local authorities to ensure that the needs of looked after children are met.
The Management of Sexual Offenders in the Community: Austerity, Engagement, Interaction and The ‘Big Society’

Kieran McCartan is based in the Department of Health and Applied Social Sciences, University of the West of England, Bristol.

‘Big Society we will tackle these root causes of poverty and criminality… In the Big Society … criminals will live in fear of the people — because there is nowhere for them to hide.’

Sexual offenders, especially child sexual abusers, are among the most reviled and ostracised offenders in society, making their reintegration into and their management within the community problematic3. The reintegration of sex offenders back into the community has always been a difficult balancing act between risk management and public protection, requiring the engagement of multitude Criminal justice agencies6. This reintegration and management is made more difficult in the United Kingdom (UK) as Child sexual abuse, especially paedophilia, is a high profile social issue and media story4 which has come about as a consequence of a number of factors, including, perceived increases in the rates of reporting, recording and responding to child sexual abuse; a number of high profile media stories; reactionary public attitudes; evidence based research7 8 and the highly politicised nature of sexual offending (i.e., general election debates, political spin and coverage, inclusion on policy agendas). These societal factors have meant that understanding and responding to child sexual abuse has become a core policing issue, a public protection and a public health issue over the past decade; leading to a number of high profile legislative changes and public campaigns in UK.

The UK does not have a single national Criminal Justice System (CJS); rather it is split into three separate jurisdictions (i.e., England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland) each with their own distinctive laws, legislation, legal systems and criminal justice agencies; although, at times these can overlap. A series of sex offender policy developments have been spearheaded in England and Wales over the past two decades, including but not limited to the implementation of a national sex offender’s register, an expansion of the Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks, the introduction of Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA) and the limited public disclosure of sex offender information. Most of these legislative changes, to date, have been implemented in both Scotland and Northern Ireland either at the same time as England and Wales, or slightly later; therefore indicating that regional, or jurisdictional, differences do come through in the management and monitoring of sex offenders in UK9 10.

Different ‘voices’ and discourses around child sexual abuse in modern society

Responding to sexual offending, especially child sexual abuse is an often complex, controversial and difficult line for the government and the CJS to walk. This is partly because of the variety of diverse understandings of and reactions to child sexual abuse by separate actors or groups in society11;
The public are concerned about child sexual abuse, often promoting a punitive response and wanting sex offenders isolated from communities\textsuperscript{13,14}; professionals tend to have no cohesive ‘voice’ on child sexual abuse, instead having a widespread and varied series of ‘voices’ dependent on their area of expertise, experience and outlook on offenders\textsuperscript{5}; official discourses tend to view child sexual abuse as a public protection and risk management issue, therefore responding in terms of risk reduction and public protection not treatment, prevention and/or reintegration\textsuperscript{16}; and media professionals tend to see, and represent, sexual abusers in negative, putative and emotional terms viewing them as a homogenous group\textsuperscript{19,20}. These disjointed discourses have resulted in an understanding of child sexual abuse that is somewhat detached from the reality of the offending, particularly in regard to paedophilia, leading to poor societal understanding, emotional and restrictive responses, reactionary politics and media misdiagnosis. Consequently, this means that discussions around how to respond to child sexual abusers becomes confined and limited to the most socially acceptable response.

**(Limited) Public disclosure of sex offender information in the UK**

Unsurprisingly members of the public and professionals who work with sex offenders have different attitudes to the management of sexual offenders who have offended against children\textsuperscript{15}, especially in regard to community reintegration. The public do not want child sexual abusers back in their communities, whereas professionals feel that community reintegration is an important and central step in offender rehabilitation\textsuperscript{21}. One of the most debated, controversial and punitive strategies for the management and monitoring of child sexual abusers in the community, both internationally and in the UK, is the public disclosure of sex offender information (known as ‘Sarah’s Law’ in the UK and ‘Megan’s Law’ in the USA). This legislation was first developed in the USA, where any member of public at large can has easy and unlimited access to the names as well as addresses of all known sex offenders within their communities\textsuperscript{21}. After much debate, research and political flip flopping\textsuperscript{24} the previous labour government piloted a limited public disclosure of sex offender information scheme in England and Wales, arguing that they wanted to see if limited disclosure could work while emphasising that the proposed approach was not an attempt ‘..to introduce a US-style Megan’s Law or automatic disclosure of sexual offenders details to the general public.’\textsuperscript{25}

The sex offender disclosure scheme was piloted in England, Wales and Scotland at various stages in 2009 — 2010, with the English and Welsh pilot taking place in four English (Warwickshire, Cleveland, Hampshire and Cambridgeshire), but no Welsh, police forces and the Scottish pilot taking place in one police force (Tayside). The piloted, and now implemented, limited disclosure scheme is based on the premise that parents, or primary caregivers, who are concerned about the behaviour of a known individual towards their child can ask for past sexual offence information about this person\textsuperscript{26,27}. Therefore it’s not a means to find out the number and locations of sex offenders in your area, unlike the American version, it is disclosure with a purpose (i.e., to find out direct information regarding a specific child and a named, potential, offender). The English, and Welsh, pilot took the form of an analysis of application forms and a series of qualitative interviews with practitioners, stakeholders, offenders and applicants. There were 585 applications made under the pilot with 21 of these resulting in disclosures being made and a further 43 leading to other child protection actions; there were no breaches of applicant confidentiality and no negative public/community action (i.e., protests, vigilantism, etc)\textsuperscript{28}. The Scottish pilot was nearly identical leading to similar results with 52 applications being made which resulted in 11 disclosures\textsuperscript{29}, with a full, simultaneous Scottish roll out of the scheme happening as a result. However, there are

\begin{itemize}
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currently no plans to develop and/or roll out a pilot study in Northern Ireland.

As a direct result of the pilots, which were hailed as a success, the limited disclosure scheme was introduced in England, Wales and Scotland. The current scheme has five stages, with the applicant making a written enquiry to the police about a specific person coming into contact with a specific child. Which, if successful, then proceeds to the applications stage where a formal face-to-face application done with a trained/specialised police officer and a background check is done on the applicant; leading on to the next stage where the applicant is given an information pack on the disclosure pilot scheme as well as general safeguarding advice. This point a full risk assessment is done on the target of the enquiring, and then a final decision is made on whether the said individual poses either a ‘concern’ or ‘no concern’. The resultant decision and related information is then disclosed to the person best suited to protect the child, not necessarily the applicant, in a secure setting after they have signed a sworn statement indicating that they will not discuss this information with anyone else and if they do they could face criminal proceedings. If the applicant is not willing to agree to the conditions of disclosure or seen to be troublesome the police will need to consider if disclosure should take place and if they are not to be told then who is best placed to be told.

Limiting disclosure, public protection and austerity measures

The public disclosure of sex offender information, whether through full or limited disclosure, raises a series of concerns surrounding community responses to information regarding sex offenders, the appropriate managing and monitoring of disclosure, as well as concerns over the successful management of known child sexual abusers in the community. One of the main arguments against the disclosure of sex offender information, particularly in regard to full public disclosure but also relating to partial disclosure, is whether the government is shifting responsibility for the management of sex offenders into the public arena, onto community groups and away from the state? Is the government dressing up a populist policy as a public protection and community safety issue? Although, these concerns are topical and high profile in and of themselves, they are particularly resonant given the current social and economic climate within the UK. Recently, as a result of austerity measures and cost saving exercises, the coalition government has sanctioned public sector cuts, both nationally and regionally, in regard to the police, prisons, probation and counter intelligence. This means that with fewer resources potentially the CJS may struggle to control and monitor offenders effectively, which could have a significant impact upon the management of certain, resource insensitive, offending populations (i.e., sex offenders). The current author believes that the potential for problems in sex offender management raised as a consequence of cuts could potentially be further inflated by the current limited disclosure scheme as practitioners are dubious of where the additional resources and funds are coming from to administer scheme currently, never mind the injection of money and resourced that would be required to make the scheme run as effectively as possible (i.e., publicity, more support for applicants, increased policing of offenders, managing confidentiality and the issues resulting from breaches in it). Hence, the limited disclosure of sex offender information could end up being fiscally expensive for government to run, especially if the scheme has a high take up and is not administrated, regulated and policed correctly.

Limited disclosure, public protection and the ‘Big Society’

The limited disclosure of sex offender information, regardless of cost and social reaction does tie into the Conservative party’s, and therefore the coalition’s governments, ideas and vision of the ‘Big Society’. The Big society aims “to create a climate that empowers local
people and communities, building a big society that will ‘take power away from politicians and give it to people’42, which means the transferring of decision making to communities, encouraging people to take an active role in their communities as well as greater support for co-ops, mutual’s, charities and social enterprises. Hence, the limited disclosure of sex offender information reflects the core ideas of the ‘Big Society’ by promoting greater community partnership, greater civil/social responsibility and the promotion of state trust in the public. In doing so limited disclosure reinforces the coalitions belief that social repair is a process based upon community engagement, restorative justice and successful reintegration43. This desire to get the public and communities more involved in local affairs and take responsibility for themselves is also tied up in the coalitions approach to policing, which aims to reduce the numbers of paid officers, increase the number of police volunteers, make the CJS more public as well as victim focused. Therefore indicating that the coalition wants to get the public, and communities, more involved in policing44, offender management and offender reintegration in their local area, and therefore by default leading them to be more engaged nationally.

The potential outcome of this marriage between austerity, limited disclosure and the ‘Big Society’ is the notion that offender management, policing and justice will become community partnership issues rather than simply state/CJS ones. Which could potentially result in the broader public, particularly community groups, offender outreach charities and/or related NGO’s, being expected to partly or entirely manage their local offenders themselves. However, for this to work there needs to be an implicit trust in, as well as between, the public, communities, partner organisations and the CJS. In reality this degree of implicit trust does not exist, for instance, research in Northern Ireland and Wales has shown that the public do not think that the state, or practitioners, trust them with sex offender information fearing that they will retaliate against these offenders. Which resulted in the participants stating that they would be disinclined to accept the responses that practitioners give them regarding sex offenders in their local areas, instead preferring to trust their own instincts. This was reinforced by practitioners, especially in Northern Ireland, stating that they were not sure that they could trust the public to react appropriately and felt that disclosure would lead to community conflict and problems for ground level staff45.

The potential outcome of this marriage between austerity, limited disclosure and the ‘Big Society’ is the notion that offender management, policing and justice will become community partnership issues rather than simply state/CJS ones.

Limited disclosure, the ‘Big Society’ and the ‘rehabilitation revolution’

If the limited disclosure of sex offender information indicates a greater potential sharing of offender information with certain narrowly defined members of the community this could impact upon organisations that take on the management of offenders as part of the rehabilitation revolution in penal policy46,47. The rehabilitation revolution means that offender management will be farmed out to independent contractors and judged through a payment through results process. This means that independent contractors will take on traditional CJS roles in a similar vein to what happened when the NHS was privatised by the previous conservative government, albeit this time the process is labelled as community partnership and engagement. When the idea of the rehabilitative revolution is married to notions surrounding the ‘Big Society’ and greater partnership working it emphasises that the public, community groups, charities, NGO’s and private companies (i.e., partner agencies) maybe increasingly responsible for offender management, potentially including child sexual offender management48.

44. See footnote 18.
45. See footnote 3.
48. See foot note 47.
This means that partner organisations could have greater access, or perceived access, to sex offender information by the public which could result in increased formal or informal disclosure to the public as a result of increased personal or professional pressure, issues with legitimacy, poor standardization of practices, and deficits in corporate responsibility for managing sex offenders in the community. Hence, if as a result of the

Big Society and the ‘rehabilitation revolution’ offender management, and potentially sex offender management, in the community is potentially going to be run through an amalgamation of partnership organisations, charities and community groups (i.e., potentially groups like NARCO, Circles UK, etc) what should their role be?

Outcomes and considerations for the broader public as well as partner organisations

Both historically and currently there is a background of partner organisations working with the CJS around offender management and reintegration (i.e., NACRO, Circles UK, Howard League). However, given the current austerity cuts, the rehabilitative revolution and greater devolvement of state powers through the Big Society these organisations need to be careful not to take on responsibilities which are outside of their jurisdictions. There are a number of potential scenarios that could play out for partner organisations, both old and new, in regard to the management of sexual abusers against children in the current climate; (1) these groups could assist victims, offenders, associated people and communities in understanding as well as responding to child sexual abuse; (2) these groups could replace the work done by existing CJS agencies in regard to child sexual abuse; or (3) these groups could become involved in partnership working with CJS agencies. All of which fit in with the coalition’s Big Society, increased partnership and public involvement manifesto. The most likely scenario seems to be that these groups would continue to be involved in partnership working with CJS agencies, as they or others have done historically, helping to respond to sexual abuse at a grass roots level; but with the caveat of possibly taking on more responsibility and therefore having more accountability. These organisations, whether new or historical partners, should be engaging with;

- Public education on the reality of sex offenders, sexual offending, sex offender management and the ‘appropriate’ use of disclosure.
- Brokering between sex offenders and their victims/communitys (with police/CJU support).
- Reinforcing, not replacing, the role of the CJS.
- Encouraging best practice among those organizations involved in the management of sex offenders and questioning bad practice.

- Helping convicted sex offenders reintegrate into society, and the community, through offering advice, support, counseling and life skills.
- Continuing to offer broad, as well as personalized, victim and community support.

However, despite the positive impact that community groups, charities, NGO’s, private businesses and/or private criminal justice groups can have in assisting the CJS manage responses to sexual violence in the community there are potential problems;

- they should not be confronting, policing and/or monitoring sex offenders themselves, particularly if they do not have a criminal justice mandate to do so;
- There is a greater possibility of sex offender information sharing with the community, especially through informal methods;
- There may be pressure, either internally and/or externally, for the organization to pass on any sex offender details or confidential information that they have on to the community;
- This could result in a ‘postcode lottery’ of sex offender management, as has happened with the NHS and in Care, with different areas of the UK getting different forms and standards of care in offender management;
- The farming out of offender, and potentially sex offender management, to independent contractors which is managed through a payment by results process may lead to a reduction in the overall care and control of sex offenders potentially resulting in breaches of public protection.

Conclusions

The limited public disclosure of sex offender information seems to lend itself, almost by chance, to the coalition governments’ emphasis on the ‘Big Society’, greater public working and the ‘rehabilitation revolution’. In addition, the introduction of harsher austerity measures and cuts in the CJS budget means that the public may have to rely on voluntary agencies, community groups and committed citizens more for the management of sex offenders in the community; potentially creating a perfect storm for the management of sexual abusers against children in the community. Hence organizations who plan to get involved in this field, or are already working in this field, need to be aware of what is, need to realistically understand what is expected of so that they do not over step professional boundaries, break the law or take on, possibly unwittingly, roles which are not part of their responsibilities.
Car Crime and Offending Behaviour: Ex-Offender Perspectives

**Dr Tina G. Patel** is a Lecturer in Criminology, at the Centre for Social Research, University of Salford.

**Introduction**

This paper reports on some of the findings of a study undertaken within a vulnerable residential area of an inner-city in the north-west of England. As a location, it has been marked as vulnerable due to its abnormally high crime rate. As such, it continues to attract police and local authority concern, who commissioned research to examine the motivations, opportunities of, and technical knowledge for undertaking one of its common crimes in the locale, that is theft from or of a motor vehicle (TMV). In using qualitative research methods with a sample of ex-offenders, victims of theft, and, users of the stolen goods market, several key factors were identified as relevant in the undertaking and consequences of TMV. Here, the role of the built environment in terms of urban disorganisation, the lack of community cohesion between the varying residential groups, problematic police-community relationships and attitudes, and the marked income inequalities within such a residential population, were all highlighted as significant. These factors intertwined with one another to create a space where the occurrence of a particular type of crime was viewed as necessary and for some, an acceptable response to their State allocated position of neglect and marginalisation.

**A Background**

Areas such as the sample site are often viewed as unattractive. Not only are they geographically and socially marginalised, and perceived as places to be best avoided, but also suffer from negative labels (i.e. high crime, poor education, high levels of unemployment and welfare recipients believed to be found there) which go on to impact on local residents. The study’s sample site is often viewed as having such characteristics. It is argued that incidence of poverty, and of the many forms of associated multiple deprivation, is highly correlated with the propensity of residents to engage in crime (TMV). This echoes the notion of a ‘criminal underclass’, a concept which I argue is highly problematic and has been criticised not least for ‘blaming the poor’, suggesting that they have problematic morals and ignoring wider structures and the complex power relations that exist in society. An alternative conception sees the source of this section of society, to lie not in their supposed problematic morality, but rather as a response to adverse social and economic circumstances, as well as a response to the physical decay of the environment and the social deprivation that its inhabitants face. This means that particular types of crimes such as TMV, may occur. This is especially so if there is a ready availability of targets in the locale — as was the case in the sample site. Research undertaken by Spencer notes that in such areas, networks exist which not only support TMV, but encourage it — for instance, offenders not only have a ready market where goods can easily be passed on for a profit, but are also often given ‘orders’ for particular items.

---
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2. Respondents discussing participation in TMV, had been recruited via parole officers and specialist programmes assisting in rehabilitation. In addition, a condition of research participation was that respondents would not be at the time of interviewing actively engaged in crimes. Although it was suspected that some respondents may still have been criminally active (suggested not least by comments made in the interviews), they are referred to as ex-offenders because this is the status they gave themselves at the start of the research.
3. This is discussed elsewhere in publications authored by members of the research team.
Light et al. and Spencer found that most of their sample became involved in car crime during their teenage years, with a large proportion being committed by young males. Many had been taught the basic skills of breaking into vehicles at an early age, either by peers, older siblings, other offenders or people from the local neighbourhood. Some of Spencer’s sample cited excitement, boredom and reputation boosting as a motivation for some types of TMV — in particular the type often described as ‘joyriding’, where a vehicle is stolen and driven at speed, and then either abandoned or destroyed, usually by being set on fire. This is supported by Cooper, who notes that joyriding is a significant factor for involvement in TMV related offences, enhanced by the fact that often for its subjects there are no other legitimate opportunities accessible to them that allows the achievement of a similar level of excitement and status. Research also highlights how TMV offenders often see stealing from cars as a way to make money. Indeed for some it is ‘an essential source of income’, as well as means of accessing ‘extras’, that is entertainment, clothes, drink and drugs. Although most saw such crimes (in particular TMV) to be wrong, few saw it to be a serious offence with little stigma attachment, but instead was something that boosted status and respect.

The literature on TMV and ‘getting caught’ indicates that many offences occur before the individual is caught — if they are at all. Although some consider what would happen if they are caught by the police, this does not act as deterrence for offending behaviour. Indeed, despite actually being caught, going to court, or being punished (i.e. fined, penalty points, conditional discharge, probation, community service, or being given a custodial sentence), only a small proportion of the offenders in Light et al.’s study stated this led to desistence of TMV and related offending behaviour. Similarly, offenders in Spencer’s study admitted that they had in fact continued to re-offend after being caught, indicating that allocated punishments were ineffective, and have a limited scope in reducing offending and re-offending rates. Rather, Light et al. found that the reasons that their sample of ex-offenders gave for desistence of TMV included maturity (i.e. growing out of it) and responsibility (i.e. a new girlfriend or becoming a father).

The Study

The reported study’s sample site is located in an inner-city area of north-west England, immediately adjacent to both the regional centre and a University campus. The neighbourhood contains what UK government statisticians call ‘lower layer Super Output Areas’ (corresponding to a population of approximately 1,500) that are within the 3-7 per cent most deprived nationally and is surrounded by Super Output Areas that are within the 3 per cent most deprived areas nationally. In terms of recorded major crime (i.e. burglary, theft, criminal damage and violence), the site can be subdivided into three ‘zones’, which, moving West to East, are in the worst 3-7 per cent, 7-10 per cent, and 3 per cent of neighbourhoods in England and Wales. Historically, the city, and especially its inner-city communities, has suffered some of the worst consequences of de-industrialisation, and resulting high levels of un- and under-employment. These inner-city neighbourhoods have been characterised by some as ‘classic’ high crime areas, containing populations which, for a variety of reasons, are unwilling to
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cooperate with the police, and where those who do face systematic intimidation\textsuperscript{20}. A further issue is the transient nature of residence for many of those living in inner-city neighbourhoods, which may dissuade individuals from full participation in community life\textsuperscript{21} — including participation in crime-reduction strategies and community development projects. The sample site is part of a Ward that has higher than average annual residential turnover, with rates more than half as high again as the city’s average. The City Council, its Central Urban Regeneration Company, and strategic partners (including the local police force) are currently targeting the city and especially the sample neighbourhood for redevelopment, part of this includes a focus for the crime prevention authorities on the offence of TMV. The frequency of TMV in the study’s sample site is an average of 34 per calendar month. In comparison, the figure for the other areas in the city is lower at 19 per calendar month\textsuperscript{22}.

Crime (TMV) in the sample site shares common characteristics with crime in many other inner-city neighbourhoods. Here, the built environment, community relationships, and wider relationships with the police, as well as income inequalities are all marked as significant. Several key factors though are identified as relevant in the undertaking of TMV, which when intertwined with one another create a space where ‘urban management strategies’ headed by partnerships between powerful groups, local agencies and criminal justice organisations under rouge of ‘broken windows’ thesis, are ‘refashioning the look and feel of city space’\textsuperscript{23}. This involves practices of control and regulation which can be better understood as ‘socio-spatial ordering practices’\textsuperscript{24}. This was an issue in the reported study, illustrated when one ex-offender spoke about the contrasts between the ‘older’ and ‘redeveloped’ areas in the locale:

\textit{Check the houses what we’re living in, do you understand what I’m saying?...what the Council’ll do...is they stick all people like us in one area, right...it’s all single mums, or its all criminals, do you know what I mean, they throw us all in one area.}

This broader social deprivation is understood to lead to criminal behaviour, as one ex-offender stated:

\textit{I learned how to break into cars in the neighbourhood while growing up. You see other people doing and you do it. People start robbing from cars at age thirteen. I was more likely to get caught when I was younger. You learn what to do, not to get caught.}

A consequence of which is a cycle of criminality across generations. For example, research field notes detailed the experiences of one ex-offender:

\textit{[Ex-offender] says everyone he grew up around was a gaffer [criminal], and that his dad has been in prison all his life. He refers to his young son, who is playing sports downstairs: ‘He’s probably going to grow up the same way as exactly what I’ve done. What can I say to him, how can I punish him for what I’ve done? I can’t do that, ‘cause that’s what my dad’s done to me’. He says that when he tries to tell his son not to fuck about in school his son answers back ‘well you can’t read and write’. This ex-offender couldn’t read the consent form, and made a mark in place of a signature. He was thrown out of school and attended a remedial centre.}

The social deprivation is reproduced and reinforced by activities of some of the area’s residents, as one ex-offender noted:

\textit{When we see a girl that moves onto our estate, young girl, two kids, we automatically think ‘party house’, fucking ‘party house’!}

Individuals are therefore given few reasons to be personally ambitious, or to believe that their situation

\textsuperscript{22} Figures calculated from local police published crime statistics.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid p.232.
can be improved, as one ex-offender noted when talking about the ‘young grafters’ in the locale and their future prospects:

Well what is there for them? Y’know what I mean? I mean for some of them it might be a life of crime. They [local council and government] don’t seem to push kids towards Youth Training Schemes anymore. How you supposed to live, you can’t ask your mum for a tenner every day can you? Well, for one you don’t want to, and no-one’s giving them anything so what do they do. They have to go out and earn it, y’know, grafting.

In such instances, crime is often considered one of the only avenues to which everyday items needed for survival, as well as more desirable items, that is mobile phones, games consoles, designer clothing, etc., can be obtained. Thus criminal behaviour, especially those associated with TMV are common in areas such as the study site\(^2\), as they allow money to be earned, in a short amount of time, and with a low likelihood of being caught — largely because of the availability of targets, the urban layout which allowed for crimes to be carried out\(^2\), and a ready market on which stolen goods could be passed on:

I’d get ten of them [car radios], and then phone a guy who would come and meet me, wherever I was, and take them off my hands. I was doing this…three or four times a day…I was making two or three hundred quid in a matter of half an hour…And I’d do that all day. And then when I finally got arrested for it, it was near enough a thousand cars.

The ease of which ex-offenders could sell items on acted as a motivation for undertaking TMV:

There’s a market for anything, people want things, and if there’s an opportunity, you wouldn’t just walk past it. It’s easy to get rid of stolen goods. I don’t care how honest anyone says they are, especially if they’re thinking about buying something, and somebody comes in and offers it them at a quarter of the price, if it’s in good condition, they’ll buy it.

Another said: ‘It takes ten minutes to get rid of any knocked-off gear’.

Another ex-offender stated:

We’ll go grafting, yeah? Say we go grafting for a laptop, we’re not going to go and hope we sell it; we’ve already got a buyer for the laptop, we’ve already got someone whose going to buy that and sell it on to make himself a profit.

Where there are views about their positions allocated position of social and financial inequality, undertaking TMV is a straightforward matter to justify:

Everyone in council houses are just going to target the more affluent groups moving into [area]. They’ve got this, they’ve got that, we’ve got nothing.

In addition though, TMV was often viewed as necessary in order to financially survive, or to support an alcohol and/or drug dependency. This is illustrated by ex-offender comments about the widespread and common use of drugs and alcohol, which then acts as a motivator for criminality:

Young kids are grafting to support cannabis habits. You hear the young ones saying ‘I need a bud, I need a bud’.

Another ex-offender stated:

When you’re on smack you need to have more. The days would pass quickly when you have heroin, but very slow when you don’t. I’d steal things, and accept lower prices, when I knew I could get a higher price later in the day, because I couldn’t wait to get my next fix.

One ex-offender said:

Basically, the weed makes you…if I didn’t have a weed I’d be sat here like [looks slumped at the table], morbid, depressed, paranoid, for me to have a weed would put me back to my normal self that I know, do you know what I mean?

---

25. Due to availability, access and reduced costs, the study site was being used as an over-flow car park for visitors to the adjoining city centre, as well as for employees, new residents (living in the newly built luxury apartments in the redeveloped areas of the sample site) and students studying on campus in the study site locale. This meant that there was a constant availability of cars, many of which often contained valuable items, i.e. laptops, mobile phones, money, etc.

26. The urban layout of the study site contained a number of narrow passages and hidden pathways which were used by ex-offenders to undertake TMV, evade detection and escape from patrolling police cars.
More well-established and professional criminals were considered being able to use ex-offenders’ substance dependency to their own ends, as some ex-offenders noted:

*People get made to rob, that they get bullied into it…if you’re in debt with someone. If you are selling drugs for someone, you have to give them the ‘gross sales’ everyday and they will give you back a ‘wage’ on a Friday. But if you get busted, then the value of any drugs seized will be owed to the main supplier…you then have to work for free’, and: ‘If you owe a dealer money then he will get you to go out grafting for him. The debt works itself off very slow, it doesn’t work itself off like it’s supposed to.’*

For some, TMV was viewed as an inevitable and acceptable response to their State allocated position of victimisation — a result of which was that they experienced psychological abuse, physical neglect and social marginalisation, indicated in their discussions about their frustration born from a lack of opportunities and access to resources:

*There is nothing in north [of the city], like cinemas, restaurants, compared to south [of the city]. So you can see why the young people are so bored. So I’m not surprised they look for their own fun. When I was young, I had friends who did this sort of stuff, stealing and joyriding out of boredom.*

Another ex-offender said:

*So for us, it was just basically, we’ll go out on a Friday night, we’ll get beer’d up, we’ll go and rob a car.*

These feelings of victimisation were particularly enhanced when ex-offenders located their positions in relation to the perceived advantaged ones that they saw new incomers in the locale (i.e. students and young professionals located in luxury developments) were being ‘given’ by the university, council and Central Urban Regeneration Company:

*Look at these estates now, round [estate], they’re all fucking top houses, but try and get me one!*

These new groups were considered by ex-offenders to be ‘rats…looking down on you’, a view which helped to justify offending behaviour.

The ex-offenders’ disappointment at limited access to resources was also evident in their views about parole and post-conviction associated support services that they had been required to join or had themselves requested help from:

*The court told me that seeing as I was mad on cars, why don’t you get an education, right, sweet, so probation have now paid for me to go panel beating, spraying cars, rebuilding engines, I can do anything you want me to do with your car…but, nobody’ll employ me, because all I’ve ever been done for is pinching cars, so I’m saying now you bastards knew I’d fail.*

Another ex-offender said:

*I’ve never been jail. At my last court appearance the judge referred me to an alcohol rehabilitation course and a drug rehabilitation course. I thought this was a good idea, until I went to the drug rehab course. The guy spoke to me for like five minutes about everything I already know about drugs, right…They didn’t send me no more interviews or ‘owt like that, so I’m back on the drugs again, I’m back drinking again. They don’t help you get a job, they just forget about you.*

This tells us that essentially, the core reasons for needing to commit TMV, that is financial survival and substance dependency, had not been resolved, which left ex-offenders again in a position where they would need to re-offend.

However, TMV did not always feature in long-term or re-offending patterns. This is because TMV is not considered a full-time, long-term practice for the sampled ‘graffers’. Rather, it is something delimited by age and by needs. One ex-offender, for instance, talked about it being something he did from his mid-teens. He had more or less given up (except where a particularly good opportunity arose) by his early twenties, instead concentrating on burglary and other more ‘serious’ crimes. His stated rationale for this change was that TMV requires repeated ‘outings’ each day for little reward, in comparison to other crimes. Thus by moving into more lucrative activities he could work fewer hours for greater rewards:

*The best are £200,000 houses on the new estates because they have everything in their bedroom draws…I’ve found large sums of money.*
Although this brought with it higher risks, the needs and rewards outweighed the perceived dangers. Therefore, stealing cars is seen as a temporary phase, but only in the sense that it is considered to be a bridge to more serious offences, such as stealing cars to use in a ram-raid or as a escape vehicle in a bank robbery:

...organised crime where they’re going to do a bank robbery, they’ll pinch a car, hide it away for a while, put ‘double-plates’ on it, and that car’ll go off to do a bigger job.

It is worth noting though that in terms of motivation, prison and probation, some respondents had positive experiences of criminal justice institutions. For example, research fieldnotes detail the case of one ex-offender who had split up with his girlfriend and notified the probation service of a change in circumstances, in that he was now homeless. He looked at a couple of hostels but decided rather to stay on the sofa of ‘a mate’. He said after this probation services found him a flat and £550 to move in with. He said he enjoyed his time with probation because he ‘wouldn’t have got that [flat] without ‘em’, adding that ‘sometimes you’ve got to be in trouble to get help.’

Conclusion

Some key themes emerged from the reported study, regarding the motivations, and the possibilities for, reducing TMV and associated crime. Here, the motivation and rationale for criminal activities is to earn a relatively small amount of money in short amount of time, with a low likelihood of being caught and an expected ease of selling items on, some of which were being stolen to order. This was especially important given the limited opportunities by which the same could be accessed through more legitimate means, that is employment. Significant here is urban disorganisation and geographical neglect. The sample site is subject to an urban redevelopment programme, which is perceived by ex-offenders to be to blame for the neglect that existing residents experienced, not least because re-development projects were concentrating inward investment for affluent outsiders, resulting in inadequate services and facilities for more established residents. In addition, because of the location of the sample site, and its closeness to neighbouring sites of interest and attractions, it was also being used as a site for alternative and cheaper car parking. These sites are attractive to offenders, not only because they provided a ready source of targets, but also due to their location (which offered accessible escape routes) and lack of onsite patrol or CCTV coverage. Although TMV is not a full-time, long-term job for ‘grafters’, most are more likely to move on to others ‘serious’ crimes, as this brings the benefits of making the same or more money, with less outings. Few reported ‘getting caught’ or being punished as deterrence for participation in TMV or other crime. Rather, ex-offenders suggested that the provision of meaningful resources and support facilities would be of more use in attempts to reduce re-offending. This could be offered via increased financial investment and improvements in existing arrangements for ex-offenders, such as more staff leading project as to allow for a greater intake of service users; multi-agency co-operation with groups such as NACRO; and, greater financial investment in ex-offender Back to Work Schemes. In addition, further specialisation of free counselling services for those with alcohol and/or drug abuse problems would also be of benefit, given that many undertake TMV to support substance abuse. Like many crime prevention initiatives though, these recommendations are tentative and will require further discussion and exploration via additional research into criminal activity associated with TMV.
From small protests to great riots grow: a critical commentary of the interconnection between race, class and economy in the 2011 August riots.

Ian Fox-Williams is Deputy Head of the Law School, Birmingham City University and Ali Malik is based at the Law School, Birmingham City University.

Introduction

The rampage of riots and looting in August 2011 may have conjured memories for many of the scenes of disorder during the previous Brixton and Tottenham riots in the 1980s. However, the manner in which the disturbances played out was beyond expectation to the point where rioting and looting swept through 22 boroughs of the capital and to other cities in England. This article will comment on three identifiable factors that have been regarded as significant influences in the uprising and wonton criminality last August; economy, race and the much maligned ‘feral underclass’ in context of the contrasting theories offered by commentators from Left and Right.

The economics of the riots

The austerity measures put into place by the coalition government along with a withdrawal of public services against the backdrop of a national and global economic downturn have all been cited as socio-demographic reasons for the riots in August 2011. Such economic and social deprivation lends itself well to the Leftist argument. If we were to accept the Leftist interpretation as somehow legitimising the actions of those involved in the rioting and looting, it would arguably be flawed where the conduct of the rioters did not traditionally support a Leftist ideology of ‘necessity’.

A good example here is the act of looting during the August riots, a Leftist explanation would offer a rationale that turns on a notion of equality yet even Leftist thinkers find it difficult to legitimise the fact that looters were choosing to target ‘Poundland.’ When looking at the reasons for the rioters to act as they did with regard to socio-economic factors, survival is clearly not the motivation, had it of been so then the rioting and looting would have been more geographically spread. Instead rioting was limited to certain locations, arguably those involved where fighting against a relative deprivation against mainstream inequality between themselves and the rich.

The age of those involved in the disturbances is also important, according to statistics following the riots (BBC 2011) the average age of those involved was between 18-20 years-old. This is a demographic that has been given little opportunity to offer a constructive response to the socio-economic state of their country and their feelings of becoming disenfranchised and alienated. This is only compounded with the closure of inner city youth services such as that in Haringey, consequently they have unified these individuals and their actions have empowered them to make a ‘collective response’. This ability to act collectively gave individuals a new level of power, one that was beyond what they could achieve individually but one that was now a threat to the rich, the rich who owned businesses and who could now, through their lawlessness, be made to suffer. However the range of their target would become indiscriminate in that a small sole-trader who had their own business was held to be in the same esteem, and suffer the same punishment, as large chain stores.

Recent research by Ponticelli and Voth indicate that austerity measures do coincide with an increase in demonstrations and rioting. There is no denying that governmental policies that reduce public spending will have, on average, a greater effect on the poor however to adopt the Right view, such does not, and should not lead to revolt. Instead moral decay amongst communities, poor parenting and an over dependency on state welfare has led to the popularly banded ‘broken society’—sick communities that have bred those involved in the riots. To say that the Right completely ignore socio-economic factors is untrue to an extent; instead it chooses to couch its position in terms of betterment. The Right cannot ignore the
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financial woes that this country is currently observing however it cannot accept the view that such individuals had little choice but to manifest their dissatisfaction in such a way. This would be going too far simply for the reason of where would such end, if indeed there ever was an endpoint.

Economy alone cannot be divorced from other sociological constraints; if it had been then the riots would not have happened in some and not all areas. It would also be foolhardy to pass off the plethora of representations in the media of looters with their wide-screen televisions and trainers that these ‘particular’ riots were economically motivated, in fact looting occurs in all riots except that it is more visible on the streets.\(^4\)

**Rioting: A colourless crime?**

The issue of race and race relations is an important motivational factor behind the London riots. The initial protest started in Tottenham after a young black man Mark Duggan was shot by police officers. The anger and confusion that followed bore many similarities to the Broadwater Farm Estate riots of 1985 when a black woman Cynthia Jarrett suffered a stroke and died whilst police were conducting a search of her home. The rioting and looting that ensued and witnessed on television screens were scenes of young men, predominantly black, out on the streets once showing disdain against authority, and was were reminiscent of previous race riots. Whilst some analysts wrote about their frustration at what they referred to as the **reductio ad absurdum of government to talk about London riots as a race issue and not just an issue of criminality** others described race, culture and race relations as defining factors. Right wing historian David Starkey, controversially, said that the summer riots in London were a ‘black’ issue and blamed the ‘nihilistic gang culture’ predominant in black communities. Conversely, Darcus Howe, a leftist author, speaking on the BBC said that he wasn’t at all surprised by the riots in areas with a majority black population. Mr Howe even went as far as saying that ‘I don’t call it rioting, I call it an insurrection of the masses of the people’. Mr. Howe was evidently pointing towards underlying factors that caused discontent among BME groups, particularly young black men.

Although Starkey’s comments may be seen as too simplistic in nature and possibly stoking the flames of blame culture, the initial figures after the riots seemed to give credence to his views that the riots were led by BME groups. According to figures published by the Ministry of Justice, 58 per cent of those arrested and brought before court in relation to August riots were from BME groups. Rioters who identified themselves as black or from a mixed black background comprised 46 per cent and were overly represented in areas such as Haringey when compared to its resident population of the same age group.\(^6\)

Whilst figures suggest that the majority of those involved in rioting and looting were from a black or mixed black background, the research carried out by LSE and The Guardian highlights that the role played by gangs is significantly overstated.\(^8\) It is also important to consider that the areas in which most of the rioting took place were some of the most deprived 
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of London where black youths represent the relative population of the area.

Darcus Howe, as other leftist authors, alluded to underlying factors such as race relations and why there was so much resentment in young black groups against the police and authority in general. There have been calls to review the police powers of stop and search exercised in deprived areas as the racial profiling of BME groups by the police possibly leads to a perception of discrimination.

Both Scarman and Macpherson Reports were commissioned to specifically look at how the police engage with ethnic minority communities, however, the violence and anger amongst some youths during the August riots seemed to suggest that much work still needs to be done to improve race relations between Metropolitan police and members of BME groups.

The ‘feral’ underclass

Leftist commentators interpreted the vast criminality of the August riots as an uprising or awakening against the ruling classes. However, most of the areas targeted during the riots in London were poor with high rates of unemployment, as one blogger commented ‘that it is the lives of the poor in Tottenham and Haringey which were blighted by the riots, not the gated communities of Kensington and Chelsea’. Conversely, right wing thinkers suggest that many of those involved in the riots belonged to ‘the underclass’. A group of people typically classified as having no job, no aspirations of future achievement, low educational attainment and a dependency on state welfare.

According to Justice Secretary Ken Clarke, the rioters belonged to an underclass that is ‘feral’ in nature and cut off from the mainstream in everything but its materialism.

According to Justice Secretary Ken Clarke, the rioters belonged to an underclass that is ‘feral’ in nature and cut off from the mainstream in everything but its materialism. By using the term feral underclass, right wing thinkers completely disregard the leftist view that the rioters were led by a social or moral motive and instead substitute it with a motive of greed and criminality. Historically, the term feral underclass has been used to describe youth from poor communities that consists of both migrant and indigenous population who arm themselves with sticks and knives, who are nihilistic and amoral, resort to opportunist theft, muggings and looting to feed their materialistic desires and consumerism.

The fact that most of the rioting took place in deprived London boroughs and a significant proportion of rioters were in receipt of state benefits, for example of those arrested 35 per cent of adults were claiming out of work benefits compared to a national average of 12 per cent. This coupled with the statistic that 75 per cent of those over 18 who were charged following the riots had a previous criminal conviction give compelling reasons to believe the right wing view that these rioters fit the description of those belonging to the feral underclass.

However use of the term feral to describe most of those involved in the riots is problematic. Former Acting Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police Tim Godwin thought the term was unhelpful and that if the term was still being used to describe inner city youth then it was something for the City to reflect upon. Leftist thinkers also believe that by labelling a group of people as feral underclass and ignoring underlying social issues leads to further marginalisation and consequent unemployment, both of which can lie at the heart of youth criminality.

Conclusion

Without doubt the economic situation in England has made for sombre times, the latest cuts in spending has fed into a relative deprivation insofar as the poor will suffer greatest by these cuts whilst the rich are able to sustain. In this sense a deprivation theory could be

used to compare the growing gap between the rich and the poor, the deprivation however is relative because only certain areas of the country were affected by the riots — cities perceived to lack opportunities for people and have been affected strongly by the withdrawal of social services.

If it were to be suggested that economy alone is not to blame, London, the original stadium for the August riots continues to foster a polarisation between the rich and the poor. Those responsible for the rioting and looting offered what they believed an appropriate manifestation of their feelings of alienation and resentment. The fact that in many of the affected London boroughs, the rich and poor were living cheek by jowl like Clapham did nothing more than further rub salt into the wounds perceived by the poor.16

It is also important to remember that the initial protest started after a young black man was shot by the police in Tottenham. Although race may not be an exclusive cause of the rioting and looting that ensued, there is a history of race related riots in Tottenham and other London Boroughs. Underlying grievances in inner city areas still exist especially among young black groups at their treatment by the police with specific reference to the use of stop and search powers. Recommendations made by Scarman and Macpherson need to be fully implemented and lessons need to be learned in order to improve relations between minority ethnic groups and the police.

There is a strong case that the rioters originated from an underclass of people who not only find themselves disenfranchised from the rest of society but who have excelled in their own homogenous environment of crime and dependency. Use of the term feral has been regarded as extreme but so was the level and severity of criminal damage and violence, news images such as rioters pulling a motorcyclist from their bike in the middle of the road or someone helping a passer-by injured in the fray so as to distract him whilst others took from his backpack are acts nothing short of ferocious and brutal, indeed ‘feral.’ Though again labelling creates a perception of marginalisation, many of those interviewed who took part in the riots, were found to be highly articulate and politicised particularly when describing the problems they faced and their frustration due to perceived lack of opportunities.17

Whilst economy, race and class are all both separately and conjointly convincing in providing both Right and Leftist views for the August riots, the rational choice of those engaged to take part in such a sheer scale of lawlessness cannot be disregarded and could be suggested as the main driver for most of those who engaged in such wonton and shocking criminal behaviour.

Reviews

Book Review

International Perspectives on the Assessment and Treatment of Sexual Offenders: Theory, Practice, and Research
Edited by By Douglas Boer, Reinhard Eher, Leam Craig, Michael Miner, and Friedemann Prafflin
Publisher: Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell (2011)
Price: £110.00 (hardback)

The assessment and treatment of sexual offenders has been the subject of a burgeoning academic and policy literature since at least the early 1980s, first in community then later in prison based settings. While there have been research endeavours and interesting developments on both sides of the Atlantic — in the United States, as well as the United Kingdom and Europe — and throughout the rest of the world, there has been a distinct lack of publications with an international collaborative focus. This book is aimed at filling this specific gap in the literature. It contains key contributions from some of the best well known names in sex offender assessment and treatment, both academics and practitioners, and thus emerges as an international showcase of current assessment and treatment practices around the world. At the same time, however, it has lost none of its breadth or depth in terms of diversity in national or local practices.

The book contains thirty six chapters in total and is divided into five main parts. The first part sets out the critical context by posing pivotal questions relating to the efficacy of adult sexual offender treatment in reducing recidivism rates; underlining the contemporary importance of adult sexual offender assessment for legal as well as treatment processes; and concludes by examining the unique issues posed by the assessment and treatment of female sexual offenders as a challenge to the dominant paradigm of the adult male sexual offender. The second and third parts of the book pick up on some of the issues raised in the first part of the book by examining a diverse range of issues and applications which are central to current discourses on sexual offender assessment and treatment. These chapters explore the particular challenges presented by a range of offender types — adult and juvenile sexual offenders, male and females, offenders with intellectual disability and mental health issues, as well as the different offending contexts of rape, incest and the internet, and the importance of work with families as well as offenders.

A key feature of the third part of the book in particular is the inclusion of an assortment of treatment approaches which have been applied in a range of cultural settings such as South Africa, Denmark, New Zealand, Australia, Canada and the United States. Indeed, there are also several significant chapters on the importance of culture and context within sexual offender treatment more generally. These serve to highlight a further important but sometimes overlooked aspect of international discourses surrounding sexual offender assessment and treatment — that assessment and treatment contexts, much like offenders themselves, are not a homogeneous entity.

There is a wide variety in subject matter and a good balance of issues in terms of the individual focus of the substantive chapters. Several chapters, however, stand out for me chiefly in terms of their relevance to some of the key contemporary issues, not just within sex offender assessment and treatment specifically, but also within public and policy discourses on sexual offending more generally. These are all areas which, although of considerable current interest and meriting specific attention, not all have been subjected to rigorous debate. They include the issue of denial or minimisation by offenders and how this particular challenge might be addressed within assessment or treatment contexts; the use of pharmacotherapy and castration with sex offenders, particularly those who may be at risk of sexual offending; the potential cross-over between incest and extra-familial abuse, that is whether sex offenders are ‘generalists’ or ‘specialists’ or a mixture of the two; the role of the internet in sexual offending; and the controversial issue of institutional child sexual abuse within the Catholic Church and other youth organisations. It is the inclusion of these chapters in particular which will extend the book’s appeal beyond practitioners, academics and students in the fields of sex offender assessment and treatment. In this respect, the book will also be of broader relevance to those interested in some of the wider debates concerning responses to sexual crime and indeed to some of the key issues within contemporary popular discourses on crime and social problems more generally.

The fourth part of the book examines human rights and ethical issues and constitutes a further significant addition to a book of
this nature. In an age in which the primary criminal justice or penal response to sexual crime has been heavily premised on risk management and the need to protect the public from the ‘special risk’ that sex offenders are seen as posing, these chapters serve to redress the balance by drawing attention to the need to be mindful also of the offender’s needs, civil liberties and human rights. In this respect, the chapters on the use of pharmacotherapy and also on the latent consequences of community protection policies, such as sex offender registration and notification and residence restrictions, highlight the failure of such ‘risk-based’ approaches ultimately to prevent re-offending.

The final part of the book, addresses future developments in terms of the role of the International Association for the Treatment of Sexual Offenders (IATSO), key challenges and issues for the future, as well as ‘the promise’ of the ‘Dunkelfeld research’. This latter chapter in particular offers the prospect of unique insights into uncovering the different psychological and social processes of both detected and undetected offending processes and in so doing raises key issues for future prevention and treatment efforts. Having reviewed the evidence presented in the various chapters, the book poses several questions and possible solutions. The future of sexual offender treatment programmes in particular is presented in a rather sensible and pragmatic fashion in terms of a more ‘mixed approach’—combining cognitive behavioural therapy with behavioural and process issues; strengths and needs-based approaches with risk and deficits models; integrating pharmacological interventions as a mainstream rather than an adjunct treatment approach; and a greater emphasis on the heterogeneity of sexual offenders and individually tailored treatment programmes.

This book has much to commend it. In undertaking a book of this magnitude the editors have admirably accomplished an ambitious task. The breadth of subject matter on a diverse range of issues central to international contemporary discourses on sexual offender assessment and treatment will ensure that this book becomes essential reading for all those interested in issues pivotal to current thinking on sexual offending — academics, practitioners, policy makers and students. This is a thorough, comprehensive and welcome addition to the literature written by some of the foremost experts, drawn from a range of disciplines, in the field. While the book is specialised and state of the art, it manages to present itself nonetheless as a highly readable and accessible account of the current state of play as well as likely future developments in sexual offender assessment and treatment. As a result, this book seems set to become a key reference text in this field for some years to come.

The poem by Moira Mpanza composed and written for IATSO, and first delivered at an IATSO conference in Cape Town where I was also present, has lost none of its resonance. The poem is written in the first person and the editors in including this poem at the outset of the book have served to usefully remind us of two central principles: That the nexus of sex offender assessment and treatment is of course the offender. Moreover, ultimately, whatever the culture or context, our common goal in assessing and treating sex offenders, or indeed in writing about these processes, is to undertake to improve the efficacy of assessment and treatment discourses by empowering the offender (the ‘I’ in the poem) to make the right ‘choice’ in terms of developing pro-social behaviour. In producing and contributing to this book, the editors and chapter authors have advanced our progress, individually and collectively, towards this end.

Anne-Marie McAlinden is a Lecturer in Law at the School of Law, Queen’s University Belfast.
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Dovegate: A Therapeutic Prison in a Private Prison and Developments in Therapeutic Work with Personality Disordered Offenders
By Dr Eric Cullen and Dr Judith Mackenzie
Publisher: Waterside Press (2011)
ISBN: 978-1-904380-54-2 (paperback)
Price: £22.95 (paperback)

This is a hard hitting, fast moving description of a unique experience of setting up a Therapeutic Prison (with five therapeutic communities within it) in the private sector of prison delivery. There are layers and layers of complexity within that outline and Eric Cullen and Judy Mackenzie take us through those with insiders’ expertise that gives them a unique position to spill some of the beans about the process, the achievements, the risks involved in the massive undertaking and the continuing challenges and opportunities.

This is a book full of hope, backed with evidence, that there is a prison regime that can provide a chance for dangerous offenders of changing themselves in order not to have more victims. This hope is sustained by the commitment of hard pressed staff working to establish sound relationships of trust within a context of hearing the most horrific life stories and experiences.
It also depends upon the courage and perseverance of countless men who have seriously offended, to risk themselves in open discussion about the secrets and lies that have brought them to their sentence of punishment. Through this involvement it is possible for them to avoid feeling the victim of their experience and take responsibility for their past and present. The authors describe this process with great skill, insight and passion. So this book will help insiders of therapeutic work feel stronger in their commitment but will also provide for those not so convinced, as many colleagues in the Prison Service are, with a strong argument to look at the evidence of the outcomes of the work of therapeutic communities in prison.

The authors remind us of several key issues. It has been known for many years that there are many prisoners who would benefit from the therapeutic community experience — a task force in 1993 identified at least 2,400 when the prison numbers were half what they are now. It is also established through much research that the TC experience is the most effective in reducing reoffending with personality disordered offenders. The whole TC regime is accredited (uniquely) and thus has closely monitored and assessed procedures and processes for audit and inspection.

The advantages of privatisation of prisons were stated to be the potential for innovative systems to be established and there is certainly greater flexibility within Dovegate which the book explores. The capacity to alter systems and improve processes is impressive but the potential advantages in the dynamics of operating a set of therapeutic communities within a large Cat B Local prison have not been explored by management until very recently as the book describes. This may well be largely because the managers of the main prison for several years did not realise the implications of having such a specialised and sensitive group of treatment systems within the whole prison. It is with the conviction of the key prison manager that therapeutic communities work and have value that the potential for the placement within the bigger prison is being explored, developed and celebrated. The prison as a whole is beginning to celebrate the therapeutic communities rather than resent them and see them as prima donnas. This insiders’ view of the changes taking place to maximise the potential of the public investment in developing the prison and its regime is fascinating from authors who only late in their careers have worked for the private sector and who may have had misgivings about the ethics of the venture from the start. The issues concerned with privatisation are well explored by them.

The critical tension between the safety of the therapeutic communities and the need to meet the number of prisoners required in the contract to be paid appropriately has worried senior staff for years and the pressures to maintain numbers has led to dangerous levels of men not in therapy and causing staff stress as a consequence as well as poor audit and inspection results. That the therapeutic communities are recovering from a disastrous period of near collapse as bravely described is due to bold management understanding of the basic safety measure of building a culture of enquiry within the communities rather than seeing them as places to keep full. The demanding dynamics underlying the sensitive and potentially dangerous work when exploring people’s traumatic history together in community calls for well qualified staff, good levels of supervision so that they remain safe in their practice and a management that provides a setting of stability, responsiveness and understanding.

The timing of the publication of the book is helped by a recent review of prison therapeutic communities so that their function is focused on programmes for the personality disordered prisoners and their future looks more secure than at other times in the past. The authors gather strength from this fact and make bold recommendations that may seem challenging at a time of the resource neutral reconviction revolution. It is worth repeating some of these here. They propose -

- a third large TC in the north to complement Grendon and Dovegate
- ten 30-40 bed units in other prisons to match some of the current ones
- four TCs for drug offenders
- PIPES or psychologically informed planned environments to support prisoners as they approach resettlement priorities

This would result in 630 beds for independent democratic therapeutic communities, 400 beds for regional units, 220 for hierarchical units and developed principles in several other prisoners. All these within a context of continuing at Dovegate

- to explore the advantages of having the therapeutic prison within the main prison,
- improving the understanding within the main prison of the nature of the regime in a tc,
- developing the research programme to include an aspect of cost benefit over the years
- integrating more closely with other prison therapeutic communities
- extending the role of prison custody officers
- developing thinking behind the model of a DSPD stepdown regime
• developing a learning disabilities service for prisoners with low IQs or with autistic traits
• developing a sex offender unit to provide safe treatment setting for them
• moving the assessment and resettlement into the main prison and focusing the therapeutic opportunities on all the units with the TC.

You could not ask for much more in a book about a specialised regime in prison. There is enthusiasm for the subject, honesty in the description of the history of Dovegate’s therapeutic community enterprise, accessible description of the complexity involved in establishing safety when working with trauma, and boldness in recommending a future that should prove a rollercoaster for those involved.

Tim Newell is a retired prison governor, formerly Governor of HMP Grendon and Springhill 1991-2001.

In this book Susan Eaton, a Reader in Law at Brunel Law School, provides an introduction to the developments in prisoner rights over the last half a century in the UK, Netherlands and USA. The book is particularly distinguished as it examines the issues not only from a purely legal, jurisprudential perspective, but places these developments in their wider socio-political context and discusses the underpinning philosophical issues regarding the position of prisoners in society.

The book opens with a context-setting chapter which discusses the notion of the prisoner as citizen. This traces historical developments from prisoners being seen as non-citizens or ‘civil dead’, to the legal recognition that they retain those rights not necessarily forfeited as a consequence of imprisonment. The succeeding chapters discuss the historical development of prisoners’ rights in the three countries. Eaton discusses this development in the context of both wider social developments and emergence of international human rights standards, including the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, the European Prison Rules and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Subsequent chapters consider specific issues and provide a macro-study of the incremental development of prisoner rights through litigation. The issues include: prison conditions, procedural justice, contact with the outside world and the right to equality. Much of this will be familiar to those who have studied or worked in prisons in recent decades, for example the formalisation of prison discipline, the de-politicisation of indeterminate sentencing and access to family contact. There is a particularly interesting chapter on prisoners’ voting rights. It was during the 2005 general election campaign that the Hirst judgement was issued by the European Court, ruling that the blanket ban on convicted prisoners voting in the UK was unlawful. Lengthy public consultations and full-throated criticisms from within Parliament have followed, but still no change has been introduced. This chapter places the debate within an international and broader philosophical context. This careful analysis brings out the central importance of the issue and also strips away the emotion.

The closing chapter brings new light to contemporary public debates. Rights, human rights and international standards have been subject to considerable challenge over recent years. There have been proposals to balance rights with responsibilities, suggesting that they should be more conditional; and there have also been controversial public discussions about the importance of rights and whether they have been misused, trivialised or ridiculed. This book concludes by strongly supporting the rights-based approach for protecting those who are vulnerable and curbing the potential excesses of state power.

This discussion of prisoner rights is a welcome addition to the current literature and is particularly timely. By placing rights in their historical, philosophical and social context the book encourages a long-view that is essentially rational and progressive.

Book Review

Prisoners’ Rights: Principles and practice
By Susan Eaton
Publisher: Routledge (2011)
ISBN: 9781843928089 (paperback) 9781843928096 (hardback)
Price: £ 24.99 (paperback) £80.00 (hardback)

In this book Susan Eaton, a Reader in Law at Brunel Law School, provides an introduction to the developments in prisoner rights over the last half a century in the UK, Netherlands and USA. The book is particularly distinguished as it examines the issues not only from a purely legal, jurisprudential perspective, but places these developments in their wider socio-political context and discusses the underpinning philosophical issues regarding the position of prisoners in society.

The book opens with a context-setting chapter which discusses the notion of the prisoner as citizen. This traces historical developments from prisoners being seen as non-citizens or ‘civil dead’, to the legal recognition that they retain those rights not necessarily forfeited as a consequence of imprisonment. The succeeding chapters discuss the historical development of prisoners’ rights in the three countries. Eaton discusses this development in the context of both wider social developments and emergence of international human rights standards, including the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, the European Prison Rules and the European Convention on Human Rights.

Subsequent chapters consider specific issues and provide a macro-study of the incremental development of prisoner rights through litigation. The issues include: prison conditions, procedural justice, contact with the outside world and the right to equality. Much of this will be familiar to those who have studied or worked in prisons in recent decades, for example the formalisation of prison discipline, the de-politicisation of indeterminate sentencing and access to family contact. There is a particularly interesting chapter on prisoners’ voting rights. It was during the 2005 general election campaign that the Hirst judgement was issued by the European Court, ruling that the blanket ban on convicted prisoners voting in the UK was unlawful. Lengthy public consultations and full-throated criticisms from within Parliament have followed, but still no change has been introduced. This chapter places the debate within an international and broader philosophical context. This careful analysis brings out the central importance of the issue and also strips away the emotion.

The closing chapter brings new light to contemporary public debates. Rights, human rights and international standards have been subject to considerable challenge over recent years. There have been proposals to balance rights with responsibilities, suggesting that they should be more conditional; and there have also been controversial public discussions about the importance of rights and whether they have been misused, trivialised or ridiculed. This book concludes by strongly supporting the rights-based approach for protecting those who are vulnerable and curbing the potential excesses of state power.

This discussion of prisoner rights is a welcome addition to the current literature and is particularly timely. By placing rights in their historical, philosophical and social context the book encourages a long-view that is essentially rational and progressive.

Book Review

Police culture in a changing world
By Bethan Loftus
Publisher: Oxford University Press (2012)
ISBN: 9780199653539 (paperback) 9780199560905 (hardback)
Price: £ 19.99 (paperback) £55.00 (hardback)

In researching this book, Bethan Loftus interviewed 60 police officers and spent over 600 hours observing them at work. The result is an impressive and enlightening insight into contemporary police culture.

The book opens by setting out the classic works on police culture, which have identified a set of enduring predispositions and values
that have informed police work and shaped their working identity. These include: a preference for the action and excitement of crime fighting; intolerance and prejudice towards those who do not fit into the dominant white, male, heterosexual mould; a suspicious and cynical disposition; and, isolation, solidarity and conservatism. Loftus goes on to describe how it has been argued that a new social field of policing has emerged as a result of changes in policy and politics. She highlights moves to control police practice such as the extensive formalisation brought about by the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (1984), but also a demand for more punitive policing through ‘crackdowns’ and ‘zero tolerance’ policing. Other changes have included the increasing predominance of race and ethnicity in policing, with moves to improve the sensitivity and reduce discrimination. However, it has also been argued that increasing social and economic inequality has led to the growth of an underclass that the police have been enlisted to control.

The project that Loftus has undertaken is to use her extensive observations and interviews to explore how far the traditional elements of police culture have been maintained and reproduced; and to see how far they have been displaced by the wider social and organisational changes that have taken place. In doing so, Loftus is essentially exploring the essence of late modernity in the organisational context, with its series of dualities between local and global, traditional and modern, and agency and structure.

Her detailed work reveals that many aspects of traditional culture endure, in particular the preference for action, suspicion, isolation and conservatism. Many of the changes in relation to policing diversity have had some superficial impact, including managing domestic violence and being aware of the issues surrounding the disproportionate policing of minority ethnic groups. However, although policy changes sometimes constrained or enabled particular behaviours, there was still and undercurrent of prejudice, which played out in back-stage talk but also permeated into interactions and the use of discretion. Loftus also helpfully highlights the often unrecognised class dimension in policing, where police would focus on those areas or individuals who on the economic margins. These observations clearly tie the micro-aspects of police work with wider macro-level issues of power and domination. This was reproduced and reinforced both structurally in police priorities and resourcing but also at an individual level in the ways that officers understood and carried out their work.

This work provides a valuable insight into police work and wider organisational cultures in late modernity. In particular, the dialectical nature of contemporary practice is revealed, characterised as it is by a complex, dynamic interaction between local and global, traditional and modern, and between structure and agency. Loftus has produced an impressive work which will be essential reading for anyone with an interest in the police or wider organisational culture.

As a final word, it is worth acknowledging and recognising that the police supported and facilitated this research at some considerable organisational risk. The work will at times make unpalatable reading and could be used to criticise them. Nevertheless, it is an important work that has provided an insight and raised questions that would not be readily apparent without such in-depth research. Their commitment to a questioning and open approach deserves recognition itself.

*Jamie Bennett is Governor of HMP Grendon and Springhill.*
Interview: Tim Newburn

Tim Newburn is Professor of Criminology and Social Policy and Head of the Social Policy Department, London School of Economics (LSE). He is the author or editor of over 30 books, has particular research interests in policing and security, youth justice and on policy-making and policy transfer and, with David Downes and Paul Rock, is writing an Official History of criminal justice.

He is currently the leading academic on the Reading the Riots project; a collaboration between the LSE and The Guardian newspaper, exploring the disorder around English cities and towns in August 2011. The first part of this research involved interviews with 270 people involved in the riots. A short report based upon analysis of these interviews and an e-book of collected journalism were published in December 2011. This interview focuses on this project and the findings that have so far emerged.

JB: Can you describe the background to the Reading the Riots research: how was it developed, how was it funded and how was it conducted?

TN: It is a study being conducted collaboratively between the LSE and The Guardian newspaper. It arose from a phone call I received from a Guardian journalist. He’d probably called several Universities. He’d been heavily involved in the reporting of the riots and the newspaper had collected a lot of data. He said that The Guardian saw themselves as being at the forefront of new data-driven, open access journalism and they were looking at ways in which they might exploit this. Building on the example of work that had been done in the aftermath of the Detroit riots in the late 1960s, they wanted to partner up with a University and get involved in a piece of social research. We agreed that this could be mutually beneficial. It was exciting opportunity to do something different, producing social research quickly but rigorously and doing it in a way that had the best chance of having some impact on public and political debate.

At the time this conversation took place in mid to late August 2011, there was a lot of political conversation in the aftermath of the riots, and people were making all sorts of claims about what had happened and why it had happened and what kinds of people were involved. The Government had set its face against a full scale public inquiry, so we thought there was a gap. We couldn’t fill it all, but we could at least try to gather some data in a reasonably robust and reliable way which would serve the purpose of having some impact on the public debate.

After that there was a rush to the wire. We approached funding bodies that we knew or had some relationship with or thought might have an interest in this. In the event we raised funding from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation and from the Open Society Foundations. Simultaneously we put together a plan of action. The focus was to be on the rioters. We decided we would do in-depth qualitative interviews focusing on them, their lives and why they had got involved in the disturbances wherever that was. The view we took was that the difficulty would be finding people who would be willing to talk, who had been involved in the riots, who had engaged in activities that were criminal, who probably hadn’t been caught, arrested, charged or prosecuted. It was going to be difficult to get those people to talk to us in an open and honest way. We figured that the only way to do that was to recruit people who had a link with the communities affected, so that they had some background that would make them plausible and be potentially able to negotiate access. We advertised through The Guardian and had just under 500 applicants. We shortlisted 50 and selected 30. They were recruited for up to four weeks work; they were trained and then sent off with a topic guide for the interviews and a guide to the kind of people we were looking for. They then went out onto the streets of various communities in London, Birmingham, Manchester, Salford and Liverpool.

JB: Why did you consider it particularly important to listen to the views and experiences of those involved in the riots rather than those from similar backgrounds who didn’t get involved, or those that resisted the riots?

TN: We’ve had some criticism for this, but I think it is straightforward. In the aftermath of the riots, even though there wasn’t a Scarman-type inquiry, there was a series of investigations set in train. The Deputy Prime Minister announced the appointment of a Victims and Communities Panel chaired by Darra Singh, which was to go around the country talking to people who were living in communities affected by the riots and those who

suffered as a consequence of the riots. To a certain extent that angle was covered, although that doesn't preclude others doing further work. HM Inspectorate of Constabulary as well as the Metropolitan Police had both set in train their own inquiries into the policing of the riots. We felt they were important issues to study, but set that aside for the second phase. It seemed to us that the big gap was rioters. Lots of claims were being made about who these people were, what they had been doing, why they had been doing it, but there was little empirical evidence. To us, that was a big and obvious gap and we attempted to fill it. That is not in any way suggesting that the perspective of others was less important, merely that this was the place we thought we could make a difference at this stage.

JB: Various causes and explanations have been offered for the riots. In your study, a number of these were considered and I would like to explore them. The riots were originally sparked by the death of Mark Duggan in Tottenham? How far did this signal event explain the origins and spreading of the riots? Was this a specific protest about this death or otherwise, were the precursor to other events in previous years, it is looting. While looting has exclusion, and crucially, a degree of opportunistic greed. Here was an opportunity to take stuff, so people took it.

What we did hear from many people was a straightforward and rather unapologetic expression of desire, want, need and greed. Here was an opportunity to take stuff, so people took it.

JB: Let us explore some of those issues in more detail. Were there any other political dimensions in the motivations of those involved in the disorder? Was there any sense that they were resisting or revolting against social institutions?

TN: Not in a formal or organised way. I would be loathe to use the word ‘political’ myself. If one digs into the accounts, as we have started to do, what one finds is that certainly there is a sense of indignation, anger, resentment, a desire to rebel, but that was not at the forefront of people’s minds in the way that one would think of a more standard political protest.

JB: Are global explanations for the riots valid or were there local factors that shaped the way, manner or scale seen in August. People saw an opportunity, in the phrase that was used, to ‘get free stuff’.

JB: Many have also argued that consumerism and the acquisition of goods fuelled the disorder. These explanations ranged from assertions that those involved were greedy or opportunistic, whilst others have offered more complex explanations, seeing the riots as a form of resistance to the exclusion from consumer society. What did your interviewees have to say about these issues?

TN: We have heard all of those things in what they were saying. Certainly some of them did talk about conspicuous wealth and conspicuous consumption that they see all around them and that they, to some extent, are excluded from. That was in part an honest reflection of some of the feelings that they had, but the difficulty is that this is into the territory of ‘techniques of neutralisation’; that is potentially a post-hoc rationalisation of other forms of behaviour. What we did hear from many people was a straightforward and rather unapologetic expression of desire, want, need and greed. Here was an opportunity to take stuff, so people took it. That varied enormously, some of it was quite organised but more typically people found themselves out on the streets, became interested in what was going on and more or less stumbled upon an opportunity by seeing stuff lying around or seeing the shutters on shops pulled up, and for whatever reason not resisting.

JB: Various causes and explanations have been offered for the riots. In your study, a number of these were considered and I would like to explore them. The riots were originally sparked by the death of Mark Duggan in Tottenham? How far did this signal event explain the origins and spreading of the riots? Was this a specific protest about this death or otherwise, were the precursor to other events in previous years, it is looting. While looting has exclusion, and crucially, a degree of opportunistic greed. Here was an opportunity to take stuff, so people took it.

JB: Let us explore some of those issues in more detail. Were there any other political dimensions in the motivations of those involved in the disorder? Was there any sense that they were resisting or revolting against social institutions?

TN: Not in a formal or organised way. I would be loathe to use the word ‘political’ myself. If one digs into the accounts, as we have started to do, what one finds is that certainly there is a sense of indignation, anger, resentment, a desire to rebel, but that was not at the forefront of people’s minds in the way that one would think of a more standard political protest.

JB: Are global explanations for the riots valid or were there local factors that shaped the
initiation and conduct of disorder? Did the motives and methods of rioters vary from place to place?

TN: I don’t think there is a one size fits all explanation. The sets of explanations and motivations that we heard, encompassed anger, frustration with the police, social marginalisation and dislocation, low level rebellion against social institutions, greed and so on, we saw those things everywhere. They were present in all of the locations in which we did interviews and in which riots occurred. What you do get is a different mixture of those issues in different places. The most obvious ever-present issue that people talked about was anger, frustration and resentment towards the police. That was ubiquitous. However, one hears it and that plays out in slightly different ways in different locations.

JB: I want to explore some specific groups and issues that have been discussed. The first is gangs. How far did gang behaviour influence what happened, for example in mobilising and facilitating involvement, shaping where and how disorder took place, and creating a social climate in which disorder was tolerated?

TN: I’m not sure I can answer the third part of the question about the creation of a particular social climate. We do have some reasonable ideas about other parts of the question. It was clear that there was a strong political view in the early aftermath of the riots that gangs were central to what went on and the organisation of it; that they were the key precipitating and organising groups behind the riots. We know now, and broadly it is politically accepted, that this was not the case. That said, it would be wrong to go to the other extreme and say that gangs were not involved in what went on as clearly they were in a number of ways. The number of those involved who had some link with gangs was substantially less than initially suggested or suspected, but was nonetheless still a not insignificant minority. There were also some examples where organised groups were involved in various events in parts of the riots, so they were there and did play an occasionally important role. The crucial issue is that with or without the presence of gangs, this occurred in the way it did largely for other reasons. They were not the central organising force and were not a central explanation for what went on. The other issue that we pointed to, which came out strongly particularly in London, was the truce that occurred. Groups that would otherwise have been antagonistic towards one another, found a new common enemy during the riots. The hostilities ceased for the duration of the disturbances and groups that would normally have nothing to do with one another, became co-operative for that period of time.

JB: Was this about young men? What role did women have in what happened?

TN: I don’t think it is about young men. The proportions are difficult to know, but we reckon about 15-20 per cent of those involved in the riots were women, so they were a substantial presence. They were involved in many, if not most, of the activities, so it’s not reducible to issues of masculinity. More broadly women occupy an interesting role. One of the factors that played a role in restricting people’s involvement, or even prevented their involvement, was what their mother would think about it, or would do. This maternal involvement and control seems to have been significant for many people. Many who talked about what they did and didn’t do and where they did or didn’t go, talked about their mother, how it would be their mother who would pay the price. Not fathers interestingly. So, one of important facets of gendered roles here is the centrality of mothers as authority figures.

JB: Was this about race and ethnicity? Does this offer an explanation for why this happened, who was involved and what they did?

TN: The ethnic origin of those involved in the riots was broadly representative of the neighbourhoods in which they took place. Although on the surface, when one looks at ethnicity, it seems that there was a disproportionate number of young Black men involved, when one takes account of where the disturbances were taking place, that difference largely disappears. That is not to say race and ethnicity are not important, as they are still deeply inscribed in lots of the experiences being recounted. They were not necessarily unique to people from minority ethnic backgrounds, but they were experienced in particular ways. Nowhere was that more true than in relationships with the police. Although the anger and frustration was recounted by all, for those of African-Caribbean origin, this came with a particular history and one that was felt deeply.

JB: There was extensive discussion about the use of social media and instant messaging in facilitating the riots. In the cold light of day, what have you uncovered about this issue?

TN: The Guardian negotiated access to a huge database from Twitter, so there was a sizeable piece of
research carried out by colleagues at Manchester on this, looking at what was being said, who was saying it, what messages were being retweeted, and what the content was. The general conclusion was that there was not a lot of activity that could be described as organising or inspiring rioting. This was more about talking, discussing and reporting what was going on. In relation to any organising, it was deployed more for the clear up than anything else. What that did reveal was the nature of the media. It is open, as with Facebook, so it would be naive to organise criminal activity using that medium. In contrast Blackberry messaging (BBM) did seem to play a more significant role. The difference is that BBM is both private and encrypted so it was used more by those involved to organise activities. I am still wary about how that is interpreted. There is a question about to what extent it is just facilitating activity rather than organising it? However, the speed at which events unfolded were only able to occur because of new social media.

**JB:** Why did the riots stop when they did? Was it because of increased police presence, the start of the rain or those involved had achieved their aims?

**TN:** I don’t think it was the latter, partly because it was not that coherent. I don’t think people had aims. The nature of rioting is that it is inchoate, people have a mixture of motivations, many of which they are not clear about themselves. So, there was not a sense that they had achieved what they set out to do. There was a complex of events. In terms of bring the riots to an end, policing was important. From the accounts of rioters themselves, it appears that events unfolded as they did because there was a sense of absence of the police. Here was an opportunity to get away with things because the police weren’t there, or weren’t there in sufficient numbers or were there but didn’t appear to be doing anything about it. When the numbers increased that did have a profound impact on the willingness of some people to get involved or stay involved. Then there were the rumours about water cannon and plastic bullets. Though they may be ineffective in dealing with the fast moving events that took place in August, intriguingly a lot of people talked about the possibility that they might be used. I wouldn’t want to overplay this, but I have a sense that the circulating rumours and stories about the potential use of baton rounds and so on, may have deterred a few.

Two other things were significant. It sounds funny but the weather is always important and the rain did have some impact. The other issue is that there was a sense in some places that the events ran out of steam — it’s only possible to keep going with these things for so long. Two, three, four days of riots and for a lot of people, the energy ran out.

**JB:** There has been a lot of discussion about the sentencing of those involved. Some have argued for exceptional sentencing but others have criticised this as disproportionate. What would be your view on these issues?

**TN:** We have not had the opportunity to analyse the sentencing in sufficient detail to make a sensible judgement about the proportionality or appropriateness of what went on, but said that, I would make a few comments. First, there were some headline cases which worried people, in particular that substantial custodial sentences were being imposed on people for offences which would not normally attract such sentences or in some cases even any custodial sentence. But these are headline cases and it is not clear to what extent they were typical. Second, I do have some concerns about what appeared on the surface to be a refusal of bail, often for children. I would have some concerns about the extent to which that was a policy decision to do that. One final thing is that some people have rushed to judgement on the sentencing without recognising the complexity. In the early days, when the riots were ongoing, there was a sense amongst those in court that there was something out of the ordinary occurring and it was part of their role to make some contribution to the restoration of order. It is important to recognise this, and to look at what happened at that time separately from what happened subsequently.

**JB:** What are the most important lessons that should be learned from the riots?

**TN:** There is a not insubstantial group of often young people who feel socially marginalised, cut off from the mainstream. They are not afforded the opportunities that others have at least the prospect of enjoying. That marginalisation leads them to feel that they have little to lose. Socially that is worrying. We have people who feel they have so little to lose that they are willing to get involved in setting fire to buildings in which people are living, attacking police officers, setting fire to vehicles, stealing goods, ransacking shops and communities. That is at the forefront of my mind.

The second issue is that it did reinforce in my mind that we have a problem with policing. Stop and search is problematic. Leaving aside the important issues of proportionality, intelligence-led approaches, or whether stops are conducted in a polite way, the reality is that significant proportions of the population perceive themselves to be unfairly targeted. This perception is at
the heart of the matter. We are no closer to doing something about that and as long as we continue to fail to do so, one crucial aspect of police-community relations will not improve. The third issue is that I take from this that it is possible for academics and journalists to work together successfully to produce robust social research quickly.

**JB:** What does your work highlight about the potential for public criminology, in particular how co-ordination and co-operation between criminology and criminal justice policy can be developed?

**TN:** I have worked as a civil servant as well as an academic. I have been involved in what one might describe as policy relevant research, as well as having contact with policy makers over extended periods. I sit in the camp that sees policy making as a messy and complicated business. All too often there is a view that research evidence should necessarily play a central part in policy making but I see that as somewhat naive. What I would want to do is get social research out into the public domain in a way that at least allows the possibility that policy-makers might take it into account in decision-making. If it is there when these debates are taking place and these policies are being developed, then there is at least a chance that this will be one of a number of elements that will have an influence. What this work does highlight is the potential for doing research quickly and getting it out in a way that is useable.

**JB:** How will your research project be developed during its course?

**TN:** We are in the second stage now. The intention is that having looked at rioters in the first stage, we now want to look at others involved in or affected by the riots. We have a series of ‘community conversations’ taking place, the first of which took place this week in Tottenham and there are six more planned in various locations. They are taking aspects of the research back to the communities affected, talking about the research and allowing a conversation to occur in which people can talk about both the work and their experiences of the riots, what they think are the political and policy priorities. In research terms, we have been interviewing defence lawyers, we hope to interview sentencers and prosecutors about the experience and the nature of sentencing. We also want to focus on policing and want to interview officers at all levels who were involved in the policing of the riots in all the major cities that were affected. Our aim is to try to understand the riots through their eyes and from their perspective. We hope to be in a position to report on this second phase in May or June 2012.
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